

1           Health worker acceptability of an HIV testing mobile health application  
2                               within a rural Zambian HIV treatment programme

3  
4   **Authors:** Andrés Montaner\*<sup>1, 3</sup>; Mulundu Mumbalanga<sup>2</sup>; Marie-Chantal Umuhoza<sup>2</sup>; Constance Wose  
5   Kinge<sup>1,3</sup>; Emeka Okonji<sup>1</sup>; Godfrey Ligenda<sup>4</sup>; Eula Mothibi<sup>1</sup>; Ben Chirwa<sup>2</sup>; Pedro Pisa<sup>1,5</sup>; Charles  
6   Chasela<sup>1,4</sup>

7   **Affiliations:** <sup>1</sup>Right to Care, Centurion, South Africa; <sup>2</sup>Right to Care Zambia, Action HIV, Lusaka,  
8   Zambia; <sup>3</sup>Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Faculty of Health  
9   Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand; <sup>4</sup>United States Agency for International Development  
10  (USAID), Zambia; <sup>5</sup>Department of Human Nutrition, University of Pretoria;

11

12

13   \* Corresponding author

14   Email: AndresM@gmail.com (Andrés Montaner)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33   **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.  
**Key Words:** Acceptability, Implementation Science, HIV Testing, Mobile Health, mHealth, Lynx

## 34 Author Contributions

35

36 The below table outlines the authorship roles and contributions to the submitted manuscript.

<b>Author</b>	<b>Contributor Role</b>
Andrés Montaner	Conceptualization, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Original Draft Preparation
Mulundu Mumbalanga	Investigation, Project Administration
Marie-Chantal Umuhoza	Project Administration, Resources
Constance Kinge	Methodology, Supervision
Emeka Okonji	Methodology, Supervision
Godfrey Ligenda	Funding Acquisition, Project Administration, Resources
Eula Mothibi	Writing – Review & Editing, Funding Acquisition, Resources
Ben Chirwa	Funding Acquisition, Project Administration, Resources
Pedro Pisa	Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing
Charles Chasela	Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing

37

## 38 List of Abbreviations

39 **AIDS:** Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome

40 **ART:** Antiretroviral Treatment

41 **GIS:** Global Information System

42 **HIV:** Human Immunodeficiency Virus

43 **KPI:** Key Person Interview

44 **NGO:** Non-Government Organisation

45 **PEPFAR:** President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief

46 **RTCZ:** Right to Care Zambia

47 **TAM:** Technology Acceptance Model

48

49

## 50 Definition of Terms

51 **mHealth:** Mobile health

52 **Modality:** Health facility care entrance point leading to HIV test (e.g. paediatric ward,  
53 antenatal care ward, inpatient ward, outpatient ward, index client intake)

54 **Tablet:** Mobile device through which a mobile application is utilised

55 **Yield:** % of positive tests in a given period (tests positive/total tests)

56

## 57 Abstract

58

### 59 Background:

60 As more people living with HIV are identified and prescribed antiretroviral treatment in  
61 Zambia, detecting new HIV infections to complete the last mile of epidemic control is  
62 challenging. To address this, innovative targeted testing strategies are essential. Therefore,  
63 Right to Care Zambia developed and implemented a novel digital health surveillance  
64 application, Lynx, in three Zambian provinces—Northern, Luapula, and Muchinga in 2018.  
65 Lynx offers real-time HIV testing data with geo-spatial analysis for targeted testing, and has  
66 proven effective in enhancing HIV testing yield. This cross-sectional mixed methods study  
67 assessed the acceptability of Lynx among HIV testing healthcare workers in Zambia.

### 68 Methods:

69 A quantitative Likert scale (1–5) survey was administered to 176 healthcare workers to gauge  
70 Lynx’s acceptability. Additionally, six qualitative key person interviews and five focus group  
71 discussions were conducted to gain an in-depth understanding of acceptability, and identify  
72 relevant barriers and facilitators. Quantitative data were analysed by averaging survey  
73 responses and running descriptive statistics. Qualitative data were transcribed and analysed in  
74 thematic coding. Data triangulation was utilised between the data sources to verify findings.

### 75 Results:

76 Overall, the average survey score of perceived ease of use was 3.926 (agree), perceived  
77 usefulness was 4.179 (strongly agree) and perceived compatibility was 3.574 (agree). Survey  
78 questions related to network requirements, resource availability, and IT support had the most  
79 “strongly disagree” responses. The qualitative data collection revealed that Lynx was perceived  
80 as useful, and easy to use. Training for staff and regular updates were identified as facilitators,  
81 while conflicting work priorities and inconsistent IT support were identified barriers.

### 82 Conclusion:

83 Lynx was identified as acceptable by health workers due to its perceived usefulness, staff  
84 trainings, and regular updates. For a mobile health intervention to be embraced in rural  
85 Zambian settings, key facilitators include robust IT support, comprehensive training, user  
86 feedback-based updates, and consideration of facility staff priorities.

## 87 Introduction

88 As of 2021, the global burden of HIV remains significant, with an estimated 37.7 million  
89 people living with the virus worldwide, and the African region continues to be the most  
90 affected, accounting for approximately two-thirds of new cases (1,2). Despite substantial  
91 progress in managing the HIV epidemic, more than 8.1 million individuals remain unaware of  
92 their HIV status, contributing to ongoing transmission and mortality, with 1.5 million new  
93 infections reported in 2020 (3,4). This underscores the critical importance of expanding HIV  
94 testing efforts.

95 Zambia has demonstrated remarkable strides in aligning with UNAIDS goals,  
96 particularly the ambitious 95-95-95 targets, aiming for 95% of all people living with HIV to be  
97 aware of their status, 95% of diagnosed individuals to receive sustained antiretroviral therapy  
98 (ART), and 95% of those on ART to achieve viral suppression by 2025(5,6). In 2021, 88.7%  
99 of adults living with HIV in Zambia were aware of their status, with 98% on ART and 96.3%  
100 achieving viral suppression (7). To reach the final milestone in identifying HIV-positive  
101 individuals, increasing testing has been identified as a pivotal strategy (8,9).

102 While mass testing and community outreach strategies have been instrumental in  
103 managing the HIV epidemic in Zambia, novel and efficient innovations such as index tracing  
104 and moonlighting are now being deployed by HIV treatment organisations to access harder-to-  
105 reach populations (10). The PEPFAR funded Zambian HIV treatment program, Right to Care-  
106 Zambia (RTCZ) has implemented the “Lynx” intervention, a mobile health (mHealth)  
107 application designed for targeted HIV testing. This application furnishes the HIV treatment  
108 programme with real-time HIV testing data aggregations, individual staff performance metrics,  
109 and geographic information systems (GIS) maps pinpointing targeted populations.

110 However, the success of such technological interventions hinges on the acceptance or  
111 “willingness to use” of their target users. Therefore, accounting for and ensuring high  
112 acceptability is crucial for maximising the application’s potential in improving targeted HIV  
113 testing efficiency (11). This study aims to evaluate the acceptability of the Lynx HIV testing  
114 mobile application among healthcare workers within a rural HIV treatment programme  
115 spanning three Zambian provinces. Acceptability is assessed through users’ perceived ease of  
116 use, usefulness, and compatibility, while also investigating barriers and facilitators to inform  
117 future implementation considerations. The goal is to enhance our understanding of how

118 healthcare providers engage with and perceive this innovative tool, optimising its integration  
119 into the healthcare system for more effective HIV testing strategies.

120

## 121 **Materials and Methods**

### 122 **Design**

123 The study employed a mixed-method, cross-sectional design, integrating both  
124 quantitative and qualitative research components involving public health workers. In the  
125 quantitative phase, a survey was utilised, adapted from a well-established and validated tool  
126 known as the technology acceptance model (TAM) (12,13). This tool comprises closed-ended  
127 questions designed to assess the acceptability of a given intervention, considering factors such  
128 as perceived ease of use, usefulness, and compatibility within a specific context. This survey  
129 draws on similar methodologies previously employed for assessing mHealth applications in  
130 sub-Saharan Africa, establishing its appropriateness for this study (14).

131 Complementing the quantitative approach, the qualitative component involved semi-  
132 structured key person interviews (KPI) and focus group discussions (FGD). These qualitative  
133 methods aimed to delve deeper into participants' perceptions and provide a richer and more  
134 nuanced understanding of their experiences with the intervention. The ensuing analysis  
135 incorporated data triangulation, reconciliation and validation of findings obtained from both  
136 quantitative and qualitative data collection methods.

137 This comprehensive mixed-method design ensures a multifaceted exploration of the  
138 acceptability of the intervention among public healthcare workers, offering a more holistic  
139 perspective that combines quantitative metrics with qualitative insights. Such an approach  
140 enhances the study's robustness and facilitates a more thorough comprehension of the complex  
141 dynamics surrounding the acceptance of the mHealth intervention in this public health context.

### 142 **Intervention Assessed**

143 In pursuit of optimising HIV testing programme resources through targeted testing,  
144 RTCZ has introduced an innovative HIV testing mHealth application in Zambia. This  
145 intervention is strategically aligned with the initial goal of the 95-95-95 targets, specifically  
146 focusing on HIV awareness. mHealth is meticulously tailored to adhere to the National  
147 Zambian HIV testing guidelines, serving as a comprehensive tool for both healthcare facilities  
148 and community-based HIV testing staff (15). This application is installed on mobile tablets and

149 digitally captures detailed patient testing information, including demographics, sexually  
150 transmitted disease (STD) and tuberculosis (TB) screening, GIS coordinates, client care point  
151 modality, HIV test kit details, HIV test results, and the completion time for testing and  
152 counselling.

153 The captured HIV testing data is then aggregated in a central online data warehouse,  
154 facilitating its review and analysis by the programme staff. Local staff engage in regular  
155 assessments, scrutinising demographic trends among HIV testing clients, evaluating facility  
156 entry points, appraising facility staff performance, and identifying GIS hotspots within the  
157 surrounding community. The overarching aim of this mHealth intervention is to enhance  
158 operational efficiency by streamlining the processing of in-depth patient information, thereby  
159 maximising available resources within Zambia.

160 Intervention sites were selected based on the HIV testing performance of facilities  
161 within the broader HIV treatment programme. Among the 168 HIV treatment facilities covered  
162 by the programme, a subset of 55 “priority facilities” emerged, contributing a significant 85%  
163 of the total newly identified HIV-positive clients. The mHealth intervention has been  
164 strategically implemented across all 55 priority facilities, distributed across Luapula (17  
165 facilities), Muchinga (21 facilities), and Northern (17 facilities) provinces. To ensure seamless  
166 integration, all HIV testing and treatment staff in these priority facilities have undergone  
167 thorough training and have been equipped with the mHealth application, paving the way for  
168 comprehensive utilisation.

## 169 **Setting**

170 RTCZ’s HIV care and treatment initiatives operate actively in the northeast region of  
171 Zambia, spanning Luapula, Muchinga, and Northern provinces. This geographical area is  
172 characterised by its rural nature, sparse population, and constrained resources. It is situated  
173 approximately 14 hours by car from the nation’s capital, Lusaka. Within this region, the HIV  
174 programme, serving as the backdrop for the research, extends support to a total of 168 public  
175 health HIV treatment facilities. These facilities encompass both primary and secondary care  
176 levels, collectively contributing to the comprehensive healthcare services delivered in this  
177 challenging and resource-limited environment.

## 178 **Participant Selection**

179 Data were collected at purposively sampled HIV treatment facilities. Most of the  
180 participant population is comfortable in reading and speaking English. All invitations were first

181 sent to facility heads and managers of the relevant health workers for approval. All HIV testing  
182 healthcare workers using the HIV testing application were invited to participate in the survey  
183 over email from January 1<sup>st</sup> to February 28<sup>th</sup> 2023. One HIV testing staff manager from two  
184 new random lottery selected facilities was invited in English from each province for six planned  
185 KPIs in November 2022, though only five were completed due to the unavailability of staff.

186 The largest facility of each province was invited to partake in the FGDs in November  
187 2022. Mansa General Hospital was invited in Luapula province, Nakonde Urban Health Center  
188 was invited in Muchinga province, and Mpulungu Urban Health Center was invited in Northern  
189 province. Three additional FGDs were conducted during data collection to ensure data  
190 saturation of the qualitative themes. Each discussion included all mHealth intervention staff  
191 from the facility. All potential participants were invited in English over email. The total number  
192 of participants for each collection method is outlined in Table 3.

193 *Table 1: Sample Sizes of Data Collection*

<b>Data Collection Tool</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>
Surveys (Quantitative)	176 persons
Key Person Interviews (Qualitative)	5 persons
Focus Group Discussions (Qualitative)	6 groups (31 persons)

194

## 195 Data collection

### 196 Quantitative

197 All identified survey participants received a link to the online survey with an implied  
198 consent participation form. The survey was anonymised, and self-administered in English on a  
199 user-friendly platform, REDCap. All healthcare workers had access to a computer with  
200 internet. The survey consisted of 15 statements written in plain English, four on the ease of use,  
201 four on usefulness, and seven on compatibility (Supporting Information 1). Participants were  
202 asked to rate their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale, where one was “strongly  
203 disagree” and five was “strongly agree”. Before data collection, the survey was reviewed and  
204 adapted by five local Zambian experts with experience in HIV care and treatment to ensure  
205 that the survey questions were comprehensible and perceived clearly. The adapted survey was  
206 then pilot tested with five users of the application from a randomly selected facility. Following  
207 the piloting, the participants regarded the tool as comprehensible, and relevant, and perceived  
208 the questions.



## 209 Qualitative

210 A semi-structured interview and group discussion guide (Supporting Information 2 and  
211 3) was developed to guide the KPIs and FGDs. Questions focused on participants' perceptions  
212 relating to barriers and facilitators of the application's compatibility, and ease of use and  
213 usefulness. KPIs and FGDs were conducted in English, on-site at the participant's facility and  
214 took 20–40 minutes. All participants provided written consent. Before data collection, the  
215 interview guide was reviewed and adapted by five local Zambian experts with experience in  
216 HIV care and treatment to ensure the interview questions were comprehensible and perceived  
217 clearly. The reviewed interview guide was then pilot tested with two users of the application  
218 from a randomly selected facility.

## 219 Data analysis

220 Survey data were inputted online through the REDCap platform and subsequently  
221 extracted into an Excel file for cleaning and analysis using R. Internal reliability and validity  
222 of the survey questions were assessed using Cronbach's alpha. The analysis focused  
223 exclusively on participants who had utilised the mHealth intervention (144 out of 176), with  
224 outliers identified and removed through z-scores. Utilising a Likert scale ranging from one to  
225 five, response averages fell within the range of 1.00 to 4.99. Each question received a mean  
226 score with standard deviations recorded, and responses were categorised into “agree” (averages  
227 3.00–3.99), “strongly agree” (averages 4.00–4.99), “disagree” (averages 2.00–2.99), and  
228 “strongly disagree” (averages 1.00–1.99).

229 The questions within each factor group were further averaged, accounting for standard  
230 deviations. To assess the significance of participant demographics on acceptability factors,  
231 Kruskal-Wallis and Wilcoxon rank sum tests were employed.

232 As for qualitative data, the KPIs and FGDs transcriptions underwent coding in  
233 MAXQDA, utilising both inductive and deductive coding methods based on themes related to  
234 perceived usefulness, ease of use, and compatibility. Codes were applied to segments of the  
235 text representing the beginning and conclusion of relevant topics or transition to another  
236 subject. These codes were then organised into themes associated with the acceptability factors.  
237 Data triangulation, comparing findings from each data collection tool, was employed to  
238 validate key insights and ensure consistency across the diverse data sources. This robust  
239 approach enhances the reliability and credibility of the study's findings.

240 Ethical Considerations

241 This study was approved by the University of the Witwatersrand Human Research Ethics  
 242 Committee (Medical) (Clearance certificate number M220720) and ERES Converge IRB in  
 243 Lusaka Zambia (Ref No. 2021-Oct-003). All participants were over 18 years of age, implied  
 244 consent was utilized for the anonymous online survey, and written consent was collected for  
 245 the KPIs and FGDs.

246

247 Results

248 Quantitative

249 Survey Participant Characteristics

250 Cronbach’s Alpha of the 15-item survey was 0.663. Table 4 outlines the socio-  
 251 demographic characteristics of the survey participants, the majority of whom are women, who  
 252 came from Luapula and Northern Provinces, and were aged 25–34.

253 *Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of Survey Participants*

	Luapula N (%)	Muchinga N (%)	Northern N (%)	Total N (%)
Sex				
Men	23 (33%)	3 (21%)	24 (39%)	50 (35%)
Women	46 (66%)	11 (79%)	37 (61%)	94 (65%)
Age Group				
18–24	4 (1%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	6 (4%)
25–34	23 (33%)	7 (50%)	24 (39%)	54 (38%)
35–44	13 (19%)	2 (14%)	13 (21%)	28 (19%)
45–54	16 (23%)	2 (14%)	10 (16%)	28 (19%)
55+	13 (19%)	3 (21%)	12 (20%)	28 (19%)
Total				
	69 (48%)	14 (10%)	61 (42%)	144

254

255 Acceptability of Lynx

256 Each statement has an averaged response score between 1.00 and 4.99. As shown  
 257 (Table 5), most of the responses averaged 3.00–3.99 “agree” followed by 4.00–4.99 “strongly  
 258 agree”. A review of the frequency of the strongest scores, “strongly agree/disagree”, in the  
 259 responses indicated that over 10% of respondents strongly agreed with 11/15 statements, and  
 260 over 10% of respondents strongly disagreed with 1/15 statements. These scores indicate that  
 261 the intervention was perceived as easy to use and useful to the HIV testing staff, but there were  
 262 factors, which could improve the compatibility with the context. These included issues related  
 263 to statements 9, 11, and 14 of Table 3. Statement 9, relating to reliance on network connectivity,

264 had the lowest response average of all questions, and the most “strongly disagree” responses.  
265 Statements 11 and 14 relating to healthcare workers’ adequate resources and support to  
266 complete the application at work also scored lower.

267 *Table 3: Survey Responses*

	Acceptability Factor	Question	Averaged (1–5) (SD)	Frequency of 1 “Strongly Disagree” (%n)	Frequency of 5 “Strongly Agree” (%n)
1	Perceived Ease of Use	Lynx is easy to use	4.242 (0.430)	0 (0%)	31 (21.5%)
2	Perceived Ease of Use	It was (not*) hard for me to learn to use Lynx	3.590* (1.132)	8*(5.5%)	21*(14.6%)
3	Perceived Ease of Use	The application layout is simple when moving between questions	4.16 (0.368)	0 (0%)	20 (13.9%)
4	Perceived Ease of Use	Whenever I made a mistake using Lynx, I could correct the mistake quickly and easily	3.721 (0.956)	1 (0.7%)	20 (13.9%)
5	Perceived Usefulness	Lynx is useful for my HIV testing practice	4.233 (0.425)	0 (0%)	28 (19.4%)
6	Perceived Usefulness	Lynx helped me manage my patient’s health effectively	4.000 (0.790)	0 (0%)	28 (19.4%)
7	Perceived Usefulness	Lynx improved my access to delivering health care [sic] services	4.175 (0.479)	0 (0%)	26 (18.1%)
8	Perceived Usefulness	Lynx has provided a helpful way to deliver healthcare services	4.129 (0.428)	0 (0%)	19 (13.2%)
9	Perceived Compatibility	I could use Lynx even when the internet connection was poor or not available	2.188 (1.085)	33 (22.9%)	4 (2.8%)
10	Perceived Compatibility	I think that Lynx fits well with the way I work	3.940 (0.794)	0 (0%)	21 (14.6%)
11	Perceived Compatibility	I have the resources necessary to use Lynx	3.407 (1.207)	12 (8.3%)	14 (9.7%)
12	Perceived Compatibility	I have the knowledge necessary to use Lynx	4.202 (0.447)	0 (0%)	24 (1.67%)
13	Perceived Compatibility	Lynx is not compatible (is compatible*) with the way I work	3.712* (0.962)	1* (0.7%)	18* (12.5%)
14	Perceived Compatibility	A specific person (or group) is available for assistance if I have difficulties concerning Lynx	3.661 (1.134)	11 (7.6%)	18 (12.5%)
15	Perceived Compatibility	If I had the opportunity, I prefer (not*) working on paper	3.492* (1.076)	4*(2.8%)	13* (9%)

268 \* Response scale of the question (2,13,15) was inverted to align with the overall scale of “5/strongly agree”  
269 indicating higher acceptability

270 Overall, statements under the “perceived usefulness” category had the most “strongly  
271 agree” responses, as well as slightly higher overall response averages as seen in Table 6.

272 *Table 4: Averaged Acceptability Factor Scores*

Characteristic	<i>N</i> = 144 <sup>1</sup>
Perceived Ease of Use	3.926 (0.436)
Perceived Usefulness	4.179 (0.422)
Perceived Compatibility	3.574 (0.467)

<sup>1</sup> Mean (SD)

273

274 Table 7 visualises the intervention’s three acceptability factors by province. All factors  
 275 scored over three, “agree” and “strongly agree”. Yet, across all provinces, the perceived  
 276 compatibility scored the lowest. Muchinga had the highest scores but also had the smallest  
 277 sample size (n = 14). The data set failed the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality resulting in the  
 278 use of medians, and the Kruskal-Wallis revealed none of the provinces to be significant on the  
 279 acceptability factors.

280 *Table 5: Survey Findings by Province*

Characteristics	Province			p-value <sup>2</sup>
	Luapula, N = 69 <sup>1</sup>	Muchinga, N = 14 <sup>1</sup>	Northern, N = 61 <sup>1</sup>	
Perceived Ease of Use	4.000 (0.500)	4.000 (0.500)	4.000 (0.500)	0.089
Perceived Usefulness	4.000 (0.500)	4.375 (0.500)	4.000 (0.000)	0.11
Perceived Compatibility	3.714 (0.429)	3.857 (0.429)	3.571 (0.536)	0.5
<sup>1</sup> Median (IQR)				
<sup>2</sup> Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test				

281

282 Both genders matched the trend of lower perceived compatibility of the intervention  
 283 compared to ease of use and usefulness as seen in Table 8. The Wilcoxon revealed neither  
 284 gender to be significant on the outcomes.

285 *Table 6: Survey Findings by Gender*

Characteristics	Gender		p-value <sup>2</sup>
	Male, N = 50 <sup>1</sup>	Female, N = 94 <sup>1</sup>	
Perceived Ease of Use	4.000 (0.500)	4.000 (0.500)	0.7
Perceived Usefulness	4.000 (0.750)	4.000 (0.250)	0.5
Perceived Compatibility	3.714 (0.571)	3.571 (0.571)	0.5
<sup>1</sup> Median (IQR)			
<sup>2</sup> Wilcoxon rank sum test			

286

287 Table 9 indicates a tendency among all age groups to score perceived compatibility  
 288 lower, but 18–24 also had lower scores overall. It is worth noting that 18–24 also had the  
 289 smallest group sample size (n = 6). The Kruskal-Wallis revealed none of the age groups to be  
 290 significant on the outcomes.

291 *Table 7: Survey Findings by Age*

Characteristics	Age Group					p-value <sup>2</sup>
	18–24, N = 6 <sup>1</sup>	25–34, N = 54 <sup>1</sup>	35–44, N = 28 <sup>1</sup>	45–54, N = 28 <sup>1</sup>	55+, N = 28 <sup>1</sup>	
Perceived Ease of Use	3.875 (0.313)	4.000 (0.500)	4.000 (0.500)	4.000 (0.500)	4.000 (0.500)	0.5

Perceived Usefulness	3.875 (0.438)	4.000 (0.250)	4.000 (0.000)	4.000 (1.000)	4.000 (0.500)	0.14
Perceived Compatibility	3.357 (0.286)	3.714 (0.429)	3.571 (0.571)	3.500 (0.714)	3.571 (0.643)	0.4
<sup>1</sup> Median (IQR)						
<sup>2</sup> Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test						

292

293

## 294 Qualitative

295 Six themes were identified concerning the acceptability of the Lynx intervention. These  
296 included efficiency gains, training, network/IT, feedback-based updates, community vs  
297 facility, and work priorities.

### 298 Efficiency Gains

299 The KPI and FGD findings revealed an overall perception that the Lynx innovation was  
300 easy to use and incredibly useful for a range of work benefits. The main healthcare uses  
301 highlighted were the live reporting function and the production of local GIS HIV testing maps.  
302 The HIV testing staff noted that Lynx allows for live programme reporting through the tablet,  
303 which saves data recording and submission times, and enables managers to see each staff  
304 member's work performance in real-time.

305 *"it [sic] has simplified matters because if we are using hard copies to send this information it would take a long*  
306 *time to reach you, and maybe in the process we lose [sic] the documents but this is instant, so it's good"* -  
307 *Kasama General health worker.*

308 *"Its [sic] not (difficult) ..... because paperwork is tedious and using paperwork you can easily lose the*  
309 *information"* - *Mpika Urban health worker.*

310 *"And the paper will pass through many people, our supervisor, the district in the process it may get lose [sic]*  
311 *and things like that so redo this, but this is just direct I think it's good"* - *Kasama General health worker.*

312 *"well [sic] no it's a good tool, it was effective, at time [sic] it could give us accurate information that we could*  
313 *get better results"* - *Luwingu District Hospital health worker.*

### 314 Training

315 While most participants perceived Lynx as easy to complete, it was clear that  
316 comprehensive training facilitated the HIV testing staff's ease of use of the application. Those  
317 who received training appreciated the capacity building and those who did not receive training  
318 expressed their desire to be trained.

319 *"For the first time it was quite difficult for me but when I got used to it, it was very nice"* - *Tazara Rural Health*  
320 *Clinic health worker.*

321 *“Lynx it is easy, so what can I say” - Lubwe Mission Hospital health worker.*

322 *“No no we did not train, I think that was the biggest challenge more [sic] especially with me because I am not*  
323 *too conversant with smart phones so some applications where [sic] difficult to use” - Mpika Urban health*  
324 *worker.*

325

## 326 Network and IT

327 Some participants faced a barrier to using Lynx due to network and IT challenges that  
328 come with rural community work. It was noted that IT repair times varied and could prevent  
329 HIV testing staff from using Lynx for weeks at a time.

330 *“For me since I was always based at the facility it was easy because of network [sic], except for the counsellors*  
331 *that [sic] were going in the field. Yes we have a bit of a challenge because you find that they have to be there*  
332 *and it can be something where you test somebody and you record but then you find that sometimes you don't*  
333 *have network [sic]., so, it's a bit of a challenge” - Mpepo Rural Health Clinic health worker.*

334 *“I think for me as well especially when the tablet is ok, there is no problem” - Kasama Urban health worker.*

335 *“When they take it to the office [for repair], but for those people to bring it back, it takes ages. That's the only*  
336 *thing” - Tazara Rural Health Clinic health worker.*

337 *“Lynx has stopped working as right [sic] now so that I can make a request to the office so they can bring us in*  
338 *[sic] the normal system so that Lynx would start working again, that is the biggest challenge I have seen.” -*  
339 *Lubwe Mission Hospital health worker.*

340 *“sometimes [sic] we need upgrading when you take these tablets to the office they are not done in time” -*  
341 *Kasama General health worker.*

342 *“he [sic] is just alone using the tablet so mostly he only captures the ones he has tested himself” - Chibansa*  
343 *Urban health worker.*

## 344 Feedback-based Updates

345 Several HIV testing staff noted that a previous update of the application further  
346 facilitated Lynx's compatibility and ease of use in their work setting. The update was based on  
347 user feedback.

348 *“At first, it was a bit difficult to use Lynx, because it was too long and the questions were too many” - Chibansa*  
349 *Urban health worker.*

350 *“Now that the questions have been simplified and some parts have been updated, ... it made the usage a little bit*  
351 *familiar and user friendly” - Chibansa Urban health worker.*

352 *“Today some of the questions have been removed. They are not necessarily because some are a duplication of*  
353 *information. But as it is now, it's ok” - Kasama Urban health worker.*

## 354 Facility vs Community

355 In general, the tablet application was described as compatible with rural settings, but  
356 there were different opinions on whether Lynx was a better fit for the community or the facility.  
357 Some counsellors prefer using Lynx in a more structured facility as opposed to using it in the  
358 community.

359 *“so [sic] you don’t have a place where you can properly work on the Lynx, unlike the facility, because at the*  
360 *facility obviously I will have a room where each client has privacy... and the client is sitting [sic] comfortable*  
361 *[sic] as I enter. For the community its [sic] different” - Mpepo Rural Health Clinic health worker.*

362 By contrast, for some, it was the lack of disturbance in the community that made the use of the  
363 app more feasible in the community.

364 *“in [sic] the community we are free, there are no disturbances but here some we are disturbed by people*  
365 *coming in this room coming in, come knocking knocking” - Lubwe Mission Hospital health worker.*

366 Additional concerns revolved around patient’s negative perceptions, and feelings of discomfort  
367 and distress with their information being captured into a tablet.

368 *“...where we are as a set up the clients would find it a bit rude when you are on the phone they would not*  
369 *understand that it’s the application that I am using, yes so it was a bit difficult” - Mpepo RHC health worker.*

370 *“That is what I am saying I am saying it’s the area, maybe in other places it might be different where these*  
371 *people are acquainted to [sic] electronics, but for [sic] here it’s kind of difficult it’s like you are on the phone*  
372 *you are not paying attention to the client (inaudible) hinder us in a way” - Mpepo RHC health worker.*

## 373 Work Priorities

374 A few of the HIV testing staff noted that the application required too much time to  
375 complete in a busy facility setting, especially since the staff are required to double capture the  
376 data into paper registers and the Lynx tablet. This challenge was often brought up about the  
377 previously mentioned training and IT challenges.

378 *“what she is saying [sic] maybe we are not in the ward, there is [sic] a lot of patients whom I need to do, to test,*  
379 *now that is a challenge for me to enter those clients in the Lynx because it take [sic] 45 minutes for me to*  
380 *complete a session because what we were told is that we should take 45 minutes for one clients [sic], so for me I*  
381 *don’t know” - Mansa General Hospital health worker.*

382 *“double [sic] capture which is more of time consuming [sic] in that way maybe Lynx could be consistently [sic]*  
383 *if we just use it that data are able to extract it from there of the same client” - Luwingu District Hospital health*  
384 *worker.*

385 *“when [sic] it’s a busy day he doesn’t enter directly on the Lynx application so that it quickens the process he*  
386 *would just use the hard copy to screen into and capture all the details that he needs to use” - Chibansa Urban*  
387 *health worker.*

388 *“especially with the facility like this there is too much work to do mostly we use registers” - Kasama Urban*  
389 *health worker.*

390 *“the [sic] only challenge that we have is time management, you know when you need to counsel a person and*  
391 *we need that information the client feels like you are delaying them, for us to do the exact way but the client*  
392 *feels you are delaying them. For an [sic] example if you ask this question you ask this one you ask this one, and*  
393 *they feel you are wasting their time” - Mansa General Hospital health worker.*

394

## 395 Discussion

396 This study aimed to evaluate the acceptability of a targeted HIV testing mobile  
397 application within a Zambian rural HIV treatment programme. The results indicate that a  
398 substantial majority of the participating HIV testing staff found the mHealth intervention  
399 acceptable within their setting. Survey findings underscored the strong perception of the  
400 intervention’s usefulness, ease of use, and compatibility with the demands of a rural HIV  
401 testing environment. Barriers and facilitators influencing the application’s use and overall  
402 acceptability were identified. Notably, no significant differences were observed between  
403 provinces, age groups, or genders among survey participants.

404 Qualitative data echoed the perceived usefulness of the intervention, emphasising the  
405 theme of efficiency gained through its implementation. While the GIS capability was  
406 acknowledged, the clear benefit highlighted by participants was the live digital data-capturing  
407 feature. Existing studies on data digitalisation and real-time reporting in healthcare underscore  
408 the efficiency gains associated with such technological advancements (16–18). Participants  
409 valued the instantaneous review of individual performance and the efficiency of digital data  
410 submission for HIV testing programme data.

411 The ease of use of the mHealth intervention was acknowledged by survey participants,  
412 aligning with the broader trend of healthcare workers in sub-Saharan Africa finding mobile-  
413 based interventions accessible (19). Training emerged as a critical facilitator, a well-established  
414 factor in the success of mHealth interventions, with repeated training sessions over time being  
415 suggested in some studies (20). Additionally, the study participants appreciated user-based



416 updates, ensuring the intervention's adaptation to their evolving contextual and work  
417 requirements.

418 Perceived compatibility differed between facility and community settings, with some  
419 participants expressing a preference for the structured environment of a facility, while others  
420 favoured the more flexible community work setting. These insights suggest the need for future  
421 investigations and consideration in design strategies, including tailored updates or training to  
422 address specific contextual challenges.

423 Despite overall positive perceptions of the application's potential, instances were  
424 reported where its use could make HIV testing clients uncomfortable or feel judged,  
425 particularly in rural communities. This finding suggests a need for nuanced strategies,  
426 incorporating new feedback-based updates, adapting the intervention to specific settings, or  
427 providing additional training to address contextual challenges.

428 Within facility settings, competing priorities and IT challenges emerged as barriers to  
429 consistent use. Some staff did not consistently prioritise the time to complete the application  
430 due to multiple demands during a work shift and data capturing requirements on different  
431 platforms. IT support, particularly issues related to internet reliance, power availability, and  
432 equipment functionality, surfaced as significant barriers. This emphasises the importance of  
433 clear IT support systems to overcome technical challenges and ensure sustained use. The study  
434 highlights the need for strategic placement of trained personnel onsite to assist with common  
435 IT challenges, particularly in settings where technical knowledge for maintenance remains  
436 limited despite the widespread adoption of mobile technology in Africa (19,21,22).

437 The study provides valuable insights into the acceptability of the targeted HIV testing  
438 mobile application within a Zambian rural HIV treatment programme. The findings emphasise  
439 the multifaceted nature of the challenges and opportunities associated with mHealth  
440 interventions, suggesting the importance of tailored strategies and ongoing support to enhance  
441 their effectiveness and acceptance within diverse healthcare settings.

442

## 443 Conclusion

444 The Lynx HIV testing application received favourable perceptions from HIV testing  
445 staff, who found it easy to use, compatible with a rural HIV programme, and incredibly useful.  
446 This study underscores the significance of providing comprehensive training for all users and

447 emphasises the crucial role of feedback-based updates to address evolving programme needs  
448 and user contexts. While the intervention has gained acceptance among its targeted users  
449 through effective training and updates, challenges persist, particularly concerning competing  
450 work priorities and consistent IT support.

451 Although acceptability is conventionally regarded as a user's perception and willingness  
452 to use an intervention, this study illuminates how acceptability levels can be influenced by  
453 contextual barriers or facilitators. Understanding these dynamics is vital for the RTCZ HIV  
454 treatment programme to navigate challenges and leverage facilitators effectively, enhancing  
455 the acceptability of the mHealth HIV testing intervention among its staff. By incorporating  
456 these findings on the barriers and facilitators of acceptability, the RTCZ programme can tailor  
457 strategies to boost acceptability levels, leading to improved outcomes in the implementation of  
458 the mHealth HIV testing intervention.

459

## 460 Acknowledgements

461 We express our gratitude to the study participants for their valuable contribution to the  
462 study as well as the Zambia Action HIV and Right to Care Organisations for their support in  
463 the study design.

464

## 465 References

- 466 1. Global HIV & AIDS statistics — Fact sheet | UNAIDS [Internet]. [cited 2022 Mar 30].  
467 Available from: <https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/fact-sheet>
- 468 2. WHO | Regional Office for Africa [Internet]. [cited 2022 May 4]. HIV/AIDS. Available from:  
469 <https://www.afro.who.int/health-topics/hiv/aids>
- 470 3. ReliefWeb [Internet]. [cited 2022 Mar 30]. Communities at the Centre: Defending Rights,  
471 Breaking Barriers, Reaching People with HIV Services - Global Aids Update 2019 - World.  
472 Available from: <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/communities-centre-defending-rights-breaking-barriers-reaching-people-hiv-services>  
473
- 474 4. De Cock KM, Barker JL, Baggaley R, El Sadr WM. Where are the positives? HIV testing in  
475 sub-Saharan Africa in the era of test and treat. *AIDS*. 2019 Feb 1;33(2):349–52.
- 476 5. AVERT [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2019 Jul 14]. HIV and AIDS in Zambia. Available from:  
477 <https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/sub-saharan-africa/zambia>
- 478 6. Frescura L, Godfrey-Faussett P, Feizzadeh A. A, El-Sadr W, Syarif O, Ghys PD. Achieving the  
479 95 95 95 targets for all: A pathway to ending AIDS. *PLoS ONE*. 2022 Aug 4;17(8):e0272405.

- 480 7. ZAMPHIA-2021-Summary-Sheet-December-2022 [Internet]. [cited 2023 Oct 3]. Available  
481 from: [https://www.cdc.gov/globalhivtb/what-we-do/phia/ZAMPHIA-2021-Summary-Sheet-](https://www.cdc.gov/globalhivtb/what-we-do/phia/ZAMPHIA-2021-Summary-Sheet-December-2022.pdf)  
482 [December-2022.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/globalhivtb/what-we-do/phia/ZAMPHIA-2021-Summary-Sheet-December-2022.pdf)
- 483 8. Mwango LK, Stafford KA, Blanco NC, Lavoie MC, Mujansi M, Nyirongo N, et al. Index and  
484 targeted community-based testing to optimize HIV case finding and ART linkage among men in  
485 Zambia. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020;23(S2):e25520.
- 486 9. Zambia - UNAIDS [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jul 24]. Available from:  
487 <https://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/zambia>
- 488 10. Kamanga J, Stankevitz K, Martinez A, Chiegil R, Nyirenda L, Mulenga F, et al. Improved HIV  
489 case finding among key populations after differentiated data driven community testing  
490 approaches in Zambia. *PLoS ONE.* 2021 Dec 2;16(12):e0258573.
- 491 11. Al-Youssef IY. Student Acceptance and Use of Internet-Based Distance Education in Saudi  
492 Electronic University (SEU): A Mixed Method Study. undefined [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2022  
493 Mar 17]; Available from: [https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Student-Acceptance-and-Use-](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Student-Acceptance-and-Use-of-Internet-Based-in-A-Al-Youssef/5022369db03c5372187a916dc5c49fc3ba01fab1)  
494 [of-Internet-Based-in-A-Al-Youssef/5022369db03c5372187a916dc5c49fc3ba01fab1](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Student-Acceptance-and-Use-of-Internet-Based-in-A-Al-Youssef/5022369db03c5372187a916dc5c49fc3ba01fab1)
- 495 12. Marangunić N, Granić A. Technology acceptance model: a literature review from 1986 to 2013.  
496 *Univ Access Inf Soc.* 2015 Mar 1;14(1):81–95.
- 497 13. Klingberg A, Sawe HR, Hammar U, Wallis LA, Hasselberg M. m-Health for Burn Injury  
498 Consultations in a Low-Resource Setting: An Acceptability Study Among Health Care  
499 Providers. *Telemed J E Health.* 2020 Apr 1;26(4):395–405.
- 500 14. Gous N, Fischer AE, Rhagnath N, Phatsoane M, Majam M, Lalla-Edward ST. Evaluation of a  
501 mobile application to support HIV self-testing in Johannesburg, South Africa. *South Afr J HIV*  
502 *Med.* 2020 Jun 30;21(1):1088.
- 503 15. Zambia-Consolidated-Guidelines2018.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2023 Nov 25]. Available from:  
504 [https://www.prepwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Zambia-Consolidated-](https://www.prepwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Zambia-Consolidated-Guidelines2018.pdf)  
505 [Guidelines2018.pdf](https://www.prepwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Zambia-Consolidated-Guidelines2018.pdf)
- 506 16. van Heerden A, Norris S, Tollman S, Richter L, Rotheram-Borus MJ. Collecting Maternal  
507 Health Information From HIV-Positive Pregnant Women Using Mobile Phone-Assisted Face-  
508 to-Face Interviews in Southern Africa. *J Med Internet Res.* 2013 Jun 10;15(6):e116.
- 509 17. Chin CD, Cheung YK, Laksanasopin T, Modena MM, Chin SY, Sridhara AA, et al. Mobile  
510 Device for Disease Diagnosis and Data Tracking in Resource-Limited Settings. *Clin Chem.*  
511 2013 Apr 1;59(4):629–40.
- 512 18. Owoyemi A, Osuchukwu JI, Azubuike C, Ikpe RK, Nwachukwu BC, Akinde CB, et al. Digital  
513 Solutions for Community and Primary Health Workers: Lessons From Implementations in  
514 Africa. *Front Digit Health.* 2022 Jun 3;4:876957.
- 515 19. Aranda-Jan CB, Mohutsiwa-Dibe N, Loukanova S. Systematic review on what works, what  
516 does not work and why of implementation of mobile health (mHealth) projects in Africa. *BMC*  
517 *Public Health.* 2014 Feb 21;14:188.
- 518 20. Haberer JE, Kiwanuka J, Nansera D, Wilson IB, Bangsberg DR. Challenges in using mobile  
519 phones for collection of antiretroviral therapy adherence data in a resource-limited setting. *AIDS*  
520 *Behav.* 2010 Dec;14(6):1294–301.

- 521 21. Leon N, Schneider H, Daviaud E. Applying a framework for assessing the health system  
522 challenges to scaling up mHealth in South Africa. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 2012 Nov  
523 5;12(1):123.
- 524 22. Ag Ahmed MA, Gagnon MP, Hamelin-Brabant L, Mbemba GIC, Alami H. A mixed methods  
525 systematic review of success factors of mhealth and telehealth for maternal health in Sub-  
526 Saharan Africa. mHealth. 2017;3:22.
- 527

## 528 Supporting Information

### 529 S1 Lynx Acceptability Survey

530

531 Facility: \_\_\_\_\_

532 Please select one answer for each question. For questions with the 1-5 scale select based on if you  
533 agree or disagree with the statement, 1 being strongly disagree up to 5 bring strongly agree.

534

535 Gender:

536 Man Woman Other

537

538 Age Group:

539

540 18-25 26-35 36-45 46-55 56+

541

#### 542 Perceived Ease of Use

543

544 1. Lynx is easy to use

545 1 2 3 4 5

546 2. It was easy for me to learn to use Lynx

547 1 2 3 4 5

548 3. The application layout is consistent when moving between questions

549 1 2 3 4 5

550 4. Whenever I made a mistake using Lynx, I could correct the mistake easily and quickly

551

552 1 2 3 4 5

553

#### 553 Perceived Usefulness

554 5. Lynx is useful for my HIV testing practice

555 1 2 3 4 5

556 6. Lynx helped me manage my patient's health effectively

557 1 2 3 4 5

558 7. Lynx improved my access to delivering health care services

559 1 2 3 4 5

560 8. Lynx has provided an acceptable way to deliver healthcare services

561 1 2 3 4 5

#### 562 Perceived Compatibility

563

564 9. I could use Lynx even when the internet connection was poor or not available

565 1 2 3 4 5

566 10. I think that using Lynx fits well with the way I like to work

567 1 2 3 4 5

568 11. I have the resources necessary to use Lynx

569 1 2 3 4 5

570 12. I have the knowledge necessary to use Lynx

571 1 2 3 4 5

572 13. Lynx is not compatible with the way I work

573 1 2 3 4 5

574 14. A specific person (or group) should be available for assistance with difficulties  
575 concerning Lynx

576 1 2 3 4 5

577 15. If I had the opportunity, I prefer working on paper

578 1 2 3 4 5

579 *This is the end of the survey, thank you for your participation.*

580

581

582

583 S2 Key Person Interview Guide

584 *Note to researcher: questions are not to be completed in particular order but can be*  
585 *completed based on the natural progression of the dialogue*

586  
587 Usefulness and Usability of Lynx application

- 588 1. What is your experience of using the Lynx system?  
589 a. Probe on: outputs of Lynx (testing services, testing strategies)  
590 b. Probe on: why positive or negative  
591 2. How does the Lynx mobile capturing process differ from the traditional paper-  
592 based capturing?  
593 a. Probe on: resources required and available for each  
594 b. Probe on: time of capturing process, effect of time use (more or less)  
595 c. Probe on: benefits or weaknesses of Lynx instead of paper  
596 3. How difficult is it to complete Lynx data capturing?  
597 a. Probe on: time required  
598 b. Probe on: resources (network, power)  
599 c. Probe on: software difficulty (education and training)

600  
601

602 Compatibility for completing client capturing on Lynx

- 603 4. Can you discuss the conditions in which it is more easy and more difficult to  
604 complete Lynx capturing?  
605 a. Probe on: different work settings (rural or urban, facility or community)  
606 b. Probe on: staff objectives and support  
607 5. What could be improved to increase compatibility?  
608 a. Probe on: software and hardware of application  
609 b. Probe on: work setting

610

- 611 6. Do you have any final comments on your experience using Lynx?  
612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619 S3 Focus Group Discussion Guide

620 *Note to researcher: questions are not to be completed in particular order but can be*  
621 *completed based on the natural progression of the dialogue*

622  
623 Usefulness and Usability of Lynx application

- 624 1. What is your experience of using the Lynx system?  
625 a. Probe on: outputs of Lynx (testing services, testing strategies)  
626 b. Probe on: why positive or negative  
627 c. Probe on: why one participant's experience is different  
628 2. How does the Lynx mobile capturing process differ from the traditional paper-  
629 based capturing?  
630 a. Probe on: resources required and available for each  
631 b. Probe on: time of capturing process, effect of time use (more or less)  
632 c. Probe on: benefits or weaknesses of Lynx instead of paper  
633 d. Probe on: why one participant's experience is different  
634 3. How difficult is it to complete Lynx data capturing?  
635 a. Probe on: time required  
636 b. Probe on: resources (network, power)  
637 c. Probe on: software difficulty (education and training)  
638 d. Probe on: why one participant's experience is different  
639  
640

641 Compatibility for completing client capturing on Lynx

- 642 4. Can you discuss the conditions in which it is more easy and more difficult to  
643 complete Lynx capturing?  
644 a. Probe on: different work settings (rural or urban, facility or community)  
645 b. Probe on: staff objectives and support  
646 c. Probe on: why one participant's experience is different  
647 5. What could be improved to increase compatibility?  
648 a. Probe on: software and hardware of application  
649 b. Probe on: work setting  
650  
651 6. Do you have any final comments on your experience using Lynx?  
652




653 S4 University of Witwatersrand Ethical Clearance Certificate



R14/49 Mr Andres Luis Larson Montaner

**HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (MEDICAL)**

**CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE NO. M220720**

**NAME:** Mr Andres Luis Larson Montaner  
**(Principal Investigator)**  
**DEPARTMENT:** School of Public Health  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Health worker acceptability of an HIV testing mobile health application within a rural Zambian HIV treatment program  
**DATE CONSIDERED:** 29/07/2022  
**DECISION:** Approved unconditionally  
**CONDITIONS:**  
**SUPERVISOR:** Prof Pedro Pisa and Prof Charles Chasela  
**APPROVED BY:**   
Dr CB Penny, Chairperson, HREC (Medical)  
**DATE OF APPROVAL:** 04/10/2022

This clearance certificate is valid for 5 years from date of approval. Extension may be applied for.

**DECLARATION OF INVESTIGATORS**

To be completed in duplicate and **ONE COPY** returned to the Research Office Secretary on the Third Floor, Faculty of Health Sciences, Phillip Tobias Building, 29 Princess of Wales Terrace, Parktown, 2193, University of the Witwatersrand. I/we fully understand the conditions under which I am/we are authorized to carry out the above-mentioned research and I/we undertake to ensure compliance with these conditions. Should any departure be contemplated, from the research protocol as approved, I/we undertake to resubmit the application to the Committee. **I agree to submit a yearly progress report.** The date for annual re-certification will be one year after the date of convened meeting where the study was initially reviewed. In this case, the study was initially reviewed in **July** and will therefore be due in the month of **July** each year. Unreported changes to the application may invalidate the clearance given by the HREC (Medical).

  
Principal Investigator Signature


04/10/2022  
Date

PLEASE QUOTE THE PROTOCOL NUMBER IN ALL ENQUIRIES

654

655

656 S5 ERES Converge Zambia Ethical Clearance Certificate



Plot No. 272, Cnr Olive Tree Meerwood Road,  
Meerwood Ibex  
Lusaka - Zambia  
Tel: +260 955 155 633  
+260 955 155 634  
Cell: +260 977 493 220  
Email: [eresconverge@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:eresconverge@yahoo.co.uk)  
I.R.B. No. 00005948  
F.W.A. No. 00011697

---

19<sup>th</sup> September, 2022.

**Ref. No. 2021-Oct- 003**

The Principal Investigator  
Dr.Cheswa Vwalika  
Plot 22877 leopards Hill Road, Ibex Hill  
LUSAKA


Dear Dr. Vwalika

**RE: AMENDMENT, RENEWAL, END OF YEAR AND 6 MONTHS PROGRESS  
REPORT FORM: END TERM EVALUATION OF THE EXTENDING  
QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (EQUIP)**

We would like to acknowledge receipt of your end of year progress, 6 months and Amendment report dated 15<sup>th</sup> September, 2022.

The study is extended for another year. The new expiry date is 14<sup>th</sup> September, 2023.

Yours faithfully,  
**ERES CONVERGE IRB**



Dr. Jason Mwanza  
Dip. Clin. Med. Sc., BA., M.Sc., PhD  
**CHAIRPERSON**

657

658

659