Monitoring socioeconomic inequalities across HIV knowledge, attitudes, behaviours and prevention: results from cross-sectional surveys in 18 sub-Saharan African countries

Mohamed Hamidouche[1,2], Pearl Anne Ante-Testard[1,2], Rachel Baggaley[3], Laura Temime[1,2], Kévin Jean[1,2,4]*

[1]Laboratoire MESuRS, Conservatoire national des Arts et Métiers, Paris, France ;

[2]Unité PACRI, Institut Pasteur, Conservatoire national des Arts et Métiers, Paris, France ;

[3]World Health Organization, Global HIV, Hepatitis and STI Programmes, Geneva, Switzerland

[4]MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Imperial College London, London W2 1PG, United Kingdom.

* Correspondance to:

Kévin Jean

Laboratoire MESuRS, Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, 292 rue Saint Martin, 75003, Paris, France

kevin.jean@lecnam.net

Keywords: HIV; health inequalities; epidemiology; sub-Saharan Africa; HIV prevention; social epidemiology

Word count:

Abstract: 244/250

Main text: 3162/3500

Objectives: Socioeconomic inequalities in the access to and uptake of HIV prevention services constitute important barriers to global prevention targets, especially in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). We aimed at monitoring these inequalities based on data from population-based surveys conducted in 18 SSA countries between 2010 and 2018.

Methods: We defined eight HIV indicators aimed at capturing access to and uptake of HIV prevention services among adult participants. Country-specific wealth-related inequalities were measured using the Relative and Slope Index of Inequalities (RII and SII, respectively) and were then pooled using random-effects meta-analyses. We compared inequalities between African regions using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test.

Results: The sample consisted of 358,591 participants (66% women). Despite the variability in inequalities between countries and indicators, the meta-analysis revealed significant levels of relative and absolute inequalities in 6 out of 8 HIV indicators. For instance, the richest participants were five times more likely than the poorest to report condom use at last sexual intercourse (RII=5.02; 95% confidence interval, CI: 2.79-9.05), corresponding to an absolute difference of 16 percentage-points (SII=0.16; 95% CI: 0.12-0.20). Similar significant inequalities were observed in HIV-related knowledge, positive attitudes toward people living with HIV, recent HIV testing, participation to prevention of mother-to-child transmission programs and medical male circumcision. Overall, inequalities tended to be larger in West and Central vs. East and Southern African countries.

Conclusions: Despite efforts to scale-up HIV-prevention programs, socioeconomic inequalities remain substantial over the continuum of HIV primary and secondary prevention in several SSA countries.

Introduction

Despite a sustained decrease over the last decade, sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) continues to bear a disproportionate burden of the global HIV epidemic, with about two thirds of the worldwide number of HIV infections [1]. Many SSA countries are not on track to meet global targets of 90% reduction of new HIV infections by 2030 compared to 2010 [2,3]. There is however a large body of literature supporting the fact that these targets could be reached by effectively combining existing prevention interventions and tools, including behavioural prevention, condoms, voluntary male medical circumcision (VMMC), pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP), HIV testing, and prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT), alongside increased antiretroviral coverage [4].

Inequalities, including socio-economic inequalities, have been recognized as a contributor in the failure to meet the UNAIDS 90-90-90 testing and treatment 2020 targets [5], and may also be a factor in the disappointing progress in effective prevention coverage. Indeed, socio-economic inequalities have been reported across HIV knowledge [6], HIV testing [7–9], PMTCT [10], and VMMC [11]. However, there has not been to date a comprehensive large-scale assessment of socioeconomic inequalities across the major prevention pillars to guide the focus of future programming to overcome current gaps. Such an assessment would be valuable, though. Firstly, it would allow to identify, within the main HIV prevention pillars, those that could potentially be at specific risk of generating socioeconomic inequalities in HIV infections. Secondly, a monitoring of national HIV prevention indicators focusing on inequalities would potentially allow to identify and then learn from settings that are specifically performant in terms of equity.

In this paper, we used recent nationally representative surveys across 18 sub-Saharan African countries to quantify wealth-related inequalities in several indicators aiming at capturing HIV prevention elements.

Methods

Study population and data

We analysed data from the most recent Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) in 18 Sub-Saharan African countries (based on data availability as of November 2020). The country sample was a convenience sample based, and slightly extended, from an earlier research project [9]. The sample included Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, Guinea, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

DHS are nationally representative surveys based on a multistage design with households as sampling units. They collect a wide range of demographic and reproduction health indicators among consenting adults that are interviewed face-to-face by trained interviewers using standardized questionnaires [12]. The collected data notably include age and gender, as well as specific data on HIV/AIDS. In particular, some DHS include an HIV serological survey, for which participants are asked to consent to be tested for HIV (anonymously in most of the surveys included here). Household wealth was assessed using the DHS wealth index, a composite measure of living standards that is based on the household's assets (e.g. refrigerators) and characteristics (e.g., sanitation facilities) [13].

All DHS were conducted by national central statistics agencies or research institutes. The institutions that approved, implemented, or provided funding for the surveys were responsible for ethical clearance, which guaranteed informed consent and confidentiality of participant's information.

HIV indicators

We defined and analysed a set of eight HIV indicators aimed at capturing HIV knowledge, attitudes, behaviours and access to and uptake of HIV prevention services. These indicators were chosen and designed in a pragmatic way based on the information collected in the DHS across all countries selected for this analysis. These HIV indicators were consistently coded as binary variables with the level 1 (the level 0, respectively) reflecting a favourable (unfavourable, respectively) condition regarding HIV. These HIV indicators were:

i) *HIV-related knowledge*: based on the responses to a set of seven questions related to HIV transmission and prevention, we defined a categorical indicator reflecting good HIV-related knowledge (coded as 1 for those answering all questions correctly, 0 otherwise).

ii) *Positive attitudes towards PLHIV*: based on a set of two questions related to stigma towards PLHIV, we defined a categorical indicator reflecting positive attitudes towards PLHIV (coded as 1 for those answering positively to both questions, 0 otherwise).

iii) *No multipartnership (no or one sexual partner) in the past year*: based on the number of sexual partners reported in the last 12 months (self-reported, coded as 1 for those reporting no or one sexual partner, 0 otherwise)

iv) *Condom use at last sexual intercourse* (self-reported, coded as 1 for those reporting having used a condom during their last intercourse, 0 otherwise).

v) *Medical Male Circumcision (MMC*, among men only): based on the self-reported circumcision status and the qualification of the person who performed the circumcision (health worker/professional). We only analysed *MMC* in 7 countries among of 14 that have been prioritized for the implementation of MMC as HIV-prevention intervention in 2007 (mainly in Eastern and Southern Africa) [14].

vi) *Participation in Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission (PMTCT*, among women only): based on self-reported HIV testing during antenatal care among women who gave birth in the 12 months preceding the survey (coded as 1 for those reporting having been tested, 0 otherwise).

vii) *Recent HIV testing*: based on self-reported HIV testing within the past 12 months (coded as 1 for those reporting having been recently tested, 0 otherwise).

viii) *HIV seronegativity among youth*: based on the result of the HIV serological survey among 15-24 years old participants (coded as 1 in seronegative youths, 0 otherwise). trends in HIV prevalence among youth (aged 15-24 years) have been documented to be a surrogate reflecting trends in HIV incidence [15,16]. As the onset of sexual activity in this group is likely to be recent, prevalence reflects recent infection and therefore incidence. We thus used the socioeconomic gradient in HIV seroprevalence among the 15-24 years old as a proxy for the socioeconomic gradient in HIV incidence. To consistently consider a level 1 reflecting a favourable condition and therefore facilitate the interpretation and comparison of inequalities across indicators, the level 1 was chosen to code HIV seronegativity.

Further details on the construction of these HIV-related indicators are provided in Appendix 1

Statistical analysis

For each country survey and each HIV indicator, we calculated percentages of positivity taking into account the survey design and sampling weights. We then assessed within-country socioeconomic inequalities related to each indicator based on participants' relative rank in the cumulative distribution of the wealth index. Inequalities were measured on both relative and absolute scales using the relative index of inequality (RII) and the slope index of inequality

(SII), respectively [17]. The RII expresses the ratio of the predicted outcomes between the richest and the poorest people in the wealth distribution. The SII represents the absolute difference in the predicted proportions of these two extremes. For instance, a RII value of 2 indicates that individuals at the upper extreme of the wealth distribution (the richest) are twice more likely to report the outcome than individuals at the lower extreme (the poorest). A SII value of 0.2 means that the proportion of the outcome is higher by 0.2 (or higher by 20 percentage-points) in the upper extreme of the wealth distribution (the richest) versus the lower extreme (the poorest). Reporting inequalities on both scales is recommended, because conclusions can be skewed when only one or the other is used [18]. Furthermore, the choice of a relative scale over an absolute scale or vice versa carries an implicit normative judgment on what a fair and socially just distribution of health should be [19].

Both RII and SII were obtained by fitting a modified Poisson regression with a robust variance and a log link function to estimate the association between participants' relative wealth rank and each indicator, and by using generalised estimating equations to account for the clustering of observations [20]. We used the Wilcoxon rank-sum test to compare indices of inequalities between West and Central Africa (WCA) versus East and Southern African (ESA) countries (except for *MMC*, which was studied in ESA only). Lastly, we used random-effects meta-analysis to average inequality estimates across countries [21].

Results

Study population

DHS included in the present work were conducted between 2010 and 2018 (Figure 1), with participation rates ranging from 90% (Ethiopia 2016) to 100% (Rwanda 2014-15) (Table 1). Overall, these studies represented 358,591 participants, (238,055 women and 120,536 men).



Figure 1: Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) year (left) and adult HIV prevalence (right) of the 18 Sub-Saharan African countries (NB: For Kenya, HIV prevalence is unavailable in its last DHS 2014)**.**

5 **Table 1: Distribution of HIV-related indicators for 18 Sub-Saharan African countries (Demographic and Health Surveys).** PLHIV: People living with HIV; PMTCT : Prevention
6 of Mother-to-Child Transmission; MMC: Medical Male Circumcision; NA: Not Available. [1]: as reported in the country's DHS final report ; [2]: within the past year; [3]: at last
7 sexual intercourse; [4]: among those aged 15-24 y. Countries are ordered west to east.

West and Central Africa

	Senegal (2017)	Sierra Leone (2013)	Guinea (2018)	Liberia (2013)	Côte d'Ivoire (2011-12)	Mali (2012-13)	Burkina Faso (2010)	Niger (2012)	Cameroon (2018)	DR Congo (2013-14)
Response rate (%)[1]	92%	96%	98%	96%	92%	94%	97%	91%	97%	98%
Sample size	23 764	23 920	14 991	13 357	15 195	14 823	24 394	15 088	20 505	27 483
HIV-related knowledge	17.7%	19.5%	15.8%	6.2%	14.0%	19.9%	22.7%	11.0%	30.3%	12.5%
Positive Attitude towards PLHIV	32.9%	34.1%	16.0%	34.7%	47.0%	45.1%	34.5%	20.1%	55.1%	35.7%
No multipartnership[2]	97.1%	88.1%	95.4%	90.1%	88.1%	95.2%	94.2%	95.6%	90.1%	91.1%
Condom use[3]	6.5%	5.0%	8.3%	12.8%	18.5%	3.6%	12.7%	1.1%	29.7%	9.2%
Participation to PMTCT (Females)	67.0%	72.2%	30.7%	76.4%	50.0%	23.2%	40.3%	33.5%	89.4%	25.0%
MMC (Males)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recent HIV-Testing[2]	18.6	14.7%	8.4%	19.1%	13.5%	6.8%	10.3%	6.9%	57.7%	8.6%
HIV-seronegativity among youth[4]	99.8%	98.9%	99.1%	98.9%	98.7%	99.2%	99.7%	100%	98.7%	99.3%

East and Southern Africa

	Zambia (2018)	Lesotho (2014)	Zimbabwe (2015)	Rwanda (2014-15)	Malawi (2015-16)	Tanzania (2011-12)	Kenya (2014)	Ethiopia (2016)
Response rate (%)[1]	94%	95%	94%	100%	96%	97%	92%	90%
Sample size	25 815	9 552	18 351	19 714	32 040	19 319	11 909	28 371
HIV-related knowledge	29.6%	23.8%	40.2%	43.4%	34.7%	28.3%	27.2%	22.2%
Positive Attitude towards PLHIV	72.8%	80.5%	77.9%	84.3%	81.6%	61.5%	75.2%	39.7%
No multipartnership[2]	92.1%	87.6%	92.9%	98.0%	96.1%	88.9%	93.4%	98.2%
Condom use[3]	18.8%	51.3%	23.4%	12.4%	14.6%	19.3%	21.6%	3.0%
Participation to PMTCT (Females)	97.3%	98.4%	97.9%	99.4%	97.2%	80.5%	98.0%	57.2%
MMC (Males)	40.4%	NA	11.3%	85.4%	9.0%	40.7%	60.0%	15.8%
Recent HIV-Testing[2]	59.8%	52.6%	43.6%	38.8%	43.9%	30.4%	64.9%	20.6%
HIV-seronegativity among youth[4]	96.1%	90.3%	95.0%	99.0%	96.9%	98.0%	NA	99.8%

178 *HIV indicators*

179 Country-specific percentages of positivity for each HIV indicator are presented in Table 1. In ESA
180 countries, good HIV-related knowledge ranged from 22% (Ethiopia) to 43 % (Rwanda) while it
181 was ≤20% in 8 out of 10 WCA countries (with the exception of Cameroon, 30% and Burkina
182 Faso, 23%). Similarly, positive attitudes toward PLHIV were >60% in 7 out of 8 ESA countries
183 (with the exception of Ethiopia, 40%) while the highest level in WCA was 55% (Cameroon).
184 Reporting no multipartnership in the past 12 months was consistently high across countries,
185 ranging from 88% (Sierra Leone, Côte d'Ivoire and Lesotho) to 98% (Rwanda and Ethiopia).
186 Reported condom use at last sexual intercourse was highest in Lesotho (51%). In other
187 countries reported condom use was lower, ranging from 1% (Niger) to 23% (Zimbabwe).
188 Overall, higher uptake of HIV testing in the past 12 months was observed in ESA, with uptake
189 >20% in all countries, as compared to in WCA, where uptake was <20% in 9 out of 10 countries.
190 Similarly, ESA countries reported levels of participation to PMTCT >95% in 6 out of 8 countries
191 (with the exception of Ethiopia, 57% and Tanzania, 81%), while it was <90% in all WCA
192 countries, with large heterogeneity (from 23% in Mali to 89% in Cameroon). As mentioned
193 earlier, MMC was reported in ESA countries only, with levels ranging from 9% (Malawi) to 85%
194 (Rwanda).

195

196 *Socioeconomic inequalities in the HIV indicators*

197 Measures of relative and absolute inequalities pooled across countries are presented in Table 2.
198 Significant levels of relative and absolute inequalities in favour of the richest were observed for
199 HIV-related knowledge, positive attitudes toward PLHIV, condom use at last sex, participation to
200 PMTCT, MMC and recent HIV testing. In contrast, we observed inequalities in the other direction
201 in reporting no multipartnership and in HIV-seronegativity among youth (that is, the poorest
202 reported lower levels of multipartnership and exhibited lower levels of HIV seropositivity),
203 although these inequalities were borderline significant and of low magnitude as compared to the

204 other indicators. The ranking of the indicators by level of inequalities varied between the
205 relative and the absolute scales. On the relative scale, the highest level was observed for condom
206 use, with the richest being approximatively 5 times more likely (RII = 5.02; 95 Confidence
207 interval, CI, 2.79-9.05) to use condom than the poorest people. In the absolute scales, the largest
208 gap between the richest and the poorest people was observed in positive attitudes toward
209 PLHIV, with a difference of 32 percentage-points (SII=0.32; 95% CI 0.26-0.39).

210 On the relative scale, levels of inequalities were significantly higher in WCA as compared to ESA
211 countries for the following indicators: HIV-related knowledge, positive attitude towards PLHIV,
212 condom use, participation to PMTCT and recent HIV testing (all rank-sum test *p*-values <0.05).
213 Absolute levels of inequalities were also higher in WCA versus ESA countries for participation to
214 PMTCT (0.43 versus 0.12, respectively, p=0.009) and for recent HIV testing, although this was
215 borderline significant (0.16 versus 0.09, respectively, p=0.06).

216 A more detailed comparison of the levels of inequalities across indicators and across countries is
217 displayed in Figure 2. In WCA countries, the countries exhibiting the higher levels of inequalities
218 were generally not the same when considering the relative or the absolute scale. In contrast, in
219 ESA countries, Ethiopia tended to exhibit the highest levels of inequalities on both the relative
220 and absolute scales. We also observed significant inequalities in favour of the poor in HIV-
221 seronegativity among youth in some countries, especially on the absolute scale (for example in
222 Sierra Leone, Zambia, Rwanda), although their magnitudes were lower than for other indicators.

223 Table 3 presents the correlations between RII (log-transformed) and SII values across HIV-
224 related indicators. We observed significant positive correlations between relative- and absolute
225 inequalities metrics for most of the indicators (Pearson correlation coefficients >0.6 in 6 out of 8
226 indicators), apart from condom use and MMC presenting no evidence of correlation.

227

Table 2: Pooled relative and absolute wealth-related inequalities in various HIV-related indicators in sub-Saharan Africa, per region and overall. RII: relative index of inequality; SII : slope index of inequality; PLHIV: People living with HIV; PMTCT : Prevention of Mother-to-Child Transmission; MMC: Medical Male Circumcision. [1]: rank-sum test p-value; [2]: within the past year; [3]: at last sexual intercourse; [4]: among those aged 15-24 y.

	West and Central Africa		East and Southern Africa			Overall (all countries)	
	Pooled RII [95% CI]	I2	Pooled RII [95% CI]	I2	*P-value*[1]	Pooled RII [95% CI]	I2
HIV-related knowledge	3.13 [2.26;4.34]	52%	1.89 [1.33;2.69]	70%	p = 0.0145	2.45 [1.91;3.14]	72%
Positive Attitude towards PLHIV	2.49 [1.74;3.56]	78%	1.60 [1.19;2.15]	76%	p = 0.016	1.99 [1.57;2.53]	81%
No multipartnership[2]	0.99 [0.97;1.00]	0%	0.99 [0.98;1.01]	0%	p = 0.32	0.99 [0.98;1.00]	0%
Condom use[3]	8.08 [3.87;16.87]	77%	2.80 [1.13;6.95]	88%	p = 0.007	5.02 [2.79;9.05]	88%
Participation to PMTCT (Females)	2.87 [1.60;5.15]	82%	1.09 [0.90;1.33]	51%	p = 0.002	1.70 [1.20;2.43]	85%
MMC (Males)	-	-	2.08 [1.38;3.15]	59%	-	-	
Recent HIV-Testing[2]	4.47 [2.13;9.40]	90%	1.24 [0.85;1.81]	76%	p = 0.003	2.43 [1.47;4.04]	92%
HIV-seronegativity among youth[4]	0.99 [0.98;0.99]	0%	0.98 [0.95;1.02]	0%	p = 0.45	0.99 [0.98;1.00]	0%
	West and Central Africa		**East and Southern Africa**			**Overall (all countries)**	
	Pooled SII [95% CI]	I2	Pooled SII [95% CI]	I2	*P-value*[1]	Pooled SII [95% CI]	I2
HIV-related knowledge	0.18 [0.13;0.23]	98%	0.18 [0.11;0.25]	98%	p = 0.89	0.18 [0.14;0.22]	98%
Positive Attitude towards PLHIV	0.33 [0.23;0.43]	99%	0.31 [0.19;0.44]	100%	p = 0.76	0.32 [0.26;0.39]	99%
No multipartnership [2]	-0.02 [-0.04;-0.00]	98%	-0.01 [-0.02;0.01]	96%	p = 0.32	-0.01 [-0.03;-0.00]	97%
Condom use[3]	0.17 [0.11;0.23]	98%	0.15 [0.10;0.20]	96%	p = 0.69	0.16 [0.12;0.20]	98%
Participation to PMTCT (Females)	0.43 [0.31;0.55]	97%	0.12 [-0.07;0.32]	99%	p = 0.009	0.29 [0.17;0.42]	99%
MMC (Males)	-	-	0.20 [0.11;0.29]	97%	-	-	
Recent HIV-Testing[2]	0.16 [0.11;0.21]	97%	0.09 [-0.01;0.19]	99%	p = 0.06	0.13 [0.08;0.18]	99%
HIV-seronegativity among youth[4]	-0.01 [-0.02;-0.01]	92%	-0.01 [-0.05;0.03]	98%	p = 1.00	-0.01 [-0.03;0.00]	97%

Figure 2 : Relative (top) and absolute (bottom) wealth-related inequalities in various HIV-related indicators across 18 sub-Saharan African countries. Countries are ordered wet to east. RII: relative index of inequality; SII : slope index of inequality; PLHIV: People living with HIV; PMTCT : Prevention of Mother-to-Child Transmission; MMC: Medical Male Circumcision.

248 **Table 3 : Correlation between country-level relative and absolute wealth-related inequalities, per**
249 **HIV indicator.** RII: relative index of inequality; SII: slope index of inequality; PLHIV: People living with
250 HIV; PMTCT : Prevention of Mother-to-Child Transmission; MMC: Medical Male Circumcision. 1: log-
251 transformed; 2: within the past year; 3: at last sexual intercourse; 4: among those aged 15-24 y.

	Correlation between RII[1] and SII values, Pearson r	***p*-value**
HIV-related knowledge	0.607	0.0075
Positive Attitude towards PLHIV	0.716	<0.001
No multipartnership[2]	0.992	<0.001
Condom use[3]	0.064	0.7996
Participation to PMTCT (Females)	0.809	<0.001
MMC (Males)	-0.098	0.8347
Recent HIV-Testing[2]	0.641	0.0041
HIV-seronegativity among youth[4]	1.000	<0.001

252

253

254 **DISCUSSION**

255 In this study, relying on cross-sectional population-based surveys, we provide an extensive
256 assessment of socio-economic inequalities in various HIV indicators capturing knowledge,
257 attitudes, behaviours and access to and uptake of prevention services in a large set of sub-
258 Saharan African countries. We document important levels of wealth-related inequalities, both on
259 the relative and absolute scales, in HIV-related knowledge, positive attitudes toward PLHIV,
260 condom use, participation to PMTCT, uptake of MMC and recent HIV testing. The magnitude of
261 these inequalities varies across countries and indicators. However, inequalities tend to be more
262 marked in WCA than in ESA countries. In contrast, we document low overall levels of
263 inequalities in multi-partnership and HIV seropositivity among youth, a surrogate of HIV
264 incidence.

265 One should bear in mind the arithmetic behind SII and RII when comparing these measures
266 across indicators and countries [22,23]. Indeed, for any indicator, the overall level in the
267 population should be considered when interpreting relative and absolute inequalities measures.
268 Relative inequalities tend to be larger at low overall levels of the considered indicator, while

269 absolute inequalities tend to be larger at intermediate levels. This arithmetic explains, for
270 instance, why condom use in Niger (overall self-reported level: 1.1%) acknowledges dramatic
271 relative inequalities (RII >100) but relatively limited absolute inequalities (SII = 0.07). This
272 illustrates the importance of reporting both relative and absolute measures when reporting
273 inequalities, as conclusions would be quite different if based on only one or the other indicators
274 in this single example. However, our analysis of correlation showed that the levels of inequalities
275 tended to correlate across both scales for most of the indicators we used.

276 Higher levels of wealth-related inequalities were observed in countries in WCA compared to
277 those in ESA, especially on the relative scale. Several factors may explain higher levels of
278 inequalities in WCA. This may be related to the historical prominence of the private healthcare
279 sector in this region, which generally implies user fees that may act as a barrier to access to care
280 for the poorest [24]. Higher levels of inequalities are also possibly linked to the smaller overall
281 HIV epidemics in WCA compared to ESA. Indeed, ESA countries had higher HIV prevalence than
282 WCA countries in our sample, except for Ethiopia, which precisely had the highest levels of
283 wealth-related inequalities within ESA countries. The country-level HIV prevalence correlates
284 with levels of HIV donor and national funding for HIV prevention services [25]. Moreover, donor
285 funding tended to prioritise prevention programs targeting key populations in WCA, as new HIV
286 infections are often predominantly in these populations in the region, whilst in ESA HIV
287 prevention efforts are broader encompassing both key populations and the general populations
288 [26]. While key populations deserve a priority focus for HIV prevention in WCA, additional
289 efforts should be considered to overcome the socioeconomic disparities in knowledge and
290 access to HIV testing and prevention services more broadly.

291 Our results allow the comparison of inequalities across various HIV-related indicators. Overall,
292 we did not observe large socioeconomic disparities in reporting having multiple sexual
293 partners, consistently with recent results [27]. Large absolute and relative inequalities, overall,
294 remain regarding lack of knowledge and stigmatizing attitudes toward PLHIV, and this may

295 undermine HIV prevention, care and treatment [28]. Concerning inequalities are observed in
296 condom use, PMTCT, MMC and HIV testing, especially in WCA countries. This is of particular
297 concern because these are interventions that can prevent new infections, directly for condom
298 use and MMC, or when linked to care and treatment for PMTCT and HIV testing. Large
299 inequalities in condom use may reflect difficulties to access condoms free of charge. However,
300 PMTCT, MMC and HIV testing are also interventions that are usually provided at no direct cost
301 for the individual, which underlines that providing these services without cost to clients is not
302 the only factor to ensure equitable access to prevention interventions. Lessons should be drawn
303 from the experiences of PMTCT or HIV testing programs in ESA countries that are currently
304 offered to all at no cost, without producing measurable health inequalities.

305 We did not find any evidence of socioeconomic inequalities in disfavour of the poorest regarding
306 HIV prevalence among the youth, an indicator we used as a proxy for HIV incidence. For WCA
307 countries specifically, we did find inequalities in disfavour of the richest (ie the wealthiest young
308 people being more likely to be HIV-positive), although the effect size was low. These results may
309 appear inconsistent with the inequalities disfavouring the poorest in terms of access to HIV
310 prevention service that we report here. They may however be linked to the complex and
311 changing social epidemiology of HIV. Since early in the epidemic, understanding its relationship
312 with socioeconomic position (SEP) has been challenging. Many early studies reported that
313 higher SEP tended to be associated with a higher prevalence of HIV infection, making this
314 distribution unusual as compared to many health outcomes [29,30]. The absence of overall
315 socioeconomic gradient we report here may represent a transient state were inequalities are
316 inversing, from a higher risk for the wealthiest to a higher risk for the poorest [31,32]. Indeed, a
317 recent study relying on a >20-years follow-up among a population-based open cohort in rural
318 Uganda documented a widening socioeconomic gradient over time, with a higher risk of incident
319 HIV infection among the poorest [33]. An effort to more systematically monitor socio-economic
320 inequalities in HIV incidence is thus of high importance to detect possibly changing SEP
321 gradients. It is anticipated that the newer-generation surveys, such as the population-based HIV

322 impact assessment surveys (https://phia.icap.columbia.edu/) which integrate HIV incidence
323 assays, may provide useful data for this monitoring.

324 This study has several limitations and strengths. The between-country comparison may be
325 affected by the period of data collection for each national survey (from 2010 to 2018). Large HIV
326 programs have been implemented over this study period and may have reduced inequalities
327 over time [9]. Our analysis was limited to indicators pragmatically built on data collected as part
328 of the DHS. As such, it matches only partially the recently proposed unifying framework of the
329 HIV prevention cascade [34] and ignores important prevention interventions, such as pre-
330 exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) or interventions targeted to key populations. However, to our
331 knowledge, this study constitutes the first effort to quantify both relative and absolute
332 socioeconomic inequalities on a large set of HIV-related indicators collected from large,
333 representative surveys conducted in numerous SSA countries.

334 In conclusion, this study provides a comprehensive monitoring of socioeconomic inequalities in
335 HIV knowledge, attitudes, behaviours and prevention in sub-Saharan Africa. In other fields such
336 as child health, such monitoring has provided important insight in the way policies may be
337 tailored to the patterns of inequalities in order to best address them [35]. We hope that this
338 study will help in the strategical articulation of HIV prevention approaches that is required for
339 fulfilling the focus on reducing inequalities that the renewed 2021-2026 Global AIDS Strategy
340 adopted [36].

341

342

343 **REFERENCES**

344 1 GBD 2017 HIV collaborators. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and mortality
345 of HIV, 1980-2017, and forecasts to 2030, for 195 countries and territories: a systematic analysis
346 for the Global Burden of Diseases, Injuries, and Risk Factors Study 2017. *Lancet HIV* 2019;
347 6:e831–e859.

348 2 2020 Global AIDS Update □— Seizing the moment □— Tackling entrenched inequalities to end
349 epidemics. https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2020/global-aids-report (accessed
350 8 Mar2021).

351 3 Sartorius B, VanderHeide JD, Yang M, Goosmann EA, Hon J, Haeuser E, *et al.* Subnational
352 mapping of HIV incidence and mortality among individuals aged 15–49 years in sub-Saharan
353 Africa, 2000–18: a modelling study. *The Lancet HIV* 2021; 8:e363–e375.

354 4 Krishnaratne S, Hensen B, Cordes J, Enstone J, Hargreaves JR. Interventions to strengthen the HIV
355 prevention cascade: a systematic review of reviews. *The Lancet HIV* 2016; 3:e307–e317.

356 5 Evidence review: Implementation of the 2016–2021 UNAIDS strategy: on the fast-track to end
357 aids. Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS; 2020. https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/UNAIDS-
358 2016-2021-Strategy-Evidence-review_en.pdf (accessed 28 May2021).

359 6 Burgoyne AD, Drummond PD. Knowledge of HIV and AIDS in women in sub-Saharan Africa. *Afr J*
360 *Reprod Health* 2008; 12:14–31.

361 7 Jean K, Anglaret X, Moh R, Lert F, Dray-Spira R. Barriers to HIV Testing in Côte d'Ivoire: The Role
362 of Individual Characteristics and Testing Modalities. *PLoS ONE* 2012; 7:e41353.

363 8 Kirakoya-Samadoulougou F, Jean K, Maheu. Uptake of HIV Testing in Burkina Faso: An
364 Assessment of Individual and Community-level Determinants. *BMC Public Health* 2017; (In
365 revision).

366 9 Ante-Testard PA, Benmarhnia T, Bekelynck A, Baggaley R, Ouattara E, Temime L, *et al.* Temporal
367 trends in socioeconomic inequalities in HIV testing: an analysis of cross-sectional surveys from 16
368 sub-Saharan African countries. *The Lancet Global Health* 2020; 8:e808–e818.

369 10 Hlarlaithe MO, Grede N, de Pee S, Bloem M. Economic and Social Factors are Some of the Most
370 Common Barriers Preventing Women from Accessing Maternal and Newborn Child Health
371 (MNCH) and Prevention of Mother-to-Child Transmission (PMTCT) Services: A Literature Review.
372 *AIDS Behav* 2014; 18:516–530.

373 11 Gummerson E, Maughan-Brown B, Venkataramani A. Who is taking up voluntary medical male
374 circumcision? Early evidence from Tanzania. *AIDS* 2013; 27:2657–2659.

375 12 Corsi DJ, Neuman M, Finlay JE, Subramanian SV. Demographic and health surveys: a profile. *Int J*
376 *Epidemiol* 2012; 41:1602–1613.

377 13 Rutstein SO, Johnson K. DHS Comparative Reports. The DHS Wealth Index. Calverton, Maryland,
378 U.S.A: ORC Macro; 2004.

379 14 Njeuhmeli E, Schnure M, Vazzano A, Gold E, Stegman P, Kripke K, *et al.* Using mathematical
380 modeling to inform health policy: A case study from voluntary medical male circumcision scale-

381 up in eastern and southern Africa and proposed framework for success. *PLOS ONE* 2019;
382 14:e0213605.

383 15 Kim AA, Hallett T, Stover J, Gouws E, Musinguzi J, Mureithi PK, *et al.* Estimating HIV Incidence
384 among Adults in Kenya and Uganda: A Systematic Comparison of Multiple Methods. *PLoS One*
385 2011; 6. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0017535

386 16 Mahy M, Garcia-Calleja JM, Marsh KA. Trends in HIV prevalence among young people in
387 generalised epidemics: implications for monitoring the HIV epidemic. *Sex Transm Infect* 2012;
388 88:i65–i75.

389 17 Moreno-Betancur M, Latouche A, Menvielle G, Kunst AE, Rey G. Relative index of inequality and
390 slope index of inequality: a structured regression framework for estimation. *Epidemiology* 2015;
391 26:518–527.

392 18 King NB, Harper S, Young ME. Use of relative and absolute effect measures in reporting health
393 inequalities: structured review. *BMJ* 2012; 345:e5774.

394 19 Harper S, King NB, Meersman SC, Reichman ME, Breen N, Lynch J. Implicit Value Judgments in
395 the Measurement of Health Inequalities. *Milbank Q* 2010; 88:4–29.

396 20 Zou G. A Modified Poisson Regression Approach to Prospective Studies with Binary Data. *Am J*
397 *Epidemiol* 2004; 159:702–706.

398 21 Viechtbauer W. Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. *Journal of Statistical*
399 *Software* 2010; 36:1–48.

400 22 Houweling TA, Kunst AE, Huisman M, Mackenbach JP. Using relative and absolute measures for
401 monitoring health inequalities: experiences from cross-national analyses on maternal and child
402 health. *Int J Equity Health* 2007; 6:15.

403 23 Mackenbach JP, Martikainen P, Menvielle G, Gelder R de. The arithmetic of reducing relative and
404 absolute inequalities in health: a theoretical analysis illustrated with European mortality data. *J*
405 *Epidemiol Community Health* 2016; 70:730–736.

406 24 Ridde V. From institutionalization of user fees to their abolition in West Africa: a story of pilot
407 projects and public policies. *BMC Health Services Research* 2015; 15:S6.

408 25 Amico P, Aran C, Avila C. HIV Spending as a Share of Total Health Expenditure: An Analysis of
409 Regional Variation in a Multi-Country Study. *PLoS One* 2010; 5.
410 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0012997

411 26 Funding for HIV and AIDS. Avert. 2021.https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-
412 world/global-response/funding (accessed 23 Jul2021).

413 27 Ali MM, Merdad L, Bellizzi S. Socioeconomic variations in risky sexual behavior among
414 adolescents in 14 sub-Saharan Africa countries who report ever having had sex. *Int J Equity*
415 *Health* 2021; 20:11.

416 28 Nyblade L, Mingkwan P, Stockton MA. Stigma reduction: an essential ingredient to ending AIDS
417 by 2030. *Lancet HIV* 2021; 8:e106–e113.

418 29 Hargreaves JR, Glynn JR. Educational attainment and HIV-1 infection in developing countries: a
419 systematic review. *Trop Med Int Health* 2002; 7:489–498.

420 30 Fox AM. The social determinants of HIV serostatus in sub-Saharan Africa: an inverse relationship
421 between poverty and HIV? *Public Health Rep* 2010; 125 Suppl 4:16–24.

422 31 Hargreaves JR, Davey C, White RG. Does the "inverse equity hypothesis" explain how both
423 poverty and wealth can be associated with HIV prevalence in sub-Saharan Africa? *J Epidemiol*
424 *Community Health* 2013; 67:526–529.

425 32 Hargreaves JR, Davey C, Fearon E, Hensen B, Krishnaratne S. Trends in Socioeconomic
426 Inequalities in HIV Prevalence among Young People in Seven Countries in Eastern and Southern
427 Africa. *PLoS ONE* 2015; 10:e0121775.

428 33 Santelli JS, Chen I, Makumbi F, Wei Y, Nalugoda F, Lutalo T, *et al.* Household wealth and HIV
429 incidence over time, rural Uganda, 1994–2018. *AIDS* 2021; 35:1835–1843.

430 34 Hargreaves JR, Delany-Moretlwe S, Hallett TB, Johnson S, Kapiga S, Bhattacharjee P, *et al.* The
431 HIV prevention cascade: integrating theories of epidemiological, behavioural, and social science
432 into programme design and monitoring. *The Lancet HIV* 2016; 3:e318–e322.

433 35 Victora CG, Joseph G, Silva ICM, Maia FS, Vaughan JP, Barros FC, *et al.* The Inverse Equity
434 Hypothesis: Analyses of Institutional Deliveries in 286 National Surveys. *Am J Public Health* 2018;
435 108:464–471.

436 36 End Inequalities. End AIDS. Global AIDS Strategy 2021-2026. Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS; 2021.
437 https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2021/2021-2026-global-AIDS-strategy
438 (accessed 28 May2021).

439


Survey year
2020
2018
2016
2014
2012
2010


HIV prevalence
30
25
20
15
10
5
0


Country
SEN
SLE
GNA
LIB
CIV
MLI
BFA
NIG
CMR
COD
ZMB
LES
ZBW
RWA
MWI
TZA
KEN
ETH
4.46 [3.81;5.23]
6.57 [5.74;7.52]
1.02 [1.01;1.03]
3.29 [2.36;4.60]
1.72 [1.51;1.96]
NA
1.72 [1.51;1.98]
1.00 [0.99;1.00]
2.13 [1.72;2.63]
1.87 [1.61;2.16]
0.95 [0.93;0.97]
4.45 [3.11;6.34]
1.45 [1.30;1.60]
NA
1.57 [1.34;1.83]
0.99 [0.98;1.00]
2.51 [2.06;3.07]
2.38 [1.81;3.14]
1.00 [0.98;1.01]
13.46 [9.22;19.67]
5.19 [3.61;7.47]
NA
11.42 [8.38;15.57]
0.99 [0.98;1.00]
3.22 [2.29;4.54]
2.34 [2.00;2.74]
0.97 [0.95;1.00]
5.51 [4.28;7.10]
1.37 [1.20;1.56]
NA
1.41 [1.20;1.66]
0.99 [0.98;1.01]
7.32 [5.97;8.98]
3.57 [3.20;3.97]
0.95 [0.92;0.97]
5.82 [4.83;7.01]
3.37 [2.73;4.18]
NA
4.11 [3.35;5.03]
1.00 [0.99;1.01]
2.28 [1.85;2.80]
2.22 [1.98;2.49]
1.01 [1.00;1.03]
45.35 [24.59;83.68]
11.00 [6.88;17.59]
NA
23.86 [17.55;32.44]
0.99 [0.98;1.00]
2.48 [2.18;2.82]
2.75 [2.46;3.08]
0.98 [0.97;0.99]
7.80 [6.09;10.00]
2.21 [1.86;2.63]
NA
5.61 [4.60;6.85]
0.99 [0.99;1.00]
6.50 [5.05;8.36]
5.95 [4.81;7.37]
0.99 [0.98;1.00]
101.57 [35.61;290.32]
4.67 [3.70;5.88]
NA
10.84 [8.18;14.36]
0.99 [0.99;1.00]
2.41 [2.16;2.68]
1.79 [1.66;1.93]
0.94 [0.92;0.96]
3.19 [2.71;3.76]
1.26 [1.18;1.35]
NA
1.63 [1.53;1.75]
1.00 [0.99;1.01]
2.19 [1.82;2.65]
1.89 [1.68;2.12]
0.98 [0.97;1.00]
6.55 [4.82;8.91]
12.33 [7.73;19.68]
NA
11.46 [8.08;16.23]
0.99 [0.99;1.00]
2.14 [1.94;2.36]
1.61 [1.54;1.69]
1.01 [1.00;1.03]
3.06 [2.65;3.53]
1.04 [1.01;1.08]
2.04 [1.76;2.36]
1.14 [1.08;1.21]
0.98 [0.96;0.99]
2.35 [2.03;2.74]
1.46 [1.39;1.53]
0.96 [0.93;0.99]
1.58 [1.43;1.75]
1.00 [0.97;1.04]
NA
1.02 [0.94;1.10]
0.99 [0.95;1.04]
1.57 [1.45;1.69]
1.28 [1.23;1.32]
0.96 [0.95;0.98]
1.49 [1.29;1.72]
1.01 [0.98;1.05]
2.53 [1.91;3.36]
1.02 [0.95;1.10]
1.01 [0.99;1.03]
1.11 [1.04;1.19]
1.21 [1.18;1.24]
0.99 [0.99;1.00]
2.96 [2.38;3.69]
1.01 [1.00;1.02]
1.10 [1.01;1.19]
1.00 [0.93;1.08]
0.99 [0.98;1.00]
1.50 [1.40;1.60]
1.24 [1.21;1.27]
0.99 [0.98;1.00]
1.93 [1.72;2.16]
1.04 [1.02;1.06]
4.15 [3.02;5.70]
0.98 [0.94;1.03]
0.99 [0.97;1.01]
1.63 [1.47;1.81]
1.87 [1.76;1.99]
1.03 [1.01;1.05]
2.04 [1.73;2.41]
1.25 [1.15;1.36]
2.21 [1.92;2.55]
1.44 [1.31;1.59]
0.99 [0.98;1.00]
2.01 [1.86;2.17]
1.69 [1.62;1.76]
0.99 [0.98;1.00]
1.52 [1.34;1.73]
1.08 [1.06;1.11]
1.72 [1.60;1.85]
1.27 [1.22;1.32]
NA
4.73 [4.14;5.41]
3.94 [3.58;4.34]
1.00 [1.00;1.01]
47.18 [32.53;68.47]
3.03 [2.57;3.58]
3.81 [2.63;5.51]
4.25 [3.73;4.84]
1.00 [0.99;1.00]
HIV-related knowledge
Positive attitude towards PLHIV
No multipartnership
Condom use
Participation to PMTCT
MMC
Recent HIV-Testing
HIV-seronegativity among youth
RII
25
5
1


Country
SEN
SLE
GNA
LIB
CIV
MLI
BFA
NIG
CMR
COD
ZMB
LES
ZBW
RWA
MWI
TZA
KEN
ETH
0.23 [0.21;0.25]
0.50 [0.48;0.52]
0.02 [0.01;0.02]
0.09 [0.07;0.11]
0.36 [0.31;0.41]
NA
0.10 [0.08;0.12]
0.00 [-0.00;-0.00]
0.14 [0.11;0.17]
0.20 [0.17;0.24]
-0.05 [-0.06;-0.04]
0.07 [0.06;0.09]
0.27 [0.23;0.32]
NA
0.07 [0.05;0.09]
-0.01 [-0.01;-0.01]
0.14 [0.11;0.16]
0.14 [0.10;0.18]
0.00 [-0.01;0.00]
0.21 [0.18;0.23]
0.53 [0.46;0.61]
NA
0.19 [0.17;0.22]
-0.01 [-0.01;-0.00]
0.06 [0.04;0.08]
0.26 [0.23;0.30]
-0.02 [-0.04;-0.01]
0.18 [0.15;0.20]
0.23 [0.17;0.28]
NA
0.06 [0.04;0.09]
-0.01 [-0.01;-0.00]
0.27 [0.25;0.29]
0.56 [0.53;0.59]
-0.05 [-0.06;-0.04]
0.32 [0.29;0.35]
0.66 [0.59;0.73]
NA
0.18 [0.16;0.20]
0.00 [-0.01;0.00]
0.16 [0.13;0.19]
0.35 [0.32;0.39]
0.01 [0.00;0.02]
0.15 [0.13;0.17]
0.54 [0.48;0.61]
NA
0.22 [0.20;0.24]
-0.01 [-0.01;-0.00]
0.22 [0.20;0.25]
0.35 [0.33;0.38]
-0.02 [-0.03;-0.02]
0.24 [0.22;0.27]
0.35 [0.30;0.40]
NA
0.18 [0.16;0.20]
-0.01 [-0.01;-0.00]
0.22 [0.20;0.25]
0.42 [0.39;0.46]
-0.01 [-0.01;-0.00]
0.07 [0.06;0.08]
0.66 [0.60;0.72]
NA
0.20 [0.18;0.22]
-0.01 [-0.01;-0.00]
0.26 [0.24;0.29]
0.32 [0.29;0.34]
-0.06 [-0.07;-0.05]
0.23 [0.21;0.26]
0.21 [0.18;0.24]
NA
0.27 [0.25;0.30]
0.00 [-0.00;0.01]
0.09 [0.08;0.11]
0.20 [0.18;0.23]
-0.02 [-0.02;-0.01]
0.14 [0.12;0.16]
0.48 [0.42;0.53]
NA
0.15 [0.14;0.17]
-0.01 [-0.01;-0.00]
0.22 [0.20;0.24]
0.34 [0.32;0.36]
0.01 [0.01;0.02]
0.21 [0.19;0.23]
0.04 [0.02;0.06]
0.30 [0.26;0.34]
0.08 [0.06;0.10]
-0.02 [-0.03;-0.02]
0.20 [0.17;0.23]
0.30 [0.28;0.32]
-0.04 [-0.05;-0.02]
0.23 [0.19;0.26]
0.00 [-0.01;0.02]
NA
0.01 [-0.02;0.03]
-0.01 [-0.03;0.02]
0.18 [0.16;0.21]
0.19 [0.17;0.21]
-0.03 [-0.04;-0.03]
0.10 [0.07;0.13]
0.01 [-0.01;0.03]
0.12 [0.09;0.15]
0.01 [-0.01;0.03]
0.01 [-0.00;0.02]
0.05 [0.02;0.07]
0.16 [0.15;0.17]
-0.01 [-0.01;-0.00]
0.14 [0.12;0.17]
0.01 [0.01;0.02]
0.08 [0.04;0.12]
-0.00 [-0.02;0.02]
-0.01 [-0.02;-0.01]
0.15 [0.13;0.16]
0.18 [0.17;0.19]
-0.01 [-0.01;-0.01]
0.10 [0.09;0.12]
0.04 [0.03;0.05]
0.12 [0.10;0.15]
-0.01 [-0.02;0.01]
-0.01 [-0.02;-0.00]
0.14 [0.11;0.16]
0.38 [0.36;0.41]
0.03 [0.02;0.04]
0.12 [0.10;0.15]
0.19 [0.15;0.23]
0.31 [0.27;0.34]
0.11 [0.09;0.13]
-0.01 [-0.02;-0.00]
0.17 [0.16;0.19]
0.37 [0.35;0.38]
-0.01 [-0.02;-0.01]
0.08 [0.06;0.10]
0.08 [0.06;0.09]
0.30 [0.28;0.33]
0.15 [0.11;0.19]
NA
0.33 [0.31;0.35]
0.60 [0.58;0.63]
0.00 [0.00;0.01]
0.21 [0.19;0.23]
0.72 [0.66;0.78]
0.17 [0.13;0.20]
0.35 [0.33;0.37]
0.00 [-0.00;0.00]
HIV-related knowledge
Positive attitude towards PLHIV
No multipartnership
Condom use
Participation to PMTCT
MMC
Recent HIV-Testing
HIV-seronegativity among youth
SII
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0