

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

DRAFT MANUSCRIPT

Title: Use of viral load to improve survey estimates of known HIV-positive status and antiretroviral treatment coverage

Running head: Adjusting survey estimates with viral load

Peter W. YOUNG<sup>1,§</sup>, Emily ZIELINSKI-GUTIERREZ<sup>1</sup>, Joyce WAMICWE<sup>2</sup>, Irene MUKUI<sup>2</sup>,  
Andrea A. KIM<sup>3</sup>, Anthony WARURU<sup>1</sup>, Clement ZEH<sup>3</sup>, Mirjam E. KRETZSCHMAR<sup>4,5</sup>, Kevin M.  
DE COCK<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Division of Global HIV & TB, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,  
Nairobi, Kenya

<sup>2</sup> National AIDS & STI Control Programme, Ministry of Health, Kenya

<sup>3</sup> Division of Global HIV & TB, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,  
Atlanta, GA, USA

<sup>4</sup> Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center  
Utrecht (UMCU), Utrecht, the Netherlands

<sup>5</sup> Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute of Public Health and the  
Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands

Abstract length: 227 words (limit 250)      Paper length: 1769 words (limit 1800)

§ Corresponding author and requests for reprints: Peter Wesley Young

PO Box 606  
Village Market  
Nairobi, Kenya 00601  
Email: [Pyoung1@cdc.gov](mailto:Pyoung1@cdc.gov) phone: +254728608673

E-mail addresses of authors:  
PWY: [pyoung1@cdc.gov](mailto:pyoung1@cdc.gov)  
EZG: [ebz0@cdc.gov](mailto:ebz0@cdc.gov)  
JW: [jwamicwe@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:jwamicwe@yahoo.co.uk)  
IM: [irenemukui5@gmail.com](mailto:irenemukui5@gmail.com)  
AAK: [bwd2@cdc.gov](mailto:bwd2@cdc.gov)  
AW: [ivq3@cdc.gov](mailto:ivq3@cdc.gov)  
CZ: [cbz2@cdc.gov](mailto:cbz2@cdc.gov)  
MEK: [M.E.E.Kretzschmar@umcutrecht.nl](mailto:M.E.E.Kretzschmar@umcutrecht.nl)  
KDC: [kmd2@cdc.gov](mailto:kmd2@cdc.gov)

38 Conflicts of interest and source of funding:

39 The 2012 Kenya AIDS Indicator Survey has been supported by the President's Emergency  
40 Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) through the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
41 (CDC) under the terms of #PS001805, GH000069, and PS001814. The survey was also  
42 funded in part by support from the Global Fund, World Bank, and the Joint United  
43 Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS.

44  
45 A portion of this analysis has been presented as a poster at the 2019 International AIDS  
46 Society (IAS) conference (<http://programme.ias2019.org/Abstract/Abstract/4626>).

47  
48 **Disclaimer:** The findings and conclusions in this manuscript are those of the author(s) and do not  
49 necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and  
50 other funding institutions.

51  
52 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## 53 **Abstract**

54 **Objective:** To compare alternative methods of adjusting self-reported knowledge of HIV-  
55 positive status and antiretroviral (ARV) therapy use based on undetectable viral load  
56 (UVL) and ARV detection in blood.

57 **Design:** *Post hoc* analysis of nationally-representative household survey to compare  
58 alternative biomarker-based adjustments to population HIV indicators.

59 **Methods:** We reclassified HIV-positive participants aged 15–64 years in the 2012 Kenya  
60 AIDS Indicator Survey (KAIS) that were unaware of their HIV-positive status by self-report  
61 as aware and on antiretroviral treatment if either ARVs were detected or viral load was  
62 undetectable (<550 copies/mL) on dried blood spots. We compared self-report to  
63 adjustments for ARVs measurement, UVL, or both.

64 **Results:** Treatment coverage among all HIV-positive respondents increased from 31.8%  
65 for self-report to 42.5% [95% confidence interval (CI) 37.4–47.8] based on ARV detection  
66 alone, to 42.8% (95% CI 37.9–47.8) when ARV-adjusted, 46.2% (95% CI 41.3–51.1) when

67 UVL-adjusted and 48.8% (95% CI 43.9–53.8) when adjusted for either ARV or UVL.  
68 Awareness of positive status increased from 46.9% for self-report to 56.2% (95% CI 50.7–  
69 61.6) when ARV-adjusted, 57.5% (95% CI 51.9–63.0) when UVL-adjusted, and 59.8% (95%  
70 CI 54.2–65.1) when adjusted for either ARV or UVL.

71 **Conclusions:** Undetectable viral load, which is routinely measured in surveys, may be a  
72 useful adjunct or alternative to ARV detection for adjusting survey estimates of  
73 knowledge of HIV status and antiretroviral treatment coverage.

74

75 **Abstract length: 227 words**

76 Keywords: HIV surveillance, antiretroviral treatment, population surveys, biomarkers,  
77 Kenya

78

## 79 **Introduction**

80 Since the 2007 Kenya AIDS Indicator Survey (KAIS), HIV seroprevalence surveys have often  
81 included questions on knowledge of HIV status and antiretroviral (ARV) use among HIV-infected  
82 respondents, as well as biomarkers such as viral load (VL) [1–3] and ARV testing. Self-reported  
83 knowledge of status and antiretroviral treatment (ART) status can be subject to either positive or  
84 negative social desirability bias in some respondents [4] due to the stigma associated with HIV  
85 [5,6]. Some respondents may also have inaccurate recall or understanding of detailed questions  
86 about their HIV testing and care histories [7].

87 Antiretroviral testing can be used to adjust self-reported HIV status by reclassifying respondents  
88 with ARVs detected in their blood as being previously diagnosed and on ART [8,9]. In the 2012  
89 KAIS 46.9% of HIV-infected respondents self-reported that they were aware of their HIV-positive  
90 status, but ARVs were also detected in 21.0% of those not reporting prior HIV diagnosis and 19.3%  
91 of those reporting no previous HIV test. However, antiretroviral testing is relatively complex,  
92 expensive, and only available within a very limited number of specialized laboratories worldwide,  
93 necessitating international shipping, resulting in additional cost, administrative paperwork, and  
94 potential for delays.

95 Unlike ARV testing, which is added exclusively to correct self-reported HIV status and ART use,  
96 viral load testing is widely available and routinely included in surveys to estimate population viral  
97 suppression (defined as VL < 1000 copies/mL [10]). Undetectable viral load (UVL) is generally  
98 indicative of viral suppression due to treatment, hence it could serve as an alternative, indirect  
99 marker for treatment. Although the presence of elite controllers (EC) who have UVL in the  
100 absence of treatment could confound use of UVL as a proxy for ART use, in US and European  
101 cohorts EC are believed to represent only 0.15–1.5% of the HIV-infected population [11], while in  
102 East African settings similarly low prevalence of EC has been observed [12,13], limiting the  
103 potential impact of this confounding.

104 Given viral load testing is already conducted routinely in HIV surveys, we examined whether  
105 adjusting estimates of knowledge of HIV-positive status and ART coverage using a measure of viral  
106 load would achieve similar results to adjustments based on detection of ARVs in a national  
107 household survey conducted in Kenya in 2012.

## 108 **Methods**

109 The 2012 K AIS included behavioral questions including self-reported HIV and ART status as well as  
110 collection of venous blood from which DBS were prepared by field teams and plasma separated  
111 and shipped for HIV testing at a national laboratory [2]. After participating in other survey  
112 procedures, participants were offered rapid HIV testing by trained HIV counselors in their homes  
113 with immediate return of results based on national HIV testing guidelines [14]. Participants testing  
114 positive for HIV at the central laboratory were subsequently tested for viral load using the Abbott  
115 M2000 platform on DBS subsequently stored at -80°C for future testing. In 2015, DBS were  
116 shipped to the University of Cape Town for testing for presence of efavirenz, nevirapine, lopinavir  
117 or lamivudine by liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry (limit of detection 0.02  
118 µg/mL) [15]. These ARVs were selected to cover first- and second-line regimens in use in Kenya at  
119 the time of specimen collection [8,16,17].

120 We retrospectively re-analyzed survey data to compare self-reported and biomarker-adjusted  
121 versions of knowledge of status and ART use among HIV-infected respondents aged 15-64 years.

## 122 **Measures**

123 We defined UVL as having a viral load <550 copies/mL on dried blood spots, the limit of detection  
124 for the assay used in the study [18]. To calculate UVL-adjusted status, we updated the status for  
125 those respondents categorized as 'unaware' or 'aware, not on ART' with undetectable viral load  
126 to 'aware, on ART'. Similarly, ARV-adjusted status was calculated by updating the status for

127 respondents with ARVs detected in blood to 'aware, on ART'. For either case, the status for  
128 respondents with missing biomarker results was not updated.

129 We explored differences in self-reported, ARV-adjusted, and UVL-adjusted indicators by age, sex,  
130 marital status, educational attainment and mobility. Results were analyzed in R version 3.5.0 [19]  
131 using the survey package [20] to adjust and weight results to account for the complex survey  
132 design. Wald confidence intervals for survey indicators were calculated on the logarithmic scale  
133 and transformed to probability scale using the 'logit' method of the svyciprop function in R;  
134 confidence intervals previously reported by Kim et al. [21] were calculated on the probability  
135 scale.

## 136 **Ethical considerations**

137 The 2012 KAIS was approved by the University of California, San Francisco, the U.S. Centers for  
138 Disease Control (CDC) in Atlanta, GA, USA and the Kenya Medical Research Institute. Prior to  
139 household and individual interviews and blood collection written consent was obtained; in the  
140 case of children aged less than 18 years assent was sought in addition to permission from their  
141 caregiver or guardian.

## 142 **Results**

143 Among 648 HIV-infected respondents, self-reported status was 'unaware' among 343 (53.1%),  
144 'aware, not on ART' among 100 (15.1%), and 'aware, on ART' among 205 (31.8%) (Supplemental  
145 Table S1). Of those with UVL and unaware of their HIV-positive status by self-report, 40 also had  
146 ARVs detected in blood (Supplemental Table S2). Antiretroviral treatment coverage among all  
147 HIV-infected increased from 31.8% (95% CI 27.3–36.6) based on self-report to 42.8% (95% CI  
148 37.9–47.8) when combining self-report and ARV detection, to 46.2% (95% CI 41.3–51.1) when  
149 combining self-report and UVL, and finally to 48.8% (95% CI 43.9–53.8) with self-report, UVL or  
150 ARVs combined (Table 1). Changes in ART coverage were consistent across demographic

151 characteristics, although the 15–24 year age group saw greater increases when adjusted  
152 compared to other age groups (Supplemental Figure S1).

153 Knowledge of status increased from 46.9% (95% CI 41.4–52.4) based on self-report to 56.2% (95%  
154 CI 50.7–61.6) when adjusting with ARVs, to 57.5% (95% CI 51.9–63.0) when adjusting for UVL, and  
155 to 59.8% (95% CI 54.2–65.1) when adjusting for either ARV or UVL (Table 2). Similar to population  
156 ART coverage, ART among those with known HIV-positive status also increased from self-report to  
157 adjustment, with similar increases between adjustment methods. The youngest age group also  
158 saw the biggest impact of adjustment versus self-report for these indicators in both relative and  
159 absolute terms.

160 We repeated the analysis excluding the respondents for whom either the ARV or UVL biomarkers  
161 were not available; findings were similar (Supplemental Table S3).

## 162 **Discussion**

163 In order to balance resources between finding undiagnosed HIV infections, linking patients to HIV  
164 treatment, and ensuring retention and adherence to care it is necessary to obtain the best  
165 possible estimates of knowledge of HIV-positive status and ART use. We set out to establish  
166 whether viral load, a routinely-available marker in HIV surveys, can be used to adjust self-  
167 reported estimates of knowledge of HIV-positive status and ART use. In KAIS 2012, UVL-adjusted  
168 point estimates were similar to, but slightly greater than ARV-adjusted estimates of knowledge of  
169 status and ART coverage, suggesting adjustment with UVL might have been sufficient. When  
170 measuring ART coverage, all of the adjusted estimates (ARV only, UVL only, and either ARV or  
171 UVL) had overlapping confidence intervals, but are notably higher than estimates based on self-  
172 report alone.

173 The change in estimates when adjusting by ARVs and UVL were similar across demographic  
174 groups, but 15–24 year olds did see a larger additional increase when adjusting by UVL. This may

175 indicate poor recent adherence in this group leading to non-detection of the ARV biomarker but  
176 undetectable viral load (<550 copies/mL in this study). Li et al found that 37% of patients still had  
177 a viral load <200 copies/mL four weeks after interrupting ART [22]. Many ARVs reach  
178 undetectable levels in blood within several days of treatment interruption [8,15,23], thus in  
179 populations with poor adherence or high rates of treatment interruption, adjusting based on UVL  
180 may result in higher estimated ART coverage than measures incorporating ARV detection.

181 The performance of UVL for adjusting ART use will depend on the prevalence of UVL in the  
182 population on HIV treatment. In populations with effective ART programs with high rates of viral  
183 suppression in the treated population, it may be a relatively sensitive marker for ART use;  
184 however, in populations with poor treatment outcomes a larger proportion of patients on  
185 treatment would not have UVL.

186 The prevalence of elite controllers has not been established in Kenya, hence it is not possible to  
187 quantify their influence on the UVL-adjusted estimates, but given the similarity between UVL-  
188 adjusted and ARV-adjusted estimates, their potential impact was limited. Simultaneously  
189 adjusting for either UVL or presence of ARVs may in fact be closest to true population prevalence  
190 of the indicators of interest. Without better data on prevalence of elite controllers in this  
191 population it is more conservative to use one or the other marker rather than both combined. In  
192 settings with ample evidence of low prevalence of elite control, or where population high ART  
193 coverage and immediate treatment initiation means even elite controllers are likely to be on  
194 treatment, using the combined indicator would likely represent the most sensitive approach to  
195 estimating population-based knowledge of status and ART coverage.

196 This analysis was subject to several limitations. While adjusting for biomarkers associated with  
197 ARV exposure from a single time-point can account for misreporting of status among those on  
198 ART, it cannot account for those who misreport their knowledge of HIV-positive status but are not  
199 currently on treatment, or those who may be on treatment but transiently non-adherent to



200 medications. Other established methods for reducing bias in self-reported estimates, such as  
201 computer-assisted self-interview methods, may also be helpful [24]. This analysis was based on  
202 data from a single country with low ART coverage (43.5%) and viral suppression among those on  
203 treatment (73.9%) at the time of the survey compared with current program coverage; the UVL  
204 adjustment may perform differently in other populations. Simulation or replication of this  
205 analysis in a diverse set of populations, including the more recent population-based HIV impact  
206 assessments conducted in many countries, could help elucidate the performance of UVL  
207 adjustment in different settings. Finally, poor specimen quality could result in false-negative  
208 results for both biomarkers. In spite of these limitations, this analysis does strongly suggest that  
209 use of UVL to adjust self-reported HIV status and ART use should be considered, especially in  
210 surveys where the inclusion of the ARV biomarker may be cost-prohibitive or subject to delays.

## 211 **Conclusion**

212 Streamlining the estimation of key HIV program indicators should allow governments, donors and  
213 other stakeholders to assess program performance more quickly and affordably. Viral load, which  
214 is routinely measured in HIV surveys, may be a useful biomarker for adjusting self-reported  
215 indicators of HIV diagnosis and treatment in cross-sectional surveys in absence of, or in addition  
216 to, adjustment based on detected ARVs in blood.

217

## 218 **Acknowledgements**

219 We would like to thank the University of Cape Town Department of Clinical Pharmacology for conducting  
220 the ART biomarker testing, the National HIV Reference Laboratory for conducting the KAIS 2012 viral load  
221 testing, the study teams that collected data in the field, and finally the survey participants.

## 222 **Competing interests**

223 All authors declare no competing interests.

## 224 **Authors' contributions**

225 PWY, EZG and KDC conceived the study. PWY conducted the analyses. All authors contributed to  
226 drafting and critical review of the manuscript.

227

## 228 **Additional files**

229 Additional file 1. Supplementary tables and figures

230 Word document containing additional supplementary analyses referenced in text.

231

## 232 **References**

- 233 1 2007 Kenya AIDS Indicator Survey Final Report. Nairobi, Kenya: National AIDS and STI  
234 Control Programme (NASCOP); 2009. <http://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/12122/>
- 235 2 Waruiru W, Kim AA, Kimanga DO, Ng'ang'a J, Schwarcz S, Kimondo L, *et al.* The Kenya AIDS  
236 Indicator Survey 2012: rationale, methods, description of participants, and response rates.  
237 *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2014; **66 Suppl 1**:S3-12.
- 238 3 Brown K, Williams DB, Kinchen S, Saito S, Radin E, Patel H, *et al.* Status of HIV Epidemic

- 239 Control Among Adolescent Girls and Young Women Aged 15–24 Years — Seven African  
240 Countries, 2015–2017. *MMWR. Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* 2018.  
241 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6701a6
- 242 4 Kelly CA, Hewett PC, Mensch BS, Rankin JC, Nsobya SL, Kalibala S, *et al.* Using biomarkers  
243 to assess the validity of sexual behavior reporting across interview modes among young  
244 women in Kampala, Uganda. *Stud Fam Plann* Published Online First: 2014.  
245 doi:10.1111/j.1728-4465.2014.00375.x
- 246 5 Bonnington O, Wamoyi J, Ddaaki W, Bukonya D, Ondenge K, Skovdal M, *et al.* Changing  
247 forms of HIV-related stigma along the HIV care and treatment continuum in sub-Saharan  
248 Africa: A temporal analysis. *Sex Transm Infect* 2017; **93**:1–6.
- 249 6 Gurmu E, Etana D. HIV/AIDS knowledge and stigma among women of reproductive age in  
250 Ethiopia. *African J AIDS Res* 2015; **14**:191–199.
- 251 7 Mooney AC, Campbell CK, Ratlhagana M-J, Grignon JS, Mazibuko S, Agnew E, *et al.* Beyond  
252 Social Desirability Bias: Investigating Inconsistencies in Self-Reported HIV Testing and  
253 Treatment Behaviors Among HIV-Positive Adults in North West Province, South Africa.  
254 *AIDS Behav* 2018; **22**:2368–2379.
- 255 8 Kim AA, Mukui I, Young PW, Mirjahangir J, Mwanyumba S, Wamicwe J, *et al.* Undisclosed  
256 HIV infection and ART use in the Kenya AIDS indicator survey 2012: relevance to targets for  
257 HIV diagnosis and treatment in Kenya. *AIDS* 2016; **30**:2685–2695.
- 258 9 Huerga H, Shiferie F, Grebe E, Giuliani R, Farhat J Ben, Van-Cutsem G, *et al.* A comparison  
259 of self-report and antiretroviral detection to inform estimates of antiretroviral therapy  
260 coverage, viral load suppression and HIV incidence in Kwazulu-Natal, South Africa. *BMC*  
261 *Infect Dis* 2017; **17**:1–8.

- 262 10 Global AIDS Monitoring 2018: Indicators for monitoring the 2016 United Nations Political  
263 Declaration on Ending AIDS. Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS; 2017.  
264 [https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media\\_asset/2017-Global-AIDS-](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/2017-Global-AIDS-Monitoring_en.pdf)  
265 [Monitoring\\_en.pdf](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/2017-Global-AIDS-Monitoring_en.pdf)
- 266 11 Gonzalo-Gil E, Ikediobi U, Sutton RE. Mechanisms of virologic control and clinical  
267 characteristics of HIV+ elite/viremic controllers. *Yale J Biol Med* 2017; **90**:245–259.
- 268 12 Kayongo A, Gonzalo-Gil E, Gümüşgöz E, Niwaha AJ, Semitala F, Kalyesubula R, *et al.*  
269 Identification of Elite and Viremic Controllers from a Large Urban HIV Ambulatory Center in  
270 Kampala, Uganda. *JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2018; **79**:394–398.
- 271 13 Kiros Y, Elinav H, Gebreyesus A, Gebremeskel H, Azar J, Chemtob D, *et al.* Identification and  
272 characterization of HIV positive Ethiopian elite controllers in both Africa and Israel. *HIV*  
273 *Med* 2018; :1–5.
- 274 14 National Guidelines for HIV Testing and Counseling in Kenya. 2nd ed. Nairobi, Kenya:  
275 National AIDS and STI Control Programme (NAS COP); 2010.
- 276 15 Koal T, Burhenne H, Römling R, Svoboda M, Resch K, Kaefer V. Quantification of  
277 antiretroviral drugs in dried blood spot samples by means of liquid  
278 chromatography/tandem mass spectrometry. *Rapid Commun Mass Spectrom* 2005;  
279 **19**:2995–3001.
- 280 16 Moyo S, Young PW, Gouws E, Naidoo I, Wamicwe J, Mukui I, *et al.* Equity of antiretroviral  
281 treatment use in high HIV burden countries: Analyses of data from nationally-  
282 representative surveys in Kenya and South Africa. *PLoS One* 2018; **13**:1–17.
- 283 17 Guidelines for antiretroviral therapy in Kenya, 4th Edition 2011. Kenya: National AIDS and  
284 STI Control Programme (NAS COP); 2011. <http://www.emtct-iatt.org/wp->

- 285 content/uploads/2013/04/Kenya\_National-ARV-Guidelines\_2011.pdf
- 286 18 Zeh C, Ndiege K, Inzaule S, Achieng R, Williamson J, Chang JCW, *et al.* Evaluation of the  
287 performance of Abbott m2000 and Roche COBAS Ampliprep/COBAS Taqman assays for  
288 HIV-1 viral load determination using dried blood spots and dried plasma spots in Kenya.  
289 *PLoS One* Published Online First: 2017. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0179316
- 290 19 R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.  
291 2018.<https://www.r-project.org/>
- 292 20 Lumley T. survey: analysis of complex survey samples. 2017.
- 293 21 Kim AA, Mukui I, Young PW, Mirjahangir J, Mwanyumba S, Wamicwe J, *et al.* Undisclosed  
294 HIV infection and antiretroviral therapy use in the Kenya AIDS indicator survey 2012:  
295 Relevance to national targets for HIV diagnosis and treatment. *AIDS* 2016; **30**.  
296 doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000001227
- 297 22 Li JZ, Etemad B, Ahmed H, Aga E, Bosch RJ, Mellors JW, *et al.* The size of the expressed HIV  
298 reservoir predicts timing of viral rebound after treatment interruption. *AIDS* 2016; **30**:343–  
299 353.
- 300 23 Jackson A, Moyle G, Watson V, Tjia J, Ammara A, Back D, *et al.* Tenofovir, emtricitabine  
301 intracellular and plasma, and efavirenz plasma concentration decay following drug intake  
302 cessation: Implications for HIV treatment and prevention. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*  
303 Published Online First: 2013. doi:10.1097/QAI.0b013e3182829bd0
- 304 24 Gnambs T, Kaspar K. Disclosure of sensitive behaviors across self-administered survey  
305 modes: a meta-analysis. *Behav Res Methods* Published Online First: 2014.  
306 doi:10.3758/s13428-014-0533-4
- 307

308 **Table 1.** Self-reported and adjusted estimates of ART coverage among people living with HIV, KAIS 2012

Characteristic	Self-reported (N=648)			ARV only (N=559)			Self-report or ARV (N=648)			Self-report or UVL (N=648)			Self-reported, ARV or UVL (N=648)		
	n	%	se	n	%	se	n	%	se	n	%	se	n	%	se
<b>Sex</b>															
Male	51	27.0	3.7	64	37.8	4.7	74	39.9	4.5	78	41.9	4.4	84	44.3	4.5
Female	154	34.7	2.5	171	45.6	2.6	198	44.6	2.5	217	48.8	2.5	230	51.6	2.5
<b>Age group</b>															
15–24 yrs	6	7.1	2.7	11	21.6	6.4	14	20.7	5.8	19	28.8	6.2	20	29.9	6.2
25–34 yrs	48	21.1	3.1	50	25.1	3.6	65	29.3	3.5	65	28.2	3.3	76	33.9	3.6
35–49 yrs	104	41.1	3.9	121	55.0	3.8	133	52.9	3.6	147	58.2	3.4	152	59.5	3.3
50–64 yrs	47	48.0	5.4	53	59.6	5.6	60	60.6	5.3	64	64.0	5.0	66	65.5	5.0
<b>Marital status</b>															
Single/never married	16	16.7	4.0	18	24.5	5.9	22	23.8	5.1	29	32.5	5.6	31	33.9	5.7

Married/cohabitating	118	31.4	3.2	141	42.0	3.4	163	43.3	3.2	175	46.1	3.1	186	48.6	3.2
Divorced /sep / widowed	71	41.5	4.0	76	53.1	4.3	87	52.6	4.0	91	54.2	3.9	97	58.1	4.0
<b>Highest educational attainment</b>															
None	28	33.2	5.8	31	35.5	5.9	39	44.6	6.0	39	45.2	6.0	41	46.5	6.0
Primary	94	26.7	2.8	111	39.5	3.6	126	38.4	3.3	137	40.8	3.3	148	44.3	3.5
Secondary	10	31.4	10.2	14	45.7	10.1	15	43.7	9.8	16	50.7	9.3	18	54.9	9.6
Higher	73	40.8	4.3	78	50.6	5.0	91	50.2	4.4	102	55.8	4.2	106	57.2	4.1
<b>Employment</b>															
unemployed	82	36.2	4.3	91	50.0	4.6	106	47.6	4.3	114	50.6	4.3	118	52.2	4.2
employed	123	29.6	2.6	144	39.0	2.8	166	40.5	2.8	181	44.0	2.7	196	47.2	2.8
<b>Mobility</b>															
Not away for >1 month in last year	112	31.2	3.0	126	42.0	3.5	146	42.2	3.2	156	44.5	3.3	166	46.8	3.2

Away >1 month in last year	87	32.1	3.4	101	43.7	4.0	117	43.7	3.6	129	48.0	3.7	137	51.4	3.9
<b>Total</b>	205	31.8	2.4	235	42.5	2.6	272	42.8	2.5	295	46.2	2.5	314	48.8	2.5

309 Note: self-reported: self-report only, ARV-only: based on presence/absence of ARVs only, self-report or ARV: either self-reported known-  
310 positive/on ART or ARVs detected, self-report or UVL: either self-reported known-positive/on ART or viral load was undetectable, self-  
311 report, ARV or UVL: either self-reported known-positive/on ART, ARVs detected, or UVL, N: unweighted denominator, n: unweighted  
312 numerator, se: standard error. Missing biomarker results were treated as biomarker not present. Percentages and standard errors are  
313 weighted and adjusted to account for the survey design.



314 **Table 2.** Self-reported and adjusted estimates of HIV care cascade, KAIS 2012

Characteristic		Self-report			Self-report or ARV			Self-report or UVL			Self-report, ARV or UVL		
Variable	Level	n	%	se	n	%	se	n	%	se	n	%	se
<b>Awareness of HIV infection (1st 90)</b>													
Gender	Male	73	38.0	4.3	92	49.5	4.9	95	50.7	4.9	99	52.6	5.0
	Female	232	52.2	2.8	268	60.4	2.6	275	61.7	2.5	286	64.2	2.5
Age group	15–24 yrs	16	18.0	5.0	24	31.7	6.5	27	37.7	7.0	28	38.8	7.0
	25–34 yrs	88	41.1	4.3	102	48.2	4.3	102	46.7	4.3	111	52.0	4.3
	35–49 yrs	144	55.9	3.8	167	65.7	3.4	172	67.6	3.3	176	68.5	3.3
	50–64 yrs	57	56.9	5.5	67	66.4	5.2	69	68.0	5.0	70	68.7	5.0
Total		305	46.9	2.8	360	56.2	2.8	370	57.5	2.8	385	59.8	2.8
<b>ART coverage among previously-diagnosed (2nd 90)</b>													
Gender	Male	51	71.0	5.8	74	80.7	4.5	78	82.5	4.0	84	84.2	3.9
	Female	154	66.4	3.3	198	73.9	3.0	217	79.1	2.7	230	80.4	2.6

Age group	15–24 yrs	6	39.3	10.4	14	65.5	10.0	19	76.3	7.3	20	77.0	7.1
	25–34 yrs	48	51.2	5.8	65	60.9	5.3	65	60.3	5.3	76	65.2	5.1
	35–49 yrs	104	73.6	4.4	133	80.5	3.7	147	86.2	2.7	152	86.8	2.6
	50–64 yrs	47	84.3	5.2	60	91.3	3.8	64	94.1	2.7	66	95.5	2.3
Total		205	67.9	3.2	272	76.2	2.8	295	80.2	2.3	314	81.7	2.3

**Viral load < 1000 copies/mL among those on ART (3rd 90)**

Gender	Male	35	72.8	6.3	52	75.9	5.1	62	82.5	4.3	62	78.4	4.6
	Female	115	76.6	3.8	146	75.4	3.5	178	83.5	2.8	178	78.8	2.9
Age group	15–24 yrs	2	34.6	19.8	9	72.4	11.3	15	83.9	7.4	15	80.8	7.9
	25–34 yrs	29	57.3	8.2	35	50.0	7.3	46	68.4	6.7	46	57.0	6.6
	35–49 yrs	84	84.5	3.8	108	85.6	3.3	127	89.1	2.7	127	87.2	2.9
	50–64 yrs	35	74.9	6.6	46	77.5	5.7	52	81.2	5.2	52	79.2	5.3
Total		150	75.4	3.3	198	75.6	2.8	240	83.1	2.3	240	78.6	2.5

315 Note: self-reported: self-report only, self-report or ARV: either self-reported known-positive/on ART or ARVs detected, self-report or UVL:

316 either self-reported known-positive/on ART or viral load was undetectable, self-report, ARV or UVL: either self-reported known-

317 positive/on ART, ARVs detected, or UVL, n: unweighted numerator, se: standard error, viral suppression defined as <1000 copies/mL.  
318 Missing biomarker results were treated as biomarker not present. Percentages and standard errors are weighted and adjusted to account  
319 for the survey design. The unweighted denominators can vary due to adjustment for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> 90 and for each indicator/measure  
320 combination are as follows: 1<sup>st</sup> 90: 305 for all measures, 2<sup>nd</sup> 90: 360 for self-report or ARV, 370 for self-report or UVL, 385 for self-report,  
321 ARV or UVL, 3<sup>rd</sup> 90: 200 for self-reported, 266 for self-reported or ARV, 308 for self-report, ARV or UVL.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/19002592>; this version posted November 26, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.