

1 **What role do community-level factors play in HIV self-testing uptake, linkage to**
2 **services and HIV-related outcomes? A mixed methods study of community-led HIV**
3 **self-testing programmes in rural Zimbabwe**

4 **Short title: Community factors and HIV self-testing, linkage, and HIV outcomes**

5 **Authors:**

6 Mary K Tumushime^{1,2} & Nancy Ruhode¹, Melissa Neuman³, Constancia Watadzaushe¹,
7 Miriam Mutseta⁴, Miriam Taegtmeier^{5,6}, Cheryl C. Johnson⁷, Karin Hatzold⁸, Elizabeth L.
8 Corbett^{9,10}, Frances M. Cowan^{1,11}, Euphemia L. Sibanda^{1,11}

- 9
- 10 1. Centre for Sexual Health and HIV/AIDS Research (CeSHHAR) Zimbabwe, Harare,
11 Zimbabwe
 - 12 2. Faculty of Public Health and Policy, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
13 (LSHTM), London, United Kingdom
 - 14 3. MRC International Statistics and Epidemiology Group, London School of Hygiene &
15 Tropical Medicine (LSHTM), London, United Kingdom
 - 16 4. Population Services International (PSI) Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe
 - 17 5. Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM),
18 Liverpool, United Kingdom
 - 19 6. Tropical Infectious Disease Unit, Royal Liverpool University Hospital, Liverpool,
20 United Kingdom
 - 21 7. Global HIV, Hepatitis and STI Programmes, World Health Organization, Geneva,
22 Switzerland
 - 23 8. Population Services International (PSI) Washington, Washington DC, USA
 - 24 9. Malawi-Liverpool Wellcome Trust Clinical Research Programme (MLW), Blantyre,
25 Malawi
 - 26 10. Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene & Tropical
27 Medicine (LSHTM), London, United Kingdom

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

28 11. Department of International Public Health, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine
29 (LSTM), Liverpool, United Kingdom

30

31 **Corresponding author**

32 Mary K. Tumushime

33 CeSHHAR Zimbabwe

34 4 Bath Rd, Belgravia

35 Harare, Zimbabwe

36 Email: mary.tumushime@gmail.com

37

38 **Author contributions**

39

40 Conceptualization: MN, MT, CCJ, KH, ELC, FMC, ELS. Data curation: MKT, NR, MN, CW,

41 MM, MT, ELS. Formal analysis: MKT, NR, MN, CW, MT, ELS. Funding acquisition: MT,

42 CCJ, KH, ELC, FMC, ELS. Investigation: MKT, NR, CW, MM. Methodology: MKT, NR, CW,

43 MM, MT, ELS, FMC, ELS. Project administration: MKT, NR, CW, MM, ELS. Writing - original

44 draft preparation: MKT, NR, MN. Writing – review and editing: MKT, NR, MN, MT, CCJ,

45 FMC, ELS.

46

47

48 **ABSTRACT**

49

50 Community-led interventions, where communities plan and lead implementation, are
51 increasingly adopted in public health. We explore what factors may be associated with
52 successful community-led distribution of HIV self-test (HIVST) kits to guide future service
53 delivery.

54

55 Twenty rural communities were supported to implement month-long HIVST kit distribution
56 programmes from January-September/2019. Participant observation was conducted to
57 document distribution models. Three months post-intervention, a population-based survey
58 measured: self-reported new HIV diagnosis; self-reported HIVST uptake; self-reported
59 linkage to post-test services; and viral load. The survey included questions for a composite
60 measure of 'community cohesion'. Communities were grouped into low/medium/high based
61 on community cohesion scores. We used mixed effect logistic regression to assess how
62 outcomes differed by community cohesion. In total, 27,812 kits were distributed by 348
63 distributors. Two kit distribution models were implemented: door-to-door distribution only or
64 distribution at venues/events within communities. Of 5,683 participants surveyed, 1,831
65 (32.2%) received kits and 1,229 (67.1%) reported using it; overall HIVST uptake was
66 1,229/5,683 (21.6%). Self-reported new HIV diagnosis increased with community cohesion,
67 from 32/1,770 (1.8%) in the lowest cohesion group to 40/1,871 (2.1%) in the medium group,
68 adjusted odds ratio (aOR) 2.94 (1.41-6.12, p=0.004) and 66/2,042 (3.2%) in the highest
69 cohesion group, aOR 7.20 (2.31-22.50, p=0.001). Other outcomes did not differ by extent of
70 cohesion.

71

72 HIVST kit distribution in high-cohesion communities was associated with seven times higher
73 odds of identifying people with new HIV diagnoses, suggesting more cohesive communities

74 may better identify those most at risk of undiagnosed HIV. Communities can learn from and
75 adopt these participatory community-led approaches to intervention planning and
76 implementation, which may foster cohesion and benefit public health programmes.

77

78

79 **INTRODUCTION**

80

81 HIV self-testing (HIVST) can increase coverage and frequency of testing including among
82 groups who would not otherwise test [1]. Since the release of the World Health Organization
83 (WHO) guidelines in 2016, many countries have introduced HIVST and are optimising HIV
84 testing programmes to reach those in greatest need of services at the lowest possible cost.
85 As the scale-up of HIVST continues, there is need for evidence to inform further optimisation
86 of HIVST distribution models to ensure the reach of individuals who remain behind.

87

88 Community-based HIVST programmes have demonstrated high impact on testing and
89 linkage outcomes [2,3,4]. In Zimbabwe, community-based self-testing led by paid distributors
90 achieved high uptake of HIV testing (50.3%), including among first-time testers (who
91 comprised 36.3% of self-testers), men (46.5%) and young people under 25 years (46.2%)
92 [2]. In addition, there was a 27% increase in uptake of antiretroviral therapy (ART) during
93 HIVST distribution campaigns [2]. Despite its success, this HIVST kit distribution model was
94 resource-intensive, requiring significant human and financial resources [5]. Furthermore, as
95 testing coverage increases, the efficiency of universal testing models in terms of
96 identification of those with unknown HIV status decreases. Therefore, there is a need for
97 alternative, sustainable distribution models which are scalable and equitable. Such models
98 would be particularly important for countries that are close to achieving the UNAIDS testing
99 and treatment targets [6] or where progress among sub-populations and geographic areas is
100 not uniform.

101

102 The community-led model has been explored as a more sustainable and empowering
103 approach to public health interventions, with potential for lower costs. Community-led
104 interventions, in which communities plan and lead the implementation or delivery of
105 interventions [7], have been successfully adopted and implemented in sanitation

106 programmes [8], dengue prevention [9], and multi-disease campaigns including HIV, malaria,
107 hypertension and diabetes screening [10]. Due to their effectiveness, global HIV targets now
108 include community-led approaches that advocate for the involvement of communities in
109 planning, delivery, and monitoring HIV interventions [11]. For instance, the Global AIDS
110 strategy 2021-2026 advocates for community-led AIDS responses and calls for 30% of
111 testing and treatment services, 80% of HIV prevention services, and 60% of societal enabler
112 programmes to be led by local communities and/or community organisations [12].

113

114 The success of community-led interventions can be attributed to strong local leadership and
115 support, effective community mobilisation, community ownership, and encouraging people to
116 have a whole-of-community rather than individual focus [8,9,10]. That each community can
117 work together to customise their own interventions further strengthens this approach [9] and
118 promotes community cohesion. Community cohesion, defined as the extent of
119 connectedness and solidarity among groups in society [13], is associated with improved
120 health outcomes [13,14] and can impact the success of community-led programmes. There
121 is theoretical evidence to suggest that a community sense of social identity and
122 connectedness promotes individual and group health behaviours, involvement in health-
123 related community interventions and improved health outcomes [15,16,17]. The effect of
124 community cohesion on HIV testing uptake in community-led interventions and subsequent
125 linkage to prevention, treatment and care services has not been investigated.


126

127 In a trial conducted in Zimbabwe and reported separately [18], we determined the effect of
128 community-led HIVST kit distribution on linkage to post-test services (confirmatory testing
129 following reactive self-tests, voluntary medical male circumcision (VMMC) and pre-exposure
130 prophylaxis (PrEP)) and self-reported recent/new HIV diagnosis. In that trial, each
131 intervention community (cluster) was allowed to design and implement its own model of
132 HIVST kit distribution. Here we explore the effects of the different community-led HIVST kit

133 distribution models, levels of community involvement in planning distribution programmes
 134 and community cohesion on: (i) HIVST uptake, (ii) linkage to post-test services (confirmatory
 135 testing, VMMC and PrEP) following HIVST, and (iii) HIV-related outcomes (new HIV
 136 diagnosis and undetectable viral load). We hypothesised that communities in which
 137 distribution relied solely on distributors' efforts (i.e., only door-to-door distribution), would
 138 perform poorer on outcomes i-iii above, compared to those in which community members
 139 actively sought and accessed HIVST kits. Furthermore, we hypothesised that closely-knit or
 140 more cohesive communities would achieve better outcomes; see Figure 1 (conceptual
 141 framework).

142

143 Figure 1: Conceptual framework - Cohesive communities achieve better HIV-related
 144 outcomes



145
 146 PrEP=pre-exposure prophylaxis, TasP = treatment as prevention, VMMC = voluntary medical male

147 circumcision

148

149 **METHODS**

150

151 **Setting**

152

153 This study was conducted as part of the Unitaid-funded HIV Self-Testing Africa (STAR)
154 Initiative (<https://unitaid.org/project/self-testing-africa-star/#en>), the largest evaluation of
155 HIVST in Africa to date, that sought to catalyse the market for HIVST and drive global scale-
156 up. The work presented here was nested within a cluster randomised trial in rural Zimbabwe
157 which compared HIV testing and linkage outcomes between community-led HIVST kit
158 distribution (intervention) and community-based HIVST kit distribution led by paid distributors
159 (comparison) [18]. Clusters/communities were defined as groups of adjacent villages headed
160 by a local leader known as a headman (headman unit) and separated by at least 20 km.
161 Forty headman units in 6 districts were randomised 1:1 to the study arms. This paper
162 focuses on the intervention arm.

163

164 ***Implementation of the community-led intervention***

165 The community-led HIVST kit distribution intervention was implemented in 20 headman
166 units. In each headman unit, Population Services International (PSI) Zimbabwe conducted
167 community engagement activities over a period of 2-3 weeks, firstly to introduce the concept
168 of community-led HIVST and telling headman units that ensuring people who needed HIV
169 treatment received it could ultimately reduce the number of new infections in their villages.
170 Community engagement included promotion of “U=U” (Undetectable=Untransmittable),
171 where people learn that those with an HIV viral load below the limit of detection have a
172 greatly reduced risk of onward transmission [19]. We packaged HIVST with U=U messaging.
173 We expected that knowing comprehensive treatment can almost eliminate new HIV
174 infections in communities and that early ART treatment can reduce HIV morbidity and
175 mortality, would promote community members to seek HIV testing and treatment. Headman
176 units were then invited to participate in the study and asked to design their own models of
177 HIVST kit distribution to suit their context. Decisions about distributor selection, access to
178 kits and/or distribution models and provision of incentives for distributors were driven by

179 community members in the headman units and as such, distribution models were allowed to
180 vary across the 20 communities. HIVST kit distributors identified from each headman unit
181 were trained to promote and support HIVST and to promote uptake of confirmatory testing,
182 VMMC and PrEP following self-testing. The local health facilities provided oversight of the
183 distribution, supported HIVST kit storage and replenishment and provided post-test linkage
184 services and/or referral where VMMC and PrEP were unavailable (confirmatory testing for
185 HIV was available from all health facilities). Headman units had to adhere to regulatory
186 requirements e.g., minimum age requirements for HIVST and non-coercive testing, which
187 were conveyed throughout community engagement. In all headman units, distribution
188 proceeded for 4 weeks. Headman units were given posters and flyers designed by PSI
189 Zimbabwe to advertise HIVST availability and U=U (they decided how best these materials
190 could be distributed/displayed for maximum effect).

191
192 Based on observations (described below), headman units implemented the following HIVST
193 kit distribution models: (i) door-to-door distribution only or (ii) a combination of different
194 delivery approaches including door-to-door and collection of kits directly from distributors at
195 their homes or at various locations in the headman unit (combined HIVST distribution
196 model). The latter model was more participatory and headman units would refine their
197 models iteratively. Changes included community members (including distributors) forming
198 committees to provide ongoing planning and logistical support for distribution; distributors
199 forming pairs or groups to support each other; distributors working in villages they had not
200 initially been assigned to, to increase coverage; and distributors taking advantage of
201 community gatherings (e.g., meetings and sporting events) and workplaces (e.g., mines) to
202 distribute self-test kits.

203

204 **Data collection**

205

206 ***Participant observations***

207 Participant observations were conducted by trained qualitative researchers at and between
208 community sensitisation and planning meetings, during distributor training and during kit
209 distribution in each headman unit to explore their progress and as part of process evaluation.
210 Observation findings were documented using a template which captured levels of
211 attendance and diversity of attendees (men, young people, leaders) at sensitisation
212 meetings, levels of participation at planning meetings, how decisions were made (whether
213 through consensus or by coercion from community leaders), degree to which headman units
214 appeared to be cohesive and aware of community-led HIVST kit distribution and/or HIVST
215 (ascertained through informal discussions with community members, leaders and healthcare
216 workers), and presence in the community of promotional material (posters and flyers) about
217 the intervention and HIVST.

218

219 ***Population-based survey***

220 We conducted a representative population-based survey in randomly-selected households
221 from three months after the end of HIVST kit distribution in each headman unit (08 October-
222 30 December 2019). First, we randomly selected three enumeration areas in each headman
223 unit, followed by random selection of one in two households. All individuals aged ≥ 16 years
224 in selected households were invited to participate. The questionnaire was self-administered
225 in the preferred language (English or two major local languages) using audio-computer
226 assisted survey instrument (ACASI). Participants were asked about household and individual
227 demographic characteristics, HIV testing history, experiences with HIV self-testing and
228 linkage to post-test services. Participants were also asked to respond to a six-item measure
229 of community cohesion validated by Lippman et al. in high HIV prevalence settings in South
230 Africa: (i) people in this community are willing to help their neighbours, (ii) this is a close knit
231 community, (iii) people in this community can be trusted, (iv) people in this community get
232 along well with each other, (v) people in this community share the same values and (vi)

233 people in this community look out for each other [20]. All items had response options of
234 strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, and
235 strongly disagree. Item response modelling (IRM) was used to assess and summarise the
236 cohesion scale using a validated, one-parameter multinomial model [20]. To verify self-
237 reports of HIV status and measure viral load, dried blood spot (DBS) samples were taken to
238 test for HIV and viral load.

239

240 **Outcomes**

241

242 For this analysis, outcomes were based on self-reports among survey respondents and viral
243 load results. The following outcomes were compared between (i) levels of community
244 cohesion (ii) the two distribution models headman units employed, and (iii) levels of
245 community involvement in planning:

246 1. Proportion of participants self-reporting uptake of HIVST. The numerator was the
247 number of surveyed participants self-reporting they used an HIV self-test kit to test
248 themselves, the denominator was the total number of surveyed participants.

249 2. Proportion of participants self-reporting linkage to post-test services following HIVST
250 (combined and individual measures):

251 i. confirmatory testing: the numerator was the number of surveyed participants
252 self-reporting uptake of confirmatory testing following a reactive (HIV positive)
253 self-test result, the denominator was the total number of surveyed participants
254 who self-reported a reactive self-test result

255 ii. VMMC: the numerator was the number of male participants self-reporting
256 uptake of VMMC following a non-reactive (HIV negative) self-test result, the
257 denominator was the number of male participants who self-reported a non-
258 reactive self-test result

259 iii. PrEP: the numerator was the number of participants self-reporting uptake of
260 PrEP following a non-reactive (HIV negative) self-test result, the denominator
261 was the number of surveyed participants who self-reported a non-reactive
262 self-test result

263 3. New HIV diagnosis following HIV self-testing: New HIV diagnosis was defined as a
264 self-reported, new provider-confirmed positive test since the start of HIVST kit
265 distribution. The numerator was the number of surveyed participants reporting a new
266 HIV diagnosis, the denominator was the total number of surveyed participants.

267 4. Undetectable viral load among people living with HIV (<1,000 copies/ml). The
268 numerator was the number of surveyed participants with undetectable viral load, the
269 denominator was the total number of HIV positive participants, as determined
270 through laboratory testing of DBS samples.

271

272 **Data analysis**

273

274 ***Participant observations***

275 We described levels of community involvement in planning distribution programmes using
276 six attributes shown in Table 1, each with three categories agreed by the research team.
277 Information pertaining to these attributes was detailed in the template described above for
278 each headman unit. Two researchers reviewed observation reports and independently
279 scored headman units on each attribute, with scores ranging from 1-3, with the lowest score
280 indicating the lowest level of community involvement. Discrepancies were discussed and
281 resolved with consensus. Scores were totalled for each headman unit. Headman units were
282 then categorised by terciles (low, medium, and high) indicating their level of community
283 involvement [21]. Construction of the scale which guided categorisation was done at the
284 beginning, and cut-off points were based on ranks, as the measure was not normally
285 distributed. For each headman unit, distribution models were coded (1) door-to-door

286 distribution only or (2) combined HIVST distribution model. Community involvement scores
 287 and coded distribution models were merged with survey responses.

288

289 **Table 1. Attributes from participant observations used to determine levels of**
 290 **community involvement in planning distribution programs**

291

Attribute	Score		
	1	2	3
1. Attendance at first community sensitization meeting	Low	Medium	High
2. Diversity of attendees at first community sensitisation meeting			
Proportion of men	Low	Medium	High
Proportion of young people	Low	Medium	High
Proportion of leaders	Least favourable	Medium	Most favourable
3. Participation in planning processes	Decisions dominated by leaders/few key individuals	Moderate participation	Majority participating
4. Ability of headman unit to finalise distribution model in a timely fashion	More than 3 weeks' time	Within 2-3 weeks' time	Within 1 week
5. Awareness of HIVST and CLD	Poor knowledge of HIVST or CLD	Some awareness of HIVST and/or CLD	Widespread awareness of both interventions
6. Support given by headman unit to distributors	No evidence of support given	Some evidence of	Clear evidence

support	of support
---------	------------

292 CLD=community led HIVST distribution; HIVST=HIV self-testing

293

294 ***Population-based survey***

295 Participants responded to a six-item measure of community cohesion (described above).

296 Individual cohesion scores were calculated using the average of item responses ranging

297 from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). Community cohesion was summarised as

298 the median score of individuals within each headman unit, and headman units were then

299 categorised by terciles (low, medium, and high cohesion) [21]. Construction of the scale is as

300 above.

301

302 We used mixed effect logistic regression to assess how the outcomes above differed by

303 distribution model, levels of community involvement and community cohesion.

304

305 Analysis used Stata v14. Before analysis, we compared similarity by distribution model,

306 levels of community involvement and cohesion group for pre-specified variables to identify

307 substantial differences that would need adjustment. All outcomes were analysed using

308 mixed effect logistic regression. All models are adjusted for district, age, gender, and

309 educational attainment. All models adjusted for the study community using a random effect.

310 Fisher's exact test was used to determine if there were significant associations between the

311 community level measures: (i) distribution model and levels of community involvement, (ii)

312 distribution model and community cohesion, and (iii) levels of community involvement and

313 community cohesion.

314

315 **Ethical considerations**

316

317 Ethical approval to conduct this study was obtained from the Medical Research Council of
318 Zimbabwe (ref. MRCZ/A/2323), London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine Research
319 Ethics Committee (ref. 15801-1) and World Health Organization Research Ethics Review
320 Committee (ref. ERC.0003065). The trial was registered with Pan African Clinical Trial
321 Registry, ref PACTR201811849455568. Trained research assistants obtained written
322 informed consent from participants prior to the survey and collection of DBS. Consenting
323 was conducted in participants' preferred language (English or one of two major local
324 languages) according to standard operating procedures; this included information giving
325 including about the study, its purpose and procedures, rights of participants, clarification of
326 matters arising, and comprehension assessment. Informed consent forms were completed in
327 duplicate by participants and research staff, with each retaining one copy. Where required,
328 witnesses were present and co-signed consent forms. Participants were aged at least 16
329 years; a waiver of parental consent for participants aged 16-17 years was approved, given
330 the age of consenting to HIV testing is 16 years old in Zimbabwe and survey questions were
331 related to HIV testing.

332

333 **RESULTS**

334

335 **Implementation of community-led HIVST kit distribution models and survey response** 336 **rate**

337

338 Implementation of the community-led HIVST kit distribution models (inclusive of community
339 engagement, HIVST distribution and the survey) was conducted between 01 October 2018
340 and 30 December 2019, in 20 headman units randomised to the community-led HIVST kit
341 distribution arm. Five headman units (5/20, 25.0%) in 3 study districts implemented door-to-
342 door distribution only (Table 2). In the other 15 headman units (15/20, 75.0%), which were
343 spread across all 6 study districts, a combination of different delivery approaches was used

344 including door-to-door combined with collection of kits directly from distributors at their
345 homes or at various locations in the headman unit (combined HIVST distribution model).
346 Overall, 348 distributors were trained and distributed 27,812 kits, with a range of 28-159 kits
347 distributed per distributor.

348
349 Based on participant observations, joint messaging on HIVST and U=U was well received
350 during community engagement and was widely disseminated during distribution. Headman
351 units actively participated in the design and implementation of their distribution models and
352 were well-supported by local leaders before and during distribution.

353
354 From 3,000 households in headman units implementing community-led HIVST kit
355 distribution, 5,683/6,748 eligible participants were surveyed, with a response rate of 84.2%.
356 Among surveyed participants, 1,831 (32.2%) received a self-test kit of whom 1,229/1,831
357 (67.1%) reported using it, giving an overall HIVST uptake of 21.6% (1,229/5,683). Uptake did
358 not differ by model of distribution: 358/1,542 (23.2%) in headman units implementing the
359 door-to-door model compared to 871/4,141 (21.0%) for the combined model (adjusted odds
360 ratio [aOR] 0.98 (95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.64-1.51, p=0.92).

361
362 **Participant and community characteristics**

363
364 Tables 2-4 show cluster- and individual-level characteristics of participants in the programme
365 and population-based survey by distribution model, levels of community involvement in
366 planning distribution programmes, and community cohesion respectively. Participant
367 characteristics were largely comparable by distribution model, levels of community
368 involvement and cohesion group.

369
370 **Table 2. Cluster- and individual-level characteristics of participants in program and**
371 **population-based survey by HIVST distribution model**

372

Characteristics	Door-to-door plus					
	Door-to-door only		household/communit y collection		Total	
	n/n	%	n/n	%	n/N	%
Cluster-level						
Total	5	100.0%	15	100.0%	20	100.0%
District						
Mutoko	0/5	0.0%	4/15	26.7%	4/20	20.0%
Muzarabani	0/5	0.0%	2/15	13.3%	2/20	10.0%
Shamva	1/5	20.0%	2/15	13.3%	3/20	15.0%
Shurugwi	2/5	40.0%	2/15	13.3%	4/20	20.0%
Umguza	0/5	0.0%	2/15	13.3%	2/20	10.0%
Zvimba	2/5	40.0%	3/15	20.0%	5/20	25.0%
Villages per cluster (mean/SD)	9.8 (5.4)		13.3 (10.5)		12.4 (9.5)	
Individual-level						
Total	1542	100.0%	4141	100.0%	5683	100.0%
Female	885/1542	57.4%	2218/4141	53.6%	3103/5683	54.6%
Age in groups						
16-19 years	252/1542	16.3%	673/4141	16.3%	925/5683	16.3%
20-29 years	430/1542	27.9%	1054/4141	25.5%	1484/5683	26.1%
30-39 years	355/1542	23.0%	913/4141	22.0%	1268/5683	22.3%
40-49 years	281/1542	18.2%	635/4141	15.3%	916/5683	16.1%
50-59 years	118/1542	7.7%	352/4141	8.5%	470/5683	8.3%
60+ years	105/1542	6.8%	510/4141	12.3%	615/5683	10.8%
Marital status*						
Married or living as married	1002/1528	65.6%	2362/4073	58.0%	3364/5601	60.0%
Never married	334/1528	21.9%	1032/4073	25.3%	1366/5601	24.4%
Widowed/separated/ divorced	192/1528	12.6%	679/4073	16.7%	871/5601	15.6%
Highest level of education						
Primary complete or	677/1542	43.9%	1361/4141	32.9%	2038/5683	35.9%

	less						
	Some secondary education	383/1542	24.8%	1058/4141	25.5%	1441/5683	25.4%
	Secondary education complete or higher	482/1542	31.3%	1722/4141	41.6%	2204/5683	38.8%
Religion							
	Apostolic	644/1542	41.8%	1411/4141	34.1%	2055/5683	36.2%
	Other	898/1542	58.2%	2730/4141	65.9%	3628/5683	63.8%
Receives regular salary†		364/1529	23.8%	899/4089	22.0%	1263/5618	22.5%

373 *14 missing marital status in communities with door-to-door only distribution and 68 in communities

374 with door-to-door plus household/community collection

375 †13 missing salary data in communities with door-to-door only distribution and 52 in communities with

376 door-to-door plus household/community collection

377 PLHIV=people living with HIV; PrEP=pre-exposure prophylaxis; SD=standard deviation;

378 VMMC=voluntary medical male circumcision

379 **Table 3. Cluster- and individual-level characteristics of participants in program and population-based survey by level of community**

380 **involvement in planning distribution programs**

381

Characteristics	Low involvement		Middle involvement		High involvement		Total		
	n/n	%	n/n	%	n/n	%	n/n	%	
Cluster-level									
Total	2	100.0%	11	100.0%	7	100.0%	20	100.0%	
District									
Mutoko	1/2	50.0%	1/11	9.1%	2/7	28.6%	4/20	20.0%	
Muzarabani	0/2	0.0%	1/11	9.1%	1/7	14.3%	2/20	10.0%	
Shamva	0/2	0.0%	1/11	9.1%	2/7	28.6%	3/20	15.0%	
Shurugwi	0/2	0.0%	3/11	27.3%	1/7	14.3%	4/20	20.0%	
Umguza	1/2	50.0%	0/11	0.0%	1/7	14.3%	2/20	10.0%	
Zvimba	0/2	0.0%	5/11	45.5%	0/7	0.0%	5/20	25.0%	
Villages per cluster (mean/SD)	15.0 (11.3)		11.7 (9.0)		12.7 (11.1)		12.4 (9.5)		
Individual-level									
Total	588	100.0%	3080	100.0%	2015	100.0%	5683	100.0%	
Female	303/588	51.5%	1709/3080	55.5%	1091/2015	54.1%	3103/5683	54.6%	
Age in groups*									

	16-19 years	95/588	16.2%	468/3077	15.2%	362/20 13	18.0%	925/5678	16.3%
	20-29 years	167/588	28.4%	798/3077	25.9%	519/20 13	25.8%	1484/5678	26.1%
	30-39 years	154/588	26.2%	662/3077	21.5%	452/20 13	22.5%	1268/5678	22.3%
	40-49 years	76/588	12.9%	521/3077	16.9%	319/20 13	15.8%	916/5678	16.1%
	50-59 years	48/588	8.2%	271/3077	8.8%	151/20 13	7.5%	470/5678	8.3%
	60+ years	48/588	8.2%	357/3077	11.6%	210/20 13	10.4%	615/5678	10.8%
Marital status†									
	Married or living as married	314/575	54.6%	1829/304 2	60.1%	1221/1 984	61.5%	3364/5601	60.1%
	Never married	175/575	30.4%	697/3042	22.9%	494/19 84	24.9%	1366/5601	24.4%
	Widowed/separated/divorced	86/575	15.0%	516/3042	17.0%	269/19 84	13.6%	871/5601	15.6%
Highest level of education									
	Primary complete or less	115/588	19.6%	1137/308	36.9%	786/20	39.0%	2038/5683	35.9%

				0		15			
	Some secondary education	128/588	21.8%	763/3080	24.8%	550/2015	27.3%	1441/5683	25.4%
	Secondary education complete or higher	345/588	58.7%	1180/3080	38.3%	679/2015	33.7%	2204/5686	38.8%
Religion				0		15			
	Apostolic	147/588	25.0%	1096/3080	35.6%	812/2015	40.3%	2055/5683	36.2%
	Other	441/588	75.0%	1984/3080	64.4%	1203/2015	59.7%	3628/5683	63.8%
Receives regular salary#		213/582	36.6%	654/3046	21.5%	396/1990	19.9%	1263/5618	22.5%

382 *3 missing age in medium involvement group and 2 in high involvement group

383 †13 missing marital status in low involvement group, 38 medium involvement group and 31 in high involvement group

384 #6 missing salary data in low involvement group, 34 medium involvement group and 25 in high involvement group

385 PLHIV=people living with HIV; PrEP=pre-exposure prophylaxis; SD=standard deviation; VMMC=voluntary medical male circumcision

386 **Table 4. Cluster- and individual-level characteristics of participants in program and population-based survey by self-reported**
 387 **community cohesion**
 388

Characteristics	Low cohesion		Middle cohesion		High cohesion		Total	
	n/n	%	n/n	%	n/n	%	n/n	%
Cluster-level								
Total	6	100.0%	7	100.0%	7	100.0%	20	100.0%
District								
Mutoko	1/6	16.7%	1/7	14.3%	0/7	0.0%	2/20	10.0%
Muzarabani	0/6	0.0%	2/7	28.6%	1/7	14.3%	3/20	15.0%
Shamva	0/6	0.0%	2/7	28.6%	2/7	28.6%	4/20	20.0%
Shurugwi	4/6	66.7%	1/7	14.3%	0/7	0.0%	5/20	25.0%
Umguza	1/6	16.7%	1/7	14.3%	0/7	0.0%	2/20	10.0%
Zvimba	0/6	0.0%	0/7	0.0%	4/7	57.1%	4/20	20.0%
Villages per cluster (mean/SD)	8 (2.8)		10.3 (11.5)		18.3 (8.9)		12.4 (9.5)	
Individual-level								
Total	1770	100.0%	1871	100.0%	2042	100.0%	5683	100.0%
Female	992/1770	56.0%	947/1871	50.6%	1164/2042	57.0%	3103/5683	54.6%
Age in groups								
16-19 years	263/1770	14.9%	326/1871	17.4%	336/2042	16.5%	925/5683	16.3%
20-29 years	475/1770	26.8%	477/1871	25.5%	532/2042	26.1%	1484/5683	26.1%

	30-39 years	439/1770	24.8%	440/1871	23.5%	389/2042	19.0%	1268/5683	22.3%
	40-49 years	293/1770	16.6%	293/1871	15.7%	330/2042	16.2%	916/5683	16.1%
	50-59 years	142/1770	8.0%	144/1871	7.7%	184/2042	9.2%	470/5683	8.3%
	60+ years	158/1770	8.9%	189/1871	10.1%	268/2042	13.1%	615/5683	10.8%
Marital status*									
	Married or living as married	1093/1748	62.5%	1140/1840	62.0%	1131/2013	56.2%	3364/5601	60.1%
	Never married	409/1748	23.4%	447/1840	24.3%	510/2013	25.3%	1366/5601	24.4%
	Widowed/separated/divorced	246/1748	14.1%	253/1840	13.8%	372/2013	18.5%	871/5601	15.6%
Highest level of education									
	Primary complete or less	612/1770	34.6%	743/1871	39.7%	683/2042	33.4%	2038/5683	35.9%
	Some secondary education	405/1770	22.9%	515/1871	27.5%	521/2042	25.5%	1441/5683	25.4%
	Secondary education complete or higher	753/1770	42.5%	613/1871	32.8%	838/2042	41.0%	2204/5683	38.8%
Religion									
	Apostolic	646/1770	36.5%	746/1871	39.9%	663/2042	32.5%	2055/5683	36.2%
	Other	1124/1770	63.5%	1125/1871	60.1%	1379/2042	67.5%	3628/5683	63.8%
Receives regular salary†		409/1754	23.3%	393/1846	21.3%	461/2018	22.8%	1263/5618	22.5%

389 *22 missing marital status in low cohesion group, 31 medium cohesion group and 29 in high cohesion group

390 †16 missing salary data in low cohesion group, 25 medium cohesion group and 24 in high cohesion group

391 PLHIV=people living with HIV; PrEP=pre-exposure prophylaxis; SD=standard deviation; VMMC=voluntary medical male circumcision

392 For community involvement in planning HIVST distribution programmes, 2 headman units
393 were classified as low involvement, 11 were classified as medium involvement and 7 high
394 involvement (Table 3). Headman units in the low involvement group were in 2 study districts,
395 while those in medium and high involvement groups were spread across 5 study districts
396 each.

397 For community cohesion, 6 headman units were in the low cohesion group and 7 headman
398 units each in medium and high cohesion, respectively (Table 4). Headman units in low and
399 high cohesion groups were in 3 study districts, while those in the medium cohesion group
400 were in 5 study districts.

401

402 **Effect of community cohesion on outcomes**

403

404 We found self-reported new HIV diagnosis increased with community cohesion, from
405 32/1,770 (1.8%) in the lowest cohesion group to 40/1,871 (2.1%) in the medium group, aOR
406 2.94 (1.41-6.12, $p=0.004$) and 66/2,042 (3.2%) in the highest cohesion group, aOR 7.20
407 (2.31-22.50, $p=0.001$) (Table 5).

408

409 **Table 5. Comparison of outcomes by levels of community cohesion**

410

	n/n	%	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value
Uptake outcome: Self-reported self-testing uptake (N=5683)						
Low cohesion	451/1770	25.5%				
Medium cohesion	375/1871	20.0%	0.66 (0.40, 1.06)	0.09	0.60 (0.36, 0.99)	0.05
High cohesion	403/2042	19.7%	0.71 (0.44, 1.15)	0.17	0.63 (0.29, 1.35)	0.23
Combined linkage outcome: Self-reported linkage to confirmatory testing, VMMC and PrEP (N=1229)						
Low cohesion	104/451	23.1%				
Medium cohesion	94/375	25.1%	0.90 (0.53, 1.52)	0.70	0.70 (0.40, 1.22)	0.21
High cohesion	120/403	29.8%	1.36 (0.83, 2.23)	0.22	0.77 (0.37, 1.62)	0.50
Linkage outcome 1: Self-reported linkage to confirmatory testing (N=1229)						
Low cohesion	9/451	2.0%				
Medium cohesion	7/375	1.9%	0.93 (0.34, 2.53)	0.89	-	-
High cohesion	15/403	3.7%	1.90 (0.82, 4.39)	0.13	-	-
Linkage outcome 2: Self-reported linkage to VMMC (N=1229)						

Low cohesion	39/451	8.6%					
Medium cohesion	47/375	12.5%	0.86 (0.38, 1.94)	0.72	-	-	
High cohesion	36/403	8.9%	0.98 (0.45, 2.14)	0.96	-	-	
Linkage outcome 3: Self-reported linkage to PrEP (N=1229)							
Low cohesion	67/451	14.9%					
Medium cohesion	61/375	16.3%	1.00 (0.61, 1.64)	1.00	-	-	
High cohesion	86/403	21.3%	1.51 (0.96, 2.38)	0.08	-	-	
HIV outcome 1: Proportion of individuals reporting a new HIV diagnosis (N=5683)							
Low cohesion	32/1770	1.8%					
Medium cohesion	40/1871	2.1%	1.14 (0.54, 2.42)	0.73	2.94 (1.41,6.12)	0.004	
High cohesion	66/2042	3.2%	1.92 (0.93, 3.95)	0.08	7.20 (2.31, 22.50)	0.001	
HIV outcome 2: Undetectable viral load among PLHIV (N=830)							
Low cohesion	150/227	66.1%					
Medium cohesion	135/234	57.7%	0.71 (0.42, 1.23)	0.22	0.93 (0.52, 1.66)	0.81	
High cohesion	224/369	60.7%	0.82 (0.49, 1.37)	0.44	0.79 (0.33, 1.89)	0.60	

411 PLHIV=people living with HIV; PrEP=pre-exposure prophylaxis; VMMC=voluntary medical male circumcision

412 Adjusted odds ratios are not presented for the specific linkage outcomes (Linkage outcomes 1-3) due to the small number of cases. Adjusted models are
413 adjusted for district and respondent age in 10-year groups, sex, and educational attainment (no or primary education, some secondary education, completed
414 secondary education.). All models adjusted for study community using a random effect.

415 Other study outcomes did not differ by cohesion group. Cohesion had no overall effect on
 416 HIVST uptake across cohesion groups ($p=0.42$); 451/1,770 (25.5%) participants in the low
 417 group and 75/1,871 (20.0%) in the medium group (aOR 0.60 (0.36-0.99), $p=0.05$) reported
 418 uptake. In the high group, 403/2,042 (19.7%) participants (aOR 0.63 (0.29-1.35), $p=0.23$)
 419 reported HIVST uptake. Trend analysis using a linear parameterisation of the cohesion
 420 group variable showed there was no trend in cohesion and HIVST uptake; (aOR for 1-unit
 421 increase in cohesion score: 0.76 (95%CI: 0.51, 1.14), $p=0.182$). Similarly, there were no
 422 differences in linkage to post-test services across groups, with 104/451 (23.1%) participants
 423 linking in the low group, 94/375 (25.1%) in the medium group, (aOR 0.70 (0.40-1.22),

	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)	p- valu e
--	------------------------	---------	------------------------------------	-----------------

424 $p=0.21$) and 120/403 (29.8%) in the high group (aOR 0.77 (0.37-1.62), $p=0.50$). Finally,
 425 undetectable viral load which was 150/227 (66.1%) participants in the low group, 135/234
 426 (57.7%) in the medium group, (aOR 0.93 (0.52-1.66), $p=0.81$) and 224/369 (60.7%) in the
 427 high group (aOR 0.79 (0.33-1.89), $p=0.60$) did not differ.

428

429 **Effect of HIVST distribution model on outcomes**

430

431 Study outcomes did not differ by distribution model (Table 6).

432

433 **Table 6. Comparison of outcomes by distribution model**

	n/n	%				
Uptake outcome: Self-reported self-testing uptake (N=5683)						
Door-to-door only	358/1542	23.2%				
Door-to-door plus household/community collection	871/4141	21.0%	0.87 (0.54, 1.40)	0.57	0.98 (0.64, 1.51)	0.92
Combined linkage outcome: Self-reported linkage to confirmatory testing, VMMC and PrEP (N=1229)						
Door-to-door only	101/358	28.2%				
Door-to-door plus household/community collection	217/871	24.9%	0.80 (0.50, 1.28)	0.35	0.92 (0.66, 1.27)	0.60
Linkage outcome 1: Self-reported linkage to confirmatory testing (N=1229)						
Door-to-door only	11/358	3.1%				
Door-to-door plus household/community collection	20/871	2.3%	0.74 (0.35, 1.56)	0.43	-	-
Linkage outcome 2: Self-reported linkage to VMMC (N=1229)						
Door-to-door only	31/358	8.7%				
Door-to-door plus household/community collection	91/871	10.4%	0.94 (0.46, 1.94)	0.88	-	-
Linkage outcome 3: Self-reported linkage to PrEP (N=1229)						
Door-to-door only	75/358	20.9%				
Door-to-door plus household/community collection	139/871	16.0%	0.70 (0.46, 1.08)	0.11	-	-
HIV outcome 1: Proportion of individuals reporting a new HIV diagnosis (N=5683)						
Door-to-door only	39/1542	2.5%				
Door-to-door plus household/community collection	99/4141	2.4%	1.01 (0.49, 2.09)	0.98	1.06 (0.50, 2.25)	0.88
HIV outcome 2: Undetectable viral load among PLHIV (N=830)						
Door-to-door only	138/211	65.4%				
Door-to-door plus household/community collection	371/619	59.9%	0.79 (0.48, 1.30)	0.36	0.77 (0.52, 1.14)	0.20

434 PLHIV=people living with HIV; PrEP=pre-exposure prophylaxis; VMMC=voluntary medical male
 435 circumcision.

436 Adjusted odds ratios are not presented for the specific linkage outcomes (Linkage outcomes 1-3) due
 437 to the small number of cases. Adjusted models are adjusted for district and respondent age in 10-year

438 groups, sex, and educational attainment (no or primary education, some secondary education,
439 completed secondary education.). All models adjusted for study community using a random effect.

440

441 New HIV diagnosis was reported by 157/4,141 (3.8%) and 54/1,542 (3.5%) participants
442 where combined or door-to-door distribution models were implemented, respectively (aOR
443 1.42 (95% CI: 0.79-2.54), $p=0.24$).

444

445 HIVST uptake in headman units implementing combined HIVST distribution models was
446 reported by 871/4,141 (21.0%) participants and by 358/1,542 (23.2%) in headman units
447 implementing door-to-door HIVST distribution only (aOR 0.98 (95% CI: 0.64-1.51), $p=0.92$).

448 Independent of the distribution model and among all who received a self-test kit (1,831), use

449 of the collected self-test kit did not differ by whether the kit was received door-to-door or

450 elsewhere in the headman unit; 896/1,325 (67.6%) participants self-tested and received a kit

451 door-to-door while 333/506 (65.8%) self-tested and received a kit by other means (aOR 1.08

452 (95% CI: 0.86-1.35), $p=0.50$). Similarly, at cluster-level self-testing uptake did not differ by

453 whether the kit was received door-to-door or elsewhere in the headman unit; there was a -

454 2% change in HIVST uptake (95% CI -10, +7, $p=0.72$) in headman units implementing the

455 combined HIVST distribution model compared with headman units conducting door-to-door

456 distribution only. Linkage to post-test services was reported by 217/871 (24.9%) and

457 101/358 (28.2%) participants where combined or door-to-door distribution models were

458 implemented, respectively (aOR 0.92 (95% CI: 0.66-1.27), $p=0.60$). Lastly, undetectable viral

459 load was 371/619 (59.9%) and 138/211 (65.4%) among participants where combined or

460 door-to-door distribution models were implemented, respectively (aOR 0.77 (95% CI: 0.52-

461 1.14), $p=0.20$).

462

463 **Effect of levels of community involvement in planning distribution programmes on**

464 **outcomes**

465

466 Study outcomes did not differ by levels of community involvement in planning (Table 7).

467 **Table 7. Comparison of outcomes by levels of community involvement in planning distribution programs**

	n/n	%	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value
Uptake outcome: Self-reported self-testing uptake (N=5683)						
Low involvement	131/588	22.3%				
Medium involvement	650/3080	21.1%	0.84 (0.41, 1.72)	0.64	0.56 (0.29, 1.07)	0.08
High involvement	448/2015	22.2%	0.90 (0.43, 1.89)	0.78	1.09 (0.56, 2.11)	0.80
Combined linkage outcome: Self-reported linkage to confirmatory testing, VMMC and PrEP (N=1229)						
Low involvement	34/131	26.0%				
Medium involvement	170/650	26.2%	1.01 (0.49, 2.07)	0.98	0.68 (0.33, 1.40)	0.29
High involvement	114/448	25.4%	0.80 (0.38, 1.71)	0.57	0.60 (0.31, 1.17)	0.14
Linkage outcome 1: Self-reported linkage to confirmatory testing (N=1229)						
Low involvement	2/131	1.5%				
Medium involvement	22/650	3.4%	2.26 (0.52, 9.73)	0.27	-	-
High involvement	7/448	1.6%	1.02 (0.21, 4.99)	0.98	-	-
Linkage outcome 2: Self-reported linkage to VMMC (N=1229)						
Low involvement	12/131	9.2%				
Medium involvement	59/650	9.1%	1.12 (0.38, 3.25)	0.84	-	-
High involvement	51/448	11.4%	0.97 (0.32, 2.97)	0.96	-	-

Linkage outcome 3: Self-reported linkage to PrEP (N=1229)						
Low involvement	22/131	16.8%				
Medium involvement	113/650	17.4%	1.03 (0.51, 2.09)	0.93	-	-
High involvement	79/448	17.6%	0.91 (0.43, 1.94)	0.81	-	-
HIV outcome 1: Proportion of individuals reporting a new HIV diagnosis (N=5683)						
Low involvement	8/588	1.4%				
Medium involvement	90/3080	2.9%	2.08 (0.70, 6.17)	0.19	1.94 (0.52, 7.21)	0.32
High involvement	40/2015	2.0%	1.11 (0.35, 3.56)	0.86	1.25 (0.38, 4.13)	0.71
HIV outcome 2: Undetectable viral load among PLHIV (N=830)						
Low involvement	55/86	64.0%				
Medium involvement	308/494	62.3%	0.86 (0.41, 1.79)	0.68	0.76 (0.36, 1.62)	0.48
High involvement	146/250	58.4%	0.77 (0.35, 1.67)	0.51	0.94 (0.49, 1.80)	0.84

468 PLHIV=people living with HIV; PrEP=pre-exposure prophylaxis; VMMC=voluntary medical male circumcision

469 Adjusted odds ratios are not presented for the specific linkage outcomes (Linkage outcomes 1-3) due to the small number of cases. Adjusted models are
470 adjusted for district and respondent age in 10-year groups, sex, and educational attainment (no or primary education, some secondary education, completed
471 secondary education.). All models adjusted for study community using a random effect.

472 New HIV diagnosis did not differ across groups, with reports by 11/588 (1.9%) participants in
473 the low group, 127/3,080 (4.1%) in the medium group, (aOR 1.98 (95% CI: 0.67-5.85),
474 $p=0.22$) and 73/2,015 (3.6%) in the high group (aOR 1.73 (0.65-4.59), $p=0.27$).

475

476 There were no differences in HIVST uptake across community involvement groups, with
477 131/588 (22.3%) participants in the low involvement group, 650/3,080 (21.1%) in the
478 medium involvement group, (aOR 0.56 (0.29-1.07), $p=0.08$) and 448/2,015 (22.2%) in the
479 high involvement group (aOR 1.09 (0.56-2.11), $p=0.80$), reporting HIVST uptake. There were
480 no differences in linkage to post-test services across groups, with 131/588 (22.3%)
481 participants linking in the low group, 650/3,080 (21.1%) in the medium group, (aOR 0.56
482 (0.29-1.07), $p=0.08$) and 448/2,015 (22.2%) in the high group (aOR 1.09 (0.56-2.11),
483 $p=0.80$). Undetectable viral load which was 55/86 (64.0%) among participants in the low
484 group, 308/494 (62.3%) in the medium group, (aOR 0.76 (0.36-1.62), $p=0.48$) and 146/250
485 (58.4%) in the high group (aOR 0.94 (0.49-1.80), $p=0.84$) did not differ. Finally, there were
486 no statistically significant associations between (i) distribution model and levels of
487 community involvement ($p=1.0$), (ii) distribution model and community cohesion ($p=0.13$),
488 and (iii) levels of community involvement and community cohesion ($p=0.15$).

489

490 **DISCUSSION**

491

492 In this mixed-methods study, we examined the effects of community cohesion, HIVST
493 distribution models and levels of community involvement in planning distribution
494 programmes on: (i) self-reported new HIV diagnosis (ii) self-reported HIVST uptake; (iii) self-
495 reported linkage to confirmatory testing, VMMC and PrEP; and (iv) viral load, among
496 headman units conducting community-led HIVST kit distribution. We found the proportion of
497 participants reporting a new HIV diagnosis increased with evidence of community cohesion
498 and there was a dose response, with 1.8%, 2.1% and 3.2% in low, medium, and high

499 cohesion groups respectively. The type of HIVST distribution models implemented by
500 headman units did not affect outcomes, nor did levels of community involvement in planning.

501

502 The finding of self-reported new HIV diagnosis increasing with community cohesion is in line
503 with our hypothesis that cohesive communities would achieve better outcomes. Similar
504 evidence was found in the parent trial; in high cohesion communities the odds of new HIV
505 diagnosis was greater in the community-led arm than in the comparison arm (OR 2.06 (95%
506 CI: 1.03-4.19), $p= 0.04$) [21].

507

508 There is some evidence that cohesive communities are close-knit with a sense of social
509 identity, belonging and understanding of each other's health needs. In addition, working
510 together provides space to confront myths, misconceptions and stereotypes about people
511 living with HIV (PLHIV) thereby reducing HIV stigma. In Zimbabwe, participation in
512 community groups facilitated linkage to HIV prevention, care and treatment services and was
513 associated with lower levels of HIV stigma [22,23] (the adverse effects of stigma on uptake
514 of HIV-related services, health outcomes and quality of life among PLHIV has been
515 documented [24,25,26]). In cohesive communities, community members' concern for good
516 health extends beyond the individual to other members. Guided by group-based norms and
517 values - the belief that "together we achieve better and more" (collective efficacy) - cohesive
518 communities would collaborate effectively to achieve a common goal, eliminating new HIV
519 infections through community-led HIVST distribution. In such headman units, U=U
520 campaigns could have appealed to community members and motivated testing. As a result,
521 HIVST kit distributors knew who to target with HIVST (active case finding), furthermore, good
522 existing social relationships and trust for the distributor mediated community members'
523 acceptance of the offer of kits [15], resulting in people who would not otherwise test, opting
524 to test.

525

526 The lack of differences in self-testing uptake by community cohesion and distribution model
527 could be attributed to each headman unit working together to design and refine ways of
528 distributing kits in their setting. Such models would overcome context-specific barriers to
529 achieve optimal uptake.

530

531 Even though cohesion was associated with higher reports of new HIV diagnosis in this study
532 and the HIVST distribution period was associated with higher ART initiation rates at health
533 facilities with or without HIVST in their catchment areas [18], it is likely that those newly
534 diagnosed and initiated on ART under WHO's "Treat All" policy [27] may not have achieved
535 undetectable viral load by the time of the survey (3-4 months after distribution). In their study
536 Ali et al. found the median time to achieve viral load suppression after initiation of ART to be
537 181 days (CI: 140.5-221.4) [28]. This may explain why the other community measures
538 (distribution models and levels of community involvement in planning) had no effect on
539 undetectable viral load.

540

541 In the trial within which this study was nested, we found similar outcomes between the
542 community-led and the paid distributor arms; linkage outcomes and reports of new HIV
543 diagnosis in the intervention arm were comparable with those using a paid distributor model
544 [18], showing communities were able to develop models that worked for them and optimised
545 outcomes. Our process evaluation data (not presented here) suggests barriers to linkage to
546 post-test services some of which have been reported in other studies; the belief that linkage
547 to post-test services is unnecessary for HIV negative people [29,30,31], poor or inaccurate
548 knowledge of PrEP [31,32,33,34] and VMMC [35,36], fear of pain during the VMMC
549 procedure [35,36,37] and long distances to health facilities [38]. Finally, healthcare workers
550 shared the view that linkage works better if they are incentivised for each client linking to
551 services [39]; incentives were not provided in this study. These barriers may have affected
552 linkage to post-test services in headman units for each of the community factors.

553

554 The strengths of this study included the use of robust methods for documenting and
555 analysing how the community-led intervention was implemented in each community. This
556 study adds to evidence on the positive effects of community cohesion on positive health
557 behaviours and outcomes [15,17]. While most studies on social cohesion consider cohesion
558 at the individual level [15,17], this study attempted to measure community cohesion
559 systematically by observing levels of community involvement in planning HIVST distribution
560 programmes using a structured observation tool (i.e., community-level). Our measure, levels
561 of community involvement in planning, relates to 4 out of 6 characteristics of Campbell et al,
562 2013 [22] conceptualisation of HIV competent communities, namely: (i) critical thinking about
563 obstacles to health-enhancing behaviour change, and discussions of locally realistic
564 strategies for tackling these; (ii) promoting a sense of local ownership and responsibility for
565 contributing to efforts that combat HIV/AIDS (iii) fostering a sense of solidarity and common
566 purpose in confronting HIV/AIDS and (iv) identification of individual and group strengths for
567 this challenge [22]. Furthermore, use of this measure was moderated by independent
568 scoring by two researchers and resolving discrepancies through consensus.

569

570 Limitations of the study include the reliance on self-reports for study outcomes. While it is
571 possible willingness to self-report could have varied by community cohesion, this is unlikely
572 as this factor seemed to affect new HIV diagnosis but not other self-reported outcomes such
573 as HIVST uptake or linkage. We tried to minimise self-reporting bias by using ACASI as well
574 as laboratory testing of DBS samples. Levels of community involvement and community
575 cohesion are related constructs, and the former may be a feature of community cohesion.
576 However, the community involvement variable was weakly associated with the validated
577 community cohesion measure - possibly due to the small sample size of 20 communities -
578 and the associations between community cohesion and new HIV diagnosis were in line with

579 our hypothesis at the beginning of the study. Although we systematically measured
580 community involvement using participant observation, this was not a validated approach.

581

582 In summary, in this mixed-methods study we found community-led interventions to distribute
583 HIVST kits are feasible and acceptable among rural Zimbabwean communities,
584 accommodating flexibility in design of community-led HIVST kit distribution models and
585 varying levels of community involvement in planning distribution to achieve outcomes similar
586 to those in programmes that were implemented by professionally supported, paid
587 distributors. Community cohesion in rural settings was associated with an increase in self-
588 reported new HIV diagnoses. This suggests that more cohesive communities may be better
589 able to identify those most at risk of undiagnosed HIV infection, and that in closely-knit
590 communities people who need to test are more likely to accept the offer of self-test kits from
591 fellow community members, under a programme that is validated by their community leaders
592 and in an environment where HIV issues can be discussed freely. Qualitative research may
593 provide further insights and be used to improve community-led HIVST programmes as
594 distribution is scaled-up. Regardless of levels of community cohesion, future community-led
595 HIVST programmes may be implemented successfully by enhancing messaging on HIVST
596 and post-test services; addressing related knowledge gaps; and confronting HIV-related
597 myths, misconceptions, and stereotypes (stigma reduction interventions). Communities can
598 learn from and adopt these participatory community-led approaches to intervention planning
599 and implementation for HIVST and other health priorities they identify. Continued
600 implementation of community-led interventions may increase community cohesion and
601 benefit various public health programmes.

602

603 **Acknowledgements**

604 The authors appreciate the support of the Zimbabwe Ministry of Health and Child Care and
605 the STAR Initiative Consortium partners, and the contribution of field researchers and
606 participants, who all made this study possible.

607

608 **Funding statement**

609 This work was funded by Unitaid (STAR Initiative), sub agreement number 4214-CeSHHAR.

610 The funder did not have any input into the conduct and analysis of the study, writing of
611 manuscript nor the decision to submit manuscript for publication.

612

613 **Competing interest statement**

614 There is no conflict of interest to declare.

615

616 REFERENCES

617

618 1. Guidelines on HIV self-testing and partner notification: supplement to
619 consolidated guidelines on HIV testing services [Internet]. World Health
620 Organization (WHO); 2016 Dec. Available from:

621 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/251655>

622 2. Sibanda EL, Neuman M, Tumushime M, Mangenah C, Hatzold K, Watadzaushe
623 C, et al. Community-based HIV self-testing: a cluster-randomised trial of supply-
624 side financial incentives and time-trend analysis of linkage to antiretroviral
625 therapy in Zimbabwe. *BMJ Global Health* [Internet]. 2021 Jul 1 [cited 2023 Jun
626 15];6(Suppl 4):e003866. Available from:

627 https://gh.bmj.com/content/6/suppl_4/e003866

628 3. Indravudh PP, Fielding K, Chilongosi R, Nzawa R, Neuman M, Kumwenda MK,
629 et al. Effect of door-to-door distribution of HIV self-testing kits on HIV testing and
630 antiretroviral therapy initiation: a cluster randomised trial in Malawi. *BMJ Global
631 Health* [Internet]. 2021 Jul 1 [cited 2023 Jun 15];6(Suppl 4):e004269. Available
632 from: https://gh.bmj.com/content/6/Suppl_4/e004269

633 4. Mulubwa C, Hensen B, Phiri MM, Shanaube K, Schaap AJ, Floyd S, et al.
634 Community based distribution of oral HIV self-testing kits in Zambia: a cluster-
635 randomised trial nested in four HPTN 071 (PopART) intervention communities.
636 *Lancet HIV*. 2019 Feb;6(2):e81–92.

637 5. Mangenah C, Mwenge L, Sande L, Ahmed N, d'Elbée M, Chiwawa P, et al.
638 Economic cost analysis of door-to-door community-based distribution of HIV
639 self-test kits in Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2019 Mar;22
640 Suppl 1.

641 6. IN DANGER: UNAIDS Global AIDS Update 2022 [Internet]. Joint United Nations
642 Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS); Available from:

- 643 https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/2022-global-aids-
644 [update_en.pdf](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/2022-global-aids-update_en.pdf)
- 645 7. CDI Study Group. Community-directed interventions for priority health problems
646 in Africa: results of a multicountry study. Bull World Health Organ. 2010 Jul
647 1;88(7):509–18.
- 648 8. Zimba R, Ngulube V, Lukama C, Manangi A, Tiwari A, Osbert N, et al. Chiengi
649 District, Zambia Open Defecation Free After 1 Year of Community-Led Total
650 Sanitation. Am J Trop Med Hyg [Internet]. 2016 Oct 5 [cited 2023 Jun
651 15];95(4):925–7. Available from:
652 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5062802/>
- 653 9. N A, E N-A, J A, A M-P, H S-L, J L-S, et al. Evidence based community
654 mobilization for dengue prevention in Nicaragua and Mexico (Camino Verde, the
655 Green Way): cluster randomized controlled trial. BMJ (Clinical research ed)
656 [Internet]. 2015 Aug 7 [cited 2023 Jun 15];351. Available from:
657 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26156323/>
- 658 10. SEARCH Collaboration. Evaluating the feasibility and uptake of a community-
659 led HIV testing and multi-disease health campaign in rural Uganda. J Int AIDS
660 Soc. 2017 Mar 30;20(1):21514.
- 661 11. Godfrey-Faussett P, Frescura L, Abdool Karim Q, Clayton M, Ghys PD, (on
662 behalf of the 2025 prevention targets working group) (2022) HIV prevention for
663 the next decade: Appropriate, person-centred, prioritised, effective, combination
664 prevention. PLoS Med 19(9): e1004102.
665 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1004102>
- 666 12. Global AIDS Strategy 2021 -2026 -End Inequalities End AIDS. Available at:
667 [https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/global-AIDS-strategy-](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/global-AIDS-strategy-2021-2026_en.pdf)
668 [2021-2026_en.pdf](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/global-AIDS-strategy-2021-2026_en.pdf)

- 669 13. Kawachi I, Subramanian SV, Kim D. Social Capital, and Health. In: Kawachi I,
670 Subramanian SV, Kim D, editors. Social Capital and Health [Internet]. New
671 York, NY: Springer; 2008 [cited 2023 Jun 15]. p. 1–26. Available from:
672 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-71311-3_1
- 673 14. Sampson RJ. The neighbourhood context of well-being. *Perspect Biol Med*.
674 2003;46(3 Suppl):S53-64.
- 675 15. Sampson RJ, Raudenbush SW, Earls F. Neighborhoods and violent crime: a
676 multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*. 1997 Aug 15;277(5328):918–24.
- 677 16. Lippman SA, Leslie HH, Neilands TB, Twine R, Grignon JS, MacPhail C, et al.
678 Context matters: Community social cohesion and health behaviors in two South
679 African areas. *Health Place*. 2018 Mar;50:98–104.
- 680 17. Chuang Y-C, Chuang K-Y, Yang T-H. Social cohesion matters in health.
681 *International Journal for Equity in Health* [Internet]. 2013 Oct 28 [cited 2023 Jun
682 15];12(1):87. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-9276-12-87>
- 683 18. Sibanda EL, Mangenah C, Neuman M, Tumushime M, Watadzaushe C,
684 Mutseta MN, et al. Comparison of community-led distribution of HIV self-tests
685 kits with distribution by paid distributors: a cluster randomised trial in rural
686 Zimbabwean communities. *BMJ Global Health* [Internet]. 2021 Jul 1 [cited 2023
687 Jun 15];6(Suppl 4):e005000. Available from:
688 https://gh.bmj.com/content/6/Suppl_4/e005000
- 689 19. Smith P, Bottenheim A, Schmucker L, et al. Undetectable = Untransmittable
690 (U = U) Messaging Increases Uptake of HIV Testing Among Men: Results from
691 a Pilot Cluster Randomized Trial. *AIDS and Behavior*. 2021 Oct;25(10):3128-
692 3136. DOI: 10.1007/s10461-021-03284-y. PMID: 34057659; PMCID:
693 PMC8165342.
- 694 20. Lippman SA, Leddy AM, Neilands TB, Ahern J, MacPhail C, Wagner RG, et al.
695 Village community mobilization is associated with reduced HIV incidence in

- 696 young South African women participating in the HPTN 068 study cohort. *J Int*
697 *AIDS Soc* [Internet]. 2018 Oct 17 [cited 2023 Jun 15];21(Suppl Suppl 7):e25182.
698 Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6192897/>
- 699 21. Thomas, K.A., Sibanda, E.L., Johnson, C. *et al.* Do community measures impact
700 the effectiveness of a community led HIV testing intervention. Secondary
701 analysis of an HIV self-testing intervention in rural communities in Zimbabwe.
702 *BMC Infect Dis* 22 (Suppl 1), 974 (2022). [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-023-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-023-08695-x)
703 [08695-x](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-023-08695-x)
- 704 22. Campbell C, Scott K, Nhamo M, Nyamukapa C, Madanhire C, Skovdal M, et al.
705 Social capital and HIV competent communities: the role of community groups in
706 managing HIV/AIDS in rural Zimbabwe. *AIDS Care*. 2013;25 Suppl 1(Suppl
707 1):S114-122.
- 708 23. Gregson S, Mushati P, Grusin H, Nhamo M, Schumacher C, Skovdal M,
709 Nyamukapa C, Campbell C. Social capital and women's reduced vulnerability to
710 HIV infection in rural Zimbabwe. *Popul Dev Rev*. 2011;37(2):333-59. doi:
711 10.1111/j.1728-4457.2011.00413.x. PMID: 22066129; PMCID: PMC3302682.
- 712 24. Kumwenda MK, Kamkwamba DB, Chirwa ML, Kasoka K, Taegtmeier M, Oraro-
713 Lawrence T, et al. (2023) Lived experiences of people living with HIV—A
714 qualitative exploration on the manifestation, drivers, and effects of internalized
715 HIV stigma within the Malawian context. *PLoS ONE* 18(4): e0284195.
716 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0284195>
- 717 25. Friedland BA, Gottert A, Hows J, Baral SD, Sprague L, Nyblade L, McClair TL,
718 Anam F, Geibel S, Kentutsi S, Tamoufe U, Diof D, Amenyeiwe U, Mallouris C,
719 Pulerwitz J; PLHIV Stigma Index 2.0 Study Group. The People Living with HIV
720 Stigma Index 2.0: generating critical evidence for change worldwide. *AIDS*.
721 2020 Sep 1;34 Suppl 1:S5-S18. doi: 10.1097/QAD.0000000000002602. PMID:
722 32881790.

- 723 26. Earnshaw VA, Bogart LM, Laurenceau JP, Chan BT, Maughan-Brown BG,
724 Dietrich JJ, Courtney I, Tshabalala G, Orrell C, Gray GE, Bangsberg DR, Katz
725 IT. Internalized HIV stigma, ART initiation and HIV-1 RNA suppression in South
726 Africa: exploring avoidant coping as a longitudinal mediator. *J Int AIDS Soc.*
727 2018 Oct;21(10):e25198. doi: 10.1002/jia2.25198. PMID: 30362662; PMCID:
728 PMC6202800.
- 729 27. Guideline on when to start antiretroviral therapy on pre-exposure prophylaxis for
730 HIV. World Health Organization (WHO); 2015 Sep.
- 731 28. Ali JH, Yirtaw TG. Time to viral load suppression and its associated factors in
732 cohort of patients taking antiretroviral treatment in East Shewa zone, Oromiya,
733 Ethiopia, 2018. *BMC Infectious Diseases* [Internet]. 2019 Dec 27 [cited 2023
734 Jun 15];19(1):1084. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-019-4702-z>
- 735 29. Bunda BA, Raniele RA, Lapayowker SA, Moore CM, Wood ME, McDermott VM,
736 Naresh A. Self-Perception of HIV Risk and Interest in Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis
737 in a General Obstetrics and Gynecology Clinic Population. *J Womens Health*
738 (Larchmt). 2023 Oct 23. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2023.0153. Epub ahead of print.
739 PMID: 37870743.
- 740 30. Nydegger, L.A., Dickson-Gomez, J. & Ko Ko, T. A Longitudinal, Qualitative
741 Exploration of Perceived HIV Risk, Healthcare Experiences, and Social Support
742 as Facilitators and Barriers to PrEP Adoption Among Black Women. *AIDS*
743 *Behav* **25**, 582–591 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-020-03015-9>
- 744 31. Smit, F., Masvawure, T.B. Barriers and Facilitators to Acceptability and Uptake
745 of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) Among Black Women in the United States:
746 a Systematic Review. *J. Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities* (2023).
747 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40615-023-01729-9>
- 748 32. Ajayi, Anthony Idowu MSc, PhDa,*; Mudefi, Elmon MSocScb; Yusuf,
749 Mohammed Sanusi MScb; Adeniyi, Oladele Vincent Mmed, Mphil, PhDc; Rala,

- 750 Ntombana MCurd; Goon, Daniel Ter DTechd. Low awareness and use of pre-
751 exposure prophylaxis among adolescents and young adults in high HIV and
752 sexual violence prevalence settings. *Medicine* 98(43):p e17716, October 2019. |
753 DOI: 10.1097/MD.00000000000017716
- 754 33. Moyo PL, Nunu WN. Oral Pre-exposure Prophylaxis Uptake and Acceptability
755 Among Men Who Have Sex With Men: A Scoping Review of the Literature. *Am*
756 *J Mens Health*. 2023 Sep-Oct;17(5):15579883231201729. doi:
757 10.1177/15579883231201729. PMID: 37776162; PMCID: PMC10541771.
- 758 34. Nabunya R, Karis VMS, Nakanwagi LJ, Mukisa P, Muwanguzi PA. Barriers and
759 facilitators to oral PrEP uptake among high-risk men after HIV testing at
760 workplaces in Uganda: a qualitative study. *BMC Public Health* [Internet]. 2023
761 Feb 20 [cited 2023 Jun 20];23(1):365. Available from:
762 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-15260-3>
- 763 35. Hatzold K, Mavhu W, Jasi P, Chatora K, Cowan FM, Taruberekera N, et al.
764 Barriers and Motivators to Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision Uptake among
765 Different Age Groups of Men in Zimbabwe: Results from a Mixed Methods
766 Study. *PLOS ONE* [Internet]. 2014 May 6 [cited 2023 Jun 20];9(5):e85051.
767 Available from:
768 <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0085051>
- 769 36. Carrasco MA, Wilkinson J, Kasdan B, Fleming P. Systematic review of barriers
770 and facilitators to voluntary medical male circumcision in priority countries and
771 programmatic implications for service uptake. *Glob Public Health*. 2019
772 Jan;14(1):91–111.
- 773 37. Tusabe J, Muyinda H, Nangendo J, Kwesiga D, Nabikande S, Muhoozi M, et al.
774 Factors Influencing the Uptake of Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision Among
775 Boda-Boda Riders Aged 18-49 years in Hoima, Western Uganda. *HIV* [Internet].
776 2022 Sep 23 [cited 2023 Jun 20];14:437–49. Available from:

777 <https://www.dovepress.com/factors-influencing-the-uptake-of-voluntary-medical->
778 [male-circumcision--peer-reviewed-fulltext-article-HIV](https://www.dovepress.com/factors-influencing-the-uptake-of-voluntary-medical-)

779 38. Mayer CM, Owaraganise A, Kabami J, Kwarisiima D, Koss CA, Charlebois ED,
780 et al. Distance to clinic is a barrier to PrEP uptake and visit attendance in a
781 community in rural Uganda. Journal of the International AIDS Society [Internet].
782 2019 [cited 2023 Jun 20];22(4):e25276. Available from:
783 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jia2.25276>

784 39. Muthuri RNDK, Senkubuge F, Hongoro C. Determinants of Motivation among
785 Healthcare Workers in the East African Community between 2009–2019: A
786 Systematic Review. Healthcare (Basel) [Internet]. 2020 Jun 10 [cited 2023 Jun
787 20];8(2):164. Available from:
788 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7349547/>

789

790