

**Table S1: Participant arm assignment**

<b>RDT price to client</b>	<b>ACT price conditional on positive malaria test</b>	
	\$0 USD (100% subsidy)	\$0.10-0.40 USD (67% subsidy)
\$0.20 USD (50% subsidy)	<b>Arm 1</b>	<b>Arm 2</b>
\$0.40 USD (No Subsidy)	<b>Arm 3</b>	<b>Arm 4</b>

Notes: The 67% subsidy price of ACTs conditional on a positive test (Arms 2 and 4) varied according to the dosage sold (which depends on the age of the sick individual).

**Table S2: Summary of Sample Size Calculations**

<b>Description of Comparison</b>	<b>Expected Increase in Testing Uptake</b>	<b>Total sample size required for 80% power at alpha=0.0167*</b>
Effect of reducing conditional ACT price from \$0.40 (67% subsidy) to \$0.00 (100% subsidy)	10 percentage points (from 67.5% to 77.5%)	832
Effect of reducing RDT price from \$0.40 (no subsidy) to \$0.20 (50% subsidy)	15 percentage points (from 65% to 80%)	370

Notes: Sample size based on a two-sample comparison of proportions via the Z-test.

\* With adjustment for multiple testing due to three tests of interest (i.e. two main effects and one interaction) for an overall 0.05 alpha (i.e. significance) level. In practice, since the most conservative scenario would require a total of 832 participants across all four arms of the trial rather than 370 for the RDT effect, this was the sample size selected as the target sample size for the trial.