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Systematic review of strategies to increase men's HIV-testing in sub-Saharan Africa

Bernadette Hensen\textsuperscript{a}, Sachiko Taoka\textsuperscript{b}, James J. Lewis\textsuperscript{c,d}, Helen A. Weiss\textsuperscript{c} and James Hargreaves\textsuperscript{a,d}

\textbf{Objective:} This systematic review summarizes evidence on the effectiveness of strategies to increase men's HIV-testing in sub-Saharan Africa.

\textbf{Methods:} Medline, EmBase, Africa-Wide Information and Global Health were searched. Cluster and individually randomized trials evaluating interventions to increase the proportion of adults (\geq 15 years) testing for HIV were eligible if they were conducted in sub-Saharan Africa, included men in the study population, and reported HIV-testing data by sex. References were independently screened.

\textbf{Results:} Of the 1852 references, 15 papers including 16 trials were eligible. Trials were judged too heterogeneous to combine in meta-analysis. Three interventions invited men to attend antenatal care-based HIV-testing via pregnant partners, of which two showed a significant effect on partner-testing. One intervention invited men to HIV-test through pregnant partners and showed an increase in HIV-testing when it was offered in bars compared with health facilities. A trial of notification to partners of newly diagnosed HIV-positive patients showed an increase in testing where notification was by healthcare providers compared with notification by the patient. Three interventions reached men already at health facilities and eight reported the effects of community-based HIV-testing. Mobile-testing had a significant effect on HIV-testing compared with standard voluntary counselling and testing. Home-based testing also had a significant effect, but reached smaller numbers of men than mobile-testing.

\textbf{Discussion:} Interventions to encourage HIV-testing can increase men's levels of HIV-testing. Community-based programmes in particular had a large effect on population levels of HIV-testing. More data on costs and potential population impact of these approaches over different time-horizons would aid policy-makers in planning resource allocation to increase male HIV-testing.
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\section*{Introduction}

Sub-Saharan Africa remains the region most affected by HIV, with 70\% of the infections in 2012 occurring in the region \cite{1}. The proportion of individuals aware of their HIV status remains low, despite the scale-up of standalone voluntary counselling and testing (VCT) sites and provider-initiated HIV-testing and counselling (PITC) in health facilities \cite{2–5}. A 2006–2011 study in four sub-Saharan African countries highlights that declines in the proportion of HIV patients enrolling into care with advanced illness have been moderate \cite{6}. Antiretroviral therapy (ART) is less effective when accessed at later stages of immune suppression \cite{7}. In light of their...
findings, the authors emphasize the need to increase efforts to expand HIV-testing and improve linkage to care for HIV-positive individuals [6]. Furthermore, opportunities to provide HIV-negative individuals and serodiscordant couples with access to prevention services are limited in settings where HIV-testing is low.

Whereas women’s HIV-testing and counselling (HTC) has increased since 2004, partly due to PITC implementation in antenatal care (ANC) [3,8], men’s HIV-testing rates remain lower than women’s across sub-Saharan Africa [2,9–11]. ART uptake is lower among HIV-infected men; men access ART at later stages of immune suppression and experience higher mortality once initiated on ART [12,13]. Approaches to increase HIV-testing rates among men are urgently needed. To date, no systematic review of interventions to increase men’s HIV-testing in sub-Saharan Africa exists. Consolidated evidence of strategies that effectively reach men with HIV-testing services would support resource allocation in countries where men’s testing is low. We systematically reviewed randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of interventions to increase HIV-testing among men in sub-Saharan Africa.

Methods

Medline, EmBase, Africa-Wide Information and Global Health were searched using combinations of search terms (Annex 2, http://links.lww.com/QAD/A567). Final searches were conducted on 25 October 2013. RCTs of interventions aimed at increasing the proportion of adults, including men testing for HIV, were included. Data on the proportion of men tested after intervention implementation and on the effect size of interventions compared with control are reported.

This systematic review is reported in line with the 2009 ‘Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses’ (PRISMA) guidelines where applicable (Annex 1, http://links.lww.com/QAD/A567) [14]. No protocol exists.

Screening references

References were independently screened for eligibility (B.H./S.T.) and removed after abstract or full-text review. Where reviewers did not agree on eligibility, a third author (J.H.) was consulted.

Inclusion criteria

Studies were eligible if they evaluated interventions to increase HTC uptake by adults (≥15 years), described the proportion of individuals testing for HIV after intervention implementation, were cluster (CRT) or individually RCTs, included men in the study population and HIV-testing data were stratified by sex, and were conducted in sub-Saharan Africa. If sex-disaggregated data were unavailable, up to three attempts were made to contact authors via e-mail. If authors confirmed that sex-disaggregated data were not available, trials were included if more than 40% of the population in all trial arms were men (n = 1) [15], but excluded when less than 40% were men (n = 1) [16]. Conference abstracts, commentaries and letters were excluded due to lack of detailed information on trial design. No language, date or other restrictions were applied.

Data extraction and analysis

Data on the proportion of men HIV-testing after intervention in all arms were extracted (B.H.). Crude and adjusted risk ratios (RR) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) were extracted when reported. Unadjusted RR were calculated from raw data using EpiInfo or Stata 12.0 with 95% CI reported for individually randomized trials. Odds ratios (ORs) or prevalence ratios were extracted if reported.

Two reviewers (B.H./S.T.) independently appraised trials for potential risk of bias using the Cochrane Collaboration risk of bias tool [17]. Risk of bias assessments were relative judgements made by two reviewers that relied primarily on reporting. Five domains were assigned: ‘low’, ‘high’ or ‘unclear’ risk of bias (Table 2) [17]. For CRTs, recruitment bias, baseline imbalances, missing outcome data on clusters and whether analyses adjusted for clustering were also assessed. Selective reporting bias was not assessed as eligibility included reporting on HIV-testing outcomes. Disagreements were resolved through consultation. Trials were not excluded based on risk of bias.

Results

The literature search identified 1852 titles. Abstract review removed 1796 titles and full-text review excluded 40 (Fig. 1). Of the 16 remaining trials, one was removed as authors confirmed that data by sex were unavailable and less than 40% of the study population were men [16]. Fifteen papers were eligible. One paper presented data for trials conducted in two sub-Saharan African countries, and a second reported on a trial conducted in four countries of which one was in sub-Saharan Africa [18,19] (Table 1).

Trials included in the review were heterogeneous (Table 1). Four evaluated interventions targeting men through pregnant partners [19–22], one targeted partners of newly diagnosed HIV-positive individuals [23], three evaluated interventions to increase HIV-testing among men attending healthcare facilities [15,24,25]. The remainder offered HIV-testing outside of the facility settings [18,26–31]. Target populations also differed. A meta-analysis was therefore not performed. The proportion of men testing in intervention arms was plotted against the proportion testing in control arms (Fig. 2).
Risk of bias
An assessment of the risk of bias across all trials was not performed due to heterogeneity. Six trials were assigned an unclear risk of selection bias as details of sequence generation and concealment were considered insufficient (Table 2). Blinding of intervention personnel/participants was reported in four trials with additional detail obtained from supporting information for two trials. Six trials were considered to have a low risk of performance bias and three a potential high risk. In one CRT, though matched, it was unclear whether baseline imbalances had been explored and adjustment for clustering made, though the latter would not bias the effect estimate.

Invitations through pregnant partners
Four interventions aimed to increase HIV-testing among men with a pregnant partner attending ANC [19–22] (Tables 1 and 3; Fig. 2). In a South African trial, pregnant women in the intervention arm received invitations for their partners to attend ANC-based VCT. The control arm received an invitation for partners to attend pregnancy information sessions [20]. In the intervention arm, 32% \( (n = 161/500) \) of partners tested for HIV compared with 11% \( (n = 57/500) \) in the control arm (RR 2.82, 95% CI 2.14–3.72).

In a Ugandan trial, an invitation requesting partners to attend the next ANC visit showed a similar effect compared with providing partners an information letter [21]. Sixteen percent \( (n = 82/530) \) of partners in the intervention arm tested compared with 13% \( (n = 68/530) \) in the control arm (RR 1.21, 95% CI 0.90–1.62).

A RCT in Democratic Republic of Congo offered pregnant women invitations for their partner to attend church or bar-based HTC [22]. Partners of women randomized to control were offered invitations for health facility-based HTC. Eighteen percent \( (n = 166/909) \) of men randomized to control health facility-based HTC were tested compared with 21% \( (n = 189/906) \) randomized to a church and 27% \( (n = 236/891) \) randomized to bar-based HIV-testing (adjusted OR: church 1.10, 95% CI 0.87–1.39; bar 1.50, 95% CI 1.19–1.89).

Facility-based HIV-testing and counselling through partner notification
In a RCT in Malawi, newly diagnosed HIV patients attending a sexually transmitted infection (STI) clinic...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author, publication year</th>
<th>Country and setting</th>
<th>Study period</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Study objectives</th>
<th>Study population</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Intervention or policy</th>
<th>Comparison group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mohlala, 2011 [20]</td>
<td>South Africa, urban ANC clinic</td>
<td>Nov 2006–Dec 2007</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>To compare women’s acceptance of written invitations for VCT and pregnancy information sessions (PIS) for male sexual partner (MSP) and uptake of VCT by MSP</td>
<td>Pregnant women at &lt;30 weeks gestation and their MSP</td>
<td>Consecutive women attending ANC without MSP, MSP recruited through women</td>
<td>1000 pregnant women; 500 intervention 500 in control</td>
<td>Written invitation for MSP to attend ANC; the for VCT along with community sensitisation 9 months before the intervention during follow-up and recruitment.</td>
<td>Written invitation for MSP to attend ANC without and MSP recruited through women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byamugisha, 2011 [21]</td>
<td>Uganda, ANC at a referral hospital</td>
<td>Oct 2009–Feb 2010</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>To evaluate the effect of an invitation letter on couples attendance to ANC and VCT uptake by MSP within a 4-week follow-up period</td>
<td>Pregnant women (≥15 years) attending their last ANC visit and their MSP</td>
<td>Women attending ANC without MSP who were willing to return within 4 weeks identified at a reception and approached by research assistant; MSP recruited through women</td>
<td>1060 pregnant women; 530 intervention 530 control</td>
<td>Written invitation letter addressed to MSP to attend subsequent ANC visit</td>
<td>A leaflet containing information on the services available at the ANC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orne-Gliemann, 2013 [19]</td>
<td>Cameroon, urban health centre</td>
<td>26 Feb–15 Oct 2009</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>To determine the impact of an invitation letter on couples attendance to ANC and VCT uptake by MSP within a 4-week follow-up period</td>
<td>Pregnant women aged ≥15 years attending their last ANC visit and their male partners</td>
<td>Women who were interested in participating and were eligible asked for written informed consent; male partners identified through women</td>
<td>484 women; 239 intervention 245 control</td>
<td>COC: develops women’s communication skills and self-efficacy; empowering women and encouraging HTC-related discussion with partners</td>
<td>Standard post-test counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditekemena, 2011 [22]</td>
<td>DRC, urban NHC, bar and church</td>
<td>1 Sept 2006–31 Jan 2007</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>To identify alternative strategies to increase participation in VCT by men whose pregnant female partner received HIV-testing</td>
<td>Male partners of pregnant women (≥18 years) who received VCT at ANC in maternity hospital</td>
<td>All women attending an ANC centre were provided with VCT information about the study and asked for consent</td>
<td>2706 pregnant women; 906 church arm, 891 bar arm, 909 NHC arm</td>
<td>Written invitation to attend VCT at a church or in a bar</td>
<td>Invitation to attend VCT in a neighbourhood health centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, 2011 [23]</td>
<td>Malawi, STI clinics in two urban hospitals</td>
<td>Oct 2008–Sept 2009</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>To determine the effectiveness of different methods of partner notification on notification rates and partner HTC uptake</td>
<td>Partners of STI clinic patients with newly diagnosed HIV infection</td>
<td>Selection of hospitals not reported. All patients aged ≥18 years tested positive for first time and sexually active within last 90 days invited to participate</td>
<td>228 patients recruited; 131 (58%) male, 114 motivational skills counselling 114 information, education</td>
<td>Provider referral: 48 female index patients 52 male partners Contract referral: 46 female index patients 50 male partners Passive referral: 46 female index patients 48 male partners</td>
<td>Passive referral to notify sexual partners and refer for HTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simbays, 2004 [15]</td>
<td>South Africa, STI clinic</td>
<td>Aug–Nov 2003</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>To test the efficacy of a brief theory-based HIV prevention counselling intervention for STI patients</td>
<td>Repeat STI patients</td>
<td>Repeat STI patients being treated for multiple STIs referred by nurse or physician</td>
<td>228 recruited; 131 (58%) male, 114 motivational skills counselling 114 information, education</td>
<td>60 min information-motivation-behavioural skills risk reduction counselling to change knowledge, attitudes and behaviours and increase self-efficacy</td>
<td>20 min information and education session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope, 2008 [25]</td>
<td>South Africa, 20 primary care TB clinics</td>
<td>12 Aug–10 Nov 2005</td>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>To determine whether opt-out PITC increases the proportion of TB patients’ HIV tested</td>
<td>Newly registered TB patients (≥18 years) who remained in case for ≥14 days</td>
<td>Clinics selected from 44 PHCs based on presence of TB nurse and min of 3 newly registered TB patients per month</td>
<td>10 intervention and 10 control clinics; 194 males intervention 238 males control</td>
<td>Clinic providing PITC, including training for nurses on the offer of HTC</td>
<td>Opt-in HIV testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reaching men in community settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanyenze et al., 2011</td>
<td>Uganda, urban hospital</td>
<td>2004–2005</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>To compare the impact of inpatient HTC on HTC uptake, linkage to care and survival among inpatients compared with referral for VCT</td>
<td>15 years surveyed; 500 inpatients 109 males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylkesnes et al., 2013</td>
<td>Zambia, rural villages</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>To evaluate the acceptability of HBHTC compared with standard HTC services</td>
<td>16 clusters; 8 intervention clusters, 484 men surveyed; 8 control clusters, 578 men surveyed after intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweat et al., 2011</td>
<td>Tanzania, 10 rural communities</td>
<td>2006–2007</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>To examine whether mobile testing in combination with community mobilisation and post-test support increases HTC uptake compared with standard VCT</td>
<td>22 clusters intervention and 22 control arm: 947 male household members ≥15 years intervention 484 males household members ≥15 years control arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnett et al., 2011</td>
<td>Swaziland, secondary school</td>
<td>2006–2007</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>To evaluate the effect of an HIV education intervention on HIV-related behaviours including HIV-testing</td>
<td>500 inpatients 109 males intervention 96 males control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugada et al., 2010</td>
<td>Uganda, 44 clusters defined by geographical area in five districts</td>
<td>2005–2007</td>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>To compare HTC uptake among household members of index ART patient offered home-based HTC to uptake among those offered vouchers for VCT</td>
<td>22 clusters intervention and 22 control arm: 947 male household members ≥15 years intervention 484 males household members ≥15 years control arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dohe et al., 2013</td>
<td>South Africa, geographically similar rural clusters</td>
<td>Intervention: Sept 2009–Nov 2010 Survey: Feb–May 2011</td>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>To determine the effectiveness of home-based HTC compared with facility-based testing</td>
<td>16 clusters; 8 intervention clusters, 484 men surveyed; 8 control clusters, 578 men surveyed after intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low et al., 2013</td>
<td>Kenya, administrative regions</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>To evaluate the effects of HBHTC on HIV testing compared with no HBHTC</td>
<td>18 clusters; 9 intervention clusters, 626 men ≥15 years surveyed; 9 control clusters, 635 men ≥15 years surveyed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- ANC: antenatal care
- ART: antiretroviral therapy
- COC: couple-oriented counselling
- CRT: cluster randomised trial
- DRC: Democratic Republic of Congo
- HHC: home-based HTC
- NGO: non-government organisation
- NHC: neighbourhood health centre
- PHC: primary healthcare
- PIS: pregnancy information sessions
- PITC: provider-initiated HIV-testing and counselling
- QA: quality
- RCT: randomized controlled trial
- S: strong
- VCT: voluntary counselling and testing

**Note:** The systematized review of HIV-testing interventions highlights various studies conducted in different contexts, comparing the impact of home-based and clinic-based HTC services on HTC uptake, linkage to care, and survival. The studies were conducted in diverse settings, including urban hospitals, rural communities, and school settings, across different regions such as Uganda, Tanzania, and South Africa. The methodologies employed include randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and cluster randomised trials (CRTs), focusing on comparing HTC uptake, linkage to care, and survival among participants who received home-based HTC versus those who did not. The studies also examined the acceptability of mobile HTC services and the impact of HTC interventions on community mobilization and post-test support. The research spans a range of years, from 2004 to 2013, demonstrating a comprehensive approach to understanding and improving HTC services in different settings.
Fig. 2. Proportion of men testing in intervention versus control arm. aOutcomes for men and women. bControl is mens uptake of voucher for off-site VCT.

Table 2. Assessment of risk of bias in individual trials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Random sequence generation</th>
<th>Allocation concealment</th>
<th>Blinding of participants and personnel</th>
<th>Blinding of outcome assessment</th>
<th>Incomplete outcome data</th>
<th>Other sources of Bias</th>
<th>For CRTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byamugisha, 2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orne-Gliemann, 2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditekemena, 2011 (Church)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditekemena, 2011 (Bar)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, 2011 (Provider)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, 2011 (Contract)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett, 2008b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnett, 2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simbayi, 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope, 2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanyenze, 2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett, 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnett, 2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweat, 2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugada, 2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doherty, 2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylkesnes, 2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low, 2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

- Risk considered low
? Risk considered unclear
+ Risk considered high
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study reference</th>
<th>Outcome measurement</th>
<th>Proportion HIV-testing intervention (%, n) (A)</th>
<th>Proportion HIV-testing control (%, n) (B)</th>
<th>Difference (%) (A - B)</th>
<th>RR (unless otherwise reported) (95% CI)</th>
<th>Adjusted RR (unless otherwise reported) (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invitations for ANC-based HTC provided through pregnant women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohlala et al., 2011</td>
<td>Num: # of men HIV-tested in study period</td>
<td>32.2 (161/500)</td>
<td>11.4 (57/500)</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>2.82 (2.14–3.72)</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byamugisha et al., 2011</td>
<td>Num: # of men HIV-tested in study period</td>
<td>15.5 (82/530)</td>
<td>12.8 (60/530)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.21 (0.90–1.62)</td>
<td>OR: 1.6 (0.4, 6.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'ne-Gliemann et al., 2013</td>
<td>Logbook only:</td>
<td>14.6 (352/239)</td>
<td>Combined: 24.7 (592/239)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Logbook only: 2.56 (1.42–4.64)</td>
<td>Combined OR: 2.38 (1.41–4.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invitations for community-based HTC provided through pregnant women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditekemena et al., 2011</td>
<td>Church:</td>
<td>20.9 (189906)</td>
<td>Bar: 26.5 (236891)</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>166/909)</td>
<td>Church: 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invitations for facility-based HTC through notification that partner is newly diagnosed HIV-positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown et al., 2011</td>
<td>Num: # of male partners tested</td>
<td>44.2 (23/52)</td>
<td>Contact: 46.2 (23/52)</td>
<td>14.6 (748)</td>
<td>Provider: 29.6</td>
<td>Contact: 33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope et al., 2008</td>
<td>Num: # of male patients tested</td>
<td>18.6 (36/194)</td>
<td>8.4 (20238)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>OR: 3.79</td>
<td>OR: 2.40 (1.05–5.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wananyenza et al., 2011</td>
<td>Num: # of male patients tested and receiving results</td>
<td>100 (109/109)</td>
<td>64.6 (62/96)</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>1.55 (1.34–1.80)</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health facility-based strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simbayi et al., 2004</td>
<td>Num: # of individuals reporting testing 1 month post-counselling</td>
<td>37.7 (43/114)</td>
<td>21.9 (25/114)</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1.72 (1.13–2.62)</td>
<td>OR: 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole et al., 2008</td>
<td>Num: # of individuals in study arm</td>
<td>30.7 (35/114)</td>
<td>25.4 (29/114)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.21 (0.79–1.83)</td>
<td>OR: 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-based strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubert et al., 2010</td>
<td>Num: # of males accepting on-site VCT/voucher for off-site VCT in study period</td>
<td>54.8 (1634/2981)</td>
<td>13.7 (340/2474)</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>2.7 (1.8–3.9)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnett et al., 2011</td>
<td>Num: # of males reporting ever-testing post-intervention</td>
<td>48.4 (15/31)</td>
<td>6.5 (2/31)</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>7.50 (1.87–30.08)</td>
<td>OR: 10.96 (4.59–26.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study reference</th>
<th>Outcome measurement</th>
<th>Proportion HIV-testing intervention (%; n) (A)</th>
<th>Proportion HIV-testing control (%; n) (B)</th>
<th>Difference (%) (A – B)</th>
<th>RR (unless otherwise reported) (95% CI)</th>
<th>Adjusted RR (unless otherwise reported) (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweat et al., 2011 (Tanzania)</td>
<td>Num: # of men testing at least once in study period Denom: 50% of target population</td>
<td>43.7 (136/3125)</td>
<td>9.1 (306/3367)</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>4.81&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweat et al., 2011 (Zimbabwe)</td>
<td>Num: # of men testing at least once in study period Denom: 50% of target population</td>
<td>52.6 (2816/5350)</td>
<td>5.3 (323/6075)</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>9.90&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugada et al., 2010</td>
<td>Num: # of male HH members tested in study period Denom: # of male HH members aged ≥15 years</td>
<td>45.1 (427/947)</td>
<td>9.1 (44/484)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.96 (3.71–6.63)&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10.41 (7.89–13.73)&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doherty et al., 2013</td>
<td>Num: # of men testing during study period Denom: # of men surveyed in post-intervention household survey</td>
<td>47.3 (229/484)</td>
<td>32.7 (189/578)</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>PR: 1.52 (1.19–1.95)</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylkesnes et al., 2013</td>
<td>Num: # of men tested in year prior to the follow-up survey Denom: # of men surveyed baseline and follow-up</td>
<td>76.1 (N = 255)</td>
<td>42.2 (N = 261)</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>1.8 (1.4–2.3)</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low et al., 2013&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Num: # of men reporting ever testing Denom: # of men surveyed in postintervention household survey</td>
<td>92.7 (580/626)</td>
<td>53.6 (351/655)</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>1.73&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANC, antenatal care; CI, confidence interval; HH, household; HTC, HIV testing and counselling; NR, not reported; OR, odds ratio; PR, prevalence ratio; RR, risk ratio.

<sup>a</sup> Per-protocol analysis: intervention 95.3% (82/86) and control 90.7% (68/75); OR adjusted for male partner’s age, occupation and education level.

<sup>b</sup> OR based on combined indicator of logbook and women’s self-report of men’s HTC. Adjusted for age, female remunerated activity, partner alcohol consumption, HIV status, whether women reports partner ever tested, ever discussed condom with partner, women suggested HIV-testing to partner.

<sup>c</sup> Adjusted for women’s age, marital status, religion and cohabitation.

<sup>d</sup> RR calculated using Epi-Info.

<sup>e</sup> OR for individuals retained at follow-up (HTC at 1 month: 47 versus 28%, HTC before 3-month follow-up: 38 versus 33%). Adjusted for age, race, sex, years of education and baseline testing rates.

<sup>f</sup> OR calculated using STATA.

<sup>g</sup> Reported OR for men and women.

<sup>h</sup> Data for males provided through personal communication (Corbett, 2011).

<sup>i</sup> RR for unadjusted mean uptake of voucher versus on-site VCT by men and women.

<sup>j</sup> Ratio of observed/expected proportions, adjusted for age, sex, marital status, education, household contact with TB patient, self-rated health and strata (high–low absenteeism). Adjusted RR for use of voucher versus on-site VCT by men and women 12.5 (8.2–16.8).

<sup>k</sup> Data for males provided through personal communication, 2014. OR of change in ever had HIV-test from pre to postintervention, excluding those who tested pretreatment.

<sup>l</sup> Calculated by assuming that 50% of the target population was male.

<sup>m</sup> Adjusted for age and sex.

<sup>n</sup> Data available in paper; however, data for men aged at least 15 years provided through personal communication (Low, 2014).

<sup>o</sup> Data for men provided through personal communication; (Brown 2013).

<sup>p</sup> Data for men provided through personal communication; (Wanyenze 2012).
were randomized to one of the three modes of partner notification (Table 1) [23]. In the provider referral arm, 44% (n = 23/52) of the male partners were HIV-tested, in the contact referral, 46% (n = 23/50) were tested, whereas in the passive referral arm, 15% (n = 7/48) were tested (RR provider 3.03, 95% CI 1.43–6.42; contract 3.15, 95% CI 1.49–6.66).

**Reaching men attending health facilities**

Three trials reached men in health facilities. In a South African RCT, patients attending a STI clinic were randomized to risk-reduction counselling or a 20-min HIV information/education session [15]. Of the 228 patients, 66% (n = 151) were men. In the intention-to-treat analyses, 38% (n = 43/114) of the patients in the intervention arm reported HIV-testing 1 month after counselling versus 22% (n = 25/114) in the control arm (RR 1.72; 95% CI 1.13–2.62).

In a CRT of opt-out PITC on tuberculosis (TB) patients HIV-testing in primary healthcare clinics in South Africa, 19% of male TB patients offered PITC tested compared with 8% in ‘opt-in’ clinics (OR 2.40, 95% CI 1.05–5.50; Table 3) [25].

A RCT in Uganda compared HIV-testing among in-patients offered PITC to HIV-testing among patients offered vouchers for HTC 1 week after discharge [24]. All male patients in the PITC arm (n = 109) were tested compared with 65% (n = 62/96) of men who were offered a voucher (RR 1.55, 95% CI 1.34–1.80) [24].

**Reaching men in community settings**

Eight trials evaluated interventions to reach individuals in community settings. In each trial, men in the intervention had higher levels of ever-testing (Table 3). In a CRT in Zimbabwe, businesses were randomized to on-site HTC or vouchers for off-site HTC. In the intervention sites, 55% of the male employees were HIV-tested. In control sites, 14% of male employees accepted vouchers (adjusted RR for men and women 2.8, 95% CI 1.8–3.8) [31]. Mean reported use of off-site VCT by men and women was 4.3% (adjusted RR: 12.5, 95% CI 8.2–16.8) [31].

In a RCT in Swaziland, 204 students were randomized to an intervention aimed at changing HIV-related knowledge, attitudes and behaviours, or control [30]. Among males aged at least 15 years with complete HIV-testing history data after intervention, 48% (n = 15/31) randomized to intervention reported testing after intervention versus 7% (n = 2/31) in control (RR 7.50, 95% CI 1.87–30.08) [30].

Service utilization data from a CRT of mobile-testing in Tanzania and Zimbabwe reported significantly higher HTC in communities randomized to mobile HTC, compared with HTC in communities randomized to standard VCT [18]. In Tanzania, testing was approximately five times higher in intervention communities [18], with an estimated 44% of men tested compared with 9% the in control communities. In Zimbabwe, testing was approximately 10 times higher in the intervention communities [18], an estimated 53% of men tested compared with 5% in control communities.

A sub-study of a CRT in Uganda compared HIV-testing among households offered home-based HTC with HTC among households offered vouchers for facility-based HTC [26]. The primary trial outcome was mortality among ART patients randomized to home or clinic-based ART delivery [32]. The sub-study targeted household members of the index-ART patient, with household members of patients randomized to home-based ART offered home-based HIV-testing, and household members of patients randomized to facility-based ART offered vouchers for facility-based HTC. Male household members aged at least 15 years in the home-based arm were significantly more likely to test compared with that in the comparison arm (45% versus 9%; RR 4.96, 95% CI 3.71–6.63) [26].

Two CRTs reported the effect of home-based HTC compared with standard of care (Table 1) [27,29]. In South Africa, 47% of men in intervention clusters reported HIV-testing during the study period compared with 33% in control clusters (PR 1.52, 95% CI 1.19–1.95) [27]. In Zambia, 76% of men in intervention clusters reported HIV-testing in the year prior to the follow-up survey compared with 42% in control clusters (RR 1.8, 95% CI 1.4–2.3). In a CRT of home-based HTC in Kenya, 93% (n = 580/626) of men in intervention communities reported ever-testing in a survey conducted 18 months after intervention versus 54% (n = 351/655) in control communities [28].

**Discussion**

This is the first systematic review of the impact of interventions to increase HIV-testing on men’s HIV-testing in sub-Saharan Africa. Previous systematic reviews of HTC explored the contribution of PITC to universal testing of pregnant women [3], determined the effect of home-based HTC compared with facility-based services [33] or the acceptability of home-based HTC [34] or reviewed evidence from community-based HTC studies [50]. Our review suggests that interventions to increase men’s testing in sub-Saharan Africa are available, although few interventions targeted men specifically. Increasing men’s population levels of HIV-testing provides opportunities to link men to HIV-treatment, prevention and care services. Furthermore, with the evidence that men’s HIV-testing is associated with women’s uptake and adherence to prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT) [35,36], men’s HIV-testing is crucial to the
success of PMTCT interventions and for women’s health [9]. Evidence arising from this review may support decision-making by the HTC implementers in countries where men’s HIV-testing is low. With four trials conducted in South Africa, evidence arising from these interventions may support HTC implementers operating in this region in developing strategies to target men with HIV-testing services.

This review is subject to limitations. Inclusion was limited to published trials and it may be subject to publication bias, as null-effect interventions may be less likely to be published. As inclusion was not restricted to a specific male population or mode of HTC service delivery, the review includes heterogeneous trials. Combining the evidence to determine overall intervention effects was challenging. We therefore did not perform a meta-analysis or compare results across interventions. To increase comparability, strict study design criteria were applied. However, by including this restriction, we excluded observational studies, which have been included in reviews of home-based HTC and may provide additional evidence in support of our findings [34]. Although heterogeneous, evidence across the trials is consistent, with HIV-testing higher in intervention sites in all trials, highlighting that interventions to increase men’s HIV-testing are available.

Trials included in the review may be subject to limitations. The potential for bias in trials that did not report details of how the random sequence was generated or whether allocation was concealed was considered unclear. In a CRT, an HIV-prevention organization working with businesses assisted in selection of businesses to be included in the trial. As such, the selected businesses may have been more responsive to the intervention [31]. Bias may be present in trials of invitations to partners as women may have opened sealed envelopes [22]. Knowledge that partners were invited to ANC [21] or where they would be offered VCT [22] may have deterred women from providing letters to their partners [22]. However, as highlighted by Ditekemena et al. (2011), it is unclear what effect this bias would have on outcomes [22]. Outcome measurement was at risk of bias in some trials in which these were self-reported, as individuals may over-report previous testing due to social desirability bias [27–29].

All trials show large and consistent effects on men’s HIV-testing. In trials included in this review, men’s attendance to ANC was low at 16–30% consistent with other research [35–37]. Nonetheless, ANC-based strategies have the potential to increase men’s HIV-testing. Evidence suggests that couple-HTC increases HIV-positive pregnant women’s use of nevirapine for PMTCT and their own health [35,36]. HIV-testing by partners of HIV-positive pregnant women is crucial for PMTCT and women’s health [22]. Three-quarters of individuals aged 20–49 years residing in sub-Saharan Africa report cohabiting [38]. With many cohabiting men likely to have a pregnant partner in the course of their relationship, ANC-based HTC has the potential to reach a high proportion of these men [38]. To increase men’s ANC-based HIV-testing, promotional campaigns to normalize their ANC attendance may prove effective. Although limited to one trial, the RCT that promoted men’s participation had a greater effect than trials with no sensitization directed at men [20]. With little evidence of the impact and cost-effectiveness of promotional campaigns on HTC acceptance in developing countries additional research is warranted.

Couple-HTC is being promoted principally in ANC [36–39]. As few men attend clinics considered ‘female’ environments, couple-HTC should be available in alternate settings including voluntary medical male circumcision (VMMC) clinics and mobile HTC [38,40]. These settings may not only prove more acceptable to men and some women but may encourage couple-HTC by non-pregnant couples. Home-based testing is an additional strategy that may prove more effective at reaching couples. In the South African home-based HTC trial, the prevalence of couple-HTC in the intervention arm was two times higher than in control (RR 2.24, 95% CI 1.49–3.03) [27]. In the Zambian trial, 62% of cohabiting respondents reported being counselled with their partner [29]. Among those tested at home, 70% reported that they received their test result with their partner [29].

Men may be reluctant to access health services due to norms associated with masculinity, including being strong and ‘disease-free’, that may act as a barrier to seeking preventive healthcare services [41]. Men’s access to HTC and HIV services may be limited further by fear and perceived lack of confidentiality of services [42–44]. With limited access to healthcare, PITC has reached few men compared with women, despite increased incentives to HIV-test with increasing ART availability [45,46]. Studies have shown that PITC is acceptable [47,48] and diagnoses a high proportion of HIV-positive individuals among those tested at relatively low costs per individual tested [45]. PITC trials included in this review showed a large effect on HIV-testing [25]. In VMMC clinics in Tanzania, 99% of men accepted PITC when offered [49]. However, the majority were young and at low risk of infection [49]. The need for interventions to reach older men therefore remains [49]. Although PITC is unlikely to increase men’s population levels of HIV-testing, the strategy can reach a high proportion of men already engaged with health services [50]. PITC is an important mode of service delivery, particularly in generalized epidemics, but PITC alone will not provide men with universal HTC access [50].

Community-based HTC strategies providing services outside of health facilities may prove more acceptable to
Home-based HTC also had a large effect on HIV-testing. A systematic review of home-based HTC acceptability shows that overall men found at home are as likely as women to be offered testing and to accept an offer of home-based HTC [34]. However, in some studies, the proportion of individuals found at home that were male was low [55]. Home-based HTC may have limited impact on population levels of HIV-testing in areas of high mobility for employment and in the absence of repeat visits to find men who are less likely to be at home. As such, increasing men's HIV-testing at population level through home-based HTC may prove less cost-effective as repeated visits would increase delivery costs [34,56]. Home-based HIV-testing identifies a lower proportion of HIV-positive men among men tested compared with PITC, yet individuals are likely to be identified at earlier stages of infection [34,45]. Home-based testing is an effective strategy that reaches a high proportion of those targeted in addition to increasing couple-HTC [27]. Furthermore, offering home-based HTC may provide an opportunity for counselling and to reach first-time testers. In the Zambian trial, 84% of men accepted counselling services [29]. First-time testing was higher in the intervention arms of the Zambian and South African trial; in Zambia, the prevalence of first-time testing was 68% in the intervention arm versus 29% in the control arm [57]. In South Africa, 46% of all testers in the intervention arm were first-time testers compared with 37% in the control arm [27]. Home-based testing is therefore an important strategy to be delivered alongside other models of HIV-testing [34,50,58].

HIV self-testing is an additional strategy that may prove effective at increasing men's population levels of HIV-testing. A feasibility study conducted in Malawi suggests that home-based self-testing was men's preferred option for future testing [59]. Additional research in developing countries is needed including population-level impact, cost-effectiveness, how to deliver HIV tests, and linkage to HIV prevention and care; yet the model remains a promising alternative to healthcare provider-delivered HIV-testing [59].

Timely diagnosis of HIV infection is crucial to the effectiveness of treatment as prevention initiatives [56]. Strategies that not only encourage first-time testing but also repeat-testing, particularly by high-risk HIV-negative individuals, are required [56]. In the Zambian trial, repeat-testing was higher in intervention communities (94 versus 74%; P < 0.001) [57]. The trial of mobile-testing reports that at the end of the intervention period, approximately 40% of the individuals attending mobile-testing clinics in the three trial countries (including Thailand) were repeating an HIV test within the clinics [18]. Additional research is required to determine the impact of community-based strategies on repeat-testing and whether these modalities encourage repeat-testing by individuals at increased risk of HIV infection [60].

In conclusion, this review provides evidence that interventions to increase HIV-testing are effective at reaching men. To increase men's HIV-testing at a population level, country and time-specific combinations of available strategies are likely to be required [58]. Additional research to determine whether these strategies encourage repeat-testing by high-risk HIV-negative men is required to support decision-making in countries opting for treatment as prevention initiatives.
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