Table of Contents

S1(a) Table: HIVST distribution strategy details - No comparison group

Study	Method of identifying seeds	Method of identifying network members	Role of social network	HIVST Delivery Method	Who distributed HIVST	Where HIVST delivered	How HIVST delivered	Testing choice offered	Testing support	Additional intervention components
Kitenge 2022	At PHCs, lay counsellors invited all users to participate. At community-based testing sites, CHWs introduced the study to all individuals visiting these sites.	PRs distributed HIVST kits to their sexual partner, family members or anyone in their social network who was above 18 years old.	Accessing the hard to-reach & Diffusion	Secondary	Lay counsellors or community health workers to peer to social network	Social network	In person	No	Instruction on use	No
Kwan 2023	Seed participants were recruited from various internet platforms, including social media platforms, a web-based forum, and location-based networking apps used by MSM.	Seed MSM participants invited their peers.	Accessing the hard to-reach & Diffusion	Secondary	Web-based platform to participants to social network	Online	Mail	Yes (finger-prick or oral fluid test)	Real-time support, including in-person, video call, and instant messaging support, at kit request.	Monetary incentive (To encourage return, an incentive of HK $20 (US $2.56) was given after manual verification of the result.)
Lippman 2018	Participants were recruited from all HIV-negative MpMS.	Participants shared the kits with sexual partners and others with whom they felt safe distributing kits	Accessing the hard to-reach & Diffusion	Secondary	HCW to participants to social network	social network	In person	HIVST (oral fluid or blood)	All participants were shown a demonstration on how to use both the oral fluid and fingerstick HIV self-tests.	No

Study	Method of identifying seeds	Method of identifying network members	Role of social network	HIVST Delivery Method	Who distributed HIVST	Where HIVST delivered	How HIVST delivered	Testing choice offered	Testing support	Additional intervention components
Li S 2021	6 key opinion leaders of MSM disseminated an HIVST recruitment advertisement to invite MSMs	IPs shared the HIVST service links on social media with their sexual partners and friends.	Accessing the hard to-reach & Diffusion	Online & mail	HIVST application link for phone app to index to alter	Online	Mail	No	HIV posttest consultation	Monetary incentive (US $2 was paid to participants who uploaded their test results)
Matovu 2020	Community residents selected one peer-leader per social network grouping	Peer-leaders distributed kits to eligible social network members.	Promote HIVST and increase linkage to HIV care among newly diagnosed HIV-positive individuals	Community -based	HCW to Peer-educators to social network	In community	In person	No	Peer-leaders received a training on oral HIV self-testing processes; basic counselling, communication and referral skills; and how to approach social network members at the time of distributing the kits;a practical demonstration of how the HIV self-testing exercise is conducted.	No
Nasuuna 2022	Recruitment of KP peers and pregnant and lactating mothers	HIVST was implemented using peer-to-peer model for KPs and secondary distribution for partners of consenting pregnant and lactating mothers.	Accessing the hard to-reach & Diffusion	Secondary	peer-to-peer/HCW to participants to partner	In community	In person	No	3-day trainings prior to distribution of HIVST kits. Education on how to use HIVST kits was provided in the local language	Phone call (Mothers and peers were asked to confirm delivery of the kits to recipients through a phone call.)

Study	Method of identifying seeds	Method of identifying network members	Role of social network	HIVST Delivery Method	Who distributed HIVST	Where HIVST delivered	How HIVST delivered	Testing choice offered	Testing support	Additional intervention components
Nguyen 2019	KPs and their partners were offered HIVST by peer-educators	Community-led outreach and social networks were used to promote HIVST.	Promote HIVST and follow-up with self-testers	Community-based	HCW to Peer-educators to KP and their partners	In community	In person	Self-testers were given the choice to test with or without assistance.	Assisted HIVST	No
Nguyen 2019	KPs and their partners were offered HIVST by peer-educators	Both in-person and social network methods were used to mobilize key populations to test for HIV and offer HTS to partners of people living with HIV.	mobilize key populations to test for HIV and offer HTS to partners of people living with HIV	Community-based	HCW to Peer-educators to KP and their partners	In community	In person	Yes: lay provider-delivered rapid testing / HIVST	Peer educators were trained to conduct rapid testing, perform and demonstrate self-testing, provide pre-test information and post-test counselling, and deliver aPN.	No
Thirumurthy 2016	HIV-uninfected women aged 18–39 years were recruited at a health facility with antenatal (ANC) and postpartum (PPC) clinics, and a drop-in center for female sex workers (FSW).	Male partners HIV-uninfected women	Increased coverage of HIV testing services for partners and the odds of partners being linked to care or prevention	Secondary	HCW to women with high HIV incidence to their sexual partners	Partners among HIV-uninfected women	In person	No	Instructions on using the OraQuick Rapid HIV 1/2 Test and telephone support	No

Study	Method of identifying seeds	Method of identifying network members	Role of social network	HIVST Delivery Method	Who distributed HIVST	Where HIVST delivered	How HIVST delivered	Testing choice offered	Testing support	Additional intervention components
Wu D 2021	MSMs were recruited from a social-media based online system	Index MSMs distributed the kits to other social contacts, including partners or friends	Accessing the hard to-reach & Diffusion	Secondary	HIVST application link for phone app to index to alter	Social network	Mail	No	Instruction on use and HIV post-test consultation	Monetary incentive (US$3 was provided to all participants who completed a questionnaire.)
Zhang J 2021	Participants were recruited from MSM in the ongoing PrEP pragmatic trial	Participants shared HIVST with their male sexual partners.	Increased coverage of HIV testing services for partners and the odds of partners being linked to care or prevention	Secondary	HCW to participants to partner	partners among MSM	In person	No	A service account on WeChat provided web-based services on the application of extra testing kits, instructions on self-testing, real-time consultation with the staff, uploading of test outcomes, and follow-up questionnaires.	Daily or on-demand PrEP
Zishiri 2022	Antenatal care (ANC) clinic attendees and people or those newly diagnosed with HIV clients were given HIVST kits.	Clinic attendees distributed HIVST kits to their partners.	Increased coverage of HIV testing services for partners and the odds of partners being linked to care or prevention	Secondary	HCW to participants to partner	In community	In person	No	Instructions and demonstration of how to use	No

S1(b) Table: HIVST distribution strategy details - Comparison group

Study	Method of identifying seeds	Method of identifying network members	Randomization method	Role of social network	HIVST Delivery Method	Who distributed HIVST	How HIVST delivered	Testing choice offered	Testing support	Additional intervention components	Comparison
Chanda 2017	Recruitment of current or former FSWs as peer educators	Participants were recruited by peer educators.	Peer educator–participant groups were randomized as clusters in a 1:1:1 fashion to 1 of the 3 study arms	Diffusion & Impact on risk and health behaviors	Facility & secondary by peer	HCW to Peer-educators to participants	In person	No	Instructions for use and telephone support	NA	Routine facility-based HIV testing
Choko 2019	Women aged 18 years and older attending an ANC at primary care clinics, whose primary male partner was not known to be on ART were recruited.	Women were given an invitation letter addressed to their male partner informing them of the importance of having an HIV test	We block randomized ANC days (representing clusters of women) to 1 of 6 trial arms (standard of care [SOC] and 5 intervention arms; ratio 1:1:1:1:1:1).	Increased coverage of HIV testing services for men and the odds of men being linked to care or prevention	Secondary	HCW to participants to partners	In person	No	Instructions for use	Monetary incentive ($3, $10, and a phone reminder)	Routine facility-based HIV testing
Choko 2021	Eligible women attending ANC were enrolled into the ANC clinic cohort and people newly diagnosed with HIV during routine clinic HIV testing were enrolled into the index cohort.	Eligible women provided with materials and brief training for their male partner. Index patients delivered materials to all sexual contacts over the past 12 months.	Restricted randomization (blocking) was used to randomize the 27 clusters to three arms in a ratio of 1:1:1, with district and HIV prevalence in ANC as the variables for restriction.	Accessing the hard to-reach & Diffusion	Secondary	HCW to participants to partner	In person	No	Instructions and demonstration of how to use	Monetary incentive	Routine facility-based HIV testing

Study	Method of identifying seeds	Method of identifying network members	Randomization method	Role of social network	HIVST Delivery Method	Who distributed HIVST	How HIVST delivered	Testing choice offered	Testing support	Additional intervention components	Comparison
Dovel 2019	Individuals living with HIV and on ART were recruited during routine ART clinic visits.	Partners of ART clients	Computer-generated randomization was used to assign clients to either the PRS or HIVST arms in a ratio of 1:2·5, respectively.	Increased coverage of HIV testing services for partners and the odds of partners being linked to care or prevention	Secondary	HCW to participants to partner	In person	No	Instructions and demonstration of how to use	NA	Routine facility-based HIV testing
Frye 2021	Recruitment was conducted via online advertising, face-to face outreach and referrals by study participants.	Participants completed an online contact card and sent a link to a friend.	Participants were randomized as friend pairs in a 1:1 ratio into either the TRUST intervention or the time- and attention-matched control intervention arm using assignments generated by the study data analyst using Sealed Envelope Ltd.	Impact on risk and health behaviors. TRUST was designed to increase uptake of consistent (every three months) HST among YBMSM/TW in New York City.	Direct	HCW to participants	In person or Mail-in	No	Instructions for use and peer-based behavioral intervention	Monetary incentive	Time and attention control arm
Gichangi 2018	The health facility nurse identified women attending first ANC and referred them to the trained study nurse.	Partner distribution in community	Participants were individually randomized into 1 of the 3 study arms.	Increased coverage of HIV testing services for men and the odds of men being linked to care or prevention	Secondary	HCW to participants to partners	In person	No	Instructions for use	Advise on partner negotiation and communication	Standard information card to invite male partners to the clinic for routine or HIV care

Study	Method of identifying seeds	Method of identifying network members	Randomization method	Role of social network	HIVST Delivery Method	Who distributed HIVST	How HIVST delivered	Testing choice offered	Testing support	Additional intervention components	Comparison
Joseph 2022	Recruitment of WLHIV who were attending HTS, HIV care/treatment services or antenatal care services by the research team and clinic staff	WLHIV`s male partners	Participants were randomized 1:1 using a random number table by participant identifier (ID)	Increased coverage of HIV testing services for men and the odds of men being linked to care or prevention	Secondary	HCW to participants to partner	In person	No	Instructions for use and telephone support	NA	Routine facility-based HIV testing
Lightfoot 2018	The peer recruiters were identified from HIV-related support groups, local gay bars, online social networking and dating apps, community-based organizations, and word of mouth.	The peer recruiters distributed OraQuick oral fluid HIV test kits to friends who they believed were AAMSM or LMSM, age 18–45, and had not tested in the last year.	N/A	Peers, who were most effective at reaching infrequent, and non-testers.	Secondary	HCW to Peers to social network	In person	No	Instructions for use	Monetary incentive(Each peer received $150 after distribution of all 5 HIVST tests. Testers had the alternative option to provide contact information for receipt of cash or another gift card for $25.	Testers in County Testing Program
MacGowan 2020	Persons who clicked the ads on social network, music, and dating websites were directed to research sites to complete eligibility screening.	Distribution HIV self-tests to social network members	Participants were randomly assigned to the self-testing (ST) arm or control arm using a computer-generated stochastic random 1:1 allocation.	Accessing the hard to-reach & Diffusion	Secondary	Website online to index to alter	mail	No	Instruction enhancement, video or study hotline	NA	Website with routine HIV testing information
Masters 2016	Trained research assistants screened and enrolled women seeking ANC or PPC at the three facilities, in a private location away from regular clinic activities.	Partner distribution in community	Participants were randomized in a 1:1 ratio using balanced block randomization (block size 20) to an HIVST group or a comparison group.	Increased coverage of HIV testing services for men and the odds of men being linked to care or prevention	Secondary	HCW to participants to partners	In person	No	Instructions and demonstration of how to use	Advise on partner negotiation and communication	Invitation card for clinic-based HIV testing

Study	Method of identifying seeds	Method of identifying network members	Randomization method	Role of social network	HIVST Delivery Method	Who distributed HIVST	How HIVST delivered	Testing choice offered	Testing support	Additional intervention components	Comparison
Merchant 2018	Via multiple social media platforms	YMSMs recommended three other 18–24-year-old black, Hispanic, or white YMSM.	Within each racial/ethnic group, we randomly assigned participants into one of three study arms (1:1:1 randomization) using block sizes of six.	Accessing the hard to-reach & Diffusion	Online & mail	Website/ Study app to participants to social network	Mail	No	No	Monetary incentive (Participants received a $10 internet-based gift card for completing the follow-up questionnaire, and up to three $5 gift cards for providing email addresses of other YMSM to be contacted about the study.)	Routine facility-based HIV testing
Mujugira 2022	PWLHIV attending antenatal care who reported that their partner's HIV status was unknown.	Secondary distribution of HIV self-test kits (HIVST) from HIV-negative pregnant women to their partners.	Eligible participants were randomized 2:1 to HIVST secondary distribution or an invitation for fast-track HIV testing for their partner.	Increased coverage of HIV testing services for men and the odds of men being linked to care or prevention	Secondary	HCW to participants to partner	In person	No	trained in the use and interpretatio n of HIVST	NA	Routine facility-based HIV testing
Okoboi 2020	Fifteen MSM peers who trained in HIVST testing procedures and results interpretation	Peers distributed HIVST kits to MSM in their social and sexual networks.	N/A	Increasing testing coverage among non-testers.	Secondary	HCW to Peers to social network	In person	No	Instructions and demonstrati on of how to use and telephone support	Transport reimbursement and T-shirts, backpacks and umbrellas as tokens of appreciation	Routine facility-based HIV testing

Study	Method of identifying seeds	Method of identifying network members	Randomization method	Role of social network	HIVST Delivery Method	Who distributed HIVST	How HIVST delivered	Testing choice offered	Testing support	Additional intervention components	Comparison
Ortblad 2017	Recruitment of FSW peer educators	Peer-educators recruitment, research assistants telephone screening, eligibility assessment, and enrollment.	We randomized FSW peer educator groups 1:1:1 to 1 of 3 study arms.	Have good access to other FSWs and are able to engage with FSWs who do not normally utilize the health system & Diffusion & Impact on risk and health behaviors	Facility & secondary by peer	HCW to Peer-educators to participants	In person	No	Instructions for use and telephone support	NA	Routine facility-based HIV testing
Pettifor 2020	Recruitment of young women from Agincourt Health and Social Demographic Surveillance System (AHDSS)	Young women offered test kits/invitations to peers and sexual partners.	Young women ages 18-26 were randomized using block randomization with a 1:1 allocation to either	Secondary distribution of HIV self-test kits is one way to reach populations who test less frequently and hard-to-reach groups.	Secondary	HCW to index to alter	In person	Yes (choice of either a clinic-based HCT invitation or oral HIV Self-Testing (HIVST) kits.)	Instructions for use, include pre- and post-test counseling information and a "frequently asked questions" document on HIV self-testing	NA	Routine facility-based HIV testing
Sha 2022	Community volunteers or public health workers invited men who visited the three clinics for HIV testing.	Indexes distributed HIV/syphilis dual self-testing kits to people in their social networks.	The two arms were implemented one at a time to compare the intended outcomes in similar catchment areas without having people choose between the two.	Accessing the hard to-reach & Diffusion	Secondary	HCW to index to alter	In person	No	Instructions for use	Monetary incentive (Indexes received $3 after completing the baseline survey and $5 for a follow-up survey. Alters and corresponding indexes both received an additional $3 when alters uploaded their test results.)	Testing card referral (facility-based test)

Study	Method of identifying seeds	Method of identifying network members	Randomization method	Role of social network	HIVST Delivery Method	Who distributed HIVST	How HIVST delivered	Testing choice offered	Testing support	Additional intervention components	Comparison
Shahmanesh 2021	Recruitment of 24 pairs of peer navigators through local municipal and traditional leaders	Peer navigators recruited young people in community settings near schools and homes.	The final groupings of peer navigators into three arms were completed using statistical software, into three groups of 8 pairs and three floating peer navigators (A, B and C).	Diffusion & Impact on risk and health behaviors	Facility & secondary by peer	HCW to Peer-educators to participants	In person	No	In all three arms, peer navigators promoted sexual health and the benefits of HIV testing PrEP and ART. In both intervention arms, they also demonstrated how to use the HIVST kit.	Monetary incentive	Routine facility-based HIV testing
Young 2013	18 peer leaders were recruited from community organizations serving African American and Latino MSM.	Participants were recruited from ads on Internet and social networking sites	Participants were randomly and blindly assigned to 1 of 2 intervention or control groups and then randomly assigned to 2 peer leaders within that group.	Diffusion & Impact on risk and health behaviors. The community peer leader model is designed to increase HIV prevention and testing behaviors by changing social norms.	Direct	HCW to Peer-educators to participants	Mail-in	No	Instructions for use	NA	General health information

Study	Method of identifying seeds	Method of identifying network members	Randomization method	Role of social network	HIVST Delivery Method	Who distributed HIVST	How HIVST delivered	Testing choice offered	Testing support	Additional intervention components	Comparison
Young 2022	79 peer leaders were recruited with help from community organizations serving Latinx and African American MSM.	From online advertisements on Facebook, Craigslist, and other websites/applications; community physical venues frequented by Latinx and African American MSM; and from direct referrals from study participants.	Using a random number generator with participants blinded to assignment and unable to request group or condition assignment.	Diffusion & Impact on risk and health behaviors. The community peer leader model is designed to increase HIV prevention and testing behaviors by changing social norms.	Direct	HCW to Peer-educators to participants	Mail-in	No	Instructions for use and communicate in the online community, by sending messages, chats, and wall posts	NA	Non-peer-led HIVST
Van Der Elst 2017	Mobilizations were done through GBMSM peers from a local GBMSM-led community group	GBMSM peers mobilized in community	NA	Accessing the hard to-reach & Diffusion	Secondary	HCW to Peers to social network	In person	No	Close supervision and daily feedback	Participants asked to report for confirmatory HTC at the clinic	Routine facility-based HIV testing
Zhou 2022	Volunteers of Xutong enrolled participants by advertising the recruitment and trial introduction in the WeChat public platform.	Index participants distributed HIVST kits to members within their social networks.	Eligible participants were randomly assigned to one of the 3 arms individually and independently by a computer-generated program electronically.	Accessing the hard to-reach & Diffusion	Secondary	HCW to index to alter	Mail-in	No	Instructions for use	Monetary incentive (Index participants in the 2 intervention groups could receive a fixed incentive ($3 USD) online for the verified test result uploaded to the digital platform by each unique alter.)	Standard secondary distribution

S2 Table: Outcomes of the included studies

Study	Study arm	HIV testing uptake			HIV seroconversion			Linkage to ART or HIV care among HIV positive			
		Time point	Offered HIVST	Tested for HIVST	Time point	All positive	Tested for HIVST1	Time point	ART initiation	Linked to HIV care	HIV positive
Chanda 2017	Standard of care	2016.9-2017.2	1mom: 296, 4mon: 301	1mom: 262, 4mon: 226	2016.9-2017.2	1mom: 59, 4mon: 84	1mom: 288, 4mon: 298	2016.9-2017.2	1mom: 27, 4mon: 54	1mom: 44, 4mon: 72	1mom: 59, 4mon: 84
Chanda 2017	Delivery	2016.9-2017.2	1mom: 296, 4mon: 295	1mom: 280, 4mon: 248	2016.9-2017.2	1mom: 49, 4mon: 74	1mom: 294, 4mon: 292	2016.9-2017.2	1mom: 11, 4mon: 35	1mom: 25, 4mon: 53	1mom: 49, 4mon: 74
Chanda 2017	Coupon	2016.9-2017.2	1mom: 294, 4mon: 302	1mom: 248, 4mon: 241	2016.9-2017.2	1mom: 36, 4mon: 77	1mom: 291, 4mon: 300	2016.9-2017.2	1mom: 9, 4mon: 44	1mom: 19, 4mon: 59	1mom: 36, 4mon: 77
Choko 2019	Standard of care	28 days	408	71	28 days	3	71	28 days	3	-	3
Choko 2019	Partner distribution in community	28 days	1941	1801	28 days	43	1801	28 days	39	-	43
Choko 2021	Standard of care	28 days	ANC:1447 index:234	ANC:498 index:209	28 days	index:9 ANC:2	index:209	-	ANC:2	-	index:9 ANC:2
Choko 2021	HIVST	28 days	ANC:1465 index:169	ANC:1106 index:155	28 days	index:13 ANC:0	index:155	-	ANC:0	-	index:13 ANC:0
Choko 2021	HIVST plus	28 days	ANC:1632 index:305	ANC:1000 index:285	28 days	index:32 ANC:22	index:285	-	ANC:22	-	index:32 ANC:22
Dovel 2019	Standard of care	2018.3-2018.6	107	27	-	4	27	12 months	3	-	4
Dovel 2019	Partner distribution in community	2018.3-2018.6	258	183	-	30	183	12 months	14	-	30
Frye 2021	Standard of care	2016.7-2019.1	197	3 months: 83 6 months: 83	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Frye 2021	Peer-based behavioral intervention	2016.7-2019.1	179	3 months: 102 6 months: 97	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gichangi 2018	Standard of care	3 months	938	239	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Gichangi 2018	Partner distribution in community	3 months	472	322	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Joseph 2022	Standard of care	3 months	85	44	3 months	6	44	3 months	6	-	6
Joseph 2022	Partner distribution in community	3 months	91	66	3 months	9	66	3 months	6	-	9
Lightfoot 2018	Self-Testers	2016.1-2017.3	165	114	2016.1-2017.3	7	114	-	-	-	7
Lightfoot 2018	Testers in County Testing Program	2016.1-2017.3	3483	1205	2016.1-2017.3	18	1205	-	-	-	18
MacGowan 2020	Standard of care	2015.3-2016.11	-	-	2015.3-2016.11	-	-	-	-	-	-
MacGowan 2020	Peer community distribution HIVST	2015.3-2016.11	2864	2301	2015.3-2016.11	34	2301	-	-	26	36
Masters 2016	Standard of care	3 months	286	148	3 months	4	148	-	-	3	4
Masters 2016	Partner distribution in community	3 months	284	258	3 months	8	258	-	-	2	8
Merchant 2018	Standard of care	3 months	71	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Merchant 2018	mail-testing	3 months	57	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Merchant 2018	Online & mail distribution	3 months	82	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mujugira 2022	Standard of care	12 months	161	75	12 months	13	75	12 months	10	-	13
Mujugira 2022	Partner distribution in community	12 months	328	159	12 months	36	159	12 months	25	-	36
Okoboi 2020	Standard of care	2018.6-2018.8	-	147	2018.1-2018.3	4	147	-	-	-	4
Okoboi 2020	Peer community distribution	2018.6-2018.8	150	143	2018.6-2018.8	8	143	-	8	8	8
Ortblad 2017	Peer community distribution HIVST	2016.10-2017.3	1mom: 289, 4mon: 262	1mom: 275, 4mon: 261	2016.10-2017.3	1mom: 39, 4mon: 44	1mom: 287, 4mon: 260	2016.10-2017.3	1mom: 13, 4mon: 19	1mom: 17, 4mon: 27	1mom: 39, 4mon: 44
Ortblad 2017	HCW at health facility	2016.10-2017.3	1mom: 321, 4mon: 297	1mom: 258, 4mon: 288	2016.10-2017.3	1mom: 54, 4mon: 80	1mom: 312, 4mon: 289	2016.10-2017.3	1mom: 10, 4mon: 27	1mom: 13, 4mon: 37	1mom: 54, 4mon: 80
Ortblad 2017	Standard-of-care	2016.10-2017.3	1mom: 316, 4mon: 302	1mom: 226, 4mon: 263	2016.10-2017.3	1mom: 39, 4mon: 53	1mom: 301, 4mon: 294	2016.10-2017.3	1mom: 13, 4mon: 24	1mom: 25, 4mon: 37	1mom: 39, 4mon: 53
Pettifor 2020	Peer community distribution	3 months	373	119	3 months	4	119	-	-	-	4

Pettifor 2020	Standard of care	9 months	406	114	9 months	8	114	-	-	-	8
Pettifor 2020	Peer community distribution	9 months	701	393	9 months	14	393	-	-	-	14
Sha 2022	Secondary distribution	2019.5-2020.1	179	139	2019.5-2020.1	8	139	-	-	-	8
Sha 2022	Testing card referral	2019.10-2020.1	26	1	2019.10-2020.1	0	1	-	-	-	0
Shahmanesh 2021	Standard of care	2019.3-2019.9	1098	-	-	-	-	-	-	111	-
Shahmanesh 2021	Direct HIVST distribution	2019.3-2019.9	1480	-	-	-	-	-	-	111	-
Shahmanesh 2021	Peer community distribution	2019.3-2019.9	1585	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	-
Young 2013	Standard of care	2011.3-2011.6	11	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Young 2013	Peer-leaders distribution in community	2011.3-2011.6	25	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Young 2022	Standard of care	2017.2-2021.1	450	102	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Young 2022	Peer-leaders distribution in community	2017.2-2021.1	450	130	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Van Der Elst 2017	Standard of care	-	-	-	2015.7-2015.12	24	690	1 Day(s)	20/24	-	24
Van Der Elst 2017	Peer community distribution HIVST	-	-	-	2016.3-2016.6	29	337	14 Day(s)	24/29	-	29
Zhou 2022	control	2019.10-2020.12	65	58	-	6	58	-	-	-	6
Zhou 2022	SD-M	2019.10-2020.12	107	101	-	4	101	-	-	-	4
Zhou 2022	SD-M-PR	2019.10-2020.12	187	185	-	5	185	-	-	-	5

HIV testing uptake among all randomized or enrolled; HIV positivity among HIV tested; Linkage to ART or HIV care among HIV positive.

S3(a)Table: Network meta-analysis relative effects (league) table of HIVST distribution strategies - HIV testing uptake

	Facility-based testing	**Peer-community**	**Partner-community**	**Peer educator-community**
Facility-based testing	**Facility-based testing**	2.59 (1.41, 5.20)	1.95 (1.29, 2.95)	1.22 (0.68, 2.18)
Peer-community	0.38 (0.19, 0.71)	**Peer-community**	0.75 (0.33, 1.56)	0.47 (0.19, 1.07)
Partner-community	0.51 (0.34, 0.77)	1.33 (0.64, 3.00)	**Partner-community**	0.63 (0.30, 1.27)
Peer educator-community	0.82 (0.46, 1.47)	2.14 (0.93, 5.30)	1.60 (0.79, 3.28)	**Peer educator-community**

S3(b)Table: Network meta-analysis ranking probabilities of HIVST distribution strategies - HIV testing uptake

Testing and distribution strategy	Probability of ranking 1	Probability of ranking 2	Probability of ranking 3	Probability of ranking 4
Facility-based testing	0.00	0.00	0.24	0.76
Peer-community	0.79	0.19	0.02	0.00
Partner-community	0.20	0.72	0.08	0.00
Peer educator-community	0.00	0.09	0.66	0.23

S4 Table: Linkage to ART or Any Care Among people living with HIV by Distribution Strategy, Study Design and Population Subgroup

Strategy	Design	Population Type	Pooled Risk Ratio	Studies
Peer-community	Cohort	MSM	0.99 [0.78, 1.27]	Van Der Elst 2017
Partner-community	RCT	Male partners of ANC clients	0.83 [0.60, 1.16]	Choko 2019, Masters 2016, Choko 2021 a
	RCT	Partners of HIV positive	0.79 [0.60, 1.04]	Joseph 2022, Mujugira 2022, Dovel 2019
Peer educators-community	RCT	FSW	0.80 [0.63, 1.02]	Chanda 2017, Ortblad 2017

S5 Table: Risk of bias for included studies - Observational studies

Study	Representativeness of exposed cohort	Selection of non-exposed cohort	Ascertainment of exposure	Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	Cohorts comparable	Assessment of outcome	Length of follow-up	Loss to follow-up rate	Overall Quality
Kwan 2023	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	*	Good
Kitenge 2022	*	*	*	*	-	*	*	-	Good
Lightfoot 2018	*	-	*	-	*	*	-	*	Fair
Lippman 2018	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	Good
Li S 2021	*	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	Poor
Matovu 2020	*	-	*	*	-	-	*	*	Fair
Nasuuna 2022	*	-	*	*	-	-	*	*	Fair
Nguyen 2019 1	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	Poor
Nguyen 2019 2	*	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	Poor
Okoboi 2020	*	*	*	*	-	*	*	-	Good
Thirumurthy 2016	*	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	Good
Van Der Elst 2017	*	*	*	-	-	-	*	*	Fair
Wu D 2021	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	*	Good
Zhang J 2021	*	-	*	*	-	-	*	*	Fair
Zishiri 2022	*	-	*	*	-	-	*	*	Fair

S6 Table: Risk of bias for included studies – RCTs and a quasi-experimental study

Study	Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Other bias
Chanda 2017	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Choko 2019	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low
Choko 2021	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Dovel 2019	Unclear	Unclear	High	High	Low	Low	Unclear
Frye 2021	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low
Gichangi 2018	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low
Joseph 2022	Low	Low	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low
MacGowan 2020	Low	Low	High	High	High	Low	Unclear
Masters 2016	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low
Merchant 2018	Low	Unclear	High	High	Unclear	Low	Low
Mujugira 2022	Low	Unclear	High	High	Unclear	Low	Unclear
Ortblad 2017	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Pettifor 2020	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low
Sha 2022	High	High	High	Unclear	High	Low	Low
Shahmanesh 2021	Low	Low	High	Low	Unclear	Low	Low
Young 2022	Low	Low	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low
Young 2013	Low	Unclear	High	High	Unclear	Low	Low
Zhou 2022	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low

S1 Figure: Risk of bias for included studies – RCTs and a quasi-experimental study



Figure S1. Cochrane risk of bias quality assessment for included studies: RCTs