


ART initiations following community-based distribution of HIV self-tests: Meta-analysis and meta-regression of STAR Initiative data

Supplemental information

Supplemental Figure 1. Diagram illustrating links between and measures of intervention, implementation, mechanisms of impact, and outcomes



Graphic adapted from Moore et al. 2015

Supplemental Table 1. Assessment of bias in selection, performance, detection, attrition, and reporting

Study author and year	Selection bias		Performance bias	Detection bias	Attrition bias	Reporting bias
	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting
Indravudh et al. 2018 ¹	Low risk. Computer-generated random sample list used.	Low risk. Community allocations made at public ceremony.	High risk. Participants and intervention staff could not be masked.	Unclear risk. Masking data prior to outcome assessment not mentioned.	Low risk. Retrospective ART data collected from pre-existing clinic record systems.	Low risk. All prespecified outcomes were reported.
Indravudh et al. 2019 ²	Low risk. Computer-generated random sample list used.	Low risk. Community allocations made at public ceremony.	High risk. Participants and intervention staff could not be masked.	High risk. Data were analyzed without reference to allocation where possible, but not formally masked.	Unclear risk. ART data collected prospectively by unmasked research assistants at facilities.	Low risk. All prespecified outcomes were reported (apart from outcomes related to second randomization, which was not completed.)
Neuman et al. 2021 ³	Low risk. Computer-generated random sample list used.	Unclear risk. No detail on how allocations communicated to communities.	High risk. Participants and intervention staff could not be masked.	Low risk. Data were masked for assessment of primary outcome	Low risk. Retrospective ART data collected from pre-existing clinic record systems.	Low risk. All prespecified outcomes were reported.

Sibanda et al. 2018 ⁴	High risk. Non-randomized comparison used.	High risk. Non-randomized comparison used.	High risk. Participants and intervention staff could not be masked.	Low risk. Data were masked for assessment of primary outcome	Low risk. Retrospective ART data collected from pre-existing clinic record systems.	Unclear risk. Outcome measures changed during trial.
Sibanda et al. 2020 ⁵	High risk. Non-randomized comparison used.	High risk. Non-randomized comparison used.	High risk. Participants and intervention staff could not be masked.	Low risk. Data were masked for assessment of primary outcome	Low risk. Retrospective ART data collected from pre-existing clinic record systems.	Low risk. All prespecified outcomes were reported.

Higgins et al. 2011 was used to structure bias assessment

Works cited

1. Indravudh P, Fielding K, Neuman M, et al. Increasing knowledge of HIV status and demand for ART using community-based HIV self-testing: a cluster randomised trial in rural Malawi. *AIDS* 2018. Amsterdam, 2018.
2. Community-led delivery of HIV self-testing targeting adolescents and men in rural Malawi: a cluster-randomised trial. *JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL AIDS SOCIETY*; 2019. JOHN WILEY & SONS LTD THE ATRIUM, SOUTHERN GATE, CHICHESTER PO19 8SQ, W
3. Neuman M, Hensen B, Mwinga A, et al. Does community-based distribution of HIV self-tests increase uptake of HIV testing? Results of pair-matched cluster randomised trial in Zambia. *BMJ Global Health* 2021;in press doi: 10.1136/

bmjgh-2020-004543

4. Sibanda E, Neuman M, Tumushime M, et al. Linkage to care after HIV self-testing in Zimbabwe: A cluster-randomized trial. Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. Boston, MA USA 2018.
5. Sibanda E, Neuman M, Mangenah C, et al. Comparison of community-led distribution of HIV self-tests kits with distribution by paid distributors: a cluster randomised trial in rural Zimbabwean communities. *In preparation* 2021