### Appendices

**Appendix I: Search strategy**

**Pubmed Search**

Search conducted on the 7th September 2021

**Search String**

```
(((uterine cervical neoplasm [MeSH Terms]) OR (cervical cancer [Title/Abstract] OR uterus cancer [Title/Abstract] OR cervix cancer [Title/Abstract] OR uterine cancer [Title/Abstract] OR cervical carcinoma [Title/Abstract] OR cervical neoplasm [Title/Abstract]))

AND

((early detection of cancer [MeSH Terms]) OR (screening [Title/Abstract] OR cervical screening [Title/Abstract] OR medical examination [Title/Abstract] OR mass screening [Title/Abstract] OR early detection of cancer [Title/Abstract] OR diagnosis [Title/Abstract] OR diagnostic screening programs [Title/Abstract]))

AND

((Cost-Benefit Analysis [MeSH Terms]) OR (economic evaluation [Title/Abstract] OR economic appraisal [Title/Abstract] OR economic valuation [Title/Abstract] OR economic assessment [Title/Abstract] OR cost-effectiveness analysis [Title/Abstract] OR cost benefit analysis [Title/Abstract]))
```

**Cochrane Search**

Search Name:

- **Date Run:** 06/09/2021 22:14:16

**Comment:**

| ID | Search Hits |
|----|-------------|
| #1 | MeSH descriptor: [Uterine Cervical Neoplasms] explode all trees (2183) |
| #2 | (cervical cancer OR uterus cancer OR cervix cancer OR uterine cancer OR cervical carcinoma OR cervical neoplasm):ti,ab,kw (7426) |
| #3 | MeSH descriptor: [Early Detection of Cancer] explode all trees (1309) |
| #4 | (early detection of cancer OR screening OR cervical screening OR medical examination OR mass screening OR early detection of cancer OR diagnosis OR diagnostic screening programs):ti,ab,kw (208527) |
MeSH descriptor: [Cost-Benefit Analysis] explode all trees (7324)

(Cost-Benefit Analysis OR economic evaluation OR economic appraisal OR economic valuation OR economic assessment OR cost-effectiveness analysis OR cost benefit analysis):ti,ab,kw (27762)

#7 #1 OR #2 (7792)

#8 #3 OR #4 (208527)

#9 #5 OR #6 (27762)

#10 #7 AND #8 AND #9 (128)

**SCOPUS Search**

Search conducted on the 7 September 2021.

( TITLE-ABS-KEY ("cervical cancer" OR "cancer of the cervix" OR "uterine cervix" OR "uterine cancer" OR "cervical carcinoma" OR "uterine cervical neoplasms") AND TITLE-ABS-KEY ("screening" OR "cervical screening" OR "medical examination" OR "mass screening" OR "early detection of cancer" OR "diagnosis" OR "diagnostic screening programs") AND TITLE-ABS-KEY ("economic evaluation" OR "economic appraisal" OR "economic valuation" OR "economic assessment" OR "cost-effectiveness analysis" OR "cost benefit analysis") ) AND ( LIMIT-TO ( OA, "publisherfullgold" ) )

**NHSHEED Search**

Search conducted on the 12th of November 2020.

(("Uterine Cervical Neoplasms"[Mesh]) AND "Early Detection of Cancer"[Mesh]) AND "Cost-Benefit Analysis"[Mesh]

**NHEED Search**

Search conducted on the 12th of November 2020.

(("Uterine Cervical Neoplasms"[Mesh]) AND "Early Detection of Cancer"[Mesh]) AND "Cost-Benefit Analysis"[Mesh]
# Appendix II: Data extraction instrument

## Review title: A Systematic Review of Economic Evaluations of Cervical Cancer Screening Methods

| Review Variables                                                                 |   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Reviewer                                                                       | 2. |
| 3. Date                                                                           | 4. |
| 5. Year                                                                           | 6. |
| 7. Author                                                                         | 8. |
| 9. Record Number                                                                  | 10. |
| 11. Sources of funding                                                            | 12. |
| 13. Competing interests                                                           | 14. |
| 15. Publication Type                                                              | 16. |
| 17. Method of Evaluation                                                          | 18. |
| 19. Study Perspective                                                             | 20. |
| 21. Intervention                                                                  | 22. |
| 23. Comparator                                                                    | 24. |
| 25. Setting                                                                       | 26. |
| 27. Geography                                                                     | 28. |
| 29. Participants                                                                  | 30. |
| 31. Source of effectiveness data                                                  | 32. |
| 33. Authors conclusions                                                           | 34. |
| 35. Reviewers comments                                                            | 36. |

## Clinical Effectiveness Results

| Clinical Effectiveness Results                                                                 |   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 37. Study design                                                                                | 38. |
| 39. Year range of primary studies                                                               | 40. |
| 41. Analysis used                                                                                | 42. |
| 43. Data source of effects                                                                       | 44. |
| 45. Method of measurements of effects                                                            | 46. |
| 47. Method of valuation of effects                                                               | 48. |
| 49. Clinical outcome results                                                                     | 50. |

## Economic Effectiveness Results

| Economic Effectiveness Results                                                                 |   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 51. Dates of economic data                                                                      | 52. |
| 53. Modelling used                                                                               | 54. |
| 55. Measure of benefits used in economic evaluation                                              | 56. |
| 57. Direct costs                                                                                 | 58. |
| 59. Indirect costs                                                                               | 60. |
| 61. Currency                                                                                    | 62. |
| 63. Time frame of analysis                                                                       | 64. |
| 65. Discount rate                                                                                | 66. |
| 67. Discount rate for costs                                                                      | 68. |
| 69. Discount rate for effects                                                                    | 70. |
| 71. Inflation rate                                                                               | 72. |
| 73. Reference year                                                                               | 74. |
| 75. Methods for identifying resource use                                                          | 76. |
| 77. Assumptions for the measurement of resources                                                 | 78. |
| 79. Methods used to calculate unit costs                                                          | 80. |
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|   |   |
|---|---|
| 81. Statistical Analyses | 82. |
| 83. Estimated benefits uses in EE | 84. |
| 85. Cost results | 86. |
| 87. Synthesis of costs and results | 88. |
| 89. Analysis of uncertainty outcomes of analysis of sensitivity analysis | 90. |
| 91. Outcomes of analysis of sensitivity analysis | 92. |
### Appendix III: JBI standardised tool and Drummond’s Checklist

| Questions                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Is there a well-defined question?                                        |
| 2  | Is there comprehensive description of alternatives?                     |
| 3  | Are all important and relevant costs and outcomes for each alternative identified? |
| 4  | Has clinical effectiveness been established?                            |
| 5  | Are costs and outcomes measured accurately?                             |
| 6  | Are costs and outcomes valued credibly?                                |
| 7  | Are costs and outcomes adjusted for differential timing?                |
| 8  | Is there an incremental analysis of costs and consequences?             |
| 9  | Were sensitivity analyses conducted to investigate uncertainty in estimates of cost or consequence? |
| 10 | Do study results include all issues of concern to users?                |
| 11 | Are the results generalizable to the setting of interest in the review? |
Appendix IV: Phillip et al Checklist for Model-Based Studies

| Model Element                              | Present | Absent | Unclear |
|--------------------------------------------|---------|--------|---------|
| Statement of decision problem/objective    |         |        |         |
| Statement of scope/perspective             |         |        |         |
| Rational for structure                     |         |        |         |
| Structural assumptions                     |         |        |         |
| Strategies/Comparators                     |         |        |         |
| Model type                                 |         |        |         |
| Time horizon                               |         |        |         |
| Disease states or pathways                 |         |        |         |
| Cycle length                               |         |        |         |
| Data identification                        |         |        |         |
| Data modelling                             |         |        |         |
| Baseline data                              |         |        |         |
| Treatment effects                          |         |        |         |
| Costs                                      |         |        |         |
| Quality of life weights                    |         |        |         |
| Data incorporation                         |         |        |         |
| Assessment of uncertainty                  |         |        |         |
| Methodological uncertainty                 |         |        |         |
| Structural uncertainty                     |         |        |         |
| Heterogeneity uncertainty                  |         |        |         |
| Parameter uncertainty                      |         |        |         |
| Internal consistency                       |         |        |         |
| External consistency                       |         |        |         |
Appendix V: Studies excluded on full text

1. Khushalani JS, Trogdon JG, Ekhueme DU, Yabroff KR. Economics of public health programs for underserved populations: a review of economic analysis of the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program.

*Reason for exclusion:* Article does not compare cervical screening methods. Article describes Economic analyses and types of analyses.

2. Messoudi W, Elmahi T, Nejjari C, Tachfouti N, Zidouh A, Saadani G, Moríña D, Diaz M. Cervical cancer prevention in Morocco: a model-based cost-effectiveness analysis.

*Reason for exclusion:* Compares VIA to no screening at all or to HPV vaccination.

3. de Kok IMCM, Korfage IJ, van den Hout WB, Helmerhorst TJM, Habbema JDF, Essink-Bot ML, van Ballegooijen M. Quality of life assumptions determine which cervical cancer screening strategies are cost-effective.

*Reason for exclusion:* Evaluates quality of life assumptions that that are used to calculate cost-effectiveness in screening.

4. Campos NG, Tsu V, Jeronimo J, Mvundura M, Kim JJ. Estimating the value of point-of-care HPV testing in three low- and middle-income countries: a modelling study.

*Reason for exclusion:* Measures cost-effectiveness of HPV (only) screening at various coverages.

5. Li Y, Carlson E, Villarreal R, Meraz L, Pagán JA. Cost-effectiveness of a patient navigation program to improve cervical cancer screening.

*Reason for exclusion:* Evaluates cost-effectiveness of patient navigation programs, not screening methods.

6. Mezei AK, Armstrong HL, Pedersen HN, Campos NG, Mitchell SM, Sekikubo M, Byamugisha JK, Kim JJ, Bryan S, Ogilvie GS. Cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer screening methods in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review.

*Reason for exclusion:* Study is a systematic review.
7. Vodicka EL, Babigumira JB, Mann MR, Kosgei RJ, Lee F, Mugo NR, Okech TC, Sakr SR, Garrison LP Jr, Chung MH. Costs of integrating cervical cancer screening at an HIV clinic in Kenya.

*Reason for exclusion:* No: Costing study and is therefore a partial economic evaluation, not full.

8. Pedersen K, Sørbye SW, Burger EA, Lönnberg S, Kristiansen IS. Using Decision-Analytic Modelling to Isolate Interventions That Are Feasible, Efficient and Optimal: An Application from the Norwegian Cervical Cancer Screening Program.

*Reason for exclusion:* Compares cytology to colposcopy.

9. Huh WK, Williams E, Huang J, Bramley T, Poulios N. Cost-effectiveness of human papillomavirus-16/18 genotyping in cervical cancer screening.

*Reason for exclusion:* Intervention being evaluated is HPV-genotyping.

10. Nahvijou A, Hadji M, Marnani AB, Tourang F, Bayat N, Weiderpass E, Daroudi R, Sari AA, Zendehdel K. A systematic review of economic aspects of cervical cancer screening strategies worldwide: discrepancy between economic analysis and policymaking.

*Reason for exclusion:* Systematic Review

11. Berkhof J, Bogaards JA, Demirel E, Diaz M, Sharma M, Kim JJ. Cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer prevention in Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia.

*Reason for exclusion:* Evaluates the cost-effectiveness of adding HPV vaccination and does not compare screening methods.

12. Kim JJ, Campos NG, O'Shea M, Diaz M, Mutyaba I. Model-based impact and cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer prevention in sub-Saharan Africa.

*Reason for exclusion:* Examines cost-effectiveness of HPV vaccination.

13. Esselen KM, Feldman S. Cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer prevention.

*Reason for exclusion:* Methods paper describing Cost-effectiveness analysis.

14. Della Palma P, Moresco L, Giorgi Rossi P. Health technology assessment report: Computer-assisted Pap test for cervical cancer screening.
**Reason for exclusion:** No English version found.

15. de Bekker-Grob EW, de Kok IM, Bulten J, van Rosmalen J, Vedder JE, Arbyn M, Klinkhamer PJ, Siebers AG, van Ballegooijen M. Liquid-based cervical cytology using Thin Prep technology: weighing the pros and cons in a cost-effectiveness analysis.

**Reason for exclusion:** No alternative screening comparators.

16. Vokó Z, Nagyjánosi L, Margitai B, Kövi R, Tóth Z, László D, Kaló Z. Modeling cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer screening in Hungary.

**Reason for exclusion:** Singular screening method (Pap smear testing) with or without colposcopy.

17. Obradovic M, Mrhar A, Kos M. Cost-effectiveness analysis of HPV vaccination alongside cervical cancer screening programme in Slovenia.

**Reason for exclusion:** Compares the CEA of adding vaccination to one screening modality (Pap smear testing)

18. Dee A, Howell F. A cost-utility analysis of adding a bivalent or quadrivalent HPV vaccine to the Irish cervical screening programme.

**Reason for exclusion:** Compares the cost-effectiveness of adding vaccination to screening.

19. Chuck A. Cost-effectiveness of 21 alternative cervical cancer screening strategies.

**Reason for exclusion:** Comparators beyond scope

20. Ratushnyak, S., Hoogendoorn, M., van Baal, P.H.M. Cost-Effectiveness of Cancer Screening: Health and Costs in Life Years Gained.

**Reason for exclusion:** Does not compare cervical cancer screening strategies.

21. Sander, B., Wong, W.W.L., Yeung, M.W., Ormanidhi, O., Atkin, K., Murphy, J., Krahn, M., Deeks, S.L. The cost-utility of integrated cervical cancer prevention strategies in the Ontario setting - Can we do better?

**Reason for exclusion:** Provides utility and cost-effectiveness for combining screening with vaccination.
22. Vokó, Z., Nagyjánosi, L., Margitai, B., Kövi, R., Tóth, Z., László, D., Kaló, Z. Modeling cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer screening in Hungary.

*Reason for exclusion:* Uses irrelevant comparators - Compares cytology with colposcopy to cytology with no colposcopy.

23. De Koning, H. The cost-effectiveness of cancer screening.

*Reason for exclusion:* Full text not available.

24. Han, L; Chang, X; Song, P; Gao, L; Zhang, Y; An, L; Shen, J. An on-going study of three different cervical cancer screening strategies based on primary healthcare facilities in Beijing China.

*Reason for exclusion:* Does not report any ICERS or relevant economic evaluation outcomes.

25. Kitchener, HC; Blanks, R; Cubie, H; Desai, M; Dunn, G; Legood, R; Gray, A; Sadique, Z; Moss, S. MAVARIC - a comparison of automation-assisted and manual cervical screening: a randomised controlled trial.

*Reason for exclusion:* Health technology intervention and comparator beyond scope of study.

26. Sankaranarayanan, R; Budukh, AM; Rajkumar, R. Effective screening programmes for cervical cancer in low- and middle-income developing countries.

*Reason for exclusion:* Does not provide an economic evaluation/analyses.

27. Bidus M A, Maxwell G L, Kulasingam S, Rose G S, Elkas J C, Chernofsky M, Myers E R. Cost effectiveness analysis of liquid-based cytology and human papillomavirus testing in cervical cancer screening.

*Reason for exclusion:* Compares the same strategy, only different sensitivities.

28. Taylor L A, Sorensen S V, Ray N F, Halpern M T, Harper D M. Cost-effectiveness of the conventional Papanicolaou test with a new adjunct to cytological screening for squamous cell carcinoma of the uterine cervix and its precursors.

*Reason for exclusion:* Compares Pap to Pap and Speculoscopy.
29. Legood R, Gray A, Wolstenholme J, Moss S. Lifetime effects, costs, and cost effectiveness of testing for human papillomavirus to manage low grade cytological abnormalities: results of the NHS pilot studies.

_Reason for exclusion:_ Focuses on triaging women who already have some level of CIN.

30. Diaz M, Kim JJ, Albero G, de Sanjose S, Clifford G, Bosch FX, Goldie SJ. Health and economic impact of HPV 16 and 18 vaccination and cervical cancer screening in India.

_Reason for exclusion:_ Compares vaccination versus unvaccinated populations.

31. Ginsberg GM, Lauer JA, Zelle S, Baeten S, Baltussen R. Cost effectiveness of strategies to combat breast, cervical, and colorectal cancer in sub-Saharan Africa and South East Asia: mathematical modelling study.

_Reason for exclusion:_ Does not specify comparators and outcomes.
### Appendix VI: Characteristics of Included Studies

**Table: Characteristics of Included Studies - Economic Evaluation Form**

| ID # | Study | Economic Evaluation Type | Study Perspective | Study Design | Participant characteristics | Study Setting/Geography | Funding Source |
|------|-------|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| 1    | Rosa Legood et al.2005 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Health service perspective | Primary | 131, 178 women aged 30-59 | Nargis Dutt Memorial Cancer Hospital, India | Not declared |
| 2    | Xie et al.2017 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | User perspective | Primary | 3086 women aged 36-65 years | Rural region in China | Institute of Cancer Prevention and Control (Wuhan, China) |
| 3    | Campos et al. 2015 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Not reported | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of Ugandan women | Health centres and Homes, Uganda | US National Cancer Institute |
| 4    | Campos et al. 2014 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Societal perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical population of women aged 30-49 years | El Salvador | Basic Health International, Einhorn Family Charitable Trust |
| 5    | Skroumpelos et al. 2019 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Social Health Insurance perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of Greece women aged 25-65 | Greece Public Health System, Greece | No funding received |
| 6    | Pista et al. 2019 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Public Healthcare Payer | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of 2,078,039 Portugue | Portugal | Roche SistemasDiagnosticos LDA |
| #  | Authors            | Type                          | Setting                  | Cohort Description                                                                 | Country     | Institute/Agency                          |
|----|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 7  | Termrungruangler et al. 2019 | Cost-effective ness analysis | Healthca re payers perspect ive | Hypothetical cohort of 67,959 360 Thai women aged 30-65 | Thailand    | Roche Diagnostics                          |
| 8  | Vasilakos et al. 2019 | Cost-effective ness evaluatio n | Healthca re payers perspect ive | Unscreene d women aged 25 years and living in Switzerland without cervical cancer | Switzerland | Not reported                              |
| 9  | Campos et al. 2018 | Cost-effective ness applicati on | Societal Perspect ive | Hypothetical cohort of women aged 30-65 | El Salvador | Einhorn Family Charitable Trust           |
| 10 | Mezei et al. 2018 | Cost-effective ness analysis | Societal Perspect ive | Hypothetical cohort of Ugandan women | Rural Uganda | Canadian Institute for Health Research     |
| 11 | Lew et al. 2018 | Cost-effective ness Analysis | Health services perspect ive | Hypothetical cohort of Australian women aged 10-84 | Australia | Department of Health, Australia            |
| 12 | Barre et al. 2017 | Cost effective ness analysis | All payers perspect ive | A hypothetical closed cohort of 100,000 French women | France | National cancer institute                 |
|   | Study Authors | Study Year | Study Approach | Perspective | Hypothetical Cohort | Study Setting | Sponsor(s) |
|---|---------------|------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|------------|
| 1 | Campos et al. | 2017       | Cost-effective analysis | Societal Perspective | Hypothetical cohort of Nicaraguan women aged 30-59 years | Nicaragua's public sector health facilities | Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation |
| 2 | Sharma et al. | 2016       | Cost-effective analysis | Societal Perspective | Hypothetical cohort of Lebanese women | Lebanon | Health Decision Science, Harvard T Chan School of Public Health |
| 3 | Jin et al.    | 2016       | Cost-effective analysis | Payer perspective | Retrospective cohort of 99,549 women tested from 2004-2010 | Cleveland Clinic, United States of America | Cleveland Clinic Research Program Committee |
| 4 | Felix et al.  | 2016       | Cost-effective analysis | Healthcare payer’s perspective | Hypothetical cohort of 1 million USA women aged 30-70 | United States of America | Not reported |
| 5 | Lince-Deroche et al. | 2015       | Cost-effective analysis | Provider perspective | 1,202 HIV Positive South African women aged 18-65 | South Africa | USAID |
| 6 | Guerrero et al. | 2015       | Cost-utility analysis | Health systems perspective | Filipino women aged 30-45, pre-adolescent Filipino | Philippines | Not reported |
|   | Authors            | Type                          | Model          | Cohort Description                          | Country/Institution                                      |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Burger et al. 2012 | Cost-effective ness analysis | Societal Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of Norwegian women | Norway, University of Oslo, The Norwegian Cancer Society, US National Cancer Institute, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation |
| 2 | Shi et al. 2011    | Cost-effective ness analysis | Societal Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of Chinese women | Rural China, Chinese Ministry of Science and Technology |
| 3 | Flores et al. 2010 | Cost-effective ness analysis | Perspective of Mexican Institute of Social Security (IMSS) in Morelos, Mexico | Retrospective cohort of Mexican women aged 20-80 | Mexico |
| 4 | Sroczynski et al. 2011 | Cost-effective ness analysis | German Healthcare System | Hypothetical cohort of German women aged 15 and older | Germany, German Agency for HTA |
| 5 | Kim et al. 2005    | Cost-effective ness analysis | Societal Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of women | United Kingdom, Netherlands, France, Italy, Not reported |
| 6 | Sherlaw-Johnson. 2004 | Cost-effective ness analysis | Healthca re provider perspective | Hypothetical cohort of women in the UK | United Kingdom, Not reported |
| No. | Authors                           | Study Type                        | Study Design | Population Description                                                                 | Country/Region                                                                 |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 25  | Chow et al. 2010                  | Cost-effectiveness analysis       | Department of Health perspective | Hypothetical cohort of Taiwanese women aged 30 and above                                 | Taiwan "Bureau of Health Promotion, Department of Health of the Republic of China (Taiwan) |
| 26  | Campos et al. 2013                 | Cost-effectiveness analysis       | Not reported | Hypothetical cohorts of women eligible for screening in respective countries            | Kenya, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zimbabwe                               |
| 27  | de Kok et al. 2012                 | Cost-effectiveness analysis       | Not reported | Unvaccinated eight million European women born from 1939 to 1992.                       | European countries European Union, Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment |
| 28  | Cromwell et al. 2021              | Cost-effectiveness analysis       | Not reported | Primary study 19009 women aged 25-65                                                  | Canada Canadian Institute for Health Research                                    |
| 29  | Campos et al. 2015                 | Cost-effectiveness analysis       | Societal perspective             | Reported elsewhere Nicaragua, Uganda, India                                             | Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation                                                |
| 30  | Termrungruanglert et al. 2017      | Cost-effectiveness analysis       | Healthcare provider perspective  | Hypothetical cohort of women                                                           | Thailand None                                                                   |
| # | Reference | Analysis Type | Perspective | Model | Cohort Details | Country | Agency |
|---|-----------|---------------|-------------|-------|----------------|---------|--------|
| 1 | Beal et al 2014 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Not reported | Primary study | Mexican women | Mexico | Not reported |
| 2 | Tantitamit et al 2019 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Provider perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of women | Thailand | Roche Diagnostics |
| 3 | Zhao et al 2019 | Cost-effectiveness and Cost-utility analysis | Societal perspective | Model-based | 3000 women aged 35-64 | China | National Health Commission of China |
| 4 | Gamboa et al 2018 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Payer perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort | Columbia | Not reported |
| 5 | Vale et al 2021 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Payer perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of women | Brazil | 1.UNICAMP 2. Roche diagnostics |
| 6 | Chauhan et al 2020 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Societal perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of women aged 30–65 | India | Department of Health Research, India |
| 7 | Jansen et al 2020 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Societal perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of women | Netherland s | EU Framework Program |
| 8 | Ma et al 2019 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Societal perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of women | China | National Health Commission of China |
| 9 | Sroczynski et al 2010 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Payer perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of women | Germany | Not reported |
| 10 | Berkhof et al 2010 | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Payer perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of 4000 | Netherland s | The Netherlands Organisation |
|   | Analysis Methodology | Health Perspective | Hypothetical Cohort | Location | Funding Body |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------|--------------|
| 1 | Vanni et al 2011     | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Health systems perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of women | Brazil | Evando Chagras Clinical Research Institute |
| 2 | Goldie et al 2005    | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Not reported | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of women | India, Kenya, Peru, South Africa, Thailand | Not reported |
| 3 | Lew et al 2016       | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Health services perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of women | New Zealand | Ministry of Health, New Zealand |
| 4 | Campos et al 2018    | Cost-effectiveness analysis | Societal perspective | Model-based | Hypothetical cohort of women | South Africa | Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation |
## Appendix VII: Abstract Checklist

| Section and Topic | Item # | Checklist item                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Reported (Yes/No) |
|-------------------|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| **TITLE**         |        |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                   |
| Title             | 1      | Identify the report as a systematic review.                                                                                                                                                                 | **Yes**           |
| **BACKGROUND**    |        |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                   |
| Objectives        | 2      | Provide an explicit statement of the main objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.                                                                                                                                 | **Yes**           |
| **METHODS**       |        |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                   |
| Eligibility criteria | 3   | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review.                                                                                                                                               | **Yes**           |
| Information sources | 4  | Specify the information sources (e.g. databases, registers) used to identify studies and the date when each was last searched.                                                                               | **Yes**           |
| Risk of bias      | 5      | Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies.                                                                                                                                     | **Yes**           |
| Synthesis of results | 6  | Specify the methods used to present and synthesise results.                                                                                                                                              | **Yes**           |
| **RESULTS**       |        |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                   |
| Included studies  | 7      | Give the total number of included studies and participants and summarise relevant characteristics of studies.                                                                                             | **Yes**           |
| Synthesis of results | 8  | Present results for main outcomes, preferably indicating the number of included studies and participants for each. If meta-analysis was done, report the summary estimate and confidence/credible interval. If comparing groups, indicate the direction of the effect (i.e. which group is favoured). | **Yes**           |
| **DISCUSSION**    |        |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                   |
| Limitations of evidence | 9 | Provide a brief summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (e.g. study risk of bias, inconsistency and imprecision).                                                                | **Yes**           |
| Interpretation    | 10     | Provide a general interpretation of the results and important implications.                                                                                                                                | **Yes**           |
| **OTHER**         |        |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                   |
| Funding           | 11     | Specify the primary source of funding for the review.                                                                                                                                                      | **YES**           |
| Section and Topic | Item # | Checklist item                                                                 | Reported (Yes/No) |
|-------------------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Registration      | 12     | Provide the register name and registration number.                               | Yes               |

*From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71*