Taking injectable PrEP to scale: Optimising the value of lenacapavir for South Africa's HIV response

Lise Jamieson[*1,2], Leigh F. Johnson[3], Jeffrey W. Imai-Eaton[4,5], Hasina Subedar[6], Linda-Gail Bekker[7], Gesine Meyer-Rath[1,2,8]

1. Health Economics and Epidemiology Research Office, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa
2. South African Centre for Epidemiological Modelling and Analysis (SACEMA), Stellenbosch University, South Africa
3. Centre for Integrated Data and Epidemiological Research, School of Public Health, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa
4. Center for Communicable Disease Dynamics, Department of Epidemiology, Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
5. MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom
6. National Department of Health, Pretoria, South Africa
7. Desmond Tutu HIV Centre, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa
8. Department of Global Health, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

*Correspondence to: Lise Jamieson, Health Economics and Epidemiology Research Office (HE^{2}RO), Postnet Suite 212, Private Bag X2600, Houghton, 2041. Email: ljamieson@heroza.org

Word limits

Abstract: 312

Main text: 3791

Tables/figures: 3 figures + 4 tables

Abstract

Background

Six-monthly injectable lenacapavir (LEN) for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) has superior efficacy to oral tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine (TDF/FTC), and similar efficacy to 2-monthly injectable cabotegravir (CAB). We evaluated the impact, cost-effectiveness and optimal populations for LEN roll-out in South Africa.

Methods

Using Thembisa v4.8, we simulated the impact of LEN scale-up, expanded oral TDF/FTC, and CAB scale-up, compared to a baseline of current TDF/FTC provision over 20 years (2026-2045). We scaled PrEP among adolescent girls and young women (AGYW), female sex workers (FSW), pregnant and breastfeeding women (PBFW), men who have sex with men (MSM), and heterosexual men. For TDF/FTC scale-up, we doubled baseline initiation rates. For LEN and CAB, conservative and optimistic scenarios assumed initiation rates similar to or double those under TDF/FTC scale-up, respectively. Duration of use varied by subpopulation under TDF/FTC (3-6 months), conservative (LEN: 6-12 months, CAB: 4-8 months), and optimistic (LEN: 12-24 months, CAB: 8-16 months). We modelled strategies to

maximise the impact of ~500,000 LEN doses currently allocated for 2026-2027, or large-scale roll-out. Costs are presented from the South African government's perspective in undiscounted 2025 USD.

Findings

Providing LEN to 1.7-2.9 million South Africans per year averted 19-31% of infections and saved 3-5% of life years anticipated to be lost to HIV, reaching incidence <0.1% in 2039-2043, 10-14 years earlier than baseline. LEN required 35-65 initiations/infection averted, compared to CAB (45-125) and TDF/FTC (280). TDF/FTC and conservative LEN scale-up increased HIV programme costs by 3%; however, LEN was vastly more cost-effective, costing $2,301-$3,567/life year saved (LYS) versus $8,143/LYS (TDF/FTC scale-up) and $11,114-$16,118/LYS (CAB). Prioritising PBFW, MSM, and FSW for the initial allocation maximized infections averted. Large-scale roll-out strategies prioritizing FSW and MSM were most cost-effective ($276-$958/LYS).

Interpretation

Delivering LEN to persons with elevated HIV risk in South Africa is vastly more cost-effective than existing PrEP options and can speed of HIV incidence reduction. Prioritising uptake among groups at highest risk is essential to maximise impact and cost-effectiveness.

Introduction

South Africa is home to the largest population with HIV, with an estimated 8 million people living with HIV (PLHIV), and, despite a 53% reduction in new infections since 2010, remains the country with the second highest rate of HIV acquisition worldwide.[1,2] Lenacapavir (LEN), a 6-monthly injectable antiretroviral drug, for HIV as pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) has demonstrated superior efficacy to oral PrEP with tenofovir diphosphate/emtricitabine (TDF/FTC) in the PURPOSE-1 AND PURPOSE-2 randomized clinical trials, both of which were unblinded early due to the extremely high efficacy of LEN.[3,4] LEN is promising for HIV prevention, particularly in South Africa, which leads the world in oral TDF/FTC uptake, accounting for 20% (roughly ~600,000) of annual PrEP initiations.

LEN was recently approved by the South African Health Products Regulatory Authority for use as PrEP.[5] To support rapid initial LEN implementation in South Africa, the Global Fund has reallocated $29 million of existing funding to provide approximately 500,000 person-years on LEN in 2026 and 2027 at a subsidised drug price to the South African HIV programme of $60 per person per year (PPPY).[6] Beyond this, affordable access could increase through generic manufacturing: Six generic manufacturers have received voluntary licenses from the originator company to produce product for selected low- and middle-income markets, including South Africa, and two have committed to an introductory price of $40 PPPY (and $17 for a one-time oral loading dose at initiation) on expectation of sufficient market volume, a similar annual commodity price to oral TDF/TFC.[7] Production cost estimates suggest eventual generic manufacturing price could be further lowered to around $25 PPPY for a market demand of 5-10 million people globally.[8,9]

However, strategic decisions for and success of LEN implementation will depend on several factors, including the pace of manufacturing, supply chain logistics, and creation of sufficient demand among and effective delivery models for those populations at highest risk of acquiring HIV infection who stand to benefit the most.[10] Additionally, the readiness of public-sector facilities, including provider training, digital system adaptations, and capacity to manage injectable PrEP at scale, will directly affect achievable uptake. South Africa largely funds its HIV programme from domestic resources, making considerations of cost-effectiveness and affordability paramount. LEN's recently announced $40 PPPY generic price and long-acting dosing may make it not only a cost-effective option within the existing PrEP landscape, but potentially a competitive investment compared to other HIV interventions, some of which may require substantially higher costs or coverage to achieve comparable impact.

Recent studies modelling the potential impact of LEN have shown that it could substantially reduce HIV incidence in sub-Saharan Africa. An analysis covering Eastern and Southern Africa—including South Africa, Zimbabwe and western Kenya—projected that LEN could avert 12%-18% of infections,

over 10 years, at 1.6%-4.0% coverage, with higher coverage (3.2-8.1%) resulting in higher impacts (21%-33% of infections averted).[11] In South Africa, a non-prioritized rollout strategy, providing 25 million person years of PrEP over a 35 years, was estimated to avert 4.4% of infections, while a risk-prioritized approach, which allocated to female sex workers first, averted three to five times more infections.[12] Both studies generated threshold estimates for a LEN price that would render it cost-effective under a cost-effectiveness threshold of US$500 per disability-adjusted life-year. Results varied by epidemic setting according to underlying incidence, risk prioritization, and coverage scenario: Kaftan *et al*. estimated a range between $27-$106 PPPY depending on risk prioritisation, while Wu *et al*. estimated $177-$213 PPPY.[11,12]

To inform the prioritization of the planned roll-out of LEN in the South Africa, we conducted three analyses: (1) we estimated the cost and cost-effectiveness of a large-scale roll-out of LEN at the generic price of $40 PPPY, compared to CAB and oral TDF/FTC scale-up, and produced budget estimates for the South African government; (2) we compared both LEN and CAB roll-out to scaling up other existing HIV interventions, including testing, prevention and treatment; and (3) we modelled several roll-out strategies to different subpopulations to optimise the epidemiologic impact of the initial 2-year LEN allocation (~500,000 person-years annually in 2026 and 2027) (Phase 1) and the planned large-scale roll-out from 2028 onwards (Phase 2).

Methods

Epidemiological model

We used Thembisa (version 4.8), a deterministic compartmental HIV transmission model of the South African HIV epidemic.[13] The model population is stratified by age, sex, sexual experience, sexual behaviour, marital status, HIV testing history and male circumcision status. The sexually experienced population is divided into two broad sexual risk groups: 'high-risk' (people who engage in concurrent partnerships and/or commercial sex) and 'low-risk'; female sex workers (FSWs) are modelled as a subset of high-risk unmarried women, and men who have sex with men (MSM) are modelled as subsets of the unmarried low-risk and high-risk groups. PrEP uptake rates vary by age, sex and sexual risk group. Regarding sexual risk, the model assumes that PrEP uptake is proportional to the product of the individual's annual number of partners and the HIV prevalence in their partners, resulting in higher uptake of PrEP of higher risk individuals. The model assumes that PrEP users (all modalities) have a 10% lower rate of condom use than individuals of the same age, sex and risk who are not using PrEP. Oral TDF/FTC effectiveness incorporates both efficacy and adherence, and was assumed to be 85% for MSM, and 65% for FSW, other women and heterosexual men.[14–16] LEN effectiveness was assumed to be 99% for all populations modelled, based on data from the PURPOSE trials.[3,4] CAB

effectiveness was assumed to be 95% across all populations.[17,18] For both LEN and CAB, we assumed that a pharmacokinetic tail protection is present beyond the respective 6- and 2-month protection that a single injection provides. For the main analysis we assumed the duration of this tail protection to be 6 months (LEN) and 3 months (CAB), based on available pharmacokinetic studies; we varied these in sensitivity analysis.[4,19] The model assumed that the relative rates of uptake between the subpopulations modelled remains similar with injectable PrEP to that of oral TDF/FTC. More detail on the epidemiological model, including sources for assumptions, are available online at Thembisa.org.[13]

Scenarios and assumptions

For the first analysis, we modelled LEN, CAB and TDF/FTC scale-up over a 20-year time horizon, starting from 2026, with uptake in all women, particularly adolescent girls and young women (AGYW) aged 15-24 years, pregnant and breastfeeding women (PBFW), FSW, MSM and heterosexual men. The baseline scenario was the current HIV programme with the current TDF/FTC roll-out, amounting to a coverage of 7% for AGYW, 0.1% (PBFW), 11% (FSW), 10% (MSM), and 0.2% (heterosexual men) (Table 1). For TDF/FTC and conservative LEN or CAB scale-up, we assumed initiation rates doubled compared to baseline, while under our optimistic LEN or CAB scale-up scenarios, we doubled these rates again. PBFW have low rates of PrEP uptake at baseline, but we assumed 29% coverage under TDF/FTC, 16% under LEN and 21%-22% under CAB. Under LEN and CAB scenarios we assumed continuation of current baseline rates of TDF/FTC initiation remain unchanged. We assumed an average duration of use for TDF/FTC of 3 months for all women and heterosexual men, and 6 months for MSM. Duration of use for LEN under the conservative scenario was assumed to be 6 months (women, heterosexual men) and 12 months (MSM), and under the optimistic scenario this doubled with 12 months (women, heterosexual men) and 24 months (MSM). Under CAB the duration assumed was less, with MSM having the longer assumed duration (conservative: 4-8 months; optimistic: 8-16 months). These assumptions resulted in varying coverage levels across scenarios and subpopulations, which are, along with other key assumptions, detailed in Table 1.

For the second analysis, we compared the impact and cost per life-year saved of PrEP scale-up to expansion of other existing HIV interventions, similar to previous analysis for the annual South African HIV Investment Case.[20,21] We constructed a simple league table by ranking interventions based on their incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) per life year saved. Interventions were scaled up separately, with each compared to baseline: ART (95% coverage, an increase from the current 81% coverage in 2025 among PLHIV who know their status), condom distribution (from 418 million to 725 million condoms/year), medical male circumcision (MMC) (from ~210,000/year to ~500,000/year),

general HIV testing (from 16.5 million to 18 million), an HIV self-screening package consisting of distributing HIV self-test kits mostly to partners of ART patients (from 333,000/year to 1 million/year),[22] PCR testing of infants at 10 weeks (from 80% to 95% coverage), PCR testing of infants at 6 months (from 40% to 95% coverage), and rapid HIV testing of infants at 18 months (from 30% to 95% coverage).

The third analysis modelled LEN strategies reaching different subpopulations to maximise the epidemiologic impact of (i) the current Global Fund LEN allocation (covering ~500,000 person-years over 2026-2027) (Phase 1),[6] and (ii) the large-scale roll-out (Phase 2). The National Department of Health (NDOH) had indicated that the planned priority populations for Phase 1 were AGYW, PBFW, FSW, MSM and transgender individuals, reaching up to 500,000 initiations over 2026-2027. To model the impact of the Phase 1 allocation, we assumed no LEN initiations from 2028 onwards, and an average duration on LEN of one year for all populations, and simulated the new infections over five years 2026-2030, reflecting primary and short-term secondary infections averted in the total population. Transgender individuals were not included as Thembisa does not currently model this population dynamically. We modelled 490 combinations of discrete increments of LEN initiations across subpopulations, up to pre-defined maximum coverages of 60% for FSW (45,000 initiations/year) and 30% for MSM (93,500 initiations/year), and the total LEN available for AGYW and PBFW. (maximum 250,000 initiations/year, corresponding to ~4% and ~20% coverage, respectively) (Table S1). For Phase 2, we modelled a large-scale LEN roll-out delivered to each subpopulation separately, as well as selected combinations of AGYW, PBFW, FSW and MSM, over a 20-year time horizon (2026-2045), and compared the impact and cost to baseline. Our uptake assumptions were intentionally conservative, aligning with baseline TDF/FTC initiation numbers, and somewhat higher for key populations (FSW, MSM) to explore the potential impact under more optimistic uptake scenarios. We assumed conservative average durations: 6 months for women and heterosexual men, and 12 months for MSM. Overall this analysis resulted in a number of initiations for AGYW that could reach ~700,000/year, FSW: ~100,000/year, PBFW: ~400,000/year, MSM: ~150,000/year and heterosexual men: ~600,000/year.

Cost analysis

Costs were analysed from the perspective of the South African government and reported in 2025 United States Dollar (USD; exchange rate 18.22 South African Rand (ZAR) per 1 USD).[23] Costs are undiscounted, representing data of use for budgeting purposes. The cost of PrEP provision was estimated using an ingredients-based approach; the full methodology has been described

elsewhere.[24] Briefly, PrEP is provided in primary healthcare clinics and includes HIV testing, counselling, provision of condoms, syndromic management of sexually transmitted infections with treatment referral, training, outreach, mobilisation, monitoring and evaluation costs. Visit schedules varied according to each product (normalised to a 12-month duration; LEN: 2 per year; CAB: 7 per year; oral TDF/FTC: 5 per year). The cost of LEN was assumed to be $40 PPPY for the injections and $17 for the loading dose, as per the recently announced agreement with generic manufacturers and funders.[25] The cost of CAB was $180 PPPY ($30 per injection),[26] while oral TDF/FTC was $41 PPPY ($3.38 for one month's supply) at current generic prices. The full-service cost of PrEP provision for all scenarios is summarised in Table 1. The estimation of costs of the other HIV interventions as well as the HIV programme overall followed the same approach as the South African HIV Investment Case.[20,27] We estimated cost-effectiveness over a 20-year time horizon (2026-2045) as the incremental cost per HIV infection averted and incremental cost per life year saved, compared to baseline.

Sensitivity analysis

We conducted a probabilistic sensitivity analysis to evaluate the impact of the uncertainty of 58 key parameters in Thembisa on the main cost-effectiveness analysis,[13] including PrEP-specific parameters such as PrEP effectiveness, duration on TDF/FTC, tail protection for injectable PrEP, and reduction in condom use while on PrEP. We varied the cost of LEN service delivery (excluding drug costs) with lower and upper bounds varying by 50% from our average estimate. A Monte Carlo simulation, encompassing 1,000 iterations, sampled data from pre-determined distributions associated with PrEP-related key parameters as described in Table S2 in the supplementary material. We report median estimates across cost and health outcomes with 95% uncertainty bounds (UB) estimated using 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles.

Ethics

As this study did not include primary human subjects data, no ethical clearance was sought.

Role of the funding source

The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

Results

Epidemiological impact

221 The numbers initiating PrEP increased substantially in all modelled scenarios. Compared to the current
222 number of TDF/FTC initiations of ~600,000/year, our TDF/FTC scale-up scenario and conservative CAB
223 and LEN scenarios would increase initiations to up to 2.4 million initiations per year by 2045- an
224 average of 1.7 million annually (Figure 1). The optimistic CAB and LEN scale-up scenarios required
225 between 900,000 and 4.4 million initiations per year (average 2.9 million annually). As CAB and LEN
226 have different dosing frequencies and assumptions regarding continuation duration, the number of
227 doses required differs between scenarios (Figure 1).

228 In the baseline scenario, population-wide HIV incidence was projected to continue declining and reach
229 <0.1%, the virtual elimination threshold towards ending AIDS, by 2053. In the optimistic scenario, LEN
230 scale-up accelerated this downward trajectory to reach <0.1% incidence by 2039, and avert on average
231 44,200 new HIV infections annually (Figure 2). Under conservative LEN scale-up, incidence reached
232 <0.1% by 2043, and averted on average 26,900 infections/year (Figure 2). Injectable CAB averted
233 slightly fewer infections, primarily because of the shorter continuation duration, with an average
234 35,500 (optimistic) and 19,500 (conservative) infections averted annually. CAB reached <0.1%
235 incidence in 2042 (optimistic) and 2045 (conservative). In comparison, TDF/FTC scale-up averted an
236 average of 6,300 infections/year, and only reached <0.1% incidence by 2050 (Figure 2). Compared to
237 baseline, LEN averted 19%-31% of HIV infections, and CAB averted 14-25% of HIV infections over the
238 20-year period, and saved 593,000-989,300 (3-5%) life years, while CAB saved 428,700-792,600 (2-4%)
239 life years (Table 2). The number of people needed to initiate PrEP to avert one HIV infection, after the
240 initial 4-year scale-up period, was ~280 initiations for TDF/FTC, and considerably less under LEN
241 (conservative: ~65; optimistic: ~35) and CAB (conservative: ~125; optimistic: ~45) (Figure S1).

242 *Cost and cost effectiveness of LEN and CAB*

243 Both TDF/FTC and conservative LEN scale-up increased total HIV programme cost by 3%; however,
244 LEN resulted in substantially greater health impact, rendering it more cost-effective (Table 2). The ICER
245 of scaling-up LEN was $2,666-$4,202/infection averted and $2,301-$3,567/life year saved (LYS),
246 compared to TDF/FTC with $9,907/infection averted and $8,143/LYS (Table 2). CAB was less cost-
247 effective than both LEN and oral TDF/FTC scale-up with an ICER of $12,877-$18,918/infection averted
248 and $11,114-$16,118/LYS over baseline (Table 2).

249 Compared to further scaling-up other HIV interventions, LEN had a larger impact on both life years
250 saved and infections averted than most, second only to scaling up ART coverage to 95% (Table 3).
251 However, it was only moderately cost-effective, ranking 6th (conservative) and 8th (optimistic) among
252 modelled interventions when comparing ICER/LYS (Table 3). Interventions more cost-effective than
253 LEN under this metric were scaling-up condoms (cost-saving), ART coverage, HIV testing of the general

population, MMC and HIV self-screening, with ICERs ranging from $577-$1,081/LYS. In terms of ICER/infection averted, LEN ranked fourth, but remained less cost-effective than condoms, MMC, and ART (Table 3).

Budget impact

The conservative LEN scale-up scenario required an additional $38-$91 million/year (2-5% over the current projected HIV programme cost) over financial years 2025/26-2029/30 (Table S3). This incremental cost was similar to the TDF/FTC scale-up scenario, but with a substantially larger impact (Table 2). Under an optimistic scenario, $84-$198 million/year (4%-10% increase) was required for scale-up (Table S3).

Optimization of LEN to subpopulations and most cost-effective long-term strategies

Optimised allocation of 500,000 PYs of LEN delivered in 2026-2027 could avert a maximum of 20,600 infections over 2026-2030. The optimised allocation meant that 55% of LEN doses would be allocated to PBFW, 26% to MSM and 18% to FSW (Figure 3); this averted ~20,500 new infections over 2026-2030, relative to baseline. However, alternative allocation strategies that included AGYW had comparable impact. When incrementally shifting LEN initiation towards AGYW (10% increments representing ~25,000 initiations annually), LEN would avert between 18,100 and 20,000 infections with 10-50% of doses allocated to AGYW (Table S4). Increasing LEN initiations in AGYW maintains strong impact, but reduces PBFW coverage and overall impact. For a large-scale roll-out, the most cost-effective strategies were delivering to FSW only, MSM only, or FSW and MSM concurrently, with ICERs $276-$958/LYS over a 20-year time horizon (Table 4). Amongst strategies modelled, the combined FSW and MSM approach averted the most infections (~187,000) over the 20 years. Delivering to a combination of subpopulations that include PBFW and AGYW resulted in higher ICER values ranging $1,769-$3,020/LYS, while LEN to heterosexual men was the least cost-effective strategy ($9,806/LYS) (Table 4).

Sensitivity analysis

The relative impact of PrEP scenarios was not sensitive to uncertainty in epidemic calibration and PrEP intervention parameters; the reduction of HIV infections for LEN (conservative UB: 13.8%-24.1%; optimistic UB: 25.5%-35.7%) and CAB (conservative UB: 10.0%-18.8%; optimistic UB: 20.1%-30.0%) still exceeded TDF/FTC (UB 3.4%-5.5%) (Table S5). LEN remained the most cost-effective option with consistently lower ICERs but wider uncertainty (conservative UB: $803-$7,142/LYS; optimistic UB: $1,761-$9,897), compared to TDF/FTC (UB $5,863-$19,157/LYS) and CAB (conservative UB: $6,516-$28,606/LYS; optimistic UB: $10,455-$38,496) (Figure S2). CAB was consistently less cost-effective

than LEN in all simulations, and less cost-effective than TDF/FTC scale-up in 88% (conservative) and 99.8% (optimistic) of simulations (Figure S2).

Discussion

Widespread use of LEN among those with elevated exposure to HIV could substantially decrease HIV infections and accelerate efforts to end AIDS in South Africa, achieving the <0.1% incidence threshold required to end AIDS 10-14 years earlier than through continuing current intervention levels, and 7-11 years sooner than further aggressive TDF/FTC scale-up. At $40 PPPY and $17 for the loading dose and an average delivery cost of $48 PPPY, LEN scale-up options were more cost-effective than both TDF/FTC and CAB scale-up but increased the HIV programme medium-term budget by 4-8%. CAB was the least cost-effective option, due to its high price.

While the newly negotiated price for LEN substantially improves affordability, large-scale roll-out would still require substantial additional investment, which may particularly strain national funding in the current context of reduced US foreign aid. Compared to other interventions, expanding ART to 95% coverage of all diagnosed PLHIV was the only intervention exhibiting greater cost-effectiveness than LEN and higher impact in terms of both life years saved and HIV infections averted. However, significant implementation challenges remain in achieving 95% ART coverage, and the feasibility and resource requirements of reaching this target are not well established. Although we did not explicitly compare interventions to budget constraints here, previous results imply that if HIV programme resources are threatened, maintaining people on ART should be safeguarded before scaling-up LEN.[28] Increasing condom distribution and MMC also remained more cost-effective prevention options than LEN and should be implemented alongside PrEP scale-up as part of a comprehensive HIV prevention strategy for South Africa; however, the overall incremental epidemiologic impact of further expanding these interventions was limited compared to LEN.

Similar to other modelling analyses, we assumed PrEP uptake would be risk differentiated, reaching individuals at disproportionately higher risk among AGYW, PBFW, and heterosexual men. Even with universal access, such differentiated uptake has defined efficient and impactful oral PrEP programmes in some settings,[12] but evidence is less clear in African epidemic settings. Some of our findings may be sensitive to this assumption, including the projected magnitude of infections averted, cost-effectiveness, and recommending prioritisation of PBFW versus AGYW. This prioritisation could change if, for example, delivery models reaching wider AGYW (e.g. through STI and other sexual and reproductive health services) were more efficient at reaching those at highest risk than delivery to pregnant women at ANC services, where providers may find it more challenging to differentiate clients.

Ambitious LEN coverage modelled among FSW and MSM may be difficult to attain, particularly in the current context. Termination of US donor funding =has disproportionately affected key population services in South Africa, which were primarily managed by organizations supported by PEPFAR or the Global Fund. Key populations often face stigma, which complicates their utilization of public health facilities, while PBFW are already served within public clinics that can provide LEN. Successful delivery of LEN to FSW and MSM will likely require the South African government to revive key population programming in a way that provides friendly and safe care, potentially through partnering with existing experienced implementing organizations. In addition, geospatial prioritisation of areas with the highest HIV incidence could further enhance both the cost-effectiveness and overall impact of LEN implementation at scale.[29]

Our analysis is subject to several limitations. First, the feasibility of delivering our modelled scenarios is currently unknown. We included costs for demand creation, but these may not be sufficient to reach the assumed large-scale uptake. In addition, South Africa may need to re-establish key population services in order to target those populations, and this may require additional resources. Together, these factors suggest that we may be overestimating LEN's cost-effectiveness. However, our conservative scenario assumes most clients receive only one injection (two for MSM), which may partially mitigate this concern. Second, with limited data available on costs of implementing of long-acting products, we opted for an ingredients-based approach. The biggest cost difference between PrEP options lies in the drugs, but further research is needed to determine the true implementation costs and explore innovative delivery methods for injectable PrEP to enhance its cost-effectiveness, especially amongst key populations. Third, our modelling assumed continuation of a baseline trajectory and intervention coverages that pre-date recent funding cuts. While the relative comparisons between interventions and overall conclusions remain valid, key populations were disproportionately affected by funding cuts and may have experienced increased HIV incidence as a result of disrupted prevention services.[28] Higher incidence would translate to greater reductions of HIV if effective prevention were scaled up in these populations.

Immediate and concurrent monitoring and evaluation of the upcoming LEN roll-out are essential to generate evidence of uptake patterns and preferences, especially across different subpopulations. Such evidence is needed to inform efficient scale-up strategies as the PrEP product landscape continues to expand. As the LEN roll-out and continued insights will help guide national decision-making, South Africa's scale and epidemic burden mean it is not merely a participant in the PrEP market – it is a market shaper whose adoption choices will influence global pricing and supply trajectories.

Data sharing

The C++ version of Thembisa is available on a GitHub repository at https://github.com/leighjohnson/Thembisa

Declaration of interests

LJ, LFJ, JWI-E, HS and GMR declare no competing interests. LGB reports receiving institutional research funding from Gilead Sciences for clinical trials of lenacapavir.

Funding

Work toward this paper was funded by the Gates Foundation (INV-063625). The conclusions and opinions expressed in this work are those of the author(s) alone and shall not be attributed to the Foundation. Under the grant conditions of the Foundation, a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License has already been assigned to the Author Accepted Manuscript version that might arise from this submission. Please note, works submitted as a preprint have not undergone a peer review process.

Contributors

LJ, LFJ, JWI-E and GMR conceptualised the analytical framework and scenarios. LJ and GMR developed the unit costs and drafted the manuscript. LFJ developed the epidemiological model. LJ performed the modelling and economic analyses. LJ and LFJ accessed and verified all data. LGB provided trial data and key information regarding implementation to inform cost and epidemiological assumptions. HS consulted on the NDOH plan for roll-out and provided valuable context to inform our approach. All authors critically reviewed and approved the final manuscript, and share final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication. All authors had access to all data in the study.

References

1 Carter A, Zhang M, Tram KH, *et al.* Global, regional, and national burden of HIV/AIDS, 1990–2021, and forecasts to 2050, for 204 countries and territories: the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *The Lancet HIV* 2024; **11**: e807–22.

2 2025 Global AIDS Update — AIDS, Crisis and the Power to Transform | UNAIDS. https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2025/2025-global-aids-update (accessed July 18, 2025).

3 Kelley CF, Acevedo-Quiñones M, Agwu AL, *et al.* Twice-Yearly Lenacapavir for HIV Prevention in Men and Gender-Diverse Persons. *N Engl J Med* 2025; **392**: 1261–76.

4 Bekker L-G, Das M, Abdool Karim Q, *et al.* Twice-Yearly Lenacapavir or Daily F/TAF for HIV Prevention in Cisgender Women. *N Engl J Med* 2024; published online July 24. DOI:10.1056/NEJMoa2407001.

5 SAHPRA Registers Lenacapavir. https://www.sahpra.org.za/news-and-updates/sahpra-registers-lenacapavir/ (accessed Oct 29, 2025).

6 Malan M. SA gets R520-million to buy the twice-a-year anti-HIV jab — but there's a snag. Bhekisisa. 2025; published online July 15. https://bhekisisa.org/health-news-south-africa/2025-07-15-sa-gets-r520-million-to-buy-the-twice-a-year-anti-hiv-jab-but-theres-a-snag/ (accessed Oct 3, 2025).

7 Unitaid, CHAI, and Wits RHI enter into a landmark agreement with Dr. Reddy's to make HIV prevention tool lenacapavir affordable in LMICs - Unitaid. https://unitaid.org/news-blog/lenacapavir-for-hiv-prevention/ (accessed Oct 29, 2025).

8 Fortunak JM, Layne J, Johnson M, *et al.* Lenacapavir to Prevent HIV Infection: Updated Estimated Costs of Production for Generic Treatments. 2025. DOI:10.2139/ssrn.5293409.

9 Hill A, Levi J, Fairhead C, *et al.* Lenacapavir to prevent HIV infection: current prices versus estimated costs of production. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* 2024; **79**: 2906–15.

10 Meyer-Rath G, Jamieson L, Mudimu E, *et al.* Who pays and what pays off in sexual and reproductive health? A review of the cost and cost-effectiveness of interventions and implications for future funding and markets. *The Lancet* 2025; **406**: 2152–67.

11 Wu L, Kaftan D, Wittenauer R, *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.

12 Kaftan D, Sharma M, Resar D, *et al.* Cost thresholds for anticipated long-acting HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis products in Eastern and Southern Africa: a mathematical modelling study. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2025; **28**. DOI:10.1002/jia2.26427.

13 Johnson L, Dorrington R. Thembisa version 4.8: a model for evaluating the impact of HIV/AIDS in South Africa. 2025 https://thembisa.org/content/downloadPage/Thembisa4_8report (accessed April 14, 2025).

14 Molina J-M, Capitant C, Spire B, *et al.* On-Demand Preexposure Prophylaxis in Men at High Risk for HIV-1 Infection. *N Engl J Med* 2015; **373**: 2237–46.

15 McCormack S, Dunn DT, Desai M, *et al.* Pre-exposure prophylaxis to prevent the acquisition of HIV-1 infection (PROUD): effectiveness results from the pilot phase of a pragmatic open-label randomised trial. *The Lancet* 2016; **387**: 53–60.

16 Bekker L-G, Roux S, Sebastien E, *et al.* Daily and non-daily pre-exposure prophylaxis in African women (HPTN 067/ADAPT Cape Town Trial): a randomised, open-label, phase 2 trial. *Lancet HIV* 2018; **5**: e68–78.

17 Delany-Moretlwe S, Hughes JP, Bock P, *et al.* Cabotegravir for the prevention of HIV-1 in women: results from HPTN 084, a phase 3, randomised clinical trial. *The Lancet* 2022; **399**: 1779–89.

18 Landovitz RJ, Donnell D, Clement ME, *et al.* Cabotegravir for HIV Prevention in Cisgender Men and Transgender Women. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **385**: 595–608.

19 Landovitz RJ, Li S, Eron JJ, *et al.* Tail-phase safety, tolerability, and pharmacokinetics of long-acting injectable cabotegravir in HIV-uninfected adults: a secondary analysis of the HPTN 077 trial. *Lancet HIV* 2020; **7**: e472–81.

20 South African HIV Investment Case: 2023 Full report. Health Economics and Epidemiology Research Office (HE2RO), 2023 https://www.heroza.org/publications/south-african-hiv-investment-case/ (accessed July 16, 2025).

21 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.

22 Jamieson L, Johnson LF, Matsimela K, *et al.* The cost effectiveness and optimal configuration of HIV self-test distribution in South Africa: a model analysis. *BMJ Glob Health* 2021; **6**: e005598.

23 Selected Historical Rates. The South African Reserve Bank. 2025. https://www.resbank.co.za/en/home/what-we-do/statistics/key-statistics/selected-historical-rates (accessed April 14, 2025).

24 Jamieson L, Johnson LF, Nichols BE, *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.

25 Two drugmakers will sell the 6-monthly anti-HIV jab for the price of the daily HIV prevention pill - Bhekisisa. https://bhekisisa.org/health-news-south-africa/2025-09-24-two-drugmakers-will-sell-the-6-monthly-anti-hiv-jab-for-the-price-of-the-daily-hiv-prevention-pill/ (accessed Oct 3, 2025).

26 Tomlinson C. #InTheSpotlight | HIV prevention injections exist, but hardly anyone can get them. Spotlight. 2024; published online June 11. https://www.spotlightnsp.co.za/2024/06/11/inthespotlight-hiv-prevention-injections-exist-but-hardly-anyone-can-get-them/ (accessed Sept 10, 2025).

27 Meyer-Rath G, van Rensburg C, Chiu C, Leuner R, Jamieson L, Cohen S. The per-patient costs of HIV services in South Africa: Systematic review and application in the South African HIV Investment Case. *PLoS One* 2019; **14**: e0210497.

450 28 Meyer-Rath G, Jamieson L, Mudimu E, Imai-Eaton JW, Johnson LF. The cost of the plunge: the
451 impact and cost of a cessation of PEPFAR-supported services in South Africa. *AIDS* 2025; **39**:
452 1476–80.

453 29 Anderson S-J, Cherutich P, Kilonzo N, *et al.* Maximising the effect of combination HIV prevention
454 through prioritisation of the people and places in greatest need: a modelling study. *The Lancet*
455 2014; **384**: 249–56.

456 30 Jamieson L, Gomez GB, Rebe K, *et al.* The impact of self-selection based on HIV risk on the cost-
457 effectiveness of preexposure prophylaxis in South Africa. *AIDS* 2020; **34**: 883–91.

458

459 **Table 1. Key assumptions on coverage, duration and effectiveness for main scenarios**

	Scenarios						
	Baseline (TDF/FTC only)	**TDF/FTC scale-up** Doubled initiation rates compared to baseline	**LEN conservative scale-up** *Same initiation rates as TDF/FTC scale-up, 6-12m duration*	**LEN optimistic scale-up** *Doubled initiation rates than TDF/FTC scale-up, 12-24m duration*	**CAB conservative scale-up** *Same initiation rates as TDF/FTC scale-up, 4-8m duration*	**CAB optimistic scale-up** *Doubled initiation rates than TDF/FTC scale-up, 8-16m duration*	**Source**
Coverage scenarios *(% coverage in population)*							
Coverage of TDF/FTC in 2030	*11% FSW* *10% MSM* *7% AGYW* *0.1% pregnant women* *0.2% heterosexual men*	*22% FSW* *21% MSM* *16% AGYW* *29% pregnant women* *0.5% heterosexual men*	*6% FSW* *7% MSM* *5% AGYW* *16% pregnant women* *0.2% heterosexual men*	*3% FSW* *4% MSM* *3% AGYW* *16% pregnant women* *0.2% heterosexual men*	*7% FSW* *7% MSM* *5% AGYW* *21% pregnant women* *0.2% heterosexual men*	*4% FSW* *5% MSM* *4% AGYW* *22% pregnant women* *0.2% heterosexual men*	[13] for baseline initiation rates, relative uptake between populations; other initiation rates assumed
Coverage of injectable PrEP in 2030 *(LEN or CAB)*	*0% all populations*	*0% all populations*	*40% FSW* *28% MSM* *31% AGYW* *41% pregnant women* *1% heterosexual men*	*65% FSW* *49% MSM* *51% AGYW* *54% pregnant women* *3% heterosexual men*	*30% FSW* *22% MSM* *23% AGYW* *40% pregnant women* *1% heterosexual men*	*55% FSW* *43% MSM* *43% AGYW* *54% pregnant women* *2% heterosexual men*	Assumed same or double initiation rates as TDF/FTC scale-up
Duration of protection, including tail protection (months)	3m (FSW, AGYW, heterosexual men) 6m (MSM)	3m (FSW, AGYW, heterosexual men) 6m (MSM)	6m (+6m tail) (FSW, AGYW, heterosexual men) 12m (+6m tail) (MSM)	12m (+6m tail protection) (FSW, AGYW, heterosexual men) 24m (+6m tail) (MSM)	4m (+3m tail) (FSW, AGYW, heterosexual men) 8m (+3m tail) (MSM)	8m (+3m tail) (FSW, AGYW, heterosexual men) 16m (+3m tail) (MSM)	[4,19]
Effectiveness in preventing HIV infection	65% (FSW, AGYW, heterosexual men) 85% (MSM)	65% (FSW, AGYW, heterosexual men) 85% (MSM)	99% (all populations)	99% (all populations)	95% (all populations)	95% (all populations)	[3,4,14–18]
Cost of provision of PrEP (per person initiated) **							
TDF/FTC	$56 (women, heterosexual men), $71 (MSM)	$56 (women, heterosexual men), $71 (MSM)	$56 (women, heterosexual men), $71 (MSM)	$56 (women, heterosexual men), $71 (MSM)	$56 (women, heterosexual men), $71 (MSM)	$56 (women, heterosexual men), $71 (MSM)	[24,30]
LEN or CAB	N/A	N/A	$60-$65 (women, heterosexual men), $85 (MSM)	$86-$91 (women, heterosexual men), $137 (MSM)	$146-$147 (women, heterosexual men), $226 (MSM)	$227-$228 (women, heterosexual men), $388 (MSM)	[24,30]

460 *Abbreviations: TDF/FTC = tenofovir/emtricitabine, LEN = lenacapavir, CAB = cabotegravir, USD = United States Dollars, FSW = female sex workers, MSM = men who have sex with men, AGYW = adolescent girls and
461 young women. **Full service cost presented includes costs for staff, HIV testing, laboratory testing, drugs, consumables and overheads. Assumed price for LEN (drug only) = $40 PPPY (4 injections/year) and $17 for a
462 loading dose (1200mg LEN tablets); price for CAB (drug only) = $30/injection or approx. $180-210 per person per year (6-7 injections/year)

Figure 1. Number of (A) PrEP initiations and (B) doses by PrEP type per year for large-scale roll-out
Dosing frequency differs by PrEP type: TDF/FTC is represented by monthly packs; CAB requires an injection at initiation, month 1, and then 2-monthly; LEN requires an injection 6-monthly, loading dose for every initiation.



Figure 2. Impact of PrEP scale-up on (A) annual total HIV incidence, (B) HIV infections averted annually, (C) total number of people on ART, (D) life years saved over baseline, and (E) total HIV programme cost



498 **Table 2. Impact and cost-effectiveness of oral TDF/FTC, injectable LEN or CAB scale-up compared with baseline over 2026–45**

	Total Cost of the HIV programme		Incremental cost effectiveness		New HIV infections		Life years lost due to AIDS	
Scenario	**Cost (billions, USD)**	**Incremental cost over baseline, %**	**Cost per infection averted (USD)**	**Cost per life year saved (USD)**	**Number (millions)**	**% averted over baseline**	**Number (millions)**	**% saved over baseline**
Baseline	40.49	-	-	-	2.72	-	19.89	-
Oral TDF/FTC scale up	41.68	3%	$9,907	$8,143	2.60	4%	19.74	1%
Lenacapavir								
Conservative	41.85	3%	$2,666	$2,301	2.21	19%	19.29	3%
Optimistic	44.02	9%	$4,202	$3,567	1.88	31%	18.90	5%
Cabotegravir								
Conservative	45.25	12%	$12,877	$11,114	2.35	14%	19.46	2%
Optimistic	53.26	32%	$18,918	$16,118	2.05	25%	19.09	4%

499 Abbreviations: TDF/FTC = tenofovir/emtricitabine, LEN = lenacapavir, CAB = cabotegravir, USD = United States Dollars, ART=antiretroviral treatment, PPPY=per person per year

500

501 **Table 3. Simple league table comparing 20-year impact (2026-2045) and cost-effectiveness of LEN and CAB scale-up scenarios to existing HIV**
502 **interventions, with incremental cost effectiveness ratios compared to baseline**

Intervention	Incremental cost over baseline, USD millions (% change)	Incremental life years saved over baseline (% change)	Incremental HIV infections averted over baseline (% change)	ICER per life year saved (USD)	*Rank (ICER/ LYS)*	ICER per HIV averted (USD)	*Rank (ICER/ HIV)*
Condom distribution (725m/year)	-301 (-0.7%)	348,165 (1.8%)	260,263 (9.6%)	Cost-saving	*1*	Cost-saving	*1*
ART (95%)	2,752 (6.8%)	4,770,659 (24.0%)	1,414,990 (52.0%)	577	*2*	1,945	*3*
General HTS (18m/year)	149 (0.4%)	167,249 (0.8%)	38,844 (1.4%)	889	*3*	3,827	*5*
MMC (500k/year)	103 (0.3%)	101,903 (0.5%)	101,324 (3.7%)	1,007	*4*	1,012	*2*
HIV self-screening package (1m/year)	213 (0.5%)	196,712 (1.0%)	35,935 (1.3%)	1,081	*5*	5,917	*7*
LEN conservative (avg 1.8m/year)	1,365 (3.4%)	593,025 (3.0%)	511,955 (18.8%)	2,301	*6*	2,666	*4*
Infant PCR testing at 10 weeks (95%)	18 (<0.1%)	6,412 (<0.1%)	17 (<0.1%)	2,850	*7*	1,074,866	*12*
LEN optimistic (avg 2.9m/year)	3,529 (8.7%)	989,334 (5.0%)	839,898 (30.9%)	3,567	*8*	4,202	*6*
Oral TDF/FTC (avg 1.8m/year)	1,189 (2.9%)	145,977 (0.7%)	119,982 (4.4%)	8,143	*9*	9,907	*8*
Infant rapid HIV testing at 18 months (95%)	76 (0.2%)	8,770 (<0.1%)	496 (<0.1%)	8,645	*10*	152,862	*11*
CAB conservative (avg 1.8m/year)	4,764 (11.8%)	428,674 (2.2%)	369,997 (13.6%)	11,114	*11*	12,877	*9*
CAB optimistic (avg 2.9m/year)	12,775 (31.6%)	792,593 (4.0%)	675,315 (24.8%)	16,118	*12*	18,918	*10*
Infant PCR testing at 6 months (95%)	66 (0.2%)	1,484 (<0.1%)	55 (<0.1%)	44,192	*13*	1,192,390	*13*

503

504

Figure 3. Five-year impact of different combinations of subpopulation uptake of LEN for initial allocation volume (~500,000 person-years on LEN) over 2026-2027. *Each of the 490 different combinations of LEN distribution are represented by vertical bars, with all results sorted by descending order of impact, therefore the leftmost combinations represent the highest impact strategies.*



512 **Table 4. Impact and cost-effectiveness of specific sub-population uptake of LEN, compared to baseline, over 20 years (2026-2045)**

Scenario	**Total cost of the HIV programme** *(USD, billions)*	**Incremental cost over baseline** *(USD, millions)*	**Life years lost to AIDS** *(millions)*	**Total new HIV infections** *(millions)*	**Incremental life years saved** *(thousands)*	**Incremental HIV infections averted** (thousands)	**ICER per life year saved** *(USD)*	**ICER per HIV averted** *(USD)*
Baseline	40.49	-	19.89	2.72	-	-	-	-
FSW	40.51	17 (0.04%)	19.82	2.67	62 (0.3%)	52 (1.9%)	276	332
FSW and MSM	40.66	174 (0.4%)	19.67	2.53	216 (1.1%)	187 (6.9%)	804	928
MSM	40.64	155 (0.4%)	19.72	2.58	162 (0.8%)	143 (5.2%)	958	1,086
FSW, MSM and pregnant women	41.12	633 (1.6%)	19.53	2.44	358 (1.8%)	286 (10.5%)	1,769	2,216
FSW and AGYW	41.05	560 (1.4%)	19.60	2.45	282 (1.4%)	272 (10.0%)	1,982	2,056
AGYW	41.03	540 (1.3%)	19.65	2.49	232 (1.2%)	231 (8.5%)	2,332	2,339
Pregnant women	40.94	454 (1.1%)	19.74	2.62	150 (0.8%)	106 (3.9%)	3,020	4,284
Heterosexual men	41.21	719 (1.8%)	19.81	2.67	73 (0.4%)	50 (1.8%)	9,806	14,458

513

514