

Provider preferences for delivery of HIV care coordination services: results from a discrete choice experiment

Rebecca Zimba, MHS^{1§}, Chunki Fong, MS¹, Madellena Conte, MS¹, Abigail Baim-Lance, PhD¹, McKaylee Robertson, PhD¹, Jennifer Carmona, MPH², Gina Gambone, MPH², Denis Nash, PhD, MPH^{1,3}, Mary Irvine, DrPH, MPH²

- 1 Institute for Implementation Science in Population Health (ISPH), City University of New York (CUNY), New York, USA
- 2 Bureau of HIV, New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, New York, USA
- 3 Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, City University of New York (CUNY), New York, USA

§ Corresponding author: Rebecca Zimba

55 W 125th Street, 6th Floor
New York, NY 10027, United States
Phone: 1-646-364-9618
Fax: 1-646-786-3894
rebecca.zimba@sph.cuny.edu

Keywords: discrete choice experiment; HIV; antiretroviral therapy; adherence; care coordination; New York City;

Word count:

Abstract = 259/350

Manuscript = 3157/3500

1 **Abstract**

2 **Introduction**

3 The PROMISE study was launched in 2018 to assess and document the implementation of
4 changes to an existing HIV Care Coordination Program (CCP) designed to address persistent
5 disparities in care and treatment engagement among persons with HIV in New York City. We
6 evaluated provider endorsement of features of the CCP to identify opportunities for
7 improvement.

8
9 **Methods**

10 We used a discrete choice experiment (DCE) to measure provider endorsement of four CCP
11 attributes, including: a) how CCP helps with medication adherence, b) how CCP helps with
12 primary care appointments, c) how CCP helps with issues other than primary care, and d) where
13 CCP visits take place (visit location). Each attribute had three to four levels. Our primary
14 outcomes were relative importance and part-worth utilities, measures of preference for the levels
15 of the four CCP program attributes.

16
17 **Results**

18 Visit location (28.6%) had the highest relative importance, followed by how staff help with ART
19 adherence (24.3%), how staff help with issues other than primary care (24.2%), and how staff
20 help with primary care appointments (22.9%). Within each of the above attributes, respectively,
21 the levels with the highest part-worth utilities were home visits 60 minutes from the program or
22 agency (19.9 utiles, 95% CI 10.7-29.0), directly observed therapy (26.1 utiles, 95% CI 19.1-
23 33.1), help with non-HIV specialty medical care (26.5 utiles, 95% CI 21.5-31.6), and reminding

24 clients about and accompanying them to primary care appointments (20.8 utiles, 95% CI 15.6-
25 26.0).

26

27 **Conclusions**

28 Ongoing CCP refinements should account for how best to support and evaluate the intensive
29 CCP components endorsed by providers in this study.

30 Introduction

31 Antiretroviral therapy (ART) adherence improves clinical outcomes among persons with HIV
32 (PWH) and reduces onward transmission of the virus [1–4]. However, in the United States, the
33 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that only 64.7% of persons
34 diagnosed with HIV in 2017 and alive at the end of 2018 had achieved viral suppression (≤ 200
35 copies/mL) by the end of 2018 [5]. In New York City (NYC), 77% of PWH were virally
36 suppressed in 2018, though stratified viral suppression rates indicate persistent disparities across
37 multiple subgroups, including age, sex, gender, race, and transmission risk [6,7].

38 In 2009, the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (NYC Health
39 Department) implemented a multi-component HIV Care Coordination Program (CCP) with the
40 goal of improving engagement in care and treatment among the most vulnerable PWH in NYC,
41 including those facing the additional challenges of mental health issues, food insecurity, and
42 unstable housing [8,9]. The program has since been included in the CDC’s Compendium of
43 Evidence-Based Interventions and Best Practices for HIV Prevention [10–12]. The initial CCP
44 was implemented at 28 Ryan White Part A-funded agencies, reaching over 7,000 clients in less
45 than four years. The CCP demonstrated modest benefits for viral load suppression among newly
46 diagnosed PWH and previously diagnosed but consistently unsuppressed PWH [9,13,14].
47 Refinements to the CCP to enhance intervention delivery and impact were implemented in 2018,
48 and the program will likely continue to evolve.

49 The PROMISE study (Program Refinements to Optimize Model Impact and Scalability
50 Based on Eevidence) was launched in 2018 to assess and document the implementation of
51 changes to the CCP. Based on the recognition that successful program implementation depends
52 upon both client and provider engagement, we conducted a discrete choice experiment (DCE) to
53 understand provider preferences for specific program features. DCEs originated in econometrics
54 [15] and increasingly are being applied to questions in the public health and healthcare settings,
55 including HIV care and prevention [16–18]. Here we present the findings from the provider
56 DCE.

57

58 **Methods**

59 *Population and sampling*

60 Ryan White Part A funding in NYC is used to fund services other than medical care, therefore
61 our target population was comprised of non-medical providers in the core CCP positions of
62 patient navigators/health educators, care coordinators/case managers, and program directors or
63 other administrators at any of the 25 agencies implementing the revised CCP. All staff in those
64 core program roles were eligible to participate. Ten agencies were community health centers, 6
65 were private hospitals, 3 were public hospitals, and 6 were community-based organizations.
66 Eleven agencies were located in Brooklyn, 10 were located in Manhattan, 9 were located in the
67 Bronx, 4 were located in Queens, and 1 was located in Staten Island. The study protocols and
68 materials were reviewed and approved by the NYC Health Department institutional review board
69 (IRB), which served as the IRB of record for the PROMISE study. All participants provided
70 informed consent.

71














72 *Developing the attributes and levels*

73 We wanted to include aspects of the CCP that could be explored in both the current provider
74 DCE and a subsequent client DCE in order to facilitate future concordance analyses. Following
75 from this, and in accordance with best practices for designing DCEs [19,20], we began
76 developing a list of program features to investigate in the DCE through two client focus groups
77 (7 participants total) and one provider focus group (5 participants) See Table, Supplemental
78 Digital Content 1 for participant details. Both providers and clients described and expressed
79 positivity about CCP service features, particularly those supporting non-medical issues.
80 Providers stressed matching CCP features to each client's particular needs.

81 We also considered which of the key elements of the program might be amenable to
82 future changes, whether in program focus, intensity, or mode of delivery. The possible features
83 and versions of those features, called attributes and attribute levels in the parlance of DCEs, were
84 originally defined by reviewing focus group feedback and through discussion within the study
85 team, and then refined based on feedback from PROMISE Study Advisory Board members at a
86 meeting in June 2019. Our final design included four attributes with three to four levels each,
87 which varied by focus, intensity, and/or mode: 1) help with adherence to ART; 2) help with
88 primary care appointments; 3) help with issues other than primary care; and 4) where program

89 visits happen (visit location). Black-and-white graphics (icons) were included to convey attribute
 90 levels and facilitate quick comprehension and comparison of the attribute levels across choice
 91 concepts. See Table 1 and Figure 1.
 92

Table 1. Attributes and levels of a discrete choice experiment investigating provider preferences for HIV care coordination services in New York City

Attribute	Attribute level description	Helper image
Help with Adherence to ART	Clients receive DOT or modified DOT	
	Clients receive medication reminders by phone call or text	
	Clients don't receive medication reminders, but are assessed and helped with medication adherence	
Help with Primary Care Appointments	Staff provide reminders and attend all primary care appointments with clients	
	Staff provide reminders and arrange transportation for clients to get to primary care appointments	
	Staff only provide reminders for primary care appointments	
Help with Issues other than Primary Care	Staff help with insurance, SSI benefits, and other general paperwork for health care coverage and benefits	
	Staff help with securing housing and food	
	Staff help with mental health and well-being issues (such as stress, substance use, diet, or personal relationships)	
	Staff help with connections to specialty medical care (cardiology, oncology, neurology, ear-nose-throat, etc.)	
Where Program Visits Happen	Staff meet with clients at the program location	
	Staff meet with clients by phone or video chat	
	Staff make home visits, 30 minutes from the program location	









Staff make home visits, 60 minutes from the program location



93

PROMISE Survey

Imagine that you had to choose between two programs with the features below. Select the one you would prefer.
(1 of 10)

Option A	Option B
Help with Adherence to ART  Clients receive DOT or modified DOT	Help with Adherence to ART  Clients don't receive medication reminders, but are assessed and helped with medication adherence
Help with Primary Care Appointments  Staff provide reminders and attend all primary care appointments with clients	Help with Primary Care Appointments  Staff provide reminders and arrange transportation for clients to get to primary care appointments
Help with Issues other than Primary Care  Staff help with insurance, SSI benefits, and other general paperwork for health care coverage and benefits	Help with Issues other than Primary Care  Staff help with connections to specialty medical care (cardiology, oncology, neurology, ear-nose-throat, etc.)
Where Program Visits Happen  Staff meet with clients at the program location	Where Program Visits Happen  Staff meet with clients by phone or video chat
Select	Select

Survey ID

Back Next

94



95 Figure 1. Example of discrete choice experiment (DCE) task presented
96 to providers, desktop or laptop browser orientation.

97

98 *DCE design*

99 The survey was designed and implemented using Lighthouse Studio Version 9.8.1 (Sawtooth
100 Software, Provo, Utah, USA) and deployed via Sawtooth's online survey hosting platform. The
101 final design included ten comparison tasks, with two alternatives per choice task; to improve
102 design efficiency and the precision of our main effects part-worth utility estimates, we chose not
103 to include a "None" option. We used Sawtooth's Balanced Overlap method [21,22] to generate
104 random tasks in which each level appeared approximately the same number of times as the other
105 levels within each attribute (level balance), some level overlap within an attribute was permitted
106 across alternatives in the same task, and levels within one attribute were included independently
107 of levels within other attributes (orthogonality). Our design's relative D-efficiency was 88%
108 compared to the D-efficiency of Sawtooth's Completely Enumerated design, which is

109 statistically more efficient but is less able to identify possible interaction effects due to minimal
110 overlap between alternatives within a choice task [21]. The survey was deployed in English.

111 Introductory text was included to describe the attributes being investigated in the survey
112 and explained that “Your responses will tell us what program features providers value most and
113 what features they might like to change.” In each choice exercise, we asked providers to
114 “Imagine that you had to choose between two programs with the features below. Select the one
115 that you would prefer.” After the choice exercise we asked respondents about their age,
116 race/ethnicity, and gender identity, and the length of time they had been providing CCP services.

117

118 *Sample size*

119 The minimum sample size for estimating main effects in a DCE can be calculated as $n \geq \frac{500c}{ta}$,
120 where n is the number of respondents, c is the maximum number of levels among all of the
121 attributes, t is the number of choice tasks, and a is the number of alternatives per task [23,24].
122 This formula assumes each main-effect level appears at least 500 times within the survey design.
123 The minimum sample size for our study given a maximum of 4 levels among our attributes, 10
124 choice tasks, and 2 alternatives per task is $\frac{500(4)}{(10)(2)} = 100$, therefore, our target sample size of 150
125 responses was sufficient to estimate main effects.

126

127 *Data collection*

128 In January 2020, we emailed individual survey IDs and links to the online survey to 227
129 providers from the 25 revised CCP implementing agencies, with a target sample of 150
130 completed responses. The DCE could be completed in any modern browser on a desktop or
131 laptop computer, tablet, or phone. Participants were compensated with \$25 gift cards upon
132 completion of the survey. The survey was closed in early March 2020, before the first wave of
133 the COVID-19 pandemic in NYC, with 152 respondents. Into the final survey data set we
134 merged additional staff and agency descriptive data, such as staff role, agency location, and CCP
135 budget, gathered from program liaisons and existing NYC Health Department contract records.

136

137 *Analysis*

138 We used Sawtooth Software’s Lighthouse Studio 9.8.1 to design, administer, and analyze the
139 survey. We estimated part-worth utilities for each attribute level using the hierarchical-Bayesian
140 (HB) method and assuming the Random Utility Model, which posits that people choose the
141 option that has the highest total utility for them [25]. The HB method analyzes the data at the
142 individual level as well as the aggregate level, which yields more stable respondent-level
143 estimates and also allows for more heterogeneity across respondents than other methods, such as
144 traditional multinomial logistic regression [26,27].

145

146 *Part-worth utilities and relative importance*

147 We interpreted part-worth utilities as preferences for or endorsements of particular features. We
148 estimated part-worth utilities using effects coding, and zero-centered the estimates at the
149 individual level in order to reduce the effect of noise on respondents’ utility ranges [15,28,29].
150 We calculated relative importance at the respondent level as the range in part-worth utilities for
151 levels within an attribute over the sum of the ranges in part-worth utilities for levels in all
152 attributes; this yielded an importance score scaled from 0 to 1 for each respondent for each
153 attribute. We then averaged this respondent-level measure to get an aggregate-level measure of
154 attribute relative importance. Attribute relative importance is a way to quantify the degree to
155 which an attribute influences choices across respondents relative to the other attributes.

156

157 *Model fit and respondent data quality*

158 We measured overall model fit using percent certainty, analogous to McFadden’s pseudo- R^2 ,
159 where values from 0.2 to 0.4 indicate a good model fit [30]. We also used the model’s overall
160 root likelihood (RLH) to evaluate model fit. RLH is the geometric mean of the likelihood of each
161 alternative within a choice task being selected, and ranges from $1/n$ (worst fit) to 1 (best fit),
162 where n is the number of alternatives per task [31,32]. In this study, an RLH of 0.5 would
163 indicate no model fit. We also assessed straightlining, response speed, and individual RLH
164 values, three common indicators of respondent quality in DCEs [33].

165

166 **Results**

167 *Respondent Demographics and Agency Characteristics*

168 Characteristics of the 152 respondents are described in Table 2. At least one provider responded
169 from each of the 25 CCP provider agencies (median 6 respondents, IQR 4-7 respondents).
170 Median time to completion following consent was 7 minutes (IQR 5 minutes-12 minutes).
171 Providers who responded to the survey were primarily Black (34%) or Latino/a (49%),
172 identifying as women (68%), and between 30 and 49 years old (60%). Most respondents were
173 patient navigators (65%) and had worked in Care Coordination for over two years (58%). The
174 agencies at which most respondents worked were based in Manhattan (34%), the Bronx (28%),
175 or Brooklyn (24%), were clinic-based (84%) (vs community-based), and had experience with the
176 initial and revised Care Coordination model (76%).
177

Table 2. Demographic and agency-level characteristics of providers (N=152)

<i>Demographic characteristics</i>	Frequency	%
Race/Ethnicity		
Asian	6	4%
Black	51	34%
Latino/Latina	74	49%
White	12	8%
Multi-racial	2	1%
Other	4	3%
Missing	3	2%
Age group		
20-29	20	13%
30-39	59	39%
40-49	32	21%
50-59	29	19%
60+	12	8%
Gender Identity		
Woman	104	68%
Man	43	28%
Trans woman	2	1%
Trans man	1	1%
Non-conforming	1	1%
Other	1	1%

Role

Care Coordinator-type staff	33	22%
Administrative staff	20	13%
Patient navigator-type staff	99	65%

Length of time respondent has worked in Care Coordination

< 6 months	9	6%
6 - 12 months	21	14%
1 - 2 years	34	22%
> 2 years	88	58%

<i>Agency-level characteristics</i>	Frequency	%
Borough		
Bronx	42	28%
Brooklyn	37	24%
Manhattan	52	34%
Queens	14	9%
Staten Island	7	5%
Location		
Clinic-based	128	84%
Non-clinic	24	16%
Care Coordination program experience		
Experienced with the initial and revised program	116	76%
New to Care Coordination under the revised program	36	24%
Care Coordination budget calendar year 2019 (median, IQR)		
< \$600,000	24	16%
\$600,000 - \$750,000	51	34%
> \$750,000	77	51%

178

179

180 *Relative importance*

181 Relative importance estimates for each attribute are shown in Table 3 and Figure 2. The attribute
 182 that had the highest relative importance was visit location (28.6%, 95% CI 27.0% to 30.3%),
 183 followed by how staff help with ART adherence (24.3%, 95% CI 22.4% to 26.1%), how staff
 184 help with issues other than primary care (24.2%, 95% CI 22.7% to 25.7%), and lastly how staff
 185 help with primary care appointments (22.9%, 95% CI 21.7% to 24.1%).


Table 3. Average relative attribute importance from a discrete choice experience among providers in New York City assessing preference for HIV care coordination program features

Attribute	Importance	Std Dev	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI
How staff help with ART adherence	24.3%	11.7%	22.4%	26.1%
How staff help with primary care appointments	22.9%	7.8%	21.7%	24.1%
How staff help with issues other than primary care	24.2%	9.6%	22.7%	25.7%
Visit location	28.6%	10.3%	27.0%	30.3%

186

187 Figure 2. Average relative attribute importance from a discrete choice experience among providers in

188 New York City assessing preference for HIV care coordination program features



189

190

191 *Part-worth utilities*

192 Part-worth utilities of levels within each attribute are shown in Table 4 and Figure 3. The
 193 magnitude and direction of part-worth utilities indicate the strength of preference or endorsement
 194 for levels within an attribute. Providers preferred programs that included directly observed
 195 therapy as a strategy to help with ART adherence (part-worth utility 26.1, 95% CI 19.1 to 33.1),
 196 compared to reminding clients to take ART via phone or text (-5.0, 95% CI -10.2 to 0.3) and
 197 only assessing and helping with ART adherence based on responses to assessments (-21.1, 95%
 198 CI -28.5 to -13.8). Providers preferred programs that offered reminders about and
 199 accompaniment to primary care appointments (20.8, 95% CI 15.6 to 26.0) and those that
 200 reminded about and arranged transportation for primary care appointments (17.4, 95% CI 12.7 to
 201 22.2), over those that only offered reminders about primary care appointments (-38.2, 95% CI -
 202 43.3 to -33.0). Providers preferred programs that focused on helping clients with connections to

203 specialty medical care for health conditions other than HIV (26.5, 95% CI 21.5 to 31.6) or with
 204 mental health and well-being (15.6, 95% CI 11.2 to 20.0), compared with programs that focused
 205 on helping with insurance, Social Security, and other benefits paperwork (2.1, 95% CI -2.6 to
 206 6.8) or helping with securing housing and food (-44.3, 95% CI -48.9 to -39.6). Lastly, providers
 207 selected programs capable of providing home visits at locations up to 60 minutes away from the
 208 program or agency location (19.9, 95% CI 10.7 to 29.0), and home visits up to 30 minutes away
 209 from the program or agency location (8.2, 95% CI 2.6 to 13.8) more than programs in which
 210 staff only met clients at the program or agency (1.6, 95% CI -5.3 to 8.5) or met clients only via
 211 phone or video chat (-29.6, 95% CI -35.8 to -24.1).


212

Table 4. Part-worth utilities* from a discrete choice experience among providers in New York City assessing preference for HIV care coordination program features

Attribute	Level	Utility	Std Dev	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI
How staff help with ART adherence	Directly observed therapy (DOT)	26.1	44.1	19.1	33.1
	Reminder via phone or text	-5.0	33.1	-10.2	0.3
	Adherence assessment	-21.2	46.1	-28.5	-13.8
How staff help with Primary care appointments	Remind & accompany clients	20.8	32.5	15.6	26.0
	Remind & arrange transportation for clients	17.4	29.9	12.7	22.2
	Remind only	-38.2	32.4	-43.3	-33.0
How staff help with issues other than primary care	Insurance, SSI benefits & other paperwork	2.1	29.3	-2.6	6.8
	Securing housing & food	-44.3	29.3	-48.9	-39.6
	Mental health & well-being	15.6	27.4	11.3	20.0
	Connections to specialty medical care	26.5	32.1	21.5	31.6
Visit location	At program/agency	1.6	43.4	-5.3	8.5
	Via phone or video chat	-29.6	34.8	-35.8	-24.1
	At clients' homes, 30 mins from program/agency	8.2	35.3	2.6	13.8
	At clients' homes, 60 mins from program/agency	19.9	57.5	10.7	29.0

*Note: Part-worth utilities were estimated using effects coding and are zero-centered

213 Figure 3. Part-worth utilities* from a discrete choice experience among providers in New York City
 214 assessing preference for HIV care coordination program features



215
 216 Note: *Part-worth utilities were estimated using effects coding and are zero-centered

217
 218 **Model fit and respondent quality**

219 Though we did not have any *a priori* hypotheses about interactions between attribute levels, all
 220 possible interactions were explored, and none were found to be statistically significant. Overall
 221 fit for our model measured using McFadden's pseudo R^2 was 0.47, and RLH for our model was
 222 0.69, both indicating better model fit over the null model. We conducted additional analyses
 223 excluding respondents identified through straightlining, fast response time, or low individual
 224 RLH, and found that dropping potentially poor-quality respondents from the analysis made no
 225 qualitative changes to part-worth utility or relative attribute importance estimates or our
 226 interpretation of the results.

228 Discussion

229 To our knowledge, provider preferences for features of HIV care coordination or HIV case
230 management programs have not previously been systematically assessed. Among providers in
231 New York City who took this survey about hypothetical variations on the HIV Care
232 Coordination program, more intensive versions of services, such as DOT or accompanying
233 clients to primary care appointments, were preferred over the less intensive alternatives, such as
234 medication or appointment reminders alone.

235 The population for which the CCP is intended comprises PWH who have either
236 documented risks for poor HIV outcomes, a clear history of poor HIV outcomes, or both. Our
237 findings reflect an endorsement among participating providers of the high degree of support the
238 program can potentially provide to these clients to help improve ART adherence. With regard to
239 the preference for home visits, providers may have been affirming both the CCP model's value
240 in filling service gaps in usual agency-based care as well as an aspect of the program that makes
241 it effective for clients, who may live up to 60 minutes from the agency location if public
242 transportation options are limited. This may be in recognition of the value of working with
243 clients at their homes or in the field, regardless of the distance from the clinic.

244 Like home-based visits, DOT is time-intensive and costly, and is uncommon in other
245 adherence-support programs. In the original CCP, clients were assigned to particular enrollment
246 tracks, which determined the frequency and type of services they received. After the redesign in
247 2018, providers had more flexibility to adjust the frequency, type, and intensity of services based
248 on periodic assessments of individual client needs. The redesign also included the option to
249 provide DOT virtually. This expanded access to DOT for clients and reduced barriers to
250 providing DOT for agencies. During the 2019 grant year (March 2019 - February 2020), 14.2%
251 of enrolled CCP clients received at least one DOT service, defined as the observation of a single
252 dose, up from 7.7% during the 2017 grant year (March 2017 - February 2018) [34].

253 Coordinating specialty medical care for non-HIV health conditions or engaging clients in
254 mental health and well-being services are activities that providers are well-positioned to
255 undertake in the CCP, relative to other case management programs. However, our findings do
256 not imply that providers devalue conventional case management activities. Because of how our
257 DCE was designed, the levels within the 'Help with Issues other than Primary Care' attribute
258 were mutually exclusive; in real life, a care coordination program could include support for

259 housing and food and support for mental health and well-being. In fact, in recognition of the
260 importance of supporting the whole client, the revised CCP includes reimbursable services
261 related to helping with benefits and linking clients to housing and food services along with
262 reimbursable services related to mental health and well-being. In this way, the CCP promotes the
263 coordination of services across the social services and medical care systems to support the whole
264 client. Similarly, this holistic approach to client care is reflected in the relative preferences for
265 ways to provide more active assistance with primary care appointments.

266

267 *Limitations*

268 Our study has several limitations which should be acknowledged. Our sample may not be
269 representative of all Care Coordination service providers in New York City Ryan White Part A
270 agencies with regard to provider demographics or agency characteristics, which may limit the
271 generalizability of our findings. We were unable to compare the frequencies of characteristics
272 between respondents and non-respondents, because individual staff demographic data are not
273 routinely collected by the NYC Health Department. Our sample may therefore not represent the
274 full spectrum of preferences among all Care Coordination service providers, and may suffer from
275 selection bias. However, all 25 Care Coordination-delivering agencies and all core Care
276 Coordination staff roles were represented among the study participants.

277 Our study was limited by the constraints of DCE design, which must balance obtaining
278 valuable and actionable data with limiting respondent cognitive fatigue. While including more or
279 other attributes and levels would have yielded different findings, the attributes and levels in our
280 study design capture the CCP features considered important by providers and clients of Care
281 Coordination as ascertained through our focus groups.

282 Finally, our ability to interpret our findings is somewhat limited by the non-specific
283 language framing our survey and the reliance on survey self-administration. We could not tell,
284 for example, whether some providers may have made choices based on what they thought would
285 make the program better for clients, while others may have been thinking more about what
286 makes the program work for themselves or their agencies. However, our larger purpose was to
287 understand what program attributes engage providers in service delivery and identify areas where
288 provider engagement could be improved. Since either or both of these perspectives (benefit to
289 clients or benefit to staff and agencies) could motivate providers to deliver the services they

290 preferred in the DCE with high fidelity, and since the most preferred services were uniformly the
291 more intensive options presented, we believe we may interpret our findings as indicating
292 endorsement of and positive engagement with the unique and intensive features of the Care
293 Coordination program.

294

295 *Conclusion*

296 Our goal in this part of the PROMISE study was to quantify providers' preferences for features
297 of NYC HIV Care Coordination programs and to identify discordance between the stated
298 preferences in the study and aspects of the CCP as designed. The CCP fills gaps in an often
299 fragmented service system through comprehensive coordination of health care and psychosocial
300 support services. We found consistent endorsement of the intensive client-focused features that
301 are rare in case management-type programs, such as DOT and visiting clients in their homes. We
302 believe our findings show that providers particularly value the availability of an array of flexible
303 Care Coordination features that have the potential to make the greatest difference for the most
304 vulnerable clients. In response to these findings, future revisions to the CCP could aim to
305 enhance the sustainability of the delivery of the CCP's labor-intensive features.

306

307 **Competing Interests**

308 None declared.

309 **Authors' contributions**

310 DN and MI conceptualized the study. ABL conducted formative work. ABL, DN, MI, and RZ
311 collaborated on the design of the data collection tool. RZ and CF performed statistical analyses.
312 RZ, CF and MC wrote the first draft of the paper. RZ, CF, MC, ABL, MR, JC,
313 GG, DN, and MI contributed to interpreting the data and to the writing and revising of the
314 manuscript.

315 **Acknowledgements**

316 *Funding*

317 Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health of
318 the National Institutes of Health under Award Number R01MH117793. The content is solely the

319 responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National
320 Institutes of Health.

321 *Additional acknowledgements*

322 We would like to acknowledge Sarah Kulkarni for her help with logistics and securing funding
323 for the study; Sarah Kozlowski for her help with logistics and recruitment; Kate Taylor for her
324 contribution to the conceptualization and drafting of the DCE; and Graham Harriman and the
325 PROMISE qualitative research team [Rachel Schenkel, Thamara Tapia, Miguel Hernandez and
326 Honoria Guarino], for their contributions to the larger project. We would also like to
327 acknowledge the PROMISE Study Advisory Board members for their contributions to the study
328 (in alphabetical order by last name): Mohammed Aldhuraibi for ACACIA Network, Lori Hurley
329 for the STAR Program at SUNY Downstate Medical Center, Tiffany Jules for Services for the
330 UnderServed, Inc., Genesis Luciano for AIDS Center of Queens County, Cyndi Morales for the
331 Council on Adoptable Children, and Vanessa Pizarro for COMPASS.

332 **Additional Files**

333 Additional file 1: Characteristics of focus group attendees
334 File format: docx. Table of characteristics of focus group attendees.
335
336

337 **References**

- 338 1. Das M, Chu PL, Santos G-M, Scheer S, Vittinghoff E, McFarland W, et al. Decreases in Community
339 Viral Load Are Accompanied by Reductions in New HIV Infections in San Francisco. PLOS ONE. 2010
340 Jun 10;5(6):e11068.
- 341 2. Cohen MS, Chen YQ, McCauley M, Gamble T, Hosseinipour MC, Kumarasamy N, et al. Prevention
342 of HIV-1 infection with early antiretroviral therapy. N Engl J Med. 2011 Aug 11;365(6):493–505.
- 343 3. Lingappa JR, Hughes JP, Wang RS, Baeten JM, Celum C, Gray GE, et al. Estimating the Impact of
344 Plasma HIV-1 RNA Reductions on Heterosexual HIV-1 Transmission Risk. PLOS ONE. 2010 Sep
345 13;5(9):e12598.
- 346 4. Montaner JSG, Lima VD, Barrios R, Yip B, Wood E, Kerr T, et al. Expanded HAART Coverage is
347 Associated with Decreased Population-level HIV-1-RNA and Annual New HIV Diagnoses in British
348 Columbia, Canada. Lancet. 2010 Aug 14;376(9740):532–9.
- 349 5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Monitoring Selected National HIV Prevention and Care
350 Objectives by Using HIV Surveillance Data—United States and 6 Dependent Areas, 2018. 25(2):104.
- 351 6. Ending the Epidemic Dashboard, NYC. People Newly Diagnosed with HIV, New York City (2006-
352 2018) [Internet]. Ending the Epidemic. [cited 2020 Jul 19]. Available from:
353 <http://etedashboardny.org/data/new-diagnoses-and-linkage/new-diagnoses-trends-nyc/>
- 354 7. Ending the Epidemic Dashboard, NYC. HIV Care Continuum - People Living with HIV. New York City
355 (2018) [Internet]. Ending the Epidemic. [cited 2020 Jul 19]. Available from:
356 <http://etedashboardny.org/data/prevalence-and-care/hiv-care-cascades/nyc/>
- 357 8. Irvine MK, Chamberlin SA, Robbins RS, Myers JE, Braunstein SL, Mitts BJ, et al. Improvements in
358 HIV care engagement and viral load suppression following enrollment in a comprehensive HIV care
359 coordination program. Clin Infect Dis. 2015 Jan 15;60(2):298–310.
- 360 9. Irvine MK, Chamberlin SA, Robbins RS, Kulkarni SG, Robertson MM, Nash D. Come as You Are:
361 Improving Care Engagement and Viral Load Suppression Among HIV Care Coordination Clients with
362 Lower Mental Health Functioning, Unstable Housing, and Hard Drug Use. AIDS Behav. 2017
363 Jun;21(6):1572–9.
- 364 10. Irvine M. HIV Care Coordination Program, Evidence-Informed for Retention in HIV Care [Internet].
365 2020 [cited 2020 Jul 19]. Available from:
366 [https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/research/interventionresearch/compendium/lrc/cdc-hiv-](https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/research/interventionresearch/compendium/lrc/cdc-hiv-intervention-lrc-ei-care-coordination-program.pdf)
367 [intervention-lrc-ei-care-coordination-program.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/research/interventionresearch/compendium/lrc/cdc-hiv-intervention-lrc-ei-care-coordination-program.pdf)
- 368 11. Irvine M. HIV Care Coordination Program (CCP) in Linkage to, Retention in, and Re-engagement in
369 HIV care (LRC) Information Sheets [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
370 Compendium of Evidence-Based Interventions and Best Practices for HIV Prevention. 2021.
371 Available from:
372 [https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/research/interventionresearch/compendium/lrc/cdc-hiv-](https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/research/interventionresearch/compendium/lrc/cdc-hiv-HIV_Care_Coordination_Program_CCP_LRC_EBI_VS.pdf)
373 [HIV_Care_Coordination_Program_CCP_LRC_EBI_VS.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/research/interventionresearch/compendium/lrc/cdc-hiv-HIV_Care_Coordination_Program_CCP_LRC_EBI_VS.pdf)

- 374 12. Irvine M. HIV Care Coordination Program (CCP) in Structural Interventions (SI) Information Sheets
375 [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Compendium of Evidence-Based
376 Interventions and Best Practices for HIV Prevention. 2021. Available from:
377 <https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/research/interventionresearch/compendium/si/cdc-hiv->
378 [HIV_Care_Coordination_Program_CCP_SI_EBI.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/research/interventionresearch/compendium/si/cdc-hiv-HIV_Care_Coordination_Program_CCP_SI_EBI.pdf)
- 379 13. Nash D, Robertson MM, Penrose K, Chamberlin S, Robbins RS, Braunstein SL, et al. Short-term
380 effectiveness of HIV care coordination among persons with recent HIV diagnosis or history of poor
381 HIV outcomes. *PLoS ONE*. 2018;13(9):e0204017.
- 382 14. Robertson MM, Penrose K, Irvine MK, Robbins RS, Kulkarni S, Braunstein SL, et al. Impact of an HIV
383 Care Coordination Program on Durable Viral Suppression. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2019
384 01;80(1):46–55.
- 385 15. Orme BK. *Getting Started with Conjoint Analysis*. Research Publishers, LLC; 2014. 234 p.
- 386 16. Zanolini A, Sikombe K, Sikazwe I, Eshun-Wilson I, Somwe P, Bolton Moore C, et al. Understanding
387 preferences for HIV care and treatment in Zambia: Evidence from a discrete choice experiment
388 among patients who have been lost to follow-up. *PLoS Med*. 2018;15(8):e1002636.
- 389 17. Dubov A, Ogunbajo A, Altice FL, Fraenkel L. Optimizing access to PrEP based on MSM preferences:
390 results of a discrete choice experiment. *AIDS Care*. 2019;31(5):545–53.
- 391 18. Viney R, Lancsar E, Louviere J. Discrete choice experiments to measure consumer preferences for
392 health and healthcare. *Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res*. 2002 Aug;2(4):319–26.
- 393 19. Bridges JFP, Hauber AB, Marshall D, Lloyd A, Prosser LA, Regier DA, et al. Conjoint Analysis
394 Applications in Health—a Checklist: A Report of the ISPOR Good Research Practices for Conjoint
395 Analysis Task Force. *Value in Health*. 2011 Jun;14(4):403–13.
- 396 20. Coast J, Horrocks S. Developing attributes and levels for discrete choice experiments using
397 qualitative methods. *J Health Serv Res Policy*. 2007 Jan;12(1):25–30.
- 398 21. Sawtooth Software. Lighthouse Studio Help: CBC Questionnaires and Design Strategy [Internet].
399 2020 [cited 2020 Jul 28]. Available from: [https://legacy.sawtoothsoftware.com/help/lighthouse-](https://legacy.sawtoothsoftware.com/help/lighthouse-studio/manual/)
400 [studio/manual/](https://legacy.sawtoothsoftware.com/help/lighthouse-studio/manual/)
- 401 22. Orme BK. Fine-Tuning CBC and Adaptive CBC Questionnaires (2009) [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jul 28].
402 Available from: [https://sawtoothsoftware.com/resources/technical-papers/fine-tuning-cbc-and-](https://sawtoothsoftware.com/resources/technical-papers/fine-tuning-cbc-and-adaptive-cbc-questionnaires-2009)
403 [adaptive-cbc-questionnaires-2009](https://sawtoothsoftware.com/resources/technical-papers/fine-tuning-cbc-and-adaptive-cbc-questionnaires-2009)
- 404 23. Orme BK. Sample Size Issues for Conjoint Analysis Studies (2019) [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jul 28].
405 Available from: [https://sawtoothsoftware.com/resources/technical-papers/sample-size-issues-for-](https://sawtoothsoftware.com/resources/technical-papers/sample-size-issues-for-conjoint-analysis-studies-2019)
406 [conjoint-analysis-studies-2019](https://sawtoothsoftware.com/resources/technical-papers/sample-size-issues-for-conjoint-analysis-studies-2019)
- 407 24. What Sample Sizes do you Need for Conjoint Analysis? [Internet]. Q Research Software. 2019
408 [cited 2020 Jul 28]. Available from: [https://www.qresearchsoftware.com/what-sample-sizes-do-](https://www.qresearchsoftware.com/what-sample-sizes-do-you-need-for-conjoint-analysis)
409 [you-need-for-conjoint-analysis](https://www.qresearchsoftware.com/what-sample-sizes-do-you-need-for-conjoint-analysis)

- 410 25. Orme BK, Chrzan K. *Becoming an Expert in Conjoint Analysis*. Sawtooth Software, Inc; 2017. 327 p.
- 411 26. CBC/HB Technical Paper (2009) [Internet]. [cited 2020 Aug 6]. Available from:
412 <https://sawtoothsoftware.com/resources/technical-papers/cbc-hb-technical-paper-2009>
- 413 27. Application of Covariates within Sawtooth Software’s CBC/HB Program: Theory and Practical
414 Example (2009) [Internet]. [cited 2020 Aug 6]. Available from:
415 [https://sawtoothsoftware.com/resources/technical-papers/application-of-covariates-within-](https://sawtoothsoftware.com/resources/technical-papers/application-of-covariates-within-sawtooth-softwares-cbc-hb-program-theory-and-practical-example-2009)
416 [sawtooth-softwares-cbc-hb-program-theory-and-practical-example-2009](https://sawtoothsoftware.com/resources/technical-papers/application-of-covariates-within-sawtooth-softwares-cbc-hb-program-theory-and-practical-example-2009)
- 417 28. Raw utilities vs. Zero-Centered Diffs - Sawtooth Software Forum [Internet]. [cited 2020 Sep 24].
418 Available from: [https://legacy.sawtoothsoftware.com/forum/7160/raw-utilities-vs-zero-centered-](https://legacy.sawtoothsoftware.com/forum/7160/raw-utilities-vs-zero-centered-diffs?show=7160#q7160)
419 [diffs?show=7160#q7160](https://legacy.sawtoothsoftware.com/forum/7160/raw-utilities-vs-zero-centered-diffs?show=7160#q7160)
- 420 29. Scaling Conjoint Part Worths: Points vs. Zero-Centered Diffs [Internet]. [cited 2020 Sep 25].
421 Available from: [https://legacy.sawtoothsoftware.com/about-us/news-and-events/sawtooth-](https://legacy.sawtoothsoftware.com/about-us/news-and-events/sawtooth-solutions/ss10-cb/1201-scaling-conjoint-part-worths-points-vs-zero-centered-diffs)
422 [solutions/ss10-cb/1201-scaling-conjoint-part-worths-points-vs-zero-centered-diffs](https://legacy.sawtoothsoftware.com/about-us/news-and-events/sawtooth-solutions/ss10-cb/1201-scaling-conjoint-part-worths-points-vs-zero-centered-diffs)
- 423 30. Hauber AB, González JM, Groothuis-Oudshoorn CGM, Prior T, Marshall DA, Cunningham C, et al.
424 *Statistical Methods for the Analysis of Discrete Choice Experiments: A Report of the ISPOR Conjoint*
425 *Analysis Good Research Practices Task Force*. *Value Health*. 2016;19(4):300–15.
- 426 31. Hill AR. *The CBC System for Choice-Based Conjoint Analysis* [Internet]. Sawtooth Software
427 *Technical Paper Series*. 2017 [cited 2020 Sep 23]. Available from:
428 [https://sawtoothsoftware.com/uploads/sawtoothsoftware/originals/CBC%20Technical%20Paper%](https://sawtoothsoftware.com/uploads/sawtoothsoftware/originals/CBC%20Technical%20Paper%20(2017).pdf)
429 [20\(2017\).pdf](https://sawtoothsoftware.com/uploads/sawtoothsoftware/originals/CBC%20Technical%20Paper%20(2017).pdf)
- 430 32. Comparing HB Root-likelihood (RLH) Between Displayr and Sawtooth [Internet]. Displayr. 2019
431 [cited 2020 Sep 23]. Available from: <https://www.displayr.com/comparing-hb-rlh/>
- 432 33. Identifying “Bad” Respondents [Internet]. [cited 2020 Oct 17]. Available from:
433 [https://sawtoothsoftware.com/help/lighthouse-](https://sawtoothsoftware.com/help/lighthouse-studio/manual/hid_web_maxdiff_badrespondents.html)
434 [studio/manual/hid_web_maxdiff_badrespondents.html](https://sawtoothsoftware.com/help/lighthouse-studio/manual/hid_web_maxdiff_badrespondents.html)
- 435 34. New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. Unpublished data. *Care and Treatment*
436 *Program, Bureau of HIV*; 2021.
- 437