

Evaluation of operational characteristics and performance of HIV rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs): Systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature from 2012 to 2020

Leonard Kingwara^{1,2*}, Nancy Bowen², Nuttada Panpradist³, Peter Lokamar², Vera Morangi², Rukia Sarah Madada², Emmanuel Nyakeriga⁴, Christabel Awuor², Jonah Onentia¹, Sarah Masyuko^{1,3}, Rose Wafula¹, and John Ndemi Kiiru²

Institutional Affiliation

1. National AIDS and STI Control Program (NASCOP), Ministry of Health, Kenya
2. Department of National Laboratory Services, Ministry of Health, Nairobi, Kenya
3. University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA
4. US Agency for International Development, Kenya and East Africa

* Corresponding author: leonard.kingwara@gmail.com.

Abstract

Background: Most countries have rolled out HIV Rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) due to their significant advantages over laboratory-based serological testing. These advantages are lower cost, ease of use, interpretation speed, and relatively high acceptability; the HIV diagnostic landscape has evolved fast, and newer technologies have been developed and deployed. Given the many options available, selecting an HIV rapid diagnostic test for a particular clinical program, self-test, or research setting can be daunting without the precise knowledge of their performance characteristics. This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to compare the field diagnostic performance of available HIV rapid test kits, cost-effectiveness, ease of use, and acceptability.

Methods: PubMed and Web of Science were searched for publications on rapid HIV tests using blood specimens. We then performed a meta-analysis and systematic analysis to quantitatively and qualitatively evaluate the diagnostic performance of rapid HIV tests compared with the western blot (WB), enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA), or an HIV diagnostic algorithm in terms of pooled sensitivity, specificity, area under the summary receiver operating characteristic (SROC) curve, and diagnostic odds ratio (DOR).

Results: The meta-analysis for the diagnostic test included 26 studies for diagnostic accuracy, while the qualitative analysis included 15 studies. On average, the RDT sensitivities were 99%; [95% CI=0.99-100%], while specificity was optimal at 100%; [95% CI=99%-100%]. The diagnostic odds ratio estimates that a single test performed better than a dual test: dual test DOR=44612.33 and single test DOR=14323.1. The impact of unobserved heterogeneity using the quantity I^2 for sensitivity was 99.47%, while that for specificity was 99.96, indicating significant heterogeneity and justifying stratified analysis of the selected studies. The diagnostic test from Unigold had the best-pooled sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic odds ratio at 99%, 99.35%, and 2896.667, respectively. Qualitative data indicate shorter time to results is preferred by both the clients and health care providers.

Conclusion: The average of the RDT sensitivities for diagnostic accuracy were 99% (95% CI=0.99-100%), while specificity was optimal at 100%; 95% CI=99-100. The diagnostic odds ratio was DOR=44612 (95% CI=14323-138954), thus indicating better RDT test performance. The performance of single test kits in HIV diagnosis was better than those for dual tests.

Background and introduction

Rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) have significant advantages over laboratory-based serological testing[1], including lower cost, ease of use, interpretation speed, and relatively high acceptability[2]. A systematic review by Olugbenga *et al.* pointed to a quick turn-around time of 20-60 minutes, eliminating the need for a second visit to the medical facilities to get test results[3].

Particularly, RDTs for HIV serology assays that detect the presence of HIV-1/2 antibodies had higher sensitivity and specificity than those of other infectious diseases[3]. RDTs have proven instrumental in increased HIV testing, allowing testing to be performed even by non-laboratory professionals in both communities and facilities (including sites with limited infrastructure, e.g., electricity)[4], [5]. Such facilities register and process low numbers of specimens daily[5]. Thus, the ease of use, cost-effectiveness, acceptability, and transportability of RDTs have resulted in higher rates of HIV diagnoses globally[4].

Additionally, the availability of rapid diagnostic kits (RDKs) has assisted in moving the proportion of those aware of their HIV positivity status from an estimated 10% in sub-Saharan Africa to 76% as of 2016 in East and Southern Africa [4]. Most countries are approaching the 90% mark of people living with HIV (PLHIV) who know their status as documented by a joint United Nations Programme (UNP) on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) benchmark[5].

Most of the systematic reviews have limited their scope to the performance characteristics of the test Kits. We have assessed the expanding success of the RDT program using existing data to assess three major outcomes of HIV self-testing (HIVST); cost-effectiveness, ease of use, and acceptability to drive accountability. Therefore, the objective of this systematic review was to evaluate the performance and operation of RDTs to inform on the global HIV response.

Materials and methods

Eligibility criteria

We followed the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis guidelines (PRISMA) for this systematic review[6]. We have included studies evaluating commercially available rapid diagnostic test kits for HIV in laboratory or field settings. The studies included

were for all populations in any geographic location. The primary outcome was diagnostic test accuracy (i.e., sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, negative predictive values). Secondary outcomes were cost-effectiveness, usability, ease of use, and acceptability. The eligible studies for inclusion were evaluation studies, cost-effectiveness studies, and usability and acceptability studies. Studies were included for the meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy if an acceptable reference standard for HIV test kit evaluation was used. This included either enzyme immunoassay (EIA), Western blot (WB), or an HIV diagnostic algorithm. Studies were excluded if they did not provide any information regarding RTDs in the context of accuracy or cost-effectiveness, usability, ease of use, and acceptability. We included studies regardless of sample size and regional location.

Search terms and strategy

Medline, Embase, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar were searched using Boolean operators to explore terms related to the following three concepts: HIV, rapid diagnostic test kits, and diagnosis. Only studies published in English were included. Studies published between January 2012 and August 2020 were included. The searches were rerun immediately before the final analyses to check for recent relevant literature. Additional records were identified by searching bibliographies of relevant publications.

Data extraction

Titles and abstracts were scrutinized to assess relevance. For the meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy, the data extracted included study title, country, test(s) evaluated, laboratory or field evaluation (and if so, sample type used), the population studied, and laboratory evaluations, whether fresh blood, saliva, or archived specimens were used. The total number of participants/samples used, prevalence (%), reference standard test, and the number of true positives, false positives, false negatives, and true negatives were all determined if they were not provided in the review publications. Seven reviewers independently extracted data from the included studies, and consensus resolved disagreements. To evaluate the methodology of the included studies, updated standards for reporting diagnostic accuracy studies (STARD) checklist was adopted [7]. Additionally, the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies (QUADAS-2) checklist was adopted to appraise the included evaluation studies [8] critically.

Data analysis plan

Test indicators outlined in **Table 1** below were analyzed. Forest plots (*Midas* package) and summary receiver operating characteristic (SROC) curves were constructed using Stata software v16.1 (Stata Corp LP, College Station, Texas, USA). Additionally, the impact of unobserved heterogeneity using the quantity I^2 was assessed. Considering that rigorous statistical analysis requires hierarchical (multilevel) models that respect the binomial data structure (hierarchical logistic regression), *Metandi* Stata package was used to facilitate the fitting of such models. The commands display the results in two alternative parameterizations and produce a customizable plot[9]. The diagnostic odds ratio (DOR) as a measure of test performance combines the strengths of sensitivity and specificity, as independent prevalence indicators, with the advantage of accuracy as a single indicator[10]. A DOR >1 indicates better test performance for the likelihood of deducting disease amongst a healthy population.

Table 1. Definition of indicators used in meta-analysis of test performance.

Test indicator	Formula	Definition
Sensitivity (true positive rate, TPR)	$TP / (TP + FN)$	The proportion of positive test results among diseased
Specificity (true negative rate, TNR)	$TN / (TN + FP)$	Proportion negative test results among the "healthy."
Positive predictive value (PPV)	$TP / (TP + FP)$	Proportion diseased among subjects with a positive test result.
Negative predictive value (NPV)	$TN / (TN + FN)$	Proportion non-diseased among subjects with a negative test result.
The likelihood ratio of a positive test result (LR+)	$sensitivity / (1 - specificity)$	The ratio of a positive test result among diseased to the same result in the "healthy."
The likelihood ratio of a negative test result (LR-)	$(1 - sensitivity) / specificity$	The ratio of a negative test result among diseased to the same result in the "healthy."
Accuracy	$(TP + TN) / (TP + TN + FP + FN)$	Proportion correctly identified subjects
Diagnostic odds Ratio (DOR)	LR+ / LR-	The diagnostic odds ratio is a measure of the effectiveness of a diagnostic test. It is defined as the ratio of the odds of the test being positive if the subject has a disease relative to the odds of the test being positive if the subject does not have the disease.

Study characteristics

The review included the analysis of the diagnostic tests for a single rapid HIV test, a dual HIV/syphilis test, and a triple HIV/syphilis/HCV and evaluated the HIV diagnostic component

of the rapid HIV test device. However, there were limited data to evaluate dual or triple HIV rapid test kits.

Diagnostic accuracy publications evaluated the performance of INSTI™ HIV-1 Antibody Test (HIV-1), DPP® HIV-HCV Screen Assay Oral Test (HIV-HCV Screen Oral), DPP® HIV-HCV-Syphilis Screen Assay Blood Test (HIV-HCV-Syphilis Blood), Multiplo Rapid HIV/HCV/HBV Antibody Test (HIV/HCV/HBV), DPP® HIV 1/2 Screen Assay Blood Test (HIV 1/2 Screen Blood), Alere Determine HIV 1&2, DPP Rapid Test HIV 1/2, DS Rapid Test HIV, Interknit HIV 1&2, HIV 1/2/O Tri-Line, Immuno-Rapido HIV 1&2, Imunocrom HIV 1/2, StatPak, Capillus, Hexagon HIV, First Response HIV1-2-O, SD Bioline HIV-1/2 3.0, HIV Tri-Dot + AG, Genie™ III HIV1/2, INSTI VIH1/2, Genie Fast™ HIV 1-2, SD Bioline HIV/SYPHILIS Duo, Vikia HIV1/2, OraQuick Advance Rapid HIV-1/2, Chembio DPP HIV 1/2 Assay, Chembio Sure Check HIV1/2 Assay, Precise HIV, and BCP HIV-1/-2. The qualitative studies evaluated the acceptability, ease of use, and cost-effectiveness of rapid diagnostic HIV test kits.

These were global studies ranging from countries in Africa, South America, Asia, and the USA to Europe. The populations studied included key populations (men who have sex with men, female sex workers (FSWs), sexual health clinic attendees), adults from the general population, children, archived samples, nursing and pharmacy students, and women in antenatal and post-partum clinics. One study was done among truck drivers in the field.

Results

Included and excluded studies

The meta-analysis for the diagnostic test included 26 studies for diagnostic accuracy, while the qualitative analysis included 15 studies, as shown in **Figure 1**. The sample sizes for each study ranged from 166 to 4,458. Apart from the rapid diagnostic tests, one self-test Kit (INSTI-test) that assessed diagnostic accuracy using blood samples of adults visiting a clinic in Kenya was included. The findings of this study indicated an accuracy of 97.9%, with a sensitivity of 98%, a specificity of 97.8%, a negative predictive value of 98.5%, and a positive predictive value of 97.9%. This study was included in the meta-analysis because it tested accuracy of the INSTI-test against enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) as the gold standard. The systematic review included a publication from Mugwanya and Pintye et al. on the feasibility and programmatic evaluation of integrating pre-exposure prophylaxis delivery in routine family

planning Kenyan clinics (ref). While the results reported the accuracy of HIV testing, this study was excluded in the meta-analysis since it did not evaluate any RDT. Characteristics and results of studies evaluating the diagnostic test accuracy of dual HIV RDTs are in **Table 2a-2d**.

Figure 1. PRISMA diagram for the present systematic review




Table 2a. Characteristics and results of studies evaluating the diagnostic test accuracy of dual HIV RDTs included in the meta-analysis; Test site; Clinic

Author	Location	Population	Index test	Sample	Sample size	Reference test	TP	FN	FP	TN	Accuracy	Sens	Spec	NPV	PPV	Prev
Choko [12] 2016	Malawi	Adults	OraQuick	Saliva	378	Determine or Unigold	175	5	0	190	365	97.2	100	97	100	47.6
Choko [12] 2016	Malawi	Adults	OraQuick	Blood	378	Determine or Unigold	174	3	1	186	360	99.5	99.5	98	99.4	46.8
Maheswaran [13] 2016	South Africa	Adults	OraQuick	Saliva	2198	Determine or Unigold	323	4	0	1860	327	98.7	100	100	100	14.8
Nangendo [14] 2017	Uganda	Adults	OraQuick	Saliva	440	N/A	65	0	0	375	440	100	100	100	100	14.8
Nkenfou [15] 2013	Cameroon	Key populations	OraQuick	Blood	1520	Determine or Unigold	13	1	1	1505	99.9	93	99.9	100	92.9	1
Aspard [16] 2014	France	General populations	OraQuick	Saliva/Whole blood	179	ChemBio Sure Check HIV	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	87.2	98	n/a	n/a	n/a
Aspard [16] 2014	France	General populations	DPP-HIV	Saliva/Whole blood	179	ChemBio Sure Check HIV1/2 Assay	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	88.3	100	n/a	n/a	n/a
Aspard [16] 2014	France	General populations	DPP-HIV	Saliva/Whole blood	179	ChemBio Sure Check HIV1/2 Assay	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100	100	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mbachu [17] 2015	Nigeria	Women	Determine	Serum	166	ELISA	19	1	0	146	99.4	95	100	99	100	12.0
Juntharasamai [18] 2015	Thailand	Key populations	OraQuick	Saliva/Whole blood	3678	ELISA	436	2	10	n/a	n/a	99.5	99.7	100	97.8	n/a
Olugbenga [17] 2018	Nigeria	Women	SD Bioline/Syphilis	Serum	4551	ELISA		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	85.8	99.5	0.9	0.15	n/a
Rapeeporn [19] 2018	Thailand	Adults	SD Bioline/Syphilis	Blood	1680	MTs using Serodia HIV 1/2	252	143	1428	1537	n/a	0.638	0.52	0.9	0.15	23.5
Swana [11] 2018	Kenya	Adults	INSTI-test	Blood	470	ELISA	196	4	6	264	97.9	98	97.8	99	97	42.5

Total Positives (TP), Total Negatives (TN), False Positives (FP), and False Negatives (FN)

Key populations: men who have sex with men, female sex workers (FSWs), and sexual health clinic attendees

Table 2b. Characteristics and results of studies evaluating the diagnostic test accuracy of dual HIV RDTs included in the meta-analysis; Test site; Field

Author	Location	Population	Index test	Sample	Sample size	Reference test	TP	FN	FP	TN	Accuracy	Sens	Spec	NPV	PPV	Prev
Belete [20] 2019	Ethiopia	Adults	OraQuick	Saliva	400	Determine or Unigold	200	1	0	200	399	99.5	100	99.5	100	50
Dziva 2019[21]	Kenya/ Zimbabwe	Children	OraQuick	Saliva	1776	Determine or Unigold	71	0	0	1705	1776	100	100	100	100	4
Fishers [22]2019	USA	Adults	DPP-HIV	Saliva	1029	ELISA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	97.2	99.5	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishers [22]2019	USA	Adults	DPP-HIV/HCV	Saliva	1029	ELISA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	97.9	99.5	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishers 2019[22]	USA	Adults	Determine	Blood	1029	ELISA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	94.6	99.9	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishers [22]2019	USA	Adults	DPP-HIV/HCV/Syphilis	Blood	1029	ELISA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100	99.9	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishers [22]2019	USA	Adults	INSTI-Test	Blood	1029	ELISA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	95.5	100	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishers [22]2019	USA	Adults	HIV/HCV/HBV	Blood	1029	ELISA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	94	100	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishers [22]2019	USA	Adults	DPP-HIV/HCV	Blood	1029	ELISA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	98	99.4	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishers [22]2019	USA	Adults	DPP-HIV/HCV	Blood	1029	ELISA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100	99.7	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishers [22]2019	USA	Adults	HIV/Syphilis test	Blood	1029	ELISA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	97	99.8	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishers [22]2019	USA	Adults	DPP-HIV/HCV	Blood	1029	ELISA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	91.1	100	n/a	n/a	n/a
Zachary [23]2012	Zambia	Key populations	OraQuick	Saliva/ Whole blood	4458	Determine or Unigold	721	40	15	3682	98.8	94.7	99.6	98.9	98	17.1
Galiwango [24]2013	Uganda	Key populations	Determine	Blood	859	EIA-WB	832	23	2	2	97.1	97.3	99.9	98.6	99.8	99.5
Galiwango [24]2013	Uganda	Key populations	StatPak	Blood	2540	EIA-WB	869	5	4	1662	99.6	99.6	99.7	99.8	99.4	34.2

Asimwe [25]2014	Uganda	Key populations	OraQuick	Saliva/ Whole blood	246	Determine or Unigold	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Madisa [26]2015	Botswana	Key populations	KHB/Unigold	Blood	875	ELISA	474	9	7	385	98.2	98.1	98.2	97.7	98.5	55.2
Madisa [26]2015	Botswana	Key populations	KHB/Unigold	Blood	297	ELISA	31	0	4	262	88.2	100	98.5	100	88.6	10.4

Total Positives (TP), Total Negatives (TN), False Positives (FP), and False, Negatives (FN)

Key populations: men who have sex with men, female sex workers (FSWs), and sexual health clinic attendees

Table 2c. Characteristics and results of studies evaluating the diagnostic test accuracy of dual HIV RDTs that were in the meta-analysis; Test site; Laboratory

Author	Location	Population	Index test	Sample	Sample size	Reference test	TP	FN	FP	TN	Accuracy	Sens	Spec	NPV	PPV	Prev
Bristow [27]2019	Brazil	Key populations	HIV/Syphilis test	Serum	400	ELISA	200	0	1	199	399	100	99.5	100	99.5	50
Marinho [28]2020	Brazil	Adults	Determine	Blood	200	WB	100	0	6	94	97	100	94	100	90.7	50
Marinho [28] 2020	Brazil	Adults	DPP-HIV	Blood	200	WB	100	0	4	96	98	100	96	100	93.6	50
Marinho[28] 2020	Brazil	Adults	DPP-HIV	Blood	200	WB	100	0	1	99	99.5	100	99	100	98.3	50
Marinho [28] 2020	Brazil	Adults	Interkit HIV 1&2	Blood	200	WB	100	0	2	98	99	100	98	100	96.7	50
Marinho [28]2020	Brazil	Adults	Bioeasy HIV	Blood	200	WB	100	0	4	96	98	100	96	100	93.6	50
Marinho [28]2020	Brazil	Adults	HIV-Line	Blood	200	WB	99	1	3	97	97.5	99	97	99.4	95.1	50
Marinho [28]2020	Brazil	Adults	Imuno-HIV 1&2	Blood	200	WB	92	8	3	99	87.5	92	99	95.5	98.2	50
Waheed [29]2013	Pakistan	Key populations	Capillus	serum	472	WB	265	15	0	192	96.8	94.6	100	92.7	100	59.3
Waheed [29]2013	Pakistan	Key populations	SD BIOLINE	serum	472	WB	280	0	3	189	99.4	100	98.4	100	98.9	59.3
Waheed [29]2013	Pakistan	Key populations	Capillus	serum	472	WB	280	0	0	192	100	100	100	100	100	59.3
Den Heuvel[29] 2019	Belgium	Archived	SD BIOLINE/SYPHILIS	Serum/whole blood	400	PCR	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100	99.5	n/a	n/a	n/a
Den Heuvel [29] 2019	Belgium	Archived	HIV/Syphilis test	Serum/whole blood	400	PCR	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100	97.5	n/a	n/a	n/a
Den Heuvel [29]2019	Belgium	Archived	Multiplo HIV	Serum/whole blood	400	PCR	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	99.5	99.5	n/a	n/a	n/a
Den Heuvel [29]2019	Belgium	Archived	INSTI-Test	Serum/whole blood	400	PCR	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	99.5	93.5	n/a	n/a	n/a

Total Positives (TP), Total Negatives (TN), False Positives (FP), and False, Negatives (FN)

Key populations: men who have sex with men, female sex workers (FSWs), and sexual health clinic attendees

Table 2d: Characteristics and results of studies evaluating the diagnostic test accuracy of dual HIV RDTs that were included in the meta-analysis; Test site; Laboratory

	Location	Population	Index test	Sample	Sample size	Reference test	TP	FN	FP	TN	Accuracy	Sens	Spec	NPV	PPV	Prevalence
Dagnra [30]2014	Togo	General population	HEXAGON HIV	Serum/plasma/whole blood	149	ELISA	52	0	5	92	96.6	100	94.8	100	91.2	3
Dagnra [30]2014	Togo	General population	FIRST RESPONSE HIV1-2-O	Serum/plasma/whole blood	206	ELISA	102	2	1	101	98.5	99	98.1	99	98.1	3
Dagnra [30]2014	Togo	General population	SD BIOLINE	Serum/plasma/whole blood	200	ELISA	98	0	2	100	99	100	98	100	98	3
Dagnra [30]2014	Togo	General population	HIV-AG	Serum/plasma	198	ELISA	93	0	2	103	98.99	100	98	100	96.9	4
Dagnra[30]2014	Togo	General population	GENIE™-2	Serum/plasma/whole blood	200	ELISA	99	1	0	100	99.5	99	100	99	100	4
Dagnra [30]2014	Togo	General population	INSTI-Test	Serum/plasma/whole blood	192	ELISA	90	2	0	100	98.96	97.8	100	98	100	4
Dagnra [30]2014	Togo	General population	GENIE-1	Serum/plasma/whole blood	200	ELISA	100	0	2	100	100	100	98	100	98	3
Dagnra [30]2014	Togo	General population	SD-SYPHILIS	Serum/plasma/whole blood	310	ELISA	107	0	0	203	100	100	100	100	100	3
Dagnra [30]2014	Togo	General population	VIKIA HIV1/2	Serum/plasma/whole blood	200	ELISA	100	0	0	100	100	100	100	100	100	3
Loukou [2014	Ivory Coast	Archived	Determine	Serum	508	ELISA	203	2	0	303	99.61	100	99.3	100	99	40

Loukou [31]2014	Ivory Coast	Archived	SD BIOLINE	Serum	508	ELISA	203	0	0	305	100	100	100	100	100	39
Loukou [31]2014	Ivory Coast	Archived	Precise HIV	Serum	508	ELISA	202	8	1	297	98.23	99.5	97.4	99.7	96.2	59
Loukou [31]2014	Ivory Coast	Archived	BCP-2	Serum	508	ELISA	203	1	0	304	99.8	100	99.7	100	99.5	40
Loukou [31]2014	Ivory Coast	Archived	OraQuick	Serum	508	ELISA	203	0	0	305	100	100	100	100	100	39
Loukou [31]2014	Ivory Coast	Archived	Visiteck	Serum	508	ELISA	202	2	1	303	99.41	99.5	99.3	99.7	99	40
Loukou [31]2014	Ivory Coast	Archived	HIV-Stat	Serum	508	ELISA	203	1	0	304	99.8	100	99.7	100	99.5	40
Ondondo [32]2013	Kenya	HIV serodiscordant couples	SD Bioline/Syphilis	Serum	680	ELISA	345	1	0	352	346	100	100	697	n/a	n/a
Bristow[33] 2014	Kenya	Archived	SD Bioline/Syphilis	Serum	698	Determine or Unigold	345	1	0	352	346	100	100	697	n/a	n/a

positives (TP), Total Negatives (TN), False Positives (FP) and False Negatives (FN)

Diagnostic Accuracy of HIV tests

1. Quantitative findings

Meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy

Table 3 shows a meta-analysis of all studies included in this quantitative analysis. The result indicates that the RDT sensitivities were 99% [95% CI=99%-100%], while specificity was optimal at 100% [95% CI=99%-100%]. The Diagnostic odds ratio (DOR) of 44,612 [95% CI=14323-138954], indicates better RDT test performance. The likelihood ratio of a positive test result (LR+) of 317.61 [95% CI=136.61-738.47] was evident.

Table 3. Meta-analysis of diagnostic Accuracy of all test Kits

	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>z	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Bivariate						
E(logitSe)	4.94	0.31			4.33	5.55
E(logitSp)	5.76	0.43			4.92	6.61
Var(logitSe)	2.33	0.78			1.20	4.49
Var(logitSp)	5.11	1.71			2.66	9.83
Corr(logits)	0.32	0.20			-0.10	0.65
HSROC						
Lambda	10.75	0.58			9.61	11.89
Theta	0.64	0.54			-0.43	1.71
Beta	0.39	0.23	1.72	0.09	-0.05	0.84
s2alpha	9.13	2.61			5.22	16.00
s2theta	1.16	0.45			0.55	2.48
Summary Estimates						
Sensitivity	0.99	0.00			0.99	1.00
Specificity	1.00	0.00			0.99	1.00
DOR	44612.33	25860.52			14323.11	138954.50
LR+	317.61	136.73			136.61	738.47
LR-	0.01	0.00			0.00	0.01
1/LR-	140.46	43.64			76.40	258.24
DOR=Diagnostic Odds ratio, LR =Likelihood Ratio (positive or negative)						

Table 4 shows a comparison of performance between single tests and dual tests. A single test's diagnostic odds ratio estimates performed better than a dual test: dual test DOR=44612.33 and

single test DOR=14323.11. However, the confidence intervals overlapped, suggesting overall similarity.

Table 4. Comparison of diagnostic performance between single and dual tests

Diagnostics results for Dual tests					Diagnostics results for Single tests				
Coef.	Std. Err.	P>z	[95% Conf.	Interval]	Coef.	Std. Err.	P>z	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Bivariate					Bivariate				
E(logitSe)	4.93	0.98	3.00	6.85	E(logitSe)	4.88	0.32	4.25	5.50
E(logitSp)	5.23	1.16	2.95	7.50	E(logitSp)	5.70	0.41	4.90	6.51
Var(logitSe)	5.04	0.54	4.08	6.22	Var(logitSe)	1.73	0.75	0.74	4.04
Var(logitSp)	7.06	0.00	7.05	7.07	Var(logitSp)	3.77	1.47	1.75	8.09
Corr(logits)	1.00	.	.	.	Corr(logits)	-0.03	0.24	-0.47	0.42
HSROC					HSROC				
Lambda	10.16	2.12	6.02	14.31	Lambda	10.62	0.52	9.60	11.64
Theta	0.28	0.06	0.16	0.40	Theta	0.61	0.69	-0.74	1.97
beta	0.17	0.05	0.00	0.27	beta	0.39	0.29	0.18	0.96
s2alpha	23.85	1.28	21.47	26.50	s2alpha	4.96	1.83	2.41	10.21
s2theta	0.00	.	.	.	s2theta	1.31	0.51	0.61	2.82
Summary points					Summary points				
Se	0.99	0.01	0.95	1.00	Se	0.99	0.00	0.99	1.00
Sp	0.99	0.01	0.95	1.00	Sp	1.00	0.00	0.99	1.00
DOR	25660.79	54493.35	399.63	1647724.00	DOR	39343.29	20210.89	14374.84	107680.80
LR+	185.53	215.21	19.10	1802.26	LR+	298.78	121.94	134.26	664.89
LR-	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.05	LR-	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
1/LR-	138.31	135.63	20.24	945.24	1/LR-	131.68	41.42	71.09	243.92





Figure 2. HSROC. Hierarchical summary ROC: ROC = receiver operating characteristic of the test Kits evaluated for quantitative analysis. The pooled sensitivity, specificity, and area under the SROC curve of these assays were 0.999, 0.991, and 1.00, respectively, which demonstrate that blood-based rapid HIV test has comparable accuracy to WB, RDT testing algorithms, or ELISA for HIV early therapy.


Forest plot for all studies



A value of 0% indicates no observed heterogeneity, and values greater than 50% may be considered substantial heterogeneity.

I^2 for sensitivity was 99.47%, while that for specificity was 99.96, indicating significant heterogeneity justifying stratified analysis.

Forest plot for dual tests also indicates heterogeneity between studies



Forest plot for single tests also indicates heterogeneity




Table 5a. Comparison of the performance of RDT samples

RDT sample type	variable	mean	SEM	SD	min	max
Blood	DOR	12359.79	7784.036	23352.11	1.89675	72213.9
	Sensitivity	85.15887	6.670319	32.67776	0.638	100
	Specificity	86.51629	6.760616	33.12012	0.518	100
	NPV	86.675	8.374253	33.49701	0.915	100
	PPV	84.12	8.199338	32.79735	0.15	100
Saliva	DOR
	Sensitivity	70.937	18.06734	47.8017	0.972	100
	Specificity	71.57143	18.22166	48.20998	1	100
	NPV	79.5794	19.65146	43.94201	0.997	100
	PPV	80.2	19.8	44.27415	1	100
Saliva/Whole blood	DOR	4424.537	.	.	4424.537	4424.537
	Sensitivity	19.69	18.75252	41.93191	0.872	94.7
	Specificity	20.716	19.721	44.0975	0.983	99.6
	NPV	49.9495	48.9505	69.22646	0.999	98.9
	PPV	49.489	48.511	68.60491	0.978	98
Serum	DOR	19051.13	11551.87	16336.82	7499.25	30603
	Sensitivity	82.22917	11.01803	38.16759	0.95	100
	Specificity	91.28333	8.210146	28.44078	1	100
	NPV	199.4903	74.69569	247.7376	0.993	697
	PPV	88.18889	10.90532	32.71595	1	100
Serum/plasma	DOR
	Sensitivity	100	.	.	100	100
	Specificity	98	.	.	98	98
	NPV	100	.	.	100	100
	PPV	96.9	.	.	96.9	96.9
Serum/plasma/whole blood	DOR	5151	.	.	5151	5151
	Sensitivity	99.475	0.287694	0.813722	97.8	100
	Specificity	98.6125	0.644326	1.82243	94.8	100
	NPV	99.5	0.267261	0.755929	98	100
	PPV	98.1625	1.052537	2.977025	91.2	100
Serum/whole blood	DOR
	Sensitivity	99.75	0.144338	0.288675	99.5	100
	Specificity	97.5	1.414214	2.828427	93.5	99.5
	NPV
	PPV
Serum	DOR
	Sensitivity	98.2	1.8	3.117691	94.6	100
	Specificity	99.46667	0.533333	0.92376	98.4	100
	NPV	97.56667	2.433333	4.214657	92.7	100
	PPV	99.63333	0.366667	0.635085	98.9	100

Table 5b. Comparison of individual RDT type

RDT sample type	variable	mean	SEM	SD	min	max
BCP-2	DOR
	Sensitivity	100	.	.	100	100
	Specificity	99.7	.	.	99.7	99.7
	NPV	100	.	.	100	100
	PPV	99.5	.	.	99.5	99.5
Bioeasy HIV	DOR
	Sensitivity	100	.	.	100	100
	Specificity	96	.	.	96	96
	NPV	100	.	.	100	100
	PPV	93.6	.	.	93.6	93.6
Capillus	DOR
	Sensitivity	97.3	2.7	3.818377	94.6	100
	Specificity	100	0	0	100	100
	NPV	96.35	3.65	5.16188	92.7	100
	PPV	100	0	0	100	100
DPP-HIV	DOR
	Sensitivity	59.8166	24.0411	53.75754	0.883	100
	Specificity	59.3	23.8084	53.23721	1	99.5
	NPV	100	0	0	100	100
	PPV	95.95	2.35	3.323402	93.6	98.3
DPP-HIV/HCV	DOR
	Sensitivity	96.75	1.944437	3.888873	91.1	100
	Specificity	99.65	0.1322876	0.2645751	99.4	100
	NPV
	PPV
DPP-HIV/HCV/Syph	DOR
	Sensitivity	100	.	.	100	100
	Specificity	99.9	.	.	99.9	99.9
	NPV
	PPV
Determine	DOR	36.17391	.	.	36.17391	36.17391
	Sensitivity	78.57	19.43081	43.44861	0.95	100
	Specificity	78.82	19.4866	43.57335	1	99.9
	NPV	74.89825	24.63729	49.27459	95.2	98.2
	PPV	72.625	23.96346	47.92691	90.3	99.8
FIRST RESPONSE H	DOR	5151	.	.	5151	5151
	Sensitivity	99	.	.	99	99
	Specificity	98.1	.	.	98.1	98.1
	NPV	99	.	.	99	99
	PPV	98.1	.	.	98.1	98.1

GENIE-1	DOR
	Sensitivity	100	.	.	100	100
	Specificity	98	.	.	98	98
	NPV	100	.	.	100	100
	PPV	98	.	.	98	98
GENIETM-2	DOR
	Sensitivity	99	.	.	99	99
	Specificity	100	.	.	100	100
	NPV	99	.	.	99	99
	PPV	100	.	.	100	100
HEXAGON HIV	DOR
	Sensitivity	100	.	.	100	100
	Specificity	94.8	.	.	94.8	94.8
	NPV	100	.	.	100	100
	PPV	91.2	.	.	91.2	91.2
HIV-AG	DOR
	Sensitivity	100	.	.	100	100
	Specificity	98	.	.	98	98
	NPV	100	.	.	100	100
	PPV	96.9	.	.	96.9	96.9
HIV-Line	DOR	3201	.	.	3201	3201
	Sensitivity	99	.	.	99	99
	Specificity	97	.	.	97	97
	NPV	99.4	.	.	99.4	99.4
	PPV	95.1	.	.	95.1	95.1
HIV-Stat	DOR
	Sensitivity	100	.	.	100	100
	Specificity	99.7	.	.	99.7	99.7
	NPV	100	.	.	100	100
	PPV	99.5	.	.	99.5	99.5
HIV/HCV/HBV	DOR
	Sensitivity	94	.	.	94	94
	Specificity	100	.	.	100	100
	NPV
	PPV
HIV/Syphilis SD Bioline test	DOR
	Sensitivity	99	1	1.732051	97	100
	Specificity	98.93333	0.7218803	1.250333	97.5	99.8
	NPV	100	.	.	100	100
	PPV	99.5	.	.	99.5	99.5
INSTI-Test	DOR
	Sensitivity	97.6	1.159023	2.007486	95.5	99.5
	Specificity	97.83333	2.166667	3.752777	93.5	100

INSTI-test	NPV	98	.	.	98	98
	PPV	100	.	.	100	100
	DOR	2156	.	.	2156	2156
	Sensitivity	0.98	.	.	0.98	0.98
	Specificity	0.978	.	.	0.978	0.978
Imuno-HIV 1&2	NPV	0.985	.	.	0.985	0.985
	PPV	0.97	.	.	0.97	0.97
	DOR	379.5	.	.	379.5	379.5
	Sensitivity	92	0	0	92	92
	Specificity	99.5	0.5	0.7071068	99	100
Interkit HIV 1&2	NPV	95.55	0.05	0.0707107	95.5	95.6
	PPV	99.1	0.9	1.272792	98.2	100
	DOR
	Sensitivity	100	.	.	100	100
	Specificity	98	.	.	98	98
Unigold	NPV	100	.	.	100	100
	PPV	96.7	.	.	96.7	96.7
	DOR	2896.667	.	.	2896.667	2896.667
	Sensitivity	99.05	0.95	1.343503	98.1	100
	Specificity	98.35	0.15	0.212132	98.2	98.5
Multiplo HIV	NPV	98.85	1.15	1.626346	97.7	100
	PPV	93.55	4.95	7.000357	88.6	98.5
	DOR
	Sensitivity	99.5	.	.	99.5	99.5
	Specificity	99.5	.	.	99.5	99.5
OraQuick	NPV
	PPV
	DOR	11592.51	4389.147	7602.226	4424.537	19565
	Sensitivity	53.82009	15.27308	50.65508	87.2	100
	Specificity	54.95227	15.57616	51.66028	98.3	100
Precise HIV	NPV	79.6096	13.10466	41.44058	99.7	100
	PPV	79.2278	13.05811	41.29337	97.8	100
	DOR	7499.25	.	.	7499.25	7499.25
	Sensitivity	99.5	.	.	99.5	99.5
	Specificity	97.4	.	.	97.4	97.4
SD BIOLINE	NPV	99.7	.	.	99.7	99.7
	PPV	96.2	.	.	96.2	96.2
	DOR
	Sensitivity	100	0	0	100	100
	Specificity	98.8	0.6110101	1.058301	98	100
SD BIOLINE/SYPHI	NPV	100	0	0	100	100
	PPV	98.96667	0.5783117	1.001665	98	100
	DOR

SD Bioline/Syphi	Sensitivity	100	.	.	100	100
	Specificity	99.5	.	.	99.5	99.5
	NPV
	PPV
	DOR	1.89675	.	.	1.89675	1.89675
StatPak	Sensitivity	46.8595	26.73917	53.47833	0.638	100
	Specificity	75.0045	24.82911	49.65823	0.518	100
	NPV	64.9717	232.0283	401.8849	91.5	97
	PPV	80.15	.	.	91.5	95
	DOR	72213.9	.	.	72213.9	72213.9
VIKIA HIV1/2	Sensitivity	99.6	.	.	99.6	99.6
	Specificity	99.7	.	.	99.7	99.7
	NPV	99.8	.	.	99.8	99.8
	PPV	99.4	.	.	99.4	99.4
	DOR
Visiteck	Sensitivity	100	.	.	100	100
	Specificity	100	.	.	100	100
	NPV	100	.	.	100	100
	PPV	100	.	.	100	100
	DOR	30603	.	.	30603	30603
	Sensitivity	99.5	.	.	99.5	99.5
	Specificity	99.3	.	.	99.3	99.3
	NPV	99.7	.	.	99.7	99.7
	PPV	99	.	.	99	99

2. Qualitative findings

a) Acceptability, ease of use for rapid tests for HIV

Overall, most studies showed the acceptability and ease of using diagnostic rapid HIV test kits [34]–[40]. Acceptability analysis papers were all on self-test as they were the ones available. For the HIV self-test Kit, Mugo *et al.* [37] and Kurth *et al.* [39] looked at the uptake, acceptability, and accuracy of oral fluid HIV in a general adult population and found a strong agreement in acceptability and accuracy (>90% accuracy). Frequent testing among index participants (IPs) and their partners – ANC: 51% (27/53), PPC: 68% (62/91), and FSW: 83% (53/64), [35] and 11/18 FSW[38] was documented in three Kenyan studies evaluating the acceptability of self-tests using OraQuick Rapid HIV-1/2 Antibody Test (OraSure Technologies) among FSWs and antenatal and post-partum women in antenatal clinics. In a randomized control trial (RCT) by Masters, Agot [35], participants were more likely to self-test (90.8%, 258/284) in the HIV self-test group than in the comparison group (52%, 148/286). Couples were more likely to test together in the

HIV self-test (ST) group than in the comparison group (75.4% versus 33.2%). The majority of the FSWs (89%, 16/18) distributed the self-testing kits to their clients, with each woman distributing them to two or more clients. Most (88%, 14/16) of the clients had positive or neutral reactions during and after using the self-tests [38]. Rumurthy et al. [35] found that most IPs distributed the test kits to their primary partners (ANC: 91% (53/58), PPC: 86% (91/106), and FSW: 75% (64/85)) and other individuals with the 256 IPs with follow-up data distributing 709 self-tests. Virtually all (99%, 442/445) of the self-tests distributed to the implementing partner (IP's) networks were used by the contacts in the presence of the IP [35].

While exploring the feasibility and acceptability of HIV-testing among PrEP users in Kenya, Ngure *et al.* [41] depicted that 98% of the HIV-uninfected participants who visited the clinics for PrEP refill accepted self-testing using OraQuick, with 93.2% agreeing to have conducted the test at least once. Further, 98% of the participants argued that the OraQuick HIV self-testing kit was easy to use, with 90.8% confirming that they did not require any help to perform the test.

Despite the overall positive feedback regarding ease of use and acceptability, a few studies reported negative experiences among women who tried to introduce the HIVST to their sex partners, thus underscoring the importance of the usability of rapid test kits in different settings [38]. Two women experienced abuse following the self-test distribution; one experienced sexual and verbal abuse (sexual abuse from one client and two clients), and the other verbal abuse from one client in the study.

Strauss *et al.* [41] explored the potential difference in the stated and revealed preference regarding oral-based HIV testing. The study found that the oral-based test for HIV (HST) was well aligned with the preferences of some truck drivers, especially those whose revealed preference was for HST. This evidence shows a strong correlation between stated preference and revealed preference, elucidating acceptability regarding the use of HIVST uptake in different populations [34]. However, the majority preferred to have these tests done in the clinic setting, where they can receive support from a healthcare worker. These findings concur with those from a randomized control trial among truck drivers in Kenya conducted by Ngure *et al.* that partly aimed at determining the HIV testing location preference [41]. The results signify that most participants (76.4%) preferred testing at the clinic, with the preference being 1.5 times higher

among those using Oraquick in the choice arm than those using Colloidal Gold in the Standard of Care (SOC).

b) Cost-effectiveness for rapid tests for HIV

Costs may be a potential barrier to accessing HIV self-test kits compared to free HTC that the government provides at health facilities. OraQuick, a rapid HIV 1/2 diagnostic HIV test kit that uses saliva to detect HIV, is among the most expensive leading rapid tests, costing around USD 4 in low-resource-limited countries [42]. A few review studies documented the probable costs of rapid HIV tests in different populations and settings. An RCT in a resource-limited country conducted by Eggman *et al.* [43] among adolescents attending the HIV clinic found that the criteria for offering rapid HIV testing and delivering non-rapid test results varied among seven clinics. This study also determined the costs of using a rapid HIV test and observed that using a rapid HIV test costs USD 22 per patient without brief risk-reduction counseling and USD 46 per patient with counseling included. Estimated incremental annual costs per clinic of implementing universal rapid HIV testing varied by whether brief counseling is conducted and by current clinic testing practices, ranging from a savings of USD 19,500 to a cost of USD 40,700 without counseling and a cost of USD 98,000 to USD 153,900 with counseling. A study by Maheswaran *et al.* [44] established that rapid HIV testing at the healthcare facility may be cost-saving but least effective from the health provider perspective using 2010 WHO ART guidelines compared to a combination of facility HTC and HIVST (USD 294.71 per person; 95% credible interval [CrI], 270.79-318.45) and least effective (11.64 quality-adjusted life-years [QALYs] per person; 95% CrI, 11.43-11.86). The cost-effective incremental ratio (ICER) for facility HTC plus HIVST, using 2015 WHO ART guidelines, was USD 253.90 (95% CrI, 201.71-342.02) per QALY gained compared with facility HTC and using 2015 WHO ART guidelines [44]. Other studies in this survey also established lower costs associated with facility HIV rapid tests, including those done by self-testing[13]. However, a study done in Malawi by Maheswaran *et al.* [44], assessing the economic costs and quality of life outcomes of HIV treatment, found lower costs associated with HIVST for ART initiation facility HTC (22.79 versus USD 19.92).

A cluster-randomized trial by Obure *et al.* [45] among pregnant women established costs associated with dual testing of pregnant women for HIV and syphilis in Colombia. They established that the cost per pregnant woman tested and the cost per woman treated for syphilis

was USD 10.26 and USD 607.99, respectively, in the single rapid diagnostic test. For dual tests, the cost per pregnant woman tested for HIV and syphilis was USD 15.89, while the cost per woman treated for syphilis was USD 1859.26. The costs per woman tested for HIV and syphilis and those treated for syphilis were lower in Cali than in Bogota across both intervention arms. Health worker costs accounted for the highest costs, while treatment costs comprised <1% of the preventive program [45].

Discussions

Timely detection and treatment are the key pillars supporting the prevention and control of HIV/AIDS. It is thus important that countries and, more so, resource-limited settings select HIV testing strategies and test kits that enable them to achieve the first UNAIDS 95-95-95 target [45], [46]. RDTs have been used optimally in many settings to achieve widespread testing coverage. This has led to the development of some RDTs with varied sensitivity and specificity results[47], [48]. The selection of RDTs continues to suffer from limited research that evaluates the effectiveness of RDTs in terms of their specificity, sensitivity, and sample types [49]. While striving to address these challenges, we conducted a meta-analysis to evaluate the specificity and sensitivity of blood-based RDTs compared with the WB or ELISA-based assay in terms of pooled sensitivity and specificity by meta-analysis. All the studies reported excellent sensitivity and specificity, with an average RDT sensitivity of 99% [95% CI=99%-100%], while specificity was optimal at 100% [95% CI=99%-100%]. The diagnostic odds ratio was DOR=44612 [95% CI=14323-138954]. Our meta-analysis evaluated the differential performance of single as opposed to dual RDT in terms of the diagnostic odds ratio. The dual test DOR of 44612.33 and single test DOR of 14323.11 evidence the superior diagnostic aspects of a single RDT, although there was an overlap in the confidence interval. This is consistent with Xiaojie et al.'s metanalysis results[49]. These results emphasize using the dual test kit as an alternative backup to the first test kit.

Areas under the SROC curves for the most popular RDT (Capillus HIV-1/HIV-2, Unigold, and Determine HIV-1/2) were above 0.99, with sensitivities above 99.9%. In addition to the most popular RTKs, 15 other kits have been evaluated in 15 studies (see mixed assays in Table 4). The pooled sensitivity, specificity, and area under the SROC curve of these assays were 0.998, 0.991,

and 1.00, respectively, which demonstrates that blood-based rapid HIV test has comparable accuracy to WB or ELISA.

Our review suggests that blood-based RDTs have high diagnostic accuracy, with comparable estimates across most test kits as the first test in resource-limited settings. Although the sensitivity and specificity of RDTs reagents both exceed 99.5%, they could be compromised due to unstandardized operations in non-laboratory settings [50], [51]. The sensitivity of RT can be reduced in the absence of a quality assurance and evaluation system [52]. Unstandardized operations may lead to an RT false-negative rate of up to 5.4% [53]. RT test inevitably faces other challenges, such as the inability to recheck the same sample, and relatively low sensitivity for early HIV infection [50]

The main limitation is that statistical comparison between subgroups (i.e., different populations) was not possible due to a lack of data. Additionally, only English language studies were included in this meta-analysis. These could have resulted in a potential reporting bias. Different areas can determine the combinations based on the performance of reagents, costs, HIV prevalence, and risk behaviors of populations. These results depict the need for counselors and clients to understand the limitations of RDTs positive results and the necessity to receive confirmatory tests, especially in low HIV epidemic settings.

Conclusions

The average of the RDT sensitivities were 99% [95% CI=99%-100%], while specificity was optimal at 100% [95% CI=99%-100%]. The diagnostic odds ratio was DOR=44612 [95% CI=14323-138954], thus indicating better RDT test performance. The performance of single test kits in HIV diagnosis was better than those for dual tests.

Overall, our study indicated that RDTs would function, and the ELISA or WB and RDTs should be accessible and extensively used for HIV diagnosis in line with the WHO recommended test and treatment strategy. Additionally, there are comparable results between the dual and the single test kits.

Key findings

1. A total of 2,120 studies were identified after rigorous screening. Eventually, 26 studies were included in the RDT performance, and 15 studies were included in the analysis for cost-effectiveness and ease of use.
2. In the meta-analysis of 26 studies, the average RDT sensitivities were 99% [95% CI=99%-100%], while specificity was optimal at 100%; 95% CI=99%-100%. The diagnostic odds ratio was DOR=44612 [95% CI=14323-138954], thus indicating better RDT test performance. The performance of single test kits was better than that for dual tests.
3. While there is significant heterogeneity between studies included in the meta-analysis, there is a need for further assessment of the inclusion criteria among the validation studies.
4. Most of the studies demonstrated a significant high level of acceptability of self-test or initiated tests.
5. Several studies have established that cost remains a barrier to accessing RDT testing for HIV, and time to result is a major factor influencing the test preference.
6. Estimated incremental annual costs per clinic of implementing universal rapid HIV testing varied by whether or not brief counseling is conducted and by current clinic testing practices, ranging from a savings of USD 19,500 to a cost of USD 40,700 without counseling and a cost of USD 98,000 to USD 153,900 with counseling [46].
7. Rapid HIV testing at the healthcare facility may be cost-saving but least effective from the health provider perspective using the 2010 WHO ART guidelines compared to a combination of facility HTC and HIVST (USD 294.71 per person; 95% credible interval [CrI], 270.79-318.45) and least effective (11.64 quality-adjusted life-years [QALYs] per person; 95% CrI, 11.43-11.86).

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study was approved by the Amref Health Africa institutional ethics review committee. This was a metanalysis and a systematic review of published literatures.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and material

All data contained within the article are publicly available?

Competing interests

None declared.

Funding

None

Authors' contributions

LK conceived the study, collected data, analyzed the data and drafted the manuscript; NP supervised data collection, contributed to data analysis and assisted in drafting and submission of the manuscript. NB, PL, VM.RSM, EN, CA, JO and SM participated in data collection and review of the manuscript. RW and JNK are the overall supervisors and contributed to data analysis, drafting and critical revision of the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the Ministry of Health Kenya through the National Public Health Laboratory (NPHL) and the National AIDS and STI Control Program (NASCOP) for facilitating sample collection and allocating staff time to write this manuscript. We thank Dr Bhavna Chohan, Washington State University, for reviewing a draft of this manuscript.

References

- [1] J. R. Paño Pardo, "Rapid Diagnostics and Biomarkers for Antimicrobial Stewardship," in *Antimicrobial Stewardship*, 2017. doi: 10.1016/b978-0-12-810477-4.00006-4.
- [2] C. AT *et al.*, "Accuracy of re-reading HIV rapid tests and the effect of prolonged high temperature," *Topics in Antiviral Medicine*, vol. 23. 2015.
- [3] I. Olugbenga *et al.*, "Clinic-based evaluation study of the diagnostic accuracy of a dual rapid test for the screening of HIV and syphilis in pregnant women in Nigeria," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 13, no. 7, 2018, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0198698.
- [4] C. S. Kosack *et al.*, "Designing HIV testing algorithms based on 2015 WHO guidelines using data from six sites in sub-Saharan Africa," *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, vol. 55, no. 10, 2017, doi: 10.1128/JCM.00962-17.
- [5] A. S. Kravitz Del Solar, B. Parekh, M. O. K. Douglas, D. Edgil, J. Kuritsky, and J. Nkengasong, "A Commitment to HIV Diagnostic Accuracy – a comment on 'Towards more accurate HIV testing in sub-Saharan Africa: a multi-site evaluation of HIV RDTs and risk factors for false positives' and 'HIV misdiagnosis in sub-Saharan Africa: a performance of diagnostic algorithms at six testing sites,'" *Journal of the International AIDS Society*, vol. 21, no. 8. 2018. doi: 10.1002/jia2.25177.
- [6] M. J. Page and D. Moher, "Evaluations of the uptake and impact of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Statement and extensions: A scoping review," *Systematic Reviews*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2017, doi: 10.1186/s13643-017-0663-8.
- [7] P. M. Bossuyt *et al.*, "The STARD statement for reporting studies of diagnostic accuracy: Explanation and elaboration," *Clinical Chemistry*, vol. 49, no. 1, 2003, doi: 10.1373/49.1.7.
- [8] P. F. Whiting *et al.*, "Quadas-2: A revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies," *Annals of Internal Medicine*, vol. 155, no. 8. 2011. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-155-8-201110180-00009.
- [9] R. M. Harbord and P. Whiting, "Metandi: Meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy using hierarchical logistic regression," *Stata Journal*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2009, doi: 10.1177/1536867x0900900203.
- [10] A. S. Glas, J. G. Lijmer, M. H. Prins, G. J. Bonsel, and P. M. M. Bossuyt, "The diagnostic odds ratio: A single indicator of test performance," *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, vol. 56, no. 11, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0895-4356(03)00177-X.
- [11] P. Bwana, L. Ochieng, and M. Mwau, "Performance and usability evaluation of the INSTI HIV self-test in Kenya for qualitative detection of antibodies to HIV," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 13, no. 9, 2018, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0202491.
- [12] A. T. Choko *et al.*, "Initial accuracy of HIV Rapid test kits stored in suboptimal conditions and validity of delayed reading of oral fluid tests," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 11, no. 6, 2016, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0158107.

- [13] H. Maheswaran *et al.*, "Cost and quality of life analysis of HIV self-testing and facility-based HIV testing and counselling in Blantyre, Malawi," *BMC Medicine*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2016, doi: 10.1186/s12916-016-0577-7.
- [14] J. Nangendo *et al.*, "Diagnostic accuracy and acceptability of rapid HIV oral testing among adults attending an urban public health facility in Kampala, Uganda," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 12, no. 8, 2017, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0182050.
- [15] C. N. Nkenfou *et al.*, "Evaluation of OraQuick® HIV-1/2 as oral rapid test," *African Journal of Infectious Diseases*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2013, doi: 10.4314/ajid.v7i2.2.
- [16] M. Jaspard *et al.*, "Finger-stick whole blood HIV-1/-2 home-use tests are more sensitive than oral fluid-based in-home HIV tests," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 9, no. 6, 2014, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0101148.
- [17] I. I. Mbachu *et al.*, "The evaluation of accuracy of serial rapid HIV test algorithm in the diagnosis of HIV antibodies among pregnant women in southeast Nigeria Pregnancy and Childbirth," *BMC Research Notes*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2015, doi: 10.1186/s13104-015-1454-8.
- [18] P. Suntharasamai *et al.*, "Assessment of oral fluid HIV test performance in an HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis trial in Bangkok, Thailand," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 10, no. 12, 2015, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0145859.
- [19] R. Wongkanya *et al.*, "HIV rapid diagnostic testing by lay providers in a key population-led health service programme in Thailand," *Journal of Virus Eradication*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2018, doi: 10.1016/s2055-6640(20)30235-1.
- [20] W. Belete *et al.*, "Evaluation of diagnostic performance of noninvasive HIV self-testing kit using oral fluid in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: A facility-based cross-sectional study," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2019, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0210866.
- [21] C. D. Chikwari *et al.*, "Diagnostic Accuracy of Oral Mucosal Transudate Tests Compared with Blood-Based Rapid Tests for HIV Among Children Aged 18 Months to 18 Years in Kenya and Zimbabwe," in *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 2019, vol. 82, no. 4. doi: 10.1097/QAI.0000000000002146.
- [22] D. G. Fisher *et al.*, "Comparisons of New HIV Rapid Test Kit Performance," *AIDS and Behavior*, vol. 23, no. 2, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10461-018-2204-4.
- [23] D. Zachary *et al.*, "Field comparison of OraQuick® ADVANCE Rapid HIV-1/2 antibody test and two blood-based rapid HIV antibody tests in Zambia," *BMC Infectious Diseases*, vol. 12, 2012, doi: 10.1186/1471-2334-12-183.
- [24] R. M. Galiwango *et al.*, "Evaluation of current rapid HIV test algorithms in Rakai, Uganda," *Journal of Virological Methods*, vol. 192, no. 1–2, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.jviromet.2013.04.003.
- [25] S. Asimwe, J. Oloya, X. Song, and C. C. Whalen, "Accuracy of Un-supervised Versus Provider-Supervised Self-administered HIV Testing in Uganda: A Randomized Implementation Trial," *AIDS and Behavior*, vol. 18, no. 12, 2014, doi: 10.1007/s10461-014-0765-4.

- [26] M. Mine, S. Chishala, K. Makhaola, T. A. Tafuma, J. Bolebantswe, and M. B. Merrigan, "Performance of rapid HIV testing by lay counselors in the field during the behavioral and biological surveillance survey among female sex workers and men who have sex with men in Botswana," *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, vol. 68, no. 3, 2015, doi: 10.1097/QAI.0000000000000434.
- [27] C. C. Bristow, S. K. V. Rivera, L. B. Ramos Cordova, L. J. Q. Palacios, K. A. Konda, and J. D. Klausner, "Dual rapid test for HIV and syphilis: A laboratory evaluation of the diagnostic accuracy of the Standard Q HIV/Syphilis Combo Test," *Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease*, vol. 94, no. 1, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2018.11.018.
- [28] F. L. de O. Marinho, N. L. de L. Santos, S. P. F. Neves, and L. de S. Vasconcellos, "Performance evaluation of eight rapid tests to detect HIV infection: A comparative study from Brazil," *PLoS One*, vol. 15, no. 8, 2020, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0237438.
- [29] U. Waheed, K. Hayat, B. Ahmad, Y. Waheed, and H. A. Zaheer, "Evaluation of HIV/AIDS diagnostics kits and formulation of a testing strategy for Pakistan," *Journal of Clinical Virology*, vol. 56, no. 4, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.jcv.2012.12.012.
- [30] A. Y. Dagnra *et al.*, "Evaluation of 9 rapid diagnostic tests for screening HIV infection, in Lomé, Togo," *Medecine et Maladies Infectieuses*, vol. 44, no. 11–12, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.medmal.2014.10.007.
- [31] Y. G. Loukou, M. A. Cabran, Z. N. Yessé, B. M. O. Adouko, S. J. Lathro, and K. B. T. Agbessi-Kouassi, "Performance of rapid tests and algorithms for HIV screening in Abidjan, Ivory Coast," *J Int Assoc Provid AIDS Care*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2014, doi: 10.1177/2325957413488168.
- [32] R. O. Ondondo, J. B. Odoyo, and E. A. Bukusi, "O15.5 Performance Characteristics of SD Bio Line Rapid HIV-Syphilis Duo Test Kit For Simultaneous Detection of HIV and Syphilis Infections," *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, vol. 89, no. Suppl 1, 2013, doi: 10.1136/sextrans-2013-051184.0171.
- [33] C. C. Bristow *et al.*, "Multisite laboratory evaluation of a dual human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)/Syphilis point-of-care rapid test for simultaneous detection of HIV and Syphilis infection," *Open Forum Infectious Diseases*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2014, doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofu015.
- [34] M. Strauss *et al.*, "Stated and revealed preferences for HIV testing: Can oral self-testing help to increase uptake amongst truck drivers in Kenya?," *BMC Public Health*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-6122-1.
- [35] S. H. Masters, K. Agot, B. Obonyo, S. Napierala Mavedzenge, S. Maman, and H. Thirumurthy, "Promoting Partner Testing and Couples Testing through Secondary Distribution of HIV Self-Tests: A Randomized Clinical Trial," *PLoS Medicine*, vol. 13, no. 11, 2016, doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002166.
- [36] H. Thirumurthy, S. H. Masters, S. N. Mavedzenge, S. Maman, E. Omanga, and K. Agot, "Promoting male partner HIV testing and safer sexual decision making through secondary distribution of self-tests by HIV-negative female sex workers and women receiving antenatal and post-partum care

- in Kenya: a cohort study," *The Lancet HIV*, vol. 3, no. 6, 2016, doi: 10.1016/S2352-3018(16)00041-2.
- [37] P. M. Mugo *et al.*, "Uptake and acceptability of oral HIV self-testing among community pharmacy clients in Kenya: A feasibility study," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2017, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0170868.
 - [38] S. Maman *et al.*, "A qualitative study of secondary distribution of HIV self-test kits by female sex workers in Kenya," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2017, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0174629.
 - [39] A. E. Kurth *et al.*, "Accuracy and Acceptability of Oral Fluid HIV Self-Testing in a General Adult Population in Kenya," *AIDS and Behavior*, vol. 20, no. 4, 2016, doi: 10.1007/s10461-015-1213-9.
 - [40] S. Kalibala, W. Tun, P. Cherutich, A. Nganga, E. Oweya, and P. Oluoch, "Factors associated with acceptability of HIV self-testing among health care workers in Kenya," *AIDS and Behavior*, vol. 18, no. SUPPL. 4, 2014, doi: 10.1007/s10461-014-0830-z.
 - [41] K. Ngunjiri *et al.*, "Feasibility and acceptability of HIV self-testing among pre-exposure prophylaxis users in Kenya," *J Int AIDS Soc*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2017, doi: 10.7448/IAS.20.1.21234.
 - [42] V. Cambiano, S. N. Mavedzenge, and A. Phillips, "Modelling the potential population impact and cost-effectiveness of self-testing for HIV: Evaluation of data requirements," *AIDS and Behavior*, vol. 18, no. SUPPL. 4, 2014, doi: 10.1007/s10461-014-0824-x.
 - [43] A. A. Eggman *et al.*, "The cost of implementing rapid HIV testing in sexually transmitted disease clinics in the United States," *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*, vol. 41, no. 9, 2014, doi: 10.1097/OLQ.0000000000000168.
 - [44] H. Maheswaran *et al.*, "Cost-Effectiveness of Community-based Human Immunodeficiency Virus Self-Testing in Blantyre, Malawi," *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, vol. 66, no. 8, 2018, doi: 10.1093/cid/cix983.
 - [45] C. D. Obure *et al.*, "A comparative analysis of costs of single and dual rapid HIV and syphilis diagnostics: Results from a randomised controlled trial in Colombia," *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, vol. 93, no. 7, 2017, doi: 10.1136/sextrans-2016-052961.
 - [46] Q. Ma *et al.*, "Rapid HIV antibody testing among men who have sex with men who visited a gay bathhouse in Hangzhou, China: A cross-sectional study," *BMJ Open*, vol. 5, no. 9, 2015, doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008661.
 - [47] W. Urassa, S. Nozohoor, S. Jaffer, K. Karama, F. Mhalu, and G. Biberfeld, "Evaluation of an alternative confirmatory strategy for the diagnosis of HIV infection in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, based on simple rapid assays," *Journal of Virological Methods*, vol. 100, no. 1–2, 2002, doi: 10.1016/S0166-0934(01)00408-6.
 - [48] D. Ménard *et al.*, "Evaluation of rapid HIV testing strategies in under equipped laboratories in the Central African Republic," *Journal of Virological Methods*, vol. 126, no. 1–2, 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.jviromet.2005.01.023.

- [49] J. Pavie *et al.*, "Sensitivity of five rapid HIV tests on oral fluid or Finger-Stick whole blood: A real-time comparison in a healthcare setting," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 5, no. 7, 2010, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0011581.
- [50] R. P. Walensky *et al.*, "Revising expectations from rapid HIV tests in the emergency department," *Annals of Internal Medicine*, vol. 149, no. 3, 2008, doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-149-3-200808050-00003.
- [51] N. P. Pai *et al.*, "Head-to-head comparison of accuracy of a rapid point-of-care HIV test with oral versus whole-blood specimens: A systematic review and meta-analysis," *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, vol. 12, no. 5, 2012, doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(11)70368-1.
- [52] S. Phillips, T. C. Granade, C. P. Pau, D. Candal, D. J. Hu, and B. S. Parekh, "Diagnosis of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection with different subtypes using rapid tests," *Clinical and Diagnostic Laboratory Immunology*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2000, doi: 10.1128/CDLI.7.4.698-699.2000.
- [53] K. P. Delaney *et al.*, "Evaluation of the performance characteristics of 6 rapid HIV antibody tests," *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, vol. 52, no. 2, 2011, doi: 10.1093/cid/ciq068.