An empirical cut-off for the Brief Berger HIV Stigma Scale to identify psychosocial vulnerability in people living with HIV in Nigeria: A cross-sectional study

HIV stigma and psychosocial vulnerability among PLHIV in Nigeria.

Kamaldeen Sunkanmi Abdulraheem[1], Adebayo T. Onajole[1,2], Alero Ann Roberts[1,2] Temidayo Olowoopejo[3]

Author's Affiliation(s)
1. Department of Community Health and Primary Health, Lagos University Teaching Hospital, Idi-Araba, Lagos State, Nigeria.
2. Department of Community Health and Primary Care, College of medicine, University of Lagos, Idi-Araba, Lagos State, Nigeria.
3. Lagos State Health Service Commission, Lagos, Nigeria

Corresponding Author
Email: olasuraheem@gmail.com (AKS)

Abdulraheem Kamaldeen Sunkanmi: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Data curation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.
Onajole Adebayo T: Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision & reviewing.
Roberts Alero Ann: Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision & reviewing.
Olowoopejo Temidayo: Data curation, Investigation.

Abstract

This study addresses a key challenge in HIV care: the lack of a validated screening tool for psychosocial vulnerability. Although the Berger HIV Stigma Scale is widely used, no clear threshold exists to identify individuals at high risk for mental health problems. Our research aimed to establish a practical, data-driven cut-off score for the scale in a Nigerian context and to explore which dimensions of stigma are most linked to psychosocial vulnerability.

We conducted a cross-sectional study with 285 people living with HIV (PLHIV) at three tertiary healthcare facilities in Lagos, Nigeria, using random sampling. Psychosocial vulnerability was defined as having moderate-to-severe depression (PHQ-9 ≥10) or anxiety (GAD-7 ≥10). We used the 12-item Brief Berger HIV Stigma Scale and checked its reliability. A Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve analysis was used to find the best cut-off score for predicting vulnerability, and logistic regression was used to identify factors that independently predicted this outcome.

The Brief Berger HIV Stigma Scale showed strong internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.87). A cut-off score of 29.5 was found to be an effective predictor of psychosocial vulnerability, with a sensitivity of 87.5% and an AUC of 0.717. In the regression analysis, concerns about public attitudes were the strongest predictor of vulnerability (OR = 1.6; 95% CI: 1.2–2.0; $p < 0.001$). We also found a marginal link to negative self-image (OR = 1.4; $p = 0.054$) and that women were more vulnerable than men.

This study provides a practical, evidence-based cut-off score for screening psychosocial risk among PLHIV in Nigeria. Our findings show that public attitudes are a primary source of distress, underscoring the need for public health efforts that address societal stigma. These results support a more integrated approach to HIV care that includes mental health screening and addresses specific drivers of vulnerability like gender disparitie

HIV Stigma, Psychosocial Vulnerability, Mental Health, Nigeria, People living with HIV (PLHIV) Berger HIV.

Introduction

Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) remains a global public health challenge. Beyond the viral infection itself, living with the disease is often accompanied by significant stigma and discrimination.[1] These pervasive experiences profoundly impact the mental health and overall well-being of PLHIV, creating barriers to care engagement and treatment adherence.[2,3] The psychological toll is substantial, with systematic reviews reporting that depression affects 20-36% of PLHIV in Africa, while anxiety prevalence among young people in sub-Saharan Africa can range from 2.2% to 25.0%.[4,5] An estimated 28.2% of people living with HIV (PLHIV) in Nigeria experiencing major depression over a 12-month period.[6]

HIV-related stigma is a complex construct with multiple dimensions, including personalized stigma, disclosure concerns, negative self-image, and anxieties about public attitudes.[7] This stigma is consistently linked to psychosocial distress, poor treatment adherence, and nondisclosure of HIV status.[8] A failure to disclose one's status not only worsens an individual's own health outcomes, such as poor viral suppression and increased morbidity, but also contributes to the ongoing transmission of the virus.[9] This interconnectedness highlights why psychosocial vulnerability, often manifesting as depression and anxiety, is so strongly linked to stigma and nondisclosure.[10]

Despite the widespread use of the Berger HIV Stigma Scale to measure these issues, a practical threshold to identify individuals at the greatest psychological risk remains a critical gap in research.[11] In Nigeria, where HIV prevalence is substantial and stigma poses significant challenges to effective disease management, the absence of validated cut-off scores limits the clinical utility of stigma assessment tools.[12,13] This represents a missed opportunity for early intervention and targeted mental health support in a high-prevalence setting.

This study was therefore designed to address this deficiency. We aimed to establish an empirically derived cut-off score for the Brief Berger HIV Stigma Scale that can predict psychosocial vulnerability among PLHIV in Nigeria. By using receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis, we sought to determine an optimal threshold that effectively balances sensitivity and specificit.[14] Additionally, we examined which specific dimensions of HIV stigma most strongly predict psychosocial vulnerability. The findings from this research will help clinicians develop more targeted interventions and enhance integrated HIV care.

Methods and Materials

Ethical Approval

Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review boards of all participating institutions: LUTH Health Research Ethics Committee (HREC assigned no: ADM/DCST/HREC/APP/6242) and NIMR Institutional Review Board (IRB/24/057). Administrative approval was also obtained from the Lagos State Ministry of Health (LSMH/4682/l/126) for LASUTH. The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles outlined in the **Declaration of Helsinki**. All participants provided written informed consent before enrollment, after a thorough explanation of the study's purpose, procedures, and their right to withdraw at any time. Participant confidentiality was maintained through the use of unique study identifiers. All data were stored securely in a password-protected computer with restricted access, ensuring that no personally identifiable information was linked to the responses.

Study Location

This study was conducted in Lagos State, Nigeria, located in the southwestern region of the country. With an estimated population of over 15 million by 2022, Lagos is the most populous city in Africa.[15] The study was conducted in three tertiary centers that provide HIV care in Lagos State: Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH), Lagos State University Teaching Hospital (LASUTH), and the Nigerian Institute of Medical Research (NIMR). LUTH and NIMR are PEPFAR-supported and offer comprehensive HIV services. LASUTH, a major referral hospital, operates its Hematology Clinic four days a week, attending to approximately 100 patients daily.

Study Design

This was an analytical cross-sectional study aimed at exploring HIV serostatus disclosure and establishing an empirical cut-off score for the Berger HIV Stigma Scale to identify psychosocial vulnerability among people living with HIV

Eligibility Criteria

Participants were required to be 18 years or older, diagnosed with HIV/AIDS, receiving care at one of the participating tertiary healthcare centers in Lagos, and in stable medical condition as determined by their attending physician. Individuals were excluded, however, if they were unable to provide informed consent due to severe illness or mental incapacitation.

Sample Size Estimation

The minimum sample size was determined using the Cochran formula[16] for proportions: $n = Z^2pq/d^2$, where Z is the standard normal deviate at 95% confidence level (1.96), p is the proportion of respondents who had disclosed their HIV status (0.819 based on prior literature)[17], q is 1-p (0.181), and d is the desired degree of accuracy (0.05). This calculation yielded a minimum sample size of 228 participants. This was adjusted to a final sample size of 285 to account for potential non-response, assuming an 80% response rate.

Sampling Methodology

Proportionate allocation was used to determine the number of participants recruited from each healthcare facility, based on their patient load: LUTH (6,379 patients) contributed 106 participants, LASUTH (5,143 patients) contributed 86, and NIMR (5,549 patients) contributed 93. The number of participants enrolled from each site was proportional to the total number of patients attending the clinics during the study period, ensuring a balanced representation. A sampling frame was created from lists of patient card numbers scheduled for clinic visits. On each clinic day, simple random sampling by balloting was used to select card numbers linked to case notes. Selected case notes were retrieved, and patients were approached for consent and enrollment. If a selected individual declined participation or did not meet eligibility criteria, another was randomly chosen. This process continued daily at each site until the required sample size was attained.

Data Collection Tool

Respondents provided socio-demographic information, including age (in completed years), gender, education level, marital status, income, and employment status, using a self-administered questionnaire. HIV-related stigma was assessed using the 12-item Brief HIV Stigma Scale, a validated short form of the original 40-item Berger HIV Stigma Scale. This version maintains comparable psychometric strength and is divided into four subscales: personalized stigma, negative self-image, disclosure concerns, and public attitudes. Responses were rated on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree), based on participants' experiences and perceptions. Depressive symptoms were measured using the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9), and anxiety symptoms were assessed using the Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 (GAD-7) scale. Both are validated tools used globally, including among PLHIV in Nigeria.

Variables

The dependent variable was psychosocial vulnerability, which was measured as a composite dichotomous variable. A participant was classified as vulnerable (1) if they met the clinical cut-off for either moderate-to-severe depression (PHQ-9 score ≥10) or moderate-to-severe anxiety (GAD-7 score ≥10); otherwise, they were classified as not vulnerable (0).

The following independent variables were included in the analysis: sociodemographic variables such as age group (21–30, 31–40, 41–50, and ≥51 years), gender (male and female), level of education (no formal education, primary, secondary, and tertiary), marital status (married, single, separated, divorced, widowed, and co-habiting), average monthly income (less than ₦50,000, ₦51,000–₦99,000, and greater than ₦100,000), and employment status (full-time, part-time, retired, and unemployed). These variables were categorized based on our study protocol and are consistent with standard demographic reporting in public health research. The categorical definitions were chosen to align with existing research to facilitate meaningful comparisons with other national health studies. The primary independent variable was the HIV stigma score, as assessed by the 12-item Brief HIV Stigma Scale.

Data Collection Procedure

Data collection was conducted by trained research assistants who administered pretested questionnaires to ensure accuracy and consistency. For participants with limited literacy, two medical doctors conducted interviewer-administered sessions. Data collection took place over four months (May to August 2024) and continued until the required sample size was achieved.

Quality Assurance

Questionnaires were pretested on a small sample (30 PLHIV, approximately 10%) to ensure clarity and cultural appropriateness. Research assistants received daily supervision, and completed questionnaires were reviewed for completeness and consistency. Data entry was performed with double verification to minimize errors.

DATA ANALYSIS

All data were cleaned in Microsoft Excel and analyzed using R (Version 2024.12.0+467). Descriptive statistics were computed to summarize participants' socio-demographic characteristics, HIV-related stigma scores, and mental health indicators (depression and anxiety). The analyzed data were presented using frequency tables and charts to provide a clear and accessible overview of the findings. Categorical variables were summarized using frequencies and proportions, while continuous variables were presented as means with standard deviations (SD), after assessing normality through visual inspection of histograms and the Shapiro–Wilk test ($p \geq 0.05$ indicating normality).

The internal consistency of the 12-item Berger HIV Stigma Scale was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha, with a reliability coefficient above 0.70 considered satisfactory.[18]

To establish an empirical cut-off, point for the 12-item Berger HIV Stigma Scale in identifying psychosocial vulnerability, stigma scores were treated as a continuous variable. Psychosocial

vulnerability was defined based on the presence of moderate-to-severe depression (PHQ-9 ≥10) and/or moderate-to-severe anxiety (GAD-7 ≥10). A ROC curve analysis was performed to determine the sensitivity and specificity of different stigma score thresholds in predicting psychosocial vulnerability. The Youden Index was used to determine the optimal cut-off score, maximizing the balance between sensitivity and specificity. The area under the ROC curve (AUC) was reported to assess the overall discriminatory ability of the stigma score, with an AUC value of 0.7 or greater considered to have acceptable discriminatory power, as is standard by Hosmer-Lemeshow.[19]

Bivariate associations between categorical variables and psychosocial vulnerability were examined using chi-square tests or Fisher's exact tests (when expected cell counts <5). All tests were two-tailed with statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$. Variables with p-values <0.20 in bivariate analyses were included in a multivariable logistic regression model. Odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and p-values were reported for all variables in the model. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$ for all analyses. There were no missing data requiring imputation. Because this was an exploratory study guided by specific research questions, we did not apply formal adjustments for multiple comparisons in the bivariate analyses. We acknowledge that this increases the risk of Type I error (false positives) and therefore interpret results with borderline significance ($p = 0.05–0.20$) cautiously. No subgroup, interaction, or sensitivity analyses were performed.

RESULT

A total of 365 individuals were screened for eligibility across the three study sites. Of these, 358 met the inclusion criteria. The final sample comprised 285 participants, as 73 individuals declined to participate. The main reasons for non-participation included refusal, lack of time, the need to collect medications or attend to other responsibilities, absence of immediate monetary benefit, and perceived disturbance or irritation.

The study included 285 participants with a mean age of 47.1 years (SD ± 11.17), predominantly in the 41-50 age group (43.51%) and over 50 years (34.04%). The sample was predominantly female (72.63%) and married (65.61%), with most participants having secondary (41.05%) or tertiary (39.65%) education. Economically, half the participants earned less than 50,000 naira monthly (50.88%), with the majority employed part-time (54.74%) and about a quarter in full-time employment (23.51%). Only 17.19% were unemployed. This demographic profile represents a predominantly middle-aged, educated, urban population engaged with formal HIV care services at tertiary healthcare facilities in Lagos.

Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of respondents.

Variables	Frequency (n= 285)	Percentage (%)
Age group (years)		
21-30	25	8.77
31-40	39	13.68
41-50	124	43.51
≥ 51	97	34.04
Mean age (SD)	47.12 ± 11.17	
Gender		
Female	207	72.63
Male	78	27.37
Level of Education		
No formal education	23	8.07
Primary	32	11.23
Secondary	117	41.05
Tertiary	113	39.65
Marital Status		
Married	187	65.61
Single	38	13.33
Separated	34	11.93
Divorced	14	4.91
Widow	7	2.46
Co-habiting	5	1.75
Average monthly Income		
Less than 50,000	145	50.88
51,000- 99, 000	106	37.19
≥ 100,000	34	11.93
Employment Status		
Full-time	67	23.51
Part-time	156	54.74
Retired	13	4.56

Unemployed	49	17.19
Total	**285**	**100.0**

Place Figure 1. here

Figure 1: Pie Chart showing the prevalence of HIV disclosure serostatus

Majority of the respondents have disclosed their HIV status 80% while 20% have not disclosed their HIV status.

The 12-item Berger HIV Stigma scale measures four subscales: Personalized Stigma, Disclosure Concerns, Concern about Public Attitude and Negative Self-Image. The overall scale reliability is strong (0.87), and participants reported varying levels of stigma across the subscales. While the average interitem covariance is moderate (0.27), the scale demonstrates good internal consistency among participants

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for items and subscales in the short-form version of the Berger Human Immunodeficiency Virus stigma scale

	Mean item score (SD)	**Average interitem covariance**	**Mean subscale score (SD)**	**Reliability α**

12 - item Berger HIV Stigma scale	33.62 (6.74)	0.27		0.87
Personalized Stigma		0.44	5.38 (1.47)	0.77
Some people avoid touching me once they know I have HIV	2.86 (0.79)			
People I care about stopped calling after learning I have HIV	2.21 (0.96)			
I have lost friends by telling them I have HIV	2.19 (0.95)			
Disclosure Concerns		0.25	9.91 (1.35)	0.72
Telling someone I have HIV is risky	2.97 (0.87)			
I work hard to keep my HIV a secret	3.16 (0.69)			
I am very careful who I tell that I have HIV	3.24 (0.63)			
Concerns about public attitudes		0.27	7.66 (1.37)	0.62
People with HIV are treated like outcasts	3.05 (0.79)			
Most people believe that a person who has HIV is dirty	2.63 (1.07)			
Most people are uncomfortable around someone with HIV	3.24(0.72)			
Negative self-image		0.41	4.74 (0.85)	0.72
I feel guilty because I have HIV	2.65 (0.80)			
People's attitudes about HIV make me feel worse about myself	2.89 (0.80)			
I feel I am not as good a person as others because I have HIV	2.47 (1.14)			

The perceived HIV stigma subscale data shows that a majority of participants reported high stigma for Disclosure Concern (96.14%) and Public Attitude (56.49%). In contrast, Personalized Stigma was high for 6.67% of participants, while Negative Self-Image was high

for only 0.7%, indicating that concerns about disclosure and public attitudes are more prevalent than internalized or personalized stigma

Table 3: Perceived Human Immunodeficiency Virus stigma subscale.

Stigma Subscale	High Freq (%)	Low Freq (%)
Personalized	19 (6.67)	266 (93.33)
Disclosure concern	273 (96.14)	11 (3.86)
Public attitude	161 (56.49)	124 (43.51)
Negative self-image	1 (0.35)	284 (99.65)

Place Figure 2 here

Figure 2: Receiver operating characteristic curve for the Berger HIV Stigma Score predicting psychosocial vulnerability (defined as PHQ-9 or GAD-7 score ≥10). The optimal cut-off score was 29.5, with sensitivity 87.5% and specificity 49.0%. Area under the curve (AUC) was 0.717 (95% CI: 0.658–0.770).

The bivariate analysis showed stigma level as the strongest predictor of psychosocial vulnerability (58% vs 17%, p<0.001), followed by gender differences with women at higher risk than men (50% vs 32%, p=0.007), and unemployment status (63% vulnerable, p=0.029). Traditional demographic variables including age, education, income, and years with HIV showed no significant associations (all p>0.05), indicating that stigma perception and gender are the primary drivers of mental health outcomes rather than socioeconomic factors.

Table 4: Association between sociodemographic variables and Psychosocial Vulnerability

Variable	**0**, N = 157	**1**, N = 128	**p-value**[2]
High Stigma			<0.001
High	80 (42%)	112 (58%)	
Low	77 (83%)	16 (17%)	
Age group (years)			0.6
>=50	55 (57%)	42 (43%)	
21-30	11 (44%)	14 (56%)	
31-40	20 (51%)	19 (49%)	
41-50	71 (57%)	53 (43%)	
Sex of respondent			0.007
Female	104 (50%)	103 (50%)	
Male	53 (68%)	25 (32%)	
Marital			0.2
Divorced/Separated	32 (67%)	16 (33%)	
Married/Co-habiting	102 (53%)	90 (47%)	
Single/Widow	23 (51%)	22 (49%)	
Level of education			0.2
No formal education	13 (57%)	10 (43%)	
Primary	14 (44%)	18 (56%)	
Secondary	60 (51%)	57 (49%)	
Tertiary	70 (62%)	43 (38%)	
People living in the same household			0.3

Variable	**0**, N = 157	**1**, N = 128	**p-value**[2]
>5	60 (54%)	51 (46%)	
1-2	34 (49%)	36 (51%)	
3-4	63 (61%)	41 (39%)	
Employment status			0.029
Full-time	37 (55%)	30 (45%)	
Part-time	93 (60%)	63 (40%)	
Retired	9 (69%)	4 (31%)	
Unemployed	18 (37%)	31 (63%)	
Income			0.2
50,000-100,000	64 (60%)	42 (40%)	
Greater than 100,000	21 (62%)	13 (38%)	
Less than 50,000	72 (50%)	73 (50%)	
HIV Disclosure			0.6
1	33 (58%)	24 (42%)	
2	124 (54%)	104 (46%)	
Years living with HIV			0.3
<1	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	
>=5	138 (55%)	115 (45%)	
2-4	15 (68%)	7 (32%)	

[1]n (%)

[2]Pearson's Chi-squared test; Fisher's exact test

Public attitudes emerged as the only significant stigma dimension associated with psychosocial vulnerability (OR = 1.6, p<0.001), while negative self-image approached significance (OR = 1.4, p=0.054). Personalized stigma and disclosure concerns showed no significant associations, indicating that anticipated societal rejection is more predictive of mental health outcomes than internalized shame or disclosure fears.

Table 5: Association between HIV Stigma Sub-scale and Psychosocial Vulnerability Among Respondents

Characteristic	OR[1]	95% CI[1]	p-value
Personalized Stigma	1.0	0.87, 1.3	0.7
Disclosure stigma	1.1	0.85, 1.3	0.6
Public attitudes	1.6	1.2, 2.0	**<0.001**
Negative Self-Image	1.4	1.0, 2.0	0.054

[1]OR = Odds Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval

In multivariate analysis, only stigma level and gender remained significant predictors. Low stigma participants had 85% lower odds of psychosocial vulnerability (OR = 0.15, p<0.001), while men had half the odds compared to women (OR = 0.53, p=0.050). All other sociodemographic variables became non-significant after adjustment.

Table 6: *Predictors of Psychosocial Vulnerability Among Respondents*

Characteristic	OR[1]	95% CI[1]	p-value
Stigma			
High	—	—	
Low	0.15	0.08, 0.29	**<0.001**
Sex of respondent			
Female	—	—	
Male	0.53	0.28, 0.99	**0.050**
Marital Status			
Divorced/Separated	—	—	
Married/Co-habiting	1.5	0.69, 3.3	0.3
Single/Widow	1.3	0.50, 3.3	0.6
Level of Education			
No formal education	—	—	

Characteristic	OR[1]	95% CI[1]	p-value
Primary	1.7	0.49, 6.0	0.4
Secondary	0.77	0.26, 2.2	0.6
Tertiary	0.62	0.21, 1.8	0.4
Employment status			
Full-time	—	—	
Part-time	0.65	0.33, 1.3	0.2
Retired	0.84	0.18, 3.5	0.8
Unemployed	1.3	0.55, 3.3	0.5
Income			
50,000-100,000	—	—	
Greater than 100,000	0.92	0.38, 2.2	0.9
Less than 50,000	1.2	0.68, 2.3	0.5

[1]OR = Odds Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to establish an empirical cut-off score for the Berger HIV Stigma Scale in order to identify individuals at high psychosocial risk and understand the elements that contribute to this vulnerability. However, before that, we verified the validity and reliability of the Berger HIV Stigma scale among the sample population. With a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87, the stigma scale was considered reliable among people living with HIV in Nigeria.

We demonstrated a threshold score of 29.5 that accurately indicates psychosocial vulnerability. The test showed an 87.5% true positive, meaning that this threshold for screening will only miss a very small at-risk population. In contrast, a marginally low specificity was recorded, indicating that a large proportion of the cases were classified as high stigma. In the context of public health, where the aim is to identify as many vulnerable individuals as possible, the concern of the likelihood of false positives is minimal.

The Area under the curve of 0.717 indicates good discriminatory ability, meaning it supports practicality, application in practice to identify PLHIV with an increased risk of psychosocial vulnerability. By establishing a practical clinical threshold, this study addresses a key research gap and enhances the use of the Brief Berger HIV Stigma Scale in routine HIV care.

We explored the four subscales of the brief Berger HIV stigma scale in predicting vulnerability and found two domains having a significant association with psychosocial vulnerability. In logistic regression, Concerns about public attitudes emerged as the most significant stigma dimension associated with psychosocial vulnerability (OR = 1.6; 95% CI: 1.2–2.0, $p < 0.001$). This is similar to what was reported among young Black Men Who Have Sex with Men in the United States.[20]

The finding that concerns about public attitudes have a critical insight with strong implications for intervention and policy. Anticipated stigma of negative public opinion can be a more potent driver of distress than other forms, such as personalized or internalized stigma. While literature has highlighted the harmful effects of stigma on mental health, our findings from a Nigerian context point to the primary importance of external, societal perceptions.

In addition, Negative Self-Image is marginally associated with psychosocial vulnerability, adding a crucial layer to our understanding of stigma's impact. With an odds ratio of 1.4, this result suggests a trend where greater feelings of self-blame and worthlessness increase the odds of experiencing psychological distress. While the finding did not meet the standard $p < 0.05$ threshold for statistical significance, its proximity to this threshold ($p = 0.054$) indicates a meaningful relationship that needs discussion. As this result aligns with existing literature on the detrimental effects of internalized stigma, where individuals internalize negative societal beliefs about HIV, leading to feelings of guilt and shame.[21]

Participants with lower stigma scores were significantly less likely to experience psychosocial vulnerability reinforces what other researchers have documented about the stigma-mental health connection. When people feel less burdened by HIV-related shame and fear of judgment, they're better positioned to maintain their psychological well-being, which makes intuitive sense given the daily stress that stigma creates.[22] This relationship suggests that stigma reduction shouldn't be viewed as merely a social justice issue, but as a core component of effective HIV care that directly impacts patient outcomes.[23]

Our finding that men were significantly less likely to experience psychosocial vulnerability compared to women reflects patterns seen in other HIV research. Several studies have documented higher rates of depression and anxiety among women living with HIV, and our results add to this evidence base.[24,25]

The reasons behind this gender difference are likely complex and rooted in social realities. Women often juggle multiple caregiving responsibilities while managing their own health, creating additional stress that men may not face to the same degree[26]. Financial pressures can be particularly acute for women, especially in settings where economic opportunities are limited. There's also the harsh reality that women may face more severe social consequences when their HIV status becomes known - including abandonment by partners, family rejection, or community ostracism.[27] Cultural expectations around women's roles may intensify these challenges. In many communities, women are expected to be the primary caregivers and maintain family stability, making it harder for them to prioritize their own mental health needs. The fear of being blamed for bringing HIV into the family can create additional psychological burden that men may not experience in the same way.[27]

Our findings have important implications for clinical practice and public health policy in Nigeria. The strong association between concerns about public attitudes and psychosocial vulnerability underscores the need to strengthen interventions for societal-level stigma. Mass communication through radio, Health education for behavioral change at the community level, and educational television shows like MTV Shuga.[28] There is also an urgency to develop gender-sensitive psychosocial services, particularly to address the compounded challenges faced by women, such as economic insecurity, family responsibilities, and navigating healthy relationships. Importantly, the establishment of a clinical cut-off score for the Berger HIV Stigma Scale provides clinicians with a practical screening tool to identify at-risk individuals and integrate timely mental health support into routine HIV care. By positioning stigma reduction as a core element of HIV care, this study shows a pathway to improving both mental health outcomes and overall quality of life for PLHIV.

This study has several limitations. The cross-sectional design prevents us from establishing causality between stigma and psychosocial vulnerability. As we relied on self-reported data, some measurement error may be present due to recall bias and social desirability bias,

particularly for the sensitive topics. It is possible that individuals with a higher burden of stigma were less likely to participate, which could have led to an underestimation of the true prevalence of psychosocial vulnerability in this population.

To address these potential sources of bias, we employed a standardized, pretested questionnaire administered by trained research assistants to minimize interviewer-related variation. For participants with literacy challenges, two medical doctors conducted structured interviews to ensure consistency and accuracy. Additionally, random selection of participants from clinic registers was used to reduce selection bias. These measures aimed to enhance the reliability of the data despite the study's inherent limitations.

Our recruitment strategy, though appropriate for reaching patients in active care, focused exclusively on tertiary hospitals in Lagos, so these results may not be generalized to those receiving care in rural areas or those not connected to formal healthcare systems. Most importantly, while our proposed cut-off score of 29.5 performed well in this sample, it needs confirmation in other populations before clinicians should rely on it for screening decisions. The demographics and care context of our participants - predominantly middle-aged, urban, and engaged with specialist HIV services - may not represent the broader experience of PLHIV in Nigeria or elsewhere.

CONCLUSION

This study establishes an initial cut-off score of 29.5 for the Brief Berger HIV Stigma Scale that effectively identifies psychosocial vulnerability among urban PLHIV receiving tertiary care in Nigeria. Pending validation in diverse populations and care settings, this practical screening threshold can enhance routine HIV care by systematically identifying at-risk patients. Our findings that concern about public attitudes are the strongest predictor of psychological distress, and that women face significantly higher vulnerability, require urgent development of interventions targeting community-level stigma alongside individual clinical screening. Future research should validate this threshold across rural populations, primary care settings, and other sub-Saharan African contexts to establish broader clinical utility.

Acknowledgement

Not Applicable.

Funding

This research received no funding

Data Availability Statement: The de-identified dataset used in this study is publicly available in the Zenodo repository and can be accessed at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17088926.[29]

References

1. Yuvaraj A, Mahendra VS, Chakrapani V, Yunihastuti E, Santella AJ, Ranauta A, et al. HIV and stigma in the healthcare setting. Oral Dis. 2020 Sep 1;26 Suppl 1(S1):103–11.
2. Audet CM, McGowan CC, Wallston KA, Kipp AM. Relationship between HIV Stigma and Self-Isolation among People Living with HIV in Tennessee. PLoS One. 2013 Aug 8;8(8).
3. Berger BE, Ferrans CE, Lashley FR. Measuring stigma in people with HIV: Psychometric assessment of the HIV stigma scale. Res Nurs Health [Internet]. 2001 Dec [cited 2025 Sep 6];24(6):518–29. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11746080/
4. Molapo DM, Mokgalaboni K, Phoswa WN. Prevalence of Depression Among People Living with HIV on Antiretroviral Therapy in Africa: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Healthcare (Switzerland) [Internet]. 2025 Jan 1 [cited 2025 Sep 6];13(1). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39791692/

5. Too EK, Abubakar A, Nasambu C, Koot HM, Cuijpers P, Newton CRJC, et al. Prevalence and factors associated with common mental disorders in young people living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review. J Int AIDS Soc [Internet]. 2021 Jun 1 [cited 2025 Sep 6];24(Suppl 2):e25705. Available from: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8222842/
6. Egbe CO, Dakum PS, Ekong E, Kohrt BA, Minto JG, Ticao CJ. Depression, suicidality, and alcohol use disorder among people living with HIV/AIDS in Nigeria. BMC Public Health [Internet]. 2017 Jun 2 [cited 2025 Sep 6];17(1):1–13. Available from: https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-017-4467-5
7. Reinius M, Wettergren L, Wiklander M, Svedhem V, Ekström AM, Eriksson LE. Development of a 12-item short version of the HIV stigma scale. Health Qual Life Outcomes [Internet]. 2017 May 30 [cited 2023 Sep 6];15(1):1–9. Available from: https://hqlo.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12955-017-0691-z
8. Thomford NE, Dampson FN, Adjei G, Eliason S, Ekor M, Kyei GB. Psychometric assessment of HIV stigma in patients attending a tertiary facility: An initial validation of the Berger HIV stigma scale in a Ghanaian perspective. PLoS One [Internet]. 2023 Apr 1 [cited 2025 Sep 6];18(4):e0282193. Available from: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0282193
9. Goodwin T, Gregson S, Maswera R, Moorhouse L, Nyamukapa C. Understanding the determinants and consequences of HIV status disclosure in Manicaland, Zimbabwe: cross-sectional and prospective analyses. AIDS Care - Psychological and Socio-Medical Aspects of AIDS/HIV [Internet]. 2021 Dec 2 [cited 2025 Sep 6];33(12):1577–94. Available from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09540121.2021.1883507
10. Ahmed A, Osinubi MO, Fasiku MM, Uthman MMB, Soyannwo T, Jimoh SO, et al. Psychological and stigma profiles of HIV patients in a North-Central city of Nigeria. J Family Med Prim Care [Internet]. 2022 May [cited 2025 Aug 18];11(5):1804. Available from: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9254793/
11. Akoko B, Regan S, Idigbe I, Ezechi O, Pierce LJ, Musa Z, et al. HIV-related stigma and psychological distress in a cohort of patients receiving antiretroviral therapy in Nigeria. AIDS Care [Internet]. 2024 Feb 1 [cited 2025 Aug 18];36(2):204–11. Available from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09540121.2023.2216006
12. National Agency for the Control of AIDS (NACA). Revised National HIV And AIDS Strategic Framework. 2019 [Internet]. 2019. Available from: https://naca.gov.ng/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/NATIONAL-HIV-AND-AIDS-STRATEGIC-FRAMEWORK-1.pdf
13. Dahlui M, Azahar N, Bulgiba A, Zaki R, Oche OM, Adekunjo FO, et al. HIV/AIDS Related Stigma and Discrimination against PLWHA in Nigerian Population. PLoS One [Internet]. 2015 Dec 1 [cited 2025 Aug 18];10(12):e0143749. Available from: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0143749
14. Bowers AJ, Zhou X. Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Area Under the Curve (AUC): A Diagnostic Measure for Evaluating the Accuracy of Predictors of Education Outcomes. J Educ Stud Placed Risk. 2019 Jan 2;24(1):20–46.
15. opendataforafrica. Lagos - Nigeria | Data and Statistics [Internet]. [cited 2022 Sep 16]. Available from: https://nigeria.opendataforafrica.org/apps/atlas/Lagos
16. Araoye MO. Research Methodology with Statistics for Health and Social Sciences. 1st editio. Ilorin: Nathadex Publishers; 2009. 112–115 p.
17. Oseni OE, Okafor IP, Sekoni AO. Issues Surrounding HIV Status Disclosure: Experiences of Seropositive Women in Lagos, Nigeria. Int J Prev Med [Internet]. 2017 Aug 1 [cited 2023 May 22];8. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC5609391/

18. Taber KS. The Use of Cronbach's Alpha When Developing and Reporting Research Instruments in Science Education. Res Sci Educ [Internet]. 2018 Dec 1 [cited 2025 Jun 24];48(6):1273–96. Available from: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2
19. Hosmer DW, Lemeshow S, Sturdivant RX, Army Academy US. Applied Logistic Regression Third Edition. 2013 [cited 2025 Aug 18]; Available from: www.wiley.com.
20. Quinn K, Voisin DR, Bouris A, Jaffe K, Kuhns L, Eavou R, et al. Multiple Dimensions of Stigma and Health Related Factors Among Young Black Men Who Have Sex with Men. AIDS Behav [Internet]. 2017 Jan 1 [cited 2025 Aug 26];21(1):207. Available from: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5124546/
21. Turan B, Budhwani H, Fazeli PL, Browning WR, Raper JL, Mugavero MJ, et al. How Does Stigma Affect People Living with HIV? The Mediating Roles of Internalized and Anticipated HIV Stigma in the Effects of Perceived Community Stigma on Health and Psychosocial Outcomes. AIDS Behav [Internet]. 2017 Jan 1 [cited 2025 Aug 26];21(1):283. Available from: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5143223/
22. Akınkoç İ, Gökengin D, Turan B. HIV-related stigma: effects on health outcomes and directions for stigma-focused interventions. Acta Med [Internet]. 2025 Mar 18 [cited 2025 Aug 26];56(1):1–10. Available from: https://actamedica.org/index.php/actamedica/article/view/1110
23. Dessie ZG, Zewotir T. HIV-related stigma and associated factors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Front Public Health. 2024 Jul 23;12:1356430.
24. Boakye DS, Setordzi M, Dzansi G, Adjorlolo S. Mental health burden among females living with HIV and AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review. PLOS Global Public Health [Internet]. 2024 Feb 1 [cited 2025 Aug 26];4(2 February):e0002767. Available from: https://journals.plos.org/globalpublichealth/article?id=10.1371/journal.pgph.0002767
25. Robinson AC, Knowlton AR. Gender Differences in Psychosocial Factors Associated with HIV Viral Suppression Among African–American Injection Drug Users. AIDS Behav [Internet]. 2016 Feb 1 [cited 2025 Aug 26];20(2):385–94. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26143248/
26. UNDP. Gender & HIV [Internet]. [cited 2025 Aug 26]. Available from: https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/migration/kh/Neary-Rattanak-4---Gender-and-HIV_Eng.pdf
27. Anugwom * Edlyne, Anugwom K. Socio-Cultural Factors in the Access of Women to HIV/AIDS Prevention and Treatment Services in South-southern Nigeria. Iran J Public Health [Internet]. 2016 Aug 15 [cited 2025 Aug 26];45(6):754–60. Available from: https://ijph.tums.ac.ir/index.php/ijph/article/view/7080
28. Creel AH, Rimal RN, Mkandawire G, Böse K, Brown JW. Effects of a mass media intervention on HIV-related stigma: "Radio Diaries" program in Malawi. Health Educ Res [Internet]. 2011 Jun [cited 2025 Aug 28];26(3):456–65. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21393376/
29. Abdulraheem K. HIV stigma and psychosocial vulnerability among PLHIV in Nigeria. [cited 2025 Sep 12]; Available from: https://zenodo.org/records/17088926



Figure 1.


ROC Curve for Berger HIV Stigma Score
Sensitivity
1 - Specificity
0.00
0.25
0.50
0.75
1.00
95% CI: 0.658–0.777
Cut-off: 29.5
Sensitivity: 88%
Specificity: 49%

Figure 2