

EFFECTS OF HAZARDOUS ALCOHOL AND DRUG USE ON ANTIRETROVIRAL ADHERENCE AND HIV VIRAL SUPPRESSION:

A MEDIATION ANALYSIS

Tesfaye S. MOGES¹, Edward R. CACHAY¹, Huifang QIN¹, Laura BAMFORD¹, David J. GRELOTTI², Wm. Christopher MATHEWS¹

1. Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Disease and Global Public Health, Owen Clinic, UC San Diego School of Medicine
2. HIV Neurobehavioral Research Program, Department of Psychiatry, UC San Diego School of Medicine

Running title: Drug and Hazardous Alcohol Use, Adherence and HIV Viral Suppression

Body text word count: 1,727

Corresponding Address:

Tesfaye S Moges, MD, MAS

University of California San Diego

200 W Arbor Drive, San Diego, California 92103-8681, USA

Telephone: (619) 794 9658

Fax: 619-543-3882

Email: tmoges@health.ucsd.edu

Alternative Corresponding Author:

W. Christopher Mathews MD, MSPH

4168 Front St.,

3rd floor San Diego, CA 92103

Phone: 619-543-3714

Fax: 619-543-3964

Email: cmathews@health.ucsd.edu

Abstract

Background: Little is known regarding the degree to which substance and alcohol use effects on HIV viral suppression are mediated through medication adherence. We hypothesized that the total effects of such use are mediated through adherence.

Methods: We included patients with HIV (PWH) receiving care at an urban academic HIV clinic between 2014 and 2018. Eligible patients were those prescribed antiretroviral therapy who completed both patient reported outcome (PRO) questionnaires, and had subsequent plasma viral load (pVL) measurements. Measures included assessments of alcohol use (AUDIT-C), drug use (ASSIST), and self-reported adherence. Substances found in bivariate analysis to predict detectable pVL were modeled separately for mediation effects through adherence. We report natural direct (NDE) and indirect effect (NIE), marginal total effect (MTE) and percentage mediated.

Results: Among 3125 Patients who met eligibility criteria, percentages of current use by category were: hazardous alcohol 25.8%, cannabis 27.1%, amphetamines 13.1%, inhalants 11.9%, cocaine 5.3%, sedative-hypnotics 4.5%, opioids 2.9%, and hallucinogens 2.3%. Excellent adherence was reported in 58% and 10% had detectable pVL. Except for sedatives use of other ascertained substances was significantly associated with worse adherence. Bivariate predictors of detectable pVL were [OR(95% CI)]: amphetamine use 2.4 (1.8 -3.2) and opioid use 2.3 (1.3 - 4.0) . The percentage mediated by adherence was 36% for amphetamine use, 26.5% for opioid use, and 39% for multiple substance use.

Conclusion: Use of amphetamines, opioids, and multiple substances predicted detectable pVL. However, less than 40% of effects were mediated by self-reported adherence.

Key words: HIV viral load, substance use, adherence, mediation analysis

Summary: We examined adherence-mediated effects of hazardous alcohol and substance use on HIV viral suppression. Use of amphetamines, opioids, and multiple substance predicted detectable viral load, however, less than 40% of effects were mediated by self-reported antiretroviral adherence.

Background

The potential effects of active alcohol and substance use on effectiveness of antiretroviral therapy have been a concern since the advent of antiretroviral therapy. A common assumption has been that any putative effects of alcohol or substance use on HIV viral control would be mediated through effects on antiretroviral medication adherence. (1-3) Regimens with higher resistance barriers, simplified dosing, and long half-lives might attenuate the detrimental effects of alcohol and substance use on both adherence-mediated and adherence-independent causal pathways toward HIV viral load suppression

Some research has suggested potential direct effects of substance use (methamphetamine, cocaine, opioids, cannabis) on immune activation pathways and viral replication. (4-14) Alcohol use has also been associated with potentially detrimental effects on viral control that are independent of medication adherence.(15-18)

We were unable to identify any published clinical studies examining both adherence-mediated and direct effects of hazardous alcohol use and substance use on HIV viral suppression. We hypothesized that adherence is a dominating mediator of alcohol and substance use effects on viral suppression.

Methods

We conducted a retrospective cross-sectional analysis of persons with HIV (PWH) receiving care in an urban academic HIV clinic between 2014 and 2018. Our cohort included PWH ≥ 18 years of age on antiretroviral therapy who both completed patient-reported outcomes (PRO) questionnaires and had available the most recent, subsequent HIV plasma viral load (pVL) collected as part of routine care. All participants signed a written consent before study enrollment. The study protocol was approved by UCSD human subjects research protection program (UCSD HRRP #171338)

The PRO questionnaire contained self-report items to ascertain alcohol use, drug use and HIV antiretroviral adherence. Substance use measures included the AUDIT-C and ASSIST as measures of hazardous drinking (AUDIT-C ≥ 4 in males and ≥ 3 in females) and recent (past 3 months) substance use, respectively.(19, 20) Categories of prescription and recreational drugs surveyed in the PRO battery included: cannabis, amphetamines (including methamphetamine), opioids (both legal

and illegal), sedatives-hypnotics, cocaine, inhalants, and hallucinogens. Self-report of adherence was assessed in four ways: (1) the number of doses missed in the last 7 days (1 = 0 missed, 6 = more than 4 missed); (2) Likert scaled adherence (1-6) where 1 = very poor and 6 = excellent; (3) visual analogue scale (VAS) of percent adherence over the past month; (4) last missed dose (1 = within past week, 6 = never skip medications). (1, 21-23)

To select a single measure of medication adherence that most discriminated between those with detectable and undetectable follow-up HIV viral load measurements, we conducted receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis of the four candidate measures using binary coded viral load (≤ 200 copies/ml vs. >200 copies/ml) as reference criterion. To evaluate whether the four adherence measures could jointly enhance discrimination beyond any individual measure, a logistic regression model was fit and predicted probabilities of viral non-suppression were estimated. ROC areas and Hosmer-Lemeshow tests evaluated model discrimination and calibration, respectively. The optimal cut-point of the most discriminating predictor of viral non-suppression was estimated using Stata *cutpoint.ado*. (StataCorp. 2016. Stata Statistical Software: Release 15.1. College Station, TX).

The selected most discriminating adherence measure was then dichotomized at the optimal cut-point and used in subsequent analyses. Next, we examined bivariate associations: (1) between alcohol and specific substance use and the most discriminating binary measure of adherence; and (2) between alcohol and specific substance use and HIV viral non-suppression. We then examined effects of alcohol and specific substance use on viral suppression in unadjusted and mutually adjusted logistic regression models. Those substances (including alcohol) that were independent predictors of viral non-suppression in logistic models were subsequently selected as independent predictors of viral non-suppression in mediation analyses. Separate mediation models were fit for each selected substance using the Stata *paramed.ado* program to estimate natural direct effect (NDE), natural indirect effect (NIE) and marginal total effect (MTE) on the odds ratio scale. Percent mediation was estimated as the ratio of natural logarithms of NDE. (24-26) We determined based on the observed prevalence of unsuppressed pVL (10%), prevalence of excellent adherence (58%), and correlation between the drug or alcohol exposure measures and adherence varying from 0.1-0.5, that with type I error = 0.05 and power = 0.8, we could detect a mediation odds ratio from 1.4-1.49, respectively, with a sample size of 3000. (27)

Results

Table 1 presents study participant characteristics. During the study period, 3125 patients met eligibility criteria for inclusion. The final sample had a median age of 51 years; 54% were non-white, 12% were female, and 72% were men who have sex with men (MSM) as self-reported HIV risk factor. Most (90%) had an undetectable (<200 copies/ml) HIV pVL. The majority of the participants (58%) reported excellent adherence to antiretroviral therapy. The overall prevalence of hazardous alcohol use was 26%. Use of prescription and recreational substances was common. The most used substances were marijuana (27%), amphetamine (13%), inhalants (12%), sedatives-hypnotics (4.5%) and opioids (3%). Multiple substance use was reported in 17% of participant.

Table 1: Patient Characteristics

Sex	
Male	2742 (87.7%)
Female	383 (12.3%)
Race	
White	1450 (46.4%)
Latino	1025 (32.8%)
Black	417 (13.3%)
Asian	121 (3.9%)
Other	112 (3.6%)
HIV Risk Factor	
MSM, not IDU	2036 (65.2%)
IDU, not MSM	132 (4.2%)
IDU+MSM	208 (6.7%)
Heterosexual, not-IDU	536 (17.2%)
All others	213 (6.8%)
Age	median=51.0 (IQR 41.0-58.0)
Age	mean=50.1 (sd 11.7)
Year	
2014	378 (12.1%)
2015	427 (13.7%)
2016	574 (18.4%)
2017	738 (23.6%)

2018	1008 (32.3%)
<hr/>	
Amphetamines	
No	2620 (86.9%)
Yes	395 (13.1%)
MISSING	110 observations
<hr/>	
Sedatives	
No	2813 (95.5%)
Yes	133 (4.5%)
MISSING	179 observations
<hr/>	
Cocaine	
No	2810 (94.7%)
Yes	158 (5.3%)
MISSING	157 observations
<hr/>	
Opioids	
No	2884 (97.1%)
Yes	86 (2.9%)
MISSING	155 observations
<hr/>	
Marijuana	
No	2177 (72.9%)
Yes	810 (27.1%)
MISSING	138 observations
<hr/>	
Hallucinogens	
No	2867 (97.7%)
Yes	66 (2.3%)
MISSING	192 observations
<hr/>	
Inhalants	
No	2594 (88.1%)
Yes	349 (11.9%)
MISSING	182 observations
<hr/>	
AUDIT-C Score	median=1.0 (IQR 0.0-3.0)
MISSING	107 observations
<hr/>	
AUDIT-C: Hazardous Drinking	
Not Hazardous Drinking	2240 (74.2%)
Hazardous Drinking	778 (25.8%)
MISSING	107 observations
<hr/>	
Self Rated Adherence	
< Excellent	1314 (42.3%)
Excellent	1796 (57.7%)

MISSING	15 observations
<hr/>	
Self Rated Adherence (VAS)	
<=98	927 (55.7%)
>98	736 (44.3%)
MISSING	1462 observations
<hr/>	
Interval of last missed dose	
2-4 weeks, 1-2 weeks, or past week	678 (39.5%)
1-3 mo, >3 mo, or never	1040 (60.5%)
MISSING	1407 observations
<hr/>	
# Missed Doses (7 days)	
≤ 1 missed dose	999 (69.7%)
> 1 missed dose	434 (30.3%)
MISSING	1692 observations
<hr/>	
Detectable pVL (≥200 c/ml)	
Undetectable (<200 c/ml)	2820 (90.2%)
Detectable (≥200 c/ml)	305 (9.8%)
<hr/>	
pVL (continuous) median (IQR)	40 (20,40)
Log10 pVL, median (IQR)	1.6 (1.30, 1.60)
<hr/>	
Delta(pVLdate - PROdate)	median=24.0 (IQR 2.0-120.0)
MISSING	12 observations
<hr/>	
Delta(pVLdate - PROdate)	mean=88.8 (sd 154.8)
MISSING	12 observations
<hr/>	
No Substances Used (ASSIST+AUDIT)	
0	1610 (59.8%)
1	633 (23.5%)
2	281 (10.4%)
3	103 (3.8%)
4-7	67 (2.5%)
MISSING	431 observations
<hr/>	
No Substances Used (ASSIST+AUDIT)	Median = 0.0 (IQR 0.0-1.0)
MISSING	431 observations
<hr/>	
No Substances Used (ASSIST+AUDIT)	mean=0.7 (sd 1.0)
MISSING	431 observations

Table 2 presents measurement properties of the four single item adherence measures and the composite predicted adherence proportion based on logistic regression of the four single items on HIV pVL. Because the fewest non-missing values (n=3110) were with item 2 and because the pVL discrimination (ROC area) of this item was highest among the

single items adherence measures, we chose this item for use in mediation analysis. The optimal cut-point in predicting pVL was at excellent (6) vs not excellent (≤ 5).

Table 2: PRO Measures of Antiretroviral Medication Adherence: Measurement Properties

Item	Content	Possible Score Range	Observed Score Range	Observed Score Median[Mean]	N (observed)	N(missing)	ROC Area ₂	Optimal Cutpoint ₂
1. Q303	# of doses missed (7 days)	1=0 missed; 6=>4 missed	1--6	1 [1.6]	1433	1692	0.65	>1
2. Q248	Self Rated Adherence	1=very poor; 6=excellent	1--6	6 [5.2]	3110	15	0.71	>5
3. Q273	Self Rated Adherence Visual Analogue Scale (VAS)	0--100	0--100	98 [92.3]	1663	1,462	0.70	>98
4. Q185	Last Missed Dose	1=past week; 6=never miss	1--6	4 [3.9]	1718	1407	0.62	>3
5. Composite ₁	Composite logistic regression predictor of viral non-suppression	0 - 1.0	0.05 -- 0.77	0.06 [0.10]	1374	1751	0.73	>0.078

1. Composite predicted adherence proportion based on logistic regression of items 1-4 on viral load indicator.

2. For items 2-4, undetectable viral load (<200 copies/ml) was coded 1. For items 1 and 5, undetectable viral load was coded 0.

Table 3 presents substance and pVL distributions by self-reported adherence category. Non-adherence was significantly associated with having detectable pVL and with use of amphetamines, cocaine, opioids, marijuana, hallucinogens and inhalants. The Table 4 shows substance use and self-reported adherence by pVL category. Detectable pVL was significantly associated with non-adherence and use of amphetamines and opioids. Hazardous alcohol consumption and use of marijuana, cocaine, inhalants, sedatives-hypnotics, and hallucinogens were not predictive of detectable pVL.

Table 3: Distribution of Substance Use by Adherence Level

Factor	Level	No Excellent adherence	Excellent adherence	p-value	Test
N		1323	1802		
Amphetamines	No	1006 (79.5%)	1614 (92.3%)	<0.001	Fisher's exact
	Yes	260 (20.5%)	135 (7.7%)		
Sedatives	No	1163 (95.0%)	1650 (95.8%)	0.32	Fisher's
	Yes	160 (13.3%)	90 (5.1%)		

					exact
	Yes	61 (5.0%)	72 (4.2%)		
Cocaine	No	1150 (93.0%)	1660 (95.9%)	<0.001	Fisher's exact
	Yes	87 (7.0%)	71 (4.1%)		
Opioids	No	1186 (95.9%)	1698 (98.0%)	0.001	Fisher's exact
	Yes	51 (4.1%)	35 (2.0%)		
Marijuana	No	848 (68.1%)	1329 (76.3%)	<0.001	Fisher's exact
	Yes	398 (31.9%)	412 (23.7%)		
Hallucinogens	No	1180 (96.8%)	1687 (98.4%)	0.005	Fisher's exact
	Yes	39 (3.2%)	27 (1.6%)		
Inhalants	No	1054 (86.5%)	1540 (89.3%)	0.021	Fisher's exact
	Yes	165 (13.5%)	184 (10.7%)		
AUDIT-C Score, median (IQR)		1 (0, 4)	1 (0, 3)	0.001	Wilcoxon rank-sum
AUDIT-C: Hazardous Drinking	Not Hazardous Drinking	902 (71.2%)	1338 (76.4%)	0.002	Fisher's exact
	Hazardous Drinking	364 (28.8%)	414 (23.6%)		
Detectable pVL (≥ 200 c/ml)	Undetectable (<200 c/ml)	1101 (83.2%)	1719 (95.4%)	<0.001	Fisher's exact
	Detectable (≥ 200 c/ml)	222 (16.8%)	83 (4.6%)		
No Substances Used (ASSIST+AUDIT)	0	590 (53.2%)	1020 (64.3%)	<0.001	Fisher's exact
	1	281 (25.4%)	352 (22.2%)		
	2	136 (12.3%)	145 (9.1%)		
	3	64 (5.8%)	39 (2.5%)		
	4-7	37 (3.3%)	30 (1.9%)		
No Substances Used (ASSIST+AUDIT), mean (SD)		.81 (1.07)	.55 (.90)	<0.001	Two sample t test
No Substances Used (ASSIST+AUDIT), median (IQR)		0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 1)	<0.001	Wilcoxon rank-sum

Table 4: Distribution of Substance Use by HIV Viral Suppression Category

Factor	Level	Undetectable (<200 c/ml)	Detectable (≥200 c/ml)	p-value	Test
N		2 820	305		
Amphetamines	No	2 403 (88.1%)	217(75.6%)	<0.001	Fisher's exact
	Yes	3 25 (11.9%)	70(24.4%)		
Sedatives	No	2 552 (95.5%)	261(95.3%)	0.88	Fisher's exact
	Yes	1 20 (4.5%)	13(4.7%)		
Cocaine	No	2 546 (94.7%)	264(94.3%)	0.78	Fisher's exact
	Yes	142 (5.3%)	16(5.7%)		
Opioids	No	2 622 (97.4%)	262(94.2%)	0.007	Fisher's exact
	Yes	70 (2.6%)	16(5.8%)		
Marijuana	No	1 983 (73.3%)	194(69.0%)	0.14	Fisher's exact
	Yes	723 (26.7%)	87(31.0%)		
Hallucinogens	No	2 607 (97.9%)	260(96.3%)	0.13	Fisher's exact
	Yes	56 (2.1%)	10(3.7%)		
Inhalants	No	2 360 (88.3%)	234(87.0%)	0.55	Fisher's exact
	Yes	3 14 (11.7%)	35(13.0%)		
AUDIT-C Score, median (IQR)		1 (0, 3)	1(0,3)	0.64	Wilcoxon rank-sum
AUDIT-C: Hazardous Drinking	Not Hazardous Drinking ¹	2 020 (74.2%)	220(74.3%)	1.00	Fisher's exact
	Hazardous Drinking ²	702 (25.8%)	76(25.7%)		
ART Adherence	No Excellent adherence ³	1 101 (39.0%)	222(72.8%)	<0.001	Fisher's exact
	Excellent adherence ⁴	1 719 (61.0%)	83(27.2%)		
No Substances Used (ASSIST+AUDIT), mean (SD) ⁵		.64 (.97)	.86(1.09)	<0.001	Two sample t test
No Substances Used (ASSIST+AUDIT), median (IQR) ⁶		0 (0, 1)	0(0,1)	<0.001	Wilcoxon rank-sum

1. AUDIT-C<3 in female and <4 men 2. AUDIT-C ≥3 in female and ≥4 in men 3. Adherence self-report either: poor, fair, good, very good 4. Adherence self-report: excellent 5. SD: standard deviation 6. IQR: interquartile range

In both unadjusted and mutually adjusted logistic regression models, use of amphetamines and use of opioids were significantly associated with having a detectable HIV viral load (Table 5). Those reporting amphetamine or opioid use were more than twice as likely to have detectable pVL. The failure of binary coded hazardous alcohol use to predict virology non-suppression was confirmed in ROC analysis of the numeric AUDIT-C score evaluated against pVL as reference criterion (ROC 0.492, 95% C.I. 0.457 - 0.527).

Table 5: Unadjusted and Adjusted Effects of Drug and Alcohol Use on Detectable HIV Viral Load

Predictor	Unadjusted Effects			Mutual Adjusted Effects ₁		
	Odds Ratio	95% CI ₂	p-value	Odds Ratio	95% CI	p-value
Sedatives	1.059	0.589, 1.904	0.847	0.693	0.352, 1.366	0.29
Cocaine	1.087	0.638, 1.850	0.76	0.568	0.287, 1.124	0.104
Amphetamines	2.385	1.779, 3.198	0.0001	2.166	1.509, 3.107	<0.0001
Opioids	2.287	1.310, 3.996	0.004	2.173	1.157, 4.081	0.016
Marijuana	1.23	0.942, 1.606	0.128	1.028	0.757, 1.396	0.862
Hallucinogens	1.791	0.903, 3.551	0.095	1.46	0.65, 3.281	0.359
Inhalant	1.124	0.773, 1.634	0.54	0.807	0.521, 1.25	0.337
Alcohol:Hazardous	0.994	0.755, 1.308	0.966	1.044	0.767, 1.421	0.783

1. Hosmer-Lemeshow chi-square (7) = 4.03, p = 0.545. ROC area = 0.591

2. CI: confidence interval

Table 6 presents mediation model results for those substances found to be significant predictors of pVL non-suppression. For single substances, the percent mediation was highest (36.2%) for amphetamine use, while for opioids, the percent mediated was 26.5%. The percentage mediation for multiple substance use was 39.7%. Patients with no missing values (complete cases) for mediation analyses (n = 2921) did not differ from incomplete (excluded) patients by year of measurement, sex, or age (p>0.10). However, patients with non-missing values were more likely to identify as

white versus non-white (47% vs. 37%, $p = 0.002$) and to report male sex with men, and not injection drug use (MSM, not-IDU) as their HIV transmission risk factor (66% vs. 57%, $p = 0.028$).

Table 6: Mediation Analysis Results

		Effect Odds		
		Ratio	Bootstrap Std Error	95% C.I.
Amphetamines				
	NDE	1.75	0.28	1.26 2.38
	NIE	1.37	0.05	1.29 1.48
	MTE	2.40	0.38	1.75 3.31
	Percent Mediated	36.18%		
Opioids				
	NDE	1.86	0.60	0.86 2.99
	NIE	1.25	0.08	1.11 1.41
	MTE	2.33	0.75	1.10 3.83
	Percent Mediated	26.48%		
No. Substances Reported				
	NDE	1.13	0.07	0.98 1.28
	NIE	1.09	0.02	1.06 1.12
	MTE	1.23	0.08	1.07 1.39
	Percent Mediated	39.74%		

NDE: natural direct effect, NIE: natural indirect effect, MTE: marginal total effect

Discussion

Our research found that recent use of amphetamines, cocaine, opioids, marijuana, hallucinogens, inhalants, hazardous alcohol use (AUDIT-C), and multiple substances use were significantly associated with less than excellent self-reported antiretroviral adherence. Although not entirely uniform in their conclusions, many previous studies have documented detrimental effects of use of specific recreational substances and alcohol on various measures of adherence that included self-report or electronic monitoring approaches. (2, 3, 28-32) Most robust conclusions pertain to the use of amphetamines, cocaine, opioids, and alcohol. Regarding cannabis use, intensity and regularity of use may modify effects on adherence. (33, 34) Our focus, however, was on distal and more impactful outcomes of antiretroviral therapy,

specifically HIV viral suppression. We were surprised to find that only self-reported use of amphetamines and of opioids as individual substances were predictive of viral non-suppression while use of multiple substances was also predictive. Differences in study design and instruments used to measure hazardous alcohol use could account for differences with other studies that observed that hazardous alcohol use is associated with having detectable viral loads. Most of these studies used cohort designs. (2, 35, 36) However, a prospective randomized control trial failed to show the same association. (37) In many of these cohorts, either exposure was defined as any alcohol use or other instruments than AUDIT-C were used. (38) Yet, our findings mirror findings of a previous study which found that hazardous alcohol use was associated with ART non-adherence but not with HIV pVL. (39) We believe that our failure to detect an effect for hazardous alcohol use was not attributable to the specific AUDIT-C cutoff score used because the ROC analysis using full range numeric AUDIT-C score showed that the measure did not discriminate between those with and without viral suppression.

Mediation analyses restricted to those substances that were associated with plasma viral load non-suppression (amphetamines, opioids, and multiple substances use) yielded a result that was not anticipated. Less than 40% of the effects on viral non-suppression appeared to be mediated through our measure of medication adherence. There are several potential explanations for this finding. It could represent a true finding pointing to the effect of these substances not mediated through antiretroviral adherence. Another potential explanation is the occurrence of pharmacokinetic or pharmacodynamics drug-drug interactions that adversely influenced antiretroviral effects independently of adherence behaviors. (40) Other possible explanations have to do with measurement issues: the specific metric chosen for substance use (any past 3 month use on NIDA ASSIST); the timing of substance use recall period with respect to subsequent viral load measurement (median 24 days); use of an insensitive measure of medication adherence (although we selected the most discriminating of the candidate measures available [Table 2]). Residual confounding and collider effects resulting in selection bias due to missing values must also be considered. These issues merit further exploration and replication efforts.

Additional limitations of our findings are that they represent a single-center experience, a cross-sectional rather than longitudinal design, and are based on a data set with missing data that limited complete case analysis for multivariable

components of the analysis. Our analysis included mainly whites and MSM and our results might not generalize to HIV with diverse characteristics. Nonetheless, we conclude that the mediation analysis findings are novel and provocative, meriting examination in expanded cohorts with longitudinal follow-up.

Funding

This work was supported by the Clinical Investigation Core of the UC San Diego Center for AIDS Research (CFAR) (AI036214)

Potential conflict of interest

All authors: EC received research grant funding paid to UC Reagent from Gilead and Merck and also consulting fees for an advisory board from Gilead for unrelated projects. Others no reported conflict of interest.

References

1. Amico KR, Fisher WA, Cornman DH, Shuper PA, Redding CG, Konkle-Parker DJ, et al. Visual analog scale of ART adherence: association with 3-day self-report and adherence barriers. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2006;42(4):455-9.
2. Chander G, Lau B, Moore RD. Hazardous alcohol use: a risk factor for non-adherence and lack of suppression in HIV infection. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2006;43(4):411-7.
3. Hendershot CS, Stoner SA, Pantalone DW, Simoni JM. Alcohol use and antiretroviral adherence: review and meta-analysis. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009;52(2):180-202.
4. Feldman MB, Thomas JA, Alexy ER, Irvine MK. Crystal methamphetamine use and HIV medical outcomes among HIV-infected men who have sex with men accessing support services in New York. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2015;147:266-71.
5. Jiang J, Wang M, Liang B, Shi Y, Su Q, Chen H, et al. In vivo effects of methamphetamine on HIV-1 replication: A population-based study. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2016;159:246-54.
6. Massanella M, Gianella S, Schrier R, Dan JM, Perez-Santiago J, Oliveira MF, et al. Methamphetamine Use in HIV-infected Individuals Affects T-cell Function and Viral Outcome during Suppressive Antiretroviral Therapy. *Sci Rep*. 2015;5:13179.
7. Prasad A, Kulkarni R, Shrivastava A, Jiang S, Lawson K, Groopman JE. Methamphetamine functions as a novel CD4(+) T-cell activator via the sigma-1 receptor to enhance HIV-1 infection. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9(1):958.
8. Saloner R, Fields JA, Marcondes MCG, Iudicello JE, von Kanel S, Cherner M, et al. Methamphetamine and Cannabis: A Tale of Two Drugs and their Effects on HIV, Brain, and Behavior. *J Neuroimmune Pharmacol*. 2020;15(4):743-64.
9. Azzoni L, Metzger D, Montaner LJ. Effect of Opioid Use on Immune Activation and HIV Persistence on ART. *J Neuroimmune Pharmacol*. 2020;15(4):643-57.
10. Buch S, Periyasamy P, Thangaraj A, Sil S, Chivero ET, Tripathi A. Opioid-Mediated HIV-1 Immunopathogenesis. *J Neuroimmune Pharmacol*. 2020;15(4):628-42.
11. Napuri J, Pilakka-Kanthikeel S, Raymond A, Agudelo M, Yndart-Arias A, Saxena SK, et al. Cocaine enhances HIV-1 infectivity in monocyte derived dendritic cells by suppressing microRNA-155. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(12):e83682.

12. Rasbach DA, Desruisseau AJ, Kipp AM, Stinnette S, Kheshti A, Shepherd BE, et al. Active cocaine use is associated with lack of HIV-1 virologic suppression independent of nonadherence to antiretroviral therapy: use of a rapid screening tool during routine clinic visits. *AIDS Care*. 2013;25(1):109-17.
13. Vidot DC, Manuzak JA, Klatt NR, Pallikkuth S, Roach M, Dilworth SE, et al. Brief Report: Hazardous Cannabis Use and Monocyte Activation Among Methamphetamine Users With Treated HIV Infection. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2019;81(3):361-4.
14. Tyagi M, Bukrinsky M, Simon GL. Mechanisms of HIV Transcriptional Regulation by Drugs of Abuse. *Curr HIV Res*. 2016;14(5):442-54.
15. Agudelo M, Figueroa G, Yndart A, Casteleiro G, Munoz K, Samikkannu T, et al. Alcohol and Cannabinoids Differentially Affect HIV Infection and Function of Human Monocyte-Derived Dendritic Cells (MDDC). *Front Microbiol*. 2015;6:1452.
16. Amedee AM, Nichols WA, Robichaux S, Bagby GJ, Nelson S. Chronic alcohol abuse and HIV disease progression: studies with the non-human primate model. *Curr HIV Res*. 2014;12(4):243-53.
17. Bagasra O, Kajdacsy-Balla A, Lischner HW. Effects of alcohol ingestion on in vitro susceptibility of peripheral blood mononuclear cells to infection with HIV and of selected T-cell functions. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 1989;13(5):636-43.
18. Molina PE, Amedee AM, Winsauer P, Nelson S, Bagby G, Simon L. Behavioral, Metabolic, and Immune Consequences of Chronic Alcohol or Cannabinoids on HIV/AIDS: Studies in the Non-Human Primate SIV Model. *J Neuroimmune Pharmacol*. 2015;10(2):217-32.
19. Bradley KA, DeBenedetti AF, Volk RJ, Williams EC, Frank D, Kivlahan DR. AUDIT-C as a brief screen for alcohol misuse in primary care. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2007;31(7):1208-17.
20. Group WAW. The Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST): development, reliability and feasibility. *Addiction*. 2002;97(9):1183-94.
21. Feldman BJ, Fredericksen RJ, Crane PK, Safren SA, Mugavero MJ, Willig JH, et al. Evaluation of the single-item self-rating adherence scale for use in routine clinical care of people living with HIV. *AIDS Behav*. 2013;17(1):307-18.
22. Stirratt MJ, Dunbar-Jacob J, Crane HM, Simoni JM, Czajkowski S, Hilliard ME, et al. Self-report measures of medication adherence behavior: recommendations on optimal use. *Transl Behav Med*. 2015;5(4):470-82.
23. Simoni JM, Kurth AE, Pearson CR, Pantalone DW, Merrill JO, Frick PA. Self-report measures of antiretroviral therapy adherence: A review with recommendations for HIV research and clinical management. *AIDS Behav*. 2006;10(3):227-45.
24. Emsley RA, Liu H, Dunn G, L. V, VanderWeele TJ. PARAMED: Causal mediation analysis using parametric models. 2013.
25. Vanderweele TJ, Vansteelandt S. Odds ratios for mediation analysis for a dichotomous outcome. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2010;172(12):1339-48.
26. Lee H, Cashin AG, Lamb SE, Hopewell S, Vansteelandt S, VanderWeele TJ, et al. A Guideline for Reporting Mediation Analyses of Randomized Trials and Observational Studies: The AGReMA Statement. *JAMA*. 2021;326(11):1045-56.
27. Vittinghoff E, Sen S, McCulloch CE. Sample size calculations for evaluating mediation. *Stat Med*. 2009;28(4):541-57.
28. Gonzalez A, Barinas J, O'Cleirigh C. Substance use: impact on adherence and HIV medical treatment. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2011;8(4):223-34.
29. Rosen MI, Black AC, Arnsten JH, Goggin K, Remien RH, Simoni JM, et al. Association between use of specific drugs and antiretroviral adherence: findings from MACH 14. *AIDS Behav*. 2013;17(1):142-7.
30. Velloza J, Kemp CG, Aunon FM, Ramaiya MK, Creegan E, Simoni JM. Alcohol Use and Antiretroviral Therapy Non-Adherence Among Adults Living with HIV/AIDS in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *AIDS Behav*. 2020;24(6):1727-42.
31. Lai HH, Kuo YC, Kuo CJ, Lai YJ, Chen M, Chen YT, et al. Methamphetamine Use Associated with Non-adherence to Antiretroviral Treatment in Men Who Have Sex with Men. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10(1):7131.
32. Socias ME, Milloy MJ. Substance Use and Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy: What Is Known and What Is Unknown. *Curr Infect Dis Rep*. 2018;20(9):36.
33. Bonn-Miller MO, Oser ML, Bucossi MM, Trafton JA. Cannabis use and HIV antiretroviral therapy adherence and HIV-related symptoms. *J Behav Med*. 2014;37(1):1-10.

34. Vidot DC, Lerner B, Gonzalez R. Cannabis Use, Medication Management and Adherence Among Persons Living with HIV. *AIDS Behav.* 2017;21(7):2005-13.
35. Conen A, Fehr J, Glass TR, Furrer H, Weber R, Vernazza P, et al. Self-reported alcohol consumption and its association with adherence and outcome of antiretroviral therapy in the Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *Antivir Ther.* 2009;14(3):349-57.
36. Conigliaro J, Gordon AJ, McGinnis KA, Rabeneck L, Justice AC, Veterans Aging Cohort 3-Site S. How harmful is hazardous alcohol use and abuse in HIV infection: do health care providers know who is at risk? *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2003;33(4):521-5.
37. Samet JH, Horton NJ, Meli S, Dukes K, Tripps T, Sullivan L, et al. A randomized controlled trial to enhance antiretroviral therapy adherence in patients with a history of alcohol problems. *Antivir Ther.* 2005;10(1):83-93.
38. Palepu A, Tyndall MW, Li K, Yip B, O'Shaughnessy MV, Schechter MT, et al. Alcohol use and incarceration adversely affect HIV-1 RNA suppression among injection drug users starting antiretroviral therapy. *J Urban Health.* 2003;80(4):667-75.
39. Nolan S, Walley AY, Heeren TC, Patts GJ, Ventura AS, Sullivan MM, et al. HIV-infected individuals who use alcohol and other drugs, and virologic suppression. *AIDS Care.* 2017;29(9):1129-36.
40. Desai N, Burns L, Gong Y, Zhi K, Kumar A, Summers N, et al. An update on drug-drug interactions between antiretroviral therapies and drugs of abuse in HIV systems. *Expert Opin Drug Metab Toxicol.* 2020;16(11):1005-18.