

A modeling framework for translating discrete choice experiment results into cost-effectiveness estimates: an application to designing tailored and scalable HIV and contraceptive services for adolescents in South Africa

Caroline Govathson¹, Lawrence C Long^{1,2}, Colin A Russell^{2,3}, Aneesa Moolla¹, Sophie Pascoe¹, Brooke E. Nichols^{1,2,3§},

¹ Health Economics and Epidemiology Research Office, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand

² Department of Global Health, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

³ Department of Medical Microbiology, Amsterdam University Medical Center, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

§ Corresponding author: Brooke Nichols brooken@bu.edu

801 Massachusetts Ave.,
Crosstown Center, 3rd Floor
Boston, MA, USA 02118
+1 857 544 7250
brooken@bu.edu

E-mail addresses of authors:

CG: cgovathson@heroza.org

LCL: lclong@bu.edu

AM: amoolla@heroza.org

SP: spascoe@heroza.org

BEN: brooken@bu.edu

CAR: c.a.russell@amsterdamumc.nl

Keywords: Discrete choice experiment; health economics; modelling; HIV; adolescents

Word count:

Abstract: 349/350

Main text: 3312/3500

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Youth in South Africa are disproportionately affected by STIs, HIV, and
3 unintended pregnancies. Despite this, their uptake of HIV and contraceptive services remains a
4 challenge. South Africa urgently needs tailored, scalable interventions to address both HIV
5 infection and early pregnancy prevention for young people. These interventions generally take
6 years to design, implement, and evaluate, leaving a gap. To that end, we have developed a
7 framework to translate the expected impact of facility-level attributes in increasing
8 HIV/contraceptive service uptake for youth from a discrete choice experiment (DCE) into a cost
9 effectiveness analysis (CEA).

10 **Methods:** We used a DCE (n=805) conducted in Gauteng, South Africa, which found that staff
11 attitude, confidentiality, Wi-Fi, subsidized food, afternoon hours and youth-only services were
12 preferred attributes of health services. Based on this we simulated uptake of services adapted for
13 these preferences. We divided preferences into modifiable attributes that could readily be
14 adapted (e.g. Wi-Fi), and non-modifiable (more nuanced attributes that are more challenging to
15 cost and evaluate): staff attitude and estimated the incremental change in uptake of services using
16 adapted services. Costs for modifiable preferences were estimated using data from two clinics in
17 South Africa (2019 US\$). We determined the incremental cost effectiveness ratio (ICER) of 15
18 intervention combinations, and report the results of interventions on the cost-effectiveness
19 frontier.

20

21 **Results:** Greatest projected impact on uptake was from friendly and confidential services, both
22 of which were considered non-modifiable (18.5% 95%CI:13.0-24.0%; 8.4% 95%CI:3.0-14.0%
23 respectively). Modifiable factors on their own resulted in only small increases in expected
24 uptake. (Food: 2.3% 95%CI:4.0%-9.00%; Wi-Fi: 3.0% 95%CI: -4.0%-10.0%; Youth only
25 services: 0.3% 95%CI: -6.0%-7.0%; Afternoon services: 0.8% 95%CI: -6.0%-7.0%). The order
26 of interventions on the cost-effectiveness frontier are Wi-Fi and youth-only services (ICER
27 US\$7.01- US\$9.78), Wi-Fi, youth-only services and food (ICER US\$9.32 - US\$10.45), followed
28 by Wi-Fi, youth-only services and extended afternoon hours (ICER US\$14.46 – US\$43.63)

29 **Conclusion:** Combining DCE results and costing analyses within a modelling framework
30 provides an innovative way to inform decisions on effective resource utilisation. Modifiable
31 preferences, such as Wi-Fi provision, youth only services and subsidized food, have potential to
32 cost-effectively increase the proportion of youth accessing HIV and contraceptive services.

33 **Introduction**

34 Existing models of care have failed to adequately address the gap in sexual health needs, access
35 to- and uptake of- HIV and contraceptive services among adolescents in South Africa (1). The
36 rate of unintended pregnancy among adolescents remains high, with about a quarter of
37 adolescent girls and young women (AWYG) giving birth before age 20 (2)(3). According to
38 UNAIDS, the incidence rate for HIV infection among adolescents aged 10-19 was 54 per 1000
39 population in 2018 in South Africa with adolescent girls disproportionately affected(4). Despite
40 the high prevalence of HIV and pregnancy among adolescents, uptake of HIV and contraceptive
41 services in this age group remains a challenge. The 2016 South African demographic health
42 survey revealed that 31% of girls aged 15-19 years and 28% of AGYW aged 20-24 years had
43 unmet contraceptive needs(5). This underscores a critical need to increase adolescent access to
44 both HIV and contraceptive services.

45
46 Many solutions have been offered to increase uptake of HIV and contraceptive services by
47 adolescents including “youth friendly clinics” and school health programs with limited success
48 (1,6,7). Children 12 years and older have the right to reproductive health, including access to
49 contraceptives and HIV/AIDS testing without consent of a parent or guardian (8). There however
50 remain many barriers to adolescents' access and uptake of reproductive health services (9–11).
51 South Africa urgently needs tailored, scalable interventions to address both HIV infection and
52 early pregnancy prevention for young people, in particular for young women. Decisions on how
53 to tailor and efficiently scale interventions with regards to cost and uptake are often difficult to
54 make due to limited data on youth preferences, impact and cost of different interventions.

55
56 Discrete choice experiments (DCE's) are a study design increasingly used in health economics to
57 explore the relative importance of different attributes that may influence decision to access and

58 utilize certain goods, services or programs (12,13). They can be used to understand whether
59 particular attributes can predict uptake of services and the relative importance of certain
60 attributes to this uptake (14). The results from a DCE can help policy makers understand the
61 impact of making certain changes to current services on service acceptability or uptake. Recent
62 research has been conducted to determine the preferences of school going youth for HIV and
63 contraceptive services through the use of a DCE(15). Key service characteristics including staff
64 attitude, confidentiality and value-added services like availability of Wi-Fi, food and youth-only
65 waiting areas were found to be key attributes affecting the decision to access care. The cost and
66 expected effectiveness of altering these key attributes to improve the likelihood that the youth
67 access health services is, however, unknown.

68
69 When designing interventions using preference data from a DCE, information on incremental
70 uptake and how much it costs to implement these interventions is essential(16,17). This
71 information allows us to compare the different interventions and select only the most cost-
72 effective, scalable interventions for trialing. Traditionally trial data, stakeholder opinions,
73 observational data of comparable scenarios are used with some underlying assumptions to
74 predict uptake and cost(16–19) In our work we describe an approach that can be used to close the
75 gap between the DCE methodology and implementation or trialing of different targeted
76 programs.

77
78 In order to guide future trials or implementation, we used the results of the DCE with school
79 going youth (15) to model the expected costs and impact (in terms of increase in the proportion
80 of youth accessing health services) of attributes of health services. We used coefficients of
81 expected uptake of HIV and contraceptive services from a recently conducted DCE (20), as an
82 estimated outcome measure as part of a cost-effectiveness analysis. This information can be used
83 to determine which interventions or combination of interventions should take priority within
84 limited budgets.

85

86 **Methods**

87 This work builds on a discrete choice experiment (DCE) that was conducted to estimate
88 preferences of school going adolescents for accessing HIV and contraceptive services(15). The
89 DCE was conducted in 10 high schools situated in neighbourhoods of varying socio-economic
90 status (SES) in Gauteng South Africa between 07/2018-09/2019 (**Figure 1**). A total of 805
91 students completed the survey for the adolescent DCE study. Over two thirds (68%) of the
92 participants were female, and two-thirds (66%) of the students who participated were aged 15-17
93 years. Details of the DCE will be published elsewhere.

94 From the above study, six factors were found to be facilitators for uptake of HIV and
95 contraceptive services (15). These were the six attributes and levels that showed significant
96 change in probability of a choice being selected. Staff attitude and confidentiality were key
97 issues affecting students' decisions to access HIV and contraceptive services. Access to
98 subsidized food, youth-only waiting areas, afternoon services and presence of free Wi-Fi were
99 the other preferences that were significantly associated with choice in the DCE. We used these
100 results to identify combinations of interventions that could be used to increase uptake of HIV and
101 contraceptive services by youths. The attributes were categorised into modifiable (easier to
102 implement, and to cost and evaluate): subsidized food, Wi-Fi, youth-only services and afternoon
103 services (after school hours); and non-modifiable (more nuanced attributes that are more
104 challenging to cost and evaluate): friendliness and confidentiality. We looked at the potential
105 increase in service uptake across the full set of mutually exclusive combinations of all six of
106 these factors (Table 1). The complete cost-effectiveness analysis was, however, only done for the
107 four factors that could be reasonably costed in a generalizable way. These four factors were
108 placed into all possible combinations of between one and four attributes. This resulted in 15
109 different modifiable mutually exclusive intervention combinations that could be evaluated to see
110 if they are cost effective options.

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136 Translation of DCE results to uptake

137

138


139

140

141

142

143



134 Figure 1: Translation of Discrete Choice Experiment results to cost-effectiveness results

136 Translation of DCE results to uptake

138 We used coefficients from the DCE (15) to estimate the expected increase in uptake of HIV and
139 contraceptive services as the outcome measure for a cost-effectiveness analysis. We defined the
140 baseline to be the set of attributes that most closely reflects current practice (Location: clinic,
141 time: morning, staff attitude: unfriendly, confidentiality: none, incentives: none and provision of
142 all health services). To estimate uptake of services, we calculated change of probability of uptake
143 of using services from baseline levels when changes are made to the next level of each attribute

144 (i.e. the incremental change in uptake). We modelled attributes, which had shown a statistically
145 significant effect on the probability of an attribute being chosen in the DCE.

146

147 The logit probability of choosing alternative i rather than alternative j is given by the equation:

148

$$149 \quad P_i = \frac{e^{\beta' x_i}}{149 \quad \sum e^{\beta' x_j}}$$

150

151
152
153 Using this equation (21), the change in the probability of choosing to use HIV and contraceptive
154 services given the baseline levels say, clinic, and morning services is then (provided all other
155 attributes remain equal) given by the above equation.

156

157 **Costs**

158

159 Costs related to the delivery of a modified package of clinic interventions delivered with the aim
160 of increasing the utilization of HIV and contraceptive services were estimated from a health
161 system perspective.

162

163 Baseline costs were estimated from cost data collected from two clinics (one government
164 primary health clinic and one South African non-profit organization providing Comprehensive
165 PHC services with DOH support) through an external study focused on the costing of primary
166 health services (22,23). The methods for the costing and the description of these primary health
167 clinics are elsewhere (22–24). For each of the intervention scenarios, only the additional costs
168 associated with the modification were calculated. The additional costs associated with the
169 modification were shared among the additional adolescent patients expected to utilize the clinic
170 following the changes.

171

172 The changes in cost in categories of assets, overheads, staff (clinical and non-clinical) and
173 supplies for each package of interventions were calculated based on a number of assumptions
174 regarding how these service modifications would be implemented and current local costs of
175 implementing those changes. We used available cost analysis data and published data on
176 interventions that have been implemented(23,25,26). All costs for the interventions were

177 allocated to the additional adolescent patients and therefore division of total additional costs was
178 by the number of extra adolescent patients.

179
180 Utilities such as electricity, water and sewage costs were allocated based on the total number of
181 monthly visits. Staff costs for the afternoon and for youth only services were calculated based on
182 number of patients seen and period of time the facility would be open in the afternoon. Food
183 costs were calculated for all adolescents but the total cost was billed only to the additional
184 adolescent patients so that the incremental cost included the cost of food to all adolescents. Extra
185 space for youth-only services or afternoon services was calculated using average size counselling
186 rooms.

187 We calculated a cost per additional adolescent patient expected to utilize HIV and contraceptive
188 services as a consequence of the clinic modifications, as well as the total costs required at the
189 facility level to implement the intervention. All costs were updated to 2019 South African Rand
190 (ZAR) and converted to USD using the mid-year exchange rate 1 USD = 14 ZAR (27). Analysis
191 of costs was done using Microsoft Excel.

192

193 **Cost-effectiveness ratios**

194

195 In order to generate incremental cost-effectiveness ratios, the predicted probability analysis was
196 combined with costing data for selected intervention scenarios. All intervention scenario costs
197 and their respective expected effectiveness were incremental from a baseline cost and
198 effectiveness of zero (e.g. no clinic modifications). We compared the new strategies
199 (Intervention B) and the cost and outcome of these against the baseline standard of care
200 (Intervention A) (i.e. $\text{Cost of Intervention B} - \text{Cost of intervention A} / (\text{Effectiveness of}$
201 $\text{intervention B} - \text{Effectiveness of intervention A})$)(28). Those strategies that cost more and did
202 not increase uptake of services were considered ‘dominated’ (e.g. costlier and less or equally
203 effective) and therefore removed from the comparison. When the intervention increased the
204 uptake of the services and was also less costly, we called it the “dominant” intervention. For
205 interventions that increased uptake and also the cost, an ICER was calculated to compare the
206 interventions, or a cost per additional youth expected to access services. To determine the most
207 cost-effective strategies we used the efficiency frontier approach. A cost-effectiveness frontier

208 representing the efficient combination of interventions of the 15 strategies assessed was
209 constructed. Interventions below the frontier are not considered cost-effective at any
210 threshold(29).

211 In the incremental analysis, strategies were compared until ultimately, only the most cost-
212 effective strategies were left and these were ordered according to their cost-effectiveness ratio,
213 lowest to highest, referencing which strategies should be adopted in incremental order dependent
214 on the availability of resources(28,29). In order to determine how sensitive our results were to
215 the specific costs at an individual clinic, we repeated the above analysis for two different clinics
216 and their respective costs.

217 **Ethics**

218 As this was a modelling study based on results from published studies that did not involve
219 human subjects, approval from an institutional review board was not necessary.

220 **Results**

221 **Preferences (Results from the DCE)**

222

223 Results from the DCE that informed this work showed that the most preferred service
224 characteristics that facilitated HIV and contraceptive service uptake by adolescents were friendly
225 health care providers and private and confidential services. Students preferred accessing services
226 in the afternoon (after school hours) compared to the morning. Youth only services, Wi-Fi and
227 access to food were likely to increase the probability of students utilising services. Students
228 preferred the more comprehensive package of services (family planning and contraceptive
229 services) or all health services as opposed to services that only provided condoms or HIV
230 counselling and Testing (HCT) (20)

231

232 **Uptake projections**

233

234 The results from the simulations conducted here indicate that uptake of HIV and contraceptive
235 services may increase as different service attributes are added to the baseline standard of care.

236 Non-modifiable/difficult to modify factors such as ensuring friendly healthcare providers and
237 confidentiality of services were projected to have the largest impact on uptake (an increase of
238 18.5%; (95%CI 13.0%-24.0%); and 8.4%; (95%CI 3.0%-14.0% respectively)). Combining these
239 non-modifiable preferences with three modifiable preferences (Wi-Fi, food, youth only services
240 and afternoon services) projected a statistically significant increase in uptake by 55.0% (95%CI
241 46.0%-65.0%) from baseline (**Figure 2**).

242
243 For the final cost-effectiveness analysis, only modifiable attributes were included. As individual
244 interventions, provision of afternoon services, or youth friendly services or Wi-Fi only or food
245 only did not yield a statistically significant increase in rates of uptake of services. The least
246 effective strategy in terms of additional youth expected to use HIV and contraceptive services
247 were, in ascending order of efficacy, youth only services, afternoon services, access to
248 subsidized food and provision of Wi-Fi separately. The combination of all four attributes,
249 however, (Wi-Fi, food, afternoon services and youth) provided the highest increase in uptake of
250 23.0% (95%CI 11.0%-35.0%) (**Figure 3**). This was followed by different combinations of just
251 three attributes which showed that uptake might be increased by roughly 17.0% for any
252 combination of the three attributes (**Table 1**). Combining only two preferred modifiable
253 attributes might also increase uptake by between 7.0% and 11.0% depending on combination of
254 preferred attributes (**Table 1**). The number of adolescents utilising HIV and contraceptive
255 services at baseline were higher at clinic B than at clinic A, therefore as a fraction, clinic A had
256 more additional adolescents utilising services.

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264


265

266

267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274

Table 1. Uptake of HIV and contraceptive services projections for intervention scenarios

	Coefficient	% usage increase from baseline	Standard error	P-value	Confidence Interval	Total %
Baseline						30.6
afternoon	0.01	0.82	0.03	0.80	-5.62 – 7.27	31.42
Wi-Fi	0.03	2.71	0.04	0.45	-4.25 – 9.67	33.31
Youth waiting area	0.00	0.29	0.03	0.93	-6.17 – 6.74	30.89
Food	0.02	2.25	0.03	0.49	-4.10 – 8.61	32.85
Friendly	0.19	18.54	0.03	0.00	13.44 – 23.63	49.14
Confidential	0.08	8.35	0.03	0.00	3.09 – 13.60	38.95
Wi-Fi and Food	0.11	10.70	0.05	0.03	10.00 – 20.00	41.30
Food and youth	0.08	8.30	0.04	0.06	0.00 – 16.00	38.90
Youth and Wi-Fi	0.09	9.00		0.07	0.00 – 18.00	39.60
Afternoon and Wi-Fi	0.09	9.00	0.04	0.02	1.20 – 17.00	39.60
Afternoon and youth only	0.07	6.90	0.04	0.08	-0.87 – 14.67	37.50
Food and afternoon	0.08	8.00	0.03	0.02	1.20 – 16.40	38.60
Youth only, afternoon and Wi-Fi	0.17	16.84	0.06	0.01	4.59 – 29.08	47.44
Wi-Fi food and youth	0.17	16.70	0.06	0.01	4.50 – 28.80	47.30
Wi-Fi, food, afternoon	0.17	17.20	0.05	0.00	6.90 – 27.48	47.80
Food, afternoon and youth	0.15	14.80	0.05	0.00	5.48 – 24.24	45.40
Wi-Fi, food, afternoon, youth	0.23	23.00	3.65	0.00	10.60 – 35.00	53.60
Youth only, Wi-Fi, afternoon, friendly	0.49	49.42	0.04	0.00	40.86 – 57.99	80.02
Youth only, fifi, afternoon, friendly	0.38	37.99	0.05	0.00	28.60 – 47.38	68.59
Youth only, Wi-Fi, Food, afternoon, friendly, confidentiality	0.55	55.00	0.05	0.00	46.00 – 65.00	85.60



275

276 **Figure 2: Uptake of HIV and contraceptive services projections for scenarios that include at least one non-modifiable**
277 **attribute**

278

279

280

281

282

283


284

285

286

287

288



289

290 **Figure 3: Uptake of HIV and contraceptive services projections for modifiable intervention scenarios**

291

292 **Cost and cost-effectiveness**

293 The cost per additional adolescent utilising services varied between the clinics depending on
 294 which interventions or package of interventions might be implemented. Clinic A costs ranged
 295 from \$10.20 to 202.90 (**Table 2**) and Clinic B from \$7.00 to \$116.50 for clinic B (**Table 3**).

296 The addition of subsidized food had the third highest cost per additional adolescent utilising HIV
 297 and contraceptive services at US\$31.5 for clinic A and US\$30.8 for clinic B. This was because
 298 we cost the food to benefit all adolescents utilising services but the cost would be borne only by
 299 the additional youth utilising services. Provision of services in the afternoon outside school hours
 300 has the next highest cost per additional adolescent utilising services (US\$78.5 per additional
 301 adolescent at clinic A and US\$77.6 at clinic B). Providing youth only services would be the
 302 costliest per additional youth accessing HIV and contraceptive services with costs for clinic A at
 303 US\$202.9 and clinic B at US\$116.5. Combining all modifiable attributes was US\$19.20 for
 304 clinic A and US\$9.76 for clinic B per additional adolescent utilising services.

305 **Figure 4** shows all non-dominated interventions scenarios for the two clinics, ranked in order of
 306 decreasing cost effectiveness. The most value for money is gained by implementing the
 307 interventions from the left to the right until the budget is exhausted (28). For both clinics, the
 308 ICER for youth only services and Wi-Fi was the best. The ICER’s for clinic A range from
 309 US\$9.78 for (Wi-Fi and youth only services) and US\$43.7 for a combination of all four
 310 modifiable attributes. The same order is retained with regards to ICER’s for clinic B, though
 311 with lower incremental costs- US\$7.01 for (WI-FI and youth only services) and US\$14.5 for all
 312 four modifiable attributes combined.

313 **Table 2: Clinic A: Cost-effectiveness of interventions to increase youth uptake of HIV and contraceptive services**

Number	Additional youths	New total youths	%	Cost per patient	Total Cost	ICER
Wi-Fi	41	1572	2.7	\$12.6	\$516.7	Dominated
youth only	4	1535	0.3	\$202.9	\$811.7	Dominated
afternoon	13	1544	0.8	\$78.5	\$1,020.2	Dominated
Food	34	1565	2.3	\$31.5	\$1,072.3	Dominated
Wi-Fi, youth only	138	1669	9.0	\$10.6	\$1,465.6	\$9.8
Wi-Fi, food	168	1699	10.7	\$10.2	\$1,706.0	Weakly dominated
food, youth only	122	1653	8.3	\$15.2	\$1,858.6	Dominated
Wi-Fi, afternoon	142	1673	9.3	\$18.3	\$2,603.3	Weakly dominated
Wi-Fi, food, youth only	260	1791	17	\$10.5	\$2,740.0	\$10.5
afternoon, youth only	106	1637	6.9	\$27.0	\$2,864.9	Dominated
Wi-Fi, afternoon, youth only	230	1761	17.0	\$13.7	\$3,147.3	Dominated
food, afternoon	138	1669	9.0	\$24.9	\$3,442.0	Dominated
food, afternoon, youth only	230	1761	15.0	\$18.1	\$4,161.0	Dominated
Wi-Fi, food, afternoon	260	1791	17.0	\$16.4	\$4,251.4	Dominated
Wi-Fi, food, afternoon, youth only	352	1883	23.0	\$19.2	\$6,758.1	\$43.7

314

315

316

317

318


319

320 **Table 3: Clinic B: Cost-effectiveness of interventions to increase youth uptake of HIV and contraceptive services**

	Additional youths	Total youths	%	Cost per patient	Total Cost	ICER
Wi-Fi	49	1857	2.7	\$10.6	\$522.7	Weakly dominated
youth only	5	1813	0.3	\$116.5	\$611.1	Dominated
Wi-Fi, youth only	163	1971	9.0	\$7.0	\$1,141.9	\$7.0
afternoon	15	1823	0.8	\$77.6	\$1,150.6	Dominated
Food	41	1849	2.3	\$30.8	\$1,254.8	Dominated
food, youth only,	145	1953	8.0	\$11.4	\$1,653.6	Dominated
afternoon, youth only	125	1933	6.9	\$13.8	\$1,721.0	Dominated
Wi-Fi, food	199	2007	10.7	\$9.0	\$1,785.6	Weakly dominated
Wi-Fi and afternoon	168	1976	9.3	\$7.5	\$1,253.7	Dominated
food, afternoon	163	1971	9.0	\$14.8	\$2,413.4	Dominated
Wi-Fi, food, youth only	307	2115	17.0	\$8.1	\$2,490.5	\$9.3
Wi-Fi, afternoon, youth only	271	2079	15.0	\$8.5	\$2,293.3	Dominated
Wi-Fi, food, afternoon	307	2115	17.0	\$12.7	\$3,914.4	Dominated
food, afternoon, youth only	271	2079	15.0	\$11.2	\$3,026.0	Dominated
Wi-Fi, food, afternoon, youth only	416	2224	23.0	\$9.8	\$4,059.7	\$14.5

321

322



323

324 **Figure 4: Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios on the cost-effectiveness frontier**

325

326

327 **Discussion**

328

329 We have described a methodology to estimate cost-effectiveness of potential service delivery
330 mechanisms- for HIV and contraceptive services for youth- utilising results of a discrete choice
331 experiment. Typically, cost-effectiveness analyses only come at the end of costly and time-
332 consuming trials or large-scale observational studies. This type of pre-intervention assessment of
333 potential cost-effectiveness of a set of interventions based on the stated preferences of the target
334 audience and an estimate of costs of each intervention can assist in guiding more efficient trial
335 planning- such that only the arms that are expected to be on the cost-effectiveness frontier are
336 included in a trial design. Results could also be used to directly guide programme planning and
337 scale-up where appropriate. The strength and innovation of this study lies in the use of DCE data
338 to calculate potential changes in uptake of services from the current standard of care if different
339 interventions were implemented, and also the use of cost data from clinics to calculate
340 incremental costs of adding interventions. The use of data from DCEs to make projections on
341 uptake of services to inform cost effectiveness analysis is valuable for intervention trials where
342 resources do not exist to do the trial and obtain actual uptake data (revealed preferences) (30–
343 32).

344 The results from the first analysis applying this novel methodology were able to determine the
345 set of non-dominated strategies for increasing uptake of services, and determine the order with
346 which they should be implemented across the cost-effectiveness frontier.

347

348 Friendliness, privacy and confidentiality are among the strongest drivers of choice for use of
349 HIV and contraceptive services among adolescents who participated in the DCE used in this
350 approach. We stratified the preferences identified from the DCE into modifiable and non-
351 modifiable preferences. Friendliness and confidentiality were considered non-modifiable
352 preferences- meaning that interventions to address these preferences are currently not well-
353 defined (and therefore not cost-able). The DCE results and uptake projections show, however,
354 that the non-modifiable factors are the most impactful and would provide the biggest increase in
355 uptake- if an intervention to address these factors could be well-defined and costed. Addressing
356 staff attitudes with regards to friendliness and confidentiality is likely a cost-effective

357 strategy(33,34) as the impact is likely to go beyond just utilization of HIV and contraceptive
358 services for adolescents into other health and educational outcomes (35,36).

359

360 The effectiveness of value-added services like access to free or affordable food, Wi-Fi and cash
361 transfers has been evaluated before (7,34). Although cost-effective, it is important to be aware of
362 their full impact and where this impact may plateau and new strategies must come in. Wi-Fi and
363 youth-only services cost an incremental \$7.01 - \$10.62 per additional adolescents expected to
364 access the healthcare facility but on their own are only expected to increase adolescent utilization
365 of health services by 9%. Should resources allow, additional considerations would be, first: Wi-
366 Fi and youth-only services, second: the addition of subsidized food and third: addition of
367 afternoon clinic hours. Our results show that the order that we must implement interventions is
368 the same between the two clinics and that altering the size of the clinic and other parameters may
369 change the cost per additional adolescent utilising services.

370

371 This study was subject to a number of limitations. Firstly, we were unable to cost the non-
372 modifiable preferences- although these produced the largest impact regarding uptake of services.
373 Ideally, more work needs to be conducted to investigate ways to increase healthcare provider
374 attitude. Behavioural economics informed interventions or nudges provide a potential way to
375 influence provider attitude and behaviour (37). Studies that investigate possible costs and
376 effectiveness of interventions that are geared towards improving provider attitudes towards
377 adolescents and their access to HIV and contraceptive services would be required to effectively
378 evaluate the cost-effectiveness of such interventions in this modeling framework. Second,
379 projections from the DCE are theoretical as they are based on stated preferences as users are not
380 observed (38). Results from DCEs have, however, been used in other studies to project uptake of
381 services or products (31,39). A DCE forms a reliable evidence base for such projections. Third,
382 our study does not look at the heterogeneity of preferences and therefore differentiated impact
383 depending on the underlying population. Relative expected cost-effectiveness might differ based
384 on the composition of the underlying population. A DCE conducted across multiple different
385 underlying populations or in different geographies would address this limitation of the present
386 application of this novel methodology.

387

388

389

390 **Conclusions**

391

392 Patient-centred care has been expounded as the ultimate goal of health care service provision but
393 is rarely a reality. The work described here might provide an approach to meet that need whilst
394 considering the resource limitations that often exist particularly in low-resource settings. Policy
395 decision making requires consideration of both patient preferences and cost-effectiveness
396 information our study utilizes the DCE methodology to infer both. In instances where funding or
397 time do not allow, the proposed methodology provides one mechanism to understand the
398 possible cost-effectiveness of different implementation scenarios. The results from this type of
399 analysis can be useful in either guiding implementation- if no plan exists for further study- or
400 could be used to guide study design for empirical cost-effectiveness studies. Follow up work
401 could look at acceptability, feasibility, and effectiveness of interventions built from these
402 scenarios on uptake of HIV services by young people in different settings.

403

404

405 **Word limit: 3500 words**

406

407 **Competing interests** [Mandatory]

408 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

409

410

411 **Authors' contributions** [Mandatory]

412 CG and BEN conceptualized and designed the study. CGM conducted the analysis. CG prepared
413 the original draft. CG, BEN, SP, LL, CAR and AM reviewed and edited the draft.

414

415 **Acknowledgements** [Mandatory]

416 **Funding:**

417 This study was made possible by the generous support of the American People and the
418 President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) through US Agency for International
419 Development (USAID) under the terms of Cooperative Agreements AID-674-A-12-00029 and
420 72067419CA00004 to Health Economics and Epidemiology Research Office. LL was supported
421 by the National Institute of Mental Health of the National Institutes of Health under grant
422 number K01MH119923. The contents are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily
423 reflect the views of the NIH, PEPFAR, USAID or the United States Government. The funders
424 had no role in the study design, collection, analysis and interpretation of the data, in manuscript
425 preparation or the decision to publish.

426

427 Disclaimer:

428

429 **Additional files** [Optional]

430 Additional file 1: Title of additional file

431 Information on file format. Brief description of file content.

432

433

434 **List of abbreviations** [Optional]

435

436 **References**

- 437 1. Smith P, Marcus R, Bennie T, Nkala B, Nchabeleng M, Latka MH, et al. What do South African
438 adolescents want in a sexual health service? Evidence from the South African studies on HIV in
439 adolescents (SASHA) project. *South African Med J* [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2021 May
440 23];108(8):677–81. Available from:
441 [http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0256-](http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0256-95742018000800020&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=en)
442 [95742018000800020&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=en](http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0256-95742018000800020&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=en)
- 443 2. Interventions for preventing unintended pregnancies among adolescents | Davids | South African
444 Medical Journal [Internet]. [cited 2021 May 23]. Available from:
445 <http://www.samj.org.za/index.php/samj/article/view/12818/9086>
- 446 3. Ajayi AI, Ezegbe HC. Association between sexual violence and unintended pregnancy among
447 adolescent girls and young women in South Africa. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20(1):1–10.
- 448 4. Unaid. Women and HIV — A spotlight on adolescent girls and young women.
- 449 5. Africa S. Demographic and Health Survey 2016 Key Findings [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jul 4].
450 Available from: www.DHSprogram.com.
- 451 6. Integrated School Health Policy.
- 452 7. Mendelsohn AS, Gill K, Marcus R, Robbertze D, Van de Venter C, Mendel E, et al. Sexual
453 reproductive healthcare utilisation and HIV testing in an integrated adolescent youth centre clinic
454 in Cape Town, South Africa. *South Afr J HIV Med*. 2018 Nov 26;19(1).
- 455 8. Africa R of S. Children’s Act, 2005. *Gov Gaz*. 2006;492(28944):48.
- 456 9. Tylee A, Haller DM, Graham T, Churchill R, Sanci LA. Youth-friendly primary-care services:
457 how are we doing and what more needs to be done? [Internet]. Vol. 369, *Lancet*. *Lancet*; 2007
458 [cited 2020 Sep 16]. p. 1565–73. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17482988/>
- 459 10. Abebe M, Awoke W. Utilization of Youth Reproductive Health Services and Associated Factors
460 among High School Students in Bahir Dar, Amhara Regional State, Ethiopia. *Open J Epidemiol*.

- 461 2014;04(02):69–75.
- 462 11. Robert K, Maryline M, Jordan K, Lina D, Helgar M, Annrita I, et al. Factors influencing access of
463 HIV and sexual and reproductive health services among adolescent key populations in Kenya. *Int J*
464 *Public Health* [Internet]. 2020 May 1 [cited 2022 May 9];65(4):425. Available from:
465 [/pmc/articles/PMC7275021/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34811111/)
- 466 12. Using Discrete Choice Experiments to Value Health and Health Care - Google Books [Internet].
467 [cited 2021 May 23]. Available from:
468 [https://books.google.co.za/books?hl=en&lr=&id=a7PsKL4rfksC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&ots=eIDi8G9](https://books.google.co.za/books?hl=en&lr=&id=a7PsKL4rfksC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&ots=eIDi8G90I6&sig=UlaB5iikE2aCREFbMaJ7LXrKjaE&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false)
469 [0I6&sig=UlaB5iikE2aCREFbMaJ7LXrKjaE&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.co.za/books?hl=en&lr=&id=a7PsKL4rfksC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&ots=eIDi8G90I6&sig=UlaB5iikE2aCREFbMaJ7LXrKjaE&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- 470 13. Soekhai V, de Bekker-Grob EW, Ellis AR, Vass CM. Discrete Choice Experiments in Health
471 Economics: Past, Present and Future. *Pharmacoeconomics* [Internet]. 2019 Feb 3 [cited 2021 May
472 23];37(2):201–26. Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s40273-018-0734-2>
- 473 14. Lancsar E, Louviere J. Conducting discrete choice experiments to inform healthcare decision
474 making: A user’s guide [Internet]. Vol. 26, *PharmacoEconomics*. *Pharmacoeconomics*; 2008
475 [cited 2021 May 23]. p. 661–77. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18620460/>
- 476 15. Govathson C, Long L, Moolla A, Mngadi-Ncube S, Ngcobo N, Mongwenyana C, et al. School-
477 going learners are more likely to access HIV and contraceptive care at locations with friendly
478 providers, Wi-Fi and other value-added services: Findings from a discrete choice experiment
479 among learners in Gauteng, South Africa. *medRxiv* [Internet]. 2022 Jul 15 [cited 2022 Sep
480 4];2022.07.13.22277459. Available from:
481 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.07.13.22277459v1>
- 482 16. Ostermann J, Njau B, Hobbie A, Mtuy T, Masaki ML, Shayo A, et al. Using discrete choice
483 experiments to design interventions for heterogeneous preferences: protocol for a pragmatic
484 randomised controlled trial of a preference-informed, heterogeneity-focused, HIV testing offer for
485 high-risk populations. *BMJ Open* [Internet]. 2020 Nov 1 [cited 2021 Oct 21];10(11):e039313.
486 Available from: <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/10/11/e039313>
- 487 17. Terris-Prestholt F, Quaife M, Vickerman P. PARAMETERISING USER UPTAKE IN
488 ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS: THE ROLE OF DISCRETE CHOICE EXPERIMENTS. 2016;
- 489 18. Uzoaru F, Nwaozuru U, Ong JJ, Obi F, Obiezu-Umeh C, Tucker JD, et al. Costs of implementing
490 community-based intervention for HIV testing in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review.

- 491 Implement Sci Commun 2021 21 [Internet]. 2021 Jul 5 [cited 2021 Oct 21];2(1):1–21. Available
492 from: [https://implementationsciencecomms.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s43058-021-](https://implementationsciencecomms.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s43058-021-00177-y)
493 00177-y
- 494 19. Fernandez ME, ten Hoor GA, van Lieshout S, Rodriguez SA, Beidas RS, Parcel G, et al.
495 Implementation Mapping: Using Intervention Mapping to Develop Implementation Strategies.
496 Front Public Heal. 2019;0(JUN):158.
- 497 20. Pascoe, Sophie JS, Govathson C, Sithabile M, Moolla, Aneesa, Mongwenyana C, Ngcobo N, et al.
498 How do we tailor services to meet young people’s needs? A discrete choice experiment to
499 determine preferences of high school students in Gauteng for accessing HIV and contraceptive
500 services. In: AIDS 2020. 2020.
- 501 21. Rockers P, Ryan M, Kolstad JR, Dolea C. How to conduct a discrete choice experiment for health
502 workforce recruitment and retention in remote and rural areas □: a user guide with case studies.
503 undefined. 2012;
- 504 22. Long LC, Girdwood SJ, Govender K, Lekodeba N, Meyer-Rath G, Miot J. Leveraging private
505 providers to improve and extend HIV treatment access in South Africa: Cost implications for
506 Universal Health Care in South Africa. In.
- 507 23. Long LC. Cost and Outcomes of Routine HIV Care and Treatment: Public and Private Service
508 Delivery Models Covering Low-Income Earners in South Africa. 2021 [cited 2022 Jun 17];
509 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-960517/v1>
- 510 24. Girdwood S, Govender K, Long L, Miot J, Meyer-Rath G. Primary healthcare delivery models for
511 uninsured low-income earners during the transition to National Health Insurance: Perspectives of
512 private South African providers. S Afr Med J. 2019;109(10):771–83.
- 513 25. PROJECT ISIZWE PROVIDING PUBLIC WI-FI ACCESS IN SOUTH AFRICA.
- 514 26. Devereux S, Hochfeld T, Karriem A, Mensah C, Morahanye M, Msimango T, et al. Food Security
515 SA Working Paper Series: #004 School Feeding in South Africa. [cited 2022 Jun 17]; Available
516 from: www.foodsecurity.ac.za
- 517 27. Selected Historical Rates [Internet]. [cited 2022 Jun 5]. Available from:
518 <https://www.resbank.co.za/en/home/what-we-do/statistics/key-statistics/selected-historical-rates>
- 519 28. Mauskopf J, Rutten F, Schonfeld W. Cost-Effectiveness League Tables: Valuable Guidance for

- 520 Decision Makers? [Internet]. Vol. 21, *PharmacoEconomics*. Springer; 2003 [cited 2021 May 23].
521 p. 991–1000. Available from: [https://link.springer.com/article/10.2165/00019053-200321140-](https://link.springer.com/article/10.2165/00019053-200321140-00001)
522 00001
- 523 29. Cost-Effectiveness Frontier - YHEC - York Health Economics Consortium [Internet]. [cited 2021
524 May 24]. Available from: <https://yhec.co.uk/glossary/cost-effectiveness-frontier/>
- 525 30. Using Discrete Choice Models with Experimental Design Data to Forecast Consumer Demand for
526 a Unique Cultural Event on JSTOR [Internet]. [cited 2021 May 26]. Available from:
527 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2488807?seq=1>
- 528 31. Quaife M, Terris-Prestholt F, Di Tanna GL, Vickerman P. How well do discrete choice
529 experiments predict health choices? A systematic review and meta-analysis of external validity.
530 *Eur J Heal Econ* [Internet]. 2018 Nov 1 [cited 2021 May 23];19(8):1053–66. Available from:
531 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29380229/>
- 532 32. Vickerman P, Quaife M, Kilbourne-Brook M, Mvundura M, Eakle R, Terris-Prestholt F. HIV
533 prevention is not all about HIV - Using a discrete choice experiment among women to model how
534 the uptake and effectiveness of HIV prevention products may also rely on pregnancy and STI
535 protection. *BMC Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2020 Sep 25 [cited 2021 May 26];20(1):1–11. Available
536 from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-020-05399-4>
- 537 33. Chilinda I, Hourahane G, Pindani M, Chitsulo C, Maluwa A. Attitude of Health Care Providers
538 towards Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health Services in Developing Countries: A
539 Systematic Review. 2014;(March 2021).
- 540 34. Black S, Wallace M, Middelkoop K, Robbertze D, Bennie T, Wood R, et al. Improving HIV
541 testing amongst adolescents through an integrated Youth Centre rewards program: Insights from
542 South Africa. *Child Youth Serv Rev*. 2014;45(C):98–105.
- 543 35. Stellenberg EL. Accessibility, affordability and use of health services in an urban area in South
544 Africa. *Curationis* [Internet]. 2015 Mar 10 [cited 2021 May 26];38(1):1–7. Available from:
545 <http://www.curationis.org.za>
- 546 36. Tylee A, Haller DM, Graham T, Churchill R, Sanci LA. Youth-friendly primary-care services:
547 how are we doing and what more needs to be done? [Internet]. Vol. 369, *Lancet*. Elsevier B.V.;
548 2007 [cited 2021 May 26]. p. 1565–73. Available from:
549 <http://www.thelancet.com/article/S0140673607603717/fulltext>

- 550 37. Wang SY, Groene O. The effectiveness of behavioral economics-informed interventions on
551 physician behavioral change: A systematic literature review. PLoS One. 2020 Jun
552 4;15(6):e0234149.
- 553 38. de Corte K, Cairns J, Grieve R. Stated versus revealed preferences: An approach to reduce bias.
554 Heal Econ (United Kingdom). 2021;30(5):1095–123.
- 555 39. Schaffer EM, Gonzalez JM, Wheeler SB, Kwarisiima D, Chamie G, Thirumurthy H. Promoting
556 HIV Testing by Men: A Discrete Choice Experiment to Elicit Preferences and Predict Uptake of
557 Community-based Testing in Uganda. Appl Health Econ Health Policy [Internet].
558 2020;18(3):413–32. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40258-019-00549-5>
- 559

Sites

- South African non-profit organization providing Comprehensive PHC services provided by nurses and doctors. DOH support- Accesses public-sector drugs and laboratory tests.
- Government, primary health clinic (PHC)

Sites reported similar mean age, days in care, and number of visits.

Costing

- Resource use was calculated from the perspective of the provider, the public health system.
- All costs were updated to 2019 public-sector prices and salaries

Summary of costs, assumptions and sources of cost data for each scenario

Cost categories	Methods	Assumptions	Source
Total PHC headcounts were calculated using monthly headcounts over a period of 12 months (2018)			
Staff (clinical and non-clinical)	top-down approach for staff	Additional youths would bear the cost of all additional staff at the facility as a result of intervention	Data collected for Long et al(1)
Consumables/supplies	Top-down. Calculated using monthly expenditure on supplies. This was shared among all PHC patients. (Total spent on consumables/total number of patients).	Maintained the per patient cost of consumables at the clinic level for the new youth patients obtained.	Data collected for Long et al(1)
Overheads	Overhead costs were calculated through a top-down approach. Additional overhead costs, i.e. extra space for youth only were all shared by additional youth.	Separate space the size of a single counselling room at the facility was allocated for youth only services. Overheads were calculated by multiplying total overhead expenditure by proportion of new youths over total PHC count.	Data collected for Long et al(1)
Assets	Bottom up inventory of all assets in clinic and shared among all patients.	Shared the total cost of assets amongst all patients as no new assets would be necessary for intervention.	Data collected for Long et al(1)
WIFI		WIFI - Project Isizwe (Free WIFI for Tshwane clinics average costs). Costs of supply to a clinic for 1 month shared by all youths.	Data collected for Long et al(1) and (2)

Subsidized food		All youth presenting received subsidised food but additional youths bore the cost. A total of ZAR 10 was cost for each adolescent patient.	Costs from (3)
------------------------	--	--	-----------------------

References

1. Long LC. Cost and Outcomes of Routine HIV Care and Treatment: Public and Private Service Delivery Models Covering Low-Income Earners in South Africa. 2021 [cited 2022 Jun 17]; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-960517/v1>
2. PROJECT ISIZWE PROVIDING PUBLIC WI-FI ACCESS IN SOUTH AFRICA.
3. Devereux S, Hochfeld T, Karriem A, Mensah C, Morahanye M, Msimango T, et al. Food Security SA Working Paper Series: #004 School Feeding in South Africa. [cited 2022 Jun 17]; Available from: www.foodsecurity.ac.za