

# HIV and viremia prevalence in non-migrating members of migrant households in Rakai region, Uganda: A cross-sectional population-based study

Ruth Young<sup>1</sup>, Joseph Ssekasanvu<sup>2</sup>, Joseph Kagaayi<sup>3,4</sup>, Robert Ssekubugu<sup>3</sup>, Godfrey Kigozi<sup>3</sup>, Steven J. Reynolds<sup>2,5,6</sup>, Maria J. Wawer<sup>2,7</sup>, Bareng A.S. Nonyane<sup>1</sup>, Larry W. Chang<sup>1,2,6</sup>, Caitlin E. Kennedy<sup>1</sup>, Ligia Paina<sup>1</sup>, Philip A. Anglewicz<sup>7</sup>, Thomas C. Quinn<sup>5,8</sup>, David Serwadda<sup>3,4</sup>, Fred Nalugoda<sup>3</sup>, M. Kate Grabowski<sup>2,8§</sup>

1 Department of International Health, The Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

2 Department of Epidemiology, The Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

3 Rakai Health Sciences Program, Kalisizo, Uganda

4 Makerere University School of Public Health, Kampala, Uganda

5 Division of Intramural Research, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, United States

6 Department of Medicine, The Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA

7 Department of Population, Family and Reproductive Health, The Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

8 Department of Pathology, The Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA

§ Corresponding author: Mary Katherine Grabowski

600 N. Wolfe Street  
Baltimore, MD, 21205, United States of America  
Phone: +1 [443-287-5736](tel:443-287-5736)  
Email: [mgrabow2@jhu.edu](mailto:mgrabow2@jhu.edu)

Keywords: Transients and Migrants; Uganda; HIV; Family Relations; Prevalence

1 **Abstract**

2 **Introduction:**

3 In sub-Saharan Africa, migrants are more likely to be HIV seropositive and viremic than  
4 non-migrants. However, little is known about HIV prevalence and viremia in non-  
5 migrants living in households with in- or out-migration events. We compared HIV  
6 outcomes in non-migrating persons in households with and without migration events  
7 using data from the Rakai Community Cohort Study (RCCS), an open population-based  
8 cohort in Uganda

9

10 **Methods:**

11 We analyzed RCCS survey data from one survey round collected between August 2016  
12 and May 2018 from non-migrating participants aged 15–49. Migrant households were  
13 classified as those reporting  $\geq 1$  member moving into or out of the household since the  
14 prior survey. A validated rapid test algorithm determined HIV serostatus. HIV viremia  
15 was defined as  $>1,000$  copies/mL. Modified Poisson regression was used to estimate  
16 associations between household migration and HIV outcomes, with results reported as  
17 adjusted prevalence ratios (adjPR) with 95% confidence intervals (95%CI). Analyses  
18 were stratified by gender, direction of migration (into/out of the household), and  
19 relationship between non-migrants and migrants (e.g., spouse).

20

21 **Results:**

22 There were 14,599 non-migrants (7,654, 52% women) identified in 9,299 households.  
23 4,415 (30%) lived in a household with  $\geq 1$  recent migrant; of these, 972(22%) had  
24 migrant spouses, 1,102(25%) migrant children, and 875(20%) migrant siblings. Overall,  
25 HIV prevalence and viremia did not differ between non-migrants in migrant and non-  
26 migrant households. However, in stratified analyses, non-migrant women with migrant  
27 spouses were significantly more likely to be HIV seropositive compared to non-migrant  
28 women with non-migrant spouses (adjPR:1.44, 95%CI:1.21-1.71). Conversely, non-  
29 migrant mothers living with HIV who had migrant children were less likely to be viremic  
30 (adjPR:0.34, 95%CI:0.13-0.86). Among non-migrant men living with HIV, spousal  
31 migration was associated with a non-significant increased risk of viremia (adjPR:1.37,  
32 95%CI:0.94-1.99). Associations did not typically differ for migration into or out of the  
33 household.

34

35 **Conclusions:**

36 Household migration was associated with HIV outcomes for certain non-migrants,  
37 suggesting that the context of household migration influences the observed association  
38 with HIV outcomes. In particular, non-migrating women with migrating spouses were  
39 more likely to have substantially higher HIV burden. Non-migrants with migrant spouses  
40 may benefit from additional support when accessing HIV services.

## 41 **Introduction**

42 Across sub-Saharan Africa, migrants have higher HIV prevalence and incidence  
43 compared to non-migrants, and are less likely to be virally suppressed if living with  
44 HIV.[1–4] However, there is limited data on the impact of migration on HIV outcomes  
45 among non-migrants who remain behind or who welcome migrants into their  
46 households.

47 There is reason to believe that migration of a household member could lead to  
48 increased risk of HIV acquisition and viremia among non-migrants. Migration can be  
49 stressful due to changes in resources and relationships.[5–8] Studies have shown that  
50 some individuals cope with increased stress by adopting riskier sexual behaviors, which  
51 may result in higher risk of HIV acquisition.[9–12] Migration of a partner can precipitate  
52 or follow changes in relationship status.[5,13,14] Separation from partners[15,16], and  
53 reduced parental supervision[6] can also lead to risky sexual behaviors and, in turn,  
54 potential increased HIV acquisition risk. Furthermore, migration may change who in the  
55 household provides care to those living with HIV or what resources are available.[5]  
56 Caregivers are often family members provide a range of instrumental and emotional  
57 support, which has been linked to improved adherence to antiretroviral therapy.[17–21]  
58 Out-migration may result in changes to caregiving and may place those living with HIV  
59 at greater risk of viremia if there is reduced care coordination or less care support for  
60 the non-migrant.

61 The nature of the relationship between a migrant and a non-migrant may determine how  
62 disruptive migration is for the non-migrant, and, as a result, differentially influence HIV

63 prevalence and viremia. Most prior studies examining the impact of migration on HIV  
64 among non-migrant residents have focused only on spouses with out-migrant  
65 partners.[15,16,22,23] Some studies found that non-migrant partners of migrants were  
66 more likely to report additional sexual partners[15,24] but this can vary by gender.[16] In  
67 addition, non-migrants with migrant partners were more likely to attribute additional HIV  
68 risk to their partner's behavior rather than their own.[1,25] In Tanzania, Kishamawe et  
69 al. found higher HIV prevalence and incidence among men with wives who were mobile  
70 and frequently away compared to resident men with resident wives.[15] Few studies  
71 have considered how migration of other household members, such as children or  
72 siblings, may indirectly impact HIV outcomes.[18,26]

73 We evaluated whether non-migrants who experienced a recent migration event into or  
74 out of the household were more likely to be HIV seropositive and, if HIV seropositive, to  
75 be viremic, compared to residents in households with no recent history of migration. We  
76 stratified data by the relationship between the migrant and non-migrant to determine  
77 which relationships were more closely linked to HIV outcomes. We hypothesized that: (i)  
78 non-migrant women in households with a recent out-migration event were more likely to  
79 be HIV seropositive; and (ii) non-migrant men and women with migrant spouses would  
80 be more likely to be HIV seropositive and, if HIV seropositive, more likely to be viremic.

## 81 **Methods**

### 82 ***Study population and setting***

83 We used cross-sectional data from the Rakai Community Cohort Study (RCCS)  
84 collected between August 2016 and May 2018 across 41 communities (37 inland, 4

85 fishing communities). The RCCS is an open population-based cohort set in a semi-rural  
86 region of south-central Uganda.[27] The RCCS first conducts a census to enumerate  
87 everyone in a household regardless of age and presence at time of census. The census  
88 collects information on their relationship to the head of the household and any  
89 movements into or out of the household since the last census. For migrants, a specific  
90 census mobility form records additional information including origin, destination, and  
91 reason for migration. Next, a survey collects demographic and self-reported sexual  
92 behaviors from residents between 15-49 years who have lived in the community for at  
93 least 6 months or at least one month with intention to stay longer. Duration of residency  
94 in the household and migration into or out of the household is confirmed at the time of  
95 survey. In addition, rapid HIV testing and counseling are offered, and blood samples are  
96 drawn to determine HIV status and viral load.

97 To evaluate the impact of migration on non-migrants, we restricted our analytic sample  
98 to non-migrating RCCS participants who consented to being surveyed and tested for  
99 HIV. Non-migrants were defined as survey-eligible participants who reported not moving  
100 or migrating since their last survey.

101

## 102 ***Exposure***

103 Our primary exposure of interest was migration in the household. In-migrants were  
104 defined as those who had migrated into the household from another community with the  
105 intention to stay or had already stayed for at least six months. Out-migrants were those  
106 who migrated out of the household to another community with the intention to stay in

107 their destination community. Communities were classified based on community  
108 boundaries defined when the cohort was established in 1994. Migration was assessed  
109 using survey data for those eligible and using the mobility form in the census for  
110 everyone else. Individuals who reported moving within communities, circular migration,  
111 or returning to communities, were classified as mobile and excluded from the analysis.  
112 Such movements over smaller distances or return migration back to the community  
113 were theorized to be less disruptive than migrating between communities.

114

115 Households were categorized into four groups based on the direction of migration into  
116 the household: (i) no-migration households, where no recent migration event was  
117 documented; (ii) in-migration only households, where member(s) migrated into the  
118 household and no members migrated out; (iii) out-migration only households, where  
119 member(s) migrated out and no member(s) migrated into the household; and (iv)  
120 bidirectional migration households, where member(s) migrated in and member(s)  
121 migrated out.

122

### 123 ***Relationship sub-analyses***

124 Sub-analyses were conducted for different non-migrant and migrant relationships.  
125 Relationships were coded based on the most recent household roster (Table S1). Three  
126 relationships were evaluated: (i) non-migrants in long-term stable relationships (e.g.,  
127 marriage), referred to as spouses, whose spouses migrate compared to non-migrants  
128 with spouses who do not migrate; (ii) non-migrant parents who have one or more

129 migrant children compared to non-migrant parents whose children do not migrate; and  
130 (iii) non-migrants who have one or more migrant siblings compared to non-migrants  
131 whose siblings do not migrate. The direction of migration, i.e., into or out of the  
132 household, was not considered in relationship sub-analyses as the sample size was too  
133 small.

134

### 135 ***Outcomes***

136 Our primary outcomes were HIV seropositivity among all non-migrants and HIV viremia  
137 among HIV-positive non-migrants. HIV status was determined using a validated testing  
138 algorithm which included three rapid tests and enzyme immunoassays or polymerase  
139 chain reaction (PCR) confirmation.[28] HIV viral loads were measured using Abbott  
140 RealTime assays, and individuals with  $\geq 1,000$  copies/mL classified as having HIV  
141 viremia.[29]

142

### 143 ***Statistical methods***

144 We first compared the demographics and self-reported sexual behaviors across the four  
145 types of migrant households (no-migration, in-migration only, out-migration only and  
146 bidirectional) for men and women separately using Kruskal-Wallis tests and chi-square  
147 tests for continuous and categorical variables, respectively.

148 Next, we assessed the relationship between household migration and our two outcomes  
149 using univariate and multivariate Poisson regression models with robust standard

150 errors.[30] Separate regressions were fitted for men and women because biological,  
151 social and structural correlates of HIV seropositivity and viremia differ between these  
152 groups.[31–34]. Measures of association were reported as prevalence ratios (PR) with  
153 95% confidence intervals (95%CI).

154 To account for differences in demographics across no-, in-, out- and bi-directional  
155 households, we used multivariate regressions adjusted for demographic confounders  
156 based on observed differences across type of migrant household in bivariate analyses  
157 and previous research linking them to higher HIV prevalence. Potential confounders  
158 included age group[27], educational attainment, marital status[35], proportion of  
159 household members under 15 years, and residency in an inland or fishing  
160 community.[27]

161 We conducted several sensitivity analyses. For HIV viremia, we reduced the threshold  
162 from 1000 copies/mL to 400 copies/mL. To determine if the direction of migration in  
163 relationship sub-analyses mattered, we stratified relationship regressions by the  
164 direction of migration (in- or out-) and compared them to no-migration relationships.  
165 Relationship analyses were also stratified for fishing and inland communities, as fishing  
166 communities have substantially higher HIV prevalence and a different demographic  
167 profile than RCCS agrarian and trading communities.[27] Analyses used Stata 17[36]  
168 and R version 4.0.4.[37]

169

170 ***Ethics***



171 The RCCS protocol has approval from the Ugandan Virus Research Institute Research  
172 Ethics Committee (GC/127/19/11/137), Uganda National Council for Science and  
173 Technology (HS 540), Johns Hopkins School of Medicine IRB (IRB00217467), and  
174 Western IRB, Olympia Washington (Protocol #20031318). All participants provided  
175 written informed consent.

176

## 177 **Results**

### 178 ***Participant characteristics***

179 At census, 22,086 non-migrant eligible residents out of 30,192 were identified, of whom  
180 14,599 (7,654 women) participated in the RCCS and were included in the final analytic  
181 sample (Figure 1). Most individuals who did not participate were away for school or  
182 work (7,087/7,487; 95%). Of those present at time of survey, 243 (1.6%) refused to  
183 participate. Non-participants were significantly more likely to be men (58% vs. 48%  
184  $p<0.001$ ), living in fishing communities (23% vs. 22%  $p=0.019$ ) and younger (median  
185 age: 25 vs. 31,  $p<0.001$ ).

186


187 Of the 14,599 non-migrants, 70% (10,184) lived in households with no recent migration  
188 events (no-migration households). Among the remaining households, there were 4,064  
189 migration events accounting for 21% of all migration events identified in the RCCS  
190 during the survey period (Figure S1, Figure 2). Most individuals lived in households with  
191 one (68.6%; 3030/4415) or two migration events (22.0%; 970/4415). Among the 30%  
192 (4,415/10,184) of participants living in households with at least one migration event, 9%

193 (1,271) lived in in-migration households; 18% (2,558) in out-migration households; and  
194 4% (586) were in bidirectional households.

195

196 For both men and women, non-migrants in out-migration only households were younger  
197 and more likely to be previously married compared to non-migrants in no-migration  
198 households (Table 1). Sexual behaviors did not vary by type or directionality of  
199 migration within the household (Table S2).

200



201

202 **Figure 1. Study flowchart**

203

204 **Table 1. Demographic characteristics of 14,599 non-migrant residents in HIV**  
 205 **prevalence analytic dataset stratified by presence and type of migration in the**  
 206 **household.**

	No migration <sup>a</sup>	In-migration only <sup>a</sup>	Out-migration only <sup>a</sup>	Bidirectional migration <sup>a</sup>
<b>Men (n=6,945)</b>				
Number of men	4,722	693	1,202	328
Education				
None - primary	3,263 (69.1)	489 (70.6)	824 (68.6)	215 (65.5)
Secondary School	1,172 (24.8)	160 (23.1)	324 (27.0)	97 (29.6)
Beyond SS	287 (6.1)	44 (6.3)	54 (4.5)	16 (4.9)
Age (yrs)	31 (23, 39)	29 (23, 37)	27 (18, 40)	29 (22, 39)
Age category				
15-19 yrs	807 (17.1)	109 (15.7)	345 (28.7)	60 (18.3)
20-24 yrs	587 (12.4)	112 (16.2)	193 (16.1)	47 (14.3)
25-29 yrs	674 (14.3)	139 (20.1)	116 (9.7)	58 (17.7)
30-34 yrs	826 (17.5)	115 (16.6)	115 (9.6)	52 (15.9)
35-39 yrs	748 (15.8)	96 (13.9)	116 (9.7)	36 (11.0)
40-44 yrs	674 (14.3)	72 (10.4)	151 (12.6)	41 (12.5)
45-49 yrs	406 (8.6)	50 (7.2)	166 (13.8)	34 (10.4)
Marital status				
Currently married	2,626 (55.6)	477 (68.8)	421 (35.0)	211 (64.3)
Prev. married	615 (13.0)	36 (5.2)	228 (19.0)	25 (7.6)
Never married	1,481 (31.4)	180 (26.0)	553 (46.0)	92 (28.0)
HH size	4.0 (2.0, 6.5)	3.5 (2.5, 6.5)	5.5 (3.0, 8.0)	5.0 (3.0, 8.5)
Proportion of HH <15 years	0.4 (0.0, 0.6)	0.4 (0.0, 0.5)	0.3 (0.0, 0.5)	0.3 (0.0, 0.5)
Resides in fishing community	1,189 (25.2)	237 (34.2)	221 (18.4)	107 (32.6)
<b>Women (n=7,654)</b>				
Number of women	5,462	578	1,356	258
Education				
None - primary	3,378 (61.8)	358 (61.9)	853 (62.9)	123 (47.7)
Secondary school	1,714 (31.4)	187 (32.4)	435 (32.1)	102 (39.5)
Beyond SS	370 (6.8)	33 (5.7)	68 (5.0)	33 (12.8)
Age (yrs)	30 (23, 37)	32 (24, 38)	34 (20, 42)	34 (24, 40)
Age category				
15-19 yrs	796 (14.6)	93 (16.1)	317 (23.4)	46 (17.8)
20-24 yrs	780 (14.3)	61 (10.6)	120 (8.8)	21 (8.1)
25-29 yrs	1,005 (18.4)	78 (13.5)	92 (6.8)	29 (11.2)
30-34 yrs	1,025 (18.8)	111 (19.2)	159 (11.7)	38 (14.7)
35-39 yrs	897 (16.4)	118 (20.4)	213 (15.7)	55 (21.3)
40-44 yrs	645 (11.8)	75 (13.0)	258 (19.0)	41 (15.9)
45-49 yrs	314 (5.7)	42 (7.3)	197 (14.5)	28 (10.9)
Marital status				
Currently married	3,450 (63.2)	341 (59.0)	576 (42.5)	133 (51.6)
Prev. married	936 (17.1)	111 (19.2)	328 (24.2)	59 (22.9)
Never married	1,076 (19.7)	126 (21.8)	452 (33.3)	66 (25.6)
HH size	5.0 (3.0, 7.0)	5.5 (3.5, 7.0)	6.5 (4.5, 8.0)	7.0 (5.0, 9.5)
Proportion of HH <15 years	0.5 (0.3, 0.6)	0.4 (0.3, 0.6)	0.4 (0.3, 0.5)	0.4 (0.3, 0.5)
Resides in fishing community	1,029 (18.8)	157 (27.2)	162 (11.9)	42 (16.3)

207 SS = Secondary School; yrs = years; Prev. = previously; HH= household

208 <sup>a</sup>Statistics presented: n(%); Median (Q1, Q3)

209 ***Prevalence of HIV among non-migrants in households with migration and without***  
210 ***migration***

211 The overall prevalence of HIV among non-migrants was 18% (2,598/14,599), with  
212 women more likely than men to be living with HIV (20% vs. 15%; PR:1.29 (95%CI:1.20-  
213 1.39)). Depending on the direction of migration, non-migrant women in-migration  
214 households had a prevalence of HIV ranging from 15-25% compared to 20% in non-  
215 migrant women in no-migration households. For non-migrant men living in households  
216 with migration, HIV prevalence ranged from 15-17% compared to 16% in no-migration  
217 households (Table 2).

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233 **Table 2. Crude and adjusted prevalence ratios for HIV status and HIV viremia**  
 234 **among non-migrating persons aged 15-49 in households which experienced a**  
 235 **migration event.**

	HIV seropositive			HIV viremia		
	n/N(%)	Crude PR (95%CI)	Adjusted PR (95%CI)	n/N(%)	Crude PR (95%CI)	Adjusted PR (95%CI)
<b>Men</b>						
No-migration (ref)	752/4722 (16)	1 [1,1]	1 [1,1]	139/1089 (13)	1 [1,1]	1 [1,1]
In-migration only	120/693 (17)	1.09 [0.91,1.30]	1.04 [0.89,1.22]	11/140 (7.9)	0.93 [0.65,1.33]	0.94 [0.663,1.325]
Out-migration only	150/1202 (12)	<b>0.78**</b> <b>[0.67,0.92]</b>	0.96 [0.83,1.12]	21/255 (8.2)	0.95 [0.69,1.30]	0.87 [0.64,1.19]
Bidirectional	49/328 (15)	0.94 [0.72,1.22]	0.93 [0.73,1.18]	4/39 (10)	1.20 [0.76,1.90]	1.3 [0.79,2.13]
Observations	6945	6945	6945	1064	1064	1064
P-value <sup>a</sup>	0.006			0.10		
<b>Women</b>						
No-migration (ref)	1090/5462 (20)	1 [1,1]	1 [1,1]	182/749 (24)	1 [1,1]	1 [1,1]
In-migration only	142/578 (25)	<b>1.23**</b> <b>[1.06,1.43]</b>	1.05 [0.92,1.21]	27/119 (23)	0.62 [0.34,1.11]	0.73 [0.41,1.31]
Out-migration only	256/1356 (19)	0.95 [0.84,1.07]	0.93 [0.83,1.04]	34/148 (23)	0.65 [0.42,1.00]	0.7 [0.45,1.08]
Bidirectional	39/258 (15)	0.76 [0.56,1.02]	0.78 [0.59,1.02]	14/48 (29)	0.80 [0.31,2.06]	0.82 [0.33,2.04]
Observations	7654	7654	7654	1523	1523	1523
P-value <sup>a</sup>	0.012			0.80		

236 Exponentiated coefficients, prevalence ratios; 95% confidence intervals in brackets

237 \* p < 0.05, \*\* p < 0.01, \*\*\* p < 0.001

238 Note:

239 <sup>a</sup>Statistical tests performed: chi-square test of independence

240 <sup>b</sup>4 men and 7 women were missing HIV viral loads measures.

241 Model: adjusted for demographics (age category, education status, fishing or inland community,

242 proportion of household members under 15 years, marital status)

243

244

245

246

247 ***Prevalence of HIV among non-migrants by relationship to migrating household***  
248 ***member***


249 Next, we assessed whether HIV prevalence varied by relationship between the non-  
250 migrant and migrant. In most cases, crude HIV seroprevalence was higher among non-  
251 migrants with migrant spouses and children, and non-migrant women with migrant  
252 siblings (Table S3). We identified 972(19%) non-migrants with migrant spouses,  
253 1,102(22%) with migrant children, and with 875(17%) migrant siblings. Most other non-  
254 migrant participants had either non-familial relationships (970, 19%) or relationships that  
255 could not be classified (Table S1).

256 We found that HIV seroprevalence was significantly higher among non-migrant women  
257 with migrant spouses compared to married non-migrant women without migrant  
258 spouses (36% vs. 17%; adjPR:1.44; 95%CI:1.21-1.71,  $p<0.001$ ; Figure 2, Table S3).  
259 This positive association between HIV seroprevalence and spousal migration was  
260 strong among non-migrant women living in inland (adjPR:1.79; 95%CI:1.37-2.33)  
261 whereas in fishing communities this association was no longer observed (adjPR:1.20;  
262 95%CI:0.97-1.47, Table S5). Non-migrant men and women with migrant spouses often  
263 cited relationship formation or dissolution as the reason for migration (79% (768/972)).  
264 However, when restricting analyses to currently married non-migrant women only,  
265 women with migrant spouses were still more likely to be HIV seropositive (adjPR:1.25;  
266 95%CI:0.98-1.59,  $p=0.07$ , Table S5). In analyses stratified by direction of migration,  
267 spouse outmigration was more strongly associated with HIV seroprevalence compared  
268 to spouse in-migration among non-migrant women (Figure 3).

269 Non-migrant men with migrant spouses also had higher HIV seroprevalence than non-  
270 migrant men with spouses who did not migrate; however, after adjustment for non-  
271 migrant participant demographics there was no longer any association between spousal  
272 migration and HIV serostatus. Similarly, child and sibling migration was not associated  
273 with HIV serostatus among non-migrant men or women after adjustment for non-migrant  
274 participant demographics (Figure 2). Parent and sibling regressions were adjusted for  
275 age, education, fishing community residence, proportion of household members under  
276 15 years, marital status, and spouse regressions were adjusted for demographics  
277 except for marital status.

278





279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

**Figure 2. Crude and adjusted prevalence ratios for HIV status and HIV viremia by relationship between migrant and non-migrant**

<sup>a</sup>Compared to spouses with non-migrating spouses

<sup>b</sup>Compared to parents with non-migrating children

<sup>c</sup>Compared to siblings with non-migrating siblings


Note: Prevalence ratios presented with 95% confidence intervals, parent and sibling regressions were adjusted for demographics (age, education, fishing community residence, proportion of household members under 15 years, marital status) and spouse regressions were adjusted for demographics except for marital status.

288 ***Prevalence of HIV viremia among non-migrants in households with migration and***  
289 ***without migration***

290 For viremia, 16.7% (432/2587) of HIV-seropositive non-migrants were viremic, with men  
291 more likely to be viremic than women (PR:2.10 95%CI:1.76-2.51). In adjusted analyses,  
292 direction of migration in the household was not associated with HIV prevalence  
293 irrespective of gender (Table 2). Among non-migrant men and women living with HIV,  
294 prevalence of viremia did not vary across direction of migration in the household in  
295 either crude or adjusted analyses.

296 ***Prevalence of HIV viremia among non-migrants by relationship to migrating***  
297 ***household member***

298 Prevalence of HIV viremia among HIV-positive non-migrants also varied by the  
299 relationship between non-migrant and migrants (Figure 2). For example, non-migrant  
300 men with migrant spouses were more likely to be viremic compared to non-migrant men  
301 with non-migrant spouses (28% vs. 18%; PR:1.57; 95%CI:1.15-2.16; adjPR:1.37;  
302 95%CI:0.94-1.99; Table S3), and this did not vary by direction of spousal migration  
303 (Figure 3, Table S6). In contrast, non-migrant mothers with migrant children were  
304 significantly less likely to be viremic (3% vs. 13%; adjPR:0.34; 95%CI:0.13-0.86, Table  
305 S3), although few (n=5/135) viremic non-migrant mothers had a migrant child.



306 ● Men, Crude ○ Men, Adjusted for demographics ● Women, Crude ○ Women, Adjusted for demographics

307 **Figure 3. Crude and adjusted prevalence ratios for HIV and HIV viremia for**  
 308 **relationship sub-analyses stratified by the direction of migration.**

309 <sup>a</sup>Compared to spouses with non-migrating spouses

310 <sup>b</sup>Compared to parents with non-migrating children

311 <sup>c</sup>Compared to siblings with non-migrating siblings

312 Note: Prevalence ratios presented with 95% confidence intervals, parent and sibling regressions were  
 313 adjusted for demographics (age, education, fishing community residence, proportion of household  
 314 members under 15 years, marital status) and spouse regressions were adjusted for demographics except  
 315 for marital status. Sibling regressions for HIV viremia were excluded due to limited sample size.

## 316 Discussion

317 We found that the relationship between household migration and non-migrant's HIV  
 318 outcome depends on the context (e.g., relationship between migrant and non-migrant,  
 319 and gender). In most cases, there was no relationship. However, spouse and child

320 migration were linked to HIV prevalence and viremia: non-migrant women with migrant  
321 spouses were more likely to be living with HIV, and non-migrant men with migrant  
322 spouses were somewhat more likely to be viremic. In contrast, non-migrant mothers  
323 with migrant children were significantly less likely to be viremic. These findings suggest  
324 that the relationship between the migrant and the non-migrant is key to understanding  
325 the impact of household migration on HIV outcomes.

326

327 Our results indicate that spouse migration is associated with higher prevalence of HIV  
328 for non-migrant women. As our analysis was cross-sectional, it is unclear if HIV  
329 seroconversion predates spouse migration so spouse migration may lead to higher risk  
330 of HIV acquisition, or if those living with HIV have a higher risk of spouse migration.  
331 Previous studies in Africa have suggested that non-migrant women with migrant  
332 spouses are more likely to be HIV seropositive as they and their partners are more likely  
333 to engage in sexual behavior that predisposes them to greater risk of acquiring  
334 HIV.[15,22] Similarly, as spouse migration is often associated with relationship  
335 formation and dissolution, our results may reflect changes in relationships. Marital  
336 dissolution is associated with higher HIV incidence[35] and greater instability for women  
337 living with HIV, leading to spouse migration.[13,38]

338

339 Our findings also suggest that non-migrant men with migrant spouses may be more  
340 likely to be viremic regardless of whether spouses migrated in or out of the household.  
341 Different demographics could explain the higher rates of HIV viremia, as non-migrant

342 men with migrant spouses tended to be younger and less educated. Alternatively, non-  
343 migrant men with migrant spouses may be less likely to engage in HIV treatment, if  
344 spouse migration is associated with relationship breakdown, or if a wife migrated for  
345 work, challenging traditional masculine roles and norms.[39] Men who feel that their  
346 masculinity is challenged by spouse migration may compensate by outwardly asserting  
347 masculine characteristics and avoid health clinics or taking medication, or experience  
348 more internalized stigma.[39,40] Alternatively, men with migrant spouses may be more  
349 stressed and have less time[41,42] to access health services or obtain antiretroviral  
350 therapy. Additional qualitative research is needed to better understand what men  
351 experience preceding, during, and following spouse migration.

352

353 We found an inverse relationship between child migration and HIV viremia among non-  
354 migrant women, suggesting that migration of a child may facilitate engagement in HIV  
355 care. Based on existing studies that highlight how children support parents living with  
356 HIV[43,44], we suggest several potential reasons why migrant children may reduce  
357 prevalence of viremia among their parents. Out-migrating children could increase the  
358 wealth of the household through remittances or improve intrahousehold resource  
359 allocation as the number of dependents decrease.[43–45] In-migrating children may  
360 provide additional assistance in the household, act as care providers for mothers or  
361 supportive care for other dependents in the household.[17,43,46] As this phenomena  
362 was not observed among fathers with migrant children, it may reflect gendered roles  
363 within the household. Compared to men, women take on more informal care within a  
364 household,[47] and so in- or out-migrating children may influence the mother's time and

365 resources, directly impacting access to HIV care. Alternatively, households with migrant  
366 children may be wealthier or more educated in ways not captured by our analysis and  
367 so individuals in those households may be virally suppressed regardless of whether  
368 children migrate. If older children are increasingly providing care support for their  
369 parents living with HIV, interventions designed to support caregivers may be needed.  
370 Further context-specific research would be needed to understand how child migration  
371 changes household dynamics, especially caregiving roles, and how that impacts access  
372 to healthcare.

373

374 Furthermore, our findings suggest additional characteristics to consider when examining  
375 how migration is linked with HIV outcomes for non-migrants. First, non-migrant and  
376 migrant relationships associated with changes in relationship status or sexual networks  
377 are associated with prevalence of HIV. For viremia, changes to relationships more likely  
378 to be linked to changes in caregiving, such as non-migrant parents with migrant  
379 children, may facilitate or impede access to treatment.[18,26] Second, the direction of  
380 migration alone was less important than we had hypothesized. Third community  
381 characteristics will impact the observed relationship between migration and HIV  
382 outcomes. In communities where HIV is common, like fishing communities in this  
383 region, the difference in HIV prevalence between non-migrant and migrant households  
384 may be less. Similarly, in communities where spouse migration is common, such as  
385 rural Mozambique, the association between spouse migration and HIV prevalence may  
386 be weaker.[48]

387

388 Our work has several limitations. The analysis excluded migration events within  
389 communities or circular migration (e.g., due to work or polygamous relationships).  
390 Separate examination of circular migration of spouses is warranted as it implies regular  
391 and returning movement between several places, distinct from other types of migration  
392 which are unidirectional. Previous research has also found an association between  
393 circular migration and HIV risk among left-behind spouses, as circular migrants are  
394 likely to travel home frequently, bridging sexual networks, and are more likely to have  
395 concurrent partners.[49,50]. Second, the data did not include potential confounders like  
396 individual wealth and changes in support (e.g. monetary, social support) provided to the  
397 non-migrant. Third, our data suggests that the impact of migration on non-migrants is  
398 likely context-specific and our findings may not apply to other contexts which have  
399 different kinds of migration and HIV epidemics. Fourth, to classify the relationship  
400 between migrant and non-migrant, we relied on the reported relationship to the head of  
401 household, but this may not capture all relationships within the household. Similarly,  
402 reported relationships may not truly reflect the support (e.g. caregiving, financial)  
403 provided.[51] We assumed that familial relationships within the household provided  
404 caregiving and support, but sources outside the household may also provide  
405 these.[52,53] Fifth, few parent-child relationships were identified in our data likely due to  
406 age-eligibility for the cohort and school-related absence during data collection. Previous  
407 literature has suggested that parental migration may impact sexual behaviors and HIV  
408 status of children remaining behind.[54,55] Lastly, analyses were prespecified, we  
409 cannot rule out that these findings were due to chance.

410

411 HIV prevention or treatment interventions have rarely been designed to incorporate  
412 migrant family members, although supportive relationships can facilitate HIV prevention  
413 and treatment.[56–58] Our results suggest that, for HIV outcomes, interventions may  
414 benefit from considering specific migrant relationships. For example, interventions  
415 tailored for couples with one migrant spouse may improve outcomes for both non-  
416 migrants and migrants. Identifying relationships where one partner is a migrant may be  
417 difficult; community health workers who may be more familiar with households could be  
418 best positioned to identify such couples. Counselling for those with migrant spouses  
419 could focus on how couple dynamics change, coping with stress, and planning for  
420 mutual support; this may support treatment adherence or reduce behaviors associated  
421 with HIV acquisition.[59,60]

422

423 Further, interventions targeting couples with one migrant partner may need to consider  
424 the specific needs of non-migrating men. Qualitative research on how household  
425 relationships and masculine identities change for non-migrant men with migrant  
426 spouses could inform future interventions by providing support and messaging that  
427 connect HIV care with masculine ideals. For instance, compared to women, men are  
428 less likely to join peer support groups as they perceive it to contradict masculine ideals  
429 of respectability, strength, and financial responsibility.[33,61,62] By incorporating  
430 income-generating activities or other opportunities to support or transform masculine  
431 ideals in peer support groups, men may be more likely to participate and improve



432 treatment adherence.[62] In addition, a range of differentiated service delivery models  
433 could improve adherence by increasing access to services through extended opening  
434 hours or additional access points for working men.[63]

## 435 **Conclusions**

436 Household migration is associated with HIV outcomes for certain sub-populations,  
437 particularly non-migrants with migrant spouses. Our findings suggest that when  
438 designing interventions to improve HIV outcomes, non-migrants with migrant spouses  
439 may benefit from targeted support when accessing HIV services.

## 440 **Declarations**

### 441 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

442 The Rakai Community Cohort Study protocol has approval from the Ugandan Virus  
443 Research Institute Research Ethics Committee (GC/127/19/11/137), Uganda National  
444 Council for Science and Technology (HS 540), Johns Hopkins School of Medicine IRB  
445 (IRB00217467), and Western IRB, Olympia Washington (Protocol #20031318). All  
446 participants provided written informed consent. All methods were carried out in  
447 accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations. The secondary data analysis  
448 presented in this article was determined to not be human subjects research as it used  
449 deidentified, existing RCCS data by the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public  
450 Health Institutional Review Board.

### 451 **Consent for publication**

452 Not applicable.

### 453 **Availability of data and materials**

454 A de-identified version of the data can be provided to interested parties subject to  
455 completion of the Rakai Health Sciences Program data request form and signing of a  
456 Data Transfer Agreement. Inquiries should be directed to [datarequests@rhsp.org](mailto:datarequests@rhsp.org).

### 457 **Competing interests**

458 No competing interests declared.

## 459 **Funding**

460 This work was supported by grants from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases  
461 (grant numbers R01AI114438, R01AI110324, R01AI123002, R01AI128779), the National  
462 Institute of Mental Health (grant number R01MH107275, R01MH105313, R01MH099733), the  
463 Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (grant  
464 number R01HD091003), the Division of Intramural Research of the National Institute for Allergy  
465 and Infectious Diseases, and the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief through the  
466 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (grant number NU2GGH000817). RY was  
467 supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human  
468 Development of the National Institutes of Health under award number [1F31HD102287].  
469 We thank the personnel at the Office of Cyberinfrastructure and Computational Biology at the  
470 National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases for data management support. Additionally,  
471 we thank the cohort participants and many staff and investigators who made this study possible.  
472 The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily  
473 represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

474

## 475 **Authors' contributions**

476 RY and MKG conceived and designed the study. RY, MKG, JS, JK, RS, GK, SJR,  
477 MJW, BAS, LWC, CEK, LP, PAA, TCQ, DS, and FN contributed to the acquisition,  
478 analysis, and interpretation of the data for the study. RY wrote the initial draft  
479 manuscript. RY, JS, JK, RS, GK, SJR, MJW, BAS, LWC, CEK, LP, PAA, TCQ, DS, FN,  
480 and MKG contributed to the draft of the manuscript, provided substantial inputs, critical  
481 comments and suggested additional analyses. RY and MKG finalized the manuscript.  
482 All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## 483 **Acknowledgements**

484 We thank the study participants and community leaders in the Rakai Community Cohort  
485 Study, the Rakai Health Sciences Program staff, and our funders without whom this  
486 research would not be possible.

## 487 **Authors' information**

488 This work was presented at the Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic  
489 Infections (CROI), online, February 12 to 16, 22, 23, and 24, 2022.

490

## 491 **List of abbreviations**

95%CI 95% confidence interval  
adjPR Adjusted prevalence ratio  
ART Antiretroviral therapy  
HH Household  
HIV Human immunodeficiency virus  
mL Milliliter  
PCR Polymerase chain reaction  
PR Crude prevalence ratio  
RCCS Rakai Community Cohort Study  
SS Secondary school  
yrs years

492

493

494 **References**

- 495 [1] Dzomba A, Tomita A, Govender K, Tanser F. Effects of Migration on Risky Sexual Behavior and HIV  
496 Acquisition in South Africa: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis, 2000-2017. *AIDS and Behavior*  
497 2018;1:1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-018-2367-z>.
- 498 [2] UN General Assembly. Political Declaration on HIV and AIDS: On the Fast Track to Accelerating the  
499 Fight against HIV and to Ending the AIDS Epidemic by 2030. Resolution 70/266, United Nations;  
500 2016.
- 501 [3] Olawore O, Tobian AAR, Kagaayi J, Bazaale JM, Nantume B, Kigozi G, et al. Migration and risk of HIV  
502 acquisition in Rakai, Uganda: a population-based cohort study. *The Lancet HIV* 2018;5:e181–9.  
503 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3018\(18\)30009-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3018(18)30009-2).
- 504 [4] Billioux VG, Chang LW, Reynolds SJ, Nakigozi G, Ssekasanvu J, Grabowski MK, et al. Human  
505 immunodeficiency virus care cascade among sub-populations in Rakai, Uganda: an observational  
506 study 2017. <https://doi.org/10.7448/IAS.20.1.21590>.
- 507 [5] Lu Y. Household migration, social support, and psychosocial health: The perspective from migrant-  
508 sending areas. *Social Science & Medicine* 2012;74:135–42.
- 509 [6] Wu LL, Martinson BC. Family Structure and the Risk of a Premarital Birth. *American Sociological*  
510 *Review* 1993;58:210–32.
- 511 [7] Cavanagh SE, Fomby P. Family Instability in the Lives of American Children. *Annual Review of*  
512 *Sociology* 2019;12:41. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073018>.
- 513 [8] Fomby P, Cherlin AJ. Family Instability and Child Well-Being. *Am Sociol Rev* 2007;72:181–204.
- 514 [9] Hulland EN, Brown JL, Swartzendruber AL, Sales JM, Rose ES, Diclemente RJ. The association  
515 between stress, coping, and sexual risk behaviors over 24 months among African-American female  
516 adolescents. *Psychology, Health and Medicine* 2015;20:443–56.  
517 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2014.951369>.
- 518 [10] Turpin R, Brotman RM, Miller RS, Klebanoff MA, He X, Slopen N. Perceived stress and incident  
519 sexually transmitted infections in a prospective cohort. *Annals of Epidemiology* 2019;32:20–7.  
520 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2019.01.010>.
- 521 [11] Nansel TR, Riggs MA, Yu KF, Andrews WW, Schwebke JR, Klebanoff MA. The association of  
522 psychosocial stress and bacterial vaginosis in a longitudinal cohort. *American Journal of Obstetrics*  
523 *and Gynecology* 2006;194:381–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2005.07.047>.
- 524 [12] Amabebe E, Anumba DOC. Psychosocial stress, cortisol levels, and maintenance of vaginal health.  
525 *Frontiers in Endocrinology* 2018;9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2018.00568>.
- 526 [13] Porter L, Hao L, Bishai D, Serwadda D, Wawer MJ, Lutalo T, et al. HIV status and union dissolution in  
527 Sub-saharan Africa: The case of Rakai, Uganda. *Demography* 2004;41:465–82.  
528 <https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.2004.0025>.
- 529 [14] Cassels S, Jenness SM, Khanna AS. Conceptual Framework and Research Methods for Migration and  
530 HIV Transmission Dynamics. *AIDS Behav* 2014;18:2302–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-013-0665-z>.
- 531
- 532 [15] Kishamawe C, Vissers DCJ, Urassa M, Isingo R, Mwaluko G, Borsboom GJJM, et al. Mobility and HIV  
533 in Tanzanian couples: Both mobile persons and their partners show increased risk. *Aids*  
534 2006;20:601–8. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.aids.0000210615.83330.b2>.
- 535 [16] Palk L, Blower S. Mapping divided households and residency changes: the effect of couple  
536 separation on sexual behavior and risk of HIV infection. *Scientific Reports* 2015;5:17598–17598.  
537 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep17598>.

- 538 [17] Angotti N, Mojola SA, Schatz E, Williams JR, Gómez-Olivé FX. ‘Taking care’ in the age of AIDS: older  
539 rural South Africans’ strategies for surviving the HIV epidemic. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*  
540 2018;20:262–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2017.1340670>.
- 541 [18] Skovdal M. Examining the trajectories of children providing care for adults in rural Kenya:  
542 Implications for service delivery. *Children and Youth Services Review* 2011;33:1262–9.  
543 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2011.02.023>.
- 544 [19] Ssekubugu R, Renju J, Zaba B, Seeley J, Bukenya D, Ddaaki W, et al. “He was no longer listening to  
545 me”: A qualitative study in six Sub-Saharan African countries exploring next-of-kin perspectives on  
546 caring following the death of a relative from AIDS. *AIDS Care* 2019;31:754–60.  
547 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540121.2018.1537467>.
- 548 [20] Knodel J, Kespichayawattana J, Saengtienchai C, Wiwatwanich S. The role of parents and family  
549 members in ART treatment adherence: Evidence from Thailand. *Res Aging* 2010;32:19–39.  
550 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027509348130>.
- 551 [21] Damulira C, Mukasa MN, Byansi W, Nabunya P, Kivumbi A, Namatovu P, et al. Examining the  
552 relationship of social support and family cohesion on ART adherence among HIV-positive  
553 adolescents in southern Uganda: baseline findings. *Vulnerable Child Youth Stud* 2019;14:181–90.  
554 <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450128.2019.1576960>.
- 555 [22] Lurie MN, Williams BG, Khangelani Z, Mkaya-Mwamburi D, Garnett GP, Sweat MD, et al. Who  
556 infects whom? HIV-1 concordance and discordance among migrant and non-migrant couples in  
557 South Africa. *AIDS* 2003;17:2245–52. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00002030-200310170-00013>.
- 558 [23] Agadjanian V, Arnaldo C, Cau B. Health Costs of Wealth Gains: Labor Migration and Perceptions of  
559 HIV/AIDS Risks in Mozambique. *Social Forces* 2011;89:1097–117.
- 560 [24] Lurie MN, Williams BG, Zuma K, Mkaya-mwamburi D, Garnett GP, Sturm AW, et al. The Impact of  
561 Migration on HIV-1 Transmission in South Africa. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 2003;30:149–56.  
562 <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007435-200302000-00011>.
- 563 [25] Dladla AN, Hiner CA, Qwana E, Lurie M. Speaking to rural women: The sexual partnerships of rural  
564 South African women whose partners are migrants. *Society in Transition* 2001;32:79–82.  
565 <https://doi.org/10.1080/21528586.2001.10419032>.
- 566 [26] Lowenthal ED, Marukutira T, Tshume O, Chapman J, Nachega JB, Anabwani G, et al. Parental  
567 Absence From Clinic Predicts Human Immunodeficiency Virus Treatment Failure in Adolescents.  
568 *JAMA Pediatrics* 2015;169:498–500. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2014.3785>.
- 569 [27] Chang LW, Quinn TC, Reynolds SJ, Health Sciences Program R, W Chang UL, Grabowski MK, et al.  
570 Heterogeneity of the HIV epidemic in agrarian, trading, and fishing communities in Rakai, Uganda:  
571 an observational epidemiological study. *Lancet HIV* 2016;3. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3018\(16\)30034-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3018(16)30034-0).
- 572 [28] Kagulire SC, Opendi P, Stamper PD, Nakavuma JL, Mills LA, Makumbi F, et al. Field evaluation of five  
573 rapid diagnostic tests for screening of HIV-1 infections in rural Rakai, Uganda. *Int J STD AIDS*  
574 2011;22:308–9. <https://doi.org/10.1258/ijisa.2009.009352>.
- 575 [29] WHO | Consolidated guidelines on the use of antiretroviral drugs for treating and preventing HIV  
576 infection: what’s new n.d.
- 577 [30] Zou G. A Modified Poisson Regression Approach to Prospective Studies with Binary Data. *Am J*  
578 *Epidemiol* 2004;159:702–6. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwh090>.
- 579 [31] Scully EP. Sex Differences in HIV Infection. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep* 2018;15:136–46.  
580 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11904-018-0383-2>.
- 581 [32] Sia D, Onadja Y, Hajizadeh M, Heymann SJ, Brewer TF, Nandi A. What explains gender inequalities in  
582 HIV/AIDS prevalence in sub-Saharan Africa? Evidence from the demographic and health surveys.  
583 *BMC Public Health* 2016;16:1136. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3783-5>.
- 584

- 585 [33] Sileo KM, Fielding-Miller R, Dworkin SL, Fleming PJ. A scoping review on the role of masculine norms  
586 in men's engagement in the HIV care continuum in sub-Saharan Africa. *AIDS Care* 2019;31:1435–  
587 46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540121.2019.1595509>.
- 588 [34] Gupta GR, Parkhurst JO, Ogden JA, Aggleton P, Mahal A. Structural approaches to HIV prevention.  
589 *The Lancet* 2008;372:764–75. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(08\)60887-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60887-9).
- 590 [35] Nalugoda F, Guwatudde D, Bwaninka JB, Makumbi FE, Lutalo T, Kagaayi J, et al. Marriage and the  
591 Risk of Incident HIV infection in Rakai, Uganda. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2014;65:91–8.  
592 <https://doi.org/10.1097/QAI.0b013e3182a7f08a>.
- 593 [36] StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 17 2021.
- 594 [37] R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2021.
- 595 [38] Anglewicz P, Reniers G. HIV Status, Gender, and Marriage Dynamics among Adults in Rural Malawi.  
596 *Studies in Family Planning* 2014;45:415–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4465.2014.00005.x>.
- 597 [39] Sileo KM, Reed E, Kizito W, Wagman JA, Stockman JK, Wanyenze RK, et al. Masculinity and  
598 engagement in HIV care among male fisherfolk on HIV treatment in Uganda. *Culture, Health and*  
599 *Sexuality* 2018;1058. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2018.1516299>.
- 600 [40] Sileo KM, Wanyenze RK, Mukasa B, Musoke W, Kiene SM. The Intersection of Inequitable Gender  
601 Norm Endorsement and HIV Stigma: Implications for HIV Care Engagement for Men in Ugandan  
602 Fishing Communities. *AIDS Behav* 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-021-03176-1>.
- 603 [41] Deng R, Lyttleton C. Linked spaces of vulnerability: HIV risk amongst migrant Dai women and their  
604 left-behind husbands in Southwest China. *Culture, Health Sexuality* 2013;15.  
605 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2013.772241>.
- 606 [42] Yeoh BSA, Somaiah BC, Lam T, Acedera KF. Doing Family in “Times of Migration”: Care Temporalities  
607 and Gender Politics in Southeast Asia. *Ann Am Assoc Geogr* 2020;110:1709–25.  
608 <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2020.1723397>.
- 609 [43] Nalugya R, Russell S, Zalwango F, Seeley J. The role of children in their HIV-positive parents’  
610 management of antiretroviral therapy in Uganda. *African Journal of AIDS Research* 2018;17:37–46.  
611 <https://doi.org/10.2989/16085906.2017.1394332>.
- 612 [44] Abimanyi-Ochom J, Inder B, Hollingsworth B, Lorgelly P. Invisible work: Child work in households  
613 with a person living with HIV/AIDS in Central Uganda. *SAHARA-J: Journal of Social Aspects of*  
614 *HIV/AIDS* 2017;14:93–109.
- 615 [45] Kohler IV, Kohler H-P, Anglewicz P, Behrman JR. Intergenerational transfers in the era of HIV/AIDS:  
616 Evidence from rural Malawi. *Demogr Res* 2012;27:775–834.
- 617 [46] Schatz E, David I, Angotti N, Gómez-Olivé FX, Mojola SA. From “Secret” to “Sensitive Issue”: Shifting  
618 Ideas About HIV Disclosure Among Middle-Aged and Older Rural South Africans in the Era of  
619 Antiretroviral Treatment. *J Aging Health* 2021:08982643211020202.  
620 <https://doi.org/10.1177/08982643211020202>.
- 621 [47] Schatz E, Seeley J. Gender, ageing & carework in East and Southern Africa: A review. *Glob Public*  
622 *Health* 2015;10:1185–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2015.1035664>.
- 623 [48] Agadjanian V, Hayford SR. Men's Migration, Women's Autonomy, and Union Dissolution in Rural  
624 Mozambique. *Journal of Family Issues* 2018;39:1236–57.  
625 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X17698184>.
- 626 [49] Lurie M, Harrison A, Wilkinson D, Karim SA. Circular migration and sexual networking in rural  
627 KwaZulu/Natal: implications for the spread of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases. *Health*  
628 *Transition Review* 1997;7:17–27.
- 629 [50] Martins-Fonteyn E, Loquiha O, Baltazar C, Thapa S, Boothe M, Raimundo I, et al. Factors influencing  
630 risky sexual behaviour among Mozambican miners: a socio-epidemiological contribution for HIV  
631 prevention framework in Mozambique. *International Journal for Equity in Health* 2017;16:179–  
632 179. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-017-0674-z>.

- 633 [51] Manderson L, Block E. Relatedness and care in Southern Africa and beyond. *Social Dynamics*  
634 2016;42:205–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02533952.2016.1218139>.
- 635 [52] Madhavan S, Clark S, Beguy D, Kabiru CW, Gross M. Moving beyond the household: Innovations in  
636 data collection on kinship. *Population Studies* 2017;71:117–32.  
637 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00324728.2016.1262965>.
- 638 [53] Madhavan S, Clark S, Araos M, Beguy D. Distance or location? How the geographic distribution of kin  
639 networks shapes support given to single mothers in urban Kenya. *Geographical Journal*  
640 2018;184:75–88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12230>.
- 641 [54] Odimegwu CO, Wet ND, Adedini SA, Appunni S. Family Demography in Sub-Saharan Africa:  
642 Systematic Review of Family Research. In: Odimegwu CO, editor. *Family Demography and Post-*  
643 *2015 Development Agenda in Africa*, Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2020, p. 9–56.  
644 [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-14887-4\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-14887-4_2).
- 645 [55] Albert LM, Edwards J, Pence B, Speizer IS, Hillis S, Kahn K, et al. Associations of Father and Adult  
646 Male Presence with First Pregnancy and HIV Infection: Longitudinal Evidence from Adolescent Girls  
647 and Young Women in Rural South Africa (HPTN 068). *AIDS Behav* 2021;25:2177–94.  
648 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-020-03147-y>.
- 649 [56] Mukumbang FC, Knight L, Masquillier C, Delpont A, Sematlane N, Dube LT, et al. Household-focused  
650 interventions to enhance the treatment and management of HIV in low- and middle-income  
651 countries: a scoping review. *BMC Public Health* 2019;19:1–14. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-8020-6)  
652 [019-8020-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-8020-6).
- 653 [57] Lauffenburger JC, Khan NF, Brill G, Choudhry NK. Quantifying Social Reinforcement Among Family  
654 Members on Adherence to Medications for Chronic Conditions: a US-Based Retrospective Cohort  
655 Study. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2019;34:855–61. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-018-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-018-4654-9)  
656 [4654-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-018-4654-9).
- 657 [58] Masquillier C, Wouters E, Mortelmans D, Wyk B van, Hausler H, Damme WV. HIV/AIDS Competent  
658 Households: Interaction between a Health-Enabling Environment and Community-Based  
659 Treatment Adherence Support for People Living with HIV/AIDS in South Africa. *PLOS ONE*  
660 2016;11:e0151379. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0151379>.
- 661 [59] Ruark A, Kajubi P, Ruteikara S, Green EC, Hearst N. Couple Relationship Functioning as a Source or  
662 Mitigator of HIV Risk: Associations Between Relationship Quality and Sexual Risk Behavior in Peri-  
663 urban Uganda. *AIDS Behav* 2018;22:1273–87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-017-1937-9>.
- 664 [60] Conroy AA, McKenna SA, Comfort ML, Darbes LA, Tan JY, Mkandawire J. Marital infidelity, food  
665 insecurity, and couple instability: A web of challenges for dyadic coordination around antiretroviral  
666 therapy. *Social Science and Medicine* 2018;214:110–7.  
667 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.08.006>.
- 668 [61] Chikovore J, Gillespie N, McGrath N, Orne-Gliemann J, Zuma T. Men, masculinity, and engagement  
669 with treatment as prevention in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *AIDS Care* 2016;28:74–82.  
670 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540121.2016.1178953>.
- 671 [62] Mburu G, Ram M, Siu G, Bitira D, Skovdal M, Holland P. Intersectionality of HIV stigma and  
672 masculinity in eastern Uganda: implications for involving men in HIV programmes. *BMC Public*  
673 *Health* 2014;14:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-1061>.
- 674 [63] Sharma M, Barnabas RV, Celum C. Community-based strategies to strengthen men’s engagement in  
675 the HIV care cascade in sub-Saharan Africa. *PLOS Medicine* 2017;14:e1002262.  
676 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002262>.
- 677