

Supplementary Table 2. Characteristics of Studies that were Excluded after Full Text Review.

1st Author	Year	Country	Study Design	N	Reason for Exclusion
Arrossi, S. [1]	2015	Argentina	Experimental	6013	Did not measure acceptability or sampling preference
Barata, P.C. [2]	2008	Canada	Cross-sectional	44	Did not self-sample
Cadman, L. [3]	2015	England	Cross-sectional	185	Did not self-sample
Castle, P.E. [4]	2011	U.S.	Cross-sectional	119	Did not measure acceptability or sampling preference
Darlin, L. [5]	2013	Sweden	Experimental	1,500	Did not measure acceptability or sampling preference
Flores, Y. [6]	2003	Mexico	Cross-sectional	7,872	Did not measure acceptability or sampling preference
Forrest, S. [7]	2004	England	Cross-sectional	200	Did not self-sample
Galbraith, K.V. [8]	2014	U.S.	Cross-sectional	199	Did not measure acceptability or sampling preference
Hill, E. M. [9]	2011	New Zealand	Cross-sectional	257	Did not self-sample
Hill, E. M. [10]	2009	Canada	Cross-sectional	259	Did not self-sample
Howard, M. [11]	2009	Canada	Cross-sectional	77	Did not self-sample
Jones, H. [12]	2010	U.S.	Cross-sectional	198	Did not measure acceptability or sampling preference
Kidder, E.O. [13]	2014	U.S.	Cross-sectional	476	Did not self-sample
Krueger, M. [14]	2013	Haiti	Cross-sectional	1,836	Did not measure acceptability or sampling preference
Mahomed, K. [15]	2014	South Africa	Cross-sectional	106	Did not self-sample
Mitchell, S. [16]	2011	Uganda	Cross-sectional	300	Did not self-sample
Mullins, R. [17]	2014	Australia	Cross-sectional	2526	Did not self-sample
Penaranda, E. [18]	2014	Mexico	Cross-sectional	21	Did not self-sample
Petignat, P. [19]	2007	11 countries	Systematic Review	5441	Did not measure acceptability or sampling preference
Richman, A. R. [20]	2011	U.S.	Cross-sectional	30	Did not self-sample
Rositch, A.F. [21]	2012	Kenya	Cross-sectional	409	Did not self-sample
Scarinci, I.C. [22]	2013	U.S.	Cross-sectional	96	Did not measure acceptability or sampling preference
Smith, L.W. [23]	2014	Canada	Cross-sectional	981	Did not self-sample
Szarewski, A. [24]	2009	England	Cross-sectional	28	Did not self-sample
Ting, J. [25]	2013	Kenya	Cross-sectional	344	Insufficient data for effect sizes
Vanderpool, R. C. [26]	2014	U.S.	Cross-sectional	31	Did not measure acceptability or sampling preference

References

1. Arrossi, S., et al., *Effect of self-collection of HPV DNA offered by community health workers at home visits on uptake of screening for cervical cancer (the EMA study): a population-based cluster-randomised trial*. *Lancet Glob Health*, 2015. 3(2): p. e85-94. PMID: 25617202.
2. Barata, P.C., et al., *Discussions about self-obtained samples for HPV testing as an alternative for cervical cancer prevention*. *J Psychosom Obstet Gynaecol*, 2008. 29(4): p. 251-7. PMID: 18608824.
3. Cadman, L., et al., *Attitudes towards cytology and human papillomavirus self-sample collection for cervical screening among Hindu women in London, UK: a mixed methods study*. *J Fam Plann Reprod Health Care*, 2015. 41(1): p. 38-47. PMID: 24521934.
4. Castle, P.E., et al., *Comparative community outreach to increase cervical cancer screening in the Mississippi Delta*. *Prev Med*, 2011. 52(6): p. 452-5. PMID: 21497619.
5. Darlin, L., et al., *Comparison of use of vaginal HPV self-sampling and offering flexible appointments as strategies to reach long-term non-attending women in organized cervical screening*. *J Clin Virol*, 2013. 58(1): p. 155-60. PMID: 23867008.
6. Flores, Y., et al., *Improving cervical cancer screening in Mexico: results from the Morelos HPV Study*. *Salud Publica Mex*, 2003. 45 Suppl 3: p. S388-98. PMID: 14746032.
7. Forrest, S., et al., *Attitudes to self-sampling for HPV among Indian, Pakistani, African-Caribbean and white British women in Manchester, UK*. *J Med Screen*, 2004. 11(2): p. 85-8. PMID: 15153323.
8. Galbraith, K.V., et al., *Perceptions of mailed HPV self-testing among women at higher risk for cervical cancer*. *J Community Health*, 2014. 39(5): p. 849-56. PMID: 25120228.
9. Hill, E.M. and M.L. Gick, *The big five and cervical screening barriers: Evidence for the influence of conscientiousness, extraversion and openness*. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 2011. 50(5): p. 662-667. PMID:
10. Hill, E.M., *Cervical cancer screening barriers and prospective method choices: the influence of attachment, personality and health beliefs (Unpublished master's thesis)*. August 2009, Carleton University.
11. Howard, M., et al., *Barriers to acceptance of self-sampling for human papillomavirus across ethnolinguistic groups of women*. *Can J Public Health*, 2009. 100(5): p. 365-9. PMID: 19994740.
12. Jones, H., *New approaches to screening for cervical cancer (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. 2010, Columbia University.
13. Kidder, E.O., *Self-administered HPV Testing as a Cervical Cancer Screening Option: Exploring the Perspectives of Hispanic and Arab Women in the United States (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. August 2014, The George Washington University.
14. Krueger, M., *Examining the Diagnostic Performance of Vaginal, Self-Screening for High-Risk Human Papillomavirus in Port-au-Prince, Haiti (Unpublished master's thesis)*. 2013, Duke University.
15. Mahomed, K., et al., *Human papillomavirus (HPV) testing on self-collected specimens: perceptions among HIV positive women attending rural and urban clinics in South Africa*. *Pan Afr Med J*, 2014. 17: p. 189. PMID: 25396015.
16. Mitchell, S., et al., *Assessing women's willingness to collect their own cervical samples for HPV testing as part of the ASPIRE cervical cancer screening project in Uganda*. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*, 2011. 114(2): p. 111-5. PMID: 21669428.
17. Mullins, R., K. Scalzo, and F. Sultana, *Self-sampling for cervical screening: could it overcome some of the barriers to the Pap test?* *J Med Screen*, 2014. 21(4): p. 201-6. PMID: 25312640.
18. Penaranda, E., et al., *Attitudes toward self-sampling for cervical cancer screening among primary care attendees living on the US-Mexico border*. *South Med J*, 2014. 107(7): p. 426-32. PMID: 25010584.

19. Petignat, P., et al., *Are self-collected samples comparable to physician-collected cervical specimens for human papillomavirus DNA testing? A systematic review and meta-analysis.* *Gynecol Oncol*, 2007. 105(2): p. 530-5. PMID: 17335880.
20. Richman, A.R., et al., *Optimising human papillomavirus self-testing for high risk women.* *Sex Transm Infect*, 2011. 87(2): p. 118-22. PMID: 21115503.
21. Rositch, A.F., et al., *Knowledge and acceptability of pap smears, self-sampling and HPV vaccination among adult women in Kenya.* *PLoS One*, 2012. 7(7): p. e40766. PMID: 22808257.
22. Scarinci, I.C., et al., *Acceptability and usability of self-collected sampling for HPV testing among African-American women living in the Mississippi Delta.* *Womens Health Issues*, 2013. 23(2): p. e123-30. PMID: 23410619.
23. Smith, L.W., et al., *Women's intentions to self-collect samples for human papillomavirus testing in an organized cervical cancer screening program.* *BMC Public Health*, 2014. 14: p. 1060. PMID: 25303975.
24. Szarewski, A., et al., *Exploring the acceptability of two self-sampling devices for human papillomavirus testing in the cervical screening context: a qualitative study of Muslim women in London.* *J Med Screen*, 2009. 16(4): p. 193-8. PMID: 20054094.
25. Ting, J., et al., *High-risk human papillomavirus messenger RNA testing in physician- and self-collected specimens for cervical lesion detection in high-risk women, Kenya.* *Sex Transm Dis*, 2013. 40(7): p. 584-9. PMID: 23965776.
26. Vanderpool, R.C., et al., *Self-collecting a cervico-vaginal specimen for cervical cancer screening: an exploratory study of acceptability among medically underserved women in rural Appalachia.* *Gynecol Oncol*, 2014. 132 Suppl 1: p. S21-5. PMID: 24125753.