

**Table S4: Modified Poisson model estimates of the effect of treatment and covariates on testing uptake on the risk difference (RD) scale**

Predictor	Risk Differences (95% CI)		
	Unadjusted	Adjusted (parsimonious)	Adjusted (full)
<b>RDT subsidy</b>	2.9% (0.3%, 5.5%)	2.5% (0.1%, 4.9%)	2.5% (0.6%, 4.4%)
<b>Conditional ACT subsidy</b>	-0.9% (-2.1%, 0.3%)	-0.8% (-2.3%, 0.7%)	-0.6% (-1.9%, 0.7%)
<b>Interaction between RDT and ACT subsidies</b>	-0.7% (-2.7%, 1.4%)	--	-0.6% (-2.3%, 1.1%)
<b>Patient gender</b>			
<b>Male</b>	--	--	-0.3% (-1.7%, 1.2%)
<i>Reference group: Female</i>			
<b>Patients age</b>			
<b>&gt;5 to &lt;18</b>			3.1% (1.0%, 5.2%)
<b>18 to &lt;35</b>	--	--	2.3% (-0.4%, 5.1%)
<b>35+</b>			1.5% (-1.9%, 4.9%)
<i>Reference group: 0 to 5</i>			
<b>Education</b>			
<b>Primary</b>			-3.1% (-6.7%, 0.5%)
<b>Secondary</b>	--	--	-1.3% (-3.8%, 1.2%)
<i>Reference group: &lt;Primary or none</i>			
<b>Occupation</b>			
<b>Unemployed</b>			2.0% (-1.3%, 5.2%)
<b>Employed</b>			1.6% (-1.0%, 4.2%)
<b>Self-employed</b>	--	--	0.2% (-2.4%, 2.9%)
<b>Informal Employment</b>			-3.1% (-9.7%, 3.5%)
<i>Reference group: Farming</i>			
<b>Household size</b>	--	--	0.1% (-0.2%, 0.4%)
<b>Wealth</b>			
<b>Below poorest 40<sup>th</sup> centile</b>	--	-4.0% (-7.2%, -0.9%)	-4.2% (-7.1%, -1.2%)
<i>Reference group: Above poorest 40<sup>th</sup> centile</i>			

Notes: Unadjusted model included the main effects of the RDT and conditional ACT subsidies and their interaction to match the 2x2 factorial design. Effect coding was used so that main effects of each subsidy level can be interpreted averaged over the levels of the other subsidy. Fully adjusted model includes age (of patient), gender (of patient), education level (of patient or guardian if patient < 18 years), occupation (of patient or guardian if patient < 18 years), household size, wealth, and main and interaction effects of RDT and conditional ACT subsidies. Only the main effects and wealth was included in the parsimonious model identified by O'Meara et al., 2016.