METHODS

The following steps were undertaken:

1. Search databases: Embase, Medline, PsycINFO, Cochrane Library and Scopus
3. Search terms covered: HIV, HIV testing, barriers to testing and Europe
4. Studies published before and after intervention data were considered
5. Two independent reviewers undertook title/abstract screening, full-text review, data extraction and quality assessment using NICE/AXIS checklists.2,3
6. Authors of conference abstracts without available full-texts were contacted for poster copies or oral presentation slides
7. Analyses were performed to describe testing approaches including by setting of testing

RESULTS

1. There were 368 articles identified through the systematic review (Fig 1):
   - Approaches to HIV testing
   - Economic evaluations
   - Barriers to testing
   - Two-thirds of studies were peer-reviewed

2. A number of approaches to increase HIV testing:
   - HIV testing implementation strategy
   - Inclusion criteria: Studies set in the EU/EEA
   - Adults (aged ≥15 years)
   - Two independent reviewers undertook title/abstract screening, full-text review, data extraction and quality assessment using NICE/AXIS checklists.2,3
   - Studies set in non-EU/EEA countries
   - All languages

3. Other studies used novel technologies including apps, text messages and social media (Table 3).
4. Analyses were performed to describe testing approaches including by setting of testing

DISCUSSION

1. This systematic review found several promising strategies to achieve high HIV testing coverage across a variety of settings in Europe.
2. Audits showed considerable missed opportunities for earlier HIV diagnosis.
3. There are a number of barriers to HIV testing at individual, provider and structural levels, similar to barriers reported in an earlier review4.
4. Few intervention studies reported before/after data, making it difficult to evaluate the improvement in test coverage.
5. The majority of testing interventions were implemented in the UK, with none from Eastern Europe.
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