

**Title: Appraising the HIV Prevention Cascade methodology to improve HIV prevention targets: Lessons learned from a general population pilot study in east Zimbabwe**

**Authors:** Louisa R. Moorhouse<sup>1</sup>, Jeffrey W Imai-Eaton<sup>1,2</sup>, Rufuworkuda Maswera<sup>3</sup>, Blessing Tsenesa<sup>3</sup>, Phyllis Magoge-Mandizvidza<sup>3</sup>, Brian Moyo<sup>4</sup>, Owen Mugurungi<sup>4</sup>, Constance Nyamukapa<sup>1,3</sup>, Timothy B Hallett<sup>1</sup>, Simon Gregson<sup>1,3</sup>

**Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup> MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup> Center for Communicable Disease Dynamics, Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

<sup>3</sup> Biomedical and Research Training Institute, Harare, Zimbabwe

<sup>4</sup> Zimbabwe Ministry of Health and Child Care, Harare, Zimbabwe

**Correspondence to:**

Louisa R Moorhouse

Medical Research Council Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, UK

[l.moorhouse@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:l.moorhouse@imperial.ac.uk)

## **Abstract**

### Introduction

Multiple HIV Prevention Cascades (HPC) formulations have been proposed to assist advocacy, monitoring of progress of HIV prevention implementation and research to identify ways to increase use of HIV prevention methods. Schaefer and colleagues proposed a unifying formulation suitable for widespread use across different populations which could be used for routine monitoring or advocacy. Robust methods for defining and interpreting this HPC formulation using real world data is required.

### Methods

Data collected as part of the Manicaland Pilot HIV Prevention Cascades Study, east Zimbabwe, in 2018-19, was used to validate the HPC framework for PrEP, VMMC, male condom and combination prevention method use. Validation measures included feasibility of populating the HPC, contrasting simple vs complex measures of the HPC (using 2-sample proportion test), and testing ability of main bars to predict prevention use and testing whether sub-bars explained why people were lost from the HPC using logistic regression.

### Results

It was possible to populate the HPC for both individual and combined prevention methods using pilot survey data. Most steps were associated with prevention method usage outcomes, except for VMMC. There were significant overlaps between individuals reporting positive responses for the main bar and those citing barriers to motivation. To refine the HPC's access bar definition, it is suggested to also consider individuals who report access barriers. While the HPC framework identifies barriers to individual prevention methods, challenges arise in identifying those for combined prevention.

### Discussion

Our study successfully utilised questionnaires from the Manicaland HPC pilot survey to measure the HPC for individual and combined prevention methods. This demonstrates the feasibility of populating this framework using general population survey data and designated questionnaire modules. We propose a final formulation of the HPC, questionnaire modules and methods to create it. With proper evaluation and promotion, the HPC can enhance prevention services, aiding in the crucial reduction of HIV incidence.

### **List of tables and figures**

Table 1 - Hypotheses tested within each objective of the validation process and the output evaluated within each objective

Table 2 - Associations between motivation and access with prevention method use, adjusted for site type and 5-year age group

Table 3 - Comparison proportions of motivation, access, and use of prevention methods with simple vs alternative measures and p-values for differences in proportions using 2-sample test of proportions

Figure 1 - HIV prevention cascades for PrEP and male condom use in females in the priority population

Figure 2 - HIV prevention cascades for PrEP and male condom use in females in the priority population

Figure 3 – HIV prevention cascades for HIV combination prevention: use of VMMC or male condoms in males and PrEP or male condoms in females

Figure 4 - Tenofovir and emtricitabine concentrations from DBS testing in females aged 15-24 years reporting current or recent PrEP use

Figure 5 - Venn diagrams of overlaps between each bar of the cascade and reporting at least one barrier to that bar for male condom use in males and females

Figure 6 - Venn diagrams of overlaps between each bar of the cascade and reporting at least one barrier to that bar for VMMC in males and PrEP use in females

Figure 7 - HIV prevention cascade with the order of Access, Motivation and Use, for PrEP and male condom use in females

Figure 8 - HIV prevention cascade with the order of Access, Motivation and Use, for VMMC and male condom use in males

Figure 91 - Associations of explanatory barriers with male condom use in females and male condom use and VMMC in males, adjusted for 5-year age group and site type

Figure 20 - Final proposed formulation of the HIV Prevention Cascade, populated with data on male condom use in men

### **List of supplementary information**

Table S1 - Male condom cascade main bar and sub bar definitions

Table S2 - PrEP cascade main bar and sub bar definitions

Table S3 - VMMC cascade main bar and sub bar definitions

Table S4 - Proposed revised definitions of each main bar of the HIV prevention cascade

Table S5 - Proposed revised definitions of each explanatory sub-bar in the HIV prevention cascade

## 1 Introduction

2 Following the success of the HIV Treatment Cascade framework to compare and evaluate national  
3 and sub-national HIV treatment programmes<sup>1-3</sup>, multiple models of HIV prevention cascades (HPC)  
4 have been proposed to monitor progress of HIV prevention implementation from national to local  
5 levels, identify ways to increase use of HIV prevention methods, allow comparison across HIV  
6 prevention programmes, and ultimately reduce HIV incidence<sup>4-11</sup>.

### 7 *The intended use of the HIV Prevention Cascade Framework*

8 The aim of the HPC model is to provide a practical framework that indicates where HIV prevention  
9 activities need to be strengthened by describing the steps required for HIV prevention to be effectively  
10 used by an individual, and identifies barriers to the individual transitioning through each of these  
11 steps<sup>5,6,12</sup>. Successful application of the HPC must be able to assist decision makers to identify  
12 intervention uptake targets that result in improved effective use of HIV prevention<sup>6,13</sup>.

13 Garnett et al proposed two general models of an HPC which were applied to data from the  
14 Manicaland cohort study in Zimbabwe<sup>5</sup>. One of these HPCs takes the view of a health care provider,  
15 i.e., provider-centric and one which takes the view of an individual potentially engaging with an HIV  
16 prevention method i.e., user-centric<sup>5</sup>. These were the first of the proposed HPC models which were  
17 more generic: rather than being developed for a specific population, such as MSM, or prevention  
18 method, such as PrEP. Hargreaves and colleagues modified and built on the HPC formulations  
19 proposed by Garnett et al<sup>5</sup>. First, by identifying three domains of the cascade that interventions could  
20 be related to: demand side interventions which aim to increase motivation; supply side interventions  
21 which improve availability; and adherence interventions to improve uptake and use of HIV  
22 prevention. Second, by incorporating known barriers in each of these domains drawn from the earlier  
23 social cognitive theoretical frameworks and the wider literature and linking these to the types of  
24 interventions most likely to reduce these barriers<sup>12</sup>. i.e., in effect, an explanatory framework.  
25 However, such theoretical frameworks were not designed for use in routine programme monitoring  
26 and advocacy and there was a need for a unifying framework which could be used for such work.

27  
28 Following a consultation in Harare on earlier HPC formulations, Schaefer *et al.* and the London  
29 Working Group on HIV Prevention Cascades (LWG) proposed a unifying cascade framework for  
30 routine monitoring and evaluation of prevention programmes<sup>6</sup>. It also highlights gaps between the key  
31 steps that need to be addressed to achieve effective prevention method use. The framework can be  
32 applied to multiple primary prevention methods and populations<sup>6</sup>. Schaefer *et al.* highlight that a  
33 successful cascade framework must be sufficiently generic to adapt across prevention methods and  
34 populations, and be efficient and practical to populate with real world data<sup>6,14</sup>. The resulting  
35 framework was proposed to be applied to multiple populations and to be used in two parts: a simple  
36 framework consisting of the main bars of the cascade (motivation, access, effective use) and a more  
37 complex framework which considers explanatory barriers to each of the gaps in the HPC (lack of  
38 motivation, lack of access, lack of capacity to effectively use)<sup>14</sup>. Recent studies have reinforced the  
39 importance of including individual-level motivation within the framework<sup>14,15</sup>. The inclusion of  
40 individual-level motivation distinguishes the Schaefer et al framework from other proposed  
41 frameworks such as that included in recent operational guidance from UNAIDS on creating HIV  
42 prevention cascades<sup>16</sup>. The UNAIDS approach adopts a more programmatic perspective with the  
43 cascade steps consisting of identifying a focus population and then measuring the reach/coverage,  
44 uptake/use and then correct/consistent use of primary HIV prevention methods<sup>16</sup>.

45 It is possible that, as suggested by Auerbach *et al.*, two different cascade formulations are required—  
46 one simple model which populates the core steps, and thus highlights gaps in the cascade, to evaluate  
47 prevention programmes, complemented by a more detailed model which includes explanatory factors

48 for the gaps observed in the cascades<sup>17</sup>. This is similar to the approach suggested by Schaefer *et al.*  
49 whereby the core steps of the cascade framework are populated initially and then, if data are available,  
50 explanatory sub-bars are populated as reasons underlying the gaps in the cascade<sup>6</sup>. However, the  
51 utility of any version of the cascade framework, either simple or extended, needs to be demonstrated  
52 using data to specifically populate HPCs for both individual and combination HIV prevention<sup>18</sup>.

### 53 *Collection and application of real-world data to populate the HIV Prevention Cascade*

54 Preliminary research has demonstrated populating the HPC using pre-existing general population  
55 survey data<sup>5,6,14,19</sup>; however, relying on pre-existing data has been recognised repeatedly as a  
56 limitation, particularly for populating the explanatory barriers. Several studies applying the  
57 LWG/Schaefer version of the HPC to various priority populations have successfully populated the  
58 core steps of the HPC cascade<sup>20</sup>, but these studies have reported lack of data availability when using  
59 the extended framework with explanatory sub-bars<sup>20-22</sup>.

60 Despite an emerging consensus that the cascade should consist of initially defining a priority  
61 population, followed by measuring motivation, access and use within this population, data collected  
62 specifically to populate and validate the cascade framework are lacking<sup>18</sup>. Before encouraging use of  
63 this HPC framework, it is necessary to understand and demonstrate the practicality of collecting data  
64 to specifically populate the cascade. The Manicaland Study, an ongoing open cohort study in east  
65 Zimbabwe, has collected data to demonstrate the practical utility of the particular generic HPC  
66 proposed by LWG/Schaefer *et al.*<sup>6</sup>. The pilot survey tested a questionnaire module to capture data on  
67 HPCs across multiple primary HIV prevention methods: male condoms, female condoms, PrEP and  
68 VMMC.

### 69 *Validating the HIV Prevention Cascade Framework*

70 The LWG/Schaefer HPC framework requires validation using data specifically collected to populate  
71 the framework. Reviewing the validity of the proposed HPC framework aims to assess whether the  
72 requirements of its specific intended use are fulfilled when populated with survey data. As  
73 emphasised repeatedly, a key feature of any cascade formulation is that it must be simple and practical  
74 to populate<sup>5,6,14</sup>. Therefore, the most parsimonious version of the HPC framework possible should be  
75 favoured when reviewing the validity of measures and survey tools to populate the framework whilst  
76 trying to maximise the information which can be gained from the framework. This will maximise the  
77 likelihood of the HPC being adopted across national and sub-national programmes and research, as  
78 well as being the most feasible to include in population surveys such as Demographic Health Surveys.  
79 Collecting data via population surveys is crucial to understand the full picture of HIV prevention  
80 method use within the larger population compared to clinic-based programmes.

81 Defining the priority population, the denominator of the HPC framework, is the first challenge to  
82 populating the cascade. Specifying a priority population for prevention is more complex than the  
83 definition of a starting population of the HIV treatment cascade<sup>17</sup>. The definition of the initial  
84 denominator of the population at risk will have a knock-on effect on the entire cascade<sup>17</sup>. Schaefer *et al.*  
85 define the priority population as the “population that could benefit from using a prevention  
86 method”, a definition which is open to adaptation according to the (national or sub-national)  
87 population of interest<sup>6</sup>. Within the context of Manicaland, work has been done to establish the  
88 definition of priority populations through a combination of literature review and analysis of sexual  
89 behaviours associated with HIV acquisition<sup>6,23</sup>.

90 Following the definition of the priority population, the LWG/Schaefer HPC core framework consists  
91 of three main bars: motivation, access, and effective use of prevention methods<sup>6</sup>. Motivation captures  
92 an individual’s desire to use a prevention method. Access captures whether an individual is able to  
93 access a prevention method. Effective use describes the use of a prevention method required to avert  
94 acquisition of HIV<sup>6</sup>. For the proposed HPC framework to successfully describe the steps taken for an

95 individual to effectively use HIV prevention, the steps leading to effective use must be predictive of  
96 effective use. Although the core cascade is designed to be generic and applicable across populations,  
97 validating the questionnaire module developed to populate the framework and the combinations of  
98 questions to measure each domain of the cascade is required to help promote use of the HPC  
99 framework.

100 Schaefer et al. stress the importance of individual-level motivation in prevention method use and  
101 therefore suggest that this should be the first step in the HPC<sup>6</sup>. Early exploratory analysis of the  
102 cascade has consistently indicated a very small drop between the motivation bar and the access bar.  
103 This raised questions about how the main bar for access was being defined and whether using a single  
104 question – “do you know a place you could access a prevention method” – was sufficient and  
105 identified a need to explore the overlap between motivation to use and access to prevention methods.  
106 This compounds a point raised during the Harare workshop that the HPC may not be as clearly linear  
107 as the treatment cascade, meaning the proposed order of motivation and access may be reversed or  
108 highly correlated<sup>14</sup>. This hypothesis requires testing using general population data. Schaefer *et al.*  
109 highlight that, given that both motivation and access are necessary for effective use, their order in  
110 the cascade is unlikely to impact programmatic decisions. Regardless of access, an individual will not  
111 use a prevention method if they are not motivated to, and individuals may still experience barriers in  
112 their capacity to use prevention methods effectively<sup>6</sup>. However, if interventions to improve HIV  
113 prevention methods are designed based on gaps identified in the cascade then the HPC framework  
114 must effectively highlight these gaps – something which could be affected by the order of the bars<sup>13</sup>.  
115 Auerbach *et al.* also suggested that in priority populations which have very high coverage of access to  
116 a prevention method, ordering the cascade so that access comes first would give greater insight to  
117 motivation to use a prevention method when access is not an issue<sup>17</sup>. The different insights gained  
118 from the HPC framework when swapping the order of motivation and access however remain to be  
119 demonstrated.

120 The extended version of the LWG/Schaefer HPC framework includes sub-bars which act as  
121 explanatory variables hypothesised to explain the gaps in each bar of the cascade. The sub-bars apply  
122 to specific domains of the cascade and therefore it is hypothesised in the framework that these  
123 explanatory variables are associated with a lack of each domain. For example, explanatory variables  
124 hypothesised to explain a lack of motivation should be associated with a lack of motivation. Inclusion  
125 of these variables in the framework was based on extensive literature review and models of behaviour  
126 change<sup>12</sup>, but it is necessary to test these associations using data specifically collected to populate the  
127 HPC framework<sup>6,24</sup>.

128 Further to work that has been carried out so far, robust methods for defining and interpreting HPCs  
129 are required. It is necessary to validate:

- 130 1) The steps and sub-bars in the cascade framework
- 131 2) The questionnaire module developed to populate and measure the cascade framework

132 We aim to assess and refine the ability of the HIV Prevention Cascade and questionnaire module  
133 proposed by Schaefer et al. to identify potential targets for HIV prevention interventions using data  
134 from a general population survey through the following objectives:

- 135 1. Test the feasibility of populating the HIV Prevention Cascade draft formulation with questions in  
136 the prevention questionnaire tool collected in the Manicaland pilot survey
- 137 2. Test whether the motivation and access main bars of the cascade frameworks are predictors of  
138 effective use of HIV prevention methods
- 139 3. Contrast alternative ways of measuring each main bar in the cascade defined in the Manicaland  
140 HIV Prevention Cascade pilot survey questionnaire module



- 141 4. Compare the populations captured within each main bar of the HPC draft formulation when the  
142 order of the motivation and access bars are swapped
- 143 5. Test the validity of the sub-bars to explain why individuals are lost from the HPC and are not  
144 effectively using HIV prevention methods
- 145 6. Propose a final validated version of the HPC framework
- 146 7. Propose a minimum questionnaire module to populate the main bars and explanatory sub-bars of  
147 the HPC framework

## 148 **Methods & Materials**

### 149 *Data sources and study setting*

150 Data were from the Manicaland HIV Prevention Cascade Pilot Study collected in 2018-19, which was  
151 carried out in Manicaland Province in eastern Zimbabwe<sup>25</sup>. Data on sociodemographic characteristics,  
152 HIV knowledge, risk and prevention method use were collected in a pilot questionnaire designed  
153 specifically to populate HPCs<sup>26</sup>. Ethical approvals for all survey activities were granted by the  
154 Medical Research Council of Zimbabwe and the Imperial College Research Ethics Committee  
155 (17IC4160).

156

### 157 *Manicaland HIV Prevention Cascade Questionnaire module*

158 The Manicaland HPC pilot study implemented a draft questionnaire module containing questions to  
159 populate HIV prevention cascades for male condoms, female condoms, VMMC, PrEP and HIV  
160 testing<sup>26</sup>. Questions were proposed following a stakeholder consultation during the Harare  
161 Workshop<sup>14</sup> and developed into HIV prevention modules of an individual questionnaire<sup>14</sup>. As part of  
162 this pilot survey, PrEP adherence laboratory testing was conducted on a sub-sample of young females  
163 reporting current or recent PrEP use<sup>23,27</sup>. Current PrEP adherence was defined by a concentration of  
164 Tenofovir above 0.7pM per DBS punch<sup>28</sup>.

### 165 *Definition of the priority population*

166 To maximise the sample size available for validation purposes, a broad definition of a priority  
167 population was used: HIV-negative participants aged 15-54 years who reported one or more sexual  
168 risk behaviours for HIV acquisition in the last 12 months. HIV status was determined by either PITC  
169 or laboratory-based testing of DBS specimens<sup>23</sup>. Sexual risk behaviours were selected based on  
170 literature review and an HIV incidence analysis of the Manicaland general population cohort<sup>23</sup>. Risk  
171 behaviours included were having multiple partners in the last 12 months; concurrent partners at the  
172 time of interview; recent transactional sex in the last month with any of the last three partners; and  
173 having at least one non-regular partner in the last 12 months.

### 174 *Populating the HIV Prevention Cascade*

175 Definitions of each bar and sub-bar of the HIV prevention cascade for each prevention method are  
176 listed in Tables S1-S3.

177 Outcomes were coded as binary variables and the bar height was calculated as this proportion within  
178 the target population:

- 179 - 0 = does not meet criteria for that bar/sub-bar  
180 - 1 = does meet criteria for that bar/sub-bar

181 For any main bar (being motivated to use, having access to or effectively using a prevention method)  
182 this was coded as:

- 183 - 0 = individual is not motivated to use a prevention method

184 - 1 = individual is motivated to use a prevention method

185 For barrier bars (such as knowledge/lack of knowledge as a barrier to prevention method use) this was  
186 coded as:

187 - 0 = individual does not experience a lack of knowledge as a barrier to prevention method use

188 - 1 = individual does experience a lack of knowledge as a barrier to prevention method use

189 An individual was only exposed to a barrier bar if they did not meet the criteria to fall within the main  
190 bar, so the cascade takes the perspective of those who have the positive motivation/access/effective  
191 use and then seek to understand the barriers for those who do not. It was assumed that all those who  
192 effectively use a prevention method were also motivated to use and had access to each HIV  
193 prevention method. The HPC framework was populated as a conditional cascade; each step was  
194 conditional on the previous step and therefore an individual must be in the previous step of the  
195 cascade in order to be allowed to experience the following step. For example, an individual must be  
196 motivated to be considered in the denominator for the access bar.

197 Each main bar of the cascade was calculated as a proportion:

198 
$$\text{Proportion motivated} = \frac{\text{number of individuals reporting to be motivated to use a prevention method}}{\text{number of individuals in priority population}}$$

$$\text{Proportion with access} = \frac{\text{number of individuals reporting to be motivated to use and have access to a prevention method}}{\text{number of individuals in priority population}}$$

199

$$\text{Proportion effectively using} = \frac{\text{number of individuals reporting to be motivated to use, have access to and be effectively using a prevention method}}{\text{number of individuals in priority population}}$$

200

201 95% confidence intervals for each main bar proportion were calculated for the main bars of the HPC  
202 framework.

203 Explanatory sub-bars were populated for individuals who met the conditions to continue through to  
204 that domain of the cascade, but did not report the main bar for this domain positively. For example, to  
205 be in the access bar individuals must report to be motivated. Explanatory barriers for motivation were  
206 populated for those in the priority population but who were not motivated; for access, those who were  
207 motivated but lacked access; and, for effective use, those who were motivated and had access but did  
208 not effectively use a prevention method.

209 *Combination prevention method use*

210 The combination HPC framework was populated by classifying whether individuals in the priority  
211 population used at least one of the prevention methods:

212 a. Males – VMMC and/or male condoms

213 b. Females – PrEP and/or male condoms

214 When calculating the main bars (e.g., motivation), individuals had to report affirmatively for those  
215 bars for at least one prevention method. This calculation built on definitions of individual prevention  
216 method use and so the combination cascade remained conditional specific to individual prevention



217 method use e.g., an individual could not be part of the combination motivated bar based on male  
218 condom motivation and then part of the combination access bar based on VMMC access.

219 Individuals were included within combination explanatory sub-bars when they did not fall into a main  
220 bar (e.g., motivation) for any prevention method. The sub-bars were assigned to the furthest possible  
221 point along the cascade, with the end point of any prevention method use in mind. For example, if an  
222 individual was motivated to use male condoms but lacks motivation to use VMMC, they continued to  
223 the access domain of the framework because they were motivated to use at least one method. At this  
224 point, if they reported a lack of access to male condoms, then explanatory barriers to this access  
225 should be reported within the cascade.

#### 226 *Measuring validity of the HPC framework*

227 Hypotheses tested within each objective are listed in Table 1. Accepting or rejecting each hypothesis  
228 is not solely based on statistical outcomes but also on the practicality and feasibility of each part of  
229 the HPC framework, and considering the previous justifications for each part of the HPC framework  
230 as set out by Schaefer et al, the LWG and during the Harare Workshop.

#### 231 *Objective 1*

232 The feasibility of populating the HPC framework was tested using data collected from the Manicaland  
233 pilot questionnaire modules. Full cascades were populated for male condoms, PrEP and combination  
234 prevention in the female priority population and male condoms, VMMC and combination prevention  
235 in the male priority population.

#### 236 *Objective 2*

237 Logistic regression was used to test the association of motivation and access as predictors of the  
238 outcome of effective use of HIV prevention methods. Regressions were fitted separately for each  
239 prevention method (male condoms, PrEP and VMMC), adjusted for 5-year age group and site type,  
240 and stratified by sex. Statistical significance was assessed using a threshold of  $p < 0.05$ .

#### 241 *Objective 3*

242 Multiple potential questions to populate each main bar of the HPC framework were included in the  
243 Manicaland pilot questionnaire module. The simplest combination of questions used to populate the  
244 cascade was considered the most favourable measure to ensure the HPC framework is as feasible as  
245 possible to routinely collect data on. Each of the main cascade bars were calculated using the simplest  
246 (primary) measure and then also using more complex (alternate) measure, as detailed in Tables S1-S3,  
247 for each prevention method and stratified by sex. Throughout this analysis, the definition of the main  
248 cascade bars included those effectively using each prevention method. Differences in the proportions  
249 captured within each bar of the cascade using simple versus alternate measures were compared using  
250 a two-sample proportion test and p-values for two-tailed tests of significance between the proportions  
251 were used to assess the hypothesis that there is a difference in proportions identified through the  
252 simple versus alternative measure. Statistical significance was assessed using a threshold of  $p < 0.05$ .  
253 Self-reported use of prevention methods was compared with alternative measures—self reported  
254 condom use at last sex versus condom use throughout all sex in the last year, self-reported PrEP use  
255 versus laboratory confirmed PrEP use and self-reported VMMC versus clinic confirmed VMMC<sup>23</sup>.  
256 Logistic regression was used to test the association between these measures of prevention method use.  
257 The proportion of individuals with overlap between reporting a positive bar and also reporting barriers  
258 to each domain of the cascade were calculated and presented using Venn diagrams e.g., those who  
259 report to be motivated to use a prevention method but also report barriers to motivation.

#### 260 *Objective 4*

261 Cascades were populated for each prevention method, stratified by sex, using the alternate order of the  
262 main bars (access > motivation > effective use). The overall proportions lost from the cascade  
263 between the starting point of the priority population to the effective use bar with each order of the bars  
264 were compared. The proportions lost at each step of the cascade were compared for each order of the  
265 main bars using z-tests.

#### 266 *Objective 5*

267 The association of explanatory factors with use of each prevention method was tested using  
268 multivariate logistic regression, adjusted for 5-year age group and site type, and stratified by sex. The  
269 association of each explanatory factor with each domain of the cascade was tested using multivariate  
270 logistic regression, adjusted for 5-year age group and site type, separately for each prevention method  
271 and stratified by sex, to test if the explanatory factors correctly explained the gap in the cascade they  
272 have been assigned to in the proposed HPC framework. The total proportion of each gap explained by the  
273 explanatory sub-bars was measured. Where the gaps were not fully explained additively by the  
274 explanatory sub-bars, the results were compared with explanatory factors for lack of prevention  
275 method use identified from individual interviews and focus groups from qualitative parts of the study  
276 and factors identified from qualitative work but not covered by the HPC framework were reviewed<sup>23</sup>.

#### 277 *Objectives 6 & 7*

278 Based on results from these analyses, a final version of the HPC framework was proposed. A  
279 questionnaire module was recommended based on the minimum questions required to populate a  
280 simple (main bars only) and extended (including explanatory sub-bars) HPC framework. The simplest  
281 measures were favoured where possible to maximise the feasibility of use of the HPC framework  
282 across multiple settings and data sources including population level surveys.

283 All statistical analyses were carried out using Stata/MP 17.0. Data visualisation was carried out using  
284 Tableau.

285

## 286 **Results**

287 9803 individuals aged 15 years and above completed the individual questionnaire (females n = 5729;  
288 males n = 4074), 77% of those eligible for participation from the household census. 9339 (95%) of the  
289 individuals completing the individual questionnaire had an HIV result, either from PITC (n = 7715) or  
290 DBS laboratory testing (n = 1624). 8404 individuals (90%) of those with an HIV test result were HIV  
291 negative. 6307/8404 (75%) self-reported sexual debut. 5223/6307 (83%) were aged 15-54 years.  
292 Among those sexually active 15-54-year-olds, 14% of females and 28% males reported  $\geq 1$  HIV  
293 sexual risk behaviour giving priority populations of 575 and 444 HIV negative males and females  
294 respectively.

#### 295 *Objective 1 - Test feasibility of populating the HIV Prevention Cascade draft formulation with* 296 *questions in the prevention questionnaire tool collected in the Manicaland pilot survey*

297 It was possible to create HPCs for PrEP and male condom use among females (Figure 1) and VMMC  
298 and male condom use among males (Figure 2) in the priority population using data collected within  
299 the Manicaland pilot questionnaire module. Levels of motivation, access and use of each prevention  
300 method could be assessed for each priority population and compared across prevention methods. Of  
301 women in the priority population, 63% were motivated to use, 62% were motivated and had access to  
302 and 32% reported motivation, access, and male condom use. PrEP use was lower: 10% were  
303 motivated to use, 8% had access to and <1% reported PrEP use. 52% of men in the priority population  
304 were motivated to have VMMC, 46% reported access and 19% reported full medical male

305 circumcision. Male condom use rates by men was higher than VMMC: 74% were motivated to use,  
306 74% had access to and 60% reported male condom use.

307 Where gaps in the cascade were identified, it was possible to populate sub-bars explaining the gaps in  
308 the cascade and barriers to progressing through the cascade. Barriers observed include lack of  
309 knowledge, lack of risk perception, perceived consequences of use and partner resistance. It was also  
310 possible to populate combination prevention cascades (Figure 3). 67% of men and 32% of women  
311 reported using at least one prevention method. It was possible to populate the sub-bars to understand  
312 explanatory barriers to use although it was not possible to see which prevention method the barriers  
313 were relating to, which prevention methods were preferred, or the proportion of people using multiple  
314 prevention methods. Some barriers, such as a lack of risk perception and a lack of knowledge of all  
315 prevention methods, could still provide some insight into barriers to combination prevention method  
316 use.

317 *Objective 2 - Test that each of the main bars of the cascade framework are predictors of effective use*  
318 *of HIV prevention methods*

319  
320 Logistic regression models, adjusted for site type and 5-year age-group, were used to measure the  
321 association between motivation and prevention method use, then access and prevention method use  
322 (Table 2). Among both women and men, motivation to use condoms and access to male condoms  
323 were strongly associated with use of male condoms, indicating that these are necessary components of  
324 the steps of the HIV prevention cascade. For PrEP, it was not possible to calculate odds ratios for  
325 associations of motivation and access with PrEP use due to small numbers of people in the priority  
326 population reporting PrEP use, all of whom reported motivation and access. Motivation for and access  
327 to VMMC were significantly associated with lower odds of having VMMC. This is likely due to the  
328 way the questions were asked: 95% of people reporting VMMC responded that they were not  
329 motivated to get VMMC or did not know somewhere to access VMMC if they did want to access it,  
330 probably because they had already had the procedure. If the HIV prevention cascade was populated  
331 without the ‘effective use assumption’—i.e., all reporting prevention method use must be motivated  
332 and have access to that prevention method—then inaccurate levels of motivation and access would be  
333 captured in the cascade.

334  
335 *Objective 3 - Contrast alternative ways of measuring each of the main bars of the cascade defined in*  
336 *the Manicaland HIV Prevention Cascade pilot survey questionnaire module*

337  
338 Simple versus alternative, more complex, ways of measuring the main steps of the HPC (Tables S1-  
339 S3) were calculated and the proportions of the population captured were compared using two-tailed  
340 two sample test of proportions (Table 3). There were no significant differences between the  
341 populations captured in the simple versus alternative measures for motivation or access across all  
342 prevention methods explored. It was not possible to compare VMMC use to an alternate measure due  
343 a lack of data on other ways of confirming VMMC. Two alternate ways of defining male condom use  
344 were tested: firstly, self-reporting using condoms at every sexual encounter for as long as an  
345 individual has been sexually active, and, secondly, self-reporting using male condoms throughout last  
346 sex. Significantly fewer ( $p<0.001$ ) both men and women reported using the simple measure compared  
347 to using condoms at every sexual encounter in both men and women, with a decrease from 32% to 6%  
348 in females and 60% to 16% in males. Comparing the simple measure to the second option—using  
349 condoms at last sex—significantly fewer men reported effective use ( $p<0.001$ ) with a decrease from  
350 60% to 43%. There was no significant difference in the female populations captured ( $p=0.432$ ). Self-  
351 reporting PrEP use was compared to a measure of using PrEP all or most days in the last month and  
352 no difference was observed in the populations of women captured ( $p=0.999$ ). Testing for the presence  
353 of tenofovir and emtricitabine was carried out on DBS collected in young women reporting current or

354 ever PrEP use across the study (Figure 4). All DBS samples had concentrations of Tenofovir above  
355 the threshold for PrEP adherence (0.7pM per DBS).

356 Overlaps between populations reporting main bars (e.g., motivation) and reporting barriers to those  
357 populations were assessed for the whole priority population without the conditional nature of the  
358 cascade (Figures 5 & 6). 73% of men and 62% of women reported motivation to use male condoms  
359 but experiencing a barrier to use (Figure 5). However, 98% of people reporting use of male condoms  
360 also report a barrier to motivation. 23% of the male priority population and 11% of the female priority  
361 population report both access to male condoms and also barriers to access. 55% of males and 25% of  
362 females in the priority population report both use of male condoms and at least one barrier to male  
363 condom use. Conversely, for PrEP, women reported only small overlaps between motivation, access  
364 (Figure 6). Men reported larger overlaps in motivation to have VMMC and reporting a motivation  
365 related barrier (43%) (Figure 6). 11% reported both access and an access related barrier and only 4%  
366 reported to have VMMC and also experience a barrier to VMMC.

367

368 *Objective 4 - Compare populations captured within each main bar of the HPC draft formulation when*  
369 *the order of the motivation and access bars are swapped*

370

371 HIV prevention cascades were populated, for the main bars only, with the order of the main bars  
372 swapped and access being the first step of the cascade (Figures 7 & 8). The proportions of the  
373 population reaching the 'use' bar of the cascade were unchanged across all prevention methods. As  
374 with the first version of the cascade (Figure 1B), only a very small proportion of the priority  
375 population reported a lack of access to male condoms (5%) (Figure 7B). There was still a large gap in  
376 motivation with a large drop between the access and motivation bars: 34% of those with access were  
377 not motivated to use male condoms. Access to PrEP was low, and lack of access was the largest gap  
378 in the PrEP cascade in women, with 89% of the priority population lost from the cascade here. The  
379 drop was smaller between the access and motivation bars of the cascade with 66% of those with  
380 access reporting a lack of motivation to use PrEP (7% of the entire priority population).  
381 77% of the male priority population reported a lack of access to VMMC (Figure 8A). The drop was  
382 small, 3%, between access to motivation. The drop was also small between the motivation and use  
383 bars: 2% of the total priority population. This is considerably smaller than the equivalent drops using  
384 the alternative order (Figure 3A) where 27% of the total priority population were lost from the second  
385 to third step. 2.6% of the male priority population reported a lack of access to male condoms (Figure  
386 8B): a very small gap in access which is similarly observed using the alternative order (Figure 2B).  
387 24% of men in the priority population with access to male condoms were not motivated to use them,  
388 representing 23% of the total priority population. 19% of men with access and motivation were not  
389 using male condoms. 14% of the overall priority population were lost from the motivation to use step  
390 here; the same proportion as lost from the access to use step in the original order of the HIV  
391 Prevention Cascade.

392

393 *Objective 5 - Test the validity of the sub-bars to explain why individuals are lost from the HPC and*  
394 *are not effectively using HIV prevention methods*

395 Logistic regression models, adjusted for 5-year age group and site type, were used to assess the  
396 association between each of the hypothesised barriers in the HPC framework and use of each  
397 prevention method (Figure 9). Associations of PrEP related barriers with PrEP use were not calculated  
398 due to the very small numbers (n=3) reporting PrEP use.

399 Odds ratios for the association of VMMC with lack of self-efficacy, easy access, availability,  
400 affordability, and acceptable provision could not be calculated because nobody reporting VMMC  
401 reported any of these barriers. Almost all other hypothesised barriers were significantly associated

402 with lower odds of having VMMC (Figure 10A). Lack of skills and partner disapproval were  
403 significantly associated with reduced odds of having VMMC: OR = 0.04 (95% CI: 0.01-0.32) and OR  
404 = 0.12 (95% CI: 0.07-0.21), respectively. Lack of social acceptability (OR = 0.3 (95% CI: 0.19-0.49),  
405 lack of knowledge (OR = 0.11, 95% CI: 0.06-0.20) and perceived negative consequences (OR = 0.51,  
406 95% CI: 0.33-0.80) were all associated with reduced odds of VMMC among men in the priority  
407 population.

408 The only access related barriers significantly associated with lower odds of male condom use among  
409 men (Figure 9B) or women (Figure 9C) was lack of easy access in females (OR = 0.52 95% CI: 0.28-  
410 0.98). Lack of skills and self-efficacy were associated with lower odds of male condom use in men  
411 and women. The motivation related barriers associated with lack of male condom use were different  
412 between men and women. In men, a lack of social acceptability (OR = 0.52 95% CI: 0.28-0.94) and a  
413 lack of future risk perception (OR = 0.56, 95% CI: 0.34-0.91) were the motivation related barriers  
414 associated with lack of male condom use. In women, a lack of social acceptability (OR = 0.46, 95%  
415 CI: 0.27-0.81) and perceived negative consequences of use (OR = 0.59, 95% CI: 0.39-0.91) were the  
416 motivation related barriers associated with lack of male condom use.

## 417 **Discussion**

### 418 Summary

419 This validation exercise demonstrated that it is feasible to populate the HIV prevention cascade  
420 framework, including both the main and sub bars, using data collected as part of the Manicaland Pilot  
421 HIV Prevention Cascades Study. The main bars in the HIV prevention cascade (motivation and  
422 access) predicted higher odds of prevention method use in male condoms and most sub-bars were  
423 associated with lower odds of prevention method use. High levels of overlap were observed of  
424 respondents reporting both the main bars and barriers to each main bar. Very little additional  
425 information was gained by swapping the order of the motivation and access bars of the cascade and in  
426 some instances, such as VMMC, this swap would lead to smaller gaps being identified and thus less  
427 insight being gained from the HPC framework.

### 428 Strengths of the cascade framework

429 Using the questionnaire modules piloted in this study, it was possible to define the priority population  
430 based on questions on sexual risk behaviours for HIV acquisition and then assess the HIV prevention  
431 cascades for this priority population in men and women for both individual and combination  
432 prevention method use. Main bars of the cascades for both individual and combination prevention  
433 could be populated, giving insight into levels and gaps of motivation, access, and use of male  
434 condoms, VMMC and PrEP, as well as overall levels of VMMC and male condom cascades for men  
435 and PrEP and male condom cascades for women.

436 This demonstration of the feasibility of applying an HIV prevention cascade framework to  
437 combination primary HIV prevention is one of the first instances of such analysis<sup>22</sup>. In this analysis,  
438 the outcome of combination prevention considered was use of at least one prevention method.  
439 Depending on the priority population and the research question, combination cascades could be  
440 constructed with an outcome of motivation to use, access to and use of 2 or more prevention methods  
441 together where multiple prevention methods are recommended in tandem to provide better protection  
442 e.g., VMMC and male condoms. Additionally, overall combination prevention cascades could be  
443 constructed in which all different combinations of prevention methods are considered. This version of  
444 the cascade framework allows this flexibility in application, provided the data are available.  
445 Application of the framework to combination prevention was one of the reasons highlighted by  
446 Schaefer *et al.* in the need for a standardised framework<sup>6</sup>.



447 Motivation to use and access to male condoms were strongly associated with increased odds in  
448 condom use in both men and women, supporting the theory behind the inclusion of these key steps in  
449 the HPC framework. Due to the small numbers reporting PrEP use, motivation to use and access to  
450 PrEP were collinear with PrEP use. There were no significant differences in the populations captured  
451 by the simple versus alternative measures of motivation and access for VMMC, male condoms or  
452 PrEP, indicating that the simplest methods of defining motivation and access are sufficient to populate  
453 the HPC framework main bars.

454 Although Schaefer *et al.*, and conclusions of the Harare workshop, argued that motivation and access  
455 are likely to be highly correlated<sup>14</sup> and the order of the cascade framework will not make much  
456 difference to programmatic decision making<sup>6</sup>, swapping the order of the framework could mean that  
457 there are smaller drops offs observed in the cascade and therefore the areas identified as having the  
458 most potential to be improved by interventions could vary depending on the order of motivation and  
459 access. In this analysis, swapping the order of the motivation and access bars did not improve the  
460 information gained (i.e., larger gaps from which to identify barriers as targets for interventions) from  
461 the gaps between bars, and in the case of VMMC, actually meant less information about gaps in  
462 motivation could be gained from the cascade framework as most people were lost from the cascade in  
463 the first (access) bar.

464 Most barriers in the HPC were associated with a lack of effective use, supporting the theory behind  
465 the development of the framework in which the barriers were selected following preliminary analysis,  
466 literature review and behavioural theory<sup>6,29</sup>. These barriers identified through quantitative analyses  
467 are also supported by qualitative findings carried out within the same population<sup>30,31</sup>. Barriers to  
468 VMMC identified through qualitative focus groups and individual interviews included pain, fear of  
469 side effects and health consequences which pertain to the perceived consequences barrier of the  
470 cascade<sup>31</sup>. Barriers to PrEP use identified through these activities included a lack of knowledge and  
471 availability; barriers which were also indicated from the cascade analysis<sup>32</sup>.

#### 472 Weaknesses of the cascade framework

473 Non-trivial proportions of individuals reported both successful attainment of steps in the cascade and  
474 a barrier to that step, for example, being motivated to use a prevention method and also reporting a  
475 barrier to motivation to use that prevention method. For those who reported using a prevention  
476 method and still report barriers to use, it can be interpreted that these people had sufficient capacity to  
477 use the prevention method that these barriers did not prevent them from using the prevention method  
478 of interest. Additionally, for the motivation bar, if people reported wanting to use a prevention method  
479 then any reported barriers to motivation are not sufficient to prevent motivation. However, the  
480 definition of access used in the cascade – knowing somewhere to access a prevention method – does  
481 not directly preclude the barriers to access in the cascade, such as affordability. The current definition  
482 of the access bar means individuals could be classified as attaining access (main bar) who still have  
483 barriers to access which prevent them actually accessing a prevention method. Further work to assess  
484 variation in overlaps by strength of views on the main bars and sub-bars could also help to improve  
485 definitions of the main and sub-bars.

486 Effective prevention method use is challenging to measure, particularly with male condoms and PrEP.  
487 In absence of laboratory testing for the presence of PrEP drugs, which is impractical and expensive  
488 for large scale application of the prevention cascade, all measures of effective use of a prevention  
489 method rely on self-report which is subject to social desirability bias. The UNAIDS version of the  
490 HIV prevention cascade defines a focus population, similar to the LWG/Schaefer *et al.* priority  
491 population, and then reports reach/coverage uptake/use and correct/consistent use<sup>16</sup>. Taking into  
492 account consistent use is important when considering the ultimate goal of preventing acquisition of  
493 HIV but is difficult to measure using cross sectional survey data. Changing the definition of male  
494 condom use produced significantly different HIV prevention cascades for the same population.



495 Ideally, effective use should be consistent use; however, this also needs to be balanced with the  
496 practicality of collecting data on consistency of prevention method use especially when adding  
497 questions to existing surveys and acknowledge that HIV risk can change rapidly such as through life  
498 course events.

499 Most of the explanatory barriers are clearly defined, however some barriers encompass several  
500 variables which could contribute to that barrier. This particularly affects 'lack of skills' which could  
501 include social skills to negotiate prevention method use but also practical skills to actually use or  
502 adhere to prevention. Combining these aspects limits the insight which could be gained from the  
503 framework about potential targets for interventions. More granular information could be obtained if  
504 these were separated. There may be some populations in which male condoms have been widely  
505 available for a long time. In these cases, it may be appropriate to assume that male condoms are  
506 always available, and nobody experiences the lack of availability barrier, particularly when the space  
507 or time available to ask questions on explanatory barriers are limited.

508 This HPC framework was designed to be used for individual and combination prevention. When  
509 addressing combination prevention, it is possible to present an overall view of motivation, access, and  
510 use of multiple prevention methods in the priority population. However, including information about  
511 the explanatory barriers to all prevention methods of interest is complicated and nuanced. There are  
512 multiple options for how the bars could be populated, such as barriers reported across all prevention  
513 methods, or barriers to use of the prevention method furthest along the prevention cascade. However,  
514 this does not provide as complete a picture of explanatory barriers as focusing on individual  
515 prevention methods. Garnett *et al.* suggested an alternative approach to populating combination  
516 prevention cascades in which an HPC is constructed for the most widely used prevention method first,  
517 then for the next most widely used method for those not using the first method<sup>5</sup>. Although this  
518 approach is less succinct, it may reveal information on sub-bars for each prevention method.

#### 519 Limitations of this validation exercise

520 This validation exercise was limited by use of self-reported cross-sectional data, which may lead to  
521 underestimation of the size of the priority population and overestimation of levels of prevention  
522 method use. 23% of those eligible to complete the individual survey did not participate and 5% of  
523 participants did not consent to PITC or DBS collection which may introduce non-response bias to the  
524 population. It was not possible to address effective use of prevention method and the effect on HIV  
525 incidence, however multiple prevention methods have been proven to reduce HIV acquisition in other  
526 studies. When used correctly, condoms are highly effective in preventing transmission of HIV, giving  
527 an estimated reduction in transmission of 90-95%<sup>33,34</sup>. Voluntary medical male circumcision (VMMC)  
528 reduces HIV acquisition in men by between 53% and 60%<sup>35-37</sup>. The Zimbabwean national VMMC  
529 programme aims to reach 80% coverage of males aged 15-29 years by 2021 to reduce HIV  
530 incidence<sup>38</sup>. Clinical trials of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) have demonstrated its efficacy in  
531 preventing acquisition of HIV infection. Reported results vary, probably explained by differences in  
532 adherence<sup>39-41</sup> - with good adherence the effectiveness of oral PrEP was as high as 90%<sup>42</sup>. No  
533 validation was carried out for applying the cascade framework to use of female condoms, although the  
534 prevention cascade for these shows that motivation and use of these is very low.

535 Validation of the HPC framework applied to PrEP use was limited due to very small numbers of  
536 individuals reporting awareness of or use of PrEP, which only very recently became available in  
537 Zimbabwe<sup>43</sup>. Motivation to use and access to PrEP were collinear with PrEP use. Although this  
538 demonstrates that those who reported PrEP use were motivated to use and did have access to PrEP,  
539 further analysis in populations with higher levels of PrEP use is required to confirm these  
540 associations. The association of explanatory barriers with PrEP use could not be tested due to such  
541 small numbers reporting the outcome.

542 Being motivated to have and reporting access to VMMC were associated with reduced odds of having  
543 VMMC, which is the opposite to what would be expected from the cascade framework. 95% of  
544 people reporting VMMC responded that they were not motivated to get VMMC or did not know  
545 somewhere to access VMMC if they did want to access it. If this issue was not considered when  
546 populating the cascade, for VMMC or other prevention methods, it could appear as if more people  
547 were using a prevention method than were actually motivated to use it or had access to it. Other  
548 studies which have applied the HIV prevention cascade have not reported or explored this, however,  
549 most have used different endpoint measures of the cascade. Hensen et al used the HPC framework to  
550 identify gaps to increase coverage of VMMC services in Zambia<sup>44</sup>, but the endpoint of the HPC  
551 framework was perceived service availability rather than actual uptake of VMMC. Some individuals  
552 reporting VMMC may have had VMMC when they were much younger, such as at school or as  
553 decided by their parents. Analysis of longitudinal data would be required to assess whether or not the  
554 men who have not yet taken up VMMC but do report motivation and access are more likely to do so  
555 compared to those who do not report motivation and access.

556 This validation exercise has only been tested in one population in Manicaland, east Zimbabwe.  
557 Further work using other populations would add to the credence of the HIV prevention cascade as a  
558 simple and effective way of understanding prevention method use. There were some explanatory  
559 barriers which were not associated with reduced odds of prevention method use, such as access  
560 related barriers to condom use, possibly because condoms are so widely available and accessible.  
561 However, associations may be significant in other populations, and, therefore, the absence of  
562 associations within this population is not sufficient to warrant recommending removing these  
563 explanatory barriers from the cascade framework. The priority population chosen was a broad age  
564 range to maximise the sample size for analysis. Qualitative data suggest differences in attitudes to  
565 prevention method use in older versus younger people, highlighting the important of choosing  
566 relevant priority populations within appropriate age ranges<sup>31</sup>.

#### 567 Recommendations for the population of and structure of the cascade framework

568 Based on this analysis, we recommend the following updates to the LWG/Schaefer *et al.* HIV  
569 prevention cascade:

- 570 1) It should be assumed that all individuals reporting prevention method use are motivated and  
571 have access to that prevention method
- 572 2) Where possible, the definition of the access bar should not include anyone who reports any  
573 barriers to access
- 574 3) Motivation and access should remain as currently ordered, with the exception of populations  
575 where access is close to 100%. In this case, more information may be gained from putting the  
576 access bar first to maximise the gaps in the cascade and aid identification of targets for  
577 interventions, but any reported access related barriers should still be assessed.
- 578 4) The lack of skills explanatory barrier should be split into 2 separate barriers: a lack of social  
579 skills and a lack of practical skills
- 580 5) Where possible, quantitative analysis should be combined with qualitative analysis to  
581 understand barriers to use of prevention methods, especially in populations where awareness  
582 and use of a particular prevention method is very low.

#### 583 Applying the HIV Prevention Cascade

584 Overall, it is possible to collect data as part of routine population surveys to populate the HIV  
585 prevention cascade. However, this required inclusion of specific questionnaire modules and this type  
586 of data may not be available without the specific questionnaires through which this can be collected.  
587 Using Demographic and Health Survey data, it could be possible to populate the main bars of the  
588 cascade and thus generate a basic cascade used for high level monitoring and evaluation purposes.

589 This could mimic the success of the treatment cascade in allowing identification of the gaps in the  
590 cascade, monitoring these over time and making comparison across and within countries. Where large  
591 gaps are found, this could be complemented with surveys to specifically explain these gaps and thus  
592 find appropriate targets for interventions.

593 The UNAIDS version of the cascade is intended to be populated primarily using programme data that  
594 are already routinely available<sup>16</sup>. The main difference between this and the LWG/Schaefer cascade is  
595 that lack of motivation is not acknowledged within the UNAIDS cascade framework as an obstacle to  
596 use of prevention methods. Although gaps in programme coverage and use of prevention methods can  
597 be identified using the UNAIDS framework, when explaining these gaps and identifying relevant  
598 interventions, distinguishing motivation and demand-related factors from access-related explanatory  
599 factors is difficult. As demonstrated in this analysis, motivation is strongly associated with prevention  
600 method use and reporting barriers to motivation is associated with reduced odds of using a prevention  
601 method, supporting the importance of addressing this step of the cascade to increasing prevention  
602 method use even in a scenario of very high access to primary prevention. Other efforts to populate this  
603 cascade framework, such as that looking at condom use in young women who sell sex in Zimbabwe,  
604 did not have data available on motivation to use condoms and so had to use a proxy measure of  
605 knowledge about condom efficacy<sup>21</sup>.

606 For a standardised approach for comparing countries, there is a strong preference and benefit to using  
607 one version of the cascade framework in order to mimic the success of the treatment cascade and  
608 allow comparison across populations. As Auerbach *et al.* propose, a solution could be to use a 2-step  
609 process involving two cascades<sup>17</sup>. The first step would use the UNAIDS framework, leveraging  
610 commonly available programmatic data to populate the cascade and identify gaps. Once the gaps are  
611 identified, the LWG/Schaefer *et al.* cascade can be used to further understand the demand side of  
612 prevention method use and reasons for gaps in the cascade using the hypothesised explanatory sub-  
613 bars. Given the demonstrated importance of motivation within the cascade framework, adding a  
614 question on motivation wherever possible, such as to routine surveys, would provide valuable  
615 information on the gaps in individual level motivation to use primary prevention methods. The latest  
616 WHO Strategic Information guidelines on HIV prevention emphasise demand-led referrals to primary  
617 prevention services<sup>45</sup>. Monitoring of this could mean that data on whether or not individuals seen in  
618 routine programmes want (are motivated) to use a prevention method would need to be collected in  
619 programme records, thus making it possible to measure the LWG/Schaefer HPC using programme  
620 data. However, these records would still only capture data on people who access or are reached by the  
621 programme.

622 Schaefer *et al.* note that the LWG/Schaefer proposed version of the cascade could be applied to  
623 mathematical modelling to predict the infections averted by current HIV prevention use and predict  
624 the impact on HIV incidence of reducing barriers within the cascade<sup>6</sup>, as also suggested by Auerbach  
625 *et al.*<sup>17</sup>, and demonstrated by Pickles *et al* using data from this study to parameterise the model using  
626 this version of the cascade framework<sup>46</sup>.

#### 627 Final recommended formulation of the HIV Prevention Cascade

628 The final proposed formulation of the HIV prevention cascade is illustrated for men's use of male  
629 condoms in Figure 10. Depending on the availability of data, the cascade can be populated as the full  
630 cascade including explanatory barriers to each step, or just as the main bars of the cascade whereby  
631 the difference in the bars indicates the gaps where people are being lost from the cascade. In the latter  
632 case, once these gaps are identified, further work can be done to establish the cause of these gaps.

#### 633 Steps to populating the HIV Prevention Cascade

634 The following steps should be taken to populate this HIV prevention cascade:

- 635 1) **Priority population:** Establish the priority population as a population that would benefit  
636 from using HIV prevention according to the population or research question of interest  
637 2) **Main bars:**  
638 a. **Use:** Calculate the number within the priority population using the HIV prevention  
639 method of interest according to the chosen definition of effective use. Suggested  
640 definitions are listed in Table 7.  
641 b. **Motivation:** Calculate the number within the priority population who are motivated  
642 to use the HIV prevention method of interest according to the chosen definition of  
643 motivation. Suggested definitions are listed in Table 7. Recode all individuals who  
644 are reporting use but not motivation to be motivated.  
645 c. **Access:** Calculate the number within the priority population who are motivated to use  
646 and report access to the HIV prevention method of interest according to the chosen  
647 definition of access. Suggested definitions are listed in Table 7. Recode all  
648 individuals who are reporting use but not access to have access. Where data is  
649 available, recode all individuals reporting motivation and at least one barrier to access  
650 as not having access.  
651 d. **Calculate motivation, access, and use as proportions:** Each main bar of the  
652 cascade is presented as a proportion with the calculations:

653 
$$\text{Proportion motivated} = \frac{\text{number of individuals reporting to be motivated to use a prevention method}}{\text{number of individuals in priority population}}$$

$$\text{Proportion with access} = \frac{\text{number of individuals reporting to be motivated to use and have access to a prevention method}}{\text{number of individuals in priority population}}$$

654

$$\text{Proportion effectively using} = \frac{\text{number of individuals reporting to be motivated to use, have access to and be effectively using a prevention method}}{\text{number of individuals in priority population}}$$

655

656 95% confidence intervals for each main bar proportion can be calculated and displayed around the  
657 main bars of the HPC framework.

- 658 3) **Explanatory sub bars:** Where data are available explanatory sub bars for each step can be  
659 populated using suggested definitions in Table 8. The explanatory sub bars should be limited  
660 to those falling within the gaps between each of the main bars in the cascade.  
661 Motivation related sub-bars should only be experienced by those who are in the priority  
662 population but unmotivated. Access related sub-bars should only be experienced by those in  
663 the priority population who are motivated but do not report access. Effective use sub-bars  
664 should only be experienced by those in the priority population who are motivated and have  
665 access but do not report using the prevention method of interest.  
666 4) **Combination prevention:** Where data are available, the measures of individual prevention  
667 method motivation, access and use can be combined to produce combination prevention  
668 cascades. Depending on the population of interest and research questions, criteria for  
669 combination motivation, access or use can either be:  
670 a. **Using at least one prevention method** – bars for combination use should be created  
671 where individual meeting the criteria for the respective bar for at least one prevention  
672 method fall within that bar

673                   **b. Using multiple prevention methods at the same time** - bars for combination use  
674                   should be created where individuals meeting the criteria for the respective bar for at  
675                   all prevention methods of interest fall within that bar

676                   Main bars only should be populated for combination prevention cascades. If gaps are  
677                   identified from this analysis, the cascades should be split into individual prevention methods  
678                   and at this point explanatory sub bars should be populated to understand the barriers relevant  
679                   to each prevention method. At this point, common barriers across prevention methods within  
680                   the priority population could be identified.

681                   5) **Comparison to national/international targets** – calculate the percentage of the priority  
682                   population who report motivation, the percentage of those motivated who report access and  
683                   the percentage of those motivated and with access who report effect use. Compare these with  
684                   the 90-90-90 equivalent targets where available, such as those set out in the UNAIDS HIV  
685                   Prevention 2025 Road Map<sup>47,48</sup>.

## 686                   Conclusions

687                   Overall, it was possible to measure the HPC for individual and combination prevention using the  
688                   questionnaires module designed for the Manicaland pilot survey. It has now been established, through  
689                   our work, that it is possible to populate an HPC framework with data collected in a general population  
690                   survey using questionnaire modules developed to facilitate this process. Through a combination of  
691                   literature review, social and behavioural theory, and evaluation using real world data, a general  
692                   consensus has been reached on what is important to include in a basic HIV prevention cascade and  
693                   how such a framework can be used to support HIV prevention efforts. If sufficiently evaluated and  
694                   promoted, the HIV prevention cascade can contribute to improvements in HIV prevention service  
695                   provision and help to bring about necessary reductions in HIV incidence to end the HIV/AIDS  
696                   epidemic as a global public health threat.

697

## 698                   Acknowledgements

699                   We are very grateful to the research team working at the Manicaland Centre for Public Health, as well  
700                   as to the study participants in Manicaland, for their contribution to this study.

701                   SG, TBH, CN, JI-E and LM conceptualised the study. CN, BT, RM, and PM-M had major roles in  
702                   collection and management of data used in this study. LM analysed the data. LM, SG and JI-E  
703                   contributed to interpretation of results. LM wrote the initial report which was reviewed and revised by  
704                   all co-authors. All authors had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

## 705                   Conflicts of Interest and Funding Sources

706                   This work was supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) (INV-09999) and the  
707                   National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) (R01MH114562-01). LM, SG, JI-E and CN  
708                   acknowledge funding from the MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis (reference  
709                   MR/X020258/1), funded by the UK Medical Research Council (MRC). This UK funded award is  
710                   carried out in the frame of the Global Health EDCTP3 Joint Undertaking.

711                   SG declares shareholdings in pharmaceutical companies GlaxoSmithKline and Astra Zeneca. All  
712                   other authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

## 713                   Data access statement

714                   Due to the sensitive nature of data collected, including information on HIV status, treatment and  
715                   sexual risk behaviour, the Manicaland Centre for Public Health does not make full analysis datasets

716 publicly available. Summary datasets of household and background sociodemographic individual  
717 questionnaire data, covering rounds 1-8 (1998-2021), are publicly available for download via the  
718 Manicaland Centre for Public Health website here - [http://www.manicalandhivproject.org/data-](http://www.manicalandhivproject.org/data-access.html)  
719 [access.html](http://www.manicalandhivproject.org/data-access.html). Quantitative data used for analyses produced by the Manicaland Centre for Public Health  
720 are available on request following completion of a data access request form here -  
721 <http://www.manicalandhivproject.org/data-access.html>. Additionally, summary HIV incidence and  
722 mortality data spanning rounds 1-6 (1998-2013), created in collaboration with the ALPHA Network  
723 are available via the DataFirst Repository here -  
724 <https://www.datafirst.uct.ac.za/dataportal/index.php/catalog/ALPHA/about>

725

726

727

728

729




## References

1. McNairy, M. L. & El-Sadr, W. M. The HIV care continuum: no partial credit given. *AIDS* **26**, 1735–8 (2012).
2. Kilmarx, P. H. & Mutasa-Apollo, T. Patching a leaky pipe: the cascade of HIV care. *Curr. Opin. HIV AIDS* **8**, 59–64 (2013).
3. Levi, J. *et al.* Can the UNAIDS 90-90-90 target be achieved? A systematic analysis of national HIV treatment cascades. *BMJ Glob. Heal.* **1**, e000010 (2016).
4. Hargreaves, J. R. *et al.* The HIV prevention cascade: integrating theories of epidemiological, behavioural, and social science into programme design and monitoring. *Lancet HIV* **3**, e318–e322 (2016).
5. Garnett, G. P. *et al.* Providing a conceptual framework for HIV prevention cascades and assessing feasibility of empirical measurement with data from east Zimbabwe: a case study. *Lancet HIV* **3**, e297–e306 (2016).
6. Schaefer, R. *et al.* HIV prevention cascades: a unifying framework to replicate the successes of treatment cascades. *Lancet HIV* **6**, e60–e66 (2019).
7. Horn, T. *et al.* Towards an integrated primary and secondary HIV prevention continuum for the United States: a cyclical process model. *J. Int. AIDS Soc.* **19**, 21263 (2016).
8. Fearon, E. *et al.* Estimating the Population Size of Female Sex Workers in Zimbabwe: Comparison of Estimates Obtained Using Different Methods in Twenty Sites and Development of a National-Level Estimate. *J. Acquir. Immune Defic. Syndr.* **85**, 30–38 (2020).
9. Liu, A. *et al.* The Spectrum of Engagement in HIV Prevention: Proposal for a PrEP cascade. in *7th International Conference on HIV Treatment and Prevention Adherence* (2012).
10. Nunn, A. S. *et al.* Defining the HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis care continuum. *AIDS* **31**, 731–734 (2017).
11. Wilton, J. *et al.* Use of an HIV-risk screening tool to identify optimal candidates for PrEP scale-up among men who have sex with men in Toronto, Canada: disconnect between objective and subjective HIV risk. *J. Int. AIDS Soc.* **19**, 20777 (2016).
12. Hargreaves, J. R. *et al.* The HIV prevention cascade: integrating theories of epidemiological, behavioural, and social science into programme design and monitoring. *Lancet HIV* **3**, e318–e322 (2016).
13. Moorhouse, L. *et al.* Application of the HIV prevention cascade to identify, develop and evaluate interventions to improve use of prevention methods: Examples from a study in east Zimbabwe. *J. Int. AIDS Soc.* **22**, e25309 (2019).
14. Manicaland Centre for Public Health Research. *HIV Prevention Cascades Stakeholder Consultation Meeting and Workshop Report on a consultation and workshop organised by the Manicaland Centre for Public Health Research\* Biomedical Research and Training Institute Imperial College London \* In association.* (2017).
15. Hill, L. M. *et al.* HIV risk, risk perception, and PrEP interest among adolescent girls and young women in Lilongwe, Malawi: operationalizing the PrEP cascade. *J. Int. AIDS Soc.* **23**, e25502 (2020).
16. UNAIDS. Creating HIV prevention cascades Operational guidance on a tool for monitoring programmes Contents. *UNAIDS* (2021).
17. Auerbach, J. D., Gerritsen, A. A. M., Dallabetta, G., Morrison, M. & Garnett, G. P. A tale of two cascades: promoting a standardized tool for monitoring progress in HIV prevention. *J. Int.*

- AIDS Soc.* **23**, e25498 (2020).
18. Hargreaves, J. R., Auerbach, J. D., Hensen, B., Johnson, S. & Gregson, S. Strengthening primary HIV prevention: better use of data to improve programmes, develop strategies and evaluate progress. *J. Int. AIDS Soc.* **23**, e25538 (2020).
  19. Weiner, R. *et al.* Using a cascade approach to assess condom uptake in female sex workers in India: A review of the Avahan data. *BMC Public Health* **18**, 897 (2018).
  20. Dumchev, K. *et al.* Operationalizing the HIV prevention cascade for PWID using the integrated bio-behavioural survey data from Ukraine. *J. Int. AIDS Soc.* **23**, e25509 (2020).
  21. Chabata, S. T. *et al.* Condom use among young women who sell sex in Zimbabwe: a prevention cascade analysis to identify gaps in HIV prevention programming. *J. Int. AIDS Soc.* **23**, e25512 (2020).
  22. Fearon, E. *et al.* How can programmes better support female sex workers to avoid HIV infection in Zimbabwe? A prevention cascade analysis. *JAIDS J. Acquir. Immune Defic. Syndr. Publ. Ahead Print* (2019).
  23. Moorhouse, L. The need for and use of primary HIV prevention in Manicaland, east Zimbabwe. (Imperial College London, 2023). doi:<https://doi.org/10.25560/105868>
  24. Schaefer, R. M. HIV prevention cascades to improve programmes and interventions. (Imperial College London, 2020). doi:10.25560/81088
  25. Rao, A. *et al.* Status of the HIV epidemic in Manicaland, east Zimbabwe prior to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLoS One* **17**, e0273776 (2022).
  26. The Manicaland Centre for Public Health. MANICALAND HIV/STD PREVENTION STUDY: ROUND 7 INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRE. (2018). Available at: [http://www.manicalandhivproject.org/uploads/4/7/1/9/4719905/r7\\_ivq\\_final.pdf](http://www.manicalandhivproject.org/uploads/4/7/1/9/4719905/r7_ivq_final.pdf). (Accessed: 27th April 2024)
  27. Thomas, R. *et al.* Improving risk perception and uptake of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) through interactive feedback-based counselling with and without community engagement in young women in Manicaland, East Zimbabwe: Study protocol for a pilot randomized trial. *Trials* **20**, 668 (2019).
  28. Anderson, P. L. *et al.* Intracellular Tenofovir-Diphosphate and Emtricitabine-Triphosphate in Dried Blood Spots following Directly Observed Therapy. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **62**, (2017).
  29. Hargreaves, J. R. *et al.* The HIV prevention cascade: integrating theories of epidemiological, behavioural, and social science into programme design and monitoring. *Lancet HIV* **3**, e318–e322 (2016).
  30. Skovdal, M. *et al.* How gender norms and ‘good girl’ notions prevent adolescent girls and young women from engaging with PrEP: qualitative insights from Zimbabwe. *BMC Womens. Health* **22**, 1–10 (2022).
  31. Moore, J. L. Masculinities, biographical time and HIV prevention: A qualitative analysis of how men 40+ in Zimbabwe perceive and understand HIV prevention methods. **118151**, (University of Copenhagen, 2021).
  32. Skovdal, M. *et al.* How gender norms and ‘good girl’ notions prevent adolescent girls and young women from engaging with PrEP: qualitative insights from Zimbabwe. *BMC Womens. Health* **22**, (2022).
  33. Pinkerton, S. D. & Abramson, P. R. Effectiveness of condoms in preventing HIV transmission. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **44**, 1303–1312 (1997).

34. UNAIDS: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. *Condoms: The prevention of HIV, other sexually transmitted infections and unintended pregnancies*. (2016).
35. Auvert, B. *et al.* Randomized, Controlled Intervention Trial of Male Circumcision for Reduction of HIV Infection Risk: The ANRS 1265 Trial Methods and Findings. **2**, e298 (2005).
36. Gray, R. H. *et al.* *Male circumcision for HIV prevention in men in Rakai, Uganda: a randomised trial*. *www.thelancet.com* **369**, (2007).
37. Bailey, R. C. *et al.* *Male circumcision for HIV prevention in young men in Kisumu, Kenya: a randomised controlled trial*. *www.thelancet.com* **369**, (2007).
38. Zimbabwe Ministry of Health and Child Care (MOHCC). *Zimbabwe country report: voluntary medical male circumcision (VMMC) bottleneck assessment*. (2013).
39. Grant, R. M. *et al.* Preexposure chemoprophylaxis for HIV prevention in men who have sex with men. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **363**, 2587–2599 (2010).
40. Baeten, J. M. *et al.* Antiretroviral prophylaxis for HIV prevention in heterosexual men and women. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **367**, 399–410 (2012).
41. Choopanya, K. *et al.* Antiretroviral prophylaxis for HIV infection in injecting drug users in Bangkok, Thailand (the Bangkok Tenofovir Study): A randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet* **381**, 2083–2090 (2013).
42. Donnell, D. *et al.* HIV protective efficacy and correlates of tenofovir blood concentrations in a clinical trial of PrEP for HIV prevention. *J. Acquir. Immune Defic. Syndr.* **66**, 340–348 (2014).
43. Zimbabwe Ministry of Health and Child Care (MOHCC). Implementation Plan for HIV Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis In Zimbabwe 2018-2020. *Zimbabwe Minist. Heal. Child Care* 1–60 (2018).
44. Hensen, B. *et al.* Application of an HIV Prevention Cascade to Identify Gaps in Increasing Coverage of Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision Services in 42 Rural Zambian Communities. *AIDS Behav.* 2019 235 **23**, 1095–1103 (2019).
45. World Health Organisation. *Consolidated guidelines on person-centred HIV strategic information: strengthening routine data for impact*. (2022).
46. Pickles M *et al.* Modelling how strengthening HIV prevention cascade could impact the HIV epidemic in Manicaland, Zimbabwe. in *AIDS 2022: The 24th International AIDS Conference* (2022).
47. UNAIDS. *HIV PREVENTION 2025 ROAD MAP*. (2022).
48. UNAIDS. *2025 AIDS TARGETS*. (2022).
49. Bailey, R. C. *et al.* Male circumcision for HIV prevention in young men in Kisumu, Kenya: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* **369**, 643–656 (2007).

**Figure 1 - HIV prevention cascades for PrEP and male condom use in females in the priority population**



**Figure 2 - HIV prevention cascades for PrEP and male condom use in females in the priority population**





Figure 3 – HIV prevention cascades for HIV combination prevention: use of VMMC or male condoms in males and PrEP or male condoms in females





**Figure 4 - Tenofovir and emtricitabine concentrations from DBS testing in females aged 15-24 years reporting current or recent PrEP use**




Figure 5 - Venn diagrams of overlaps between each bar of the cascade and reporting at least one barrier to that bar for male condom use in males and females






Figure 6 - Venn diagrams of overlaps between each bar of the cascade and reporting at least one barrier to that bar for VMMC in males and PrEP use in females



**Figure 7 - HIV prevention cascade with the order of Access, Motivation and Use, for PrEP and male condom use in females**



**Figure 8 - HIV prevention cascade with the order of Access, Motivation and Use, for VMMC and male condom use in males**






Figure 91 - Associations of explanatory barriers with male condom use in females and male condom use and VMMC in males, adjusted for 5-year age group and site type



\*Odds ratios for the association between these variables and VMMC could not be calculated due to nobody reporting to have had VMMC reporting any of these barriers.



**Figure 10 - Final proposed formulation of the HIV Prevention Cascade, populated with data on male condom use in men**



**Table 1 - Hypotheses tested within each objective of the validation process and the output evaluated within each objective**

	<b>Objective</b>	<b>Hypothesis</b>	<b>Output for evaluation</b>
1	Test feasibility of populating the HIV Prevention Cascade draft formulation with questions in the prevention questionnaire tool collected as part of the Manicaland pilot survey	It is possible to populate the HPC framework with questions developed as part of the questionnaire module of the Manicaland HPC survey	Individual and combination cascades including measurements of the main and sub bars
2	Test that each of the main bars within the steps of the cascade frameworks are predictors of effective use of HIV prevention methods	Motivation is associated with effective use of HIV prevention methods Access is associated with effective use of HIV prevention methods	Logistic regression measuring association between an exposure of being motivated or not and separate outcomes of male condom use, PrEP use and VMMC Logistic regression measuring association between an exposure of having access or not and separate outcomes of male condom use, PrEP use and VMMC
3	Contrast ways of measuring each of the main bars of the cascade defined in the Manicaland HIV Prevention Cascade pilot survey questionnaire module	There is no difference in the populations captured within each bar of the cascade when using the simplest measures included as part of the Manicaland HPC pilot survey questionnaire module	HPCs of simple measure vs Likert scale cut off Test of difference in proportions of population in each main bar of HPC with simple vs alternate definitions Compare self-reported use of prevention with alternative measures: condom use at last sex vs all sex and intention at next sex, PrEP adherence measures, clinic confirmed VMMC
4	Compare populations captured within each main bar of the HPC draft formulation when the order of the motivation and access bars are swapped	There is no difference in the drop offs of the cascade when the access bar is swapped with the motivation bar	HPC figures with alternate order for each prevention method Test of difference in proportions of population lost in each step of the HPC with each order (motivation>access>use/access>motivation>use)
5	Test the validity of the sub-bars to explain why individuals are lost from the HPC and are not effectively using HIV prevention methods	The explanatory factors are associated with a lack of effective use of HIV prevention methods The explanatory factors are associated with the corresponding main bar The sub-bars additively explain the gaps in the cascade and are sufficient to explain reasons for lack of use of different HIV prevention methods	Regression of explanatory factors with each of male condom use, PrEP use and VMMC Regression of explanatory factors with each main bar e.g. motivation sub bars with motivation % of each gap explained by sub-bars & comparison with explanatory factors for lack of prevention method use identified from qualitative aspects of the study
6	Propose a final validated version of the HPC framework		Final formulation of HPC framework
7	Propose a minimum questionnaire module to populate the main bars and explanatory sub-bars of the HPC framework & compare the questionnaire module to the questions available in routinely collected questionnaire modules		Minimum questionnaire module with comparison to similar questions available from routinely collected data □

**Table 2 - Associations between motivation and access with prevention method use, adjusted for site type and 5-year age group**

	Motivation		Access	
	n (%)	OR (95% CI)	n (%)	OR (95% CI)
PrEP (Female)	44 (9.9)	<i>collinear</i>	4 (0.9)	<i>collinear</i>
VMMC (Male)	252 (43.8)	0.06 (0.02-0.15)	228 (39.7)	0.09 (0.03-0.22)
Male condoms (Female)	280 (63.0)	26.83 (11.73-61.35)	183 (41.2)	17.90 (8.91-35.97)
Male condoms (Male)	428 (74.4)	8.36 (5.58-12.53)	391 (68.0)	8.33 (5.57-12.44)

**Table 3 - Comparison proportions of motivation, access, and use of prevention methods with simple vs alternative measures and p-values for differences in proportions using 2-sample test of proportions**

	Motivation		
	Simple measure	Alternative measure	p-value
	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	
Male condoms - female	61.5 (56.9-65.9)	58.8 (54.1-63.3)	0.411
Male condoms - male	63.5 (59.5-67.3)	62.3 (58.2-66.1)	0.669
VMMC - male	51.7 (47.6 - 55.7)	51.0 (46.9 - 55.0)	0.813
PrEP - female	9.9 (6.9-12.3)	9.9 (7.5 - 13.1)	0.999
	Access		
Male condoms - female	59.5 (54.8-63.9)	57.2 (52.5-61.7)	0.634
Male condoms - male	62.8 (58.7-66.6)	62.3 (58.2-66.1)	0.999
VMMC - male	27.8 (24.3-31.6)	24.3 (21.0-28.0)	0.179
PrEP - female	7.6 (5.1-10.0)	6.8 (4.8-9.5)	0.999
	Use		
Male condoms - female	31.8 (27.6-36.2)	5.6 (3.8-8.2)	<0.001
Male condoms at last sex* - female	31.8 (27.6-36.2)	34.2 (30.0-38.8)	0.432
Male condoms - male	60.2 (56.1-64.1)	15.8 (13.1-19.0)	<0.001
Male condoms at last sex* - male	60.2 (56.1-64.1)	43.0 (39.0-47.0)	<0.001
VMMC - male	18.8 (15.8-22.2)	n/a	n/a
PrEP - female	0.7 (0.2-2.1)	0.7 (0.2-2.1)	0.999

*\*Reported to have used male condoms throughout last sexual intercourse as measure of use of condoms*

