

Appendix 1: Literature Search

A comprehensive literature search was carried out on October 11, 2021, and updated on July 19, 2022. Five databases were searched to look for information on dual treponemal and non-treponemal test in the diagnosis of syphilis and yaws.

1.1 Search methodology

The search strategy was initially developed in Ovid and adapted for the other databases. The search terms were built around overarching terms like “RDT”, “point of care test”, “treponemal”, “non-treponemal”, “syphilis” and “yaws”; relevant terms were included as well. The search limits were from 2010 to current. The search strategy was refined with the research team until the results retrieved reflected the scope of the project.

The following database were searched:

1. OvidSP Medline® All, 1946 to July 19, 2022
2. OvidSP Embase Classic + Embase, 1974 to July 19, 2022
3. OvidSP Global Health, 1973 to July 19, 2022
4. EBSCO CINAHL Complete, complete database
5. Web of Science, All Database,
 - a) Web of Science Core Collections
 - b) *Current Contents Connect*
 - c) *BIOSIS Previews*
 - d) *CAB Abstracts*
 - e) *MEDLINE*
6. Preprints (MedRxiv, bioRxiv, SSRN)

1.2 Search results

| Database name | Number of references before removal of duplicates |
|--|---|
| OvidSP Medline® + Embase + Global Health | 530 |
| CINAHL complete | 109 |
| Web of Science | 111 |
| Total | 750 |

1.3.1 OvidSP Medline® + Embase + Global Health

| Database name | Medline, Embase, Global Health |
|----------------------------|---|
| Database platform | OvidSP |
| Dates of database coverage | 1946 to July 19, 2022 1974 to July 19, 2022 1973 to July 19, 2022 |
| Date searched | July 19, 2022 |
| Searched by | YZ |
| Number of hits | 530 |

| # | Query | Results from July 19, 2022 |
|----|--|----------------------------|
| 1 | exp syphilis/ | 90772 |
| 2 | syphilis.mp. | 110496 |
| 3 | exp yaws/ | 5120 |
| 4 | yaws.mp. | 5625 |
| 5 | exp Treponema pallidum/ | 31646 |
| 6 | treponema*.mp. | 50740 |
| 7 | (non-treponema* or nontreponema*).mp. | 1519 |
| 8 | 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 | 116245 |
| 9 | 5 and 6 or 7 | 51534 |
| 10 | 8 and 9 | 36717 |
| 11 | (RDT or RST).mp. | 14403 |
| 12 | (rapid adj2 diagnos* adj2 test*).mp. | 17859 |
| 13 | (rapid adj2 screening adj2 test*).mp | 2717 |
| 14 | (point-of-care adj3 test*).mp. | 38901 |
| 15 | (point adj1 of adj1 care adj3 test*).mp. | 4571 |
| 16 | 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 | 66150 |
| 17 | 10 and 16 | 618 |
| 18 | Limit 2010 to current | 530 |

1.3.2 EBSCO CINAHL

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Database name | CINAHL complete |
| Database platform | EBSCOhost |
| Dates of database coverage | 2000 to July 19, 2022 |
| Date searched | July 19, 2022 |
| Searched by | YZ |
| Number of hits | 109 |

| # | Query | Results from July 19, 2022 |
|---|--|----------------------------|
| 1 | TX syphilis OR TX yaws | 16,231 |
| 2 | TX treponema* OR (TX non-treponema* or nontreponema*) | 2,348 |
| 3 | 1 AND 2 | 1,454 |
| 4 | (TX rapid N2 diagnos* N2 test*) OR (TX rapid N2 screening N2 test*) OR (TX RDT OR TX RST) OR (TX point-of-care N3 test*) | 47,143 |

| OR (TX point N1 of N1 care N3 test*) | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----|
| 7 | 3 AND 4 | 141 |
| 8 | Limit from 2010 to current | 109 |

1.3.3 Web of Science

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Database name | Web of Science All Database |
| Database platform | Clarivate Web of Science |
| Dates of database coverage | Complete to July 19, 2022 |
| Date searched | July 19, 2022 |
| Searched by | YZ |
| Number of hits | 111 |

| # | Query | Results from July 19, 2022 |
|---|--|----------------------------|
| 1 | ALL=(syphilis OR yaws) | 47,459 |
| 2 | (ALL=(treponema*) OR ALL=(non-treponema* OR nontreponema*)) | 9,951 |
| 3 | 1 AND 2 | 3,748 |
| 4 | AB=(rapid NEAR/2 diagnos* NEAR/2 test* OR rapid NEAR/2 screening NEAR/2 test* OR RDT OR RST OR point-of-care NEAR/3 test* OR point NEAR/1 of NEAR/1 care NEAR/3 test*) OR TI=(rapid NEAR/2 diagnos*NEAR/2 test* OR rapid NEAR/2 screening NEAR/2 test* OR RDT OR RST OR point-of-care NEAR/3 test* OR point NEAR/1 of NEAR/1 care NEAR/3 test*) OR TS=(rapid NEAR/2 diagnos* NEAR/2 test* OR rapid NEAR/2 screening NEAR/2 test* OR RDT OR RST OR point-of-care NEAR/3 test* OR point NEAR/1 of NEAR/1 care NEAR/3 test*) | 25,687 |
| 5 | 4 AND 3 | 127 |
| 6 | Limit from 2010 to current | 111 |

1.3.4 MedRxiv

| | |
|---------------|---------|
| Database name | MedRxiv |
|---------------|---------|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Database platform | Science, Nature, The BMJ, The Scientist |
| Dates of database coverage | Complete to July 19, 2022 |
| Date searched | July 19, 2022 |
| Searched by | YZ |
| Number of hits | 32 |

| # | Query | Results from July 19, 2022 |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| 1 | Terms & Keywords =(syphilis OR yaws) | 326 |
| 2 | (Terms & Keywords =(treponema*) OR Terms & Keywords =(non-treponema* OR nontreponema*)) | 57 |
| 3 | 1 AND 2 | 32 |

1.3.5 bioRxiv

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Database name | bioRxiv |
| Database platform | bioRxiv |
| Dates of database coverage | Complete to July 19, 2022 |
| Date searched | July 19, 2022 |
| Searched by | YZ |
| Number of hits | 71 |

| # | Query | Results from July 19, 2022 |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| 1 | Terms & Keywords =(syphilis OR yaws) | 854 |
| 2 | (Terms & Keywords =(treponema*) OR Terms & Keywords =(non-treponema* OR nontreponema*)) | 370 |
| 3 | 1 AND 2 | 71 |

1.3.6 SSRN

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Database name | SSRN |
| Database platform | SSRN All |
| Dates of database coverage | Complete to July 19, 2022 |
| Date searched | July 19, 2022 |

| | |
|----------------|----|
| Searched by | YZ |
| Number of hits | 4 |

| # | Query | Results from July 19, 2022 |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| 1 | Title, Abstract, Keywords, Authors = syphilis | 73 |
| 2 | 1 AND treponema | 3 |
| 3 | 1 AND non-treponema | 1 |
| 4 | 1 AND non-treponemal | 2 |
| 5 | 1 AND nontreponema | 0 |
| 6 | 1 AND nontreponemal | 1 |
| 7 | Title, Abstract, Keywords, Authors = yaws | 3 |

Appendix 2: Summary of secondary outcomes

Acceptability

Two studies assessed the stakeholder acceptability of the dual syphilis RDT in the diagnosis of syphilis – one of them was the DPP-RDT and the other was a smartphone dongle Triplex test. The DPP-RDT for the diagnosis of syphilis and yaws was perceived by most healthcare workers (16/20) in a study in the Solomon Islands to be reliable, and this perception was reinforced by concordance with reference laboratory results.¹ The healthcare workers found the DPP-RDT more favourable in comparison to standard testing which may take a week for results to come back.¹ Healthcare workers in Rwanda also reported satisfaction for the smartphone triplex test as they did not have to rely on user interpretation for results. In terms of client acceptability, overall high levels of satisfaction were reported. The vast majority of patients in the Rwandan study (97%) would recommend the Triplex Test to others, mainly due to the rapid turnaround time but also for the simplicity of the test and the ability to diagnose both HIV and syphilis in one test.² Almost all patients (98%) also preferred the RDT testing over conventional venepuncture, as generally only one fingerprick was needed and they cited various benefits including that it was less painful, faster than that compared to venepuncture, healthcare workers would have less difficulty in obtaining a blood sample.²

Feasibility

The smartphone dongle test was found to be viewed favourably by healthcare workers in terms of feasibility. As it does not require external power to operate, it would be useful in field settings or in the case of power outages in clinics.² In general, healthcare workers found the DPP-RDT also improved access to testing in settings where testing at the clinic level was advantageous as distance and cost of getting to hospital were deemed to be barriers to testing.¹

Usability

Healthcare workers generally found the DPP-RDT to be easy to perform. All healthcare workers in one study in the Solomon Islands reported that familiarity with using the Malaria point-of-care test (POCT) helped them conduct the DPP POCT for syphilis and yaws, although some noted mistakes made with the timing of the test and volume of buffer had the potential to result in testing errors.¹ Only one healthcare worker out of 20, reported that the withdrawal of blood for fingerprick testing was difficult. Four studies assessed and compared digital and visual reading of the DPP-RDT for either syphilis or yaws.³⁻⁶ Three studies suggested there was a high level of concordance with visual and digital results for both treponemal and non-treponemal tests.^{3 4 6} However, one study in Botswana suggested that visual reading missed three out of five active syphilis infections, classifying them as past infections, and therefore suggested that the digital reader should be used to avoid missing cases with confirmed high titre non-treponemal test results.⁵

Appropriate treatment following testing

The rationale for using RDTs to better identify active infection is to eliminate lost to follow-up and reduce unnecessary treatment in clients with previously treated syphilis and yaws. In a modelling study using pilot data from three antenatal screening centres, it was discovered that the single treponemal-only test resulted in much more missed instances of syphilis infection and overtreatment in pregnant women than the dual RDT.⁷ According to Owusu-Edusei Jr's study, when RPR+TPHA was used to diagnose maternal syphilis, treatment rates declined from 100% to 67%, indicating that a large proportion of clients were lost to follow-up due to delay with the provision of test results.⁸ This lost to follow-up is concerning since these

untreated mothers are at an elevated risk of congenital syphilis and adverse birth outcomes. In another study conducted on pregnant women in Burkina Faso, of the women with RPR titres $\geq 1:8$, 16% would not be treated if they were only screened with the DPP-RDT compared to the treponemal-only rapid test.⁹ There was an unexpectedly high proportion of pregnant women who were found to be treponemal and non-treponemal positive based on reference tests (37.6%). A high proportion had high level RPR titres $\geq 1:8$ (19%), suggesting they had either been incompletely treated for untreated bejel (an endemic treponematosi), or untreated active syphilis. The study highlighted the importance of establishing baseline treponemal/non-treponemal seroprevalence in any population when identifying the most effective strategy to screen and treat for treponemal diseases.

Thus, the utility of this test will depend on the proportion of people treated for syphilis and background prevalence of syphilis. As the first syphilis infection can be detected using the cheaper single treponemal-only test, the value of the DPP-RDT is to identify individuals with syphilis or yaws with confirmed high-titre non-treponemal tests. Moreover, Yin reported that the single-treponemal test will result in overtreatment and counselling, particularly in populations with high prevalence of syphilis such as MSM.⁶

In a study on diagnosis of yaws, Avoye advocated for the use of the DPP-RDT before mass treatment to identify clients with active yaws and during resurvey to support detecting new active cases.³ Clients who were tested dually positive were given immediate treatment, and those who tested negative but had lesions were given syndromic treatment and followed up further.³ The use of DPP-RDT would potentially reduce overtreatment in mass treatment compared to the standard single-treponemal rapid test, making it a suitable tool to support diagnosis in the renewed eradication effort for yaws-endemic countries.


Cost-effectiveness

In a modelling study where several antenatal syphilis screening and treatment strategies were compared, the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of the clinical RPR approach (ICER: US\$23–138 per DALY averted) was dominated by the single treponemal-only rapid test (ICER: US\$16–53 per DALY averted), the dual treponemal–nontreponemal RDT (ICER: US\$18–76 per DALY averted) and the sequential approach (single rapid test followed by dual RDT) (ICER: US\$19–62 per DALY averted).⁷ Although the dual RDT detected more true cases of syphilis and reduced overtreatment compared to the other three strategies, the cost of per woman screened with the dual RDT was highest, with the exception of Peru where labour cost for RPR testing was high. Further univariate sensitivity analysis showed that the cost of the dual test kit had to be reduced by approximately 38% from the assumed baseline unit price of US\$2.50 to achieve the same cost per DALY averted as the treponemal-only rapid test.⁷ Even though the single treponemal-only rapid test was most cost-effective among the four strategies, it may lead to overtreatment.⁷

Yet, in another cost-effectiveness study on yaws, the sequential screening strategy (single rapid test followed by dual RDT) versus was concluded to be more cost-effective than the dual RDT for both individual diagnosis and community surveillance of yaws.¹⁰

Despite the fact that the dual RDT is more expensive than the single rapid test and RPR (excluding labor costs), Owusu-Edusei Jr discovered that test performance had a significant impact on the cost-effectiveness of antenatal syphilis screening.⁸ The greatest cost savings occurred when the sensitivity of the dual RDT was increased to 0.97 and this conclusion held

true when the unit price was varied from US\$0.50 to \$5.00, indicating that test performance has a bigger impact on cost-effectiveness than the RDT's price.⁸

Supplementary Figure 1. Risk of bias summary as percentage

Supplementary Table 1. Risk of bias of studies included for meta-analysis

| STUDY | RISK OF BIAS | | | | APPLICABILITY CONCERNS | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------|--------------------|
| | PATIENT SELECTION | INDEX TEST | REFERENCE STANDARD | FLOW AND TIMING | PATIENT SELECTION | INDEX TEST | REFERENCE STANDARD |
| Ayove (2014) ³ | − | + | + | + | − | + | + |
| Castro (2010) ¹¹ | − | ? | + | + | − | + | + |
| Castro (2010) ¹² | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Castro (2014) ¹³ | − | ? | ? | ? | − | + | + |
| Causer (2015) ¹⁴ | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Constantine (2017) ⁴ | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Guinard (2013) ¹⁵ | ? | + | + | + | ? | + | + |
| Hess (2014) ¹⁶ | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Langendorf (2019) ⁹ | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Marks (2014) ¹⁷ | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Pham (2020) ¹⁸ | − | − | + | + | − | + | + |
| Pham (2019) ¹⁹ | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + |
| Skinner (2015) ²⁰ | ? | + | + | + | ? | + | + |
| Yin (2013) ⁶ | − | + | ? | + | − | + | + |
| Zorzi (2017) ²¹ | + | + | ? | + | + | + | + |

 Low risk
  High Risk
  Unclear Risk

N.B. Quality assessment was not conducted for the two unpublished papers (Aziz et al. and Taleo et al.).

Supplementary Table 2. A) Summary of findings for treponemal test component for syphilis; B) Summary of findings for nontreponemal test component for syphilis; C) Summary of findings for treponemal test component for yaws; D) Summary of findings for nontreponemal test component for yaws

A)

| Outcome | No of studies (No of patients) | Study design | Factors that may decrease certainty of evidence | | | | | Effect per 1,000 patients tested | | | Test accuracy CoE |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | Risk of bias | Indirectness | Inconsistency | Imprecision | Publication bias | pre-test probability of 0% | pre-test probability of 10% | pre-test probability of 20% | |
| True positives (patients with syphilis) | 11 studies 4695 patients | cross-sectional | not serious a,b,c,d | not serious | serious ^e | not serious | none | 0 (0 to 0) | 93 (86 to 97) | 186 (172 to 194) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE |
| False negatives (patients incorrectly classified as not having syphilis) | | | | | | | | 0 (0 to 0) | 7 (4 to 13) | 14 (8 to 26) | |
| True negatives (patients without syphilis) | 11 studies 4762 patients | cross-sectional | not serious a,b,c,d | not serious | serious ^e | not serious | none | 983 (964 to 992) | 884 (868 to 893) | 786 (771 to 794) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE |
| False positives (patients incorrectly classified as having syphilis) | | | | | | | | 17 (8 to 36) | 15 (7 to 32) | 14 (6 to 29) | |

Explanations

- a. Most studies had low risk of patient selection bias^{4 9 12 14 16 21} and was scored “low” for risk of bias using the QUADAS checklist in the patient selection criterion. Two studies^{15 20} were unclear in their description of random sampling of patients. Three studies^{6 11 13} were at

high risk of bias in patient selection, as samples were not selected at random^{11 13}, or subjects deemed at higher risk for syphilis were oversampled.⁶

- b. All the studies had low potential of index test bias except two unclear studies.^{11 13} In one study, all the patient identifiers were removed before receipt at the CDC but it did not specify if the assay was performed blinded to the results.¹¹
- c. All the studies had low potential of reference test bias except three studies which were unclear.^{6 13 21}
- d. All the studies had low potential for flow and timing bias,^{4 6 9 11 12 14-16 20 21} except one. Castro¹³ did not present a clear description of the patient flow.
- e. There is considerable heterogeneity ($p < 0.001$), $I^2 = 96.9\%$ and 94.7% for sensitivity and specificity, respectively, with some overlap in confidence intervals

B)

| | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|
| T2 Sensitivity | 0.90 (95% CI: 0.82 to 0.95) |
| T2 Specificity | 0.97 (95% CI: 0.92 to 0.99) |

| | | | |
|------------|----|-----|-----|
| Prevalence | 0% | 10% | 20% |
|------------|----|-----|-----|

| Outcome | No of studies (No of patients) | Study design | Factors that may decrease certainty of evidence | | | | | Effect per 1,000 patients tested | | | Test accuracy CoE |
|--|--|-----------------|---|--------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Risk of bias | Indirectness | Inconsistency | Imprecision | Publication bias | pre-test probability of 0% | pre-test probability of 10% | pre-test probability of 20% | |
| True positives (patients with syphilis) | 13 studies ^a 3699 patients | cross-sectional | not serious b,c,d,e | not serious | serious ^f | not serious | none | 0 (0 to 0) | 90 (82 to 95) | 180 (164 to 190) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE |
| False negatives (patients incorrectly classified as not having syphilis) | | | | | | | | 0 (0 to 0) | 10 (5 to 18) | 20 (10 to 36) | |
| True negatives (patients without syphilis) | 13 studies ^a 6619 patients | cross-sectional | not serious | not serious | serious ^f | not serious | none | 974 (920 to 992) | 876 (828 to 893) | 779 (735 to 794) | ⊕⊕⊕○ |

| Outcome | No of studies (No of patients) | Study design | Factors that may decrease certainty of evidence | | | | | Effect per 1,000 patients tested | | | Test accuracy CoE |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------|---|--------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | Risk of bias | Indirectness | Inconsistency | Imprecision | Publication bias | pre-test probability of 0% | pre-test probability of 10% | pre-test probability of 20% | |
| False positives (patients incorrectly classified as having syphilis) | | | b,c,d,e | | | | | 26 (8 to 80) | 23 (7 to 72) | 21 (6 to 64) | MODERATE |

Explanations

- There were 2 additional studies for the nontreponemal component.^{18 19}
- Most studies had low risk of patient selection bias^{4 9 12 16 21} and was scored “low” for risk of bias using the QUADAS checklist in the patient selection criterion. Four studies^{13 15 19 20} were unclear in their description of random sampling of patients. Four studies^{6 11 13 18} were at high risk of bias in patient selection, as samples were not selected at random^{11 13 18}, or subjects deemed at higher risk for syphilis were oversampled.⁶
- Most of the studies had low potential of index test bias except three unclear studies.^{11 13 19} In one study, all the patient identifiers were removed before receipt at the CDC but it did not specify if the assay was performed blinded to the results.¹¹ Pham¹⁸ had high risk of bias.
- Four studies had unclear risk of bias for reference standard.^{6 13 19 21}
- All the studies had low potential for flow and timing bias,^{4 6 9 11 12 14-16 20 21} except two. Two studies^{13 19} did not present a clear description of the patient flow.
- There is heterogeneity observed in the studies, $I^2= 98.3%$ and $99.3%$ for sensitivity and specificity, respectively, with some overlap in confidence intervals.

C)

| T1 Sensitivity | 0.86 (95% CI: 0.66 to 0.95) | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---|----|-----|----------------------------------|---------------|
| T1 Specificity | 0.97 (95% CI: 0.94 to 0.99) | | | | | | |
| | | | Prevalence | 0% | 10% | 20% | |
| Outcome | No of studies (No) | Study design | Factors that may decrease certainty of evidence | | | Effect per 1,000 patients tested | Test accuracy |

| | of patients) | | Risk of bias | Indirectness | Inconsistency | Imprecision | Publication bias | pre-test probability of 0% | pre-test probability of 10% | pre-test probability of 20% | CoE |
|--|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| True positives (patients with yaws) | 4 studies ^a 716 patients | cross-sectional | not serious ^{b,c} | not serious | serious ^d | not serious | none | 0 (0 to 0) | 86 (66 to 95) | 171 (132 to 190) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE |
| False negatives (patients incorrectly classified as not having yaws) | | | | | | | | 0 (0 to 0) | 14 (5 to 34) | 29 (10 to 68) | |
| True negatives (patients without yaws) | 4 studies ^a 895 patients | cross-sectional | not serious ^{b,c} | not serious | serious ^d | not serious | none | 969 (935 to 985) | 872 (841 to 886) | 775 (748 to 788) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE |
| False positives (patients incorrectly classified as having yaws) | | | | | | | | 31 (15 to 65) | 28 (14 to 59) | 25 (12 to 52) | |

Explanations

- Of the 4 studies, there were 2 unpublished studies where assessment of certainty of evidence was not possible.
- One study¹⁷ was at low risk of bias for patient selection, while another study³ presented high risk of bias as it was a community-based survey and no comment on randomisation or further detail on recruitment was reported.
- Both studies^{3 17} reported low risk of bias for index test, reference standard and patient flow and timing.
- There is some heterogeneity observed in the studies for sensitivity ($I^2=96.4\%$, $p<0.001$) and specificity ($I^2=84.2\%$, $p<0.001$).

D)

| | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|
| T2 Sensitivity | 0.80 (95% CI: 0.55 to 0.93) |
| T2 Specificity | 0.96 (95% CI: 0.92 to 0.98) |

| Prevalence | 0% | 10% | 20% |
|------------|----|-----|-----|
| | | | |

| Outcome | No of studies (No of patients) | Study design | Factors that may decrease certainty of evidence | | | | | Effect per 1,000 patients tested | | | Test accuracy CoE |
|--|---|-----------------|---|--------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Risk of bias | Indirectness | Inconsistency | Imprecision | Publication bias | pre-test probability of 0% | pre-test probability of 10% | pre-test probability of 20% | |
| True positives (patients with yaws) | 4 studies ^a 597 patients | cross-sectional | not serious _{b,c} | not serious | serious ^d | not serious | none | 0 (0 to 0) | 80 (55 to 93) | 160 (110 to 186) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE |
| False negatives (patients incorrectly classified as not having yaws) | | | | | | | | 0 (0 to 0) | 20 (7 to 45) | 40 (14 to 90) | |
| True negatives (patients without yaws) | 4 studies ^a 1015 patients | cross-sectional | not serious _{b,c} | not serious | serious ^d | not serious | none | 963 (920 to 983) | 867 (828 to 885) | 770 (736 to 786) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE |
| False positives (patients incorrectly classified as having yaws) | | | | | | | | 37 (17 to 80) | 33 (15 to 72) | 30 (14 to 64) | |

Explanations

- Of the 4 studies, there were 2 unpublished studies where assessment of certainty of evidence was not possible.
- One study¹⁷ was at low risk of bias for patient selection, while another study³ presented high risk of bias as it was a community-based survey and no comment on randomisation or further detail on recruitment was reported.
- Both studies^{3 17} reported low risk of bias for index test, reference standard and patient flow and timing.
- There is some heterogeneity observed in the studies for sensitivity ($I^2=97.8\%$, $p<0.001$) and little heterogeneity for specificity ($I^2=88.5\%$, $p<0.001$).

Supplementary Table 3. A) Meta-regression of treponemal test component for syphilis; B) Meta-regression of nontreponemal test component for syphilis

| Variable | Number of studies | Univariate | | | | Multivariable | | Joint model | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------|
| | | Sensitivity | p-value | Specificity | p-value | Sensitivity | Specificity | <i>I</i> ² (95% CI) | p-value |
| Study setting | | | | | | | | 87 (74 - 100) | < 0.001 |
| General Practice/Clinic | 5 | 0.91 (0.82 - 1.00) | 0.22 | 0.98 (0.95 - 1.00) | 0.59 | 0.91 (0.82 - 1.00) | 0.98 (0.97 - 1.00) | | |
| Laboratory | 5 | 0.95 (0.89 - 1.00) | 1.00 | 0.98 (0.97 - 1.00) | 0.14 | 0.95 (0.89 - 1.00) | 0.98 (0.95 - 1.00) | | |
| Field/Non-clinical facility | 0 | NA | | NA | | NA | NA | | |
| Sample type | | | | | | | | 70 (34 - 100) | 0.03 |
| Serum | 5 | 0.96 (0.93 - 1.00) | 0.83 | 0.96 (0.93 - 0.99) | <0.001 | 0.96 (0.93 - 1.00) | 0.96 (0.93 - 0.99) | | |
| Finger-prick | 1 | NA* | | NA* | | NA* | NA* | | |
| Whole blood | 5 | 0.88 (0.79 - 0.97) | <0.001 | 0.99 (0.98 - 1.00) | 0.47 | 0.88 (0.79 - 0.97) | 0.99 (0.98 - 1.00) | | |
| Plasma | 0 | NA | | NA | | NA | NA | | |
| RDT reading method | | | | | | | | 60 (9 - 100) | 0.08 |
| Human eye | 9 | 0.92 (0.87 - 0.98) | 0.56 | 0.98 (0.96 - 0.99) | <0.001 | 0.92 (0.87 - 0.98) | 0.98 (0.96 - 0.99) | | |
| Digital reader | 2 | 0.95 (0.86 - 1.00) | 0.83 | 0.99 (0.99 - 1.00) | 0.56 | 0.95 (0.86 - 1.00) | 0.99 (0.99 - 1.00) | | |

Abbreviations: EIA= enzyme immunoassay, TPHA= *Treponema pallidum* hemagglutination, TPPA= *Treponema pallidum* passive particle agglutination assay

* fingerprick combined with whole blood, TPHA combined with TPPA


B)

| Variable | Number of studies | Univariate | | | | Multivariable | | Joint model | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------|
| | | Sensitivity | p-value | Specificity | p-value | Sensitivity | Specificity | I^2 (95% CI) | p-value |
| Brand of RDT | | | | | | | | 0 (0 - 100) | 0.74 |
| DPP | 11 | 0.89 (0.83 - 0.96) | 0.55 | 0.98 (0.94 - 1.00) | 0.12 | 0.89 (0.83 - 0.96) | 0.98 (0.94 - 1.00) | | |
| Burnet's | 2 | 0.95 (0.85 - 1.00) | 0.37 | 0.97 (0.88 - 1.00) | 0.25 | 0.95 (0.85 - 1.00) | 0.97 (0.88 - 1.00) | | |
| Study setting | | | | | | | | 92 (85 - 99) | < 0.001 |
| General Practice/Clinic | 6 | 0.85 (0.72 - 0.98) | 0.05 | 0.99 (0.97 - 1.00) | 0.18 | 0.85 (0.72 - 0.98) | 0.99 (0.97 - 1.00) | | |
| Laboratory | 6 | 0.93 (0.86 - 0.99) | 0.94 | 0.97 (0.92 - 1.00) | 0.56 | 0.93 (0.86 - 0.99) | 0.97 (0.92 - 1.00) | | |
| Field/ non-clinical facility | 0 | | | | | NA | NA | | |
| Sample type | | | | | | | | 64 (20 - 100) | 0.05 |
| Serum | 5 | 0.95 (0.92 - 0.99) | 0.94 | 0.92 (0.79 - 1.00) | 0.09 | 0.95 (0.92 - 0.99) | 0.92 (0.79 - 1.00) | | |
| Finger-prick | 1 | NA* | | NA* | | NA* | NA* | | |
| Whole blood | 7 | 0.83 (0.74 - 0.93) | <0.001 | 0.99 (0.97 - 1.00) | 0.03 | 0.83 (0.74 - 0.93) | 0.99 (0.97 - 1.00) | | |
| Plasma | 0 | NA | | NA | | NA | NA | | |
| RDT reading method | | | | | | | | 0 (0 - 100) | 0.48 |
| Human eye | 11 | 0.92 (0.86 - 0.97) | 0.48 | 0.97 (0.93 - 1.00) | 0.64 | 0.92 (0.86 - 0.97) | 0.97 (0.93 - 1.00) | | |
| Digital reader | 2 | 0.80 (0.56 - 1.00) | 0.13 | 0.99 (0.97 - 1.00) | <0.001 | 0.80 (0.56 - 1.00) | 0.99 (0.97 - 1.00) | | |


Abbreviations: RPR= rapid plasma reagin, TRUST= toluidine red unheated serum test

* fingerprick combined with whole blood

Supplementary Figure 2. A) Hierarchical summary receiver operating characteristic (HSROC) plot for treponemal test component for syphilis; B) HSROC plot for nontreponemal test component for syphilis; C) HSROC plot for treponemal test component for yaws; D) HSROC plot for nontreponemal test component for yaws



Supplementary Figure 3. A) Deeks' plot for treponemal test component for syphilis; B) Deeks' plot for nontreponemal test component for syphilis; C) Deeks' plot for treponemal test component for yaws; D) Deeks' plot for nontreponemal test component for yaws



Supplementary Table 4. A) The positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) for treponemal component of syphilis, over a range of background prevalence of syphilis; B) PPV and NPV for nontreponemal component of syphilis, over a range of background prevalence of syphilis; C) PPV and NPV for treponemal component of yaws, over a range of background prevalence of yaws; D) PPV and NPV for nontreponemal component of yaws, over a range of background prevalence of yaws

A)

| Prevalence | Sensitivity | Specificity | PPV | NPV | Number of cases | Missed cases | False Positive (Overtreated) |
|------------|-------------|-------------|-------|-------|-----------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| 0.05 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.742 | 0.996 | 50 | 4 | 16 |
| 0.1 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.859 | 0.992 | 100 | 7 | 15 |
| 0.15 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.906 | 0.988 | 150 | 11 | 14 |
| 0.2 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.932 | 0.983 | 200 | 14 | 14 |
| 0.25 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.948 | 0.977 | 250 | 18 | 13 |
| 0.3 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.959 | 0.970 | 300 | 21 | 12 |
| 0.35 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.967 | 0.963 | 350 | 25 | 11 |
| 0.4 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.973 | 0.955 | 400 | 28 | 10 |
| 0.45 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.978 | 0.945 | 450 | 32 | 9 |
| 0.5 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.982 | 0.934 | 500 | 35 | 9 |
| 0.55 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.985 | 0.920 | 550 | 39 | 8 |
| 0.6 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.988 | 0.903 | 600 | 42 | 7 |
| 0.65 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.990 | 0.883 | 650 | 46 | 6 |
| 0.7 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.992 | 0.858 | 700 | 49 | 5 |
| 0.75 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.994 | 0.824 | 750 | 53 | 4 |
| 0.8 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.995 | 0.778 | 800 | 56 | 3 |
| 0.85 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.997 | 0.712 | 850 | 60 | 3 |
| 0.9 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.998 | 0.609 | 900 | 63 | 2 |
| 0.95 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 0.999 | 0.425 | 950 | 67 | 1 |
| 1 | 0.930 | 0.983 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 1000 | 70 | 0 |

B)

| Prevalence | Sensitivity | Specificity | PPV | NPV | Number of cases | Missed cases | False Positive (Overtreated) |
|------------|-------------|-------------|-------|-------|-----------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| 0.05 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.646 | 0.995 | 50 | 5 | 25 |
| 0.1 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.794 | 0.989 | 100 | 10 | 23 |
| 0.15 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.859 | 0.982 | 150 | 15 | 22 |

| | | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-----|----|
| 0.2 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.896 | 0.975 | 200 | 20 | 21 |
| 0.25 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.920 | 0.967 | 250 | 25 | 20 |
| 0.3 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.937 | 0.958 | 300 | 30 | 18 |
| 0.35 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.949 | 0.948 | 350 | 35 | 17 |
| 0.4 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.958 | 0.936 | 400 | 40 | 16 |
| 0.45 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.966 | 0.923 | 450 | 45 | 14 |
| 0.5 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.972 | 0.907 | 500 | 50 | 13 |
| 0.55 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.977 | 0.889 | 550 | 55 | 12 |
| 0.6 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.981 | 0.867 | 600 | 60 | 10 |
| 0.65 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.985 | 0.840 | 650 | 65 | 9 |
| 0.7 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.988 | 0.807 | 700 | 70 | 8 |
| 0.75 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.990 | 0.765 | 750 | 75 | 7 |
| 0.8 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.993 | 0.709 | 800 | 80 | 5 |
| 0.85 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.995 | 0.632 | 850 | 85 | 4 |
| 0.9 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.997 | 0.520 | 900 | 90 | 3 |
| 0.95 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 0.998 | 0.339 | 950 | 95 | 1 |
| 1 | 0.900 | 0.974 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 1000 | 100 | 0 |

C)

| Prevalence | Sensitivity | Specificity | PPV | NPV | Number of cases | Missed cases | False Positive (Overtreated) |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 0.05 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.592 | 0.992 | 50 | 7 | 29 |
| 0.1 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.754 | 0.984 | 100 | 14 | 28 |
| 0.15 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.830 | 0.974 | 150 | 22 | 26 |
| 0.2 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.873 | 0.964 | 200 | 29 | 25 |
| 0.25 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.902 | 0.953 | 250 | 36 | 23 |
| 0.3 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.922 | 0.940 | 300 | 43 | 22 |
| 0.35 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.937 | 0.926 | 350 | 50 | 20 |
| 0.4 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.948 | 0.910 | 400 | 58 | 19 |
| 0.45 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.958 | 0.892 | 450 | 65 | 17 |
| 0.5 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.965 | 0.871 | 500 | 72 | 16 |
| 0.55 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.971 | 0.846 | 550 | 79 | 14 |
| 0.6 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.976 | 0.818 | 600 | 86 | 12 |
| 0.65 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.981 | 0.784 | 650 | 94 | 11 |
| 0.7 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.985 | 0.743 | 700 | 101 | 9 |
| 0.75 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.988 | 0.692 | 750 | 108 | 8 |

| | | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-----|---|
| 0.8 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.991 | 0.627 | 800 | 115 | 6 |
| 0.85 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.994 | 0.543 | 850 | 122 | 5 |
| 0.9 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.996 | 0.428 | 900 | 130 | 3 |
| 0.95 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 0.998 | 0.262 | 950 | 137 | 2 |
| 1 | 0.856 | 0.969 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 1000 | 144 | 0 |

D)

| Prevalence | Sensitivity | Specificity | PPV | NPV | Number of cases | Missed cases | False Positive (Overtreated) |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 0.05 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.532 | 0.989 | 50 | 10 | 35 |
| 0.1 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.706 | 0.977 | 100 | 20 | 33 |
| 0.15 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.792 | 0.965 | 150 | 30 | 31 |
| 0.2 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.844 | 0.951 | 200 | 40 | 30 |
| 0.25 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.878 | 0.935 | 250 | 50 | 28 |
| 0.3 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.903 | 0.918 | 300 | 60 | 26 |
| 0.35 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.921 | 0.899 | 350 | 70 | 24 |
| 0.4 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.935 | 0.878 | 400 | 80 | 22 |
| 0.45 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.946 | 0.855 | 450 | 90 | 20 |
| 0.5 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.956 | 0.828 | 500 | 100 | 19 |
| 0.55 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.964 | 0.798 | 550 | 110 | 17 |
| 0.6 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.970 | 0.762 | 600 | 120 | 15 |
| 0.65 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.976 | 0.722 | 650 | 130 | 13 |
| 0.7 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.981 | 0.674 | 700 | 140 | 11 |
| 0.75 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.985 | 0.616 | 750 | 150 | 9 |
| 0.8 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.989 | 0.546 | 800 | 160 | 7 |
| 0.85 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.992 | 0.459 | 850 | 170 | 6 |
| 0.9 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.995 | 0.349 | 900 | 180 | 4 |
| 0.95 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 0.998 | 0.202 | 950 | 190 | 2 |
| 1 | 0.800 | 0.963 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 1000 | 200 | 0 |

REFERENCES

1. Marks M, Esau T, Asugeni R, et al. Point-of-care tests for syphilis and yaws in a low-income setting— A qualitative study of healthcare worker and patient experiences. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2018;12(4):e0006360.
2. Laksanasopin T, Guo TW, Nayak S, et al. A smartphone dongle for diagnosis of infectious diseases at the point of care. *Sci Transl Med* 2015;7(273):273re1.
3. Ayove T, Houniei W, Wangnapi R, et al. Sensitivity and specificity of a rapid point-of-care test for active yaws: A comparative study. *Lancet Glob Health* 2014;2(7):E41-421.
4. Constantine NT, Sill AM, Gudesblat E, et al. Assessment of two rapid assays for diagnostic capability to accurately identify infection by *treponema pallidum*. *J Appl Lab Med* 2017;1(4):346-56.
5. Maan I, Lawrence DS, Tlhako N, et al. Using a dual antibody point-of-care test with visual and digital reads to diagnose syphilis among people living with HIV in Botswana. *Int J STD AIDS* 2021;32(5):453-61.
6. Yin YP, Chen XS, Wei WH, et al. A dual point-of-care test shows good performance in simultaneously detecting nontreponemal and treponemal antibodies in patients with syphilis: A multisite evaluation study in China. *Clin Infect Dis* 2013;56(5):659-65.
7. Terris-Prestholt F, Vickerman P, Torres-Rueda S, et al. The cost-effectiveness of 10 antenatal syphilis screening and treatment approaches in Peru, Tanzania, and Zambia. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2015;130:S73-S80.
8. Owusu-Eduesei Jr K, Gift TL, Ballard RC. Cost-effectiveness of a dual non-treponemal/treponemal syphilis point-of-care test to prevent adverse pregnancy outcomes in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Sex Transm Dis* 2011;38(11):997-1003.
9. Langendorf C, Lastrucci C, Sanou-Bicaba I, et al. Dual screen and confirm rapid test does not reduce overtreatment of syphilis in pregnant women living in a non-venereal treponematoses endemic region: A field evaluation among antenatal care attendees in Burkina Faso. *Sex Transm Infect* 2019;95(6):402-04.
10. Fitzpatrick C, Asiedu K, Sands A, et al. The cost and cost-effectiveness of rapid testing strategies for yaws diagnosis and surveillance. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2017;11(10):e0005985.
11. Castro AR, Mody HC, Parab SY, et al. An immunofiltration device for the simultaneous detection of non-treponemal and treponemal antibodies in patients with syphilis. *Sex Transm Infect* 2010;86(7):532-36.
12. Castro AR, Kikkert SE, Ballard RC, et al. Novel point-of-care test for simultaneous detection of nontreponemal and treponemal antibodies in patients with syphilis. *J Clin Microbiol* 2010;48(12):4615-19.
13. Castro R, Lopes Â, da Luz Martins Pereira F. Evaluation of an immunochromatographic point-of-care test for the simultaneous detection of nontreponemal and treponemal antibodies in patients with syphilis. *Sex Transm Infect* 2014;41(8):467-9.
14. Causer LM, Kaldor JM, Conway DP, et al. An evaluation of a novel dual treponemal/nontreponemal point-of-care test for syphilis as a tool to distinguish active from past treated infection. *Clin Infect Dis* 2015;61(2):184-91.
15. Guinard J, Prazuck T, Pere H, et al. Usefulness in clinical practice of a point-of-care rapid test for simultaneous detection of nontreponemal and *Treponema pallidum*-specific antibodies in patients suffering from documented syphilis. *Int J STD AIDS* 2013;24(12):944-50.

16. Hess KL, Fisher DG, Reynolds GL. Sensitivity and specificity of point-of-care rapid combination syphilis-HIV-HCV tests. *PLoS One* 2014;9(11):e112190.
17. Marks M, Goncalves A, Mabey D, et al. Evaluation of a rapid diagnostic test for yaws infection in a community surveillance setting. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2014;8(9):e3156.
18. Pham MD, Wise A, Garcia ML, et al. Improving the coverage and accuracy of syphilis testing: The development of a novel rapid, point-of-care test for confirmatory testing of active syphilis infection and its early evaluation in China and South Africa. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020;24:100440.
19. Pham MD, Wise A, Garcia ML, et al. Novel rapid test for improved diagnosis of active syphilis at the point of care. *Sex Transm Infect* 2019;95:A319.
20. Skinner L, Robertson G, Norton R. Evaluation of the dual path platform syphilis point of care test in North Queensland. *Pathology* 2015;47(7):718-20.
21. Zorzi A, Cordioli M, Gios L, et al. Field evaluation of two point-of-care tests for syphilis among men who have sex with men, Verona, Italy. *Sex Transm Infect* 2017;93:S51-S58.