

Title Page

Full title: A Randomized Clinical Trial Comparing Visual Inspection with Acetic Acid (VIA) to Pocket Colposcopy for the Triage of HPV+ women living with HIV in Kisumu, Kenya (162 characters)

Short Title: RCT Comparing Diagnostic Performance for cervical cancer screening (66 characters)

Author information: Mary E. Dotson (1,2); Eliza Steinberg (1,2); Maria Olivia Santos (1,2); Jeniffer Ambaka, (5); Megan Huchko MD MPH (3,4); Nimmi Ramanujam PhD (1,2)

1. Center for Global Women's Health Technologies, Duke University, Durham NC, USA
2. Biomedical Engineering Department, Duke University, Durham NC, USA
3. Duke Global Health Institute, Duke University, Durham NC, USA
4. Center for Global Reproductive Health, Duke University, Durham NC, USA
5. Kenya medical Research Institute, Kisumu, Kenya

Corresponding Author: Dr. Nimmi Ramanujam, nimmi.ramanujam@duke.edu

Disclaimers: The research conducted and described in this article are the original work of the authors.

Financial Disclosure: This RCT (NCT04998318) was supported by USAID-Development Innovation Ventures (DIV) under award #7200AA19FA00001

Clinical Trails Number: NCT04998318

Key words: cervical cancer screening; HPV-based screening, women living with HIV, digital health and Kenya

Competing Interests Statement: Dr. Nimmi Ramanujam is an advisor and Mary E Dotson is an employee of the Calla Health Foundation which have commercialized the Pocket Colposcope for distribution globally.

Corresponding Author: Nimmi Ramanujam PhD, +1-919-475-8358; 140 Science Drive Durham NC 27708

Author Contribution: NR and MH conceived the study design. All authors (MD, ES, MS, MH, NR) aided in the data collection, data analysis, writing and final review before submission.

Creative Commons License: All authors agree to publish this article under the creative Commons Attribution 3.0 IGO license.

Abstract

Objective: The World Health Organization recommends a “screen, triage, treat” approach for cervical cancer screening for Women Living with HIV (WLWH) in resource-limited settings, with Human Papillomavirus (HPV) testing preferred for screening. We assessed the use of the Pocket colposcope as an adjunct tool to Visual Assessment with Acetic Acid (VIA) for the triage of HPV+ WLWH.

Methods: We carried out a randomized clinical trial across six clinics in Kisumu, Kenya between November 2022 and April 2023 (NCT04998318). WLWH who screened positive with self-collected HPV were randomized to either the VIA or Pocket arm. Exam positivity was determined by presence or absence of aceto-white epithelium (AWE). Directed biopsies were performed on AWE; if negative, two random biopsies were taken. Pathology was used to determine diagnostic accuracy. Providers and participants took brief surveys after each exam.

Findings: The rate of a positive exams was 17.3% for VIA compared to 14.3% for the Pocket. The overall rate of CIN2/3 was 15.4%, with 12.2% in the VIA Arm and is 18.8% in the Pocket Arm. Pocket and VIA performed comparably on all sensitivity, specificity and negative predictive value (NPV). For Pocket compared to VIA, Sensitivity was 26.3% vs 25.0%; specificity was 88.9% vs 84.0%; and NPV was 82.9% vs 87.1%. However, the positive predictive value (PPV) of the Pocket colposcope arm was almost a factor of two higher than that of the VIA arm (Pocket arm PPV was

375 is and that of the VIA arm was 20.6%). The Pocket Colposcope was acceptable to providers and patients for clinic-based triage of HPV positivity.

Conclusion: Provider assessment with the Pocket colposcope detected significantly more treatable disease, thereby reducing the need for overtreatment. This study indicates that the Pocket colposcope is a feasible, lower cost colposcopic device, which could facilitate biopsy-confirmation of disease, increase provider training, patient education and facilitate remote diagnosis.

Introduction

Cervical cancer remains a global health challenge because effective prevention technologies are not accessible to most women around the world. Each year, almost 600,000 women worldwide are diagnosed with cervical cancer, and over 330,000 women die from the disease.(1) Invasive cervical cancer is highly preventable through vaccination for the human papillomavirus (HPV) or screening, diagnosis, and treatment of cervical precursor lesions.(2) The highly effective prevention methods that are the standard in most developed countries are not widely available in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) due to cost and infrastructure requirements. To avert deaths of up to 50 million women who will not have effective coverage from the vaccine in the next fifty years, the World Health Organization (WHO) recommends adoption of simplified screening technologies coupled directly with treatment.(3) One such strategy, molecular testing for HPV, has been shown to reduce the incidence and mortality from cervical cancer when coupled directly with outpatient ablative treatment for women with HPV-positive results.(4) However, this “screen & treat” approach leads to overtreatment with consequent burdens on both women and health care systems, and potential under-treatment of missed cancers.(5) These risks are increased among women living with HIV (WLWH), and as a result, the WHO recently updated their recommendations to include a triage step for this

population.(6) Kenya, a middle-income country with a high burden of cervical cancer and HIV, has also adopted guidelines that recommend HPV with a triage step prior to treatment.(7)

The currently recommended triage tests, colposcopy or visual inspection with acetic acid (VIA), are not effective solutions for HPV positive women in LMICs. Colposcopy with biopsy is the standard of care for positive screening tests in most high-income settings. Colposcopes are expensive and require a second visit to a referral facility, a trained provider, a pathologist, and a concurrent tracking system for patients, specimens and results. All these factors make colposcopy and biopsy an unrealistic triage method for many women in LMICs. VIA, a simpler and less expensive test, is often used instead. VIA involves applying acetic acid to the cervix, examining the cervix with the naked eye, followed by a diagnosis and treatment decision. VIA has high variability depending on provider experience, patient age, and size of lesion and has low sensitivity due to lack of adequate lighting and magnification.²⁻⁷ Because there is no ability to capture images with VIA, there is no mechanism for quality monitoring or opportunity for skills improvement.(8) (9) There remains a crucial need for a triage technique that is low-cost, easy-to-use and will accurately identify precancerous lesions.

To address these gaps, our team developed a low-cost, mobile colposcope, called a Pocket Colposcope.(10)(11) The device is powered by a cell phone which houses a software called the Calla Health App (CHA) through which patient information and corresponding images can be captured, stored, and transferred between health facilities or to remote specialists for diagnostic evaluation. The Pocket is inserted through a speculum and positioned at a short working distance (3 cm) to the cervix, obviating the need for high-end optics and high-resolution cameras used in long working distance (30 cm) standard Colposcopes. The Pocket Colposcope has image quality

comparable with standard colposcopes and has the capability to perform both white light imaging of acetic acid and green light imaging.(12)

The Pocket colposcope has been tested in more than 6 countries (most of which are LMICs), and has been successfully used by physicians, nurses, and clinical officers. The Pocket colposcope can be used to bridge the gaps in health care infrastructure and services. Specifically, it can be used by primary providers as an adjunct to improve visual triage for women who are HPV positive or can be coupled with biopsy and used as a lower cost replacement to colposcopy. The CHA software can provide linkages between providers and care facilities, facilitating remote diagnosis and reducing attrition to completion of care. Further, the images can be stored in a database that can be retrieved for training of deep learning algorithms which can be used to facilitate diagnosis either as a standalone tool or as an aid to a physical provider.

We sought to evaluate the effectiveness of the Pocket as an adjunct to visual inspection through a randomized comparison of diagnostic accuracy of standard VIA to that of the Pocket colposcope for the triage of HPV positive WLWH in Western Kenya (Figure 1). To evaluate implementation readiness, we compared provider and patient experiences with the VIA and Pocket. **Figure 1.** Pocket Colposcope and Calla Health App Integration.

Methods

Study Site

This study took place in 6 clinics providing HIV care in the Municipality of Kisumu, Kenya from November 2022 to June 2023. Kisumu is in the Nyanza Province in western Kenya, consisting of a population approximately 500,000 people. It contains both rural and urban households.

Study Design

We carried out an RCT to examine the diagnostic accuracy of the Pocket Colposcope as a triage tool for cervical cancer screening. WLWH were approached across six clinics to participate in HPV testing using self-collected cervical sampling. Upon receiving a positive HPV test result, women were recruited to the study if they were between 25 and 65 years of age and planned to undergo evaluation for treatment at the clinic following their positive HPV test result. Women were excluded if they declined to consent to the study, were pregnant, had a history of cervical cancer, or had a pelvic exam with concern for infection or invasive cervical cancer.

Women who consented to the study were randomized to either the standard-of-care (VIA) arm or the intervention (Pocket Colposcope) arm. For women in both study arms, providers applied acetic acid to the cervix and waited 60 seconds before visualizing the cervix for any aceto-whitened lesions. For women randomized to the standard-of-care arm, providers performed standard VIA. In the Pocket arm, providers used the Pocket Colposcope to visualize the cervix before and after acetic acid application and to capture images using both white and green light (Figure 2). **Figure 2.** Enrollment of 404 HPV+ women living with HIV, were randomized to receive the control arm (VIA) or the intervention arm (enhanced VIA using the Pocket Colposcope). An imbalance in participant numbers in each arm occurred due to a technical error in the randomization scheme.

In both arms, providers provided a diagnosis of either “positive” if they believed there was an area of aceto-white epithelium (AWE) present after a minute or “negative” if no changes were seen. Women in both arms had biopsies taken in areas with AWE, or if no AWE was visualized, providers took biopsies at two random locations. Per WHO recommendations all HPV screen-positive women eligible for ablative treatment received treatment in the clinic, regardless of the provider’s visual diagnosis.⁽⁷⁾ Participants who were suspected to have lesions too large to treat

(using VIA or Pocket), or areas with suspected invasive carcinoma were referred for treatment at an advanced care center. They were withdrawn from enrollment.

Following the exam, a member of the research team administered a questionnaire to assess the participant's experiences with VIA or the Pocket Colposcope, knowledge of cervical cancer before and after the exam, comfort, and pain during the exam, perceived confidence in the provider's diagnosis, and the likelihood of recommending the exam to a friend. Providers filled out surveys after each exam to assess their experiences with VIA or the Pocket Colposcope as it related to their ability to complete the exam, ability to make a diagnosis, perception of patient comfort, experience with patients sharing any discomfort, concerns, or pain during the exam, with opportunity for qualitative elaboration, and experience with any challenges during the exam.

Provider and Study Staff Training

Kenyan providers were trained on using the Pocket Colposcope and CHA using the "train the trainer" method. A clinical officer with 5 years of training and experience performing VIA partnered with staff from Duke University to provide clinical and device training to the KEMRI research assistants, nurses, and community health volunteers prior to the start of enrollment. The training covered basic HPV and Cervical cancer background best practices for VIA, the Pocket Colposcope (capturing high-quality images with the Pocket Colposcope) and CHA in clinical exams and optimizing clinic workflow. Following the in-person training, KEMRI study staff trained local providers on operating the Pocket Colposcope and the accompanying CHA app. Providers were clinical officers and nurses providing general outpatient and HIV-specific care in government of Kenya clinics. Study providers incorporated study visits into their regular clinical duties. Duke study staff maintained weekly calls with KEMRI research assistants throughout the course of the study to troubleshoot any issues.

Data Management and Analysis

All exam forms, participant and provider surveys, and cervix images were documented and saved in CHA on a mobile device and were later uploaded to a HIPAA-compliant online database. Histopathological results from cervical biopsies were later matched to each corresponding participant identification number. Data were analyzed using R (version 2022.07.02) to determine the concordance between provider diagnoses and histopathology. Histopathological results were used as the “gold standard” when calculating, sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) for provider diagnoses in each study arm. For participant and provider surveys, frequencies and percentages are presented for each answer choice.

Ethical Review

The study protocols, consent forms, and provider and patient questionnaires were reviewed by the institutional review boards of both the Kenya Medical Research Institute (KEMRI) and Duke University prior to study initiation.

Results

Demographics

Between November 2022 and April 2023, 2,794 women living with HIV screened for HPV, 503 (18%) tested HPV-positive, and 404 HPV-positive women were enrolled, randomized, and underwent triage with VIA (208) or the Pocket colposcope (196), which will be referred to the Pocket from this point on (Figure 2). The median age of the participants was 39 years old (IQR: 28-65). The largest number of patients were enrolled at Lumumba, a sub-county hospital with the greatest patient volume among the six clinics (Table 1). Majority of women had three or more children, approximately 50% of women had previously been screened for cervical cancer, and

approximately 60% used a contraceptive, most commonly an injectable or implant. **Table 1.** Demographic and clinical characteristics of HPV+ Women Living with HIV assigned to Pocket or VIA study arm.

Patient Diagnosis (Provider Visual Diagnosis and Histopathology)

In the Pocket arm, providers used the Pocket Colposcope to visualize the cervix before and after acetic acid application and to capture images using both white and green light (Figure 2). Only white light images were used to confer a diagnosis. The pre-acetic acid images as well as the green light images were captured for the purposes of algorithm development. It should be noted that at the time of data analysis, 388 out of 404 enrolled patients had processed biopsy results. The remaining 16 were lost during processing, resulting in a sample size of 196 and 197 for the Pocket arm and the VIA arm, respectively. The sample size in Tables 3,4, and 5 are consistent with that in Table 2. The percentage of a positive visual exam was 17.3% (95% CI = 12.4-23.1%) for the VIA arm compared to 14.3% (95% CI = 9.7-20.0%) for the Pocket arm ($X^2 = 0.48$, $p = 0.487$; Figure 3). The overall rate of CIN2/3 confirmed on pathology was 15.5%, with 24 cases (12.2%) in the VIA arm and 36 cases (18.8%) in the Pocket Arm. There was a high rate of CIN3 for both the Pocket and VIA arms (17.3% and 9.6%, respectively) (Figure 3; Table 2). Majority of biopsies were histologically diagnosed as negative (NILM) in both the Pocket and VIA arms (75.9% and 80.2%, respectively). **Figure 3.** Representative cervix images of HPV+ women living with HIV, imaged with Pocket Colposcope at each stage of cervical precancer (pathology confirmed). **Table 2.** Provider and histopathology diagnoses following exams with Pocket Colposcope or VIA.

The diagnostic characteristics were similar for VIA and Pocket with exception of the PPV. The sensitivity for correctly identifying CIN2+ (including CIN2, CIN3, SCC, and AGC) lesions was similar (26.3% vs. 25.0%, respectively; Table 3). The specificity of the Pocket arm was 4.9%

higher than that of the VIA arm (88.9% vs. 84%, respectively; Table 3). The NPV for the VIA arm (87.1%) was approximately 4% higher than that of the Pocket arm (82.9%). On the other hand, the PPV for the Pocket arm (37%) was almost a factor of two higher than that of the VIA arm (20.6%).

Table 3. Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) for provider visual diagnosis of the cervix, compared to pathology.

Provider and Participant Experience with Pocket Colposcope Compared to VIA

Study exams were carried out by 14 providers (Table 4). Each provider completed both Pocket and VIA exams based on which arm the patient was randomized to following consent. Majority of providers expressed “no challenges” during the exam for both procedures (96.0% and 97.1% for Pocket and VIA, respectively; Table 4). When using the Pocket, less than 1% of providers expressed difficulty with the internet, recording patient information/results, or perceived patient discomfort during a Pocket examination. Difficulty visualizing the patient’s cervix was expressed for 2.5% of Pocket exams compared to 0.5% of VIA exams. Additionally, providers answered that they were able to “complete the exam” and “make a diagnosis” for both the Pocket and VIA exams 100% of the time (Table 4).

A total of 190 women in the Pocket arm and 197 participants in the VIA arm completed the participant survey (Table 5). Almost all participants stated that the provider explained the importance of getting treated for cervical cancer and why they were either being examined by VIA or the Pocket (Table 5). Participants indicated little or no knowledge about cervical cancer and cervical cancer prevention prior to the exam, with majority expressing “none” or a “little” knowledge prior to the exam (Pocket: 94.8%, VIA: 95.9%). However, participants felt that their knowledge increased following the exam, with 81.0% of participants in the Pocket arm and 84.8%

of participants in the VIA arm stating that they knew “somewhat” or “very much” about cervical cancer and its prevention.

Providers answered that their patients shared their discomfort, concern, or pain during the examination with both the Pocket and VIA alone (27.7% and 26.9% respectively; Table 4). Consistently, majority of participants expressed little or no pain (Pocket: 93.2%, VIA: 92.8%; Table 5). Almost all participants in both arms stated that they were “somewhat” or “very much” confident about the providers’ assessment (Pocket: 96.8%, VIA: 97.4%) and similarly, most would “likely” or “very likely” recommend the exam to a friend (Pocket: 98.9%, VIA: 99.5%). **Table 4:** Post-exam Provider Pocket vs VIA Survey Question 8 and 10, full survey in Appendix. **Table 5.** Post-exam Female Participant Pocket vs. VIA Survey Responses, full survey in Appendix.

Discussion

We sought to compare the diagnostic accuracy of VIA to the Pocket colposcope through an RCT of HPV positive women living with HIV (WLWH) in western Kenya. The results of this study show prevalence of CIN lesions among HIV-positive women consistent with other studies.(13)-(14) The study arm that used the Pocket colposcope had similar sensitivity, and a slightly lower specificity and NPV compared to that of VIA; however, it had almost a factor of two higher PPV. In this scenario, the Pocket Colposcope aided providers in yielding a greater percentage of pathology-confirmed positive visual diagnoses compared to VIA, without sacrificing sensitivity, thus avoiding unnecessary treatment. Providers expressed satisfaction with the use of the Pocket colposcope and reported very few challenges with the additional technology such as internet access and documenting information/results of the exam on the CHA app.

Majority of participants were satisfied with the exams in both arms, including with their provider’s explanation of the procedures and in the provider’s assessment, and would recommend

the exam to a friend. They also expressed that their knowledge about cervical cancer screening and prevention increased after the exam. While very few participants reported pain during the survey, it is not surprising that a large percentage of women expressed some pain or discomfort during the exam, with no difference between arms. There are a number of studies that report that women fear the speculum-based exam and find that the speculum is painful and a deterrent for follow-up care.(15)(16)(17) The Pocket did not seem to add any additional discomfort or pain to the speculum exam.

VIA has been promoted as an effective strategy in low-resource settings because it is resource efficient and providers with limited colposcopy experience can be trained to complete the exam. One study in Kenya of WLWH showed that VIA had a sensitivity of 69.6% and specificity of 51% when CIN2+ lesions were used as the threshold.(14) Another study among WLWH in Kenya demonstrated VIA to have a sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV of 86.6%, 71.6%, 30.3% and 97.4%, respectively for CIN2+ lesions as the threshold(18) Finally, one study conducted among WLWH in Nigeria reported a sensitivity, specificity, and PPV of VIA to be 76%, 83%, and 34% respectively for CIN2+ lesions as the threshold. The specificity of VIA in our study (84.0%) was comparable to or in some cases better than what has been reported previously; however, sensitivity (25.0%) was substantially lower. This is likely because none of these studies included HPV screening. On the other hand, the PPV (20.6%) and NPV (87.1%) in our study were more comparable with that reported previously.(19)

It is important to highlight that in general, direct comparison between different studies and ours is difficult owing to different populations, study designs, device characteristics, and provider training. Therefore, comparison between different approaches within the same study can potentially reduce these inconsistencies. Several investigators have compared VIA based on the

unaided eye and imaging, as we have reported in this study. It is important to note that none of these studies were carried out on a HIV+ population. Comparison between VIA and the Cervioscope without HPV screening (a 13.6 MP Sony cyber shot camera) resulted in a sensitivity, specificity, PPV and NPV of 71.42%, 92%, 20%, and 99.1%, for VIA and 71.42%, 93.62%, 23.8%, and 99.1% for Cervioscope, when compared to histopathology.(20) Another study that compared VIA to digital colposcopy had different findings. The sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV were 62.5%, 98.8%, 90.9%, and 93.2% for VIA and 46.7%, 97.6%, 77.8%, 91%, for digital colposcopy, and similar to the case in the previous study, no HPV test was performed as a primary screening step.(21) Surprisingly, both sensitivity and specificity were lower for the imaging arm. In another study, one gynecologist in Madagascar was asked to complete VIA for HPV+ women and then smartphone images were sent to 3 expert colposcopists in Geneva for classification. Interestingly, the comparison of groups did not reach significance due to small sample size, but the results were suggestive of the potential of digital colposcopy.(22) It is expected that any two-step screening process, such as HPV followed by VIA or Pocket, will have a lower sensitivity than a single step process since we are able to more effectively reduce false positives.

The results from our RCT study showed consistently lower sensitivity of 25-30% in both the VIA and Pocket colposcope arms. Much of this decrement in sensitivity is the fact that the visual exams were performed as a triage step after an initial HPV test, compared to the cited studies in which the visual assessment was the primary screening exam. However, this study has provided much information about the need for improved provider training and continued feedback and mentorship on exam and diagnostic quality. Because we sought to test the Pocket in a real-world clinical setting in Kenya, we engaged providers with varying levels of colposcopic expertise and experienced a high rate of provider turnover unrelated to the study. This is further supported by

the fact that in our group’s previous studies, in which we found similar sensitivities and specificities between expert interpretation (by the same providers) of the Pocket colposcope and standard-of-care colposcope images (sensitivity and specificity was 79.8% and 56.6%, respectively for the standard of care colposcope and 71.2% and 57.5%, respectively for Pocket colposcope images).(12)

Ultimately, our study and those reported by others point to the importance of standardizing diagnostic interpretation, and there is a concerted effort in augmenting visual interpretation with machine learning algorithms. However, the ability to capture non-blurry images of all four quadrants of the cervix with minimal glare is equally important as any algorithm will be influenced by these factors.(23) A different study analyzing a portion of the data set used in the present study used an automated blur detection algorithm to assign binary categories of “Blurry” or “Clear” to each Pocket image.(24) This study found that an expert provider’s confidence in identifying a lesion was significantly higher in “Clear” versus “Blurry” images.(25) Another study assessing an automated diagnostic algorithm for cervix images taken with a mobile phone camera found that de-blurring images improved algorithm performance by 21.4%.(26) In addition to blur, other confounding factors, such as glare, can impact diagnostic interpretation. Robust, standardized, and continuous training on image interpretation and image quality will continue to be an important factor in the hands of less experienced providers. Automated methods/algorithms that provide real time or near real time feedback on the quality of the image during the exam can allow the provider to retake images, potentially improving quality control.

Overall, we found the Pocket Colposcope to be acceptable to providers and patients for clinic-based triage of HPV positivity in western Kenya. We did not find that Pocket colposcope substantially increased specificity or sensitivity over VIA when used as a visual adjunct alone

though PPV was significantly higher reducing overtreatment. However, this study does provide key data to support use of Pocket as a feasible, lower cost colposcopic device, which could facilitate biopsy-confirmation of disease. The Pocket can also be explored as a mode of increased provider training, patient education or a way to facilitate remote diagnosis. Finally, the images and image quality feedback can be used to inform algorithms for image improvement or automated algorithms for diagnosis of precancer.

Acknowledgments: The team would like to acknowledge the significant efforts of the Kenya Medical Research Institute (KEMRI). Jeniffer Ambaka, study coordinator, Saduma Ibrahim, Data Manager, Evans Obuto and the research assistants.

References

1. J F, I S, M E, R D, S E, C M, et al. GLOBOCAN 2012: Estimated Cancer Incidence, Mortality and Prevalence Worldwide in 2012 v1.0 [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 11]. Available from: <https://publications.iarc.fr/Databases/Iarc-Cancerbases/GLOBOCAN-2012-Estimated-Cancer-Incidence-Mortality-And-Prevalence-Worldwide-In-2012-V1.0-2012>
2. Comprehensive cervical cancer control. A guide to essential practice - Second edition [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 11]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789241548953>
3. Comprehensive cervical cancer prevention and control - a healthier future for girls and women [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 11]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789241505147>
4. Sankaranarayanan R, Nene BM, Shastri SS, Jayant K, Muwonge R, Budukh AM, et al. HPV screening for cervical cancer in rural India. *N Engl J Med*. 2009 Apr 2;360(14):1385–94.
5. Shastri SS, Temin S, Almonte M, Basu P, Campos NG, Gravitt PE, et al. Secondary Prevention of Cervical Cancer: ASCO Resource-Stratified Guideline Update. *JCO Glob Oncol*. 2022 Sep;8:e2200217.
6. New evidence on cervical cancer screening and treatment for women living with HIV [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 12]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news/item/12-12-2023-new-evidence-on-cervical-cancer-screening-and-treatment-for-women-with-hiv>
7. Viviano M, DeBeaudrap P, Tebeu PM, Fouogue JT, Vassilakos P, Petignat P. A review of screening strategies for cervical cancer in human immunodeficiency virus-positive women in sub-Saharan Africa. *Int J Womens Health*. 2017 Feb 2;9:69–79.
8. Vedantham H, Silver MI, Kalpana B, Rekha C, Karuna BP, Vidyadhari K, et al. Determinants of VIA (Visual Inspection of the Cervix After Acetic Acid Application) positivity in cervical cancer screening of women in a peri-urban area in Andhra Pradesh, India. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomark Prev Publ Am Assoc Cancer Res Cosponsored Am Soc Prev Oncol*. 2010 May;19(5):1373–80.
9. Lohiya A, Daniel RA, Kumar D, Varghese C, Rath RS, Abdulkader RS, et al. Effectiveness of Visual Inspection with Acetic Acid (VIA) Screening on Cervical Cancer Mortality and Incidence - A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev APJCP*. 2022 Feb;23(2):399–407.
10. Lam CT, Krieger MS, Gallagher JE, Asma B, Muasher LC, Schmitt JW, et al. Design of a Novel Low Cost Point of Care Tampon (POCkeT) Colposcope for Use in Resource Limited Settings. *PloS One*. 2015;10(9):e0135869.

11. Lam CT, Mueller J, Asma B, Asiedu M, Krieger MS, Chitalia R, et al. An integrated strategy for improving contrast, durability, and portability of a Pocket Colposcope for cervical cancer screening and diagnosis. *PLOS ONE*. 2018 Feb 9;13(2):e0192530.
12. Mueller JL, Lam CT, Dahl D, Asiedu MN, Krieger MS, Bellido-Fuentes Y, et al. Portable Pocket colposcopy performs comparably to standard-of-care clinical colposcopy using acetic acid and Lugol's iodine as contrast mediators – An investigational study in Perú. *BJOG Int J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2018 Sep;125(10):1321–9.
13. Sankaranarayanan R, Wesley R, Somanathan T, Dhakad N, Shyamalakumary B, Amma NS, et al. Visual inspection of the uterine cervix after the application of acetic acid in the detection of cervical carcinoma and its precursors. *Cancer*. 1998 Nov 15;83(10):2150–6.
14. Mabeya H, Khozaim K, Liu T, Orango O, Chumba D, Pisharodi L, et al. Comparison of Conventional Cervical Cytology Versus Visual Inspection With Acetic Acid Among Human Immunodeficiency Virus–Infected Women in Western Kenya. *J Low Genit Tract Dis*. 2012 Apr;16(2):92.
15. Rosser JI, Hamisi S, Njoroge B, Huchko MJ. Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening in Rural Kenya: Perspectives from a Provider Survey. *J Community Health*. 2015 Aug;40(4):756–61.
16. Nwankwo KC, Aniebue UU, Aguwa EN, Anarado AN, Agunwah E. Knowledge attitudes and practices of cervical cancer screening among urban and rural Nigerian women: a call for education and mass screening. *Eur J Cancer Care (Engl)*. 2011 May;20(3):362–7.
17. McFarland DM. Cervical cancer and Pap smear screening in Botswana: knowledge and perceptions. *Int Nurs Rev*. 2003 Sep;50(3):167–75.
18. Huchko MJ, Sneden J, Sawaya G, Smith-McCune K, Maloba M, Abdulrahim N, et al. Accuracy of Visual Inspection with Acetic Acid to detect Cervical Cancer Precursors Among HIV-infected Women in Kenya. *Int J Cancer J Int Cancer*. 2015 Jan 15;136(2):392–8.
19. Akinwuntan AL, Adesina OA, Okolo CA, Oluwasola OA, Oladokun A, Ifemeje AA, et al. Correlation of cervical cytology and visual inspection with acetic acid in HIV-positive women. *J Obstet Gynaecol J Inst Obstet Gynaecol*. 2008 Aug;28(6):638–41.
20. Singhakum N, Laiwejpithaya S, Chaopotong P. Digital Cervicography by Simply Portable Device as an Alternative Test for Cervical Cancer Screening in Rural Area of Thailand. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev APJCP*. 2018;19(4):1145–9.
21. Khodakarami N, Farzaneh F, Aslani F, Alizadeh K. Comparison of Pap smear, visual inspection with acetic acid, and digital cervicography as cervical screening strategies. *Arch Gynecol Obstet*. 2011 Nov;284(5):1247–52.
22. Ricard-Gauthier D, Wisniak A, Catarino R, van Rossum AF, Meyer-Hamme U, Negulescu R, et al. Use of Smartphones as Adjuvant Tools for Cervical Cancer Screening in Low-Resource Settings. *J Low Genit Tract Dis*. 2015 Oct;19(4):295–300.

23. Weiser R, Morgado F, Dias P, Fernandes K, Levitz D. Approaches to blur reduction in cervical images for automated visual evaluation. In: Optics and Biophotonics in Low-Resource Settings IX [Internet]. SPIE; 2023 [cited 2024 Jun 14]. p. 7–11. Available from: <https://www.spiedigitallibrary.org/conference-proceedings-of-spie/PC12369/PC1236907/Approaches-to-blur-reduction-in-cervical-images-for-automated-visual/10.1117/12.2651693.full>
24. Bhanurangarao M, Mahaveerakannan R. Improving Skin Lesion Diagnosis: Hybrid Blur Detection for Accurate Dermatological Image Analysis. In: Rajagopal S, Popat K, Meva D, Bajaja S, editors. Advancements in Smart Computing and Information Security. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland; 2024. p. 225–40.
25. Ekem L, Skerrett E, Huchko MJ, Ramanujam N. Automated Image Clarity Detection for the Improvement of Colposcopy Imaging with Multiple Devices [Internet]. Rochester, NY; 2024 [cited 2024 Jun 11]. Available from: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=4725066>
26. Mccutcheon J. The vanishing author in computer-generated works: A critical analysis of recent Australian case law. *Melb Univ Law Rev.* 2013 Jan 1;36:915–69.

Figure 1.



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.05.24316753>; this version posted November 5, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Figure 2.




Figure 3.




Table 1.

	Pocket Arm (n = 196)	VIA Arm (n = 208)	Total (n = 404)
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Age by category			
25-34	49 (25.0)	56 (26.9)	102 (25.2)
35-44	87 (44.4)	81 (35.2)	168 (41.6)
45-54	45 (23.0)	46 (21.1)	91 (22.5)
55-65	15 (7.7)	25 (10.1)	40 (9.9)
Clinic locations for screening			
Lumumba	68 (34.6)	70 (33.7)	138 (34.2)
Nyangande	27 (13.7)	28 (13.5)	55 (26.4)
Nyalenda	7 (3.6)	17 (8.2)	24 (5.9)
Rabuor	27 (13.7)	36 (17.3)	63 (15.6)

Hongo Ogosa	54 (27.6)	48 (23.1)	102 (25.2)
Gita	13 (6.6)	9 (4.3)	22 (5.4)

Parity

0	3 (1.5)	5 (2.4)	8 (2.0)
1	18 (9.2)	21 (10.1)	39 (9.7)
2	34 (17.3)	25 (12.0)	59 (14.6)
3	42 (21.4)	43 (20.7)	85 (21.0)
4	4 (20.4)	43 (20.7)	47 (11.6)
5 or more children	66 (33.7)	64 (30.8)	130 (32.2)
Answer not indicated	7 (3.6)	7 (3.4)	14 (3.5)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.05.24316753>; this version posted November 5, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Prior cervical cancer screening

Yes	103 (52.6)	104 (50.0)	207 (51.2)
No	86 (43.9)	97 (46.6)	183 (45.3)
Answer not indicated	7 (3.6)	7 (3.4)	14 (3.5)

Screening result for those who indicated having prior cervical cancer screening (above, n = 207)

	Pocket Arm (n=103) N (%)	VIA Arm (n=104) N (%)	Total (n=207) N (%)
Positive	3 (2.9)	2 (1.9)	5 (2.4)
Negative	96 (93.2)	100 (96.2)	196 (94.7)
I don't know	4 (1.9)	2 (1.9)	6 (3.0)

Contraceptive use

Yes	69 (35.2)	90 (43.2)	159 (39.4)
No	120 (61.2)	110 (52.9)	230 (56.9)
Decline to answer	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.2)
Answer not indicated	7 (3.6)	7 (3.4)	14 (3.5)

Type of contraceptives used for those who indicated using contraceptives (above, n = 159)

	Pocket Arm (n=69) N (%)	VIA Arm (n=84) N (%)	Total (n=159) N (%)
--	-------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

Injectable	13 (18.8)	8 (8.9)	21 (13.2)
Pills	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	1 (0.6)
IUD	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.6)
Female Sterilization	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.6)
Implant	16 (23.2)	26 (28.9)	42 (26.4)
Male Condom	4 (5.8)	6 (6.7)	10 (11.1)
Other	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Answer not indicated	34 (49.3)	49 (54.4)	83 (52.2)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.04.20316243>; this version posted November 5, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Table 2.

	Pocket Arm (n = 191)		VIA Arm (n = 197)		Total (n = 388)
	N (%) Total patients	N (% of pathology category) Correct diagnosis	N (%) Total patients	N (% of pathology category) Correct diagnosis	N (%) Total patients in both arms
NILM	145 (75.9)	132 (91.0)	155 (80.2)	133 (85.8)	300 (77.3)
CIN1	8 (4.2)	4 (50.0)	14 (7.1)	9 (35.7)	22 (5.7)
CIN2	3 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	5 (2.5)	3 (60.0)	8 (2.1)
CIN3	33 (17.3)	10 (30.3)	19 (9.6)	3 (15.8)	52 (13.4)
CIN2/3	36 (18.8)	10 (27.8)	24 (12.2)	6 (25.0)	60 (15.5)
SCC	2 (1.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (1.5)	1 (33.3)	5 (1.3)
AGC	0 (0.0)	N/A	1 (0.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)

At the time of data analysis, 388 out of 404 enrolled patients had processed biopsy results. The remaining 16 were lost during processing resulting in a sample size of 191 and 197 for the Pocket arm and the VIA arm, respectively. The sample size in Tables 3, 4, and 5 are consistent with that in Table 2. NILM = negative for intraepithelial lesion or malignancy; CIN1, CIN2, CIN3 = cervical intraepithelial neoplasia grades 1-3; SCC = squamous cell carcinoma; AGC = atypical glandular cells

Table 3.

	Pocket Arm (n = 191)	VIA Arm (n = 197)
Sensitivity	26.3%	25.0%
Specificity	88.9%	84.0%
PPV	37.0%	20.6%
NPV	82.9%	87.1%
<i>Positive pathology diagnosis = HSIL/CIN2, HSIL/CIN3, SCC, AGC</i>		
<i>Negative pathology diagnosis= NILM, LSIL/CIN1</i>		

Table 4.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.05.24316753>; this version posted November 5, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

	Pocket (n = 191) N (%)	VIA (n = 197) N (%)
8. Did any patient share their discomfort, concerns or pain during today's exam?		
Yes	53 (27.7)	53 (26.9)
No	138 (72.2)	144 (73.1)
10. Did you run into any of the following challenges during today's exam?		
No challenges	184 (96.3)	191 (97.0)
Difficulty with internet	1 (0.5)	N/A
Difficulty visualizing cervix	5 (2.6)	1 (0.5)
Difficulty recording patient info or results	1 (0.5)	0 (0)
Patient refusal	0 (0)	1 (0.5)
Patient discomfort	1 (0.5)	4 (2.0)

Table 5.

	Pocket (n = 190) N (%)	VIA (n = 197) N (%)
Did a provider explain why it is important to get treated for cervical cancer?		

	Pocket (n = 190)	VIA (n = 197)
	N (%)	N (%)
Yes	189 (99.5)	196 (99.5)
No	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)
Did a provider explain why they did today's exam with either the Pocket or VIA?		
Yes	189 (99.5)	197 (100.0)
No	1 (0.5)	0 (0.0)
Prior to today's visit, how much did you know about cervical cancer and cervical cancer prevention?		
None	41 (21.6)	43 (21.8)
A little	139 (73.2)	146 (74.1)
Somewhat	10 (5.3)	6 (3.0)
Very much	0 (0)	2 (1.0)
After today's visit, how much do you know about cervical cancer and cervical cancer prevention?		
None	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)
A little	35 (18.4)	29 (14.7)
Somewhat	137 (72.1)	139 (70.6)
Very much	17 (8.9)	28 (14.2)
Did you experience any pain throughout your exam?		
None	23 (12.1)	19 (9.6)
A little	154 (81.1)	164 (83.2)
Somewhat	13 (6.8)	14 (7.1)
Very much	0 (0)	0 (0)
How confident are you in the provider's assessment from today's visit?		
None	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)



	Pocket (n = 190)	VIA (n = 197)
	N (%)	N (%)
A little	6 (3.2)	5 (2.5)
Somewhat	54 (28.4)	56 (28.4)
Very much	130 (68.4)	136 (69.0)
Don't Know	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)

How likely would you recommend this medical exam to a friend?

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.05.24316753>; this version posted November 5, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Not likely at all	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5)
Not likely	2 (1.1)	0 (0.0)
Likely	43 (22.6)	37 (18.8)
Very likely	145 (76.3)	159 (80.7)


The participant survey was administered verbally directly following the exam with Pocket or VIA.



DECISION MAKING



POINT-OF-CARE
DIAGNOSTICS



AFFORDABLE



COMMUNICATION

Figure 2

Histopathology:

NILM

CIN 1

CIN 2

CIN 3

Pre-Acetic
Acid
White-light
Capture



Acetic Acid
White-light
Capture



Acetic Acid
Green-light
Capture




Figure 3




Figure 1