

# 1 **Understanding Health worker Perspectives on Risk**

## 2 **Screening for HIV Testing - A Qualitative Study from**

### 3 **Zimbabwe**

4 Hamufare D. Mugauri<sup>1,2\*#a</sup>, Joconiah Chirenda<sup>1</sup>, Kudakwashe Takarinda<sup>3</sup>, Owen Mugurungi<sup>2</sup>,  
5 Getrude Ncube<sup>2</sup>, Ishmael Chikondowa<sup>2</sup>, Patrick Mantiziba<sup>4</sup>, Mufuta Tshimanga<sup>1</sup>

6

7 1. The University of Zimbabwe, Department of Primary Health-care Sciences, Harare,  
8 Zimbabwe

9 2. Ministry of Health and Child Care, AIDS and TB Unit, Harare, Zimbabwe

10 3. Organisation for Public Health Interventions and Development (OPHID), Harare, Zimbabwe

11 4. Clinton Health Access Initiative (CHAI), Harare, Zimbabwe

12

13 #a Current Address: Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Department of Primary Health-care  
14 Sciences, New Health Sciences Building, Parirenyatwa Complex, Mazowe road, Harare,  
15 Zimbabwe

16 \*Corresponding Author

17 Email: [dumiwaboka@gmail.com](mailto:dumiwaboka@gmail.com) (HDM)

18

19

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## 20 **Abstract**

21 **Background:** The use of screening tools during targeted human immunodeficiency virus  
22 (HIV) testing services improves efficiency by identifying individuals who are likely to test  
23 positive. Effective utilization of screening tools requires an understanding of health care worker  
24 perception and willingness to use the tools. We determined health workers' perspectives on  
25 screening tools to enhance their effective and consistent utilisation.

26 **Methods:** We conducted a qualitative study among healthcare workers at 8 selected  
27 primary healthcare facilities in Zimbabwe. Interviewer guided, in-depth interviews were  
28 conducted with healthcare workers and their immediate supervisors. Inductive and deductive  
29 coding (hybrid) was applied to develop and analyze themes following a framework built around  
30 the grounded theory model to describe perspectives that influence the effective and consistent  
31 utilization of HIV screening tools and suggestions for improved eligibility screening.

32 **Results:** Behavioural factors facilitating the utilisation of the screening tool included  
33 motivation to adhere to standard practice, awareness of screening role in targeting testing, and its  
34 ability to manage workload through screening out ineligible clients. This was evident across  
35 service delivery levels. Barriers included limited healthcare capacity, confidentiality space,  
36 multiple screening tools and opaque screening in/out criteria and the potential of clients not  
37 responding to screening questions truthfully.

38 **Conclusions:** Across geographical and service delivery levels, correct placing of the  
39 screening tool at HIV testing entry point, healthcare worker knowledge on screening in/out  
40 criteria emerged as enablers for correct and consistent use of the screening tools. Further,  
41 standardizing the tools used would improve the utilisation of the correct tool.

42  
43 **Key Words:** Screening tool, qualitative, HIV Testing Services, health worker perspectives,  
44 grounded theory framework

## 45 **Introduction:**

46 More than two decades into the HIV pandemic, an estimated 79.3 million people have  
47 been infected and approximately 36.3 million people have succumbed to AIDS-related  
48 illnesses globally (1,2). The virus remains a major global public health threat with an  
49 estimated 37.7 million people living with HIV (including 1.7 million children), globally in  
50 2020. Notably, around 16% of the people living with HIV (6.1 million) do not know their  
51 HIV status exposing a large gap in testing (1).

52 The HIV pandemic is skewed against East and Southern Africa, which contributes  
53 20.6 million people living with HIV and 670,000 new HIV infections in 2020 alone, making  
54 it the epicentre of the pandemic (2). Further, one in every 25 adults (3.6%) is living with HIV  
55 in Southern Africa alone, accounting for more than two-thirds of the people living with HIV  
56 worldwide (1).

57 Knowing one's HIV status through testing is key to mitigating the onward  
58 transmission of the virus in the community. While universal testing (provider and client-  
59 initiated testing) remains the gold standard, many resource-poor settings are struggling to  
60 offer this, mainly because of test kit shortages indicating the need for cost-effective  
61 approaches to HIV testing. To respond to this context, screening tools are suggested to aid  
62 testers to segregate clients and prioritize testing clients who are most likely to test HIV  
63 positive, thereby reducing “unnecessary testing” – whereby a negative test result is almost  
64 predictable. Screening tools are an integral component of the targeted testing strategy (3).

65 Zimbabwe shifted from testing for coverage and embraced targeted testing in 2017 as  
66 a stratagem to enhance positivity yield (4). Further, an adult HTS screening tool was  
67 introduced in 2019 to aid testers to direct HIV testing for clients likely to test positive. This  
68 tool was subsequently evaluated and validated, resulting in a revised tool that met the

69 properties acceptable to effectively reduce testing volumes and minimally screen out potential  
70 positive testers.

71 During the evaluation and validation exercise, it was anticipated that the positivity  
72 yield would decline since no screening was being done (both screened in and screened out  
73 clients were tested) in contrast with before the exercise when the screening tool guided  
74 eligibility for testing. However, it was noted with concern that a positivity yield of 7.53% was  
75 documented during the evaluation comparable with 7.68%, which was documented at the  
76 same facilities a month before the evaluation exercise. This finding strongly suggested that  
77 either the tool was not being routinely utilized as expected, or that the tool was not effective  
78 in its determination of eligibility for testing.

79 Using a qualitative research approach and drawing on perspectives from Nurse  
80 managers and testers, this study sought to generate an in-depth understanding of the factors  
81 that influence the utilisation of screening tools at public health facilities in Zimbabwe. The  
82 goal was to inform the effective, routine and standardized implementation of screening tools  
83 to guide targeted testing.

## 84 **Materials and Methods**

### 85 **Study design and theoretical framework**

86 This cross-sectional qualitative study using in-depth interviews (IDIs) sought to understand  
87 and describe the factors that influence health workers' and their managers' perspectives on  
88 the utility of HIV Testing Services screening tools. We applied objectivist and constructivist  
89 attributes of the Grounded theory adapted to our context. This facilitated the application of  
90 the comparative methodology that provided systematic guidance for gathering, synthesizing,  
91 analysing, and conceptualizing qualitative data to understand health workers' perspectives on

92 the use of Screening tools in HIV testing (5). The adaptation of the Grounded theory is  
93 illustrated in **Fig 1**.

#### 94 ***Fig1. Adaptation of the grounded theory***

95 Two-part questionnaires were developed to guide the elicitation of key variables from the  
96 Nurse managers (Sister in Charge and Matrons) and the Testers (Nurses and Primary  
97 Counsellors).

#### 98 **Study Setting**

99 The study was carried out at Primary Health Care (PHC) facilities which are the first port  
100 of call for communities seeking healthcare in Zimbabwe.

101 Zimbabwe is a landlocked, low-income country in Southern Africa which is located  
102 between Botswana, South Africa, Mozambique and Zambia with an estimated population of 16  
103 million and a human development index of 0.516, ranked number 154 globally out of 189  
104 countries in 2016 (6). The country is divided into two urban provinces, eight rural provinces and  
105 62 districts. The capital city is Harare and other major cities include Bulawayo, Gweru, Kadoma,  
106 Kwekwe, Masvingo and Mutare (7).

107 All clients who report at the public health facilities are offered HIV testing services  
108 after being screened for eligibility, according to existing Job aides and OSDM (Operational  
109 Service Delivery Manual) (8). Provider initiated testing and counselling (PITC) is practised at  
110 the facility and in the community, whereby the health worker makes the initiative to offer  
111 HIV testing services to eligible clients regardless of the purpose of the visit. Clients may also  
112 demand the service (Client-Initiated Testing and Counselling - CITC) (9). HIV screening  
113 results are not routinely documented, the process only aids the service provider to determine

114 if the client can be tested during that visitor to be advised to report back at a later date,  
115 according to their risk profile.

116 Outpatients (OPD), Family and Child Health (FCH) departments, as well as  
117 Opportunistic Infections clinics (OIC), are the common entry points for HTS. Admitted  
118 clients may also be tested within the wards.

119

## 120 **Sampling, participant recruitment, and data collection**

121 Eight healthcare facilities were selected from the 25 facilities that participated in the  
122 quantitative evaluation and validation of the screening tool. The rationale for facility selection  
123 was to synthesise interrelated circumstances and participants for the quantitative and qualitative  
124 studies, on account of their inter-relatedness. Health workers (Nurse managers and testers) found  
125 onsite during the data collection exercise were recruited into the study, which recorded a 100%  
126 response rate from the health workers identified. Data were collected in November 2021 by Data  
127 collectors with experience in conducting qualitative interviews. The facilities, selected from 4 of  
128 the 10 provinces of the country included 1 Rural hospital (Hwedza), 1 district Hospital (Banket),  
129 1 Mission Hospital (Avilla), 3 urban Polyclinics (Zengeza, Overspill and Seke south), Partner run  
130 site (New Africa house Newstart centre) and a rural clinic (Ruyamuro) as tabulated below;

131

132

133

134

135

136 **Table 1. Sites for Qualitative Data Collection for the Adult HTS Screening tool, 2021**

Province	District	Name of site
Mashonaland West	Banket	Banket District Hospital
Harare	Harare City	Ruyamuro clinic, Overspill Clinic, New Africa house Newstart Centre
	Chitungwiza	Seke South Clinic, Zengeza clinic
Manicaland	Nyanga	Avila Mission hospital
Mashonaland East	Hwedza	Hwedza Rural Hospital

137

138 All participants were provided with detailed study information before giving their written  
139 informed consent. All participants were either Nurse managers (Sister in Charge or Matron) or  
140 Testers, (Nurses and Primary Counsellors) working at the selected clinics and willing to consent  
141 to the audio recording of the interview. Consenting participants were assigned a unique study  
142 number for confidentiality. The final sample of 20 participants included male and female Nurse  
143 managers, nurses and primary counsellors. The variedness of this ultimate sample would enable  
144 obtaining a fairly comprehensive picture of experiences and perceptions related to using HTS  
145 screening tools (10).

146 Interviews lasted 25–35 minutes and were carried out using a guide with open-ended  
147 questions. Topics covered in the guide included awareness of the existence of the screening tool,  
148 its usefulness and consistency in its usage to guide decision making on eligibility for an HIV test  
149 for clients. Experiences using screening tools as well as the barriers to and facilitators for usage,

150 and provider perceptions of their value in targeting HIV testing were also investigated. Interviews  
151 were conducted in quiet locations, mostly in open spaces or in offices. Discussions were  
152 primarily conducted in English, but participants were free to express themselves in vernacular  
153 (Shona) which they felt helped them better articulate their experiences when utilising HTS  
154 screening tools. Saturation of themes during data collection was achieved through regular  
155 debriefing discussions among the investigators on probing techniques (11). Interviews were  
156 stopped when no new issues emerged.

### 157 **Data analysis**

158 All interviews were transcribed verbatim. Audio recordings with renderings of local  
159 languages were directly transcribed and translated to English by the investigators fluent in the  
160 study languages, and checked the accuracy of the transcripts against digital recordings. Multiple  
161 reading of transcripts was done by both investigators, followed by manual coding and  
162 categorisation into pre-set themes, new themes were also developed from recurring related  
163 responses. Transcripts were imported into QSR International NVivo version 10 software to group  
164 the initial codes into themes and subsequently organize them into key dimensions and identify  
165 patterns across groups. (12). Soft-copy transcripts were stored securely and safely on password-  
166 protected computers and audio recordings were deleted from recorders. Transcripts were not  
167 returned to participants for comment.

168 The two members of the study team independently reviewed and coded the transcripts  
169 guided by the Grounded theory constructs to explore the perceptions of participants on  
170 perceptions on the utility of screening tools in public health settings. We applied open and axial  
171 coding to facilitate the interpretation of collected data. To analyse the qualitative data, we used  
172 thematic analysis and inductively and deductively developed codes (hybrid). The codes were  
173 organized into three overarching domains of factors for nurse managers, namely location, usage,



174 and capacity. For implementers, the overarching themes were four, namely time, honesty,  
175 capacity and impact.

176 Collaboratively, the investigators reviewed and refined emerging key dimensions and  
177 themes The process of refining, and reviewing key dimensions and emerging themes were  
178 repeatedly done until saturation was achieved when no additional themes or categories could be  
179 identified (12). The analysis process identified salient differences in the health workers'  
180 perceptions of screening tools and their utility in public health settings. Participant demographic  
181 characteristics were obtained from the qualitative interviews. We categorized gender based on the  
182 responses to the question: “Tell us more about yourself,” when the participant explicitly and  
183 voluntarily mentioned their gender as either male or female without probing.

## 184 **Results**

### 185 **Participants’ characteristics**

186 The participants (n = 20) were mostly female (n = 13, 65%), and of median age of 37  
187 (IQR: 31–40) years. The majority were Primary Counsellors (n=9, 45%), followed by Sisters in  
188 Charge (n=6, 30%) and 1 Matron (5%). Most reported having professional experience of between  
189 2 and 5 years (9, 45%) and having served for less than 2 years at the current facility (n=8, 40%).  
190 (Table 2.)

191

192

### 193 **Table 2. Demographic characteristics of participants.**

---

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Number (%)<sup>*</sup></b>	<b>N=20</b>
---------------------	-------------------------------	-------------

---

---

**Sex**

- Female 13 (65)
- Male 6 (35)

**Age**—median (interquartile range) 37 (31-40)

**Professional category**

- Matron 1 (5)
- Sister in Charge 6 (30)
- Registered General nurse 4 (20)
- Primary Counsellor 9 (45)

**Professional years of experience**

- <2years 4 (20)
- 2-5 years 9 (45)
- >5 years 7 (35)

**Years working in the current clinic**

- <2 years 8 (40)
- 2-5 years 5 (25)
- >5 years 7 (35)

---

194 \*column percentage

195 We present five themes from the analysis (Table 3) supported with verbatim, minimally edited  
196 quotes.

197 **Health worker perceptions of screening tools**

198 Healthcare Workers (HCW) expressed varying perceptions on the ideal placing of the screening  
 199 tool to maintain an ideal client flow. Further, they expressed their opinions on the timeframe  
 200 required to proficiently conduct the screening process and how the screening decision should be  
 201 communicated to the client as well as how to deal with clients who may falsify responses to  
 202 obtain the desired HIV test, or avoid it. The perceptions were informed by their experience using  
 203 the tools and for others, how they perceived the questions when they were shared with them.

204 **Table 3. Themes and key dimensions from in-depth interviews and their relevant Grounded**  
 205 **theory constructs and domains.**

Theme and key dimensions	Relevant Grounded theory construct and the <i>operational definition</i>	Relevant Grounded domain
<p><b>Theme 1: Ideal placing of the HTS screening tool within the health care facility</b></p> <p><i>Key dimensions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening for HTS eligibility at facility entry, reception area, consultation room or HIV testing point</li> <li>• Opinions on the best placing of a screening tool within the healthcare setup</li> </ul>	<p><b>Outcome expectations</b></p> <p><i>“Health workers identifying the ideal location of the screening process to achieve optimal client flow and utility of the tool”</i></p>	<p>Social or Environmental Factors</p>
<p><b>Theme 2: Potential negative sequelae from utilising HIV screening tools by health workers</b></p> <p><i>Key dimensions</i></p>	<p><b>Reciprocal determinism</b></p> <p><i>“Interactions between personal and social/environmental factors that positively or negatively influence utilization of HIV screening tools”</i></p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fear of the screening process increasing the workload for HIV testing</li> <li>• Health workers are not clear about the screening in/out process due to a lack of orientation</li> <li>• Concerns from providers that multiple tools are available and it's not clear which tool to utilize</li> <li>• Client flow is already reduced at health facilities hence no need to screen the few that come</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Theme 3: Potential deliberate misinformation by clients desiring an HIV test</b></p> <p><i>Key dimensions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fear of clients not responding honestly when asked screening questions because of their desire to be tested/ not tested</li> <li>• Confidentiality environment creation and assurance at the onset of engaging with the client</li> <li>• Client attitudes towards being screened for eligibility before testing</li> </ul>	<p><b>Behavioural capability</b></p> <p><i>“Having and using acquired knowledge and skills to promote honesty in responding to screening questions to ensure that screening decision is based on true factors”</i></p>	<p>Professional and Personal factors</p>
<p><b>Theme 4: Amount of time required to perform the screening process</b></p>	<p><b>Self-efficacy</b></p>	

<p><i>Key dimensions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To correctly ascertain the amount of time required to conduct HIV screening</li> <li>Contrasting the amount of time required to conduct an HIV test against the amount of screening</li> <li>Determining screening duration time reduction when screening is routinely performed</li> </ul>	<p><i>“Having a good understanding of the importance of screening for HIV testing and the minimum time it takes when routinely applied”</i></p>	
<p><b>Theme 5: The effect that screening for HIV testing has on various health aspects; resources, workload, efficiency</b></p> <p><i>Key dimensions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflect on how reducing testing volumes through eligibility screening discourages high frequent testing with no corresponding positivity yield</li> <li>Drawing from regular onsite data analysis how positivity yield is impacted by testing volumes</li> </ul>	<p><b>Observational learning</b></p> <p><i>“Reflecting on the role of eligibility screening for HIV testing in reducing testing volumes, reduce workload and promote efficiency in HIV testing”</i></p> <p><b>Reinforcements</b></p> <p><i>“Encouraging positive changes through interpersonal and structural support”</i></p>	<p>Environmental and professional factors</p>

206

207 **The ideal placing of the HTS screening tool within the health care facility**

208

209 This theme was observed across various facility levels and sizes. Clinic setups have single entry  
210 points and usually attend to low volume clients whereas larger facilities such as district and rural  
211 hospitals had multi-entry points hence the need to determine the most ideal placing of the tool.

212 *“it is useful but needs to be placed at the right entry point, where the health worker engages with*  
213 *the client one on one....” (Male, Primary Counsellor, District Hospital.)*

214 Further, a relationship between correct placing and subsequent utilization and the ease thereof  
215 was suggested.

216 *“We need to screen clients at all testing points for HIV, where we meet the client who has opted*  
217 *in for HIV testing following the group education sessions. If we screen them on arrival, this may*  
218 *discourage them from visiting our facility. (Female, Sister in Charge, Rural Hospital)*

#### 219 **Potential negative sequelae from utilising HIV screening tools by health workers**

220 Participants across the geographical areas had different opinions on how screening tools would  
221 impact their workload which reflected that a few of them did not have a clear understanding of  
222 their utilization.

223 *“When clients come into the testing room, they want to be tested. I would rather not waste time*  
224 *asking them screening questions when yet there is a queue outside....” (Female, Primary*  
225 *Counsellor, Urban Clinic)*

226 *“Few clients are turning up for HIV testing because of COVID-19. I think the few that come*  
227 *should just be tested because they made efforts to come. Those who are not at risk are not*  
228 *coming” (Male, Primary Care Nurse, Mission Hospital)*

229 Most of the health care workers were aware of the application of the screening tool to assess  
230 eligibility for an HIV test, which inevitably result in some clients being screened out.

231 *“When a client is screened out, I won't proceed with testing and explain that they are not eligible*  
232 *at the time” – (Female, Sister In Charge, Urban Clinic).*

233 Few of the HCWs were not clear on the role of the screening tool: that it should be applied to  
234 assess eligibility for an HIV test on the day of the visit. If a client does not meet the screening  
235 criteria, then they should not be tested but advised on their next date for re-screening. Further,  
236 some clients should not be screened because they are catered for under specific programs.

237 *“Client would still test despite being screened out according to SOP” Female, Sister In Charge,*  
238 *District Hospital).*

239 The cited Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) referred to pregnant and lactating women  
240 retesting algorithm, which is unique to them whilst the rest of the population does not utilize it.

241 There seemed to be multiple screening tools being utilized, particularly among partner-run sites.

242 *“Here we use our own tool supplied by our organisation, which is electronic because we review*  
243 *the work done by our counsellors in determining who to test and who not to test.”– (Female,*  
244 *Doctor, Partner-run health centre).*

245 Lastly, discussions revealed that utilization of available interventions was said to depend on  
246 attitude and HIV risk perception.

#### 247 **Potential deliberate misinformation by clients desiring an HIV test**

248 Aligned to the behavioural capability construct, this theme focused on the risk of clients  
249 deliberately providing false information during the screening process to access an HIV test or  
250 decline it.

251 *“Some clients will lie because they want to get tested and will be angry if you say you won't test*  
252 *them” (Female, Registered General Nurse, Mission Hospital).*

253 Health workers across geographical settings concurred that creating confidential space and  
254 assuring the client of the same is needed in routine practice when dealing with HIV issues and  
255 that the screening process is no exception.

256 *“To get honest responses, we discuss with our clients in the privacy and assure them that no one*  
257 *will know about the conversation. We also explain that the risk assessment provides us with*  
258 *important information to advise them on how best to live their lives, without exposing themselves*  
259 *to HIV...” (Female Primary Care Nurse, Rural Hospital).*

260 Discussions revealed that the screening process, just like any other medical procedure, requires  
261 confidentiality to be created and assured. Clients may vary their responses to achieve an end and  
262 it's the health worker's responsibility to identify inconsistencies and highlight them courteously  
263 to verify facts.

#### 264 **Amount of time required to perform the screening process**

265 Participants who had never used the screening tool were motivated to utilize the tool in pairs and  
266 determine how much time they required to apply it whilst those who had experience using the  
267 tool provided feedback on the time they usually took to complete the screening process.

268 *“I only needed 6 minutes to ask all the questions because I was not familiar with them, with*  
269 *routine use, I will probably need less than 5 minutes because I would have memorised*  
270 *them...”(Male, Primary Counsellor, Rural Clinic).*



271 Discussions revealed that health workers would take an average of 5 minutes if they routinely  
272 utilize the screening tool. Further, observing medical work ethics is essential to avoid the  
273 screening process being used to wantonly reduce workload.

274 *“The time I need to conduct an HIV test is 25 minutes at the minimum, that is if I am doing things*  
275 *right, the screening time is less than a third of that time, so it’s not much, but there is a need to*  
276 *make sure everyone screened out was not eligible for a test, to avoid some people screening*  
277 *clients out to reduce workload” (Male, Primary Counsellor, Urban Clinic).*

278 **The effect that screening for HIV testing has on various health aspects; resources,**  
279 **workload, efficiency**

280 This theme focused on the impact of screening for eligibility for HIV testing on workload against  
281 positivity yielding results and efficiency in the delivery of HIV testing services. Consistency was  
282 observed, across geographical locations that screening and testing clients who are likely to test  
283 HIV positive result in efficiency and economic use of finite resources (test kits) whilst ensuring  
284 that the positivity yield is optimal.

285 *“Seeing that our positivity remains low despite efforts to raise it, the screening will reduce the*  
286 *total number of tests we do and we will test clients who mostly test positive and we would have*  
287 *done well...” (Female, Matron, District Hospital).*

288 HCWs mentioned additional strengthening of the existing system to ensure that screening  
289 becomes mandatory at all facilities and that the client responses to screening questions should be  
290 documented for verification.

291 **Discussion**

292 Our findings highlight the relevance of using the GTM framework to enhance the routine  
293 utilization of HIV risk screening tools by HCWs. GTM provides a framework for understanding  
294 how perceptions about the ideal placing of the tool, self-efficacy and outcome expectations,  
295 influenced by personal, interpersonal and environmental factors, as well as behaviour capability,  
296 ultimately affect the utilization of the tools. In this regard, the FGDs revealed that placing the  
297 screening tool at the HIV testing entry points is ideal to ensure that the tool is administered to  
298 clients who are willing to conduct an HIV test and the screening process is conducted within a  
299 confidential space. Assuring the client of confidentiality was suggested to complement the  
300 environment and ensure that the client can freely discuss sexual matters. The relationship  
301 between confidentiality and client willingness to divulge sensitive information is well  
302 documented in the literature (13–15). The interactions between factors at each one of these levels  
303 are particularly important for understanding the factors that motivate the routine utilization of  
304 screening tools by HCWs in heterogeneous settings.

305 The construct of self-efficacy emphasized the importance of screening process orientation  
306 and awareness of the right tool for utilization. The existence of multiple screening tools was  
307 identified as a hindrance to the effective use of the same. Health workers across facility levels  
308 suggested the standardization of the screening tools across the country, regardless of whether a  
309 facility is supported by a partner or entirely run by the government. This will create a  
310 comprehensive database of screening for eligibility for testing thereby creating an opportunity to  
311 evaluate adherence to the laid down procedure at determined intervals.

312 The construct of behavioural capability emphasized the need for creating a therapeutic  
313 relationship with clients, grounded on confidentiality to ensure honesty in response to the  
314 screening questions. Inconsistencies in client responses to questions can be confronted in this

315 confidential space complimented by assurance o confidentiality. This can only be achieved if the  
316 HCWs are skilled in counselling dynamics as emphasized in the literature (16,17).

317 Our study showed that the minimal time needed to conduct screening is +/-5mins. Routine  
318 implementation of the screening tool will result in the questions being integrated as part of a  
319 continuous therapeutic conversation with the healthcare worker, during which the risk profile of  
320 the client is determined and hence the screening decision arrived at. This finding was consistent  
321 with what is documented regarding the value of targeting HIV testing to high-risk clients who are  
322 likely to obtain a positive test result (18,19). Discussions with HCWs indicated that the time  
323 taken to screen is worth the benefits of screening out ineligible testers, improving efficiency in  
324 testing services and improving positivity yield since targeted testing is enhanced by testing  
325 individuals likely to obtain a positive diagnosis. Applied regularly and consistently, screening is  
326 an effective tool to improve client flow at health facilities.

327 Further, it was observed that the screening process needs to be integrated into the  
328 minimum package for clients seeking HIV testing services. To achieve this end screening should  
329 be a mandatory step for all clients seeking HIV testing services. This is consistent with the drive  
330 to target HIV testing where screening tools form an integral part of risk assessment, particularly  
331 in environments where clients have a culture of high-frequency testing without regard to risk.  
332 Done correctly and consistently, screening for eligibility for an HIV test has documented benefits  
333 (20,21).

### 334 **Conclusions**

335 Assessing eligibility for an HIV test is an integral part of targeting HIV testing services. This  
336 reduces the retesting frequency and considers the risk profile before offering an HIV test. Across  
337 geographical and service delivery levels, the correct placing of the screening tool at HIV testing

338 entry point, healthcare worker knowledge on screening in/out criteria emerged as enablers for  
339 correct and consistent use of the screening tools. Further, standardizing the tools used would  
340 improve the utilisation of the correct tool.

## 341 **Declarations**

### 342 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

343 Approval to conduct this study was obtained from the Ministry of Health and Child  
344 Care head office, the Joint Research Ethics Committee for the University of Zimbabwe  
345 Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences and Parirenyatwa Group of Hospitals (JREC  
346 280/2021) and the Medical Research Council of Zimbabwe (MRCZ/A/2783). Written  
347 informed consent was obtained from all participants before conducting FDGs and recording  
348 the participants.

349

### 350 **Consent for publication**

351 All authors consent to the publication of this work

352

### 353 **Availability of data and material**

354 The interview guide for this study has been provided in **S1 Annex**

355

### 356 **Competing interests**

357 The authors declare that they have no competing interests

358

### 359 **Funding**

360 This project did not receive direct funding for its implementation. The study was conducted  
361 as part of routine service provision for the Zimbabwe Ministry of Health and Childcare HIV testing  
362 services.

### 363 **Authors' contributions**

364 Conception and design: HDM, JC, KT, OM, GN, PM, MT; development of data capture  
365 tools: HDM, KT, PM; data collection: HDM, KT, PM; data entry: HDM, PM; data analysis and  
366 interpretation: all authors; preparing the first draft of the manuscript: HDM, KT, OM, JC, MT;  
367 critical review and approval of final draft: all authors

368

### 369 **Acknowledgements**

370 I acknowledge several individuals and institutions that made this study a success. Special  
371 gratitude goes to my academic supervisors, Professor M. Tshimanga, Dr J. Chirenda and Dr K.  
372 Takarinda, The Director of AIDS & TB Unit, Dr O. Mugurungi and the entire HTS team for their  
373 support and prodding during this study. Further, I thank the Clinton Health Access Initiative which  
374 provided financial support to meet travelling costs associated with the implementation of this study.

### 375 **References**


- 376 1. UNAIDS. Global HIV Statistics. Fact Sheet 2021. 2021;(June):1–3.
- 377 2. UNAIDS GA. CONFRONTING INEQUALITIES.  
378 <https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2021/2021-global-aids-update>. 2021;
- 379 3. Routine and Targeted HIV Testing [Internet]. [cited 2022 Feb 10]. Available from:  
380 <https://www.thebodypro.com/article/routine-and-targeted-hiv-testing>
- 381 4. Ministry of Health and Child Care (MOHCC) Z. Zimbabwe National HIV Testing  
382 Services Strategy, 2017-2020. 2017; Available from: [https://hts.hivci.org/hts-](https://hts.hivci.org/hts-score.html?countryid=GTM)  
383 [score.html?countryid=GTM](https://hts.hivci.org/hts-score.html?countryid=GTM)

- 384 5. Charmaz K. Grounded Theory: Methodology and Theory Construction. *Int Encycl Soc*  
385 *Behav Sci.* 2001;6396–9.
- 386 6. UNAIDS. UNAIDS. Country: Zimbabwe [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2018 Apr 17]. Available  
387 from: <http://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/zimbabwe>
- 388 7. World Population Review.com/countries/zimbabwe-population/. Zimbabwe Population  
389 2019 (Demographics, Maps, Graphs) [Internet]. [cited 2019 Apr 4]. Available from:  
390 <http://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/zimbabwe-population/>
- 391 8. AIDS & TB Programme M of H and CCZ. Zimbabwe Operational and Service Delivery  
392 Manual (OSDM) for the Prevention, Care and Treatment of HIV in Zimbabwe, 2017  
393 [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2020 Dec 9]. Available from: [http://www.ophid.org/treat-all-](http://www.ophid.org/treat-all-toolkit/MOHCC%20Guidelines/MOHCC%20Zimbabwe%20OSDM%202017.pdf)  
394 [toolkit/MOHCC Guidelines/MOHCC Zimbabwe OSDM 2017.pdf](http://www.ophid.org/treat-all-toolkit/MOHCC Guidelines/MOHCC Zimbabwe OSDM 2017.pdf)
- 395 9. Zimbabwe Ministry of Health and Child Care, National AIDS Council Z. Zimbabwe HIV  
396 and AIDS Strategy for the Informal Economy 2017-2020.
- 397 10. Moser A, Korstjens I. Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 3: Sampling,  
398 data collection and analysis. *Eur J Gen Pract* [Internet]. 2018 Jan 1 [cited 2022 Mar  
399 9];24(1):9. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC5774281/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35774281/)
- 400 11. Elo S, Kääriäinen M, Kanste O, Pölkki T, Utriainen K, Kyngäs H. Qualitative Content  
401 Analysis. *SAGE Open.* 2014 Jan 1;4(1):215824401452263.
- 402 12. Wong L, Li Ping W. Data Analysis in Qualitative Research: A Brief Guide to Using  
403 Nvivo. *Malaysian Fam Physician Off J Acad Fam Physicians Malaysia* [Internet]. 2008  
404 [cited 2022 Mar 9];3(1):14. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC4267019/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/194267019/)
- 405 13. Sirinskiene A, Juskevicius J, Naberkovas A. Confidentiality and duty to warn the third

- 406 parties in HIV/AIDS context. *Med Etika Bioet* [Internet]. [cited 2022 Apr 21];12(1):2–7.
- 407 Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16607711>
- 408 14. Duty of Confidentiality and HIV/AIDS - PubMed [Internet]. [cited 2022 Apr 21].
- 409 Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28758472/>
- 410 15. Konradsen H, Lillebaek T, Wilcke T, Lomborg K. Being publicly diagnosed: A grounded
- 411 theory study of Danish patients with tuberculosis. *Int J Qual Stud Health Well-being*. 2014
- 412 Apr 23;9(1):1–8.
- 413 16. Confidentiality and disclosure of HIV infection: HIV-positive persons' experience with
- 414 HIV testing and coping with HIV infection in Latvia - PubMed [Internet]. [cited 2022 Apr
- 415 21]. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11177453/>
- 416 17. Deribe K, Woldemichael K, Wondafrash M, Haile A, Amberbir A. Disclosure experience
- 417 and associated factors among HIV positive men and women clinical service users in
- 418 southwest Ethiopia. *BMC Public Health*. 2008;8.
- 419 18. Liu GG, Guo JJ, Smith SR. Economic costs to business of the HIV/AIDS epidemic.
- 420 *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2004;22(18):1181–94.
- 421 19. Bloom DE, Glied S. Benefits and costs of HIV testing. *Science* [Internet]. 1991 [cited
- 422 2022 Apr 21];252(5014):1798–804. Available from:
- 423 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1829547/>
- 424 20. Howard J. Hiv screening scientific, ethical, and legal issues. *J Leg Med*. 1988;9(4):601–
- 425 10.
- 426 21. Screening for HIV. *N Engl J Med* [Internet]. 1988 Feb 11 [cited 2022 Apr 21];318(6):378–
- 427 80. Available from: <http://www.nejm.org/doi/abs/10.1056/NEJM198802113180610>

428 **Supplementary file:** SI\_ Qualitative Study Dataset





HTS: HIV Testing Services

Fig 1. Adaptation of the grounded theory