TITLE

Gaps in Sexually Transmitted Infection Screening among
Men who have Sex with Men in PrEP Care in the United States

AUTHORS

Christina Chandra,[1] Kevin M. Weiss,[1] Colleen F. Kelley,[2] Julia L. Marcus,[3] Samuel M. Jenness[1]

[1] Department of Epidemiology, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

[2] Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA

[3] Harvard Medical School and Harvard Pilgrim Health Care Institute, Boston, MA

CORRESPONDENCE

Samuel M. Jenness, Emory University, 1520 Clifton Road, Atlanta, GA 30323. Email: samuel.m.jenness@emory.edu

FUNDING

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health grant R21 MH112449.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

WORD COUNTS

Abstract: 244
Text: 3655

ABSTRACT

Background The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommends comprehensive sexually transmitted infection (STI) screening every 3–6 months for men who have sex with men (MSM) using HIV preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP). The gaps between clinical practice and these recommendations by region have not been quantified.

Methods We collected data between 2017 and 2019 on STI screening among MSM across the U.S., stratified by current, prior, and never PrEP use. Poisson regression models with robust error variance were used to assess factors, including residence in the Southeastern U.S., associated with exposure site-specific STI screening during PrEP care.

Results Of 3259 HIV-negative MSM, 19% were currently using PrEP, 6% had used PrEP in the past, and 75% had never used PrEP. Among ever PrEP users, 87%, 78%, 57%, and 64% were consistently (always or sometimes) screened for STIs by blood sample, urine sample/urethral swab, rectal swab, or pharyngeal swab, respectively, during PrEP care. PrEP users in the Southeast were significantly less likely to be consistently screened for urogenital [adjusted prevalence ratio (aPR): 0.86, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.76, 0.98] and rectal STIs (aPR: 0.76, 95% CI: 0.62, 0.93) during PrEP care compared to PrEP users in all other regions of the U.S.

Conclusions Significant gaps exist between CDC recommendations for STI screening during PrEP care and current clinical practice, particularly for rectal and pharyngeal exposure sites that can harbor asymptomatic infections and for MSM in Southeastern states where the STI burden is substantial.

KEYWORDS

HIV, PrEP, STI screening, men who have sex with men

INTRODUCTION

In the United States (U.S.), cases of the three major reportable bacterial sexually transmitted infections (STIs) — syphilis, gonorrhea, and chlamydia — increased by up to 71% between 2014 and 2018, reaching all-time highs.[1] Rates of new HIV diagnoses have remained stable overall and increased in key subgroups during this time.[2] Men who have sex with men (MSM) are disproportionately affected by both bacterial STIs and HIV, accounting for more than half of new infectious syphilis cases, 40% of gonorrhea cases, and 66% of HIV cases in 2018 despite only representing approximately 4% of the U.S. population.[1–3] Additionally, more than half of new HIV diagnoses in 2018 occurred in the South, and the South has the highest STI rates.[1,2]

In a recent meta-analysis, the pooled STI prevalence among PrEP users within three months of PrEP initiation was 23.9%, and STI incidence was estimated at 72 per 100 person-years among persistent PrEP users globally.[4] U.S.-based studies have found that STI prevalence or incidence increased among MSM after initiation of PrEP.[5,6] The difference in STI rates before and after PrEP initiation could be a result of multiple factors, including appropriate PrEP prescribing, increased detection of cases from more frequent screening in PrEP care, changes in sexual risk behavior after initiation of PrEP (sometimes called “risk compensation”), and trends in sexual behavior and STI rates that pre-date the availability of PrEP.[1,7–10] Whether this association is causal is a matter of debate, but, regardless, many PrEP users are at elevated risk of STIs simply because PrEP is recommended to MSM with a history of inconsistent condom use, multiple partners, or STI diagnoses.[11]

Comprehensive PrEP services ideally achieve the dual objectives of HIV prevention *and* population-level STI control through routine STI detection and treatment. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommends comprehensive STI screening every 3–6 months for PrEP-using MSM.[11] This includes blood tests to screen for syphilis and pharyngeal and rectal STI screening to detect asymptomatic gonorrhea and chlamydia infections for everyone regardless of assessment of sexual exposure at specific anatomical sites. We previously modeled that while STI diagnoses may initially increase with expanded PrEP use due to variations of risk compensation, routine screening and treatment of STIs could prevent 42% of gonorrhea and 40% of chlamydia cases among MSM over ten years.[12] These projections assumed perfect adherence to PrEP-related STI screening and treatment recommendations; in secondary scenarios, the study projected that STI incidence could increase if fewer than 50% of PrEP users were screened and treated.

Quantifying any gaps between PrEP STI screening recommendations and clinical practice is therefore critical to understanding the role of PrEP care for STI control. Several recent studies have

evaluated this in different regions using different study designs. In the Pacific Northwest, while STI screening coverage was higher compared to non-PrEP users, only 69% of PrEP-using MSM were screened for rectal STIs in the past 12 months.[7] In New York City, in contrast, 32% of PrEP-using MSM received comprehensive PrEP care (including STI screening) at their last PrEP visit,[13] and in Baltimore, only 44% of MSM were screened for the three STIs at all anatomical sites of sexual exposure at PrEP initiation.[14] This was consistent with an analysis of commercial insurance claims that found that 49% and 39% of all users (not only MSM) were screened for syphilis and chlamydia/gonorrhea, respectively, within 6 months of PrEP initiation.[15]

While these studies have provided important evidence regarding the gaps in PrEP care, there are still no national-level studies that have compared these gaps across geographic regions. Geographic heterogeneity in clinical practice is important to understand because of the regional differences in infrastructure for PrEP-related services such as the ability to assess kidney function and serological confirmation of HIV and Hepatitis B status for PrEP eligibility and the spatial clustering of high STI burden in Southeastern U.S.[16,17] Differences in STI screening practices during PrEP care may also reflect state-level factors that may impact PrEP care, including access to health care (e.g., Medicaid expansion) and other social determinants of health that may vary by state (e.g., housing stability, employment).[18,19] By examining these differences, we may better understand which regions might benefit the most from interventions to improve PrEP care.

In this study, we compared STI screening practices among MSM who were currently using PrEP, those who had previously used PrEP, and those who had never used PrEP. Among MSM who had ever used PrEP, we evaluated factors associated with STI screening at PrEP care visits, including residence in the Southeast and recent sexual exposure at anatomical sites. We hypothesized that there would be strong geographic differences in STI screening at all anatomical sites among PrEP-using MSM even after controlling for demographic and behavioral factors.

METHODS

Study Design. ARTnet was an anonymous and cross-sectional web-based study of MSM in the U.S. conducted between 2017 and 2019.[20] The study recruited participants through the American Men's Internet Survey (AMIS), a national web-based study on the sexual health of MSM.[21] AMIS recruited participants through banner ads placed on websites or social network applications. ARTnet eligibility criteria included male sex at birth, current male identity, lifetime history of sexual activity with another man, and age between 15 and 65 years. The study surveyed participants about recent sexual behaviors,

HIV and STI screening, and egocentric network data on up to five sexual partners.[22] Data collection occurred in two waves: July 2017 to February 2018 and September 2018 to January 2019. Respondents were deduplicated within and across survey waves based on IP and email addresses; the most recent survey record was used for any duplicate respondents. We restricted the participants in this analysis to PrEP-eligible MSM who we classified as: MSM who had ever had an HIV test and who self-reported as HIV-negative at the time of the study. The Emory University Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved the ARTnet study.

Measures. In this analysis, we quantified patient-reported survey data on HIV and STI screening from blood samples, urine sample/urethral swabs, and rectal and pharyngeal swabs in the past 12 months, past 2 years, and at PrEP care visits. Participants who had ever used PrEP were asked "At these PrEP (i.e., Truvada) check-up visits, how often did you get tested for HIV and sexually transmitted diseases (STD)? STDs could include gonorrhea, chlamydia, and syphilis." Participants could answer "Always", "Sometimes", "Rarely", or "Never" for HIV screening or STI screening site/method: throat (pharyngeal swab), anus (rectal swab), genital/penis (urine sample or urethral swab), or blood sample. We assumed blood-based screening was used to screen for syphilis. For STI screening responses, we dichotomized the outcomes to consistent screening ("Always" or "Sometimes") versus inconsistent screening ("Rarely" or "Never"). CDC recommendations are for STI screening every 3 to 6 months during PrEP care visits, which are recommended quarterly and would not require STI screening at every visit.

We evaluated correlates of consistent STI screening. We considered age group (15–24, 25–34, 35–44, 45–54, or 55–65), race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, non-Hispanic other, or non-Hispanic white), current health insurance (private health insurance, public health insurance, or no health insurance), annual household income ($0–$19,999, $20,000–$39,999, $40,000–$74,999, $75,000 or more), recent sexual exposure at anatomical site, and geographic region of residence. Using data on the five most recent reported partners in the past year, respondents were classified as having been exposed at the urethra (any insertive anal or insertive oral intercourse), rectum (any receptive anal intercourse), or pharynx (any receptive oral intercourse). For geography, we considered Census division and state by matching reported residential ZIP Codes against Census databases.[20] Our primary exposure of interest was residence in 12 Southeastern states as defined by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, which included Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.[23]

Statistical Analysis. Our primary research objective was to quantify the association between residence in Southeastern states and comprehensive screening for STIs among MSM who were currently using PrEP,

those who had previously used PrEP, and those who had never used PrEP. We first evaluated the bivariable associations between our hypothesized correlates — age, race/ethnicity, current health insurance, annual household income, recent sexual exposure at anatomical site, and geography (by Census division and residence in the Southeast U.S.) — and consistent site-specific STI screening using Poisson regression with robust error variance. In multivariable Poisson regression models with robust error variance, we estimated the association between our primary exposure (residence in a Southeastern state) and consistent STI screening adjusted for four variables that could differ by geography: age, race/ethnicity, annual household income, and sexual exposure at anatomical site (for urogenital, rectal, and pharyngeal STIs). We did not control for variables that would be considered mediators of the associations between residence in the Southeast and consistent STI screening. These include variables like health insurance that may vary by state as a result of Medicaid expansion or other state-level factors like HIV prevention funding that may impact STI screening for PrEP users. All analyses were conducted in R 3.6.1.[24] Analysis scripts are provided in a Github repository (https://github.com/EpiModel/PrEP-STI-Test).

RESULTS

After excluding participants who had either never had an HIV test, reported living with HIV, or had missing information on PrEP use, 3259 MSM were included in this analysis. Of those, 631 (19%) were currently using PrEP at the time of the survey, 178 (6%) had previously used PrEP, and 2450 (75%) had never used PrEP. Table 1 presents the distributions of race/ethnicity, age, geography, health insurance, and frequency of HIV and STI screening among respondents stratified by PrEP use history. Overall, most participants were non-Hispanic white (74%) and more than half were between 15 and 34 years old (51%). The South Atlantic Census division contained the highest proportion of participants (22%), followed by the Pacific (17%), East North Central (14%), and Middle Atlantic (14%) divisions. Only 23% of the participants lived in Southeastern states. PrEP users were generally underrepresented in the Southeast, with 25% of MSM who had never used PrEP residing in the Southeast compared to 19% of current PrEP users and prior PrEP users. Four in five (82%) current PrEP users reported having any private health insurance compared with 72% of prior PrEP users and 75% of never-PrEP users. Only 3% of current PrEP users were uninsured compared with 10% of prior PrEP users and 9% of those who had never used PrEP.

A higher proportion of current PrEP users reported screening for a bacterial STI in the past year (89%), compared to prior PrEP users (71%) and participants who had never used PrEP (44%). Similarly,

98% of current PrEP users were screened for HIV in the past year compared to 80% of prior PrEP users and 65% of those who had never used PrEP.

Among MSM who had ever used PrEP, 84% of current users reported attending PrEP care visits at least every three months compared to 71% of prior PrEP users (Table 2). Overall, 91% of MSM who had ever used PrEP were always screened for HIV at their PrEP care visits. Greater proportions of current PrEP users, compared to prior PrEP users, reported always being screened for a bacterial STI by throat swab (44% versus 35%), rectal swab (37% versus 32%), syphilis (70% versus 57%), and urine sample/urethral swab (59% versus 50%) at these visits. In contrast, among all MSM who had ever used PrEP, 35% had never provided a rectal swab, 28% had never provided a throat swab, and 17% had never provided a urine sample or urethral swab for STI screening during PrEP care visits.

A higher percentage of MSM who had ever used PrEP reported consistent screening for syphilis (87%) and screening for urogenital STIs (78%) (Table 3) compared to pharyngeal STI screening (64%) and rectal STI screening (57%) (Table 4). Participants aged 15–24 years had the highest proportion of consistent screening compared to participants aged 55–65 years who had the lowest proportion of consistent screening for urogenital STIs (80% versus 71%), pharyngeal STIs (70% versus 60%), and rectal STIs (67% versus 53%) (Tables 3 and 4). Reporting of consistent STI screening ranged widely across Census divisions from 74% in West North Central to 92% in the Pacific for syphilis screening, 60% in West North Central to 88% in the Pacific for urogenital STI screening, 43% in East South Central to 77% in the Pacific for pharyngeal STI screening, and 33% in East South Central to 71% in New England for rectal STI screening. Lower levels of consistent screening were reported by those residing in Southeastern states compared to those not currently residing in the region for urogenital STI screening (66% versus 80%), pharyngeal STI screening (55% versus 66%), and rectal STI screening (44% versus 60%) (Tables 3 and 4). Exposure at the anatomical site was indicative of higher levels of consistent screening for urogenital STIs (78% versus 68% among those unexposed), pharyngeal STIs (64% versus 63%), rectal STIs (60% versus 44%).

Among MSM who had ever used PrEP, age, race/ethnicity, health insurance, annual household income, Census division, and Southeastern states were not significantly associated with syphilis screening at PrEP care visits in bivariable Poisson regression analysis with robust error variance (Table 3). For urogenital, rectal, and pharyngeal STIs, however, there was a general trend of younger MSM reporting consistent screening compared to older MSM at PrEP care visits (Tables 3 and 4). In crude analyses, participants who lived in Southeastern states were less likely to report consistent urogenital STI screening [prevalence ratio (PR) = 0.83; 95% confidence interval (CI) = 0.73, 0.94], consistent rectal STI

screening (PR = 0.73; 95% CI = 0.59, 0.89), and consistent pharyngeal STI screening (PR = 0.83; 95% CI = 0.71, 0.97) during PrEP care (Table 4). MSM who reported exposure at the rectal site were 35% more likely to report consistent rectal STI screening at PrEP care visits (PR = 1.35; 95% CI = 1.11, 1.65). There was no bivariable association between sexual exposure at anatomical site and consistent STI screening for urogenital and pharyngeal STIs.

After adjusting for age, race/ethnicity, annual household income, and anatomical site-specific exposure (for urogenital, rectal, and pharyngeal screening only), MSM residing in Southeastern states were less likely to receive consistent STI screening compared to MSM in other regions (Table 5). MSM in the Southeast had 14% lower prevalence of consistent urogenital STI screening [adjusted prevalence ratio (aPR) = 0.86; 95% CI = 0.76, 0.98] and 24% lower prevalence of consistent rectal STI screening (aPR = 0.76; 95% CI = 0.62, 0.93) at PrEP care visits. MSM residing in the Southeast were also less likely to receive consistent pharyngeal STI screening (aPR = 0.87; 95% CI = 0.74, 1.03). There was no association between Southeastern residence and consistent syphilis screening (aPR = 1.02; 95% CI = 0.95, 1.10).

DISCUSSION

At recommended levels of STI screening, we would expect participants to report high levels of consistent STI screening among PrEP-using MSM from blood samples (for syphilis), urine samples/urethral swabs, and rectal and pharyngeal swabs at PrEP care visits. In this national study of MSM, consistency of STI screening at PrEP care visits was lower than recommended, especially for urogenital, rectal, and pharyngeal STI screening and for MSM residing in the Southeast. Our findings highlight the regional variation in gaps between recommendations and PrEP clinical practice overall, and raise concerns about whether PrEP-related STI screening could achieve STI control, particularly in the Southeast where the burden of bacterial STIs is highest.[1,17]

Our analysis contributes to the growing literature on STI screening within PrEP care. With the exception of one larger national study using insurance claims data,[15] similar studies have been limited to individual clinics or health systems, with limited sample sizes.[7,13,14,25,26] The strengths of these previous studies include a variety of data sources to evaluate STI screening frequency at PrEP care visits, including electronic health records in a primary care network, health insurance claims, or laboratory screening.[14,25,26] However, these studies used different measures to quantify the main outcome, frequency of STI screening, including: screening at last PrEP care visit (blood sample, urine sample, rectal swab, oral swab);[13] STI or rectal STI screening in the prior 12 months;[7] or proportion screened for

STIs (syphilis, gonorrhea, chlamydia) within 6 months of PrEP initiation.[15] Our survey measured consistency (always or sometimes versus rarely or never) of STI screening across all PrEP care visits. Varied data collection methods, definitions of STI screening frequency, and sample populations may partially explain the range of STI screening practices observed across studies.

Prior studies on STI screening frequency in PrEP care have consistently shown suboptimal STI screening rates among PrEP users, especially among MSM.[13–15,25] Similar to a study conducted in Baltimore, MD, we found that among all exposure site-specific screening, rectal screening was provided to MSM the least consistently at PrEP visits.[14] A study in New York City, NY, however, found that pharyngeal STI screening was the least practiced at the last PrEP care visit for MSM.[13] These results underscore national trends of infrequent extragenital (rectal of pharyngeal) STI screening among MSM overall that is not specific to PrEP care.[27–29] Low levels of screening at extragenital sites are a concern because many asymptomatic cases of chlamydia or gonorrhea may go undetected, and STIs at these sites lead to increased risk of HIV infection.[22,30]

Researchers have identified several factors associated with more recent or comprehensive STI screening, including younger age, being white, not being in a serodiscordant relationship, college education, reporting anal or oral sex (i.e., exposure at anatomical sites that may trigger screening), and having previous syphilis diagnoses.[7,13,14,25] Our study additionally found that residence in the Southeast was associated with inconsistent screening for urogenital and rectal STIs, even after adjusting for age, race/ethnicity, annual household income, and anatomical site exposure where appropriate. These results have implications for the improvement of comprehensive health services in PrEP care. Kojima and Klausner have suggested a number of strategies to improve the STI care of PrEP users, including frequent extragenital screening at rectal and pharyngeal sites and methods to address repeated infections (including expedited partner therapy).[31] Provider training, cost, and access to services may be especially important in ensuring more consistent screening for STIs, particularly extragenital STIs. A recent study found that 96% of current or potential PrEP providers were somewhat or completely comfortable with screening for STIs, suggesting that providers are well-equipped to provide comprehensive STI care and that other barriers exist to STI screening and treatment.[32] For example, the cost for ancillary services associated with PrEP care such as STI screening may be a barrier, as providers have noted that high cost of antiretroviral medication and health insurance coverage may hinder the real-world effectiveness of PrEP.[33] Moreover, 7 of the 12 Southeastern states have not expanded Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act, potentially limiting the ability of MSM to obtain health insurance that covers STI screening.[34] Further research is warranted to understand multilevel barriers and

facilitators to STI screening at PrEP care visits. Wide implementation of various STI screening methods such as self-collected rectal swabs or home screening kits may also enhance routine STI screening for PrEP-using MSM.[35–37]

Limitations. This study has several limitations. First, this online sample does not represent the larger population of MSM relative to age, race/ethnicity, health insurance, annual household income, and geographic residential location. Most participants were white, had higher income levels, had some form of private health insurance, and lived in the mid-Atlantic/Northeast or the West Coast. Compared to venue-based sampling, web-based sampling of MSM may yield a sample with more non-Hispanic white men and those in higher income groups.[38] Second, stratifying participant data by race/ethnicity, Census division, residence in the Southeast, and exposure at anatomical site yielded small sample sizes in some categories. Third, we relied on self-reported data on the exposures and outcomes, and there may be misclassification of screening frequency due to not understanding what specific STIs they are being tested. Fourth, the data were also limited in classifying anatomical site exposure since the ARTnet study collected data on a maximum of five partners in the past year. For prior PrEP users, exposure at anatomical site in the past year may not align with their PrEP visits if these visits occurred more than a year prior to responding to the ARTnet survey. Fifth, we assume that prior and current PrEP users accessed PrEP in their reported residential ZIP code, but it is possible that prior PrEP users accessed PrEP in a state where they previously lived or that current PrEP users access PrEP in a neighboring state. Sixth, we may be overestimating consistency of syphilis screening, because participants may misinterpret blood draws for HIV screening or other tests at PrEP care visits as inclusive of STI screening. Finally, the STI screening frequency measure (always, sometimes, rarely, or never) allows for an approximate but not perfect estimate of adherence to CDC recommendations for PrEP care, particularly because “sometimes” can represent a wide range of screening frequencies as interpreted by respondents. For this reason, we used the term “consistent” rather than “as recommended”.

Conclusions. Using data from a large national sample of MSM allows for understanding geographic differences in comprehensive health services for PrEP users. Although a higher proportion of PrEP users reported recent STI screening compared to non-PrEP users, our results suggest that barriers exist to fully implementing CDC guidelines to comprehensively screen for STIs at all exposure sites among MSM. This was especially true in Southeastern states where the STI burden is high and where the federal government has prioritized funding HIV prevention programs through the Ending the HIV Epidemic initiative.[39] As PrEP is scaled up in the Southeast through the national initiative, resources to support STI screening and treatment as part of PrEP care should simultaneously be strengthened. Otherwise,

suboptimal STI screening in PrEP care may threaten potential long-term reductions in overall STI incidence among MSM as a result of STI screening and treatment through PrEP programs.

REFERENCES

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance 2018. *US Dep Health Hum Serv*. 2019. doi:10.15620/cdc.79370
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *HIV Surveillance Report, 2018 (Preliminary)*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2019. http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/library/reports/hiv-surveillance.html.
3. Purcell DW, Johnson CH, Lansky A, et al. Estimating the Population Size of Men Who Have Sex with Men in the United States to Obtain HIV and Syphilis Rates. *Open AIDS J*. 2012;6:98-107. doi:10.2174/1874613601206010098
4. Ong JJ, Baggaley RC, Wi TE, et al. Global Epidemiologic Characteristics of Sexually Transmitted Infections Among Individuals Using Preexposure Prophylaxis for the Prevention of HIV Infection: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2(12):e1917134-e1917134. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.17134
5. MONTAÑO MA, DOMBROWSKI JC, DASGUPTA S, et al. Changes in Sexual Behavior and STI Diagnoses among MSM Initiating PrEP in a Clinic Setting. *AIDS Behav*. 2019;23(2):548-555. doi:10.1007/s10461-018-2252-9
6. Marcus JL, Hurley LB, Hare CB, et al. Preexposure Prophylaxis for HIV Prevention in a Large Integrated Health Care System: Adherence, Renal Safety, and Discontinuation. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 1999*. 2016;73(5):540-546. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000001129
7. Menza TW, Lipira L, Bhattarai A, Ramirez FJ, Orellana ER. Self-Reported Screening for Rectal Sexually Transmitted Infections Among Men Who Have Sex With Men: *Sex Transm Dis*. 2019;46(10):683-688. doi:10.1097/OLQ.0000000000001046
8. Volk JE, Marcus JL, Phengrasamy T, et al. No New HIV Infections With Increasing Use of HIV Preexposure Prophylaxis in a Clinical Practice Setting. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am*. 2015;61(10):1601-1603. doi:10.1093/cid/civ778
9. Paz-Bailey G, Mendoza MCB, Finlayson T, et al. Trends in condom use among MSM in the United States: the role of antiretroviral therapy and seroadaptive strategies. *AIDS Lond Engl*. 2016;30(12):1985-1990. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000001139
10. Harawa NT, Holloway IW, Leibowitz A, et al. Serious concerns regarding a meta-analysis of preexposure prophylaxis use and STI acquisition: *AIDS*. 2017;31(5):739-740. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000001386
11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Preexposure Prophylaxis for the Prevention of HIV Infection in the United States – 2017 Update: A Clinical Practice Guideline*.; 2018. https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/risk/prep/cdc-hiv-prep-guidelines-2017.pdf.
12. Jenness SM, Weiss KM, Goodreau SM, et al. Incidence of Gonorrhea and Chlamydia Following Human Immunodeficiency Virus Preexposure Prophylaxis Among Men Who Have Sex With Men: A Modeling Study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017;65(5):712-718. doi:10.1093/cid/cix439
13. Parsons JT, John SA, Whitfield THF, Cienfuegos-Szalay J, Grov C. Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Sexually Transmitted Infection Counseling and Testing Services Received by Gay and Bisexual Men Using Preexposure Prophylaxis at Their Last PrEP Care Visit. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2018;45(12):798-802. doi:10.1097/OLQ.0000000000000880
14. Schumacher C, Wu L, Chandran A, et al. STI Screening among Gay, Bisexual and Other Men who Have Sex with Men Prescribed PrEP in Baltimore City, Maryland. *Clin Infect Dis*. November 2019. doi:10.1093/cid/ciz1145
15. Huang YA, Tao G, Samandari T, Hoover KW. Laboratory Testing of a Cohort of Commercially Insured Users of HIV Preexposure Prophylaxis in the United States, 2011–2015. *J Infect Dis*. 2018;217(4):617-621. doi:10.1093/infdis/jix595
16. Sullivan PS, Mena L, Elopre L, Siegler AJ. Implementation Strategies to Increase PrEP Uptake in the South. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2019;16(4):259-269. doi:10.1007/s11904-019-00447-4
17. Marotta P. Assessing Spatial Relationships between Race, Inequality, Crime, and Gonorrhea and Chlamydia in the United States. *J Urban Health Bull N Y Acad Med*. 2017;94(5):683-698. doi:10.1007/s11524-017-0179-5
18. Patel RR, Mena L, Nunn A, et al. Impact of insurance coverage on utilization of pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention. *PLoS ONE*. 2017;12(5). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0178737
19. Philbin MM, Parker CM, Parker RG, Wilson PA, Garcia J, Hirsch JS. The Promise of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis for Black Men Who Have Sex with Men: An Ecological Approach to Attitudes, Beliefs, and Barriers. *AIDS Patient Care STDs*. 2016;30(6):282-290. doi:10.1089/apc.2016.0037
20. Weiss KM, Goodreau SM, Morris M, et al. Egocentric sexual networks of men who have sex with men in the United States: Results from the ARTnet study. *Epidemics*. 2020;30:100386. doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2020.100386

21. Zlotorzynska M, Sullivan P, Sanchez T. The Annual American Men's Internet Survey of Behaviors of Men Who Have Sex With Men in the United States: 2016 Key Indicators Report. *JMIR Public Health Surveill*. 2019;5(1):e11313. doi:10.2196/11313
22. Jenness SM, Weiss KM, Prasad P, Zlotorzynska M, Sanchez T. Bacterial Sexually Transmitted Infection Screening Rates by Symptomatic Status Among Men Who Have Sex With Men in the United States: A Hierarchical Bayesian Analysis. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2019;46(1):25-30. doi:10.1097/OLQ.0000000000000896
23. BEA Regions. Bureau of Economic Analysis: U.S. Department of Commerce. https://apps.bea.gov/regional/docs/regions.cfm.
24. R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2019. https://www.R-project.org/.
25. Spinelli MA, Scott HM, Vittinghoff E, et al. Provider Adherence to Pre-exposure Prophylaxis Monitoring Guidelines in a Large Primary Care Network. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2018;5(6). doi:10.1093/ofid/ofy099
26. Hevey MA, Walsh JL, Petroll AE. PrEP Continuation, HIV and STI Testing Rates, and Delivery of Preventive Care in a Clinic-Based Cohort. *AIDS Educ Prev Off Publ Int Soc AIDS Educ*. 2018;30(5):393-405. doi:10.1521/aeap.2018.30.5.393
27. de Voux A, Bernstein KT, Kirkcaldy RD, Zlotorzynska M, Sanchez T. Self-Reported Extragenital Chlamydia and Gonorrhea Testing in the Past 12 Months Among Men Who Have Sex with Men in the United States-American Men's Internet Survey, 2017. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2019;46(9):563-570. doi:10.1097/OLQ.0000000000001032
28. Barbee L, Dhanireddy S, Tat S, Marrazzo J. Barriers to Bacterial Sexually Transmitted Infection Testing of HIV-Infected Men Who Have Sex With Men Engaged in HIV Primary Care. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2015;42(10):590-594. doi:10.1097/OLQ.0000000000000320
29. Patton ME, Kidd S, Llata E, et al. Extragenital gonorrhea and chlamydia testing and infection among men who have sex with men--STD Surveillance Network, United States, 2010-2012. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am*. 2014;58(11):1564-1570. doi:10.1093/cid/ciu184
30. Bernstein KT, Marcus JL, Nieri G, Philip SS, Klausner JD. Rectal gonorrhea and chlamydia reinfection is associated with increased risk of HIV seroconversion. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 1999*. 2010;53(4):537-543. doi:10.1097/QAI.0b013e3181c3ef29
31. Kojima N, Klausner JD. Improving Management of Sexually Transmitted Infections in Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis for Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection Users. *AIDS Lond Engl*. 2018;32(2):272-275. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000001703
32. Petroll AE, Walsh JL, Owczarzak JL, McAuliffe TL, Bogart LM, Kelly JA. PrEP Awareness, Familiarity, Comfort, and Prescribing Experience among US Primary Care Providers and HIV Specialists. *AIDS Behav*. 2017;21(5):1256-1267. doi:10.1007/s10461-016-1625-1
33. Krakower D, Ware N, Mitty JA, Maloney K, Mayer KH. HIV Providers' Perceived Barriers and Facilitators to Implementing Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis in Care Settings: A Qualitative Study. *AIDS Behav*. 2014;18(9):1712-1721. doi:10.1007/s10461-014-0839-3
34. Kaiser Family Foundation. Status of State Medicaid Expansion Decisions: Interactive Map. *Henry J Kais Fam Found*. February 2020. https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/status-of-state-medicaid-expansion-decisions-interactive-map/. Accessed March 4, 2020.
35. Moncada J, Schachter J, Liska S, Shayevich C, Klausner JD. Evaluation of Self-Collected Glans and Rectal Swabs from Men Who Have Sex with Men for Detection of Chlamydia trachomatis and Neisseria gonorrhoeae by Use of Nucleic Acid Amplification Tests. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2009;47(6):1657-1662. doi:10.1128/JCM.02269-08
36. Park I, Schapiro J, Hurley L, et al. LB 2.59 Improving std screening in hiv care through implementation of self-collected extragenital swabs. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2017;93(Suppl 2):A92-A92. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2017-053264.235
37. Fisher M, Wayal S, Smith H, et al. Home Sampling for Sexually Transmitted Infections and HIV in Men Who Have Sex with Men: A Prospective Observational Study. *PLoS ONE*. 2015;10(4). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120810
38. Chen Y-T, Bowles K, An Q, et al. Surveillance Among Men Who have Sex with Men in the United States: A Comparison of Web-Based and Venue-Based Samples. *AIDS Behav*. 2018;22(7):2104-2112. doi:10.1007/s10461-017-1837-z
39. Fauci AS, Redfield RR, Sigounas G, Weahkee MD, Giroir BP. Ending the HIV Epidemic: A Plan for the United States. *JAMA*. 2019;321(9):844-845. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.1343

TABLES

Table 1. Characteristics of PrEP-Eligible ARTnet Participants, Stratified by PrEP Use History

	Total[a]		Current PrEP Use		Prior PrEP Use		Never Used PrEP	
	N or Mean	%[b] or SD	N or Mean	% or SD	N or Mean	% or SD	N or Mean	% or SD
Total Sample	3259	100.0	631	100.0	178	100.0	2450	100.0
Race/Ethnicity								
Black (Non-Hispanic)	134	4.1	28	4.4	4	2.3	102	4.2
Hispanic	422	12.9	81	12.8	23	12.9	318	13.0
Other (Non-Hispanic)	283	8.7	53	8.4	11	6.2	219	8.9
White (Non-Hispanic)	2420	74.3	469	74.3	140	78.7	1811	73.9
Age	37.3	13.6	39.5	12.4	34.1	11.5	36.9	13.9
15–24	713	21.9	71	11.3	36	20.2	606	24.7
25–34	947	29.1	196	31.1	76	42.7	675	27.6
35–44	518	15.9	122	19.3	26	14.6	370	16.3
45–54	573	17.6	149	23.6	24	13.5	400	16.3
55–65	508	15.6	93	14.7	16	9.0	399	16.3
Residence in Census Division[c]								
Pacific	562	17.2	155	24.6	31	17.4	376	15.3
Mountain	281	8.6	30	4.8	21	11.8	230	9.4
West North Central	187	5.7	32	5.1	13	7.3	142	5.8
East North Central	466	14.3	92	14.6	25	14.0	349	14.2
West South Central	323	9.9	61	9.7	11	6.2	251	10.2
East South Central	132	4.1	19	3.0	6	3.4	107	4.4
South Atlantic	701	21.5	119	18.9	35	19.7	547	22.3
Middle Atlantic	442	13.6	92	14.6	20	11.2	330	13.5
New England	165	5.1	31	4.9	16	9.0	118	4.8
Residence in Southeast[b]								
Yes	760	23.3	121	19.2	33	18.5	606	24.7
No	2499	76.7	510	80.8	145	81.5	1844	75.3
Health Insurance								
Private	2441	76.4	516	82.2	128	71.9	1797	75.2
Public	514	16.1	94	15.0	33	18.5	387	16.2
None	242	7.6	18	2.9	17	9.6	207	8.7
Annual Household Income								
$0 to $19,999	372	12.3	54	9.3	18	10.7	300	13.2
$20,000 to $39,999	574	19.1	93	16.1	34	20.2	447	19.7
$40,000 to $74,999	861	28.6	153	26.4	56	33.3	652	28.8
$75,000 or more	1206	40.0	279	48.2	60	35.7	867	38.3
Screened for HIV in the Past 12 Months								
Yes	2106	71.9	561	98.2	129	79.6	1416	64.5
No	822	28.1	10	1.8	33	20.4	779	35.5
Screened for an STI in Past 12 Months								
Yes	1677	54.4	547	89.1	122	70.9	1008	43.8
No	1408	45.6	67	10.9	50	28.1	1291	56.2

Abbreviations: PrEP, preexposure prophylaxis; SD, standard deviation; USD, U.S. Dollars; STI, sexually transmitted infection

[a] Totals may not add up to sample total due to missing data for health insurance, annual household income, and screening for

[b] Column percents

[c] https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/maps-data/maps/reference/us_regdiv.pdf

[d] Residence in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia

Table 2. Frequency of PrEP Care Visits and HIV/STI Screening at PrEP Care Visits among MSM with Current or Prior PrEP Use

	Total[a]		Current PrEP Use		Prior PrEP Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Sample	809	100.0	631	100.0	178	100.0
Frequency of PrEP Care Visits						
Every Month	23	2.9	13	2.1	10	5.7
Every 3 Months	629	78.3	514	82.0	115	65.3
Every 6 Months	83	10.3	75	12.0	8	4.5
Every 9 Months	3	0.4	1	0.2	2	1.1
Every 12 Months	8	1.0	8	1.3	0	0.0
Returned Only Once	21	2.6	3	0.5	18	10.2
Returned at Some Other Interval of Time	11	1.4	6	1.0	5	2.8
Did Not Return Regularly	25	3.1	7	1.1	18	10.2
Frequency of HIV screening at PrEP Care Visits		0				
Always	685	91.1	566	92.5	119	85.0
Sometimes	50	6.6	40	6.5	10	7.1
Rarely	7	0.9	3	0.5	4	2.9
Never	10	1.3	3	0.5	7	5.0
Frequency of Throat Swab at PrEP Care Visits						
Always	316	42.5	267	44.1	49	35.3
Sometimes	161	21.6	134	22.1	27	19.4
Rarely	56	7.5	44	7.3	12	8.6
Never	211	28.4	160	26.4	51	36.7
Frequency of Rectal Swab at PrEP Care Visits						
Always	270	36.2	226	37.2	44	31.7
Sometimes	155	20.8	128	21.1	27	19.4
Rarely	58	7.8	50	8.2	8	5.8
Never	263	35.3	203	33.4	60	43.2
Frequency of Blood Sample at PrEP Care Visits						
Always	492	67.4	415	69.9	77	56.6
Sometimes	143	19.6	114	19.2	29	21.3
Rarely	32	4.4	21	3.5	11	8.1
Never	63	8.6	44	7.4	19	14.0
Frequency of Urine Sample or Swab at PrEP Care Visits						
Always	425	57.3	356	59.0	69	49.6
Sometimes	150	20.2	128	21.2	22	15.8
Rarely	42	5.7	33	5.5	9	6.5
Never	125	16.8	86	14.3	39	28.1

Abbreviations: STI, sexually transmitted infection; PrEP, preexposure prophylaxis

[a] Totals may not add up to sample total due to missing data

Table 3. Bivariable Associations of Consistent Syphilis and Urogenital STI Screening with Demographic and Behavioral Factors among MSM Who Have Ever Used PrEP

	Syphilis Screening[a] (N=730)						Urogenital STI Screening (N=742)					
	Consistent[b]		Inconsistent				Consistent		Inconsistent			
	N	%	N	%	PR	95% CI	N	%	N	%	PR	95% CI
Total Sample	635	87.0	95	13.0			575	77.5	167	22.5		
Age												
15-24	75	83.3	15	16.7	1.00	-	73	80.2	18	19.8	1.00	-
25-34	215	87.8	30	12.2	1.05	0.95, 1.17	201	80.1	50	19.9	1.00	0.89, 1.12
35-44	123	90.4	13	9.6	1.09	0.97, 1.21	104	75.4	34	24.6	0.94	0.82, 1.08
45-54	140	85.9	23	14.1	1.03	0.92, 1.15	127	77.9	36	22.1	0.97	0.85, 1.11
55-65	82	85.4	14	14.6	1.02	0.91, 1.16	70	70.7	29	29.3	0.88	0.75, 1.04
Race/Ethnicity												
Black (Non-Hispanic)	30	93.8	2	6.3	1.00	-	28	87.5	4	12.5	1.00	-
Hispanic	84	91.3	8	8.7	0.97	0.87, 1.09	78	84.8	14	15.2	0.97	0.83, 1.13
Other (Non-Hispanic)	53	91.4	5	8.6	0.97	0.87, 1.10	45	77.6	13	22.4	0.89	0.73, 1.07
White (Non-Hispanic)	468	85.4	80	14.6	0.91	0.83, 1.00	424	75.7	136	24.3	0.87	0.75, 0.99
Health Insurance												
None	28	84.8	5	15.2	1.00	-	23	69.7	10	30.3	1.00	-
Public	98	87.5	14	12.5	1.03	0.88, 1.21	91	79.8	23	20.2	1.15	0.90, 1.46
Private	507	87.1	75	12.9	1.03	0.89, 1.19	459	77.5	133	22.5	1.11	0.88, 1.40
Annual Household Income												
$0 to $19,999	54	83.1	11	16.9	1.00	-	50	76.9	15	23.1	1.00	-
$20,000 to $39,999	86	80.4	21	19.6	0.97	0.84, 1.12	87	79.1	23	20.9	1.03	0.87, 1.21
$40,000 to $74,999	165	87.3	24	12.7	1.05	0.93, 1.19	147	75.4	48	24.6	0.98	0.84, 1.14
$75,000 or more	279	89.1	34	10.9	1.07	0.96, 1.21	244	77.2	72	22.8	1.00	0.87, 1.16
Residence in Census Division												
New England	36	92.3	3	7.7	1.00	-	33	80.5	8	19.5	1.00	-
Middle Atlantic	89	85.6	15	14.4	0.93	0.82, 1.05	86	79.6	22	20.4	0.99	0.83, 1.18
East North Central	89	84.0	17	16.0	0.91	0.80, 1.03	83	77.6	24	22.4	0.96	0.80, 1.16
West North Central	29	74.4	10	25.6	0.81	0.66, 0.99	24	60.0	16	40.0	0.75	0.56, 1.00
South Atlantic	119	86.9	18	13.1	0.94	0.84, 1.05	93	67.9	44	32.1	0.84	0.70, 1.02
East South Central	18	85.7	3	14.3	0.93	0.76, 1.13	13	61.9	8	38.1	0.77	0.53, 1.11
West South Central	62	89.9	7	10.1	0.97	0.86, 1.10	57	82.6	12	17.4	1.03	0.85, 1.24
Mountain	34	79.1	9	20.9	0.86	0.72, 1.02	32	74.4	11	25.6	0.92	0.73, 1.17
Pacific	159	92.4	13	7.6	1.00	0.91, 1.11	154	87.5	22	12.5	1.09	0.93, 1.28
Residence in Southeast[c]												
No	517	87.2	76	12.8	1.00	-	484	80.0	121	20.0	1.00	-
Yes	118	86.1	19	13.9	0.99	0.92, 1.06	91	66.4	46	33.6	0.83	0.73, 0.94
Exposure at Anatomical Site[d]												
No							15	68.2	7	31.8	1.00	-
Yes							560	77.8	160	22.2	1.14	0.86, 1.52

Abbreviations: STI, sexually transmitted infection; PrEP, preexposure prophylaxis; PR, prevalence ratio; CI, confidence interval

[a] Participants who provided blood samples for STI screening were considered to be screened for syphilis

[b] Consistent screening defined as always or sometimes (versus rarely or never) being screened at PrEP care visits compared

[c] Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and W Virginia

[d] Defined as any insertive anal intercourse or receiving oral sex for urogenital STI screening

Table 4. Bivariable Associations of Consistent Rectal and Pharyngeal STI Screening with Demographic and Behavioral Factors among MSM Who Have Ever Used PrEP

	Rectal STI Screening (N=746)						Pharyngeal STI Screening (N=744)					
	Consistent		Inconsistent				Consistent		Inconsistent			
	N	%	N	%	PR	95% CI	N	%	N	%	PR	95% CI
Total Sample	425	57.0	321	43.0			477	64.1	267	35.9		
Age												
15-24	61	67.0	30	33.0	1.00	-	63	70.0	27	30.0	1.00	-
25-34	146	57.9	106	42.1	0.86	0.72, 1.03	163	64.9	88	35.1	0.93	0.79 1.09
35-44	74	53.6	64	46.4	0.80	0.65, 0.99	89	64.5	49	35.5	0.92	0.77 1.11
45-54	91	55.2	74	44.8	0.82	0.67, 1.00	102	61.8	63	38.2	0.88	0.74 1.06
55-65	53	53.0	47	47.0	0.79	0.63, 1.00	60	60.0	40	40.0	0.86	0.70 1.06
Race/Ethnicity												
Black (Non-Hispanic)	16	50.0	16	50.0	1.00	-	19	59.4	13	40.6	1.00	-
Hispanic	57	62.0	35	38.0	1.24	0.85, 1.82	61	66.3	31	33.7	1.12	0.81, 1.54
Other (Non-Hispanic)	39	67.2	19	32.8	1.34	0.91, 1.99	43	74.1	15	25.9	1.25	0.90, 1.73
White (Non-Hispanic)	313	55.5	251	44.5	1.11	0.78, 1.58	354	63.0	208	37.0	1.06	0.79, 1.42
Health Insurance[a]												
None	19	57.6	14	42.4	1.00	-	22	66.7	11	33.3	1.00	-
Public	58	50.0	58	50.0	0.87	0.62, 1.23	74	63.8	42	36.2	0.96	0.73, 1.26
Private	347	58.4	247	41.6	1.01	0.75, 1.37	380	64.2	212	35.8	0.96	0.75, 1.23
Annual Household Income												
$0 to $19,999	35	53.0	31	47.0	1.00	-	44	66.7	22	33.3	1.00	-
$20,000 to $39,999	59	53.6	51	46.4	1.01	0.76, 1.35	62	56.4	48	43.6	0.85	0.67, 1.07
$40,000 to $74,999	109	55.9	86	44.1	1.05	0.81, 1.37	125	64.4	69	35.6	0.97	0.79, 1.18
$75,000 or more	187	58.8	131	41.2	1.11	0.87, 1.42	206	65.0	111	35.0	0.97	0.81, 1.18
Residence in Census Division												
New England	29	70.7	12	29.3	1.00	-	30	73.2	11	26.8	1.00	-
Middle Atlantic	65	60.2	43	39.8	0.85	0.66, 1.09	74	69.2	33	30.8	0.95	0.76, 1.18
East North Central	57	52.8	51	47.2	0.75	0.57, 0.97	59	54.6	49	45.4	0.75	0.58, 0.96
West North Central	21	52.5	19	47.5	0.74	0.52, 1.06	24	61.5	15	38.5	0.84	0.62, 1.15
South Atlantic	65	46.1	76	53.9	0.65	0.50, 0.85	79	56.0	62	44.0	0.77	0.60, 0.97
East South Central	7	33.3	14	66.7	0.47	0.25, 0.89	9	42.9	12	57.1	0.59	0.35, 0.99
West South Central	40	58.0	29	42.0	0.82	0.62, 1.09	47	68.1	22	31.9	0.93	0.73, 1.19
Mountain	19	45.2	23	54.8	0.64	0.43, 0.94	20	47.6	22	52.4	0.65	0.45, 0.94
Pacific	122	69.3	54	30.7	0.98	0.79, 1.22	135	76.7	41	23.3	1.05	0.86, 1.28
Residence in Southeast[b]												
No	364	60.1	242	39.9	1.00	-	400	66.2	204	33.8	1.00	-
Yes	61	43.6	79	56.4	0.73	0.59, 0.89	77	55.0	63	45.0	0.83	0.71, 0.97
Exposure at Anatomical Site[c]												
No	61	44.2	77	55.8	1.00	-	15	62.5	9	37.5	1.00	-
Yes	364	59.9	244	40.1	1.35	1.11, 1.65	462	64.2	258	35.8	1.03	0.75, 1.41

Abbreviations: STI, sexually transmitted infection; PrEP, preexposure prophylaxis; PR, prevalence ratio; CI, confidence interval

[a] Consistent screening defined as always or sometimes (versus rarely or never) being screened at PrEP care visits compared

[b] Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and W Virginia

[c] Defined as any receptive anal intercourse for rectal STI screening and any performance of oral sex on a partner for pharyngeal STI screening

Table 5. Multivariable Associations of Consistent[a] STI Screening with Residence in the Southeast U.S.[b] Among MSM who Have Ever Used PrEP

	Adjusted PR[c]	95% CI
Syphilis Screening[d]		
Residence Outside Southeast	1.00	-
Residence in Southeast	1.02	0.95, 1.10
Urogenital STI Screening		
Residence Outside Southeast	1.00	-
Residence in Southeast	0.86	0.76, 0.98
Rectal STI Screening		
Residence Outside Southeast	1.00	-
Residence in Southeast	0.76	0.62, 0.93
Pharyngeal STI Screening		
Residence Outside Southeast	1.00	-
Residence in Southeast	0.87	0.74, 1.03

Abbreviations: STI, sexually transmitted infection; PrEP, preexposure prophylaxis; PR, prevalence ratio; CI, confidence interval

[a] Consistent screening defined as always or sometimes (versus rarely or never) being screened at PrEP care visits compared

[b] Residence in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia

[c] Adjusted for age, race/ethnicity, annual household income, and sexual exposure at anatomical site

[d] Not adjusted for sexual exposure at anatomical site