

1 **Cost-utility analysis of primary HPV testing through home-based self-sampling in**
2 **comparison to visual inspection using acetic acid for cervical cancer screening in**
3 **East district, Sikkim, India, 2023**

4

5 Roopa Hariprasad¹, Bhavani Shankara Bagepally^{2**}, Sajith Kumar², Sangeeta Pradhan³,
6 Deepsikka Gurung³, Harki Tamang³, Arpana Sharma⁴, Tarun Bhatnagar^{1*}

7

8

9

10 ¹School of Public Health, Indian Council Medical Research-National Institute of
11 Epidemiology, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

12

13 ²Health Technology Assessment Resource Centre, Indian Council Medical Research-
14 National Institute of Epidemiology, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

15

16 ³Department of Health and Welfare, Government of Sikkim, Gangtok, Sikkim, India

17

18 ⁴Jhpiego - an affiliate of Johns Hopkins University, Gangtok, Sikkim, India

19

20

21 * Corresponding author

22 E-mail: drtarunb@gmail.com (TB)

23

24

25

26 ** Co-Corresponding author

27 E-mail: bshankara@gmail.com (BSB)

28

29 **Abstract**

30 **Introduction**

31 Primary Human Papilloma Virus (HPV) testing offers higher sensitivity and
32 specificity over Visual Inspection using Acetic acid (VIA) in cervical cancer
33 screening. Self-sampling is a promising strategy to boost participation and reduce
34 disparities. However, concerns about the initial costs hinder HPV testing adoption in
35 low and middle-income countries. This study assesses the cost-utility of home-based
36 HPV self-sampling versus VIA for cervical cancer screening in India

37

38 **Methods**

39 A cross-sectional study was conducted in East district, Sikkim, India, comparing the
40 costs and utility outcomes of population-based cervical cancer screening through VIA
41 and primary HPV screening through self-sampling. Cost-related data were collected
42 from April 2021 to March 2022 using the bottom-up micro-costing method, while
43 utility measures were collected prospectively using the EuroQoL-5D-5L
44 questionnaire. The utility values were converted into quality-adjusted life days
45 (QALDs) for an 8-day period. The willingness to pay threshold (WTP) was based on
46 per capita GDP for 2022. . If the calculated Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio
47 (ICER) value is lower than the WTP threshold, it signifies that the intervention is
48 cost-effective.

49

50 **Results**

51 The study included 95 women in each group of cervical cancer screening with VIA
52 & HPV self-sampling. For eight days, the QALD was found to be 7.977 for the VIA
53 group and 8.0 for the HPV group. The unit cost per woman screened by VIA and

54 HPV self-testing was ₹1,597 (US\$ 19.2) and ₹1,271(US\$ 15.3), respectively. The
55 ICER was ₹-14,459 (US\$ -173.6), which was much below the WTP threshold for
56 eight QALDs, i.e. ₹ 4,193 (US\$ 50.4).

57

58 **Conclusion**

59 The findings support HPV self-sampling as a cost-effective alternative to VIA. This
60 informs policymakers and healthcare providers for better resource allocation in
61 cervical cancer screening in Sikkim.

62

63 **Key words:** Cervical cancer screening, Cost-utility analysis, Primary Human
64 Papilloma Virus (HPV) testing, Self-sampling, Visual Inspection using Acetic acid
65 (VIA), EuroQoL-5D-5L

66

67 **Introduction**

68 Cervical cancer ranks as the second most prevalent cancer among women in India.
69 Globocan estimates for 2020 showed 123,907 incident cases, and 77,348 cases
70 succumbed to this disease [1]. In 2016, the Government of India, through the Ministry
71 of Health and Family Welfare, implemented an operational framework with the goal
72 of facilitating the screening and early detection of three preventable cancers: oral,
73 breast, and cervical cancer [2]. Although visual inspection using the acetic acid (VIA)
74 screening method adopted in the program for cervical cancer is evidence-based, there
75 are concerns about the feasibility of its implementation in the field and beneficiary
76 satisfaction [3,4]. Further, Human Papilloma Virus (HPV) testing exhibits higher
77 sensitivity (98%) and specificity (90.6%) than VIA [sensitivity 31.6% and specificity
78 87.5%] [5].

79 In accordance with World Health Organization's (WHO) recommendation, high-
80 income countries have transitioned from cytology-based screening to primary HPV
81 testing [6]. Research has demonstrated that self-collected samples for HPV testing by
82 women yield comparable results to clinician-collected cervical samples [7,8].
83 Nevertheless, the implementation of HPV programs in low- and middle-income
84 countries is hindered by the upfront financial burden associated with the adoption of
85 this approach despite its evident advantages over VIA. A systematic review on the
86 cost-effectiveness of all cervical cancer screening methods in low- and middle-
87 income countries revealed that HPV testing through self-sampling is the most cost-
88 effective to screen cervical cancer [9]. In the context of India, a single modeling study
89 has examined the cost-effectiveness of three cervical cancer screening strategies:
90 VIA, Pap smear, and HPV DNA [10]. However, to obtain more precise and
91 trustworthy insights, empirical data is required. By utilizing real-world data, we can

92 gather more reasonable information on the actual costs, effectiveness, and outcomes
93 of cervical cancer prevention strategies when implemented within the Indian
94 healthcare system. Such empirical studies are crucial for enhancing the applicability
95 and validity of findings, empowering policymakers to make well-informed decisions
96 regarding resource allocation for cervical cancer prevention programs in India.
97 Sikkim, a northeastern state in India, has piloted primary HPV screening through self-
98 sampling in the East district to explore the challenges in implementation and planning
99 to scale up to all districts based on the results and availability of funds for the same.
100 In order to consider HPV testing as the primary screening of cervical cancer in the
101 State, a detailed economic analysis using contextual data is needed. An essential
102 factor in evaluating the validity of a new screening program is its ability to
103 demonstrate economic efficiency while also surpassing the physical, psychological,
104 and societal harms stemming from the associated testing and screening procedures.
105 Thus, the current study was planned to assess the cost-utility of home-based HPV
106 self-sampling compared to VIA for cervical cancer screening among women over 30
107 years in the East district of Sikkim state.

108

109 **Methods**

110 **Study design and setting**

111 We did a cross-sectional study in the East district, Sikkim, India, in which cost-related
112 data was collected retrospectively, while the data for utility measures was collected
113 prospectively. Fig 1 illustrates the study workflow. It includes estimates on the cost
114 of population-based cervical cancer screening through VIA (facility-based) under the
115 National Program for Prevention and Control of Non-Communicable Diseases (NP-
116 NCD) program and primary HPV screening through self-sampling (home-based)

117 from a disaggregated societal perspective. This perspective considers costs estimated
118 at both the health provider/system level and the individual level, specifically focusing
119 on the direct expenses borne by women undergoing screening in the form of out-of-
120 pocket payments.

121 **Fig 1: Illustration of the Study Work Flow**

122

123 Under the NP-NCD, VIA is performed on the eligible population (women aged 30
124 years and older) by the Community Health Officer (CHO) at Health and Wellness
125 Centres (HWCs). If they are found to be VIA positive, women are referred to PHC
126 for confirmation by Primary Health Centre (PHC) Medical Officer. In the primary
127 HPV screening group, Accredited Social Health Activists (ASHAs) provide the
128 sampling kits to women when they make home visits for either filling Community
129 Based Assessment Checklist (CBAC) or Reproductive and Child Health (RCH)
130 program-related activities. Community Health Workers in India are referred to as
131 ASHAs. They are equipped with Information Education and Communication (IEC)
132 materials, such as charts and videos, which demonstrate the correct procedure for
133 collecting vaginal samples. The woman then collects the sample herself and hands
134 over the sampler kit back to ASHA. The sample is transported to the HPV lab at the
135 district hospital from PHC in an ambulance, which does a weekly visit to District
136 Hospital for transportation of other contingencies like vaccines and medicines.

137 The detailed flow of the screening process in both groups is provided in Fig A of the
138 supplementary file. The activities in both groups are the same once the woman is
139 referred to PHC after screening. Hence, the unit cost is calculated only up to the
140 screening process. Participants' eligibility criteria for calculating the utility values
141 were as follows; women aged 30 years or older who underwent screening using VIA

142 at HWCs by CHOs, and women aged 30 years or above who underwent screening
143 using HPV self-sampling at home were included in the study. Women who declined
144 to provide consent were not included in the study. The reference period for costing
145 was from April 2021 to March 2022.

146 Considering the mean EuroQol-5 dimension score (SD) of women after cervical
147 cancer screening by VIA to be 0.89 (0.19) and the mean EQ-5D-5L score (SD) of
148 women after HPV self-sampling to be 0.98 (0.19) [11] and power as 85%, alpha as
149 5% (two-sided), we calculated a sample size of 81 women in each group. Adjusting
150 for a 15% attrition rate, the sample size was calculated to be 95 women in VIA and
151 HPV groups. East district of Sikkim consists of eight PHCs (Two urban and six rural)
152 and forty-three health and wellness centres (HWCs). HPV self-sampling (home-
153 based) is implemented by the state govt in the East district in three PHC catchment
154 areas (two urban and one rural). These HWCs selected for HPV screening do not
155 perform VIA screening anymore. Out of the remaining thirty-two HWCs in the
156 district, the best performing eleven HWCs in terms of number of women screened by
157 VIA were selected.

158 **Data collection-costs**

159 For cost analysis, costing related to human resources, space/building, furniture,
160 equipment, consumables, IEC Material, stationery and overheads for both screening
161 methods was obtained. Utility measures were calculated using EQ-5D-5L scores.

162 Cost analysis in this study was undertaken using a bottom-up approach of micro-
163 costing methods. All costs were reported for the reference year 2022 (financial year
164 April 2021 to March 2022). All the resources used in screening for cervical cancer
165 using VIA and HPV were identified, measured and valued. Data on capital and
166 recurrent resources utilised to deliver cervical cancer screening services during the

167 reference year were considered. Costing related to space/building, human resources,
168 furniture, equipment, consumables, IEC Material, stationery and overheads for both
169 screening methods were obtained from records and the data of the same were
170 accessed between 15th January 2023 to 30th April 2023.

171 For estimating the building cost, the current market rental price of a similar space
172 through three key informant interviews was collected for each of the eleven HWCs
173 and the HPV laboratory. The average of the three rental prices was considered. To
174 allocate the cost specifically to the VIA screening activity, an apportioning factor was
175 calculated considering the working time dedicated to VIA screening in a year relative
176 to the total working hours of the healthcare facility.

177 To estimate the human resources cost, the investigator interviewed the study
178 participants and healthcare persons using a structured questionnaire. The information
179 related to salary/wages, perks and time spent on each of the activities of screening
180 were collected. The human resources costs associated with screening were calculated
181 using the apportioning factor derived from the time spent on activities.

182 The consumable cost was assessed using the cost, quantity and procurement date of
183 consumables procured during the reference period for VIA and HPV tests by the state
184 central procurement division. The details were obtained from their stock register and
185 accounts division. For women screened by VIA, the Out of Pocket Expenditure
186 (OOPE) accounted for direct costs associated with transportation to the facility, as
187 well as any food expenses incurred during the screening period for both the women
188 and their attendants, if accompanied. However, in the HPV group, it was not
189 applicable as screening took place at home. The cost of overheads like water,
190 maintenance, the electricity of HWCs and HPV testing lab was obtained at the facility
191 level. The total annual cost incurred by each group was calculated by summing up

192 the costs associated with various components. Unit cost was calculated by dividing
193 the total cost of screening by the number of individuals screened in each group as
194 unit cost per woman screened by VIA and unit cost per woman screened by HPV
195 self-sampling

196 **Data collection-utility**

197 EQ-5D-5L questionnaire was used for the personal interview [12]. Permission to use
198 the paper, telephonic, and digital versions has been obtained from the EuroQol office.
199 The questionnaire has five dimensions graded across five levels of problems. The
200 tool comprises a descriptive questionnaire along with a visual analog scale (VAS) to
201 assess perceived problems. These problem levels were assigned numerical codes
202 ranging from 1 to 5, with each state represented by a 5-digit code. The questionnaire
203 encompasses five dimensions, namely mobility, self-care, usual activities,
204 pain/discomfort, and anxiety/depression, and investigates five problem levels,
205 including the absence of problems, minor problems, moderate problems, significant
206 problems, and extreme difficulties or inability to perform.

207 EQ-5D-5L was administered to all the Women undergoing cervical cancer screening
208 by VIA at HWCs as well as women undergoing cervical cancer screening at home by
209 HPV self-sampling between the period 15th January 2023 to 30th April 2023. Cervical
210 cancer screening by VIA is performed at HWCs by trained CHOs as a part of the
211 ongoing NP-NCD program. The questionnaire was administered after the screening
212 procedure is complete and before the CHO informs the VIA result to the woman. For
213 women undergoing HPV self-testing at home, it was administered after she collected
214 the sample.

215 Permission from women to contact her telephonically after eight days was taken in
216 the consent form. The EQ-5D-5L questionnaire was administered telephonically on

217 the 8th day of screening, and the status of symptoms was collected as per the
218 satisfaction questionnaire.

219 **Data analysis**

220 Scoring in EQ-5D-5L and calculation of QALD for 8 eight days

221 The EQ-5D-5L questionnaire responses from study participants were converted into
222 a single index value using India-specific tariff values. This conversion process
223 considered the health-related quality of life (HRQoL) across all five dimensions
224 (mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, anxiety/depression) and
225 assigned a weighted value to each health state. Once the EQ-5D-5L index value was
226 obtained for each individual, it was multiplied by 8 (duration of interest) to calculate
227 the QALDs. This calculation combines the individual's health state utility value with
228 the duration, reflecting the overall quality of life experienced during that period. The
229 EQ-5D-5L VAS scale assesses the self-evaluated quality of life on a scale of 1 (worst
230 imaginable health state) to 100 (best imaginable health state). Median quality of life
231 with interquartile range was reported.

232 **Utility score**

233 An EQ-5D-5L summary index was calculated by deducting the appropriate weights
234 from 1, the value for full health (i.e., state 11111). For estimating the quality-of-life
235 utility values, health states generated from the scoring on the EQ-5D-5L descriptive
236 system was converted into utility scores using the India's value set [13] (which is a
237 collection of index values (weights) for all possible EQ-5D-5L states) was used for
238 estimating the utility score.

239 **Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio (ICER)**

240 As per WHO guidance, the Willingness to Pay (WTP) threshold was determined
241 based on the per capita GDP for the year 2022, amounting to ₹ 1,91,288 (US\$ -

242 2297.7) per QALY. Then, for an eight (days period) QALDs, the WTP of ₹ 4193
243 (US\$ 50.4) was considered. The Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio (ICER) was
244 then computed by dividing the difference in costs (incremental cost) between the two
245 groups by the difference in the QALD8 scores. If the calculated ICER value is lower
246 than the WTP threshold, it signifies that the intervention is cost-effective.

247 **Uncertainty analysis**

248 A one-way sensitivity analysis was conducted to examine the effects of varying the
249 number of individuals screened using both HPV & VIA methods. Additionally, the
250 analysis included adjustments of all cost components with 10% and 25% variations,
251 and the results were graphically presented.

252 Scenario analysis was performed to evaluate the potential impacts of different testing
253 facility settings, including rural or urban locations. Furthermore, the analysis
254 considered the reduction in HPV cost resulting from competitive pricing offered by
255 manufacturers. We also explored the scenarios, where a healthcare provider at the
256 facility conducted HPV testing, as well as the option of self-sampling at the facility.

257 Statistical analysis was done using Epi-info version 7.2.1.0

258 All the costs are reported both in Indian National Rupees (INR) -₹ and United States
259 Dollar (US\$) (1 US\$ = ₹83.2526). ([https://www.exchangerates.org.uk/USD-INR-16_08_2023-
260 exchange-rate-history.html](https://www.exchangerates.org.uk/USD-INR-16_08_2023-exchange-rate-history.html))

261

262 **Ethical approval**

263 Study proposal was approved by the Institute Human Ethics Committee of the
264 ICMR-National Institute of Epidemiology, Chennai, India (Reference number:
265 NIE/IHEC/A/202212-02). All the respondents were interviewed after obtaining
266 written informed consent.

267 **Results**

268 The baseline and screening attributes of women (95 in each group) interviewed in the
269 VIA and HPV screening group are provided in Table 1. Both the HPV group and the
270 VIA group were comparable in terms of age distributions, marital status, educational
271 status, parity and age at first intercourse. However, there was a significant disparity
272 in residence patterns, with VIA consisting of a higher proportion (99%) of
273 participants residing in rural areas, while HPV predominantly comprised individuals
274 living in urban regions (84%). There was a notable distinction in occupational
275 profiles that emerged, with a greater proportion of homemakers (70%) observed in
276 the VIA group, while the HPV testing group exhibited a more diverse range of
277 occupations.

278 After screening, it was observed that the VIA group reported a higher prevalence of
279 symptoms (74%) compared to the HPV group (9%). There was a significant
280 difference among the groups regarding time spent on screening. The out-of-pocket
281 expenditure (OOPE) of women in the VIA group ranged from 0 to ₹ 6000 (US\$ 0 to
282 72.1) with a median of ₹120 (IQR ₹ 60-200) (US\$ 1.4, IQR), which. Time to reach
283 the facility and OOPE did not apply to the HPV group since the screening was
284 conducted in their homes.

285

286 **Table 1: Demographic characteristics of screened women in VIA and HPV group**

	Women screened by VIA (n=95)	Women screened by HPV (n= 95)
Age (years)		
Mean (SD)	43.6 (\pm 9.8)	41.3 (\pm 8.5)
Range (yrs)	30-65	30-63

Residence n (%)		
Urban	1 (1)	80 (84)
Rural	94 (99)	15 (16)
Education n (%)		
Literate	89 (94)	87 (92)
Illiterate	6 (6)	8 (8)
Occupation n (%)		
Home maker	66 (70)	49 (51)
Others	29 (30)	46 (49)
Marital status n (%)		
Ever married	87 (91)	88 (92)
Others	8 (9)	7 (8)
Age at first intercourse		
<18 years	17 (18)	14 (15)
18 years and above	78 (82)	81 (85)
Parity		
[mean (SD)]	2.44 ±1.5	2.05±1.2
Symptoms after screening		
(any) n (%)		
Present	70 (74)	8 (9)
Absent	25 (26)	87 (91)
Time taken to reach the facility		
≤1 hour	86 (90)	NA
More than one hour	9 (10)	

Time spent on the screening test		
≤ 30 min	85 (89)	95 (100)
> 30 min	10 (11)	0
Out of pocket expenditure (INR)		
Median {IQR }	120 {60, 200}	NA

287 Abbreviations- VIA: Visual Inspection using Acetic acid, HPV: Human Papilloma Virus, NA: Not

288 Applicable

289

290 The total annual expenditure on screening women for cervical cancer through VIA
 291 and HPV DNA tests amounted to ₹5,79,059 (US\$ 6955.4) and ₹28,16,019 (US\$
 292 33825), respectively. The details of the annual costs for both screening methods are
 293 provided in Table 2. The distribution of the total annual costs for VIA and HPV
 294 screening revealed that training (33%) and consumables (30%) comprised the largest
 295 proportion of overall expenses in the VIA group. Notably, in the HPV group,
 296 approximately 40% (₹11,29,706, US\$ 13569.6) of the total cost was allocated to the
 297 purchase of consumables, followed by human resources, which accounted for 30%
 298 (₹ 8,55,848 US\$ 10280.1) of the expenditure.

299 **Table 2: Distribution of total annual cost by inputs for VIA and HPV based screening**
 300 **for cervical cancer during the financial year of 2021-22, Sikkim**

301

Inputs	Annual cost in VIA group		Annual cost in HPV group	
	INR	US\$	(INR)	US\$

Space/Building	8447	101.5	3,54,281	4255.5
Furniture & Equipment	12,111	145.5	1,60,859	1932.2
Human resource	1,52,803	1835.4	8,55,848	10280.1
Consumables	1,76,136	2115.7	11,29,706	13569.6
IEC Material	-	-	22,600	271.5
Training and meetings	1,91,000	2294.2	1,57,125	1887.3
Overheads	38,562	463.2	1,35,600	1628.8
Total cost	5,79,059	6955.4	28,16,019	33825
No of tests	392		2216	
Unit cost per test	1,597	19.2	1,271	15.3

302 Abbreviations- VIA: Visual Inspection using Acetic acid, HPV: Human Papilloma Virus, IEC: Information

303 Education & Communication

304

305 During the study period, 392 women underwent VIA screening across eleven HWCs.

306 These HWCs covered a population of 6,031 eligible women, resulting in a screening

307 coverage of 6.5%. In the HPV group, 2,216 women were screened out of the 6,331

308 eligible women, yielding a screening coverage of 35%. The unit cost per woman

309 screened by VIA and HPV was ₹ 1,597 (US\$ 19.2) and ₹ 1,271 (US\$ 15.3),

310 respectively.

311 The comparison of EQ-5D-5L index scores of screened women in VIA and HPV

312 groups is tabulated in Table 3. The mean EQ-5D-5L score was significantly higher

313 in the HPV group (1.00±0) than in the VIA group (0.9903±0.02) (p<0.0001). On the

314 eighth day of screening, the EQ-5D-5L scores remained significantly higher in the

315 HPV group (1.000±0) than in the VIA group (0.9972±0.0118) (p=0.02). The overall

316 health score on the day of screening was significantly higher in the HPV group

317 (88.18±5.44) compared to the VIA group (84.4±6.41), (p<0.0001).

319 **Table 3: EQ-5D-5L index scores of screened women in VIA and HPV group**

EQ-5D-5L		VIA	HPV	p
Utility score (0-1) (mean score±SD)	Day 1	0.9903 ±0.0210	1.0000±0	<0.0001
	Day 8	0.9972±0.0118	1.0000 ±0	0.02
Visual Analogue Score (1-100) (mean score±SD)	Day 1	84.4 ±6.41	88.18±5.44	<0.0001
	Day 8	89.23 ±3.42	90.75 ±3.66	0.04

320 Abbreviations- VIA: Visual Inspection using Acetic acid, HPV: Human Papilloma Virus

321

322 None of the women in the HPV group complained of any deviation from normal in
 323 the five dimensions of the EQ-5D-5L. However, in the VIA group, 17% and 7%
 324 experienced pain and anxiety, respectively, on day one; on day eight, 3% reported
 325 anxiety. (Supplementary Table A)

326 For a duration of 8 days, the QALD was found to be 7.977 for the VIA group and 8
 327 for the HPV group. Hence the ICER was ₹-14,459 (US\$ 173.7). This is much below
 328 the WTP threshold for eight days, i.e., ₹ 4,193 (US\$ 50.4).

329 The sensitivity analysis results for changes in the number of women screened using
 330 the VIA method is shown in Fig. 2A. As the number of screened women decreases,
 331 the ICER increases. When the number of screened women exceeds 549, HPV self-
 332 testing ceases to be more cost-effective than VIA. This implies that a screening
 333 coverage increase of 40% is required for VIA to be considered cost-effective than
 334 HPV self-testing.

335 **Fig 2A: Sensitivity analysis: Change in ICER value with variation in the**
 336 **number of women screened by VIA**

337 In contrast, Fig. 2B demonstrates the impact of changes in the number of women
 338 screened by the HPV self-testing method on the ICER. As the number of women

339 screened by HPV self-testing decreases, the ICER increases. Specifically, if the
340 screened numbers fall below 1,665, HPV self-testing ceases to be cost-effective.
341 However, even with a 25% lowering in screened numbers, the HPV self-testing
342 method remains cost-effective.

343 **Fig 2B: Sensitivity analysis: Change in ICER value with variation in the**
344 **number of women screened by HPV**

345

346 The sensitivity analysis results for VIA screening (Fig. 3A) highlighted that training
347 expenses and consumables had the highest impact on the ICER. Conversely, for HPV
348 screening, consumables and human resources were found to have the greatest impact
349 on the ICER (Fig 3B). ICER was below the WTP threshold for all the listed scenarios
350 listed. (Supplementary Table B)

351 **Fig 3A: Sensitivity analysis; Key driving factors of ICER with 10% variation**
352 **in item cost**

353 **Fig 3B: Sensitivity analysis; Key driving factors of ICER with 25% variation**
354 **in item cost**

355

356 **Discussion**

357 The findings of our study indicate that primary HPV screening through self-sampling
358 is a cost-saving approach for cervical cancer screening, compared to the current
359 recommendation of VIA for population-based screening in India. While the total cost
360 of HPV screening may appear higher, the unit cost per test is substantially lower than
361 VIA, primarily due to the higher screening coverage achieved with HPV screening.
362 HPV self-sampling has been widely recognized for its ability to increase participation
363 in cervical cancer screening as it overcomes various barriers; self-sampling

364 effectively encourages more individuals to participate in regular screening programs,
365 especially in low and middle-income countries [14,15]. Existing literature indicates
366 that adopting self-sampling approaches can enhance screening participation among
367 women and potentially lead to cost reductions [16]. According to a meta-analysis of
368 29 randomized controlled trials, the utilization of cervical cancer screening services
369 was found to be twice as likely among women who underwent self-sampling
370 compared to those who followed standard-of-care screening practices [17]. Women
371 exhibit a preference for self-collection of samples within the convenience of their
372 homes, as opposed to visiting healthcare facilities for screening [18]. It was found
373 that there was a high level of compliance among women who opted for this self-
374 collection method, with fewer operational challenges encountered during its
375 implementation. Self-sampling presents a distinct opportunity to reach populations
376 that are typically difficult to access, making it one of the most viable strategies for
377 post-pandemic screening[19]. Self-sampling for HPV holds the promise of
378 diminishing disparities in cervical screening participation within specific
379 demographics and extending access to underserved and previously unscreened
380 women [20,21].

381 Although VIA is known as a low-cost test and is recommended in low- and middle-
382 income countries, the implementation of this subjective test is a major challenge. An
383 Indian randomized controlled trial demonstrated that a single HPV test can
384 effectively decrease the incidence of advanced cervical cancer and associated
385 mortality. In contrast, VIA screening did not exhibit similar benefits in terms of
386 cancer prevention and mortality reduction [22]. The significant hurdle to the
387 widespread implementation of the more precise and efficient HPV screening method
388 arises from the substantial upfront expenses required to establish screening programs.

389 Although cost plays a vital role, it should not be the exclusive factor guiding decision-
390 making. It is imperative to consider the well-being of women, along with their overall
391 quality of life and satisfaction [23].

392 Our study findings also show significant differences in quality of life between women
393 screened by HPV self-sampling who reported higher utility scores and a better quality
394 of life compared to those who underwent VIA. The higher utility scores indicate that
395 women screened through HPV self-sampling experienced better health-related
396 quality of life, potentially due to reduced anxiety, pain and discomfort associated with
397 the self-sampling approach. These results highlight the potential benefits of
398 implementing HPV self-sampling as a preferred screening method, providing women
399 with a more positive screening experience and ultimately contributing to improved
400 health outcomes.

401 Previous studies have evaluated the cost-effectiveness of HPV self-sampling and VIA
402 for cervical cancer screening [10, 24]. However, unlike these model-based studies,
403 our study uniquely utilizes empirical data, marking the first instance of such an
404 approach in India. An earlier model-based study in India that assessed the cost
405 effectiveness of three screening strategies ie. Papanicolaou test, VIA and clinician
406 based primary HPV testing for cervical cancer screening concluded VIA done every
407 5 years to be cost effective approach [10]. However, the study measured the health-
408 related quality of life of cervical cancer patients rather than screened women to
409 calculate the utility values. This approach failed to capture the immediate change in
410 quality of life associated with the screening procedure itself. In addition, the study
411 did not take into account the building cost of VIA screening as they reported data
412 from camp-based approach.

413 Another study that evaluated cost effectiveness of same three screening strategies
414 within a large cluster randomized trial from rural India (*Legood R et al., 2005*). The
415 study dismissed HPV to be a cost-effective method for cervical cancer screening. It
416 is important to note that this study accounted for all the costs in 2002, during which
417 HPV testing was relatively new and prices were high, likely due to reduced
418 competition in the market. Moreover, the study was conducted in a controlled settings
419 of the trial that would vary from ‘real life’ situations. The ASPIRE randomized
420 controlled trial included a cost-effectiveness study, which determined that
421 community-based self-collected HPV testing is a cost-effective screening strategy
422 [25].

423 Our study had few limitations. Building costs are typically higher in urban areas
424 compared to rural areas. Differential implementation of HPV testing in urban areas
425 and VIA testing in rural areas could have led to an overestimation of costs associated
426 with the HPV testing strategy and an underestimation of costs associated with the
427 VIA strategy. It is crucial to consider this limitation when interpreting the cost
428 comparisons between the two screening methods. Another limitation of our study
429 originates from the exclusive implementation of HPV screening within the East
430 district of Sikkim [26]. The adoption of HPV screening specifically within urban area
431 in the district has resulted in the inclusion of women who underwent VIA screening
432 solely from rural PHC catchment regions. This specific sampling approach introduces
433 a potential bias in the recruitment of participants, which may in turn limit the
434 generalizability of the study findings.

435 In this study we have leveraged empirical data to evaluate the cost-utility of
436 population-based self-collected HPV testing that is performed at women’s homes.
437 The findings of this study provide a robust support for advocating the adoption and

438 implementation of HPV self-sampling in India. The results indicate that the benefits
439 obtained outweigh the associated costs, establishing it as a cost-effective approach
440 within the provided threshold.. Further research following a similar framework in
441 diverse settings across India is recommended. These studies would contribute to a
442 more comprehensive understanding of the feasibility of HPV self-sampling as a
443 primary screening method in various regional contexts.

444

445 **REFERENCES:**

- 446 1. IARC. Cervix uteri - Globocan 2020.
447 <https://gco.iarc.fr/today/data/factsheets/cancers/23-Cervix-uteri-fact-sheet.pdf>.
448 Published 2021. Accessed [6 Nov 2023]
449
- 450 2. Operational Guidelines. Prevention Screening and Control of Common Non-
451 Communicable Diseases: Hypertension, Diabetes and Common Cancers (Oral, Breast
452 and Cervix) New Delhi: National Health Mission Ministry of Health and Family
453 Welfare Government of India; 2016. Available from:
454 [https://main.mohfw.gov.in/sites/default/files/Operational%20Framework%20Managem](https://main.mohfw.gov.in/sites/default/files/Operational%20Framework%20Management%20of%20Common%20Cancers_1.pdf)
455 ent%20of%20Common%20Cancers_1.pdf accessed [29 August 2023].
456
- 457 3. Shastri SS. Cancer trends and disparities in India: data needs for providing equitable
458 cancer care. *Lancet Oncol.* 2018;19(10):1260-1261.
459
- 460 4. Mpinga EK and Chastonay P. Patient satisfaction studies and the monitoring of the
461 right to health: Some thoughts based on a review of the literature. *Glob JHealth Sci*
462 2011;3:64-7.
463
- 464 5. Gravitt PE, Paul P, Katki HA, Vendantham H, Ramakrishna G, Sudula M, et al.
465 Effectiveness of VIA, Pap, and HPV DNA testing in a cervical cancer screening
466 program in a peri-urban community in Andhra Pradesh, India. *PLoS One.* 2010 Oct
467 28;5(10):e13711.
468
- 469 6. World Health Organization. Global strategy to accelerate the elimination of cervical
470 cancer as a public health problem. Geneva. 2020.
471 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240014107> Accessed [6 Nov 2023]
472

- 473 7. Bhatla N, Dar L, Patro AR, Kumar P, Kriplani A, Gulati A, et al. Can human
474 papillomavirus DNA testing of self-collected vaginal samples compare with physician-
475 collected cervical samples and cytology for cervical cancer screening in developing
476 countries? *Cancer Epidemiol.* 2009; 33(6):446-50.
477
- 478 8. Arbyn M, Verdoodt F, Snijders PJ, Verhoef VM, Suonio E, Dillner L, et al. Accuracy
479 of human papillomavirus testing on self-collected versus clinician-collected samples: a
480 meta-analysis. *Lancet Oncol.* 2014;15(2):172-83.
481
- 482 9. Mezei AK, Armstrong HL, Pedersen HN, Campos NG, Mitchell SM, Sekikubo M, et
483 al. Cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer screening methods in low- and middle-income
484 countries: A systematic review. *Int J Cancer.* 2017; 141(3):437-446.
485
- 486 10. Chauhan AS, Prinja S, Srinivasan R, Rai B, Malliga JS, Jyani G, et al. Cost
487 effectiveness of strategies for cervical cancer prevention in India. *PLoS One.* 2020 Sep
488 1;15(9):e0238291
489
- 490 11. Korfage IJ, van Ballegooijen M, Wauben B, Looman CW, Habbema JD, Essink-Bot
491 ML. Having a Pap smear, quality of life before and after cervical screening: a
492 questionnaire study. *BJOG.* 2012;119(8):936-44.
493
- 494 12. EuroQol Research Foundation. EQ-5D-5L User Guide., 2019. Available from:
495 <https://euroqol.org/publications/user-guides>.
496
- 497 13. Jyani G, Sharma A, Prinja S, Kar SS, Trivedi M, Patro BK, et al. Development of an
498 EQ-5D Value Set for India Using an Extended Design (DEVINE) Study: The Indian 5-
499 Level Version EQ-5D Value Set. *Value Health.* 2022;25(7):1218-1226.
500

- 501 14. Di Gennaro G, Licata F, Trovato A, Bianco A. Does self-sampling for human
502 papilloma virus testing have the potential to increase cervical cancer screening? An
503 updated meta-analysis of observational studies and randomized clinical trials. *Front*
504 *Public Health*. 2022;10:1003461.
- 505
- 506 15. Gupta S, Palmer C, Bik EM, Cardenas JP, Nuñez H, Kraal L, et al. Self-Sampling for
507 Human Papillomavirus Testing: Increased Cervical Cancer Screening Participation and
508 Incorporation in International Screening Programs. *Front Public Health*. 2018; 6:77.
- 509
- 510 16. Arrossi S, Thouyaret L, Herrero R, Campanera A, Magdaleno A, Cuberli M, et al.
511 EMA Study team. Effect of self-collection of HPV DNA offered by community health
512 workers at home visits on uptake of screening for cervical cancer (the EMA study): a
513 population-based cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2015;3(2):e85-94.
- 514
- 515 17. Yeh PT, Kennedy CE, de Vuyst H, Narasimhan M. Self-sampling for human
516 papillomavirus (HPV) testing: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Glob*
517 *Health*. 2019;4(3): e001351.
- 518
- 519 18. Kilfoyle KA, Des Marais AC, Ngo MA, Romocki L, Richman AR, Barclay L, Brewer
520 NT, Rahangdale L, Smith JS. Preference for Human Papillomavirus Self-Collection
521 and Papanicolaou: Survey of Underscreened Women in North Carolina. *J Low Genit*
522 *Tract Dis*. 2018;22(4):302-310.
- 523
- 524 19. Lozar T, Nagvekar R, Rohrer C, Dube Mandishora RS, Ivanus U, Fitzpatrick MB.
525 Cervical Cancer Screening Post pandemic: Self-Sampling Opportunities to Accelerate
526 the Elimination of Cervical Cancer. *Int J Women's Health*. 2021; 13:841-859.
- 527

- 528 20. Levinson KL, Jernigan AM, Flocke SA, Tergas AI, Gunderson CC, Huh WK, et al.
529 Intimate Partner Violence and Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening: A Gynecologic
530 Oncology Fellow Research Network Study. *J Low Genit Tract Dis.* 2016;20(1):47-51
531
- 532 21. Berner AM, Connolly DJ, Pinnell I, Wolton A, MacNaughton A, Challen C, et al.
533 Attitudes of transgender men and non-binary people to cervical screening: a cross-
534 sectional mixed-methods study in the UK. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2021;71(709):e614-e625.
535
- 536 22. Sankaranarayanan R, Nene BM, Shastri SS, Jayant K, Muwonge R, Budukh AM, et al.
537 HPV screening for cervical cancer in rural India. *N Engl J Med.* 2009; 360(14):1385-
538 94.
539
- 540 23. Sawaya GF, Sanstead E, Alarid-Escudero F, Smith-McCune K, Gregorich SE,
541 Silverberg MJ, Leyden W, Huchko MJ, Kuppermann M, Kulasingam S. Estimated
542 Quality of Life and Economic Outcomes Associated With 12 Cervical Cancer
543 Screening Strategies: A Cost-effectiveness Analysis. *JAMA Intern Med.*
544 2019;179(7):867-878.
545
- 546 24. Legood R, Gray AM, Mahé C, Wolstenholme J, Jayant K, Nene BM, et al. Screening
547 for cervical cancer in India: How much will it cost? A trial-based analysis of the cost
548 per case detected. *Int J Cancer.* 2005;117(6):981-7.
549
- 550 25. Mezei AK, Pedersen HN, Sy S, Regan C, Mitchell-Foster SM, Byamugisha J, et al.
551 Community-based HPV self-collection versus visual inspection with acetic acid in
552 Uganda: a cost-effectiveness analysis of the ASPIRE trial. *BMJ Open.*
553 2018;8(6):e020484.
554

555 26. Dhanasekaran K, Tamang H, Pradhan S, Lhamu R, Hariprasad R. Challenges in setting
556 up a primary human papillomavirus-DNA testing facility in a lower and middle income
557 country: lessons learned from a pilot programme. *Ecancermedicalsecience*. 2022;
558 16:1492.

559

560

561

Supplimentary file:

562

a. Table A: EQ-5D-5L frequencies and proportions reported by dimensions and
563 level

563


564

b. Table B: Comparison of ICER and unit cost for different cervical cancer
565 screening scenarios

565

566

c. Fig A: Flow of screening process in HPV and VIA group



$$\text{ICER} = \frac{\Delta \text{cost}}{\Delta \text{Effect}}$$

$$\frac{\text{Cost of HPV} - \text{Cost of VIA}}{\text{QALD8 of HPV} - \text{QALD8 of VIA}}$$

Figure 1




Figure 2A




Figure 2B




Figure 3A




Figure 3B