

HIV self-testing positivity rate and linkage to confirmatory testing and care: a telephone survey in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal

Arsène Kouassi Kra^{1*}, Arlette Simo Fotso^{1,2}, Nicolas Rouveau¹, Mathieu Maheu-Giroux³, Marie-Claude Boily⁴, Romain Silhol⁴, Marc d'Elbée^{1,5}, Anthony Vautier⁶ and Joseph Larmarange^{1,2} on behalf of the ATLAS team

¹ Centre Population et Développement (Ceped), Université Paris Cité, Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD), Inserm, France

² Institut National d'études Démographiques (Ined), France

³ Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Population and Global Health, McGill University, Montréal, QC, Canada

⁴ MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

⁵ National Institute for Health and Medical Research UMR 1219, Research Institute for Sustainable Development EMR 271, Bordeaux Population Health Centre, University of Bordeaux, France

⁶ Solidarité Thérapeutique et Initiatives pour la Santé (Solthis), Sénégal

*Corresponding author

Correspondence: arsene.kra.kouassi@ceped.org

ABSTRACT

HIV self-testing (HIVST) empowers individuals to decide when and where to test and with whom to share their results. From 2019 to 2022, the ATLAS program distributed ~ 400,000 HIVST kits in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal. It prioritised key populations, including female sex workers and men who have sex with men, and encouraged secondary distribution of HIVST to their partners, peers and clients.

To preserve the confidential nature of HIVST, use of kits and their results were not systematically tracked. Instead, an anonymous phone survey was carried out in two phases during 2021 to estimate HIVST positivity rates (phase 1) and linkage to confirmatory testing (phase 2). Initially, participants were recruited via leaflets from March to June and completed a sociobehavioural questionnaire. In the second phase (September-October), participants who had reported two lines or who reported a reactive result were recontacted to complete another questionnaire. Of the 2,615 initial participants, 89.7% reported a consistent response between the number of lines on the HIVST and their interpretation of the result (i.e., 'non-reactive' for 1 line, 'reactive' for 2 lines).

Overall positivity rate based on self-interpreted HIVST results was 2.5% considering complete responses, and could have ranged from 2.4% to 9.1% depending on the interpretation of incomplete responses. Using the reported number of lines, this rate was estimated at 4.5% (ranging from 4.4% to 7.2%). Positivity rates were significantly lower only among respondents with higher education. No significant difference was observed by age, key population profile, country or history of HIV testing.

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

45 The second phase saw 78 out of 126 eligible participants complete the questionnaire. Of the 27
46 who reported a consistent reactive response in the first phase, 15 (56%, 95%CI: 36 to 74%)
47 underwent confirmatory HIV testing, with 12 (80%) confirmed as HIV-positive, all of whom began
48 antiretroviral treatment.

49 The confirmation rate of HIVST results was fast, with 53% doing so within a week and 91% within
50 three months of self-testing. Two-thirds (65%) went to a general public facility, and one-third to
51 a facility dedicated to key populations.

52 The ATLAS HIVST distribution strategy reached people living with HIV in West Africa. Linkage to
53 confirmatory testing following a reactive HIVST remained relatively low in these first years of
54 HIVST implementation. However, if confirmed HIV-positive, almost all initiated treatment. HIVST
55 constitutes a relevant complementary tool to existing screening services.

56
57 **Keywords:** AIDS; HIV; Self-Testing; Key Populations; MSM; sex-workers; phone-based survey; West Africa;
58 confirmatory testing; follow-up care; public health program evaluation.

59
60
61

62

Introduction

63 Early testing followed by successful linkage to antiretroviral treatment for those diagnosed with HIV can
64 drastically reduce the risk of onward HIV transmission and mortality [1–6]. In 2021, according to the United
65 Nations Program for HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), 81% of the adult population living with HIV in West and Central Africa
66 knew their status. Only 77% of them were on antiretroviral treatment [7], below the 95-95-95 UNAIDS targets
67 for 2025 [8]. The 95-95-95 targets aim for 95% of people living with HIV to know their status, 95% of those
68 diagnosed to receive treatment, and 95% of those on treatment to achieve viral suppression. Improving
69 diagnosis coverage, especially among vulnerable key populations at high risk of HIV acquisition and
70 transmission, is the necessary first step to achieve this goal.

71 HIV self-testing (HIVST) is the process by which a person who wants to know their HIV status collects their
72 own sample (oral fluid or blood), performs the test, and then interprets the results themselves, often in a private
73 setting [9]. It is an innovative tool that empowers individuals and guarantees the confidentiality of the test
74 result [10]. Individuals may decide when and where to test and with whom they want to share their result. It
75 is a tool that is widely accepted by various populations, including key populations [11–18]. It has been shown
76 to be effective in screening populations vulnerable to HIV acquisition and transmission that are often hardly
77 reached through conventional approaches [19–21]. The World Health Organization (WHO) has recommended
78 HIVST as a complementary testing approach since 2016 [22].

79 The HIV Self-Testing in Africa (STAR) project carried in Eastern and Southern Africa and funded by Unitaid
80 aimed to boost the global market for HIVST (<https://www.psi.org/fr/project/star/>). The project unfolded in
81 three phases: Phase 1 ran from September 2015 to August 2017, Phase 2 spanned from August 2017 to July
82 2020, and Phase 3 took place between January 2020 and July 2021. Following the experience gained in Eastern
83 and Southern Africa under the STAR project [11, 23–28], the Unitaid funding agency sought to stimulate HIVST
84 in West Africa, where HIV epidemics are distinguished by their more concentrated and less generalised nature
85 compared to those in Eastern and Southern Africa. In this region, the general population prevalences are
86 relatively low to very low, and key populations (for example, female sex workers and men who have sex with
87 men) are particularly affected and bear a disproportionate share of the HIV burden [29]. The ATLAS programme
88 (*AutoTest de dépistage du VIH : Libre d'Accéder à la connaissance de son Statut*) aimed to promote, implement,
89 and expand HIVST in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal [30] where the national HIV prevalence in 2021 was 1.9%
90 (1.7%-2.2%), 0.8% (0.6%-1%), and 0.3% (0.3%-0.4%) respectively [31].

91 To preserve the anonymity and confidentiality of HIVST and not impede their use, ATLAS decided, in line
92 with WHO recommendations, not to track the use and outcomes of distributed HIVST kits systematically. Such
93 tracking can be logistically challenging and costly and could limit the distribution, redistribution and use of
94 HIVST [32]. Without systematic tracking, it is challenging to obtain information on the users of the HIVST,
95 their results and on linkage to confirmatory testing and treatment, which are crucial indicators to assess
96 program effectiveness and impact. For instance, the positivity rate can reflect the yield of new individuals
97 diagnosed with HIV and if the testing modality is indeed reaching those in need. Diagnosed individuals must
98 seek confirmatory testing and be linked to care to maximise health benefits and decrease onward
99 transmission.

100 We conducted an innovative survey by setting up an anonymous and free telephone platform in Côte
101 d'Ivoire, Mali and Senegal while preserving anonymity and encouraging voluntary participation. In the second
102 phase (September-October), participants who had reported two lines or a self-interpreted HIVST result as
103 reactive were recontacted to complete another questionnaire. Here we present the HIV test positivity rates
104 from the phase 1 questionnaire and the links with confirmatory tests and care.

105

Materials and Methods

106 ATLAS program description


107 ATLAS HIVST distribution was integrated into existing testing policies, programmes and activities in each
108 country; 397,367 HIVST kits were freely distributed between July 2019 and February 2022 as part of the three
109 countries' national AIDS strategies. At the time of ATLAS's implementation in 2019, only small-scale HIVST pilot
110 programs had been previously conducted in Senegal and Côte d'Ivoire, whereas Mali had no previous

111 experience with HIVST. In Senegal, for instance, the first pilot survey took place between April 2017 and June
 112 2018 [33].

113 The design of the different delivery channels and the priority populations were developed with country
 114 stakeholders including national AIDS programs/councils, international institutions including the WHO,
 115 international and national non-governmental organisations involved in local HIV programs, and civil society
 116 and community leaders. ATLAS HIVST distribution was organised through eight different operational delivery
 117 channels (Figure 1), i.e. five facility-based approaches (delivery of HIVST kits through public or community-
 118 based health facilities) and three community-based approaches involving outreach activities engaging female
 119 sex workers (FSW), men who have sex with men (MSM), and people who use drugs (PWUD) [30]. Peer
 120 educators conducted these outreach activities through group activities (e.g. talks, discussion groups, night
 121 visits, social events, or parties) and face-to-face activities (e.g. home visits). Outreach activities represented
 122 the majority (~85%) of ATLAS’s distribution volume.

123

ATLAS delivery channels to reach key populations and other vulnerable populations



124


125 **Figure 1.** ATLAS delivery channels (adapted from [30]). FSW=female sex workers, MSM=men who have
 126 sex with men, PLHIV=people living with HIV PMTCT=prevention of mother-to-child transmission,
 127 PWUD=people who use drugs, STI=sexually transmitted infection.

128

129 ATLAS activities relied on both primary and secondary distribution. HIVST kits were distributed by peer
 130 educators and healthcare professionals to primary contacts for their personal use (primary distribution). With
 131 secondary distribution, primary contacts were provided HIVST kits and invited to redistribute them to their
 132 peers, partners, and clients. These secondary contacts were often members of key populations that can be
 133 more difficult to engage in HIV prevention, along with other peripheral vulnerable populations. This chain-
 134 referral distribution of HIVST implies that end-users were not limited to primary contacts.

135 Only oral self-testing (OraQuick HIV Self-Test®) has been distributed through ATLAS. OraSure Technologies,
 136 the manufacturer of the OraQuick test, accompanies each HIVST kit with a user manual for result
 137 interpretation. OraQuick HIVST results should be interpreted as follow: “reactive” (“positive”) if two lines (C &
 138 T) are visible (even barely), “non-reactive” (“negative”) if only the C (control) line is visible, and “invalid” if no
 139 line is visible or if only the T (test) line is visible. To be noted, the French version of the HIVST instructions
 140 distributed by ATLAS (Figure 2, Figure S1) used the wording “reactive” / “non-reactive” instead of “positive” /
 141 “negative” to qualify the HIVST result, following WHO vocabulary in their HIVST guidelines [20] as an HIVST is
 142 triage test and does not provide a definitive HIV-positive diagnosis. The questionnaire of the survey also used
 143 “reactive” / “non-reactive” wording (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11061878>).

144



IN ALL CASES, IF YOU'RE NOT SURE OF YOUR RESULT, CALL 106 FOR HELP.

145

146

147

148

Figure 2. English translation of the guidelines for interpreting HIVST result, following manufacturer instructions for use (OraQuick HIV Self-Test®), as included in the ATLAS brochure distributed with HIVST (Ivorian version). See <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11086135> for the original French version.

149

150

151

152

153

154

In addition to the manufacturer's instructions, locally adapted brochures and explanatory videos in French and local languages have been developed to help users perform the test, interpret the result and know what actions should be taken following a non-reactive, a reactive or indeterminate result (for example : <https://youtu.be/laCCjVEKZto> in English or <https://youtu.be/1xzitLD309U> in French). They also encouraged people with a reactive HIVST to seek confirmatory HIV testing and care. Individuals with a non-reactive test

155 were invited to retest after 3 months if still exposed to HIV. Existing toll-free hotlines in each country were
156 strengthened and trained on HIVST, to offer information about HIV, prevention, testing, use and interpretation
157 of HIVST and counseling.

158 **Study design and data collection**

159 The ATLAS program embedded multiple research activities, from qualitative studies to economic analyses,
160 which have been described in detail elsewhere [17, 30, 34–37].

161 The program included a voluntary anonymous phone survey. Between mid-March and mid-June 2021,
162 dedicated survey flyers were distributed with the HIVST kits inviting self-test users in each country to call a toll-
163 free number to complete a questionnaire (phase 1). All calls from the three countries, over the same period,
164 were rerouted to a telephone platform located in Abidjan and operated by Ipsos Côte d'Ivoire, which was
165 selected following an international call for tenders.

166 A pilot survey was initially conducted without offering financial compensation to the participants [38].
167 Following its results, we decided to introduce a reward as a token of appreciation for the time participants
168 dedicated to the survey. Consequently, completion of the questionnaire was rewarded with 2,000 XOF
169 (approximately 3.40 USD) of phone communication credit. This reward was mentioned on the survey flyers. In
170 order to participate in the survey, participants had to be of legal age to use an HIVST on their own without
171 parental permission (16 years in Côte d'Ivoire, 18 years in Mali, and 15 years in Senegal) and had to have used
172 an HIVST provided to them through the ATLAS project.

173 As the survey was anonymous, there was a risk that some HIVST users may participate more than once or
174 that individuals who have never used HIVST tried to participate to receive the financial incentive. To limit these
175 risks, several measures were taken: (i) the leaflet distributed with the HIVST kits had a unique 9-digit number
176 generated by the research team that was requested prior to participation in the survey, (ii) the same unique
177 number could not be used twice, (iii) the financial incentive was only paid out once the questionnaire was fully
178 completed (however individuals could refuse to answer any particular question), (iv) the same telephone
179 number could not be used twice to receive the telephone credit. These unique 9-digit numbers were generated
180 non-sequentially and were grouped by country, delivery channel and implementing partner. Thus, any unique
181 number could indirectly identify the delivery channel where the HIVST kit was initially dispensed.

182 The time when participants received their HIVST kit was not collected. However, as a survey leaflet was
183 mandatory to participate, we could estimate that all participants received their HIVST kit during the survey
184 period (i.e. between mid-March and mid-June 2021).

185 The phase 1 questionnaire, which lasted 20 to 30 minutes, collected information on sociodemographic
186 characteristics of HIVST users (including age, sex, marital status, education level), testing history (having ever
187 tested for HIV before using HIVST and date of last HIV test), sexual and preventive behaviours, HIVST use and
188 difficulties encountered [39]. Specifically, each participant was asked about the number of lines that appeared
189 when reading the HIVST result and their self-interpretation of it (reactive or non-reactive).

190 In total, 2,615 participants were recruited for phase 1 [39]. Those who reported two lines or a reactive
191 result (n=126) were asked for their consent to be called back a few months later to participate in a
192 complementary survey and, if consented, to provide a phone contact (n=120). As some individuals may delay
193 their decision to undergo a confirmatory test by several weeks/months after using an HIV self-test, we chose
194 a minimum of 3-month gap between our two surveys to potentially get an estimate of the maximum number
195 of participants who eventually underwent confirmatory testing.

196 From September 27th to October 22nd, 2021, 96 were successfully recontacted and invited to complete a
197 5-minute questionnaire (phase 2). Among those, 89 accepted to participate in phase 2 and 78 fully completed
198 phase 2 questionnaire. Phase 2 questionnaire asked the participants if they had undergone a confirmatory test
199 following their HIVST, reasons for not linking to confirmatory testing (if not linked), time between HIVST and
200 confirmatory testing (if linked), type of facility for confirmatory testing, confirmation test result, linkage to
201 antiretroviral treatment (if confirmed HIV-positive).

202
203 The interviews were conducted in either French, English, Bambara, or Wolof. On-the-fly translation into
204 other local languages was also available. Compensation of XOF 2,000 (≈3.40 USD) in the form of telephone
205 credit was given to participants who completed the phase 2 questionnaire. Unlike in phase 1, it was not a
206 financial incentive as participants were informed about it only at the end of the interview. Interviews were not

207 audio-recorded. Questionnaires' responses were captured on a computer and stored in a database managed
208 by PAC-CI, an Ivorian research institute with expertise in clinical research.

209 At the end of the survey, collected telephone numbers (for appointments and rewards) were deleted from
210 the database. All procedures have been described in a publicly available data management plan
211 (<https://dmp.opidor.fr/plans/3354/export.pdf>). The complete project protocol, including the data
212 management plan (required by the ethics committees), was written in French. Both phase 1 and phase 2
213 questionnaires have been made available online and a link is now provided
214 (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10210464>).

215 **Data analysis**

216 Following a previously published analysis [39], and due to the small numbers of participants in certain
217 distribution channels, distribution channels (Figure 1) were grouped into three categories: FSW-based
218 channels (outreach or facility-based), MSM-based channels (outreach or facility-based) and other channels
219 (PWUD-based channels, index testing, STI consultations). As the profile of participants should differ
220 substantially by sex and distribution channel (women from the FSW-based channel are more likely FSW while
221 those from the MSM-based channel are more likely female partners of MSM; men from the MSM-based
222 channel are more likely MSM while those from the FSW-based channel are more likely partners or clients of
223 FSW, see Figure 1), we decided to combine distribution channel and sex into a single combined variable named
224 key population profile.

225 Based on phase 1 participants' self-reports, we distinguished between those who provided a consistent
226 response, i.e. the reported number of visible lines was consistent with the reported self-interpretation (2
227 visible lines reported as reactive, one line reported as non-reactive, or no/one line and interpreted as invalid),
228 those who provided an inconsistent response, i.e. the number of visible lines was inconsistent with the self-
229 interpretation of the result, or those who returned only a partial response (refusal to answer or answered "I
230 don't know" to one or both questions).

231 Due to the inconsistency of responses, we considered self-reported results and reported number of HIVST
232 lines separately to estimate HIVST positivity rates. For each source, we calculated positivity rates for complete
233 responses (excluding 'don't know' and refusals (DK-R) from the numerator and denominator). We also
234 calculated the potential range of positivity rates by including incomplete responses (highest possible rate, DK-
235 R responses are considered reactive, and lowest possible rate, DK-R responses are considered non-reactive).

236 We conducted two separate multivariable logistic regressions, based respectively on self-interpreted
237 results and the reported number of lines, to analyse differences in positivity rates according to key population
238 profile, country, age group, marital status, educational level, and first-time tester. Global p-values for each
239 variable were computed using likelihood-ratio tests (using the *Anova()* function from 'car' R package). To
240 account for multiple comparisons, q-values were computed with the Bonferroni correction (using the R
241 *p.adjust()* function). We deemed it important to stratify the positivity rates by country, key population profile,
242 and age group (15-24, 25-34, and 35+).

243 We described the selection of eligible participants for phase 2 questionnaires and corresponding
244 participation rates. To assess any participation bias, characteristics of phase 2 participants (country, sex and
245 distribution channel, age group, marital status, educational level, and first-time testers, i.e. whether they ever
246 tested for HIV before using HIVST) were compared with individuals eligible for phase 2 but who did not
247 participate and with phase 1 participants not eligible for phase 2. Simple comparisons were conducted using
248 chi-square tests, and multiple comparison was performed using a multivariable multinomial logistic regression
249 model, followed by the calculation of likelihood ratio tests.

250 Among phase 2 eligible participants who completed their questionnaire, linkage to confirmatory testing,
251 the proportion being confirmed HIV positive, and the proportion who initiated treatment were described,
252 stratified by the reported number of lines and self-interpreted HIVST result in phase 1 questionnaire.

253 We also described (i) for those who did not link to confirmatory testing, the main reported reason; and (ii)
254 for those who did link to confirmatory testing, the type of facility attended for confirmation and the time
255 between HIVST and confirmatory testing.

256 A dedicated anonymised dataset and the corresponding R script are available on Zenodo
257 (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11086135>) to allow replication of the analysis. All analyses have been
258 performed using R version 4.3.1 [40]. All the descriptive tables were generated using the *tbl_summary()*
259 function from the 'gtsummary' package [41]. Confidence intervals (95% confidence interval, 95%CI) were

260 computed using Wilson's method with Yate's continuity correction (*prop.test()* function in the 'stats' package).
261 Multinomial models were computed with *multinom()* from the 'nnet' package and likelihood-ratio tests with
262 *Anova()* from 'car'.
263

264 **Ethics**

265 ATLAS research protocol (version 3.0, October 8 2020) has been approved by the WHO Ethical Research
266 Committee (January 12, 2021, reference: ERC 0003181), the National Ethics Committee for Life Sciences and
267 Health of Côte d'Ivoire (November 27, 2020, reference: 191-20/MSHP/CNESVS-km, IRB:000111917), the Ethics
268 Committee of the Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy of the University of Bamako, Mali (November 16, 2020,
269 reference: 2020/254/CE/FMPOS/FAPH), and the National Ethics Committee for Health Research of Senegal
270 (January 26, 2021, protocol SEN19/32, n°8 MSAS/CNERS/Sec).

271 The full research protocol was written in French (https://hal.science/ATLAS_ADVIH/hal-04121482v1). The
272 peer-reviewed protocol has been published in English elsewhere [30].

273 **Results**

274 **HIVST results**

275 Of the 2,615 participants recruited in phase 1, 2,346 (89.7%) reported a self-interpreted HIVST result
276 consistent with their reported number of visible lines on the HIVST: 2,292 (88.0%) reported one line self-
277 interpreted as non-reactive, 50 (1.9%) two lines self-interpreted as reactive, and 4 (0.2%) no/one line self-
278 interpreted as invalid (table 1). In contrast, 48 (1.8%) reported an inconsistent response: 10 (0.4%) one line
279 self-interpreted as reactive, 35 (1.3%) two lines self-interpreted as non-reactive/ and 3 (0.1%) no line self-
280 interpreted as non-reactive. Finally, 221 (8.5%) reported a partial result: 147 (5.6%) reported 0, 1 or 2 lines but
281 did not know how to interpret the result or refused to answer, 46 (1.7%) self-interpreted their result but did
282 not know or refused to report the number of lines, and 28 (1.1%) did not know or refused to answer to both
283 questions.

284

285 **Table 1.** Reported self-interpreted HIV self-test (HIVST) result, reported number of lines on the HIVST, and
 286 positivity rates according to different hypotheses among participants of the first phase of the survey in Côte
 287 d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021).

Phase 1 participants	Formula	2615 (100%)
Consistent response (C)	C = C₁ + C₂ + C₃	2346 (89.7%)
2 lines / reactive [†]	C ₁	50 (1.9%)
1 line / non-reactive	C ₂	2 292 (88%)
0-1 line/ invalid	C ₃	4 (0.2%)
Inconsistent response (I)	I = I₁ + I₂ + I₃ + I₄ + I₅	48 (1.8%)
1 line / reactive [†]	I ₁	10 (0.4%)
0 line / reactive [†]	I ₂	0 (0%)
2 lines/ non-reactive [†]	I ₃	35 (1.3%)
0 line / non-reactive	I ₄	3 (0.1%)
2 lines/ invalid [†]	I ₅	0 (0%)
Partial response (P)	P = P₁ + P₂ + P₃ + P₄ + P₅ + P₆ + P₇	221 (8.5%)
0 line / DK-R	P ₁	1 (<0.1%)
1 line / DK-R	P ₂	117 (4.5%)
2 lines/ DK-R [†]	P ₃	29 (1.1%)
DK-R / reactive [†]	P ₄	2 (<0.1%)
DK-R / non-reactive	P ₅	44 (1.7%)
DK-R / invalid	P ₆	0 (0%)
DK-R / DK-R	P ₇	28 (1.1%)
Positivity Rate		
Based on self-interpreted test results		
Lowest possible rate (DK-R as not reactive)	$(C_1 + I_1 + I_2 + P_4) / n$	62 / 2615 (2.4 %)
Complete responses (DK-R excluded)	$(C_1 + I_1 + I_2 + P_4) / (C + I + P_4 + P_5 + P_6)$	62 / 2440 (2.5 %)
High possible rate (DK-R as reactive)	$(C_1 + I_1 + I_2 + P_1 + P_2 + P_3 + P_4 + P_7) / n$	237 / 2615 (9.1%)
Based on the reported number of lines		
Lowest possible rate (DK-R as 1 line)	$(C_1 + I_3 + I_5 + P_3) / n$	114 / 2615 (4.4 %)
Complete responses (DK-R excluded)	$(C_1 + I_3 + I_5 + P_3) / (C + I + P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$	114 / 2541 (4.5 %)
Highest possible rate (DK-R as 2 lines)	$(C_1 + I_3 + I_5 + P_3 + P_4 + P_5 + P_6 + P_7) / (C + I + P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$	188 / 2615 (7.2 %)
†: Eligible for phase 2 Survey		
DK: don't know. R: refused to answer		

288

289 **HIVST positivity rates**

290 Based on the self-interpreted HIVST results, the overall positivity rate was 2.5% when only complete
 291 responses were considered (Table 1). It would have been similar (2.4%) if DK-R responses were considered
 292 non-reactive (lowest possible rate). Considering DK-Rs as reactive would have increased the positivity rate to
 293 9.1% (highest possible rate). Based on the estimated number of visible lines, the overall positivity rate was
 294 4.5% (complete responses, lowest possible rate: 4.4%, highest possible rate: 7.2%).

295 Multivariable models did not show any significant effect of key population profile, country, age group,
 296 marital status, or being a first-time tester on positivity rates (Tables S1a and S1b). No effect of educational


297 level was observed on positivity rates based on the reported number of visible lines. However, a significant
298 effect of the educational level was observed on positivity rates based on self-reported HIVST results ($p=0.002$,
299 $q=0.014$): individuals with a secondary or a higher level of education have a higher probability of reporting a
300 reactive test (adjusted OR equal to 4.00 [95% confidence interval: 1.44 to 12.9] and 4.12 [1.76 to 12.1]
301 respectively).

302 Although not statistically significant, we observed variations between key population profiles (Figure 3,
303 Table S2). Based on self-reported results, positivity rates were 3.4% for men [possible range from 3.2 to 9.8%]
304 and 1.0% for women [1.0 to 2.9%] in MSM-based channels, 1.7% for men [1.6 to 8.2%] and 2.7% [2.5 to 10.0%]
305 for women in FSW-based channels, vs 0.8% for men [0.7 to 5.8%] and 1.5% for women [1.4 to 8.2%] in the
306 other distribution channels (PWUD-based channels, index testing and STI consultations). Observed positivity
307 rates varied by age group (Table S3): 2.4% for 15-24 years old [2.2 to 7.8%], compared to 2.9% for 25-34 years
308 old [2.7 to 9.5%] and 2.0% for those aged 35 years or older [1.8 to 12.0%].

309 **Participation in phase 2**

310 During phase 1, 126 individuals reported two lines or self-interpreted their result as reactive and were
311 therefore eligible for phase 2 (Table 1). Among them, 6 refused to be recontacted after phase 1 (Figure 4).
312 Among the 120 (95%) who agreed to be recontacted, 24 (20%) were unreachable at the time of the phase 2
313 survey, and 96 (80%) were successfully recontacted. Among the latest, 89 (93%) accepted to participate in the
314 phase 2 survey. Ten dropped out before the end of the interview, and 1 disconnected and was unreachable
315 afterwards. As a result, 78 participants completed phase 2 questionnaire. Of the 78 participants, 39 (50%) were
316 from Côte d'Ivoire, 31 (40%) from Mali, and 8 (10%) from Senegal (Table S2). Participation rates were 54%
317 (27/50) for participants who reported a consistent response (2 lines and reactive), 71% (32/45) for those with
318 an inconsistent response (either 2 lines & non-reactive, or 1 line & reactive), and 66% (19/31) for those
319 reporting a partial response (2 lines & DK-R or DK-R & reactive).

320 The participants who completed the phase 2 questionnaire had similar sociodemographic characteristics
321 (e.g. country, sex, distribution channel, age group, marital status) compared to those eligible for phase 2, but
322 that did not complete it, and to phase 1 participants not eligible for phase 2 (Table S4). For most participants
323 (86%), phase 2 questionnaire was completed between 4 and 6 months after phase 1 questionnaire (Table S5).



325


326

327

328

329

Figure 3. Positivity rates based on self-interpreted HIVST results or the reported number of visible lines, by key population profiles and country, among participants of the first survey phase in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021). Error bars indicate possible range. An asterisk indicates that there was less than 25 participants in that distribution channel. FSW=female sex worker, MSM=men who have sex with men. MSM-based channels include facility-based and outreach. FSW-based channels include facility-based and outreach. Other channels include PWUD-based channels, index testing and STI consultations.



330

331

332

333

Figure 4. Flow chart of the participant selection process for the 2nd phase of the survey in Côte d'Ivoire (CI), Mali (ML), and Senegal (SN) (2021).

334 **Linkage to confirmatory testing and care**

335 Overall, 34 of the 78 who completed the phase 2 questionnaire (44%) reported having performed
336 confirmatory testing. Linkage was higher for those who reported 2 lines and correctly self-interpreted their
337 result as reactive (56%, 95%CI: 36-74%), than for those who reported two lines but did not know or refused
338 to report their test interpretation (44%, (95%CI: 22-69%) and those who reported 2 lines but incorrectly
339 self-interpreted the result as non-reactive (36%, 95%CI: 19-57%) (Table 3). Finally, among the 8 participants
340 who reported none/one line or did not know how many lines and incorrectly self-interpreted the result as
341 reactive, only 2 linked to confirmatory testing.

342 The main reason given for not linking to confirmatory testing was that *"their HIVST was non-reactive"*
343 (18/44, 41%, and although 8 of these 18 reported a reactive result in phase 1 questionnaire), followed by
344 *"not knowing that a confirmation test was required"* (10/44, 23%), and *"not having time"* (8/44, 18%) (Table
345 S6).

346 When participants were linked to confirmatory testing, it was usually shortly after performing their
347 HIVST: 53% linked in less than one week and 91% in less than 3 months (Table S5). Most participants (65%)
348 performed their confirmatory testing in a general public facility (health centre, hospital, clinic or maternity)
349 whereas 35% chose a community-based clinic or health centre dedicated to key populations (Table S7).

350 Among the 34 that linked to confirmatory testing, 19 (56%, 95%CI: 38-72%) were confirmed HIV-
351 positive, and 18 (95%, 95%CI: 72-100%) initiated antiretroviral treatment. Of the 18 participants who
352 initiated ART, 11 (72%) underwent their confirmation test less than a week after their self-test, 2 (11%) did
353 so between 1 and 2 weeks, 1 (5.6%) between 3 and 4 weeks, 1 (5.6%) waited between 1 and 2 months, and
354 1 (5.6%) proceeded with the test three months later. Among the 27 who reported a consistent reactive
355 response in the phase 1 questionnaire, 15 (56%, 95%CI: 36-74%) linked to confirmatory test, 12 (80%) were
356 confirmed HIV-positive and all started treatment (100%).

357
358

359
360

Table 2. Linkage to confirmatory testing, proportion being confirmed HIV positive and treatment initiation, by reported number of lines and self-interpreted HIVST result among eligible participants of the second phase of the survey who completed their questionnaire in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021).

Reported number of lines/ self-interpreted HIVST result	Completed phase 2 n	Linked to confirmatory testing		Confirmed HIV positive		Initiated ART	
		n (%)	95%CI	n (%)	95%CI	n (%)	95%CI
Overall	78	34 (44%)	33% to 55%	19 (56%)	38% to 72%	18 (95%)	72% to 100%
2 lines / reactive	27	15 (56%)	36% to 74%	12 (80%)	51% to 95%	12 (100%)	70% to 100%
1 line / reactive	7	1 (14%)	1% to 58%	0 (0%)	0% to 80%		
2 lines / non-reactive	25	9 (36%)	19% to 57%	3 (33%)	9% to 69%	3 (100%)	31% to 100%
2 lines / DK-R	18	8 (44%)	22% to 69%	4 (50%)	22% to 78%	3 (75%)	22% to 99%
DK-R / reactive	1	1(100%)	5% to 100%	0 (0%)	0% to 95%		

DK: don't know. R: refuse to answer. CI: confidence interval.

361
362

363

Discussion

364 Our study shows that the strategy implemented by the ATLAS program, through primary and secondary
365 distribution of HIVST kits and dedicated channels, achieved HIV positivity rates of 2.5% (central hypothesis,
366 low: 2.4%, high: 9.1%) based on self-interpreted results, and 4.5% (central hypothesis, low: 4.4%, high:
367 7.2%) based on the reported number of lines. The proportion of participants with a reactive HIVST that
368 sought confirmatory testing was 44% (95% CI: 33%-55%). Of those who underwent confirmatory testing,
369 56% (95% CI: 38%-72%) were found to be HIV-positive and, among them, 95% (95% CI: 72%-100%) initiated
370 treatment. Among the participants who confirmed their reactive HIVST with a traditional facility-based HIV
371 test, 65% did so within a week and 91% within three months.

372

373 According to our estimates, HIVST positivity rates in Côte d'Ivoire were 2.0% (complete responses,
374 lowest possible: 1.8%, highest possible: 9.8%) based on self-interpreted results and 3.9% (3.8% to 5.4%)
375 based on the number of lines reported. In Mali, these rates were respectively 3.6% (3.5 to 6.7%) and 5.0%
376 (4.9% to 7.8%), while, in Senegal, they were 1.4% (1.2 to 15.0%) and 6.0% (5.4% to 14.9%). Overall, these
377 results for HIVST positivity are generally higher than the average overall positivity of HIV testing services
378 (excluding HIVST) in West Africa. Our results are in line with data collected by ATLAS implementing
379 partners. Between 2020 and 2021, these ATLAS partners collected spontaneous feedback from HIVST
380 users. This unpublished data collection was non-systematic and varied from one partner to another. Among
381 4,463 documented feedbacks, HIVST was reactive for 188 cases (4.2%), consistent with our estimates based
382 on the reported number of visible lines (4.5%). In 2021, a study based on the UNAIDS-supported *Shiny90*
383 mathematical model [43] estimated, using data from 184 population surveys and reports from national HIV
384 screening programs from 40 sub-Saharan African countries, that the positivity rates for conventional HIV
385 testing were 1.4% in Côte d'Ivoire, 2.2% in Mali, and 1.0% in Senegal. Our estimates for HIVST were higher
386 than these estimates for conventional testing. Collectively, these results provide evidence that HIVST is a high-
387 yield testing modality that can address the unmet HIV testing needs of key populations and their partners.

388

389 It is important to interpret HIV positivity rates while considering the treatment-adjusted prevalence
390 (i.e., removing those on treatment from the numerator and denominator of HIV prevalence), a more
391 reliable indicator for evaluating the effectiveness and positivity rates of targeted screening programs [44].
392 In West Africa, the treatment-adjusted prevalence remained relatively low in 2021: 0.6% in Côte d'Ivoire,
393 0.7% in Mali, and 0.06% in Senegal, according to UNAIDS data (<https://aidsinfo.unaids.org/>). Our positivity
394 rates in each country are higher than the treatment-adjusted prevalence, suggesting that the ATLAS HIVST
395 distribution strategy successfully reached a hard-to-reach population and at positivity levels at least as high
396 as with passive surveillance.

397

398 In our study, 2.0% of the participants reported an inconsistent response between the number of visible
399 lines and their self-interpretation of the result and 6.0% reported a number of lines but didn't know how
400 to interpret it or refused to answer, suggesting potential issues in interpreting the number of visible lines
401 on HIVST kits. In the context of the ATLAS program, the distribution strategy combining primary and
402 secondary approaches has led many HIVST users to perform their HIVST without receiving advice from a
403 healthcare professional or a trained peer educator. Although the HIVST is not designed to require
404 supervision, it is essential to have received information on its use before proceeding with the test. A study
405 conducted within the framework of the ATLAS program demonstrated that the manufacturer's instructions
406 alone were insufficient in a multilingual context with low literacy levels. The use of additional aid, such as
407 a demonstration video or a toll-free helpline, proved to be necessary [45]. Similarly, a study carried out in
408 China in 2018 on the unsupervised use of HIVST among 27 MSM found that only 5 (or 19%) made no errors,
409 and 44% received an invalid test result due to various mistakes made [46]. However, the lack of supervision
410 is likely insufficient to explain the inconsistencies observed [23]. Some inconsistencies may result from a
411 misunderstanding of the terms "reactive" and "non-reactive", particularly considering that HIVST was a
412 new tool in our context and that traditional terms used to describe conventional HIV testing are "positive"
413 and "negative". This possible misunderstanding of the terms is also highlighted by the fact that 8
414 participants reported a "reactive" result in phase 1 questionnaire and then in phase 2 that their test was
415 "non-reactive" as the main reason for not linking to confirmatory testing. It is also suggested by the fact

416 that, in our multivariable logistic regression models, individuals with a low level of education were
417 significantly less likely to report a reactive HIVST result, while no significant difference was observed
418 regarding the reported number of visible lines. Specific qualitative interviews or focus groups discussion
419 with HIVST users could help better understand how they perceive different terms.

420
421 Linkage to confirmatory testing following a reactive test was 44% (95% confidence interval from 33%
422 to 55%). However, this estimate includes some individuals who did not adequately self-interpreted their
423 HIVST result as reactive. When considering only those who reported two lines and self-interpreted their
424 result as reactive, the linkage rate increased to 56% (36% to 74%). This percentage is closer to that was
425 observed in a study conducted in Kenya on HIV testing of FSW male partners using HIVST secondary
426 distribution, where 65% of men with a reactive result had a confirmatory test [47]. Our estimates were
427 based on small numbers resulting in large confidence intervals, but are still showing a low rate.

428 Linkage to confirmatory testing happened relatively quickly after HIVST use: 53% did it in less than a
429 week and 91% in less than three months. Similar results were observed in a study in the general population
430 in Zambia[48], and a study among MSM in Nigeria [49].

431
432 The main reasons given for not linking to confirmatory testing suggest potential misinterpretation of
433 the result or misunderstanding about the need to perform a confirmatory HIV test, highlighting the need
434 to improve messaging around HIVST, in particular when HIV self-testing policies will be scaled-up. For those
435 who did confirmatory testing and were confirmed HIV positive, initiation of antiretroviral treatment was
436 almost systematic, showing good linkage to care after confirmatory testing, as observed in many HIVST
437 studies in sub-Saharan Africa [50–52].

438
439 Previous analyses of ATLAS data showed that HIVST could reach people not reached by conventional
440 HIV testing approaches [53], particularly partners and clients of key populations and key population
441 members not self-identifying as such [54]. It is consistent with the finding that two-thirds of participants
442 who did confirmatory testing went to a general health facility rather than a community clinic dedicated to
443 key populations. In a study conducted in 2018 in Côte d'Ivoire among MSM, one-third of the participants
444 preferred community-based testing, one-third expressed no preference, and one-third preferred
445 undifferentiated HIV testing services (general population), mentioning the lack of discretion and anonymity
446 of community-based sites and the desire to avoid the gaze of others [55].

447
448 The implementation of a telephone survey, aimed at gathering information from HIVST users while
449 preserving anonymity and without interfering with secondary distribution, has proven to be very useful to
450 evaluate the ATLAS program. However, its high cost makes it difficult to integrate it into national strategies
451 for assessing the impact of HIVST. In addition, due to the small number of observations, we had low
452 statistical power regarding the estimates of positivity rates and linkage to confirmatory testing.
453 Nevertheless, other impact evaluation methods, such as data triangulation [36] and modelling [37], may
454 prove more suitable for routine monitoring of HIVST's impacts.

455
456 A previous analysis of this survey among ATLAS HIVST users showed that HIVST secondary distribution
457 was feasible and acceptable [39]: participants reported that they appreciated the ease of use of HIVST, its
458 discretion and the fact that they are autonomous in carrying out the test. Finally, HIVST appeared as a
459 relevant additional approach for those usually distant from community activities and HIV testing services,
460 and has the potential to reach, beyond key populations, partners, clients, and other groups vulnerable to
461 HIV.

462
463 ATLAS' HIVST distribution strategy successfully reached people living with HIV in West Africa, although
464 linkage to confirmatory testing following a reactive HIVST remained relatively low in these first years of
465 HIVST implementation, and sub-optimal in the perspective of achieving UNAIDS 95-95-95 targets.
466 However, among participants who confirmed their reactive self-test result with a traditional facility-based
467 HIV test, a substantial proportion quickly proceeded with this confirmation (more than half in less than a
468 week and the vast majority in less than three months). Furthermore, if individuals were confirmed HIV-
469 positive, almost all began antiretroviral treatment. We showed that HIVST has the potential to reach more

470 hidden populations and constitutes a relevant complementary tool to existing screening services. To fully
471 harness the potential of self-tests, messaging around HIVST and its interpretation could be improved.

472

Acknowledgements

473 We wish to acknowledge the commitment and determination of all the ATLAS program teams, which
474 made this research possible. We would also like to thank the interviewers for their professionalism in
475 collecting this sensitive data. Finally, we are grateful to the participants who were kind enough to give us
476 some of their time by agreeing to take part in the survey.

477

Data, scripts, code, and supplementary information availability

478 Data, scripts and code are available online(<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11086135>) as well as the
479 survey questionnaires (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10210464>). Supplementary figures and tables are
480 provided in the appendices.

481

Conflict of interest disclosure

482 The authors declare that they comply with the PCI rule of no financial conflicts of interest in relation to
483 the content of the article. They declare no conflict of interest.

484

Funding

485 This work was supported by Unitaid (Grant Number: 2018-23 ATLAS) with additional funding from
486 Agence Française pour le Développement (AFD). AKK benefits from an ANRS thesis allowance. MMG's
487 research program is supported by a Canada Research Chair (Tier 2) in Population Health Modeling. The
488 funding bodies were not involved in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of
489 data and in writing the manuscript.

490 MCB and RS acknowledge funding from the MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis (reference
491 MR/R015600/1), jointly funded by the UK Medical Research Council (MRC) and the UK Foreign,
492 Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO), under the MRC/FCDO Concordat agreement and is also
493 part of the EDCTP2 programme supported by the European Union. For the purpose of open access, the
494 author has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license to any Author Accepted Manuscript
495 version arising.
496

497

References

- 498 1. Das M, Chu PL, Santos G-M, Scheer S, Vittinghoff E, McFarland W, et al. Decreases in Community Viral Load
499 Are Accompanied by Reductions in New HIV Infections in San Francisco. *PLoS ONE*. 2010;5:e11068.
- 500 2. Lima VD, Johnston K, Hogg RS, Levy AR, Harrigan PR, Anema A, et al. Expanded Access to Highly Active
501 Antiretroviral Therapy: A Potentially Powerful Strategy to Curb the Growth of the HIV Epidemic. *J Infect Dis*.
502 2008;198:59–67.
- 503 3. Cohen MS, Chen YQ, McCauley M, Gamble T, Hosseinipour MC, Kumarasamy N, et al. Prevention of HIV-1
504 Infection with Early Antiretroviral Therapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365:493–505.
- 505 4. Quinn TC, Wawer MJ, Sewankambo N, Serwadda D, Li C, Wabwire-Mangen F, et al. Viral Load and
506 Heterosexual Transmission of Human Immunodeficiency Virus Type 1. *N Engl J Med*. 2000;342:921–9.
- 507 5. Hayes RJ, Donnell D, Floyd S, Mandla N, Bwalya J, Sabapathy K, et al. Effect of Universal Testing and Treatment
508 on HIV Incidence — HPTN 071 (PopART). *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381:207–18.

- 509 6. Grinsztejn B, Hosseinipour MC, Ribaud HJ, Swindells S, Eron J, Chen YQ, et al. Effects of early versus delayed
510 initiation of antiretroviral treatment on clinical outcomes of HIV-1 infection: results from the phase 3 HPTN 052
511 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2014;14:281–90.
- 512 7. UNAIDS. UNAIDS data 2021. Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS;UNAIDS/JC3032E. Geneva;
513 2021.
- 514 8. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. Fast-Track - Ending the AIDS epidemic by 2030.
515 https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/JC2686_WAD2014report_en.pdf. Geneva; 2014.
- 516 9. Johnson C, Baggaley R, Forsythe S, van Rooyen H, Ford N, Napierala Mavedzenge S, et al. Realising the
517 Potential for HIV Self-Testing. *AIDS Behav*. 2014;18:391–5.
- 518 10. Njau B, Covin C, Lisasi E, Damian D, Mushi D, Boulle A, et al. A systematic review of qualitative evidence on
519 factors enabling and deterring uptake of HIV self-testing in Africa. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19:1289.
- 520 11. Hector J, Davies M-A, Dekker-Boersema J, Aly MM, Abdalad CCA, Langa EBR, et al. Acceptability and
521 performance of a directly assisted oral HIV self-testing intervention in adolescents in rural Mozambique. *PloS*
522 *One*. 2018;13:e0195391.
- 523 12. Grésenguet G, Longo J de D, Tonen-Wolyec S, Bouassa R-SM, Belec L. Acceptability and Usability Evaluation
524 of Finger-Stick Whole Blood HIV Self-Test as An HIV Screening Tool Adapted to The General Public in The Central
525 African Republic. *Open AIDS J*. 2017;11:101–18.
- 526 13. Harichund C, Moshabela M, Kunene P, Abdool Karim Q. Acceptability of HIV self-testing among men and
527 women in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *AIDS Care*. 2019;31:186–92.
- 528 14. Kalibala S, Tun W, Cherutich P, Nganga A, Oweya E, Oluoch P. Factors Associated with Acceptability of HIV
529 Self-Testing Among Health Care Workers in Kenya. *AIDS Behav*. 2014;18:405–14.
- 530 15. Kelvin EA, Cheruvillil S, Christian S, Mantell JE, Milford C, Rambally-Greener L, et al. Choice in HIV testing: the
531 acceptability and anticipated use of a self-administered at-home oral HIV test among South Africans. *Afr J AIDS*
532 *Res*. 2016;15:99–108.
- 533 16. Martínez Pérez G, Steele SJ, Govender I, Arellano G, Mkwamba A, Hadebe M, et al. Supervised oral HIV self-
534 testing is accurate in rural KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2016;21:759–67.
- 535 17. Ky-Zerbo O, Desclaux A, Boye S, Vautier A, Rouveau N, Kouadio BA, et al. Willingness to use and distribute
536 HIV self-test kits to clients and partners: A qualitative analysis of female sex workers' collective opinion and
537 attitude in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal. *Womens Health*. 2022;18:174550572210922.
- 538 18. Kurth AE, Cleland CM, Chhun N, Sidle JE, Were E, Naanyu V, et al. Accuracy and Acceptability of Oral Fluid
539 HIV Self-Testing in a General Adult Population in Kenya. *AIDS Behav*. 2016;20:870–9.
- 540 19. Johnson CC, Kennedy C, Fonner V, Siegfried N, Figueroa C, Dalal S, et al. Examining the effects of HIV self-
541 testing compared to standard HIV testing services: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Int AIDS Soc*.
542 2017;20:21594.
- 543 20. World Health Organization. RECOMMENDS HIV SELFTESTING – EVIDENCE UPDATE AND CONSIDERATIONS
544 FOR SUCCESS. <https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/329968/WHO-CDS-HIV-19.36-eng.pdf>. Geneva:
545 World Health Organization; 2019.
- 546 21. Choko AT, Jamil MS, MacPherson P, Corbett E, Chitembo L, Ingold H, et al. Measuring linkage to HIV
547 treatment services following HIV self-testing in low-income settings. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2020;23.
- 548 22. World Health Organization. Guidelines on HIV self-testing and partner notification: supplement to
549 Consolidated guidelines on HIV testing services. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/251655>. 2016.

- 550 23. Asiimwe S, Oloya J, Song X, Whalen CC. Accuracy of Un-supervised Versus Provider-Supervised Self-
551 administered HIV Testing in Uganda: A Randomised Implementation Trial. *AIDS Behav.* 2014;18:2477–84.
- 552 24. Figueroa C, Johnson C, Ford N, Sands A, Dalal S, Meurant R, et al. Reliability of HIV rapid diagnostic tests for
553 self-testing compared with testing by healthcare workers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet HIV.*
554 2018;5:e277–90.
- 555 25. Chanda MM, Ortblad KF, Mwale M, Chongo S, Kanchele C, Kamungoma N, et al. HIV self-testing among
556 female sex workers in Zambia: A cluster randomised controlled trial. *PLOS Med.* 2017;14:e1002442.
- 557 26. Tonen-Wolyec S, Filali M, Mboup S, Bélec L. HIV self-testing in Africa: stakes and challenges. *Médecine Santé*
558 *Trop.* 2018;28:144–9.
- 559 27. Pant Pai N, Behlim T, Abrahams L, Vadnais C, Shivkumar S, Pillay S, et al. Will an Unsupervised Self-Testing
560 Strategy for HIV Work in Health Care Workers of South Africa? A Cross Sectional Pilot Feasibility Study. *PLoS*
561 *ONE.* 2013;8:e79772.
- 562 28. Brown AN, Djimeu EW, Cameron DB. A Review of the Evidence of Harm from Self-Tests. *AIDS Behav.*
563 2014;18:445–9.
- 564 29. Dwyer-Lindgren L, Cork MA, Sligar A, Steuben KM, Wilson KF, Provost NR, et al. Mapping HIV prevalence in
565 sub-Saharan Africa between 2000 and 2017. *Nature.* 2019;570:189–93.
- 566 30. Rouveau N, Ky-Zerbo O, Boye S, Fotso AS, d’Elbée M, Maheu-Giroux M, et al. Describing, analysing and
567 understanding the effects of the introduction of HIV self-testing in West Africa through the ATLAS programme
568 in Côte d’Ivoire, Mali and Senegal. *BMC Public Health.* 2021;21:181.
- 569 31. UNAIDS. UNAIDS DATA 2022. Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme on
570 HIV/AIDS;UNAIDS/JC3063E.https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/data-book-2022_en.pdf.
571 Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS; 2022.
- 572 32. World Health Organization. Consolidated guidelines on HIV prevention, testing, treatment, service delivery
573 and monitoring: recommendations for a public health approach.
574 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK572729/>. 2021 update. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.
- 575 33. Lyons CE, Coly K, Bowring AL, Liestman B, Diouf D, Wong VJ, et al. Use and Acceptability of HIV Self-Testing
576 Among First-Time Testers at Risk for HIV in Senegal. *AIDS Behav.* 2019;23:130–41.
- 577 34. Boye S, Bouaré S, Ky-Zerbo O, Rouveau N, Simo Fotso A, d’Elbée M, et al. Challenges of HIV Self-Test
578 Distribution for Index Testing When HIV Status Disclosure Is Low: Preliminary Results of a Qualitative Study in
579 Bamako (Mali) as Part of the ATLAS Project. *Front Public Health.* 2021;9:653543.
- 580 35. d’Elbée M, Traore MM, Badiane K, Vautier A, Simo Fotso A, Kabemba OK, et al. Costs and Scale-Up Costs of
581 Integrating HIV Self-Testing Into Civil Society Organisation-Led Programmes for Key Populations in Côte d’Ivoire,
582 Senegal, and Mali. *Front Public Health.* 2021;9:653612.
- 583 36. Simo Fotso A, Johnson C, Vautier A, Kouamé KB, Diop PM, Silhol R, et al. Routine programmatic data show a
584 positive population-level impact of HIV self-testing: the case of Côte d’Ivoire and implications for
585 implementation. *AIDS.* 2022;36:1871–9.
- 586 37. Silhol R, Maheu-Giroux M, Soni N, Fotso AS, Rouveau N, Vautier A, et al. Assessing the potential population-
587 level impacts of HIV self-testing distribution among key populations in Côte d’Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal: a
588 mathematical modelling analysis. preprint. *HIV/AIDS;* 2023.
- 589 38. Simo Fotso A, Kra AK, Maheu-Giroux M, Boye S, d’Elbée M, Ky-zerbo O, et al. Is it possible to recruit HIV self-
590 test users for an anonymous phone-based survey using passive recruitment without financial incentives?
591 Lessons learned from a pilot study in Côte d’Ivoire. *Pilot Feasibility Stud.* 2022;8:4.

- 592 39. Kra AK, Fosto AS, N'guessan KN, Geoffroy O, Younoussa S, Kabemba OK, et al. Can HIV self-testing reach first-
593 time testers? A telephone survey among self-test end users in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal. *BMC Infect Dis.*
594 2023;22:972.
- 595 40. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>. 2021.
- 596 41. Sjoberg D D, Whiting K, Curry M, Lavery J A, Larmarange J. Reproducible Summary Tables with the gtsummary
597 Package. *R J.* 2021;13:570.
- 598 42. Giguère K, Eaton JW, Marsh K, Johnson LF, Johnson CC, Ehui E, et al. Trends in knowledge of HIV status and
599 efficiency of HIV testing services in sub-Saharan Africa, 2000–20: a modelling study using survey and HIV testing
600 programme data. *Lancet HIV.* 2021;8:e284–93.
- 601 43. Maheu-Giroux M, Marsh K, Doyle CM, Godin A, Lanièce Delaunay C, Johnson LF, et al. National HIV testing
602 and diagnosis coverage in sub-Saharan Africa: a new modeling tool for estimating the 'first 90' from program
603 and survey data. *AIDS.* 2019;33 Supplement 3:S255–69.
- 604 44. Tippet Barr B, Lowrance D, Case Johnson C, Baggaley RC, Rogers J, Balachandra S, et al. Treatment-adjusted
605 prevalence to assess HIV testing programmes. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2021;99:874–82.
- 606 45. Vautier A. La notice d'utilisation du fabricant suffit-elle dans un contexte multilingue et de faible
607 alphabétisation ? L'exemple de l'autodépistage du VIH en Afrique de l'Ouest. 2020.
- 608 46. Wei C, Yan L, Li J, Su X, Lippman S, Yan H. Which user errors matter during HIV self-testing? A qualitative
609 participant observation study of men who have sex with men (MSM) in China. *BMC Public Health.* 2018;18:1108.
- 610 47. Thirumurthy H, Masters SH, Mavedzenge SN, Maman S, Omanga E, Agot K. Promoting male partner HIV
611 testing and safer sexual decision making through secondary distribution of self-tests by HIV-negative female sex
612 workers and women receiving antenatal and post-partum care in Kenya: a cohort study. *Lancet HIV.*
613 2016;3:e266–74.
- 614 48. Chipungu J, Bosomprah S, Zanolini A, Thirumurthy H, Chilengi R, Sharma A, et al. Understanding linkage to care
615 with HIV self-test approach in Lusaka, Zambia - A mixed method approach. *PLOS ONE.* 2017;12:e0187998.
- 616 49. Tun W, Vu L, Dirisu O, Sekoni A, Shoyemi E, Njab J, et al. Uptake of HIV self-testing and linkage to treatment
617 among men who have sex with men (MSM) in Nigeria: A pilot programme using key opinion leaders to reach
618 MSM. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2018;21:e25124.
- 619 50. Choko AT, MacPherson P, Webb EL, Willey BA, Feasy H, Sambakunsi R, et al. Uptake, Accuracy, Safety, and
620 Linkage into Care over Two Years of Promoting Annual Self-Testing for HIV in Blantyre, Malawi: A Community-
621 Based Prospective Study. *PLOS Med.* 2015;12:e1001873.
- 622 51. Green KE, Vu BN, Phan HT, Tran MH, Ngo HV, Vo SH, et al. From conventional to disruptive: upturning the
623 HIV testing status quo among men who have sex with men in Vietnam. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2018;21 Suppl 5:e25127.
- 624 52. Hlongwa M, Hlongwana K, Makhunga S, Choko AT, Dzinamarira T, Conserve D, et al. Linkage to HIV Care
625 Following HIV Self-testing Among Men: Systematic Review of Quantitative and Qualitative Studies from Six
626 Countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. *AIDS Behav.* 2023;27:651–66.
- 627 53. Ky-Zerbo O, Desclaux A, Kouadio AB, Rouveau N, Vautier A, Sow S, et al. Enthusiasm for Introducing and
628 Integrating HIV Self-Testing but Doubts About Users: A Baseline Qualitative Analysis of Key Stakeholders'
629 Attitudes and Perceptions in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali and Senegal. *Front Public Health.* 2021;9.
- 630 54. Kouassi AK, Fosto AS, N'Guessan NK, Geoffroy O, Younoussa S, Kabemba OK, et al. Reaching key and
631 peripheral populations: a phone-based survey of HIV self-test users in West Africa. Durban: poster
632 #PEC004. <https://hal.science/hal-04121478>. 2021.

633 55. Inghels M, Kouassi AK, Niangoran S, Bekelynck A, Carilon S, Sika L, et al. Preferences and access to
634 community-based HIV testing sites among men who have sex with men (MSM) in Côte d'Ivoire. *BMJ Open*.
635 2022;12:e052536.

636

Appendices

Table S1a: Factors associated (logistic regression) with positivity rate based on the reported number of visible lines among participants of the first survey phase in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021)

	Adjusted OR	95% CI	p-value	q-value
(Intercept)	0.04	0.01, 0.10	<0.001	<0.001
Key population profile			0.5	>0.9
Man : MSM-based channels	—	—		
Woman : MSM-based channels	1.14	0.38, 2.73		
Man : FSW-based channels	0.90	0.54, 1.49		
Woman : FSW-based channels	0.69	0.40, 1.17		
Man: Other delivery channels	0.46	0.13, 1.29		
Woman : Other delivery channels	0.40	0.06, 1.49		
Country			0.3	>0.9
Côte d'Ivoire	—	—		
Mali	1.22	0.80, 1.88		
Senegal	1.79	0.84, 3.59		
Age group			0.079	0.6
15-24 years or less	—	—		
25-34 years	1.56	1.02, 2.42		
35 years or more	1.78	0.92, 3.34		
Marital status			0.2	>0.9
single	—	—		
divorced / separated / widowed	0.48	0.21, 1.22		
living with partner / married	0.64	0.28, 1.60		
Educational level			0.2	>0.9
none / primary	—	—		
secondary	1.49	0.78, 2.86		
higher	1.56	0.95, 2.64		
First time tester			0.083	0.6
no	—	—		
yes	1.44	0.95, 2.16		

FSW: female sex workers, MSM: men having sex with men.

644
645

Table S1b: Factors associated (logistic regression) with positivity rate based on self-reported HIVST, among participants of the first survey phase in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021)

	adjusted OR	95% CI	p-value	q-value
(Intercept)	0.01	0.00, 0.06	<0.001	<0.001
Key population profile			0.13	>0.9
Man : MSM-based channels	—	—		
Woman : MSM-based channels	0.28	0.02, 1.35		
Man : FSW-based channels	0.42	0.19, 0.86		
Woman : FSW-based channels	0.55	0.28, 1.05		
Man: Other delivery channels	0.25	0.01, 1.40		
Woman : Other delivery channels	0.42	0.02, 2.42		
Country			0.2	>0.9
Côte d'Ivoire	—	—		
Mali	1.48	0.85, 2.62		
Senegal	0.69	0.15, 2.31		
Age group			0.3	>0.9
15-24 years or less	—	—		
25-34 years	1.57	0.89, 2.79		
35 years or more	1.35	0.48, 3.39		
Marital status			0.5	>0.9
single	—	—		
divorced / separated / widowed	0.53	0.18, 1.98		
living with partner / married	0.48	0.16, 1.79		
Educational level			0.002	0.014
none / primary	—	—		
secondary	4.00	1.44, 12.9		
higher	4.12	1.76, 12.1		
First time tester			0.10	0.7
no	—	—		
yes	1.58	0.91, 2.78		

646
647

FSW: female sex workers, MSM: men having sex with men.

648
649
650

Table S2. Positivity rates based on self-interpreted HIVST results or the reported number of visible lines, by distribution channel, sex and country, among participants of the first survey phase in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021). FSW-based channels include facility-based and outreach. Other channels include PWUD-based channels, index testing and STI consultations.

		MSM-based channels		FSW-based channels		Others delivery channels		Total	
		Man	Woman	Man	Woman	Man	Woman		
Positivity rate based on self-reported HIVST results	Lowest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	2.5% (16/650)	1.4% (1/73)	1.5% (5/339)	1.2% (3/245)	0% (0/60)	0% (0/23) †	1.8% (25/1 390)
		Mali	4.6% (14/306)	0% (0/29)	1.9% (5/269)	3.9% (14/360)	9.1% (1/11) †	0% (0/9) †	3.5% (34/984)
		Senegal	4.9% (2/41)	0% (0/1) †	0% (0/12) †	0% (0/80)	0% (0/66)	2.4% (1/41)	1.2% (3/241)
		Overall	3.2% (32/997)	1.0% (1/103)	1.6% (10/620)	2.5% (17/685)	0.7% (1/137)	1.4% (1/73)	2.4% (62/2,615)
	Complete responses	Côte d'Ivoire	2.7% (16/597)	1.4% (1/71)	1.6% (5/311)	1.4% (3/221)	0% (0/58)	0% (0/21) †	2.0% (25/1,279)
		Mali	4.7% (14/301)	0% (0/29)	1.9% (5/257)	4.1% (14/345)	9.1% (1/11) †	0% (0/9) †	3.6% (34/952)
		Senegal	6.1% (2/33)	0% (0/1) †	0% (0/11) †	0% (0/65)	0% (0/61)	2.6% (1/38)	1.4% (3/209)
		Overall	3.4% (32/931)	1.0% (1/101)	1.7% (10/579)	2.7% (17/631)	0.8% (1/130)	1.5% (1/68)	2.5% (62/2,440)
	Highest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	10.6% (69/650)	4.1% (3/73)	9.7% (33/339)	11% (27/245)	3.3% (2/60)	8.7% (2/23)	9.8% (136/1,390)
		Mali	6.2% (19/306)	0% (0/29)	6.3% (17/269)	8.1% (29/360)	9.1% (1/11) †	0% (0/9) †	6.7% (66/984)
		Senegal	24.0% (10/41)	0.0% (0/1) †	8.3% (1/12) †	19.0% (15/80)	7.6% (5/66)	9.8% (4/41)	15.0% (35/241)
		Overall	9.8% (98/997)	2.9% (3/103)	8.2% (51/620)	10.0% (71/685)	5.8% (8/137)	8.2% (6/73)	9.1% (237/2,615)
Positivity rate based on the reported number of visible lines	Lowest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	4.2% (27/650)	5.5% (4/73)	4.7% (16/339)	2.0% (5/245)	0% (0/60)	4.3% (1/23)	3.8% (53/1 390)
		Mali	4.9% (15/306)	3.4% (1/29)	4.5% (12/269)	5.3% (19/360)	9.1% (1/11) †	0% (0/9) †	4.9% (48/984)
		Senegal	12.2% (5/41)	0% (0/1) †	0% (0/12) †	5.0% (4/80)	4.5% (3/66)	2.4% (1/41)	5.4% (13/241)
		Overall	4.7% (47/997)	4.9% (5/103)	4.5% (28/620)	4.1% (28/685)	2.9% (4/137)	2.7% (2/73)	4.4% (114/2,615)
	Complete responses	Côte d'Ivoire	4.2% (27/641)	5.5% (4/73)	4.8% (16/331)	2.1% (5/241)	0% (0/60)	4.5% (1/22) †	3.9% (53/1,368)
		Mali	5.0% (15/298)	3.4% (1/29)	4.5% (12/264)	5.5% (19/344)	9.1% (1/11) †	0% (0/9) †	5.0% (48/955)
		Senegal	13.2% (5/38)	0% (0/1) †	0% (0/10) †	5.3% (4/75)	5.3% (3/57)	2.7% (1/37)	6.0% (13/218)
		Overall	4.8% (47/977)	4.9% (5/103)	4.6% (28/605)	4.2% (28/660)	3.1% (4/128)	2.9% (2/68)	4.5% (114/2,541)
	Highest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	5.5% (36/650)	5.5% (4/73)	7.1% (24/339)	3.7% (9/245)	0% (0/60)	8.7% (2/23) †	5.4% (75/1,390)
		Mali	7.5% (23/306)	3.4% (1/29)	6.3% (17/269)	9.7% (35/360)	9.1% (1/11) †	0% (0/9) †	7.8% (77/984)
		Senegal	19.5% (8/41)	0% (0/1) †	16.7% (2/12) †	11.2% (9/80)	18.2% (12/66)	12.2% (5/41)	14.9% (36/241)
		Overall	6.7% (67/997)	4.9% (5/103)	6.9% (43/620)	7.7% (53/685)	9.5% (13/137)	9.6% (7/73)	7.2% (188/2,615)

651
652
653
654
655

DK: don't know. R: refusals. FSW: female sex workers, MSM: men having sex with men, PR: positivity rate.

†: indicated cells with less than 25 participants.

Lowest possible rate: DK-R as non-reactive or 1 line. Complete responses: DK-R excluded from the numerator and the denominator. Highest possible rate: DK-R as reactive or 2 lines.

656
657

Table S3. Positivity rates based on self-interpreted HIVST results or the reported number of visible lines, by age group and country, among participants of the first survey phase in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021).

			15-24 years	25-34 years old	35 years or more	Total
Positivity rate based on self-reported HIVST results	Lowest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	1.7% (11/645)	2.0% (11/553)	1.6% (3/192)	1.8% (25/1 390)
		Mali	3.3% (15/455)	3.9% (16/415)	2.6% (3/114)	3.5% (34/984)
		Senegal	0.0% (0/64)	2.1% (2/95)	1.2% (1/82)	1.2% (3/241)
		Overall	2.2% (26/1 164)	2.7% (29/1 063)	1.8% (7/388)	2.4% (62/2 615)
	Complete responses	Côte d'Ivoire	1.8% (11/604)	2.2% (11/506)	1.8% (3/169)	2.0% (25/1 279)
		Mali	3.4% (15/439)	4.0% (16/403)	2.7% (3/110)	3.6% (34/952)
		Senegal	0.0% (0/56)	2.4% (2/82)	1.4% (1/71)	1.4% (3/209)
		Overall	2.4% (26/1 099)	2.9% (29/991)	2.0% (7/350)	2.5% (62/2 440)
	Highest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	8.1% (52/645)	10.0% (58/553)	14.0% (26/192)	9.8% (136/1 390)
		Mali	6.8% (31/455)	6.7% (28/415)	6.1% (7/114)	6.7% (66/984)
		Senegal	13.0% (8/64)	16.0% (15/95)	15.0% (12/82)	15.0% (35/241)
		Overall	7.8% (91/1 164)	9.5% (101/1 063)	12.0% (45/388)	9.1% (237/2 615)
Positivity rate based on the reported number of visible lines	Lowest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	3.1% (20/645)	4.5% (25/553)	4.2% (8/192)	3.8% (53/1 390)
		Mali	4.8% (22/455)	4.8% (20/415)	5.3% (6/114)	4.9% (48/984)
		Senegal	1.6% (1/64)	7.4% (7/95)	6.1% (5/82)	5.4% (13/241)
		Overall	3.7% (43/1 164)	4.9% (52/1 063)	4.9% (19/388)	4.4% (114/2 615)
	Complete responses	Côte d'Ivoire	3.1% (20/637)	4.6% (25/546)	4.3% (8/185)	3.9% (53/1 368)
		Mali	4.9% (22/447)	5.0% (20/401)	5.6% (6/107)	5.0% (48/955)
		Senegal	1.9% (1/54)	8.2% (7/85)	6.3% (5/79)	6.0% (13/218)
		Overall	3.8% (43/1 138)	5.0% (52/1 032)	5.1% (19/371)	4.5% (114/2 541)
	Highest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	4.3% (28/645)	5.8% (32/553)	7.8% (15/192)	5.4% (75/1 390)
		Mali	6.6% (30/455)	8.2% (34/415)	11.0% (13/114)	7.8% (77/984)
		Senegal	17.0% (11/64)	18.0% (17/95)	9.8% (8/82)	15.0% (36/241)
		Overall	5.9% (69/1 164)	7.8% (83/1 063)	9.3% (36/388)	7.2% (188/2 615)

658
659

660
661
662

Table S4. Eligibility and participation in phase 2 survey by sociodemographic characteristics, distribution channel, and HIV testing history (bivariable comparison and multivariable multinomial regression model). FSW-based channels and MSM-based channels include facility-based and outreach. Other channels include PWUD-based channels, index testing and STI consultations.

	completed phase 2 questionnaire N = 78	eligible for phase 2 but did not complete the questionnaire N = 48	phase 1 participants not eligible for phase 2 N = 2,489	Bivariable comparison p-value (Chi ² test)	Multivariable multinomial regression model p-value	Overall N = 2,615 (phase 1 participants)
Country				0.9	0.8	
Côte d'Ivoire	39 (50%)	23 (48%)	1,328 (53%)			1,390 (53%)
Mali	31 (40%)	20 (42%)	933 (37%)			984 (38%)
Senegal	8 (10%)	5 (10%)	228 (9.2%)			241 (9.2%)
Sex and distribution channel				0.3	0.06	
Man: MSM-based channels	35 (45%)	18 (38%)	944 (38%)			997 (38%)
Woman: MSM-based channels	5 (6.4%)	0 (0%)	98 (3.9%)			103 (3.9%)
Man: FSW-based channels	22 (28%)	10 (21%)	588 (24%)			620 (24%)
Woman: FSW-based channels	14 (18%)	16 (33%)	655 (26%)			685 (26%)
Man: Other delivery channels	1 (1.3%)	3 (6.3%)	133 (5.3%)			137 (5.2%)
Woman: Other delivery channels	1 (1.3%)	1 (2.1%)	71 (2.9%)			73 (2.8%)
Age group				0.5	0.11	
15-24 years or less	27 (35%)	21 (44%)	1,116 (45%)			1,164 (45%)
25-34 years	38 (49%)	20 (42%)	1,005 (40%)			1,063 (41%)
35 years or more	13 (17%)	7 (15%)	368 (15%)			388 (15%)
Marital status				0.3	0.5	
single	54 (69%)	32 (67%)	1,675 (67%)			1,761 (67%)
divorced / separated / widowed	6 (7.7%)	2 (4.2%)	89 (3.6%)			97 (3.7%)
living with partner / married	18 (23%)	14 (29%)	725 (29%)			757 (29%)
Educational level				0.079	0.09	
none / primary	13 (17%)	13 (27%)	477 (19%)			503 (19%)
secondary	50 (64%)	29 (60%)	1,353 (54%)			1,432 (55%)
higher	15 (19%)	6 (13%)	659 (26%)			680 (26%)
First-time tester				0.2	0.228	
no	40 (51%)	25 (52%)	1,472 (59%)			1,537 (59%)
yes	38 (49%)	23 (48%)	1,017 (41%)			1,078 (41%)

FSW: female sex workers, MSM: men having sex with men.

663
664

665
666
667
668

Table S5. Time between HIVST and confirmatory testing among phase 2 participants who did link to confirmatory testing, by reported number of lines and self-interpreted HIVST result

	Overall	2 lines /reactive	1 line /reactive	2 lines /non-reactive	2 lines /DK-R	DK-R / reactive
less than a week	18 (53%)	12 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (75%)	0 (0%)
between 1 and 2 weeks	4 (12%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	1 (12%)	0 (0%)
between 3 and 4 weeks	2 (5.9%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (12%)	0 (0%)
between 1 and 2 months	7 (21%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
more than 3 months	3 (8.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	34 (100%)	15 (44.2%)	1 (2.9%)	9 (26.5%)	8 (23.5%)	1 (2.9%)

DK: don't know. R: refuse to answer

669
670
671
672

Table S6. Main reason for not linking to confirmatory testing among phase 2 participants who did not link to confirmatory testing, by reported number of lines and self-interpreted HIVST result.

	Overall	2 lines /reactive	1 line /reactive	2 lines /non-reactive	2 lines /DK-R
My test was non-reactive	18 (41%)	6 (50%)	2 (33%)	5 (31%)	5 (50%)
I didn't know we should get a confirmatory test	10 (23%)	2 (17%)	2 (33%)	5 (31%)	1 (10%)
I didn't have time	8 (18%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)	3 (19%)	2 (20%)
I feared that others would know the result	2 (4.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6.2%)	1 (10%)
I already knew the result before using HIVST	2 (4.5%)	1 (8.3%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
I had no specific reason	2 (4.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	1 (6.2%)	0 (0%)
I didn't know where to take the test	1 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6.2%)	0 (0%)
The testing site was too far away	1 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)

DK: don't know. R: refuse to answer

673
674

675
676

Table S7. Place of confirmatory testing among phase 2 participants who did link to confirmatory testing, by reported number of lines and self-interpreted HIVST result.

	Overall	2 lines /reactive	1 line /reactive	2 lines /non-reactive	2 lines /DK-R	DK-R / reactive
Health Center / Hospital / Clinic / Maternity	12 (35%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	6 (67%)	3 (38%)	0 (0%)
Community Clinic / KP-dedicated Health Center	22 (65%)	12 (80%)	1 (100%)	3 (33%)	5 (62%)	1 (100%)
Total	34 (100%)	15 (44.2%)	1 (2.9%)	9 (26.5%)	8 (23.5%)	1 (2.9%)

677 DK: don't know. R: refuse to answer

678
679
680

Table S8. Time between phase 1 and phase 2 interviews among phase 2 participants who did link to confirmatory testing, by reported number of lines and self-interpreted HIVST result.

	Overall	2 lines /reactive	1 line /reactive	2 lines /non-reactive	2 lines /DK-R	DK-R / reactive
less than 4 months	8 (10%)	3 (11%)	0 (0%)	4 (16%)	1 (5.6%)	0 (0%)
between 4 and 6 months	67 (86%)	24 (89%)	5 (71%)	21 (84%)	17 (94%)	0 (0%)
more than 6 months	3 (3.8%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Total	34 (100%)	15 (44.2%)	1 (2.9%)	9 (26.5%)	8 (23.5%)	1 (2.9%)

681 DK: don't know. R: refuse to answer

682
683
684