Evolving landscape of economic evaluations of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis and pre-exposure prophylaxis implementation strategies: A systematic review

Min Xi[1,2,3], Darrell H. S. Tan[4,5,6,7,8], Stefan D. Baral[9], Howsikan Kugathasan[5], Lisa Masucci[1,4,10], Becky Skidmore[11], Derek R. MacFadden[1], Kednapa Thavorn*[1,12,13], Sharmistha Mishra[§]*[2,4,5,6,7,8,12]

[1]Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, The Ottawa Hospital, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

[2]Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[3]Toronto General Hospital Research Institute, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[4]Institute of Health Policy, Management, and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[5]MAP Centre for Urban Health Solutions, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St Michael's Hospital, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[6]Division of Infectious Diseases, St Michael's Hospital, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[7]Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[8]Institute of Medical Science, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[9]Department of Epidemiology, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, United States

[10]Toronto Health Economics and Technology Assessment Collaborative, Toronto General Hospital Research Institute, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[11]Skidmore Research & Information Consulting Inc., Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

[12]ICES, Ontario, Canada

[13]School of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

*co-senior authors

[§]corresponding author

Corresponding author:

Sharmistha Mishra

Tel: +1 416-864-5568
Email: sharmistha.mishra@utoronto.ca

Number of Tables: 0

Number of Figures: 4

Number of Appendices: 3

Number of Words: 4928

Email addresses of all authors:

MX: min.xi@mail.utoronto.ca ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8398-7239

DHST: darrell.tan@gmail.com ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3069-2875

SDB: sbaral@jhu.edu ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5482-2419

HK: howsikan@hotmail.com

LM: lmasucci@ohri.ca

BS: becky.skidmore.rls@gmail.com ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8293-9238

DM: dmacfadden@toh.ca

KT: kthavorn@ohri.ca ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4738-8447

SM: sharmistha.mishra@utoronto.ca ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8492-5470

Key words: HIV, Pre-exposure prophylaxis, Cost-benefit analysis, Cost-effectiveness analysis, Mathematical model, HIV epidemic

Abstract

Introduction: Economic evaluations of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) and associated implementation strategies guide evidence-based policies, programmes, and resource allocation. Since 2015, there has been an evolution in PrEP modalities, implementation strategies, and prioritization of key populations with unmet HIV prevention needs, alongside the scale-up of other HIV prevention interventions. Our systematic review describes the evolving landscape of economic evaluations of PrEP to help identify evidence gaps relevant to the current HIV epidemic and response (PROSPERO: CRD42016038440).

Methods: We searched five databases, without language restrictions, for peer-reviewed economic evaluations from inception to December 21, 2024. We describe the evolution of study characteristics over time, including perspective of analysis, region, population, PrEP modality/implementation strategy, and comparators.

Results: Of 5,046 studies identified, 114 met inclusion criteria, of which 81 examined HIV epidemics in 2015 or later and 16 adopted a societal perspective. HIV epidemics studied primarily spanned countries in Sub-Saharan Africa (N=45) and in North America (N=32). Modeled populations for receipt of PrEP primarily comprised: gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (N=66), female sex workers (N=23), serodifferent partnerships (N=16), and persons who inject drugs (N=12). Most evaluated oral, daily PrEP (N=70), followed by on-demand PrEP (N=12), long-acting injectable PrEP (N=12), and others (e.g., vaginal ring, topical gel; N=7). Ten studies compared different PrEP modalities with each other. Three studies evaluated different implementation strategies to increase PrEP uptake, adherence, and persistence. Of the 108 studies that compared PrEP to a combination of other HIV prevention interventions, only 25 scaled up at least part of the comparator over time.

Discussion: To support decision-making, future economic evaluations should consider costs and benefits beyond the health system and consider comparators that better reflect the current HIV response across regions and populations. The increasing availability of novel PrEP modalities allows future studies to evaluate a mix of PrEP modalities and person-centered implementation strategies.

Conclusions: The growing number of PrEP economic evaluations have not kept pace with emerging PrEP modalities or the current HIV epidemic/response, resulting in challenges in making evidence-based policies, programmes, and resource allocation.

Introduction

The last decade has seen an expansion in the adoption and roll-out of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP), consisting of emtricitabine and either tenofovir disoproxil fumarate or tenofovir alafenamide, for HIV prevention. Oral PrEP was first authorized for use in the United States in 2012 [1]. There has also been an expansion in PrEP modalities (daily or "on-demand" oral [2]; long-acting injectable and topical formulations [3]), and implementation strategies (e.g., mobile phone applications [4] or online modules [5] with information on PrEP or peer support for PrEP initiation and persistence). By 2015, PrEP became a key component of combination HIV prevention globally when the World Health Organization recommended oral PrEP for individuals at "substantial risk" of acquiring HIV (annual HIV risk greater than 3%) [6]. By 2021, 144 countries recommended oral PrEP within their national HIV prevention guidelines, with 14 more planning to adopt PrEP into their guidelines within the next two years [7].

PrEP implementation strategies have been a central focus for HIV programmes in the last decade [8, 9] because, despite the inclusion of PrEP in national guidelines, coverage remains low in many countries [10]. PrEP use in 2020 was at 8% of the 2025 global target set by UNAIDS [11]. While individual-level efficacy in preventing HIV acquisition is high (upwards of 99% [12]), real-world individual-level or partnership-level effectiveness has been lower [13–16] partly due to challenges with adherence and persistence [17, 18]. Although mathematical modelling studies suggest large potential for reducing sexual transmission of HIV at the population-level, such outcomes depend on PrEP reaching individuals with the most unmet prevention needs who are part of sexual networks with high rates of HIV transmission [19–21].

Economic evaluations of PrEP and PrEP implementation strategies are valuable for informing policy decisions, optimizing resource allocation, and guiding the adoption of different

implementation strategies [22]. To date, there have been 12 reviews of economic evaluations of PrEP [23–34], but they were largely restricted with respect to geography and/or populations. Two reviews synthesized evidence from a single country (United States) [23, 24], three were restricted to a subset of countries (high-income, early PrEP adopting countries) [32, 34] or to one region (Sub-Saharan Africa) [33], and two focused on specific populations (gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men; persons who inject drugs) [23, 24]. These earlier reviews were also restricted to economic evaluations conducted prior to the recent expansions in PrEP roll-out and expansions in PrEP modalities and implementation strategies [23–30].

The evolution of PrEP roll-out over the last decade signals a need to characterize how economic evaluations may have evolved (e.g., the examination of different PrEP modalities and implementation strategies) to keep pace with implementation-relevant questions for decision-makers and communities most affected by HIV [9]. The most recent systematic review, which included economic evaluations conducted between 2010 and 2020, was not designed to describe the evolution of comparators used in PrEP economic evaluations over time and whether these comparators reflected the evolving HIV epidemic response [31] (e.g., implementation and scale-up of concurrent HIV prevention tools, strategies, and guideline [35–37]). For example, comparison of PrEP to steady levels of other modes of primary and secondary HIV prevention at a population level may be less applicable for decision-making in recent years, especially given acceleration in sustained viral suppression as secondary HIV prevention [38]. The scale-up of combination HIV prevention interventions has led to large reductions in HIV incidence globally, including in countries with some of the highest burden of HIV, and incidence reductions in populations at highest risk of HIV acquisition (including gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men, cisgender female sex workers and other women engaged in sex work, transgender

women, persons who inject drugs) [39]. Therefore, the questions being asked by decision-makers involve comparing and choosing between different PrEP modalities and implementation strategies [40]. In doing so, decision-makers seek strategies to improve each step of the PrEP cascade [40] (including persistence [18]) and determine where and among whom new HIV infections continue to be acquired despite local efforts in scaling up combination HIV prevention [39].

In this study, we sought to: 1) describe the evolving landscape of economic evaluations of PrEP and its implementation strategies over time and across epidemic contexts (population focus, country/region) and 2) highlight gaps in the literature. Our goal was to provide guidance for future economic evaluations (e.g., which PrEP interventions/implementation strategies to evaluate and which comparators, HIV epidemic context, and perspective should be used during analyses) to better support decision-making in the evolving landscape of PrEP implementation.

Methods

Our systematic review followed the Preferred Reporting items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Appendix A) [41]. Our full review protocol was peer-reviewed and published [42] and registered in PROSPERO (registration number CRD42016038440). Our full review protocol objectives included: 1) estimating the incremental cost per health outcome of PrEP or PrEP implementation strategies compared to placebo, status quo, or other HIV prevention strategies, 2) assessing the variability in and quality of economic evaluations of PrEP or PrEP implementation strategies, and 3) identifying potential sources of heterogeneity in the cost-effectiveness of PrEP or PrEP implementation strategies. In this first paper, we described the trends and characteristics of PrEP economic evaluations over time and across epidemic contexts, with a focus on relevance to evolving decision-making needs in the

current stage of the global HIV epidemic - specifically, regarding PrEP modalities, implementation strategies, comparators [39].

Search Strategy and Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

An information specialist (BS) developed the strategy in consultation with the review team. The strategies were executed in Ovid MEDLINE® ALL, Embase Classic+Embase (Ovid), and the NHS Economic Evaluation Database (Wiley). An initial search was conducted on August 30, 2019, updated to December 23, 2021, and updated again to December 21, 2024. The NHS Economic Evaluation Database was not included in the updated search as it was no longer being updated and was removed from the Cochrane Library. The search included a combination of controlled vocabulary (e.g., “HIV Infections/pc [Prevention & Control]”, “Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis”, “Models, Economic”) and free-text terms (e.g., “HIV prevention”, “PrEP”, “economic evaluation”). There were no language or date restrictions but, where possible, animal-only records and conference abstracts were removed from the results. The full search strategy is available in Appendix B. We (MX) also conducted a bibliographic hand search of relevant reviews to identify studies that may have been missed by the electronic database searches.

We included full economic evaluations (i.e., cost-minimization analyses, cost-benefit analyses, cost-effectiveness analyses, or cost-utility analyses) that compared both costs and outcomes of PrEP or of a PrEP implementation strategy [43]. Studies could compare PrEP as an intervention to placebo, to other HIV prevention interventions (e.g., ART, condoms, HIV testing, HIV counselling, male circumcision), or to other PrEP modalities; and/or compare different PrEP implementation strategies to each other. We excluded editorials, conference abstracts, and review articles. We excluded studies evaluating emtricitabine and either tenofovir disoproxil fumarate or

tenofovir alafenamide for post-exposure prophylaxis rather than PrEP. We excluded economic evaluations focussed solely on the prevention of parent-to-child transmission of HIV.

Following duplicate removal, titles and abstracts were screened independently by two reviewers (two of either MX, KT, SM) for inclusion/exclusion using Covidence (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia). For included titles/abstracts and in cases where the title and abstract were deemed insufficient for an exclusion decision, two reviewers (two of either MX, HK, KT, SM) independently conducted full text screening against the inclusion/exclusion criteria. Discrepancies during title and abstract and full text screening were resolved by consensus.

Data extraction

Data from the included publications were extracted by one reviewer (MX, LM, HK, or NM) and verified by a second reviewer (MX, LM, HK, NM, or OD). For study purposes, we categorized the extracted variables as follows: (1) epidemic context; (2) perspective of analyses; (3) intervention, and (4) comparator (Appendix C).

Epidemic context pertained to the underlying epidemic and population under study, with variables including country and population who received PrEP and populations included in the outcome measures. Variables related to the underlying epidemic included: country and World Bank region[44], publication year and model time-horizon, HIV epidemic period modelled, and calendar time-period of PrEP use. Populations included population focus, such as gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men, persons who inject drugs, female sex workers, male sex workers, HIV-serodifferent partners, adolescent girls and young women; and the wider population (e.g., total adult population).

For the perspective of analyses, we extracted data on whether evaluations were conducted using a health system, societal perspective, and/or other perspective. Intervention variables included: concurrent interventions (e.g., concomitant ART, condoms, etc.); PrEP modality (oral [daily or on-demand], continuous, long-acting, vaginal ring, topical gel]); PrEP implementation strategies (e.g., PrEP provider strategy, strategies to increase PrEP coverage and/or to improve adherence to PrEP).

For comparator-related variables, we extracted the comparator type (e.g., ART alone; ART with other HIV prevention interventions excluding PrEP; other prevention interventions without ART). If PrEP modality or implementation strategies were evaluated, then comparators could also include: alternate PrEP modalities with or without ART and/or other prevention interventions; alternate PrEP implementation strategies with or without ART and/or other prevention interventions. If comparators did not fall into the above categories, we classified them as “other” and provided details in the extraction form. Finally, we extracted data on whether any of the interventions included in the comparator was scaled up during the period of comparative analyses (e.g., increased coverage ART).

Data Synthesis

We conducted a narrative synthesis of economic evaluations and summarized the results in tabular and graphical formats (performed in R version 4.2.0 [45]). We described the following characteristics of the included studies: epidemic context, perspective of analysis, PrEP modality or implementation strategy, and comparator(s). We examined whether comparators used in analyses included the use and scale up of various modes of primary and secondary population-level HIV prevention interventions [35, 36, 38]. Specifically, we quantified the number of

studies that included ART or other HIV prevention interventions in the comparator and whether models accounted for the increased uptake/coverage of at least one of these HIV prevention interventions over time. For studies that compared one PrEP modality or implementation strategy to another, we described the PrEP modality, HIV prevention interventions, and/or PrEP implementation strategies included in the comparator. Results were stratified by year of publication to show the evolution of the landscape of PrEP and PrEP implementation economic evaluation studies over time. We also quantified the number of studies published in 2015 or later, following World Health Organization endorsement of PrEP [6].

Results

Study selection

Figure 1 describes the study inclusion process. Our search identified 5,046 unique records. Following title and abstract screening, 295 studies were retrieved for full text screening. 114 studies met the inclusion criteria and were included in our review.

Timeline in number of economic evaluations by key events

We identified an increasing trend in the number of economic evaluations that assessed the cost-effectiveness of PrEP in recent years. Six studies (5%) [46–51] were published between 2008 and 2011 prior to US FDA approval of PrEP [1], 15 studies (13%) [52–66] were published between 2012 and 2014 following US FDA approval of PrEP [1], 20 studies (18%) [67–86] were published between 2015 and 2016 following WHO endorsement of PrEP [6], and 73 studies (64%) [4, 87–158] were published between 2017 and 2024 following the availability of generic PrEP [159, 160].

Eighty-one studies (71%) [4, 49, 50, 53–63, 67, 68, 71–73, 75, 78–81, 84, 85, 88–92, 94, 98, 102–113, 117–124, 128–144, 146, 147, 149–155, 157, 158] simulated HIV epidemics that

included a time-period in 2015 or later, with 59 studies [50, 53, 60, 62, 63, 71, 72, 75, 78–81, 84, 85, 88–90, 92, 94, 98, 102, 106, 109–113, 118–123, 128, 129, 131–133, 135–144, 146, 147, 149–155, 157, 158] simulating epidemics and outcomes in 2030 or later (up to 2103 [136]). One study simulated an HIV epidemic prior to 2015 [47]. The remaining 32 (28%) studies did not report the year(s) of HIV epidemic captured in the model [46, 48, 51, 52, 64–66, 69, 70, 74, 76, 77, 82, 83, 86, 87, 93, 95–97, 99–101, 114–116, 125–127, 145, 148, 156].

Distribution of PrEP economic evaluations by perspective of analysis and year of publication

Ninety-four of the 114 (82%) included studies conducted analyses from a health system perspective [4, 47, 49–51, 54–63, 66–69, 71, 73–83, 86–88, 90–92, 94–100, 102–107, 109–112, 114, 116–126, 128–130, 132–141, 143–150, 152–158]. These studies captured healthcare costs and associated health outcomes within the context of the health system (e.g., costs covered by a public healthcare payer). From 2013 to 2024 (i.e., following the first authorized use of PrEP by the US FDA), 71% to 100% of PrEP cost-effectiveness studies each year were conducted from a health system perspective (Figure 2).

Less than a fifth of included studies conducted analyses from a societal perspective (n=16, n=14%) and examined the full range of costs and outcomes associated with PrEP use including productivity costs [48, 52, 53, 64, 65, 70, 72, 84, 85, 89, 101, 108, 115, 127, 131, 142]. Four studies did not report the perspective taken for analysis [46, 93, 113, 151].

Economic evaluation of PrEP by region, population who received PrEP, and populations included in outcome measures

Forty-five (39%) studies modeled HIV epidemics in countries across in Sub-Saharan Africa (Figure 3a) [49–52, 55–60, 62, 66–69, 71, 73–75, 77, 79–81, 84, 88, 90, 91, 100, 106, 110, 111, 117, 118, 123, 125, 129, 133, 137, 139, 141, 143, 146, 149, 150, 155]. Almost a third of the eighty-seven included studies modeled HIV epidemics in North America (n=32, 28%) [4, 47, 48, 53, 63, 64, 72, 76, 82, 83, 85–87, 89, 93, 96, 97, 102, 107, 116, 120–122, 126, 127, 132, 134, 135, 138, 145, 147, 153]. The remaining studies modeled HIV epidemics in Europe and Central Asia (n=14, 12%) [60, 65, 70, 78, 92, 94, 95, 101, 112, 124, 128, 130, 136, 142], East Asia and Pacific (n=17, 15%) [60, 61, 98, 103, 104, 108, 113, 114, 131, 140, 144, 151, 152, 154, 156–158], Latin America and Caribbean (n=5, 4%) [54, 60, 99, 105, 148], South Asia (n=4, 3%) [60, 109, 119, 151], and Middle East and North Africa (n=1, 1%) [115].

Except in the context of HIV epidemics across Sub-Saharan Africa, most studies modelled the receipt and use of PrEP among gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men across HIV epidemics across each of the World Bank regions: 27 (84%) in North America [4, 47, 48, 53, 63, 64, 72, 76, 82, 83, 85–87, 102, 107, 116, 120–122, 126, 132, 134, 135, 138, 145, 147, 153], 12 (86%) in Europe and Central Asia [60, 78, 92, 94, 95, 101, 112, 124, 128, 130, 136, 142], 14 (82%) in east Asia and Pacific [60, 61, 98, 103, 104, 108, 113, 114, 140, 144, 151, 156–158], four (80%) in Latin America and Caribbean [54, 60, 99, 148], four (100%) in South Asia [60, 109, 119], and one (100%) in Middle East and North Africa [115] (Figure 3b).

In contrast, nearly two-thirds (n=31, 69%) of the studies of HIV epidemics Sub-Saharan Africa countries examined PrEP use in the wider population, defined as the total adult male and/or female population in a region (Figure 3b) [49, 50, 52, 56, 58–60, 62, 66, 67, 74, 75, 77, 80, 81, 88, 90, 100, 106, 110, 111, 117, 118, 129, 137, 139, 141, 143, 146, 149, 155]. In studies modelling HIV epidemics across Sub-Saharan Africa, PrEP receipt and use was also assessed in

the following populations: female sex workers (n=21, 47%) [60, 75, 80, 81, 84, 90, 91, 100, 111, 117, 118, 123, 129, 133, 139, 141, 143, 146, 149, 150, 155], male sex workers (n=2, 4%) [91, 146], HIV-serodifferent partners (n=11, 22%) [51, 55, 57, 60, 68, 69, 71, 73, 84, 123, 143], adolescent girls and young women (n=13, 29%) [52, 74, 88, 90, 100, 111, 117, 123, 129, 139, 143, 146, 155], gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (n=9, 20%) [59, 60, 80, 81, 91, 118, 139, 141, 150], and persons who inject drugs (n=2, 4%) [60, 141].

Across the 114 included studies, particularly studies modelling World Bank regions other than Sub-Saharan Africa, few studies assessed the cost-effectiveness of PrEP among other key populations including HIV-serodifferent partners (n=14, 15%) [51, 55, 57, 60, 63, 68–71, 73, 84, 97, 123, 131, 143, 154], persons who inject drugs (n=12, 11%) [60, 63, 65, 89, 93, 96, 109, 119–121, 141, 147], female sex workers (n=23, 51%) [60, 75, 80, 81, 84, 90, 91, 100, 111, 117, 118, 123, 129, 133, 139, 141, 143, 146, 148–150, 155, 157], male sex workers (n=5, 4%) [54, 91, 116, 146, 148], and adolescent girls and young women (n=13, 11%) [52, 74, 88, 90, 100, 111, 117, 123, 129, 139, 143, 146, 155].

Overall, 94 studies (82%) [4, 46–63, 65–71, 73–86, 88–91, 94, 96–99, 102–124, 127, 129–133, 135, 136, 138–143, 145–147, 149, 150, 152, 153, 155] included transmission dynamics (i.e., indirect benefit to partners of people who received PrEP) and 20 (18%) [64, 72, 87, 92, 93, 95, 100, 101, 125, 126, 128, 134, 137, 144, 148, 151, 154, 156–158] did not.

Economic evaluations by PrEP modality

Most studies (n= 91, 80%) assessed oral PrEP, of which 70 (77%) assessed daily oral PrEP [4, 47, 49, 53, 54, 57, 58, 61–66, 68, 69, 74–79, 82, 85, 87, 89, 92, 97–101, 103, 104, 107–109, 111–115, 117, 118, 124, 126–133, 135, 136, 139–146, 149, 151–156, 158], 12 (13%)

assessed on-demand oral PrEP [72, 76, 78, 94, 95, 101, 113, 115, 130, 145, 151, 158], and 18 (20%) assessed oral PrEP without specifying daily oral or on-demand [48, 51, 52, 56, 80, 81, 86, 88, 91, 96, 102, 105, 116, 121, 123, 125, 137, 157]. Twelve (11%) of the 114 included studies evaluated long-acting injectable PrEP [74, 84, 100, 110, 125, 133, 135, 139, 145, 149, 155, 158]. Seven (6%) studies evaluated other PrEP modalities (e.g., vaginal ring, topical gel) [46, 50, 52, 59, 100, 106, 111]. Seventeen (15%) studies did not specify the PrEP modality (i.e., oral, injectable, vaginal ring, topical gel) evaluated [55, 60, 67, 70, 71, 73, 83, 90, 93, 119, 120, 122, 134, 138, 147, 148, 150].

Type of comparators used over time in economic evaluations of PrEP

Of the 108 studies that included at least one HIV prevention intervention in the comparator, the most common comparator was a combination of ART and other HIV prevention interventions excluding PrEP (n=71; 66%; Figure 4) [51–55, 57–70, 73–75, 78–82, 84–86, 88, 91, 93, 94, 96, 98, 99, 103, 105–107, 109, 110, 112–120, 123–125, 127, 129–132, 135, 137, 141–146, 148, 152, 156]. Sixteen studies (15%), published between 2008 and 2024, only included ART in the comparator (i.e. no other concomitant HIV prevention interventions) [47–49, 54, 71, 76, 77, 83, 90, 92, 97, 104, 128, 140, 150, 154]. Three (3%) studies published from 2017 to 2019 did not include ART but included other concomitant HIV prevention interventions (e.g., condoms, HIV testing, HIV monitoring, and/or male circumcision) in their comparator [87, 100, 108]. One of the studies simulated an HIV epidemic between 2009 and 2019 [108] while the other two studies did not report the time period of the HIV epidemics simulated [87, 100]. Studies (n=9, 8%) that included PrEP along with other HIV prevention interventions in the comparator were all published in 2017 or later [89, 102, 122, 133, 134, 136, 147, 157, 158].

Fifty-three of the 71 studies (75%) that compared PrEP to ART and other HIV prevention interventions excluding PrEP assumed that the coverage of the comparators remained stable over time [51–54, 57–59, 61–66, 69, 70, 74, 78, 79, 82, 85, 88, 93, 94, 96, 98, 99, 103, 105, 107, 109, 112–119, 125, 127, 129, 130, 132, 135, 141–146, 148, 152, 156]. Of the 108 studies that included at least one HIV prevention intervention in the comparator, 22 (20%) considered the scale-up (i.e., increased coverage and increased uptake) of ART [49, 55, 60, 67, 68, 73, 75, 80, 81, 84, 86, 91, 106, 110, 120, 122–124, 131, 137, 147, 149], and 17 studies (16%) considered increased coverage and/or uptake of other prevention interventions over time [55, 60, 67, 68, 75, 80, 81, 84, 86, 91, 106, 122, 123, 137, 147, 151, 155].

Economic evaluations comparing PrEP modalities and implementation strategies

Ten studies (9%) evaluated the cost-effectiveness of one PrEP modality versus another PrEP modality (Figure 4) including: 1) seven studies that compared long-acting injectable PrEP to daily or on-demand oral PrEP and other concomitant interventions (published between 2016 and 2024) [74, 111, 135, 139, 145, 149, 155]; 2) a study that compared dapivirine vaginal rings to daily oral PrEP with concomitant ART, condom use, and voluntary male circumcision (published in 2019) [111]; and 3) two studies that compared branded to generic daily oral PrEP without any concomitant interventions in the comparator (published in 2020) [126, 151].

Only three studies (3%), published between 2021 and 2024, examined the cost-effectiveness of different PrEP implementation strategies [4, 138, 153]. Three studies evaluated the cost-effectiveness of PrEP with and without PrEP engagement interventions (i.e., interventions to improve PrEP initiation, adherence, and persistence). PrEP initiation interventions assessed included: 1) a phone app with information about PrEP including

individualized risk assessments and PrEP provider locations [4]; and 2) a phone app that assessed PrEP eligibility among gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men, and allowed users to order HIV/STI tests and safe sex products [153]. PrEP adherence interventions assessed included: 1) counseling [4, 153]; 2) text message support [138]; 3) PrEP patient navigation via trained healthcare professionals and navigators; and 4) educational training and PrEP screening questionnaires to help physicians integrate PrEP consultation and referral into visits [138]. Two studies evaluated the use of mobile phone apps that sought to facilitate telemedicine visits with PrEP providers to improve PrEP persistence [4, 153].

Discussion

Our review identified 114 economic evaluations of PrEP, highlighting a rapidly growing number of studies over time. It highlights key areas for future work in assessing the cost-effectiveness of PrEP policy, programmes, and person-centered decisions. Almost three-quarters of published economic evaluations of PrEP examined HIV epidemics in 2015 or later, following WHO endorsement of PrEP and the increasing number of countries who have authorized the use of PrEP [7]. We identified a paucity of studies in the following areas: quantifying value for money from a broader societal perspective; capturing diverse epidemic context (geographic regions and populations); and evaluating different PrEP modalities and implementation strategies. Finally, a key gap across the current landscape of PrEP economic evaluations was the comparator: only 25 of the 114 studies included at least one HIV prevention intervention in the comparator and accounted for the concurrent scale-up of other HIV prevention interventions, reflecting current HIV prevention programmes.

Emerging PrEP modalities, particularly long-acting regimens, introduce costs (healthcare, transportation, accommodation, caregiving, productivity loss) and benefits (PrEP uptake and

adherence, prevention of HIV transmission) that differ from existing or no PrEP scenarios [139]. These differences underscore the need to expand the perspective of economic evaluations to include societal impacts, capturing both immediate and downstream health benefits and quality of life as well as broader societal gains such as improved productivity and the spillover effects of improved public health [161, 162]. Previous costing studies have shown that PrEP can enhance work productivity by reducing the risk of HIV transmission [161, 163, 164]. Economic evaluations that only consider health system perspectives may underestimate PrEP's value for money [165], potentially leading to suboptimal resource allocation decisions. As future economic analyses of PrEP modalities and/or PrEP implementation are developed, adopting a societal perspective would align more directly with the current era of an expansive choice in PrEP modalities, thereby supporting decision-making surrounding "person-centered" HIV prevention [166].

Our findings suggest important areas for future economic evaluations to keep pace with the evolving HIV response. Chief among them is the examination of different implementation strategies and PrEP modalities – particularly long-acting PrEP [167, 168]. Programmatic and policy decisions have shifted from the "technology" (i.e., whether PrEP should be offered), particularly among populations experiencing disproportionate risk, to implementation in an era of choice, with a focus on long-acting PrEP. Implementation includes focusing on how to reach those who would benefit at an individual-level or those who may be part of sexual and/or injecting networks so that PrEP use can reduce population-level HIV transmission as well as how to support user choices across regimens (building upon previous binary comparisons of oral PrEP vs. long-acting PrEP) [139]. Despite the expansion and availability of different PrEP modalities in the last decade and their inclusion in national guidelines [8, 9], PrEP coverage [10,

169], uptake [169], and adherence [170] remain programmatic challenges in many regions. In 2020, PrEP coverage was estimated at 8% of the estimated global need, and 28% of the estimated need in low- and middle-income countries [169]; with inequities in PrEP coverage by race, age, geography, and socioeconomic status [171]. As empirical data on the comparative reach and effectiveness of implementation strategies emerge, economic evaluations of implementation strategies delivering on choice can support the selection and scale-up of effective and efficient programmes. These include, but are not limited to, estimating the maximum pricing of PrEP and the pricing of programme/service delivery, for PrEP programmes to be considered good value for money by a country's health system [172].

Alongside expansion of PrEP modalities, is the integration of HIV prevention services and programmes within a broader mandate of universal health care and service provision, and evolving epidemic response and epidemic dynamics surrounding populations at highest risk of new HIV infections [173]. Across many priority populations, HIV prevention programmes are part of community-based programmes [174]. In many countries, particularly in the global south, population-focused HIV prevention programmes may be integrated within the larger health sector, such that PrEP implementation strategies may change (along with cost and effectiveness of such strategies) [175]. A key gap identified in our review is the use of more relevant comparators – particularly the concomitant scale-up of combination HIV prevention including HIV treatment [38], which could tip the balance on cost-effectiveness analyses in either direction. While our review found that a range of populations have been considered in PrEP economic evaluations, most focussed on a range of underlying HIV risks among gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men. Thus, there remain subsets of the population at disproportionate HIV risk among whom future work could be conducted to support decision-

making given heterogeneity in HIV risks and service delivery (programme implementation): including but not limited to individuals engaged in sex work (formal and informal); men who pay for sex (clients of sex workers); people who inject drug; adolescents and young women; transgender women; [176, 177]. Ensuring PrEP (across its modalities) is accessible to and reaches those who could benefit also means considering health equity as one of the population-level goals (in addition to reduction in population-level transmission). Such goals would benefit from integrating efforts at examining distributional cost-effectiveness and equity-informed economic evaluations [178]. Taken together, there remains an important opportunity for future economic evaluations to build on the prior literature, with a focus on likely programmatic shifts, current prevention gap, and comparators that mirror the current and potential trajectory (scale-up) of concomitant combination HIV prevention coverage over time.

Limitations

Our study had several limitations. First, our review was restricted to peer-reviewed publications and did not include gray literature, such as reports from health technology assessment agencies, which often inform health system decisions. As such, our study may not fully represent the breadth of economic evaluations conducted, potentially overlooking some data used in policy decision-making. Second, the lack of detailed reporting in some studies hindered our ability to extract all variables of interest, resulting in gaps in our synthesis. Although reporting guidelines for full economic evaluations exist and their adoption is increasing [179, 180], many studies included in our review predate these guidelines. Consequently, these studies often omitted several key elements necessary for assessing methodological quality. This deficiency raises concerns about the reliability of their findings. Future work, as proposed,

includes conducting a more detailed methodological review to assess the validity and reliability of included studies [42].

Conclusions

Economic evaluations of HIV PrEP have grown over time. There remain important areas for future economic evaluations to prioritize, including consideration of societal costs and benefits, the broader impacts of PrEP, choice across a growing expanse of PrEP modalities, comparison across PrEP implementation strategies, and the most relevant comparators as the HIV epidemic dynamics evolve. The global HIV response is at a critical juncture, with integration into the universal health care mandate, overall reduction in funding and resources, sustainability and acceleration to end HIV as a public health threat, and a re-centering of health equity given persistent disproportionate risks among populations experiencing social, economic and structural marginalization [173, 181]. Programmatic and policy decisions that use estimates of value for money will need economic evaluations that mirror the current state of HIV prevention implementation and HIV epidemic realities and those anticipated into the near future.

Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram of study selection.



Abbreviations: n=number of studies

Figure 2. Number of PrEP cost-effectiveness studies by perspective of the analysis and year of publication (N=114).



Abbreviations: N=number of studies; NR=not reported

Figure 3a. Geographic location of PrEP intervention and implementation strategy cost-effectiveness models (N=114).



Abbreviations: N=number of studies

Note: Six studies were conducted in the Sub-Saharan African region, but did not specify the countries assessed so they are not shown on the map.

Figure 3b. Number of studies by World Bank region and study population who received PrEP (N=114).



"Other" includes: those with early HIV detection; transgender women; partners of persons who inject drugs; White and Black adolescent sexual minority males; adolescents and young adults; clients of female sex workers; and female partners of miners.

Abbreviations: N=number of studies; NA=not applicable

Note: Some studies involved multiple populations so total number of studies adds up to greater than 114.

Figure 4. Types of comparators among included studies by applicability to real-world practice and year of study publication.



Legend: ● 2008 ● 2009 ● 2010 ● 2011 ● 2012 ● 2013 ● 2014 ● 2015 ● 2016 ● 2017 ● 2018 ● 2019 ● 2020 ● 2021 ○ 2022 ● 2023 ● 2024

[a] "other prevention interventions" may include condoms, HIV testing, HIV monitoring, male circumcision, etc.
[b] "other PrEP intervention strategies" included daily oral PrEP.
[c] "implementation studies" included studies that evaluated engagement strategies to increase PrEP uptake and/or retention (e.g., phone app with information regarding PrEP).
[d] Other includes three studies that compared the PrEP cost needed to avert one infection to the cost of one HIV infection.
Note: Some studies may have assessed more than one comparison.

Acknowledgments

We thank helpful discussions with Nasheed Moqueet (Unity Health Toronto), Anna Simkin (Unity Health Toronto), and Olivia D'Silva (Ottawa Hospital Research Institute). SM's research program is supported by a Tier 2 Canada Research Chair in Mathematical Modeling and Program Science (grant number 950-232643). DHST's research program is supported by a Tier 2 Canada Research Chair in HIV Prevention and STI Research. Stefan Baral's effort is supported by the Center for HIV and Mental Health Stigma Elimination Strategies (CHIMES), funded by the National Institutes of Mental Health (P30MH136919). SB's effort is supported by the Center for HIV and Mental Health Stigma Elimination Strategies (CHIMES), funded by the National Institutes of Mental Health (P30MH136919).

Funding: This study was funded by an Early Researcher Award (ER17-13-043), a Canadian Institutes for Health Research Foundations award (FDN-143266), and a Canadian Institutes for Health Research Project grant (416186).

Conflict of Interest: DHST's institution has received support from Gilead for investigator-initiated research and from Glaxo Smith Kline for participation in industry-sponsored clinical trials. No other authors have any conflicts of interest.

References

1. Tanner MR, Miele P, Carter W, Valentine SS, Dunville R, Kapogiannis BG, et al. Preexposure Prophylaxis for Prevention of HIV Acquisition Among Adolescents: Clinical Considerations, 2020. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2020;69:1–12.

2. Molina J-M, Ghosn J, Assoumou L, Delaugerre C, Algarte-Genin M, Pialoux G, et al. Daily and on-demand HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis with emtricitabine and tenofovir disoproxil (ANRS PREVENIR): a prospective observational cohort study. The Lancet HIV. 2022;9:e554–62.

3. Beymer MR, Holloway IW, Pulsipher C, Landovitz RJ. Current and Future PrEP Medications and Modalities: On-demand, Injectables, and Topicals. Curr HIV/AIDS Rep. 2019;16:349–58.

4. Jenness SM, Knowlton G, Smith DK, Marcus JL, Anderson EJ, Siegler AJ, et al. A decision analytics model to optimize investment in interventions targeting the HIV preexposure prophylaxis cascade of care. AIDS. 2021;35:1479–89.

5. Charest M, Sharma M, Chris A, Schnubb A, Knox DC, Wilton J, et al. Decentralizing PrEP delivery: Implementation and dissemination strategies to increase PrEP uptake among MSM in Toronto, Canada. PLoS ONE. 2021;16:e0248626.

6. Organization WH, others. Guideline on when to start antiretroviral therapy and on pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV. World Health Organization; 2015.

7. World Health Organization. Global State of PrEP. 2023.

8. Underhill K, Operario D, Mimiaga MJ, Skeer MR, Mayer KH. Implementation Science of Pre-exposure Prophylaxis: Preparing for Public Use. Curr HIV/AIDS Rep. 2010;7:210–9.

9. Sullivan PS, Siegler AJ. Getting pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) to the people: opportunities, challenges and emerging models of PrEP implementation. Sex Health. 2018;15:522.

10. Schaefer R, Schmidt H-MA, Ravasi G, Mozalevskis A, Rewari BB, Lule F, et al. Adoption of guidelines on and use of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis: a global summary and forecasting study. The Lancet HIV. 2021;8:e502–10.

11. UNAIDS. Pre-exposure prophylaxis use expands, but not fast enough. 2022.

12. Anderson PL, Glidden DV, Liu A, Buchbinder S, Lama JR, Guanira JV, et al. Emtricitabine-Tenofovir Concentrations and Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis Efficacy in Men Who Have Sex with Men. Sci Transl Med. 2012;4.

13. Abdool Karim Q, Abdool Karim SS, Frohlich JA, Grobler AC, Baxter C, Mansoor LE, et al. Effectiveness and Safety of Tenofovir Gel, an Antiretroviral Microbicide, for the Prevention of HIV Infection in Women. Science. 2010;329:1168–74.

14. Baeten JM, Donnell D, Ndase P, Mugo NR, Campbell JD, Wangisi J, et al. Antiretroviral Prophylaxis for HIV Prevention in Heterosexual Men and Women. N Engl J Med. 2012;367:399–410.

15. Grant RM, Lama JR, Anderson PL, McMahan V, Liu AY, Vargas L, et al. Preexposure Chemoprophylaxis for HIV Prevention in Men Who Have Sex with Men. N Engl J Med. 2010;363:2587–99.

16. Choopanya K, Martin M, Suntharasamai P, Sangkum U, Mock PA, Leethochawalit M, 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. The Lancet. 2013;381:2083–90.

17. Dimitrov DT, Mâsse BR, Donnell D. PrEP Adherence Patterns Strongly Affect Individual HIV Risk and Observed Efficacy in Randomized Clinical Trials. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2016;72:444–51.

18. Rao A, Mhlophe H, Comins C, Young K, Mcingana M, Lesko C, et al. Persistence on oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) among female sex workers in eThekwini, South Africa, 2016–2020. PLoS ONE. 2022;17:e0265434.

19. Hansson D, Strömdahl S, Leung KY, Britton T. Introducing pre-exposure prophylaxis to prevent HIV acquisition among men who have sex with men in Sweden: insights from a mathematical pair formation model. BMJ Open. 2020;10:e033852.

20. Kim SB, Yoon M, Ku NS, Kim MH, Song JE, Ahn JY, et al. Mathematical Modeling of HIV Prevention Measures Including Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis on HIV Incidence in South Korea. PLoS ONE. 2014;9:e90080.

21. Roberts DA, Bridenbecker D, Haberer JE, Barnabas RV, Akullian A. The impact of prevention□effective PrEP use on HIV incidence: a mathematical modelling study. J Int AIDS Soc. 2022;25:e26034.

22. World Health Organization. WHO implementation tool for pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) of HIV infection. 2017.

23. Schackman BR, Eggman AA. Cost–effectiveness of pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV: a review. Current Opinion in HIV and AIDS. 2012;7:587–92.

24. Campbell JD, Herbst JH, Koppenhaver RT, Smith DK. Antiretroviral Prophylaxis for Sexual and Injection Drug Use Acquisition of HIV. American Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2013;44:S63–9.

25. Cambiano V, Miners A, Phillips A. What do we know about the cost–effectiveness of HIV preexposure prophylaxis, and is it affordable?: Current Opinion in HIV and AIDS. 2016;11:56–66.

26. Hellinger FJ. Assessing the Cost Effectiveness of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis for HIV Prevention in the US. PharmacoEconomics. 2013;31:1091–104.

27. Jacobsen MM, Walensky RP. Modeling and Cost-Effectiveness in HIV Prevention. Curr HIV/AIDS Rep. 2016;13:64–75.

28. Keller SB, Smith DM. The price of tenofovir-emtricitabine undermines the cost-effectiveness and advancement of pre-exposure prophylaxis. AIDS. 2011;25:2308–10.

29. Walensky RP. Combination HIV Prevention: The Value and Interpretation of Mathematical Models. Curr HIV/AIDS Rep. 2013;10:195–8.

30. Yu W, Wang L, Han N, Zhang X, Mahapatra T, Mahapatra S, et al. Pre-exposure prophylaxis of HIV: A right way to go or a long way to go? Artificial Cells, Nanomedicine, and Biotechnology. 2016;44:201–8.

31. Bozzani FM, Terris-Prestholt F, Quaife M, Gafos M, Indravudh PP, Giddings R, et al. Costs and Cost-Effectiveness of Biomedical, Non-Surgical HIV Prevention Interventions: A Systematic Literature Review. PharmacoEconomics. 2023;41:467–80.

32. Hoornenborg E, Krakower DS, Prins M, Mayer KH. Pre-exposure prophylaxis for MSM and transgender persons in early adopting countries. AIDS. 2017;31:2179–91.

33. Sarkar S, Corso P, Ebrahim-Zadeh S, Kim P, Charania S, Wall K. Cost-effectiveness of HIV Prevention Interventions in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Systematic Review. EClinicalMedicine. 2019;10:10–31.

34. Brunner P, Brunner K, Kübler D. The Cost-Effectiveness of HIV/STI Prevention in High-Income Countries with Concentrated Epidemic Settings: A Scoping Review. AIDS Behav. 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-022-03583-y.

35. Olding M, Enns B, Panagiotoglou D, Shoveller J, Harrigan PR, Barrios R, et al. A historical review of HIV prevention and care initiatives in British Columbia, Canada: 1996□2015. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2017;20:21941.

36. De Cock KM, Jaffe HW, Curran JW. Reflections on 40 Years of AIDS. Emerg Infect Dis. 2021;27:1553–60.

37. Rotheram-Borus MJ, Swendeman D, Chovnick G. The Past, Present, and Future of HIV Prevention: Integrating Behavioral, Biomedical, and Structural Intervention Strategies for the Next Generation of HIV Prevention. Annu Rev Clin Psychol. 2009;5:143–67.

38. UNAIDS. Understanding fast track: Accelerating action to end the AIDS epidemic by 2030. 2015.

39. UNAIDS. The path that ends AIDS: 2023 UNAIDS global AIDS update. Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS; 2023.

40. CDC. HIV Pre-exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) Care System. 2023.

41. Higgins JPT, Cochrane Collaboration, editors. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. Second edition. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell; 2020.

42. Thavorn K, Kugathasan H, Tan DHS, Moqueet N, Baral SD, Skidmore B, et al. Economic evaluation of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis strategies: protocol for a methodological systematic review and quantitative synthesis. Syst Rev. 2018;7:47.

43. Turner HC, Archer RA, Downey LE, Isaranuwatchai W, Chalkidou K, Jit M, et al. An Introduction to the Main Types of Economic Evaluations Used for Informing Priority Setting and Resource Allocation in Healthcare: Key Features, Uses, and Limitations. Front Public Health. 2021;9:722927.

44. World Bank. Regions. 2022.

45. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2023.

46. Wilson DP, Coplan PM. Mathematical models and health economic aspects of microbicides: Current Opinion in HIV and AIDS. 2008;3:587–92.

47. Desai K, Sansom SL, Ackers ML, Stewart SR, Hall HI, Hu DJ, et al. Modeling the impact of HIV chemoprophylaxis strategies among men who have sex with men in the United States: HIV infections prevented and cost-effectiveness. AIDS. 2008;22:1829–39.

48. Paltiel AD, Freedberg KA, Scott CA, Schackman BR, Losina E, Wang B, et al. HIV Preexposure Prophylaxis in the United States: Impact on Lifetime Infection Risk, Clinical Outcomes, and Cost□Effectiveness. CLIN INFECT DIS. 2009;48:806–15.

49. Pretorius C, Stover J, Bollinger L, Bacaër N, Williams B. Evaluating the Cost-Effectiveness of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) and Its Impact on HIV-1 Transmission in South Africa. PLoS ONE. 2010;5:e13646.

50. Williams BG, Abdool Karim SS, Karim QA, Gouws E. Epidemiological Impact of Tenofovir Gel on the HIV Epidemic in South Africa. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2011;58:207–10.

51. Hallett TB, Baeten JM, Heffron R, Barnabas R, De Bruyn G, Cremin Í, et al. Optimal Uses of Antiretrovirals for Prevention in HIV-1 Serodiscordant Heterosexual Couples in South Africa: A Modelling Study. PLoS Med. 2011;8:e1001123.

52. Walensky RP, Park J-E, Wood R, Freedberg KA, Scott CA, Bekker L-G, et al. The Cost-effectiveness of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis for HIV Infection in South African Women. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2012;54:1504–13.

53. Juusola JL, Brandeau ML, Owens DK, Bendavid E. The Cost-Effectiveness of Preexposure Prophylaxis for HIV Prevention in the United States in Men Who Have Sex With Men. Ann Intern Med. 2012;156:541.

54. Gomez GB, Borquez A, Caceres CF, Segura ER, Grant RM, Garnett GP, et al. The Potential Impact of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis for HIV Prevention among Men Who Have Sex with Men and Transwomen in Lima, Peru: A Mathematical Modelling Study. PLoS Med. 2012;9:e1001323.

55. Cremin I, Alsallaq R, Dybul M, Piot P, Garnett G, Hallett TB. The new role of antiretrovirals in combination HIV prevention: a mathematical modelling analysis. AIDS. 2013;27:447–58.

56. Long EF, Stavert RR. Portfolios of Biomedical HIV Interventions in South Africa: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. J GEN INTERN MED. 2013;28:1294–301.

57. Nichols BE, Boucher CAB, Van Dijk JH, Thuma PE, Nouwen JL, Baltussen R, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) in Preventing HIV-1 Infections in Rural Zambia: A Modeling Study. PLoS ONE. 2013;8:e59549.

58. Verguet S, Stalcup M, Walsh JA. Where to deploy pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in sub-Saharan Africa? Sex Transm Infect. 2013;89:628–34.

59. Terris-Prestholt F, Foss AM, Cox AP, Heise L, Meyer-Rath G, Delany-Moretlwe S, et al. Cost-effectiveness of tenofovir gel in urban South Africa: model projections of HIV impact and threshold product prices. BMC Infect Dis. 2014;14:14.

60. Stover J, Hallett TB, Wu Z, Warren M, Gopalappa C, Pretorius C, et al. How Can We Get Close to Zero? The Potential Contribution of Biomedical Prevention and the Investment Framework towards an Effective Response to HIV. PLoS ONE. 2014;9:e111956.

61. Schneider K, Gray RT, Wilson DP. A Cost-effectiveness Analysis of HIV Preexposure Prophylaxis for Men Who Have Sex With Men in Australia. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2014;58:1027–34.

62. Nichols BE, Baltussen R, Van Dijk JH, Thuma PE, Nouwen JL, Boucher CAB, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of PrEP in HIV/AIDS Control in Zambia: A Stochastic League Approach. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2014;66:221–8.

63. Kessler J, Myers JE, Nucifora KA, Mensah N, Toohey C, Khademi A, et al. Evaluating the impact of prioritization of antiretroviral pre-exposure prophylaxis in New York. AIDS. 2014;28:2683–91.

64. Chen A, Dowdy DW. Clinical Effectiveness and Cost-Effectiveness of HIV Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis in Men Who Have Sex with Men: Risk Calculators for Real-World Decision-Making. PLoS ONE. 2014;9:e108742.

65. Alistar SS, Owens DK, Brandeau ML. Effectiveness and Cost Effectiveness of Oral Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis in a Portfolio of Prevention Programs for Injection Drug Users in Mixed HIV Epidemics. PLoS ONE. 2014;9:e86584.

66. Alistar SS, Grant PM, Bendavid E. Comparative effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of antiretroviral therapy and pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention in South Africa. BMC Med. 2014;12:46.

67. Cremin Í, Hallett TB. Estimating the range of potential epidemiological impact of pre-exposure prophylaxis: run-away success or run-away failure? AIDS. 2015;29:733–8.

68. Cremin I, Morales F, Jewell BL, O'Reilly KR, Hallett TB. Seasonal PrEP for partners of migrant miners in southern Mozambique: a highly focused PrEP intervention. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2015;18:19946.

69. Jewell BL, Cremin I, Pickles M, Celum C, Baeten JM, Delany-Moretlwe S, et al. Estimating the Cost-Effectiveness of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis to Reduce HIV-1 and HSV-2 Incidence in HIV-Serodiscordant Couples in South Africa. PLoS ONE. 2015;10:e0115511.

70. Mabileau G, Schwarzinger M, Flores J, Patrat C, Luton D, Epelboin S, et al. HIV-serodiscordant couples desiring a child: 'treatment as prevention,' preexposure prophylaxis, or medically assisted procreation? American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology. 2015;213:341.e1-341.e12.

71. Mitchell KM, Lépine A, Terris-Prestholt F, Torpey K, Khamofu H, Folayan MO, et al. Modelling the impact and cost-effectiveness of combination prevention amongst HIV serodiscordant couples in Nigeria. AIDS. 2015;29:2035–44.

72. Ouellet E, Durand M, Guertin JR, LeLorier J, Tremblay CL. Cost Effectiveness of 'On Demand' Hiv Pre□Exposure Prophylaxis for Non□Injection Drug□Using Men Who Have Sex with Men in Canada. Canadian Journal of Infectious Diseases and Medical Microbiology. 2015;26:23–9.

73. Ying R, Sharma M, Heffron R, Celum CL, Baeten JM, Katabira E, et al. Cost□effectiveness of pre□exposure prophylaxis targeted to high□risk serodiscordant couples as a bridge to sustained ART use in Kampala, Uganda. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2015;18:20013.

74. Walensky RP, Jacobsen MM, Bekker L-G, Parker RA, Wood R, Resch SC, et al. Potential Clinical and Economic Value of Long-Acting Preexposure Prophylaxis for South African Women at High-Risk for HIV Infection. J Infect Dis. 2016;213:1523–31.

75. Smith JA, Anderson S-J, Harris KL, McGillen JB, Lee E, Garnett GP, et al. Maximising HIV prevention by balancing the opportunities of today with the promises of tomorrow: a modelling study. The Lancet HIV. 2016;3:e289–96.

76. Ross EL, Cinti SK, Hutton DW. Implementation and Operational Research: A Cost-Effective, Clinically Actionable Strategy for Targeting HIV Preexposure Prophylaxis to High-Risk Men Who Have Sex With Men. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2016;72:e61–7.

77. Price JT, Wheeler SB, Stranix-Chibanda L, Hosek SG, Watts DH, Siberry GK, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of Pre-exposure HIV Prophylaxis During Pregnancy and Breastfeeding in Sub-Saharan Africa. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2016;72:S145–53.

78. Nichols BE, Boucher CAB, Van Der Valk M, Rijnders BJA, Van De Vijver DAMC. Cost-effectiveness analysis of pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV-1 prevention in the Netherlands: a mathematical modelling study. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2016;16:1423–9.

79. Moodley N, Gray G, Bertram M. The Price of Prevention: Cost Effectiveness of Biomedical HIV Prevention Strategies in South Africa. Clin Res HIV AIDS. 2016;3:1031.

80. McGillen JB, Anderson S, Hallett TB. PrEP as a feature in the optimal landscape of combination HIV prevention in sub□Saharan Africa. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2016;19:21104.

81. McGillen JB, Anderson S-J, Dybul MR, Hallett TB. Optimum resource allocation to reduce HIV incidence across sub-Saharan Africa: a mathematical modelling study. The Lancet HIV. 2016;3:e441–8.

82. MacFadden DR, Tan DH, Mishra S. Optimizing HIV pre□exposure prophylaxis implementation among men who have sex with men in a large urban centre: a dynamic modelling study. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2016;19:20791.

83. Juusola JL, Brandeau ML. HIV Treatment and Prevention: A Simple Model to Determine Optimal Investment. Med Decis Making. 2015;36:391–409.

84. Glaubius RL, Hood G, Penrose KJ, Parikh UM, Mellors JW, Bendavid E, et al. Cost-effectiveness of Injectable Preexposure Prophylaxis for HIV Prevention in South Africa. Clin Infect Dis. 2016;63:539–47.

85. Drabo EF, Hay JW, Vardavas R, Wagner ZR, Sood N. A Cost-effectiveness Analysis of Preexposure Prophylaxis for the Prevention of HIV Among Los Angeles County Men Who Have Sex With Men. Clin Infect Dis. 2016;63:1495–504.

86. Chaillon A, Hoenigl M, Mehta SR, Weibel N, Little SJ, Smith DM. A practical online tool to estimate antiretroviral coverage for HIV infected and susceptible populations needed to reduce local HIV epidemics. Sci Rep. 2016;6:28707.

87. Adamson B, Carlson J, Kublin J, Garrison L. The Potential Cost-Effectiveness of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis Combined with HIV Vaccines in the United States. Vaccines. 2017;5:13.

88. Alsallaq RA, Buttolph J, Cleland CM, Hallett T, Inwani I, Agot K, et al. The potential impact and cost of focusing HIV prevention on young women and men: A modeling analysis in western Kenya. PLoS ONE. 2017;12:e0175447.

89. Bernard CL, Owens DK, Goldhaber-Fiebert JD, Brandeau ML. Estimation of the cost-effectiveness of HIV prevention portfolios for people who inject drugs in the United States: A model-based analysis. PLoS Med. 2017;14:e1002312.

90. Chiu C, Johnson LF, Jamieson L, Larson BA, Meyer-Rath G. Designing an optimal HIV programme for South Africa: Does the optimal package change when diminishing returns are considered? BMC Public Health. 2017;17:143.

91. Cremin I, McKinnon L, Kimani J, Cherutich P, Gakii G, Muriuki F, et al. PrEP for key populations in combination HIV prevention in Nairobi: a mathematical modelling study. The Lancet HIV. 2017;4:e214–22.

92. Ong KJ, Desai S, Field N, Desai M, Nardone A, Van Hoek AJ, et al. Economic evaluation of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis among men-who-have-sex-with-men in England in 2016. Eurosurveillance. 2017;22.

93. Uyei J, Fiellin DA, Buchelli M, Rodriguez-Santana R, Braithwaite RS. Effects of naloxone distribution alone or in combination with addiction treatment with or without pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention in people who inject drugs: a cost-effectiveness modelling study. The Lancet Public Health. 2017;2:e133–40.

94. Cambiano V, Miners A, Dunn D, McCormack S, Ong KJ, Gill ON, et al. Cost-effectiveness of pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention in men who have sex with men in the UK: a modelling study and health economic evaluation. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2018;18:85–94.

95. Durand-Zaleski I, Mutuon P, Charreau I, Tremblay C, Rojas D, Pialoux G, et al. Costs and benefits of on-demand HIV preexposure prophylaxis in MSM. AIDS. 2018;32:95–102.

96. Fu R, Owens DK, Brandeau ML. Cost-effectiveness of alternative strategies for provision of HIV preexposure prophylaxis for people who inject drugs. AIDS. 2018;32:663–72.

97. Leech AA, Burgess JF, Sullivan M, Kuohung W, Horný M, Drainoni M-L, et al. Cost-effectiveness of preexposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention for conception in the United States. AIDS. 2018;32:2787–98.

98. Li J, Peng L, Gilmour S, Gu J, Ruan Y, Zou H, et al. A mathematical model of biomedical interventions for HIV prevention among men who have sex with men in China. BMC Infect Dis. 2018;18:600.

99. Luz PM, Osher B, Grinsztejn B, Maclean RL, Losina E, Stern ME, et al. The cost□effectiveness of HIV pre□exposure prophylaxis in men who have sex with men and transgender women at high risk of HIV infection in Brazil. J Intern AIDS Soc. 2018;21:e25096.

100. Quaife M, Terris□Prestholt F, Eakle R, Cabrera Escobar MA, Kilbourne□Brook M, Mvundura M, et al. The cost□effectiveness of multi□purpose HIV and pregnancy prevention technologies in South Africa. J Intern AIDS Soc. 2018;21:e25064.

101. Reyes-Urueña J, Campbell C, Diez E, Ortún V, Casabona J. Can we afford to offer pre-exposure prophylaxis to MSM in Catalonia? Cost-effectiveness analysis and budget impact assessment. AIDS Care. 2018;30:784–92.

102. Shen M, Xiao Y, Rong L, Meyers LA, Bellan SE. The cost-effectiveness of oral HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis and early antiretroviral therapy in the presence of drug resistance among men who have sex with men in San Francisco. BMC Med. 2018;16:58.

103. Suraratdecha C, Stuart RM, Manopaiboon C, Green D, Lertpiriyasuwat C, Wilson DP, et al. Cost and cost effectiveness analysis of pre exposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men in two hospitals in Thailand. J Intern AIDS Soc. 2018;21:e25129.

104. Wong NS, Kwan TH, Tsang OTY, Lee MP, Yam WC, Lam W, et al. Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) for MSM in low HIV incidence places: should high risk individuals be targeted? Sci Rep. 2018;8:11641.

105. Bórquez A, Guanira JV, Revill P, Caballero P, Silva-Santisteban A, Kelly S, et al. The impact and cost-effectiveness of combined HIV prevention scenarios among transgender women sex-workers in Lima, Peru: a mathematical modelling study. The Lancet Public Health. 2019;4:e127–36.

106. Glaubius R, Ding Y, Penrose KJ, Hood G, Engquist E, Mellors JW, et al. Dapivirine vaginal ring for HIV prevention: modelling health outcomes, drug resistance and cost effectiveness. J Intern AIDS Soc. 2019;22:e25282.

107. Goedel WC, Chan PA, King MRF, Prosperi MCF, Marshall BDL, Galárraga O. Cost-Effectiveness of a Statewide Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis Program for Gay, Bisexual, and Other Men Who Have Sex with Men. R I Med J (2013). 2019;102:36–9.

108. Hu Q, Meyers K, Xu J, Chu Z, Zhang J, Ding H, et al. Efficacy and cost-effectiveness of early antiretroviral therapy and partners' pre-exposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men in Shenyang, China: a prospective cohort and costing study. BMC Infect Dis. 2019;19:663.

109. Kazemian P, Costantini S, Kumarasamy N, Paltiel AD, Mayer KH, Chandhiok N, et al. The Cost-effectiveness of Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Preexposure Prophylaxis and HIV Testing Strategies in High-risk Groups in India. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2019;70:633–42.

110. Van Vliet MM, Hendrickson C, Nichols BE, Boucher CA, Peters RP, Van De Vijver DA. Epidemiological impact and cost effectiveness of providing long acting pre exposure prophylaxis to injectable contraceptive users for HIV prevention in South Africa: a modelling study. J Intern AIDS Soc. 2019;22:e25427.

111. Reidy M, Gardiner E, Pretorius C, Glaubius R, Torjesen K, Kripke K. Evaluating the potential impact and cost-effectiveness of dapivirine vaginal ring pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention. PLoS ONE. 2019;14:e0218710.

112. Van De Vijver DAMC, Richter A-K, Boucher CAB, Gunsenheimer-Bartmeyer B, Kollan C, Nichols BE, et al. Cost-effectiveness and budget effect of pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV-1 prevention in Germany from 2018 to 2058. Eurosurveillance. 2019;24.

113. Zhang L, Peng P, Wu Y, Ma X, Soe NN, Huang X, et al. Modelling the Epidemiological Impact and Cost-Effectiveness of PrEP for HIV Transmission in MSM in China. AIDS Behav. 2019;23:523–33.

114. Choi H, Suh J, Lee W, Kim JH, Kim JH, Seong H, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of pre-exposure prophylaxis for the prevention of HIV in men who have sex with men in South Korea: a mathematical modelling study. Sci Rep. 2020;10:14609.

115. Ginsberg GM, Chemtob D. Cost utility analysis of HIV pre exposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men in Israel. BMC Public Health. 2020;20:271.

116. Goedel WC, Mimiaga MJ, King MRF, Safren SA, Mayer KH, Chan PA, et al. Potential Impact of Targeted HIV Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis Uptake Among Male Sex Workers. Sci Rep. 2020;10:5650.

117. Grant H, Gomez GB, Kripke K, Barnabas RV, Watts C, Medley GF, et al. Time to Scale Up Preexposure Prophylaxis Beyond the Highest-Risk Populations? Modeling Insights From High-Risk Women in Sub-Saharan Africa. Sexual Trans Dis. 2020;47:767–77.

118. Jamieson L, Gomez GB, Rebe K, Brown B, Subedar H, Jenkins S, et al. The impact of self-selection based on HIV risk on the cost-effectiveness of preexposure prophylaxis in South Africa. AIDS. 2020;34:883–91.

119. Kazemian P, Costantini S, Neilan AM, Resch SC, Walensky RP, Weinstein MC, et al. A novel method to estimate the indirect community benefit of HIV interventions using a microsimulation model of HIV disease. Journal of Biomedical Informatics. 2020;107:103475.

120. Krebs E, Zang X, Enns B, Min JE, Behrends CN, Del Rio C, et al. Ending the HIV Epidemic Among Persons Who Inject Drugs: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis in Six US Cities. The Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020;222 Supplement_5:S301–11.

121. Krebs E, Zang X, Enns B, Min JE, Behrends CN, Del Rio C, et al. The impact of localized implementation: determining the cost-effectiveness of HIV prevention and care interventions across six United States cities. AIDS. 2020;34:447–58.

122. Nosyk B, Zang X, Krebs E, Enns B, Min JE, Behrends CN, et al. Ending the HIV epidemic in the USA: an economic modelling study in six cities. The Lancet HIV. 2020;7:e491–503.

123. Pretorius C, Schnure M, Dent J, Glaubius R, Mahiane G, Hamilton M, et al. Modelling impact and cost□effectiveness of oral pre□exposure prophylaxis in 13 low□resource countries. J Intern AIDS Soc. 2020;23:e25451.

124. Reitsema M, Hoek AJV, Van Der Loeff MS, Hoornenborg E, Van Sighem A, Wallinga J, et al. Preexposure prophylaxis for men who have sex with men in the Netherlands: impact on HIV and Neisseria gonorrhoeae transmission and cost-effectiveness. AIDS. 2020;34:621–30.

125. Vogelzang M, Terris-Prestholt F, Vickerman P, Delany-Moretlwe S, Travill D, Quaife M. Cost-Effectiveness of HIV Pre-exposure Prophylaxis Among Heterosexual Men in South Africa:

A Cost-Utility Modeling Analysis. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2020;84:173–81.

126. Walensky RP, Horn T, McCann NC, Freedberg KA, Paltiel AD. Comparative Pricing of Branded Tenofovir Alafenamide–Emtricitabine Relative to Generic Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate–Emtricitabine for HIV Preexposure Prophylaxis: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2020;172:583–90.

127. Wang LY, Hamilton DT, Rosenberg ES, Aslam MV, Sullivan PS, Katz DA, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis Among Adolescent Sexual Minority Males. Journal of Adolescent Health. 2020;66:100–6.

128. O Murchu E, Teljeur C, Hayes C, Harrington P, Moran P, Ryan M. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of a National Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) Program in Ireland. Value in Health. 2021;24:948–56.

129. Phillips AN, Cambiano V, Johnson L, Nakagawa F, Homan R, Meyer-Rath G, et al. Potential Impact and Cost-Effectiveness of Condomless-Sex–Concentrated PrEP in KwaZulu-Natal Accounting for Drug Resistance. The Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2021;223:1345–55.

130. Van Hoek AJ, Reitsema M, Xiridou M, Van Sighem A, Van Benthem B, Wallinga J, et al. Offering a choice of daily and event-driven preexposure prophylaxis for men who have sex with men in the Netherlands: a cost-effectiveness analysis. AIDS. 2021;35:1677–82.

131. Wu H, Yu Q, Ma L, Zhang L, Chen Y, Guo P, et al. Health economics modeling of antiretroviral interventions amongst HIV serodiscordant couples. Sci Rep. 2021;11:13967.

132. Amick AK, Eskibozkurt GE, Hosek SG, Flanagan CF, Landovitz RJ, Jin EY, et al. Daily Oral HIV Pre-exposure Prophylaxis Among Young Men Who Have Sex With Men in the United States: Cost-saving at Generic Drug Price. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2024;78:402–10.

133. Bansi-Matharu L, Revill P, Taramusi I, Steen R, Chabata ST, Busza J, et al. The effect on HIV transmission and cost-effectiveness of programmes for female sex workers in East, Central, and Southern Africa: a modelling study. The Lancet Global Health. 2024;12:e1436–45.

134. Borre ED, Ahonkhai AA, Chi KK, Osman A, Thayer K, Person AK, et al. Projecting the Potential Clinical and Economic Impact of HIV Prevention Resource Reallocation in Tennessee. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2024;79:1458–67.

135. Brogan AJ, Davis AE, Mellott CE, Fraysse J, Metzner AA, Oglesby AK. Cost-effectiveness of Cabotegravir Long-Acting for HIV Pre-exposure Prophylaxis in the United States. PharmacoEconomics. 2024;42:447–61.

136. Cambiano V, Miners A, Lampe FC, McCormack S, Gill ON, Hart G, et al. The effect of combination prevention strategies on HIV incidence among gay and bisexual men who have sex with men in the UK: a model-based analysis. The Lancet HIV. 2023;10:e713–22.

137. Cox SN, Wu L, Wittenauer R, Clark S, Roberts DA, Nwogu IB, et al. Impact of HIV self-testing for oral pre-exposure prophylaxis scale-up on drug resistance and HIV outcomes in western Kenya: a modelling study. The Lancet HIV. 2024;11:e167–75.

138. Enns B, Sui Y, Guerra□Alejos BC, Humphrey L, Piske M, Zang X, et al. Estimating the potential value of MSM□focused evidence□based implementation interventions in three Ending the HIV Epidemic jurisdictions in the United States: a model□based analysis. J Int AIDS Soc. 2024;27:e26265.

139. Jamieson L, Johnson LF, Nichols BE, Delany-Moretlwe S, Hosseinipour MC, Russell C, et al. Relative cost-effectiveness of long-acting injectable cabotegravir versus oral pre-exposure prophylaxis in South Africa based on the HPTN 083 and HPTN 084 trials: a modelled economic evaluation and threshold analysis. The Lancet HIV. 2022;9:e857–67.

140. Jin X, Shi L, Wang C, Qiu T, Yin Y, Shen M, et al. Cost-effectiveness of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis and expanded antiretroviral therapy for preventing HIV infections in the presence of drug resistance among men who have sex with men in China: A mathematical modelling study. The Lancet Regional Health - Western Pacific. 2022;23:100462.

141. Kripke K, Eakle R, Cheng A, Rana S, Torjesen K, Stover J. The case for prevention – Primary HIV prevention in the era of universal test and treat: A mathematical modeling study. eClinicalMedicine. 2022;46:101347.

142. López Seguí F, Oyón Lerga U, Laguna Marmol L, Coll P, Andreu A, Meulbroek M, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of the daily HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis in men who have sex with men in Barcelona. PLoS ONE. 2023;18:e0277571.

143. Milali MP, Resar D, Kaftan D, Campbell J, Olowu A, Edwards D, et al. Cost-effectiveness of the dual prevention pill for contraception and HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis. Front Reprod Health. 2023;5:1144217.

144. Mizushima D, Nagai Y, Mezzio D, Harada K, Piao Y, Barnieh L, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis in Japan. Journal of Medical Economics. 2023;26:886–93.

145. Neilan AM, Landovitz RJ, Le MH, Grinsztejn B, Freedberg KA, McCauley M, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of Long-Acting Injectable HIV Preexposure Prophylaxis in the United States: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. Ann Intern Med. 2022;175:479–89.

146. Phillips AN, Bershteyn A, Revill P, Bansi-Matharu L, Kripke K, Boily M-C, et al. Cost-effectiveness of easy-access, risk-informed oral pre-exposure prophylaxis in HIV epidemics in sub-Saharan Africa: a modelling study. The Lancet HIV. 2022;9:e353–62.

147. Quan AML, Mah C, Krebs E, Zang X, Chen S, Althoff K, et al. Improving health equity and ending the HIV epidemic in the USA: a distributional cost-effectiveness analysis in six cities. The Lancet HIV. 2021;8:e581–90.

148. Quirola-Amores P, Espinosa P, Oleas S, Hernandez I, Henriquez AR, Teran E. HIV Rapid Testing in the General Population and the Usefulness of PrEP in Ecuador: A Cost–Utility Analysis. Front Public Health. 2022;10:884313.

149. Smith J, Bansi-Matharu L, Cambiano V, Dimitrov D, Bershteyn A, Van De Vijver D, et al. Predicted effects of the introduction of long-acting injectable cabotegravir pre-exposure prophylaxis in sub-Saharan Africa: a modelling study. The Lancet HIV. 2023;10:e254–65.

150. Stone J, Bothma R, Gomez GB, Eakle R, Mukandavire C, Subedar H, et al. Impact and cost□effectiveness of the national scale□up of HIV pre□exposure prophylaxis among female sex workers in South Africa: a modelling analysis. J Int AIDS Soc. 2023;26:e26063.

151. Ten Brink DC, Martin-Hughes R, Minnery ME, Osborne AJ, Schmidt H-MA, Dalal S, et al. Cost-effectiveness and impact of pre-exposure prophylaxis to prevent HIV among men who have sex with men in Asia: A modelling study. PLoS ONE. 2022;17:e0268240.

152. Versteegh L, Amatavete S, Chinbunchorn T, Thammasiha N, Mukherjee S, Popping S, et al. The epidemiological impact and cost-effectiveness of key population-led PrEP delivery to prevent HIV among men who have sex with men in Thailand: A modelling study. The Lancet Regional Health - Southeast Asia. 2022;7:100097.

153. Wheatley MM, Knowlton G, Kao S-Y, Jenness SM, Enns EA. Cost-Effectiveness of Interventions to Improve HIV Pre-exposure Prophylaxis Initiation, Adherence, and Persistence Among Men Who Have Sex With Men. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2022;90:41–9.

154. Wu C, Xu X, Peng C, Dong Y, Lou Z, Pan L, et al. Cost-effectiveness of different intervention strategies of HIV in Zhejiang, China. AIDS. 2024;38:1850–60.

155. Wu L, Kaftan D, Wittenauer R, Arrouzet C, Patel N, Saravis AL, et al. Health impact, budget impact, and price threshold for cost-effectiveness of lenacapavir for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis in eastern and southern Africa: a modelling analysis. The Lancet HIV. 2024;11:e765–73.

156. Yamamoto N, Koizumi Y, Tsuzuki S, Ejima K, Takano M, Iwami S, et al. Evaluating the cost-effectiveness of a pre-exposure prophylaxis program for HIV prevention for men who have sex with men in Japan. Sci Rep. 2022;12:3088.

157. Zhang Y, Wang L, Jiang Z, Yan H, Liu X, Gu J, et al. Exploration for the Priority of HIV Intervention: Modelling Health Impact and Cost-Effectiveness — Six Cities, Eastern China, 2019–2028. China CDC Weekly. 2024;6:463–9.

158. Zhao R, Fairley CK, Cook AR, Phanuphak N, He S, Tieosapjaroen W, et al. Optimising HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis and testing strategies in men who have sex with men in Australia, Thailand, and China: a modelling study and cost-effectiveness analysis. The Lancet Global Health. 2024;12:e243–56.

159. Kay ES, Pinto RM. Is Insurance a Barrier to HIV Preexposure Prophylaxis? Clarifying the Issue. Am J Public Health. 2020;110:61–4.

160. Spinner CD, Hanhoff N, Krznaric I, Knecht G, Kuemmerle T, Ruesenberg R, et al. 2016 PREP attitudes in Germany: high awareness and acceptance in MSM at risk of HIV. Infection. 2018;46:405–8.

161. Schnitzler L, Jackson LJ, Paulus ATG, Roberts TE, Evers SMAA. Intersectoral costs of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) and HIV: a systematic review of cost-of-illness (COI) studies. BMC Health Serv Res. 2021;21:1179.

162. Neumann P, Sanders GD, Russell LB, Siegel JE, Ganiats TG, editors. Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine. Second edition. New York, NY, United States of America: Oxford University Press; 2017.

163. Hutchinson AB, Farnham PG, Dean HD, Ekwueme DU, Del Rio C, Kamimoto L, et al. The Economic Burden of HIV in the United States in the Era of Highly Active Antiretroviral Therapy: Evidence of Continuing Racial and Ethnic Differences. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2006;43:451–7.

164. DiBonaventura M daCosta, Gupta S, Cho M, Mrus J. The association of HIV/AIDS treatment side effects with health status, work productivity, and resource use. AIDS Care. 2012;24:744–55.

165. Jönsson B. Ten arguments for a societal perspective in the economic evaluation of medical innovations. Eur J Health Econ. 2009;10:357–9.

166. Godfrey-Faussett P, Frescura L, Abdool Karim Q, Clayton M, Ghys PD, (on behalf of the 2025 prevention targets working group). HIV prevention for the next decade: Appropriate, person-centred, prioritised, effective, combination prevention. PLoS Med. 2022;19:e1004102.

167. Coelho LE, Torres TS, Veloso VG, Landovitz RJ, Grinsztejn B. Pre-exposure prophylaxis 2.0: new drugs and technologies in the pipeline. The Lancet HIV. 2019;6:e788–99.

168. Liegeon G, Ghosn J. Long□acting injectable cabotegravir for PrEP□: A game□changer in HIV prevention? HIV Medicine. 2023;24:653–63.

169. UNAIDS Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. Global AIDS update 2021: Confronting inequalities. 2021.

170. Whitfield THF, John SA, Rendina HJ, Grov C, Parsons JT. Why I Quit Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP)? A Mixed-Method Study Exploring Reasons for PrEP Discontinuation and Potential Re-initiation Among Gay and Bisexual Men. AIDS Behav. 2018;22:3566–75.

171. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Monitoring selected national HIV prevention and care objectives by using HIV surveillance data—United States and 6 dependent areas, 2019. 2021.

172. Wu L, Kaftan D, Wittenauer R, Arrouzet C, Patel N, Saravis AL, et al. Health impact, budget impact, and price threshold for cost-effectiveness of lenacapavir for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis in eastern and southern Africa: a modelling analysis. The Lancet HIV. 2024;11:e765–73.

173. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. The path that ends AIDS: UNAIDS Global AIDS Update 2023. Geneva; 2023.

174. Ayala G, Sprague L, van der Merwe LL-A, Thomas RM, Chang J, Arreola S, et al. Peer- and community-led responses to HIV: A scoping review. PLoS One. 2021;16:e0260555.

175. Bulstra CA, Hontelez JAC, Otto M, Stepanova A, Lamontagne E, Yakusik A, et al. Integrating HIV services and other health services: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS Med. 2021;18:e1003836.

176. Brown T, Peerapatanapokin W. Evolving HIV epidemics: the urgent need to refocus on populations with risk. Current Opinion in HIV and AIDS. 2019;14:337–53.

177. Mumtaz GR, Chemaitelly H, AlMukdad S, Osman A, Fahme S, Rizk NA, et al. Status of the HIV epidemic in key populations in the Middle East and north Africa: knowns and unknowns. The Lancet HIV. 2022;9:e506–16.

178. Asaria M, Griffin S, Cookson R. Distributional Cost-Effectiveness Analysis: A Tutorial. Med Decis Making. 2016;36:8–19.

179. Husereau D, Drummond M, Augustovski F, de Bekker-Grob E, Briggs AH, Carswell C, et al. Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022) Statement: Updated Reporting Guidance for Health Economic Evaluations. Pharmacoeconomics. 2022;40:601–9.

180. Wilkinson T, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Revill P, Briggs A, Cairns JA, et al. The International Decision Support Initiative Reference Case for Economic Evaluation: An Aid to Thought. Value in Health. 2016;19:921–8.

181. Akullian A, Akulu R, Aliyu G, Anam F, Guichard A-C, Ayles H, et al. The HIV response beyond 2030: preparing for decades of sustained HIV epidemic control in eastern and southern Africa. The Lancet. 2024;404:638–41.

1071