medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Title: Evaluation of the impact of PEPFAR transition on retention in care in South Africa's Western Cape

Authors' Information: *Jessica Chiliza, Alana T Brennan, Richard Laing, Frank Goodrich Feeley, III,*

Disclaimer: The author(s) of this article are solely responsible for the content.

1. **Jessica Chiliza* (Corresponding author)**

Affiliation: Department of Global Health, School of Public Health, Boston University, Massachusetts, Boston, USA

Email: jchiliza@bu.edu

ORCID: 0000-0002-7516-2827

Tel: +27 712078101

Address: 60 Stirling Crescent, Durban North 4051

2. Alana T Brennan

Affiliation: Department of Global Health, School of Public Health, Boston University, Massachusetts, Boston, USA

Email: abrennan@bu.edu

ORCID: 0000-0002-7746-0668

3. Richard Laing

Affiliation: Department of Global Health, School of Public Health, Boston University, Massachusetts, Boston, USA and School of Public Health, University of Western Cape, Bellville, South Africa.

Email: richardl@bu.edu

ORCID: 0000-0002-3825-217X

4. Frank Goodrich Feeley III

Affiliation: Department of Global Health, School of Public Health, Boston University, Massachusetts, Boston, USA

Email: ffeeley@bu.edu

ORCID: 0000-0002-7176-5698

Disclaimers:

Source(s) of support/funding: ATB was funded by the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK) 1K01DK116929-01A1.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Word count: 3,495

Disclosure of relationships and activities (ie, conflict of interests): The authors have no conflicts of interest.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Background: Research on the impact of the PEPFAR transition in South Africa (SA) in 2012 found varying results in retention in care (RIC) of people living with HIV (PLWH).

Objectives: We investigated the factors that impacted RIC during the U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) transition in Western Cape, South Africa in 2012.

Methods: We used aggregate data from 61 facilities supported by four non-governmental organizations from to 2007-2015. The main outcome was RIC at 12-months after antiretroviral therapy initiation for two time periods. We used quantile regression to estimate the effect of the PEPFAR pull-out and other predictors on RIC. The models were adjusted for various covariates.

Results: Regression models (50th quantile) for 12-month RIC showed a 4.6% (95%CI: -8.4, -0.8%) decline in RIC post direct service. Facilities supported by Anova/Kheth'impilo fared worst post PEFPAR; a decline in RIC of (-5.8%; 95% CI: -9.7, -1.8%), while that'sit fared best (6.3% increase in RIC; 95% CI:2.5,10.1%). There was a decrease in RIC when comparing urban to rural areas (-5.8%; 95% CI: -10.1, -1.5%). City of Cape town combined with Western Cape Government Health facilities showed a substantial decrease (-9.1%; 95% CI: -12.3, -5.9%), while community health clinic (vs. primary health clinic) declined slightly (-4.4; 95% CI: -9.6, 0.9%) in RIC. We observed no RIC difference by facility size and a slight increase when two or more human resources transitioned from PEPFAR to the government.

Conclusions: When PEPFAR funding decreased in 2012, there was a decrease in RIC. To ensure the continuity of HIV care when a major funder withdraws sufficient and stable transition resources, investment in organizations that understand the local context, joint planning, and coordination are required.

Key Words: PEPFAR, HIV, retention, South Africa, low-and middle-income country

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Since 2003, President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) has been the United States' most ambitious initiative to combat the global burden of HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis. PEPFAR is the largest contributor to global HIV/AIDS efforts (1). From 2004 to 2016, PEPFAR invested $72.7 billion globally in HIV and TB, including contributions to the Global Fund (2) PEPFAR has increased the number of people receiving HIV treatment globally,(3) and decreased HIV-related mortality by 10.5 % when compared to non-PEPFAR supported countries (4,5).

South Africa is the country with the highest number of people living with HIV (PLWH) globally (7.5 million).(6) By the end of 2017/2018 with 4.1 million adults on treatment (7), South Africa was running the largest HIV treatment program in the world (8). Due to the high burden of HIV/AIDS, South Africa was one of the first PEPFAR focus countries. In 2004, when PEPFAR began working in South Africa, the HIV prevalence among adults was 20% (9) and was a death sentence due to the lack of access to free care and treatment in public sector health facilities.

Initial PEPFAR funds were emergency funds spent on antiretroviral (ARV) treatment, using U.S. organizations based in South Africa (i.e., Population Services International, Family Health International) and private doctors (10) to roll out HIV treatment outside of the public health system (9). As time progressed during the direct service phase (2007-2012), PEPFAR supported local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that employed health workers to work within the public health system to strengthen HIV services. In May 2009, the South African government (SAG)(11) adopted World Health Organization (WHO) treatment guidelines to start patients on treatment early (at a CD4 count of 350 rather than 200) (12), boosted the HIV budget by R1.7 million, and rolled out an ambitious testing campaign which reached 14.7 million South Africans in one year (12). During this time, PEPFAR strengthened its relationship with the SAG.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Most PEPFAR funds in South Africa were distributed to NGOs that work within state health facilities to strengthen HIV/AIDS care and treatment programs. In addition, many local NGOs were sub-contracted to various other organizations, resulting in PEPFAR partnering with 120 NGOs in South Africa by the end of 2013 (8).

PEPFAR Transition in South Africa

SAG has been the main financial contributor to national HIV efforts. In 2012, to allow SAG to take greater financial responsibility for the South African HIV epidemic, the U.S government (USG) along with the SAG developed the Partnership Framework, which outlined an annual 48% funding decrease in PEPFAR funds ($483 to $250 million) by 2017 (13). The framework also outlined the transition of PEPFAR resources to the SAG and the USGs strategic shift from direct service (i.e., ARV roll out, purchasing ARV's and placing staff in SAG health facilities) to a focus on health systems strengthening, technical assistance, and sustaining health outcomes (14,15). In the Western Cape, human resource transition was a formalized process led by the Western Cape Government Health (WCGH) with input from health facilities. This resulted in the absorption of 78 HIV posts across the province (16).

There were multiple changes and challenges associated with this transition. Due to a change in PEPFAR leadership, the Partnership Framework did not develop as originally planned, PEPFAR's budget increased by 71%, from $259 million in 2015, to $443 million in 2016. The transition focused solely on care and treatment, and there was no plan for other PEPFAR-funded activities (i.e., prevention). Since the transition was negotiated at the national level, there was a lack of capacity at the provincial level to absorb PEPFAR-supported patients (17).

Literature on the impact of the PEPFAR transition in South Africa has found varying outcomes. Lince-Deroche et al. (18) looked at HIV service delivery post-PEPFAR in three

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

clinics in Johannesburg and found no reduction in service delivery post-PEPFAR, while Cloete et al. (14) found 20% loss to follow up (LTFU) of patients transferred from private to government health facilities. Katz et al.'s qualitative study found patients who were transferred to the public system were frustrated due to long queues and missed work opportunities, decreased quality of care, highlighting disrespectful staff, "low quality communication" and lack of holistic care (19). Kavanagh speculates approximately 50,000 to 200,000 people living with HIV were adversely affected by the PEPFAR transition (8). This high LTFU was a major concern due to lack of adherence and possible increase of drug resistant strains of the virus.

Retention in care (RIC) in South Africa (broadly defined as a patient's regular engagement with medical care at a health care facility after initial entry into the system) is a key indicator that demonstrates the long-term sustainability of ART programs. In 2015, the average RIC in Sub-Saharan Africa aligned with global RIC rates (74% RIC at 24 months).(20) However, in 2015, South African national RIC was slightly lower, at 57%) (21). More recent research using from South Africa's National Health Laboratory Service showed that HIV care retention was substantially higher (63.3%) when viewed from a national perspective than from a facility perspective (29%). Our results suggest that traditional clinical cohorts underestimate retention. Supporting the idea that failure to account for patient movement between clinics (sometimes referred to as a "silent transfer") can make estimates of retention in care seem worse than they really are. To the best of our knowledge, there has been no formal evaluation of the PEPFAR transition in South Africa. As such, our study sought to assess the impact of PEPFAR transition on RIC in 2012.

METHODS

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Data

The aggregate data used for this study was retrieved from the WCGH's HIV data system, (Tier.net) (22). The primary purpose of Tier.net is to manage the HIV program at a facility level. Data from Tier.net aggregated at the facility level were collected for 61 health facilities supported by four local PEPFAR treatment non-governmental organizations (NGO) from to 2007-2015: (1) Kheth'impilo (n=15); (2) Anova Health Institute (Anova) (n=23); (3) Right to Care (n=5); and (4) TB, HIV/AIDS, Treatment Support, and Integrated Therapy (that'sit) (n=11). There was a fifth category in our analysis of Anova/Kheth'impilo, as these two NGOs overlapped in their support of seven health facilities in the study sample. Raw RIC data per health facility were provided for the cohort initiated ART each year. A cohort was defined by the WCGH as the number of new HIV patients (including transfers in) initiating ART treatment at a particular facility in a specific year (January 1-December 31) from 2007-2015.

PEPFAR NGO's

The four NGOs used in this study were the main NGOs working in the Western Cape that received PEPFAR funding to support comprehensive HIV/AIDS care and treatment services at government facilities from 2007 to 2012 (Table 1). Note that Right to Care's timeline was slightly later, from 2009 to 2014. During this time, funding was used to scale up, support, and expand access to HIV services, including HIV testing and counselling, treatment, prevention of mother-to-child transmission, combination prevention and screening, and treatment of tuberculosis. In 2013, that'sit, Right to Care and Kheth'impilo received extension funds to close out projects and phase out direct service support starting in 2013 through 2015, while Anova and Kheth'impilo received new PEPFAR grants to support the Western Cape from 2013 to 2017 in the Metro and Winelands regions. Each NGO worked in a specific geographic region in the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

province. As noted, Anova and Keth'impilo both worked in the Metro District, supporting seven of the same health facilities.

Study variables

The main outcome of interest was RIC at 12 and 24 months after ART initiation in each health facility from 2007 to 2015. RIC was analyzed for two separate time periods: (1) PEPFAR direct service (2007 to 2012) and (2) post-PEPFAR direct service (2013 to 2015). The study definition for RIC among adults (age >15 years) is as follows:

$$\text{Retention in Care} = \frac{\text{(patients on ART + patients who stopped treatment)}}{\text{(total on treatment – total transferred out)}}$$

Total on treatment includes HIV clients who are transferred to the health facility via a formal or silent transfer. Mortality was included in patients who stopped treatment. We conducted a sensitivity analysis by adding death to the definition, and the results did not change. Retention was calculated across the nine-year period (2007-2015) for each clinic. Other covariates of interest were patient volume for each clinic (stratified into quintiles, location (urban vs. rural), number of job posts transferred from PEPFAR NGOs to government (categorized as $\leq$1 and $\geq$2), facility type (central day clinic (CDC), community health clinic (CHC), and primary health clinic (PHC)) and government (City of Cape Town, Western Cape Government and a combination where they both overlapped) and NGO (Anova, Anova/Kheth'impilo, Kheth'impilo, that'sit and Right to Care). RIC for each health facility supported by Anova, that'sit and Kheth'impilo were calculated at 12 and 24 months for the two time periods 2007 to 2012 (during PEPFAR direct service) and 2013 to 2015 (post-PEPFAR direct service). Since the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Right to Care became active two years later, the average RIC cut-off was 2009 to 2012 (PEPFAR direct service) and 2013 to 2015 (post-PEPFAR direct service).

Simple descriptive statistics were used to report the characteristics of the study sample and were stratified by NGO. We graphically displayed trends in 12- and 24-month retention, loss to follow-up (defined as clients who have not visited the health facility for more than 90 days), and total clients starting treatment at the start and end of the cohort by year overall and stratified by NGO.

Quantile regression was used to estimate the associations between PEPFAR pull-out and changes in 12-month retention in care at the 25th, 50th and 75th quantiles adjusted for covariates. The models contain the dependent variable (12-month retention), conditional on time (years), plus an indicator variable for PEPFAR pull-out (set to 0 for each year during PEPFAR funding and set to 1 for years post-PEPFAR), an interaction term between these two variables to display trends over time, and additional covariates (i.e., clinic volume, government, NGO, transfer in human resource posts, facility type, and location). The coefficient for the indicator variable for PEPFAR pullout can be interpreted as the quantile difference in retention between the PEPFAR and post-PEPFAR periods for the 25th, 50th and 75th quantiles of our study sample. We graphed the crude predicted results from the quantile regression models and overlaid scatter plots of retention by clinic overall and stratified by each NGO to show the intercept shift and trends in retention during and post-PEPFAR. We conducted quantile regression on 24-month retention as well but focused on the main results of this study on 12-month retention because they did not differ greatly and displayed 24-month retention as supplementary tables and figures. STATA 16 and Excel 2016 were used to analyze the data.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

RESULTS

Characteristics of the study sample

The 61 health facilities included in the study sample were predominately WCGH owned (77%), with a total of 190,343 patients, and equally split between rural and urban areas (Table 2). The majority of the clinics were supported by Anova (n=23, 38%) and Kheth'impilo (n=15, 25%), while Right to Care had the lowest number (n=5, 8%). ART cohorts gradually increased in size, though in 2015, there was a dramatic increase in the number of HIV clients on treatment (Figure 1).

Trends of retention over time

When assessing the trends in 12-month retention overall, our results show an increase in the number of people starting ART from 8,338 in 2007 to 31,260 in 2015 (Figure 1), with Anova having the greatest increase in patients during that time period and Right to Care having the smallest (Supplemental Figure 2a-2e). The overall 12-month retention of the study sample was 67.5% (95% confidence interval (CI): 67.2-67.8%) during PEPFAR and 60.8% (CI: 60.4-61.1%) post-PEPFAR. Retention for each NGO decreased post-PEPFAR direct service, with the exception of Anova, which observed an increase in RIC of 14.3% points post-PEPFAR. Overall, the graphs for each NGO showed a decrease in RIC in 2012/2013 (Supplemental Figure 2a-e). The mortality rate of the study sample substantially decreased post the PEPFAR transition, falling from 3.8% in 2007 to 0.7% in 2015 (post-PEPFAR) (Figure 1). This is most likely due to a delay in reporting of mortality, as previous research shows 50% of loss to follow-up is due to mortality.(23)

Quantile regression

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

We report the results for the 50th quantile for all models, as the 25th and 75th percentiles are displayed in the tables and figures. The median RIC for the 50th percentile was 66.0% (interquartile range (IQR): 57, 73%). We observed a decline of 4.0% (quantile difference (QD) -7.7, -0.4%) in 12-month RIC post-PEPFAR compared to during PEPFAR (Table 3 and Figure 2). Additionally, there was a slight decline in RIC in the PEPFAR era and a plateau in the post-PEFAR period (indicated in the direction of the slopes), as shown in Table 3 and Figure 2. It is also important to note that, health facilities supported by Anova/Kheth'impilo fared worst with regard to RIC post PEFPAR (50th QD: -4.9%; 95% CI:-8.8, -1.0%), while that'sit fared best (50th QD: 3.6%; 95% CI: -0.2, 7.3%) when compared to Anova. We observed a larger decline post-PEPFAR in 24-month RIC (50th QD: -7.0%; 95% CI: -10.2, -3.9%) and all other NGO's performing slightly better post-PEPFAR when compared to Anova (Supplemental Table 1 and Supplemental Figure 2a-f.)

We also saw a large decrease of -7.8% (95%CI: -12.8, -2.9%) for the 50th quantile in RIC in urban health facilities when compared to rural areas, while City of Cape Town (CoCT) combined with WCGH had a substantial drop (50th QD: -6.1%; 95% CI:-10.6, -1.7%) in RIC when compared to CoCT alone, while CHCs (50th QD: -6.4%; 95% CI: -10.6, -2.1%) and PHCs (50th QD: -2.8%; 95% CI: -5.8, 0.1%) had a larger decline in RIC when compared to CDCs. We saw an increase of RIC in health facilities that had $\geq$2 posts transferred from PEPFAR to government (50th QD: 3.4%; 95% CI: -0.1, 7.0%) compared to $\leq$1. There was no clear trend in RIC when assessing the relationship between health facility size, measured by total clients on ART, and RIC. With regard to the 24-month RIC, we saw a slight decline in RIC as health facility size increased, while trends in all other variables were consistent with the 12-month RIC (Supplemental Table 1 and Supplemental Figure 2a-e).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

DISCUSSION

In this assessment of RIC post-PEPFAR in South Africa's Western Cape, we found a 12-month retention decline in the post-PEPFAR era. For all NGO supported clinics, RIC during PEPFAR was a 6.7% percentage point decrease from the PEPFAR direct service period. There are several explanations for these results. One explanation for the decline from 2012 could be the direct effect of PEPFAR, moving from direct service support to a focus on health systems strengthening. This change meant a decrease in human resources, supported by the local healthcare system. Much of PEPFAR's support was for HIV-specific community health workers, tracers, and data capturers, who were key for high performance and sustained HIV outcomes, particularly retention. The Western Cape PEPFAR transition did not prioritize the absorption of PEPFAR-supported community posts, which meant that in 2012/2013, the province lost 418 community posts supported by PEPFAR (16).

Our findings are consistent with Kavanagh's (8) report on the South African transition. Owing to PEPFAR's transition strategy, health facilities lost close ties with the community, and HIV retention and prevention efforts fell off the priority list. If the government had made the decision to transition to more staff in smaller health facilities and prioritize community staff in the transition, they would have been more likely to see sustained retention in smaller health facilities. Another alternative explanation could be the 2010 change in HIV treatment policy, which increased the CD4 eligibility threshold for ART from 200 to 350 cells/mm^3 (24) The increase in eligibility threshold would have resulted in more patients accessing the health care system for monitoring and treatment of the HIV disease, stressing the health system and beginning ART with more patients who were not yet seriously symptomatic. Research from Cape Town, South Africa showed that LTFU and the risk of virological failure increased when

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

the ratio of patients per health worker increased (25). One explanation for this could be the increase in ARV treatment sites over time and that patients were able to move between facilities but would be recorded as LTFU in the original health facility where they were enrolled on treatment.

When stratifying our results by NGO, we showed that overall RIC at health facilities supported by Kheth'impilo was the highest, while Anova supported health facilities with the lowest RIC (Table 2). Kheth'impilo support was localized to urban areas, and even with high ART patient volumes, they were able to maintain high RIC throughout the transition. Kheth'impilo was also able to retain the largest number of PEFPAR posts (28) compared to the other NGOs. Sustaining former PEPFAR human resources in the health system likely facilitated high RIC (26).

The CoCT RIC performance was better than that of WCGH. CoCT may have performed better than WCGH health facilities because post-Apartheid or post 1994 they inherited a relatively strong health system that provided HIV services for longer than the WCGH and spent more funding per patient than WCGH (27). Pre-1994 and prior to PEPFAR, HIV care and treatment were not available. HIV treatment was initially rolled out in the Metro District, leaving the rural areas of the Western Cape with little access to HIV services. Additionally, because CoCT provides services in an urban area, there is easier access to healthcare services, allowing patients to stay on their treatment. HIV patients living in rural areas often lack transport and resources and fear loss of confidentiality, while rural health systems suffer more medication stockouts, which affect RIC (28).

Anova/Kheth'impilo were impacted more, with as high as a 7.5% decline in RIC post-PEPFAR in the 75th quantile vs. Anova alone, while Right to Care was the least impacted, with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

as high as a 7.7% increase post-PEPFAR in the 75th quantile vs. Anova alone. We recently published a qualitative analysis of this work (26) which showed that established NGOs with a history of working in Western Cape supported facilities with higher RIC. Anova and Kheth'impilo had been working in Western Cape for many years, understood the health system gaps, had long-standing relationships with local officials, and produced high sustainability results. Qualitative data highlighted that stable staff and the consistency of patient/provider relationships were important for sustaining RIC. It is important that patients trust and feel understood by health facility staff. If donors flood the local health system with additional staff, withdrawing them will result in less sustainable outcomes (26).

Limitations

Our results should be considered, in addition to their limitations. First, our data are from government health facilities and NGOs operating in South Africa's Western Cape, which had the lowest estimated prevalence of HIV among 15-49-year-olds (9.4%; 95% CI: 8.5, 10.2%) in 2013, compared to the other provinces, such as KwaZulu-Natal (26.8%; 95% CI: 25.8%–27.6%).(29) Therefore, our results may not be generalizable to other provinces and/or other sub-Saharan African countries where PEPFAR was implemented. Second, our data was aggregate data that provided by Tier.net, a government-owned HIV electronic patient management system. As such, we run the risk of possible loss of information and are vulnerable to the ecological fallacy, resulting in false inferences about individual behavior on the basis of population-level data. However, our estimates of retention are consistent with previously published literature on retention in ART programs in South Africa's Western Cape during PEPFAR (74.2%; 95% CI: 73.2%–75.2%) (30) and post-PEFAR 54.3% (95% CI:52.4%- 56.1%) at 36 months follow up that used individual patient level data in their analysis (31). Third, we could have unmeasured

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

confounding due to the inability to control for potential confounders due to missing information at the facility level (i.e., transfers, employee turnover rate). We attempted to minimize confounding by type of health facility by including only primary healthcare facilities (i.e., clinics, community day centers, and community health centers) in our study.

Conclusion

Our results show that when donor funding decreased, there was a decline in RIC of patients in HIV care post-PEPFAR compared to the PEPFAR direct service era. To ensure that the RIC is high, the system needs to minimize loss to follow-up. Support from different government bodies and the size of health facilities had no effect on RIC, although additional human resources in the system and support from NGOs with a history in the province assisted in sustaining retention. Although it is unlikely that there would ever be as large a program as PEPFAR to support HIV care and treatment in the future, it would be valuable for donors working in government health facilities to allocate funding to support health facilities and NGOs as they transition out. These funds would help maintain quality patient care and sustain clinical outcomes during the transition. In conclusion, future donor transitions should prioritize close planning with local governments, together with stable human and financial resources, to ensure sustained health outcomes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

1. Institute of Medicine. PEPFAR Evaluation [Internet]. The National Academies Press. 2013 [cited 2016 Sep 7]. Available from: https://www.nap.edu/read/18256/chapter/9

2. amfAR. PEPFAR Country/Regional Operational Plans (COPs/ROPs) Database [Internet]. [cited 2016 Jul 3]. Available from: https://copsdata.amfar.org/

3. Wools-Kaloustian K, Kimaiyo S, Musick B, Sidle J, Siika A, Nyandiko W, Einterz R, Tierney WM YCT. The Impact of the President's Emergency Fund for AIDS Relief on Expansion of HIV care services for adult patients in western Kenya. Aids. 2009;23:195–201.

4. Bendavid E, Bhattacharya J. The president's emergency plan for AIDS relief in Africa: An evaluation of outcomes. Ann Intern Med. 2009;150(10):688–95.

5. Bendavid E, Holmes CB, Bhattacharya J, Miller G. HIV development assistance and adult mortality in Africa. JAMA - J Am Med Assoc. 2012;307(19):2060–7.

6. UNAIDS. South Africa Country Facts [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021 Apr 22]. Available from: https://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/southafrica

7. Health Systems Trust. District Health Barometer 2017/18: Section 11 [Internet]. Westville, South Africa; Available from: https://www.hst.org.za/publications/Pages/DHB20172018.aspx

8. Kavanagh MM. The Politics of Transition & the Economics of HIV- AIDS & PEPFAR in South Africa. 2014;1–48. Available from: http://www.health-e.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Politics-of-Transition-Report-AIDS-South-Africa.pdf

9. Katz I, Basset I V, Wright AA. PEPFAR in Transition — Implications for HIV Care in South Africa. N Engl J Med. 2014;369(15):1385–7.

10. Kavanagh MM. The politics and epidemiology of transition: PEPFAR and AIDS in South Africa. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr [Internet]. 2014;65(3):247–50. Available from: http://europepmc.org/abstract/MED/24346642

11. Simelela NP, Venter WDF. A brief history of South Africa's response to AIDS. South African Med J. 2014;104(3):249–51.

12. Brundage S. Terra Nova: How to Achieve a Successful PEPFAR Transition in South Africa. 2011.

13. PEPFAR. Partnership Framework Implementation Plan in Support of South Africa's National HIV , STI & TB Response between The Government of the Republic of South Africa and The Government of the United States of America [Internet]. 2012. Available from: http://www.pepfar.gov/documents/organization/196651.pdf

14. Cloete C, Regan S, Giddy J et al. The Linkage Outcomes of a Large-scale, Rapid Transfer

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

of HIV-infected Patients From Hospital-based to Community-based Clinics in South Africa. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2014;1(2).

15. PEPFAR. Country Operational Plan Strategic Direction Summary [Internet]. 2015. Available from: http://www.pepfar.gov/documents/organization/250290.pdf

16. Chiliza J. Western Cape PEPFAR Transition: A Case Study. 2014.

17. Katz IT, Bogart LM, Cloete C, Crankshaw TL, Govender T, Gaynes MR, et al. Understanding HIV-Infected Patients' Experiences with PEPFAR-associated Transitions at a Centre of Excellence in Kwa-Zulu Natal, South Africa. AIDS Care. 2017;7(10):1298–303.

18. Lince-deroche N, Leuner R, Long L. When Donor Funding Leaves: The immediate impact on resources of withdrawal of support for direct HIV care and treatment at public health faciliteis in Johannesburg. In: IAS. 2017.

19. Bassett, Ingrid; Cloete, Christie;Regan, Susan; Giddy, Janet;Freedberg, Kenneth A. and RPW. Large scale, rapid transfer of HIV-infected patients from hospital-based to primary health clinics in South Africa: an assessment of self-reported linkage to care. In: 8th International Conference on HIV Treatment and Prevention Adherence. Miami; 2013.

20. Fox MP, Rosen S. Retention of Adult Patients on Antiretroviral Therapy in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2015;69(1):98–108.

21. Johnson LF, Dorrington RE, Moolla H. Progress towards the 2020 targets for HIV diagnosis and antiretroviral treatment in South Africa. South Afr J HIV Med. 2017;18(1):1–8.

22. University of Washington. Paper Health Registers Project Case Study: South Africa's 3-Tiered Antiretroviral Treatment Monitoring System Country Profile [Internet]. www.Tech-21.org. 2014. Available from: http://technet-21.org/forums/performance-monitoring/8500-case-studies-on-paper-immunization-registers#12111

23. Fox, Matthew P., Brennan,A., Maskew, M., MacPhail, P., Sanne, I. Using Vital Registration Data to Update Mortality among Patients Lost to Follow-up from ART Programs: Evidence from the Themba Lethu Clinic, South Africa. Trop Med Int Heal. 2010;15(4):405–13.

24. National Department of Health. The South African Antiretroviral Treatment Guidelines 2010 [Internet]. South African National AIDS Council. Pretoria; 2010. Available from: https://sahivsoc.org/Files/Summary_The_South_African_Antiretroviral_Treatment_2010.pdf

25. Nglazi MD, Lawn SD, Kaplan R, Kranzer K, Orrell C, Wood R, et al. Changes in programmatic outcomes during 7 years of scale-up at a community-based antiretroviral treatment service in South Africa. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2011;56(1):1–8.

26. Chiliza J, Laing R, Feeley FG, Borba CPC. Program sustainability post PEPFAR direct service support in the Western Cape, South Africa. PLoS One [Internet]. 2021;16(5 May):1–16. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251230

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

27. Gilson L, Brady L, Naledi T, Schneider H, Pienaar D, Hawkridge A, et al. Development of the health system in the Western Cape: experiences since 1994. 1994;59–70.

28. Julien A, Anthierens S, Van Rie A, West R, Maritze M, Twine R, et al. Health Care Providers' Challenges to High-Quality HIV Care and Antiretroviral Treatment Retention in Rural South Africa. Qual Health Res. 2021;31(4):722–35.

29. Johnson LF, Dorrington RE, Moolla H. HIV epidemic drivers in South Africa: A model-based evaluation of factors accounting for inter-provincial differences in HIV prevalence and incidence trends. South Afr J HIV Med. 2017;18(1):1–9.

30. Fox MP, Bor J, Brennan AT, Macleod WB, Maskew M, Stevens WS, et al. Estimating retention in HIV care accounting for patient transfers□: A national laboratory cohort study in South Africa. 2018;3:30–43.

31. Bengtson AM, Colvin C, Kirwa K, Cornell M, Lurie MN. Estimating retention in HIV care accounting for clinic transfers using electronic medical records: evidence from a large antiretroviral treatment programme in the Western Cape, South Africa. Trop Med Int Heal. 2020;25(8):936–43.

Figure 1. 12-month retention in care, loss to follow-up and death overlaid on total patients on ART at the start and end of the 12-month period.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 2. Quantile regression estimates for 12-month retention stratified by NGO.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Table 1. Western Cape NGO PEPFAR Timeline of Grants

		Direct Service						Health Systems Strengthening		
NGO	**District**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Kheth'impilo	Metro	x	x	x	x	x	x	Extension + New Grant	x	x
that'sit	Eden	x	x	x	x	x	x	Extension	x	x
Right to Care	Overberg; Central Karoo			x	x	x	x	x	Extension	x
Anova	West Coast	x	x	x	x	x	x			
Anova	Winelands	x	x	x	x	x	x	New Grant	x	x
Anova	Metro	x	x	x	x	x	x	New Grant	x	x

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 2: Study characteristics stratified by NGO (N=61)

		NGO (n=total facilities supported)					
		Anova n= 23 (37.7%)	**Anova/Kheth'impilo n=7 (11.5%)**	**that'sit n=11 (18%)**	**Right to Care n=5 (8.2%)**	**Kheth'impilo n=15 (24.6%)**	**TOTAL**
Total facilities supported, n (%)		23 (38%)	7 (11%)	11 (18%)	5 (8%)	15 (25%)	61 (100%)
Total Clients on ART, n (%)		84,610 (44%)	39,752 (21%)	13,202 (7%)	5,528 (3%)	47,251 (25%)	190,343 (100%)
Government ownership of facilities, n (%)	WCGH	20 (87%)	3 (43%)	11 (100%)	5 (100%)	8 (53%)	47 (77%)
	CoCT	2 (9%)	3 (43%)	-	-	7 (47%)	12 (20%)
	combined	1 (4%)	1 (14%)	-	-	-	2 (3%)
Geographic area, n (%)	rural	14 (61%)	-	11 (100%)	5 (100%)	-	30 (49%)
	urban	9 (39%)	7 (100%)	-	-	15 (100%)	31 (51%)
12 month RIC PEPFAR Direct Service, % (95% CI)		65% (64.6-65.5%)	67.8% (67.2%-68.5%)	69.1% (68%-70.1%)	75.8% (74.1%-77.4%)	70.4% (69.9%-71%)	67.5%(67.2-67.8%)
12 month RIC Post PEPFAR Direct Service, % (95% CI)		57.7% (57.1-58.2%)	60.8% (60.1%-61.6%)	60.4% (59.1%-61.6%)	66.4% (64.5%-68.2%)	66.2% (65.5%-66.8%)	61% (60.7%-61.4%)
12 month Overall RIC (2007-2015), % (95% CI)		62% (61.6%-62.3%)	64.7% (64.2%-65.2%)	65.3% (64.4%-66.1%)	71.1% (69.9%-72.4%)	68.5% (68.1%-69%)	64.7% (64.5-64.9%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Crude and adjusted quantile regression for the outcome of 12-month retention.

	Crude quantile difference (95% CI)			Adjusted quantile difference (95% CI)		
	25%	**50%**	**75%**	**25%**	**50%**	**75%**
post PEPFAR	-4.2% (-11.6, 3.2%)	-5.6% (-10.4, -0.7%)	-4.5% (-8.6, -0.4%)	-5.2% (-12.4, 2.0%)	-4.6% (-8.4, -0.8%)	-4.8% (-9.2, -0.3%)
slope during PEPFAR	-0.2% (-1.7, 1.2%)	-1.0% (-1.9, 0.0%)	-1.6% (-2.4, -0.9%)	0.5% (-0.9, 2.0%)	-1.3% (-2.1, -0.6%)	-1.9% (-2.8, -1.0%)
change in slope post-PEPFAR	0.0% (-2.7, 5.7%)	-0.5% (-3.3, 4.3%)	-0.2% (-3.3, 3.0%)	0.0 (-5.7, 5.5%)	-0.3% (-3.3, 2.7%)	2.5% (-0.1, 5.0%)
Constant	59.8% (54.4, 65.2%)	66.4% (62.9, 70.0%)	72.0% (69.1, 75.0%)	57.3% (47.3, 67.3%)	73.2% (67.9, 78.5%)	81.9% (75.7, 88.1%)
PEPFAR NGO						
Anova	-	-	-	ref.	ref.	ref.
Kheth'impilo	-	-	-	6.1% (-0.6, 12.8%)	-1.6% (-5.2, 2.0%)	-1.2% (-5.3, 3.0%)
Anova/ Kheth'impilo	-	-	-	0.4% (-7.0, 7.9%)	-5.8% (-9.7, -1.8%)	-7.5% (-12.2, -2.9%)
Right to Care	-	-	-	7.7% (-1.9, 17.4%)	6.0% (0.8, 11.1%)	6.6% (0.6, 12.6%)
that'sit	-	-	-	1.9% (-5.2, 9.1%)	6.3% (2.5, 10.1%)	5.5% (1.1, 10.0%)
clinic size						
174-1020	-	-	-	ref.	ref.	ref.
1021-2562	-	-	-	6.6% (-0.6, 12.8%)	4.9% (1.1, 8.7%)	-0.0% (-4.5, 4.4%)
2563-4021	-	-	-	4.3% (-3.0, 11.7%)	1.6% (-2.3, 5.5%)	-3.6% (-8.1, 1.0%)
4022-5856	-	-	-	9.5% (2.0%, 16.9%)	3.5% (-0.5, 7.4%)	-0.3% (-4.9, 4.4%)
5857-9760	-	-	-	11.4% (2.5, 20.2%)	2.1% (-2.6, 6.8%)	-5.6% (-11.1, -0.1%)
location						
rural	-	-	-	ref.	ref.	ref.
urban	-	-	-	5.0% (-3.1, 13.0%)	-5.8% (-10.1, -1.5%)	-8.9% (-13.9, 3.9%)
government support						
City of Cape Town	-	-	-	ref.	ref.	ref.
Western Cape Government	-	-	-	2.7% (-8.6, 13.9%)	-3.2% (-9.2, 2.7%)	-4.6% (-11.6, 2.4%)
Combined	-	-	-	-8.3% (-14.3, -2.2%)	-9.1% (-12.3, -5.9%)	-7.5% (-11.2, -3.8%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.