

1 **TITLE**

2 Online tests for sexually transmitted infections – Friend or Foe? An analysis of providers in  
3 the United Kingdom.

4 **List of Authors**

5 Eleanor Clarke<sup>1</sup>, Paddy Horner<sup>2,3</sup>, Peter Muir<sup>4</sup>, Katy M. E. Turner<sup>2,3</sup>, Emma M. Harding-  
6 Esch<sup>1\*</sup>

7 <sup>1</sup> London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Clinical Research Department, London,  
8 UK.

9 <sup>2</sup>University of Bristol, Bristol Medical School, School of Population Health Sciences, UK

10 <sup>3</sup>NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Behavioural Science and Evaluation at University  
11 of Bristol

12 <sup>4</sup>Public Health England, South West Regional Laboratory, Bristol, UK.

13 P Horner - ORCID 0000-0003-0411-8332

14 P Muir - ORCID 0000-0003-2697-0892

15 K Turner - ORCID 0000-0002-8152-6017

16 E Harding-Esch - ORCID 0000-0002-1432-8109

17

18 **\*Corresponding author**

19 Emma M. Harding-Esch, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Clinical Research  
20 Department, Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London, WC1E 7HT, UK.

21 [Emma.harding-esch@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:Emma.harding-esch@lshtm.ac.uk)

22

23 **Word count, excluding title page, abstract, references, figures and Tables:**

24 2,981

25

26 **Key Words**

27 Testing, Providers, Online, Guidelines, Patient Care, Antimicrobial resistance

28

29

30

31 **ABSTRACT**

32 **Objectives:** Online testing for sexually transmitted infections (STIs) may contribute to  
33 overcoming barriers to traditional testing such as stigma and inconvenience. However,  
34 regulation of these tests is lacking, and the quality of services is variable, with potential  
35 short- and long-term personal, clinical and public health implications. This study aimed to  
36 evaluate online tests available in the UK against national standards.

37 **Methods:** Providers of online STI tests (self-sampling and self-testing) in the UK were  
38 identified by an internet search of Google and Amazon (June 2020). Website information on  
39 tests and care was collected, and further information requested from providers via an online  
40 survey, sent twice (July 2020, April 2021). The information obtained was compared to British  
41 Association for Sexual Health and HIV (BASHH) guidelines for diagnostics and standards of  
42 STI management.

43 **Results:** 31 providers were identified: 13 self-test, 18-self-sample, and two laboratories that  
44 serviced multiple providers. Seven responded to the online survey. Many conflicts with  
45 national guidelines were identified, including: lack of health promotion information, lack of  
46 sexual history taking, use of tests licensed for professional use only marketed for self-  
47 testing, inappropriate infections tested for, incorrect specimen type used, and lack of advice  
48 for post-diagnosis management.

49 **Conclusions:** Very few online providers met the BASHH national STI management  
50 guidelines standards that were assessed, and there is concern that this will also be the case  
51 in areas that were not covered by this study. For-profit providers were the least compliant,  
52 with concerning implications for patient care and public health. Regulatory change is urgently  
53 needed to ensure that online providers are compliant with national guidelines to ensure high-  
54 quality patient care, and providers are held to account if non-compliant.

55

56 **Key message box**

- 57
- Online providers help overcome many barriers to STI testing and are increasingly
- 58 popular, but quality of services is not assured
- 59
- Many online testing services, particularly for-profit providers, did not comply with
- 60 national guidelines
- 61
- Substandard services can lead to serious personal, clinical and public health
- 62 implications, such as inappropriate testing, inappropriate antimicrobial prescribing,
- 63 unnecessary emotional distress and missed diagnoses
- 64
- Regulatory change is required to ensure online providers comply with national
- 65 guidelines and are held to account when they do not

66

67 **INTRODUCTION**

68 Sexually transmitted infections (STIs) are an increasing public health problem in the world,[1]  
69 including the United Kingdom (UK).[2] Early diagnosis is a core intervention for guiding  
70 appropriate management, thus reducing the risk of antimicrobial resistance (AMR)  
71 emergence, preventing reproductive sexual health (RSH) sequelae, and reducing onward  
72 transmission.[1] Therefore, access to validated and approved testing services is vital. Tests  
73 for self-directed use available to purchase online (henceforth referred to as 'online tests') are  
74 increasingly popular, especially with the advent of the COVID-19 pandemic.[3] Even pre-  
75 COVID-19, online tests were widely viewed as an asset to public health, with studies  
76 demonstrating they can overcome barriers such as stigma and inconvenience,[2,4] and were  
77 the second most frequent testing service type in the UK's National Chlamydia Screening  
78 Programme (NCSP) in 2019.[2] Online tests come in two main forms: self-sampling, where  
79 the user can order a kit, take a specimen independently and then post the sample to the  
80 laboratory with results received through a text, letter or online portal;[5] and self-testing,  
81 where the user collects a specimen, conducts the test themselves, and interprets the result  
82 in private.[5]

83 However, drawbacks to online testing services have also been widely reported. Barriers for  
84 use include technical ability, language, and health or digital literacy.[4] Lack of interaction  
85 with a health professional may also be a worry to users and can result in improper  
86 management of infections and follow-up care.[6] In the UK, standards for providers of sexual  
87 health services are published by the British Association for Sexual Health and HIV (BASHH)  
88 and Faculty of Sexual and Reproductive Healthcare (FSRH).[7,8] Within these standards is  
89 the stipulation that services must include health promotion and prevention interventions and  
90 correct signposting information,[7] however, these may not always be present,[9] leaving  
91 users vulnerable to making misinformed decisions. Additionally, private testing may result in  
92 data not being captured by national surveillance systems, posing issues for epidemiological  
93 monitoring.[6,10]

94 A key concern relating to online testing is the quality of the tests themselves. Although  
95 product regulatory standards such as CE-marking are often used to assess product  
96 quality,[11] this may not always indicate good performance.[12] Poor diagnostic accuracy  
97 can lead to false-positives resulting in unnecessary treatment, with resulting AMR risk and  
98 relationship implications, and false-negatives enabling further transmission and RSH  
99 sequelae.[13] Furthermore, some testing panels include infections that STI guidelines  
100 recommend should not be routinely tested for,[14,15] resulting in similar consequences to  
101 false-positive test results.

102 In this study, we assessed whether UK patients accessing online STI tests are receiving  
103 quality of care consistent with diagnostic standards. First, we identified and characterised  
104 online test providers in the UK, before comparing them to BASHH diagnostic guidelines [16]  
105 and BASHH standards for STI management.[7]

106

## 107 **METHODS**

108 Ethical approval was granted by the MSc Research Ethics Committee of the London School  
109 of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (reference number 22195).

### 110 **Internet search of providers**

111 To identify tests available in the UK, a structured search of Google and Amazon was  
112 completed on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2020. Full details of the search are available in Supplementary  
113 Table 1. To reduce unrelated results, a combination of smaller searches was used, and the  
114 results pooled. Searches aimed to replicate the consumer experience, so layman's terms  
115 were used.

116 According to click through data,[17] the majority of Google users do not go past the first  
117 page of search results, however for thoroughness the first five pages of results were

118 screened by title and description. All Amazon results were screened. Inclusion criteria for a  
119 provider were:

- 120 1) The test had to be available in the UK
- 121 2) The test had to be either for self-sampling or self-testing
- 122 3) The test was not provided by an individual borough (administrative unit), as these are  
123 geographically limited and often use National Health System (NHS) services.

124 Data on the tests available, price, specimen type and advice/information were extracted  
125 iteratively from eligible websites. For products identified through third-party sellers, the  
126 original provider was identified and any other tests they provided also recorded.

### 127 **Provider questionnaire**

128 Further information was requested from providers and associated laboratories through an  
129 online questionnaire, guided by categories identified during data extraction and BASHH  
130 guidelines.[7] Questionnaires were tailored for each provider, depending on the tests they  
131 provided and the information available on their website. The full set of questions is available  
132 in Supplementary Table 2. The questionnaire was first sent to providers in July 2020. In  
133 March 2021, BASHH published a position statement regarding online services. This  
134 highlighted inappropriate use of multiplex testing platforms, and suboptimal antibiotic  
135 treatment regimens for bacterial STIs,[12] emphasising the presence of inappropriate  
136 testing, incorrect specimens and poor treatment options that may have implications for AMR.  
137 The statement called for increased regulation of these services, as some providers' practices  
138 are inconsistent with national guidelines. The questionnaire was sent again in April 2021 to  
139 the providers who did not respond in the first round, in the hope that the position statement  
140 publication would increase the response rate.

### 141 **Comparison with national and regulatory diagnostic guidelines**

142 Data obtained from provider services were categorised into: test type, specimen type,  
143 diagnostic accuracy, health information, follow-up/treatment, and accreditation. Comparison  
144 of services offered with BASHH guidelines was then conducted.[7,16] A full list of guidelines  
145 used for specific pathogens is available in Supplementary Table 3.

## 146 **RESULTS**

### 147 **Overview of provider responses**

148 The Google and Amazon search returned 13 self-test and 18 self-sample providers, as well  
149 as two laboratories that serviced multiple providers. In the first round of surveys, two  
150 providers completed the questionnaire, and one requested a phone call. The second round  
151 of surveys prompted four more replies. Therefore, most information was collected from  
152 provider websites. Provider names have been anonymised, in accordance with the survey  
153 terms of consent (Supplementary Table 2). The main guidelines providers were compared  
154 to are summarised in Table 1. Tests available and specimen type requested are shown in  
155 Table 2, compared to national guidelines. Further details of tests identified can be found in  
156 Supplementary Tables 3a and 3b. In general, the providers that were closest to the  
157 guidelines were free services, providing an appropriate range of tests, correct sample types,  
158 and up-to-date, comprehensive information.

**Table 1:** A summary of recommendations from the British Association of Sexual Health and HIV (BASHH) standards for the management of sexually transmitted infections (STIs).[7] These were used to assess whether online providers were providing an adequate standard of care to patients

Standard	BASHH Standards for STI Management
1: Test audience and pre-test process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online services are not appropriate for people with genital symptoms or symptoms of sexual infection</li> <li>• There should be the recording of a medical and sexual history, including use of contraception and drug and alcohol risk assessment, whether taken by a healthcare professional or self-completed.</li> </ul>
2: Test process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specimens for STI testing including as a minimum those for chlamydia, gonorrhoea, syphilis and HIV from all relevant exposed sites.</li> <li>• Specimens for microbiological testing obtained during the examination should be in line with national guidance. This should include samples from extra-genital sites if indicated in the sexual history.</li> <li>• If home sampling or testing kits are provided, it is the providers' responsibility to ensure there are clear and comprehensive written instructions on how to use the kit and how to access follow up and support if necessary</li> </ul>
3: Health information and signposting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STI tests offered to individuals should be explained clearly, including what they are for, how samples are taken, the limits of each test i.e. window periods</li> <li>• Health promotion and prevention interventions including encouragement of safer sex behaviour and condom usage.</li> <li>• Providers should ensure that appropriate advice is given about effective preventative interventions such as post exposure prophylaxis</li> </ul>
4: Follow Up/Treatment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have clear agreed care pathways in place to ensure people have access to appropriate care based on their need.</li> </ul>
5: Accreditation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laboratories should be United Kingdom Accreditation Services (UKAS) accredited and have evidence of External Quality Assessment (EQA), Internal Quality Control (IQC) and Internal Quality Assurance (IQA).</li> </ul>

**Table 2:** Chart showing the pathogens tested for by online self-test and self-sample providers, and the samples requested for each pathogen. A full list of guidelines compared against is available in Supplementary Table 3.

Type	Provider ID	Chlamydia	Gonorrhoea	Oral/Rectal chlamydia or gonorrhoea	Syphilis	HIV	Hepatitis B	Hepatitis C	Herpes (1&2)	Trichomoniasis	<i>Mycoplasma genitalium</i>	<i>Mycoplasma hominis</i>	<i>Ureaplasmas</i>	<i>Gardnerella</i> (as indicator of bacterial vaginosis)	<i>Haemophilus ducreyi</i>	Human Papillomavirus	Yeasts
BASHH Recommendation [7,16]		V (female), U (male), C if clinician collected	V (female), U (male)	S	B or lesion swab	B	B	B	Lesion swab or B	V, US, U	U (male and female), V/C (female) – symptomatic only	Not advised for routine testing	Not advised for routine testing	Not recommended as an indicator of bacterial vaginosis	Lesion swab – symptomatic only	Lesion Swab – symptomatic only (screening uses C which are clinician collected)	V – symptomatic only
Self-Test	1					B											
	2	U/C/US	U/C/US		B					C/US							
	3	C/US	C/US		B	B	B	B									
	4	C															
	5	S	S						B	V							
	6	U/C/US	?		B	B/O	B	B									
	7									V							
	8	?	S		B				B								
	9	V															
	10	C															
	11						B										
	12						B										
	13										?				?		
Self-Sample	14	U/V	U/V	S	B	B	B	B	U/V	U/V	U/V (Sp?)	U/V	U/V	U/V		V	
	15	U/V	U/V	S	B	B	B	B	U/V	U/V	U/V (Sp?)	U/V	U/V	U/V		V	

16	U/V	U/V	S	B	B				U/V							
17†	U/V	U/V	S	B	B											
18	U/V	U/V	S	B	B	B	B									
19†	U/V	U/V	S	B	B	B	B									
20	U*	U*	S	B	B	?	B	B/S/U	U	U (Sp?)		U	U		V	
21	U/V	U/V	S	B	B			?	?	?	?	?		?	V	
22	U	U		?	?	B	B	B	U	?		?	?		V	
23	U/V	U/V	S	B/S	B	B	B	B/S/U	U/V	U/V		U/V	U/V		V	V
24	U	U	S	B	B	B	B	B/U	U	U (Sp?)		U	U			
25†	U/V	U/V	S	B	B											
26†	U/V	U/V	S	B	B											
27	U/V	U/V		B	B	B	B	U/V	U/V	U/V (Sp?)		U/V	U/V			
28	U	U		B	B	B	B	B	?	?		?	?		V	
29	U	U														
30	U/V	U/V	S	B	B	B	B	U/V	U/V	U/V		U/V	U/V			
31†	U/V	U/V	S	B	B	B	B									

B = Blood; O=Oral transudate; S = Swab; Sp? = species unclear; U = Urine; US = urethral swab; V = Vaginal swab; ? = specimen unclear. This reflects where a provider explicitly states what sample is used. This is often not included on package tests, so may not reflect all tests offered; \* = most tests requested urine, but a vaginal swab was available separately. † Indicates a free service

159 **Test audience**

160 Standard 1 was often not met. BASHH advice is that symptomatic users are not suitable for  
161 online services as they need to be examined,[7] yet providers specifically targeted this group  
162 and recommended a large panel of tests. Additionally, five self-test providers offered tests  
163 that were marked as being for professional use only. With regards to sexual history taking  
164 pre-testing, some providers used an online questionnaire to recommend the most  
165 appropriate options, but most providers did not have this feature.

166 **Test Process**

167 Whilst providers did offer tests for the minimum requirement in standard 2, these were often  
168 available individually and in various packages, leaving users able to pick and choose. For  
169 the 13 self-testing kits, the main pathogens were chlamydia (n=8), HIV (n=5), and  
170 gonorrhoea (n=5). Less common pathogens were herpes (n=2), trichomoniasis (n=4),  
171 syphilis (n=4), hepatitis B (n=2), hepatitis C (n=2), *Gardnerella* (n=1) and *Candida albicans*  
172 (n=1). Currently, only HIV self-tests are approved for use in the UK,[18] which implies the  
173 availability of other self-tests is not regulated.

174 All 18 self-sample providers offered tests for chlamydia and gonorrhoea, but availability  
175 varied for other tests (Table 1). Self-sample tests were available in various combinations,  
176 with as many as 12 tests in one bundle. Free services provided a smaller range of tests than  
177 paid services. Ten self-sample services offered tests individually or within bundles for  
178 organisms generally regarded as commensal, such as *Ureaplasmas* or *Mycoplasmas*,  
179 however, it is recommended that these should not be routinely tested for.[14,15] It was also  
180 often unclear precisely which species was being referred to. *Gardnerella* infection was often  
181 used as a proxy for bacterial vaginosis, contrary to recommendations.[19] Private providers  
182 often exaggerated the pathogenicity and importance of testing for these commensal  
183 organisms. For example, two paid services claimed an advantage over the NHS by testing

184 for organisms not included in routine testing, whilst exaggerating the long-term effects of the  
185 infections.[14]

186 Specimen type often conflicted with guidelines (Table 2). For self-test services, specimen  
187 type was appropriate where it could be identified, however five providers requested cervical  
188 samples, which should be clinician-collected.[20] As the test package inserts were  
189 unavailable, it was not possible to assess whether instructions on use were clear. For self-  
190 sample services, five providers only requested urine samples for chlamydia and gonorrhoea,  
191 with four of these having no option for females to order a vaginal swab, which is  
192 recommended.[20,21] The remaining provider did offer a vaginal swab, however this was  
193 stand-alone and offered separately from their main test package. Additionally, for herpes  
194 infections, at least seven self-sample providers requested urine samples. BASHH guidance  
195 states “Urine tests are inappropriate for the diagnosis of herpes” and instead recommends  
196 that lesion swabs are taken, or blood for serology.[22]

197 Eleven self-test providers reported sensitivity and specificity estimates, all of which were  
198 >85%, however information about reference tests used or sample sizes was often  
199 unavailable. Due to lack of website information and low survey response rate, it was not  
200 possible to obtain information on diagnostic accuracy from most self-sample providers.  
201 Those who reported these results (n=5) gave values >95% for sensitivity or specificity, but in  
202 three of these, only the HIV test performance was stated.

### 203 **Health information and signposting**

204 To assess standard 3, we extracted information on whether sites gave information on STI  
205 symptoms, window periods, transmission details and health promotion (e.g. condom use).  
206 Health information was often lacking or inconsistent. For self-tests, as the package insert  
207 was only available for four providers, it was difficult to ascertain health promotion materials  
208 that may be provided to those purchasing the tests. As self-tests were often marked as  
209 professional use only, there could be lack of appropriate health information or signposting,

210 as information would be targeted at a clinician. Using information from provider websites,  
211 only five self-sample providers provided information on window periods, transmission details  
212 and infection prevention. For other providers, information was not on the same page as the  
213 test or was inconsistently mentioned across different tests. One provider gave links to  
214 Wikipedia. Advice on accessing HIV post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) was also not  
215 mentioned by eight of the self-sample providers; guidelines stipulate that users in need of  
216 this service should be directed to a clinic.[7]

### 217 **Follow-up/treatment**

218 It was difficult to assess whether standard 4 was met as often post-diagnosis processes  
219 were not shared. Where post-positive diagnosis information was provided, options involved a  
220 private consultation, treatment ordered online (mainly for chlamydia), or advice to visit a  
221 General Practitioner (GP). Partner notification was often mentioned non-specifically and may  
222 instead have been discussed post-diagnosis. Exact treatment options were unclear, however  
223 at least one provider offered an oral course of azithromycin and cefixime for gonorrhoea  
224 treatment which was easy to purchase online, instead of the recommended intramuscular  
225 ceftriaxone as per BASHH recommendations, which requires a visit to a healthcare  
226 professional.[21]

### 227 **Accreditation**

228 Although the BASHH standards do not refer to accreditation for self-tests, it is recommended  
229 that they hold the CE-mark.[18] Eleven self-test providers had at least one of their tests CE-  
230 marked, two claimed World Health Organization (WHO) approval and one claimed Food and  
231 Drug Administration (FDA) accreditation. One self-test provider marked their chlamydia and  
232 gonorrhoea self-tests with an NHS logo, describing themselves as an NHS provider, but  
233 whether that product had received NHS endorsement was unclear. For self-sample  
234 providers, United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS) accreditation was claimed as  
235 required in Standard 5, however, it was often used as a blanket term for the laboratory

236 without details of the specific laboratory service that had received accreditation.[23] Of the  
237 two laboratory providers we were able to identify, one had UKAS accreditation for certain  
238 STI tests and the other had UKAS accreditation for tests other than STIs. Care Quality  
239 Commission (CQC) accreditation was reported for 12 self-sample providers, although mostly  
240 only for laboratories used for sample testing, as opposed to the providers themselves.

241

## 242 **DISCUSSION**

243 This study identified and analysed 31 providers of online tests in the UK. We found  
244 significant areas of suboptimal service that often conflicted with national guidelines on STI  
245 diagnostics and management. These included a lack of health promotion information, lack of  
246 sexual history taking, use of tests licensed for professional use only marketed for self-  
247 testing, inappropriate infections tested for, incorrect specimen type used, and lack of advice  
248 for post-diagnosis management. As a result, users are at risk of taking unnecessary tests,  
249 with poor performance, that could lead to incorrect results, inappropriate management and  
250 receiving inadequate clinical information and support.

251 The first limitation of this study was low questionnaire response rate from providers, despite  
252 a follow-up in 2021 following the BASHH position statement publication,[12] meaning that  
253 not all aspects of care could be evaluated. Data considered missing in our analysis may  
254 have been available once the user had bought the test. Furthermore, data were extracted  
255 from websites in July 2020 but providers may have subsequently updated their websites.  
256 Although our internet search was comprehensive, it is not possible to identify all online STI  
257 test providers. The sample analysed here may therefore not be fully representative of all  
258 providers. This lack of representativeness may be further compounded by the small number  
259 of providers who responded to the survey and for whom we therefore have more extensive  
260 data. However, the low response rate we observed has been seen in similar studies where  
261 providers were contacted for information, and is not unique to our study.[24,25] In addition,

262 as our study was unfunded, tests could not be purchased to identify whether information was  
263 available post-purchase. This also meant we were unable to test the services independently,  
264 either from a user perspective through a “mystery shopper” exercise,[26] or from a  
265 diagnostic accuracy perspective by independently assessing test performance claims. These  
266 are obvious next steps for future work. Despite this, we were able to collect large amounts of  
267 information from provider websites, giving an accurate perspective of what a consumer  
268 would experience when choosing to order an online test.

269 Whilst it was difficult to assess test performance in the identified providers due to lack of  
270 available information and inability to perform independent evaluations, it is expected that test  
271 performance was sub-optimal in at least some instances.[27] BASHH guidelines note that  
272 chlamydia and gonorrhoea tests should be nucleic acid amplification test (NAAT)-based.  
273 [20,21] However, many non-NAAT chlamydia and gonorrhoea self-tests were on offer.  
274 Although many products had CE-marks, as noted by BASHH,[12] this is easily obtainable  
275 and tests may not have been adequately validated. Using incorrect sample types, or being  
276 sold tests approved for professional use only, as seen in our evaluation, may exacerbate  
277 poor test performance and add to this issue.[20–22]

278 The lack of appropriate health information given by providers poses a risk to users on  
279 multiple levels. Access to healthcare professionals as part of online STI services is  
280 recognised as important for offering information, technical assistance, and support such as  
281 reassurance and navigating relationship implications.[28] Receiving accurate information  
282 regarding appropriate services and tests is critical to providing appropriate patient care,  
283 ensuring that patients receive the correct tests relevant to their situation. In contradiction to  
284 this, we found that several online providers specifically targeted symptomatic patients,  
285 whereas standard BASHH guidelines are clear that online services are appropriate for  
286 asymptomatic individuals only,[7] as well as not being signposted to vital services such as  
287 PEP for HIV.[7] Patients were also frequently offered testing for commensal *Mycoplasmas*  
288 and *Ureaplasmas*,[14] which could lead to unnecessary costs, treatments, and results of

289 uncertain significance,[15,29] resulting in emotional distress and poor antimicrobial  
290 stewardship. These additional tests were only found in paying providers' services,  
291 suggesting that they may be more motivated by profit than by high quality healthcare  
292 provision.[30] It would be important to understand why individuals choose to pay for testing  
293 rather than opting for the free services, to help ensure patients are offered the best possible  
294 care.

295 Whilst this is the first time to our knowledge that an evaluation of UK online testing providers  
296 has been conducted, studies in other countries externally assessing online test providers  
297 have reported similar results. A 2010 study of online tests in America was able to perform  
298 independent assessments of online STI test providers, finding that they were hard to contact,  
299 and although self-tests had poor performance, self-sample tests had high accuracy.[27]  
300 Providers of chlamydia online tests in The Netherlands were found to often not meet quality  
301 indicators regarding health promotion or follow-up (especially for self-tests), but the process  
302 of an evaluation taking place did provoke providers to improve their service.[25] Similarly, an  
303 Australian study of HIV self-tests showed that none conformed to national product  
304 guidelines, and often had inadequate pre-test information and linkage to care.[24] These  
305 studies demonstrate that sub-optimal online testing service provision is a problem across the  
306 world. Actions such as publications highlighting short-falls and position statements with  
307 recommendations may create short-term impacts. However, if there are no mechanisms to  
308 maintain improved practice and prevent providers from, for example, appearing under a  
309 different name,[31] these efforts are of little long-term benefit. For there to be sustained  
310 improvements in patient care, regulatory change is needed so that providers are regularly  
311 monitored and can be held to account. Part of this involves services frequently being  
312 evaluated against national guidelines, which must also be continually updated to adapt to  
313 evolving service provision.[8,12]

314

315 **CONCLUSION**

316 Online testing is a welcome addition to STI diagnostics, offering a convenient and flexible  
317 option for users. However, the proliferation of providers that do not follow guidelines, in  
318 particular for-profit sites, jeopardises these advantages and puts users at risk. If current  
319 trends continue, online testing usage will increase, resulting in more online providers as  
320 demand increases. Regulatory change is required to ensure that the standard of care  
321 received online meets national guidelines to protect patients and the wider population from  
322 the repercussions of underperforming or inappropriate tests. If we do not act now, patients  
323 will continue to receive sub-optimal care with potentially significant adverse personal,  
324 clinical, and public health implications.

325 **Acknowledgments**

326 We thank all providers who responded to the questionnaire. We would also like to thank the  
327 BASHH Bacterial Special Interest Group (BSIG) members for reviewing the manuscript.

328 EMHE would like to thank Julius Schachter who set the challenge to address this issue at  
329 the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the European Society for Chlamydia Research, September 2016, Oxford,  
330 UK. It is not yet the outcome you hoped for, but progress is slowly being made.

331

332 **Competing Interests**

333 The authors declare no competing interests.

334

335 **Funding and all other required statements**

336 KMET acknowledges support from HDRUK CFC 0129 and PH and KMET acknowledge  
337 support from the Health Protection Research Unit in Behavioural Science and Evaluation,  
338 NIHR 200877, at University of Bristol.

## REFERENCES

- 1 WHO. Global Health Sector Strategy on Sexually Transmitted Infections 2016-2021. 2016. Available at: <https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/rtis/ghss-stis/en/> (Accessed June 2021)
- 2 Public Health England. Sexually Transmitted Infections and Screening for Chlamydia in England, 2019. 2020. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/914249/STI\\_NCSP\\_report\\_2019.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/914249/STI_NCSP_report_2019.pdf) (Accessed June 2021)
- 3 Public Health England. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on prevention, testing, diagnosis and care for sexually transmitted infections, HIV and viral hepatitis in England. 2020. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/943657/Impact\\_of\\_COVID-19\\_Report\\_2020.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/943657/Impact_of_COVID-19_Report_2020.pdf) (Accessed June 2021)
- 4 Grandahl M, Larsson M, Herrmann B. 'To be on the safe side': a qualitative study regarding users' beliefs and experiences of internet-based self-sampling for Chlamydia trachomatis and Neisseria gonorrhoeae testing. *BMJ Open* 2020;10:e041340. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-041340 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33376171/>
- 5 Harding-Esch EM, Hollis E, Mohammed H, *et al.* Self-sampling and self-testing for STIs and HIV: the case for consistent nomenclature. *Sex Transm Infect* 2017;93:445–8. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2016-052841 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27811311/>
- 6 Cannon CA, Piraino AK, Golden MR, *et al.* STI Testing Using Online Companies: Benefits, Drawbacks and Call for Official Guidance. *Sex Transm Dis* Published Online First: 2021. doi:10.1097/olq.0000000000001401 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33633071/>
- 7 British Association for Sexual Health and HIV. BASHH Standards for the Management of Sexually Transmitted Infections (STIs). 2019. Available at: <https://bashh.org/about-bashh/publications/standards-for-the-management-of-stis/> (Accessed June 2021)
- 8 British Association for Sexual Health and HIV/The Faculty of Sexual and Reproductive Healthcare. Standards for Online and Remote Providers of Sexual and Reproductive Health Services. 2020. Available at: <https://www.fsrh.org/standards-and-guidance/documents/fsrhhbashh-standards-for-online-and-remote-providers-of-sexual/> (Accessed June 2021)
- 9 Public Health England. National Chlamydia Screening Programme Audit Report: internet-based chlamydia testing. 2013. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/736125/NCSPInternetTestingSept2013\\_final.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/736125/NCSPInternetTestingSept2013_final.pdf) (Accessed June 2021)
- 10 Harding-Esch E, Nardone A, Gibbs J, *et al.* Can remote STI/HIV testing and eClinical Care be compatible with robust public health surveillance? In: *DH'15: Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Digital Health*. 2015. 129–30. doi:10.1145/2750511.2750517 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26742547/>
- 11 Department for Business Energy & Industrial Strategy. Guidance: CE Marking. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ce-marking> (Accessed January 2021)

- 12 British Association for Sexual Health and HIV. BASHH Position Statement on the Inappropriate Use of Multiplex Testing Platforms, and Suboptimal Antibiotic Treatment Regimens for Bacterial Sexually Transmitted Infections. 2021. Available at: <https://www.bashh.org/news/news/bashh-position-statement-on-the-inappropriate-use-of-multiplex-testing-platforms-and-suboptimal-antibiotic-treatment-regimens-for-bacterial-sexually-transmitted-infections-1/> (Accessed June 2021)
- 13 Price MJ, Ades AE, Soldan K, *et al.* The natural history of Chlamydia trachomatis infection in women: a multi-parameter evidence synthesis. *Health Technol Assess* 2016;20:1–250. doi:10.3310/hta20220 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27007215/>
- 14 Horner P, Donders G, Cusini M, *et al.* Should we be testing for urogenital Mycoplasma hominis, Ureaplasma parvum and Ureaplasma urealyticum in men and women? – a position statement from the European STI Guidelines Editorial Board. *J Eur Acad Dermatology Venereol* 2018;32:1845–51. doi:10.1111/jdv.15146 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29924422/>
- 15 Taylor-Robinson D, Horner P, Pallearos A. Diagnosis of some genital-tract infections: part 2. Molecular tests and the new challenges. *Int J STD AIDS* 2020;31:198–207. doi:10.1177/0956462419890526 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32009570/>
- 16 British Association for Sexual Health and HIV. BASHH Guidelines. Available at: <https://www.bashh.org/guidelines> (Accessed June 2021)
- 17 Erskine R. 20 Online Reputation Statistics That Every Business Owner Needs To Know. *Forbes*. 2017. Available at: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/ryanerskine/2017/09/19/20-online-reputation-statistics-that-every-business-owner-needs-to-know/#3fa04a7ccc5c> (Accessed July 2020)
- 18 Public Health England. HIV Testing and Self-Testing: Information update November 2015. 2015. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/769460/HIV\\_Self-Testing\\_PHE\\_Position\\_v13\\_-\\_Nov\\_15\\_updated.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/769460/HIV_Self-Testing_PHE_Position_v13_-_Nov_15_updated.pdf) (Accessed June 2021)
- 19 British Association for Sexual Health and HIV. UK National Guideline for the Management of Bacterial Vaginosis 2012. 2012. Available at: <https://www.bashhguidelines.org/media/1041/bv-2012.pdf> (Accessed June 2021)
- 20 Nwokolo NC, Dragovic B, Patel S, *et al.* 2015 UK national guideline for the management of infection with Chlamydia trachomatis. *Int J STD AIDS* 2015;27:251–67. doi:10.1177/0956462415615443 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31870237/>
- 21 Fifer H, Saunders J, Soni S, *et al.* 2018 UK national guideline for the management of infection with Neisseria gonorrhoeae. *Int J STD AIDS* 2019;31:4–15. doi:10.1177/0956462419886775 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31870237/>
- 22 Patel R, Green J, Clarke E, *et al.* 2014 UK national guideline for the management of anogenital herpes. *Int J STD AIDS* 2015;26:763–76. doi:10.1177/0956462415580512 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25861804/>
- 23 United Kingdom Accreditation Service. Reference to Accreditation for Laboratories. 2018. Available at: <https://www.ukas.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/LAB-1->

- Reference-to-Accreditation-for-Laboratories-1.pdf (Accessed June 2021)
- 24 Williams OD, Dean JA, Harting K, *et al.* Implications of the on-line market for regulation and uptake of HIV self-testing in Australia. *AIDS Care* 2017;29:112–7. doi:10.1080/09540121.2016.1200716 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27337946/>
  - 25 den Daas C, Sukel B, Bos H, *et al.* Evaluation and enumeration of online test providers for sexually transmitted infections, specifically chlamydia, in the Netherlands. *Sex Transm Infect* 2019;95:380–5. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2018-053771 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30670600/>
  - 26 Okecha E, Patel S, Boardman E, *et al.* O2O Online prescribing for sexually transmitted infections – what’s on offer! *Sex Transm Infect* 2017;93:A7. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2017-053232.20 Available at: [http://sti.bmj.com/content/93/Suppl\\_1/A7.3.abstract](http://sti.bmj.com/content/93/Suppl_1/A7.3.abstract)
  - 27 Owens SL, Arora N, Quinn N, *et al.* Utilising the internet to test for sexually transmitted infections: results of a survey and accuracy testing. *Sex Transm Infect* 2010;86:112–6. doi:10.1136/sti.2009.037226 Available at: <https://sti.bmj.com/content/86/2/112>
  - 28 Aicken CRH, Sutcliffe LJ, Gibbs J, *et al.* Using the eSexual Health Clinic to access chlamydia treatment and care via the internet: a qualitative interview study. *Sex Transm Infect* 2018;94:241–7. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2017-053227 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28988193/>
  - 29 Plummer EL, Vodstrcil LA, Bodiya K, *et al.* Are *Mycoplasma hominis*, *Ureaplasma urealyticum* and *Ureaplasma parvum* associated with specific genital symptoms and clinical signs in non-pregnant women? *Clin Infect Dis* Published Online First: January 2021. doi:10.1093/cid/ciab061 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33502501/>
  - 30 Minichiello V, Rahman S, Dune T, *et al.* E-health: potential benefits and challenges in providing and accessing sexual health services. *BMC Public Health* 2013;13:790. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-13-790 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23987137/>
  - 31 Schachter J. Point-of-care tests using enzyme detection to diagnose Chlamydia trachomatis infection do not work. But when they fail in clinical trials, they reappear under different names. *Sex Transm Infect* 2016;92:406–7. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2015-052508 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26895879/>