## Appendix

**Table A1: Summary of Results from One-Way Sensitivity Analyses Varying Positivity, Number of Tests, or Personnel Costs**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **San Joaquin** | **Pima** |
| **Input** | **Level** | **Value** | **Cost per Positive** | **Value** | **Cost per Positive** |
| **Positivity** | Low | 0.0004 | $545,386 | 0.0001 | $1,847,242 |
| Baseline | 0.05 | $4,363 | 0.0155 | $13,140 |
| High | 0.1 | $2,182 | 0.0291 | $6,983 |
| **Number of Tests** | Low | 321 | $5,187 | 155 | $16,264 |
| Baseline | 401 | $4,363 | 194 | $13,140 |
| High | 481 | $3,813 | 233 | $11,062 |
| **Personnel Costs** | Low | $36,217 | $3,912 | $21,059 | $11,385 |
| Baseline | $45,271 | $4,363 | $26,323 | $13,140 |
| High | $54,325 | $4,815 | $31,588 | $14,895 |

San Joaquin County included the three outreach screening events engaging people experiencing homelessness, Pima County included the LGBTQ venues reached via a mobile clinic. Costs inflated to 2019 USD. Summary results from one-way sensitivity analyses are presented for both San Joaquin and Pima Counties. Personnel costs were allowed to vary ± 20%, approximately the interquartile range of pay for similar positions according to the BLS (<https://www.bls.gov/oes/tables.htm>). Positivity was varied from a minimum of the overall county-level incidence, to a maximum of the positivity found for the highest racial/ethnic group from each site (San Joaquin [0.04% -10%]; Pima [0.01% - 2.9%]). Number of tests were varied ± 20% and were assumed to impact costs only through the “Supplies” and “Test Kits” categories.

**Figure A1: Estimated Cost per Patient Tested by Number of Tests Conducted with Comparisons to Previous Findings**

\*Lewis et al. 2011: Philadelphia community-based organizations outreach at LGBTQ venues, conducted in 2007. Ciesielski et al. 2005: Mobile clinic was used to test at Chicago bars and bathhouses in 2002. Only personnel cost data was collected in the Ciesielski study, so we assumed personnel was 55% of total costs for the sake of comparisons. Costs from 2002 and 2007 were inflation adjusted to 2019 USD.

**Figure A2: Estimated Cost per Positive by Positivity**

Costs inflated to 2019 USD.

**Figure A3: One-Way Sensitivity Analysis, The Impact of Positivity on Cost per Positive**

San Joaquin county included the three outreach screening events engaging people experiencing homelessness, Pima county included the LGBTQ venues reached via a mobile clinic. Costs inflated to 2019 USD. Positivity was varied from a minimum of the overall county-level incidence, to a maximum of the positivity found for the highest racial/ethnic group from each site (San Joaquin [0.04% -10%]; Pima [0.01% - 2.9%]). The lower bound positivity results were omitted from the graph for scale; table A3 contains those values.