Multi-level modeling and multiple group analysis of disparities in continuity of care and viral suppression among Nigerian adolescents and youths living with HIV

Okikiolu Abimbola Badejo^{1,2,3§}, Christiana Noestlinger², Toyin Jolayemi¹, Juliet Adeola¹, Prosper Okonkwo¹, Sara Van Belle², Edwin Wouters³, Marie Laga²

1 APIN Public Health Institute, Abuja, Nigeria
2 Department of Public Health, Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp, Belgium
3 Department of Sociology, University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

§ Corresponding author: Okikiolu Abimbola Badejo

10 Ndagi Mamudu Street
Jabi, Abuja, Nigeria
+2348025419082
Email: Okikolubadejo@gmail.com ; Obadejo@ext.itg.be

E-mail addresses of authors:

CN: cnoestlinger@itg.be

TJ: tjolayemi@apin.org.ng

JA: jadeola@apin.org.ng

CN: cnoestlinger@itg.be

TJ: pokonkwo@apin.org.ng

SVB: svbelle@itg.be

CN: cnoestlinger@itg.be

EW: edwin.wouters@uantwerpen.be

ML: mlaga@itg.be

Keywords: HIV care, retention, viral suppression, adolescent, youth

Abstract

Introduction: Substantial disparities in care outcomes exist between different sub-groups of adolescents and youths living with HIV(ALHIV). Understanding variation in individual and health-facility characteristics could be key to identifying targets for interventions to reduce these disparities. We modeled variation in ALHIV retention in care and viral suppression, and quantified the extent to which individual and facility characteristics account for observed variations.

Methods: We included 1,177 young adolescents (10-14 years), 3,206 older adolescents (15-19 years) and 9,151 young adults (20-24 years) who were initiated on antiretroviral therapy (ART) between January 2015 and December 2017 across 124 healthcare facilities in Nigeria. For each age-group, we used multilevel modeling to partition observed variation of main outcomes(retention in care and viral suppression at 12 months post ART initiation) by individual (level one) and health facility (level two) characteristics. We used multiple group analysis to compare the effects of individual and facility characteristics across age-groups.

Results: Facility characteristics explained most of the observed variance in retention in care in all the age-groups, with smaller contributions from individual-level characteristics (14-22.22% vs 0 - 3.84%). For viral suppression, facility characteristics accounted for a higher proportion of variance in young adolescents (15.79%), but not in older adolescents (0%) and young adults(3.45%). Males were more likely to not be retained in care(aOR=1.28; $p<0.001$ young adults) and less likely to achieve viral suppression (aOR=0.69; $p<0.05$ older adolescent). Increasing facility-level viral load testing reduced the likelihood of non-retention in care, while baseline regimen TDF/3TC/EFV or NVP increased the likelihood of viral suppression.

Conclusions: Differences in characteristics of healthcare facilities accounted for observed disparities in retention in care and, to a lesser extent, disparities in viral suppression. An optimal combination of individual and health-services approaches is, therefore, necessary to reduce disparities in the health and wellbeing of ALHIV.

Key Messages

What is already known?

- Adolescents and youths living with HIV have worse care and treatment outcomes compared to other groups
- Significant disparity in care and treatment outcomes exist between different adolescent and youth subgroups

What are the new findings?

- Differences in characteristics of healthcare facilities delivering services are associated with disparities in outcomes within and across adolescent and youth age-groups.

What do the new findings imply?

- An optimal combination of individual and health-services approaches is necessary to reduce disparities in the health and wellbeing of adolescent and youths living with HIV.

1. Introduction

Adolescents and youths are an important group in global efforts to eliminate HIV. Compared to adults, adolescents and youths engage less with health care services and have lower viral suppression rates (1–5), resulting in increases in AIDS-related deaths despite a global reduction of AIDS-mortality among other age-groups (6–8). Under current circumstances, the global optimism to eliminate HIV by 2030 does not appear to hold for adolescents and youths (9,10).

Sub-optimal outcomes among adolescents and youths living with HIV (ALHIV) has been ascribed to unique individual vulnerabilities due to developmental factors associated with transitioning to adulthood (11–13). However, recent research suggests that such poor outcomes also demonstrate a failure of clinical care services to address the unique needs of ALHIV as they transition to adulthood. Research in this area seeks to identify and modify aspects of health services to be more adolescent and youth-friendly to improve care and treatment outcomes. Although some of these efforts highlight some promising strategies results have been mixed (14–24). More important, much of the research does not sufficiently disentangle the multi-layered influences of individual- and health services factors. This is important because delineating the relative contributions of individual and higher-level factors can inform the design of specific individual- or higher-level interventions across often different and heterogeneous ALHIV groups and communities.

In this multilevel study, we, therefore, examined the interplay of factors influencing ALHIV outcomes at the individual- and health-services levels as they relate to retention in care and viral suppression among a large sample of ALHIV in Nigeria. Nigeria accounts for a significant proportion of ALHIV burden in sub-Saharan Africa, and one of the few countries where mortality among ALHIV continues to increase (25). The national HIV program began in 2002 in only 25 public (government-owned) tertiary-level healthcare facilities. Gradual decentralization since then has resulted in an increased mix in types and levels of health care facilities delivering HIV services (26). While this has significantly increased access to HIV services, it has also brought about heterogeneity in terms of how national HIV guidelines are interpreted and implemented. The extent to which these differences in service delivery channels have shaped HIV-related outcomes have received little attention partly because of little information sharing between the public and private health sectors. Our study will characterize how this heterogeneity operates alongside individual-

level characteristics to affect retention in care and viral suppression within and between ALHIV age-groups, thereby enabling the development of more context-appropriate individual or service-delivery interventions. We hypothesize that differences in characteristics of healthcare facilities delivering services to ALHIV will be associated with differences in these outcomes within and across ALHIV age-groups.

2. Methods

Study setting and study population

Nigeria is administratively divided into 36 states and within these states, comprehensive HIV services are freely provided by the Government of Nigeria with funding support from the US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). Our study covered two of the 36 states (Benue and Plateau).

We retrospectively evaluated routine data for ALHIV enrolled in HIV care and treatment between 1 January 2015 to 31 December 2017 within a network of healthcare facilities supported by the APIN Public Health Initiatives Ltd/Gte treatment network (APIN). APIN is a PEPFAR implementing agency that provides technical and programmatic support to 285 health-care facilities to deliver comprehensive HIV care and treatment, spread across 95 local government areas (LGAs) in eight states of Nigeria (the country has a total of 774 LGAs distributed across 36 states; LGAs may be the equivalent of districts in other settings). The cohort for this study was enrolled in HIV care across 124 secondary and tertiary level healthcare facilities in two of the program's eight states (Benue and Plateau states). Secondary facilities provide HIV services within a generalist, non-specialized clinic setting, while tertiary facilities provide services in specialist hospital settings. Healthcare facilities were included if they had provided comprehensive HIV prevention, care, and treatment services for at least one year at the time of the study.

Enrollment into care and follow-up

All ALHIV in our study received free comprehensive HIV care according to Nigeria's national guidelines for HIV prevention, care, and treatment, which is regularly updated according to the WHO recommendations. These include antiretroviral treatment (ART) for children, adolescents, and adults, the prevention of mother-to-child-transmission services (PMTCT); laboratory services including viral load, CD4 count, routine safety monitoring of laboratory test results; and pharmacy services.

Outcome variables

Retention in care: To assess this outcome, we adapted indicators 1.2 and 1.3 of the Global AIDS Monitoring tool (GAM) (27). GAM indicator 1.2 describes the proportion of people living with HIV who are on antiretroviral therapy including people reinitiating antiretroviral therapy after previously having stopped treatment or being classified as lost to follow-up. We adapted this indicator to define retention according to the pattern of care-engagement at three-time points (30 days, 90 days, and 365 days) within the first 12 months after initiating ART. ALHIV were considered retained in care if they established care contact at all the three time points as evidenced by documented clinic visit and/or drug pick up. ALHIV were considered to have interrupted care if they missed care contact on one or two of the three time-points, and classified as lost to follow up (LTF) if there was no care contact at all three time-points after initiating ART.

Viral suppression: GAM indicator 1.3 assesses the percentage and number of adults and children living with HIV who have suppressed viral load and tracks progress towards the third 90 of UNAIDS 90-90-90 targets (28). For the numerator, the GAM recommends reporting the estimated number of people who have suppressed viral load if viral load testing coverage (i.e., the number of people routinely tested among all people on treatment) is $\geq 50\%$; or reporting only the number of routine viral load tests if viral load testing coverage is less than 50%. As the viral load coverage in our study population exceeded 50%, we adapted both the numerator (viral suppression rates) as our second outcome and the denominator (viral load testing coverage) as one of the explanatory variables at the service-delivery level (described below). Consistent with the GAM indicator 1.3 we defined viral suppression as HIV-RNA viral load < 1000 copies/ml. Although national policy recommends a viral load test at 12 months, we used viral load tests conducted within a 12-18 month

window after ART initiation to allow some time for viral load testing among tracked ALHIV who returned to care following care interruption or LTF

Exposure variables

Individual-level data measures

We included demographic and clinical information routinely collected at baseline during enrollment into HIV care. Demographic information collected included age at enrolment, sex, marital status, pregnancy status, level of education. Clinical characteristics included CD4 cells/ml count at enrollment, TB status, WHO clinical stage, ART regimen received. Information about the follow-up drug or clinic appointments visits were also available.

Facility-level measures

We used variables at the health care facility level to assess characteristics at the service delivery level. Such information included type/level of services offered (secondary or tertiary level care), the facility size (i.e. total number of ALHIV enrolled in care categorized as < 200, 200 - 500, > 500), viral load test coverage (proportion of enrolled ALHIV who have had at least one viral load test at 12 months or more after initiating ART) and whether the health facility was a designated adolescent/youth friendly center. Adolescents and youth centers within the APIN program refer to any healthcare facility implementing dedicated services to adolescents and youths in addition to routine HIV service provision. Such services are focused on modifying certain structures of care to be adolescent-friendly and may include re-organizing or changing the location of the clinic, dedicated clinic days, availability of peer support groups, adolescent-provider communication modalities, appointment availability and scheduling, and trained providers for adolescents and youth.

Data management

We retrieved de-identified clinical data from the APIN/PEPFAR electronic database, which routinely captures patient demographic, clinical, and laboratory data. APIN supports health facility information systems with relational database management that is opensource (OpenMRS; www.openmrs.com).

Statistical analysis

We first conducted descriptive analyses of baseline individual and facility-level characteristics using proportions, frequencies, means, and median. ALHIV in the cohort were categorized into three age-groups (10-14 years young adolescents, 15-19 years older adolescents, 20-24 years young adults) and the baseline characteristics were compared for the three age-groups using chi-square statistics. Next, we conducted a bivariate analysis of age-group comparisons of patterns of retention in care and viral measures.

To develop multi-level models to examine the association between individual- and facility-level factors and the two outcomes of interest (retention in care and viral suppression), we adopted a binary outcome logistic multilevel modeling approach, partitioning each outcome's variance by its individual- (level one) and facility-level (level two) components concurrently to account for the nested structure of our data. In this approach, we allow the model intercepts to vary at random. We conducted the modeling analysis in three steps. In the first step (Model 1, null model) we did not include any explanatory variable, allowing an estimate of the total variation in outcomes by health facilities. In the second step (Model 2), we included only individual-level factors. This step allowed us to test whether or how much of the total random variation observed in the first stage could be explained by our individual-level data. In the third step (Model 3) we added facility-level factors to Model 2. This allowed us to test whether or how much of the random variation could be explained by the facility-level characteristics. For each outcome, we repeated these model steps for each of our three ALHIV age-group.

Measures of association (fixed effects) in our models are presented as odds ratios (ORs) and their p-values.

Measures of variation (random effects) in the models are random slope variance, intra-cluster correlation (ICC), and explained variation. Random slope variance indicates whether a contextual phenomenon differs in magnitude for different groups and whether the facility level modifies associations between individual-level exposures.

To check whether the effect of explanatory variables differed across ALHIV age-groups, we conducted a multiple group analysis. We used *mysuest* program to combine models from the three

ALHIV age-groups and then used *mitesttransform* command to test for equality of each variable coefficients across the three age-groups using a 5% significance threshold.

To minimize potential bias due to missing data, we performed multiple imputations with chained equations after data exploration to verify that data were missing at random. A total of 163 data imputations were done as determined by the STATA module “how_many_imputations” (29) All statistical analyses were conducted using Stata version 16.1 (Stata Corporation, College Station, Texas, USA).

Ethics

As part of the APIN protocol written informed consent and, where necessary, assent for service provision and participation (or data use) for future evaluations were obtained at the point of enrollment into HIV care and treatment. Adolescents or minors less than 15 years at enrolment provide another written and signed informed consent as soon as they become 15 years or older when transferred/transitioned to the adult ART program. Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the IRBs of APIN and the Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp.

3. Results

Baseline characteristics

Our study included a total of 13,527 AYLHIV who were initiated on ART between 1 January 2015 and 31 December 2017. Table 1 below presents the baseline characteristics.

The demographic and clinical characteristics of the study population at ART initiation were compared by three age-groups 10-14 years, 15-19 years, and 20-24 years. The three age-groups were similar in terms of pregnancy status and TB status at baseline ($p=0.06$, $p=0.27$ respectively) but differed in other characteristics. As expected, young adolescents (10-14years) were predominantly single ($p<0.00$), with the highest level of education at the primary level ($p<0.00$). Compared to the other age-groups, young adolescents also had higher enrollment at a tertiary healthcare facility ($p<0.00$), presented earlier for treatment (Median CD4 399cells/ML with mostly mild or no immune deficiency at baseline). Predominant ART regimen at baseline among young adolescents was ABC or AZT/3TC/EFV or NVP, compared to the other age-groups that were

279 predominantly initiated on TDF/3TC/EFV or NVP. Older adolescents and young adult ART
 280 enrollees were almost exclusively female (82.9-88.1%), commonly married (42.9-59.8%), and
 281 educated up to a secondary or higher level of education (43.8- 47.6%)

282

283 Table 1: Baseline Characteristics of ALHIV by age-group

Characteristics	Total	Young Adolescents (10-14years)	Older Adolescents (15-19years)	Young Adults (20-24 years)	X p-value
AYLHIV (N, %)	13,527(100%)	1,177 (8.7)	3,206 (23.7)	9,151 (67.6)	
Female, n (%)	11,380 (84.1)	656 (56.1)	2,658 (82.9)	8,066 (88.1)	
Age at enrolment (Median, IQR)	21 (19-23)	12 (10-13)	18 (17-19)	22(21-23)	
Female	21 (19-23)	10 (12-13)	18(17-19)	22 (21-23)	
Male	20 (15-22)	10(12-13)	17 (16-18)	22(21-24)	
Marital Status, n (%)					0.000
Single	1,481 (33.4)	169 (82.4)	492 (46.6)	820 (25.9)	
Married	2,365 (53.4)	18 (8.8)	453 (42.9)	1,894 (59.8)	
Others	581 (13.1)	18 (8.8)	111 (10.5)	453 (14.3)	
Missing	9,100	965	2,150	5,985	
Pregnancy status, n (% of females)					0.06
Pregnant	121 (1)	1 (0.2)	32 (1.2)	88 (1.1)	
Non-pregnant	8,971 (99)	130 (99.8)	2,031 (98.8)	6810 (98.9)	
Missing	2,288	525	595	1,168	
Education, n (%)					0.00
None/Informal	1072 (34.6)	45 (31)	257 (33.7)	770 (35.1)	
Primary	610 (19.7)	60 (41.4)	171 (22.4)	379 (17.3)	
Secondary and higher	1418 (45.7)	40 (27.6)	334 (43.8)	1044 (47.6)	
Missing	10,427	1025	2444	6958	
Level of care, n(%)					
Secondary	12658 (93.6)	1041 (89)	2940 (91.7)	8677 (94.8)	0.00
Tertiary	869 (6.4)	129 (11)	266 (8.3)	474 (5.2)	
Year of ART initiation, n (%)					0.00
2015	4509 (33.3)	343 (29.3)	1037 (32.3)	3129 (34.2)	
2016	4997 (36.9)	430 (36.8)	1233 (38.5)	3334 (36.4)	
2017	4021 (29.7)	397 (33.9)	936 (29.2)	2688 (29.4)	
Baseline CD4 cells/ml (Median, IQR)	345 (198-516)	399 (185-634)	348 (201-515)	337 (198-508)	
Baseline immunodeficiency, n(%)					0.00
None (CD4≥500cells/ml)	1432 (26.9)	157 (34.9)	346 (27)	929 (25.8)	
Mild (CD4≥350-499cells/ml)	1190 (22.3)	100 (22.3)	287 (22.4)	803 (22.3)	
Advanced (CD4≥200-349cells/ml)	1364 (25.6)	76 (16.9)	332 (25.9)	956 (26.6)	
Severe (CD4 < 200cells/ml)	1342 (25.2)	116 (25.8)	316 (24.7)	910 (25.3)	
Missing	8199	721	1925	5553	
TB Status at baseline, n (%)					0.27
No signs or symptoms of TB	7442 (92.7)	589 (92.9)	1794 (92.6)	5059 (92.7)	
Presumptive or confirmed TB	443 (5.5)	32 (5)	100 (5.2)	311 (5.7)	
On IPT	143 (1.8)	13 (2.1)	44 (2.3)	86 (1.6)	
Missing	5499	536	1268	3695	
WHO Stage, n(%)					0.00
1	6475 (77.7)	493 (74)	1584 (79.3)	4398 (77.6)	
2	1272 (15.3)	105 (15.8)	274 (13.7)	893 (15.8)	
3	517 (6.2)	61 (9.2)	119 (6)	337 (5.9)	
4	67 (0.8)	7 (1)	21 (1)	39 (0.7)	
Missing	5196	504	1208	3484	
Baseline ART Regimen, n(%)					0.00
ABC or AZT/3TC/EFV or NVP	2048 (15.1)	740 (63.2)	466 (14.5)	842 (9.2)	
ABC or AZT/3TC/ATVr or LPVr	38 (0.3)	9 (0.8)	16 (0.5)	13 (0.1)	
TDF/3TC/EFV or NVP	11349 (83.9)	409 (35)	2691(83.9)	8249 (90.1)	
TDF/3TC/ATVr or LPVr	32 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	18 (0.6)	12 (0.1)	
Others	60 (0.4)	10 (0.9)	15 (0.5)	35 (0.4)	

Retention in care and viral outcomes

The overall proportion of ALHIV who had viral load testing was higher among young adolescents compared to older adolescents and young adults (59.1% vs 49.5% and 51.3%). Of ALHIV who had viral load testing, the proportion with VL less than 1000 copies/mL was lower among younger adolescents compared to older adolescents and young adults (63.5% vs 81.2% and 88.3%) (Figure 1)

Viral load testing and viral suppression varied between age-groups by the pattern of care continuity. For ALHIV retained in care, the proportion who had viral load testing was highest among young adolescents (78%) compared to older adolescents (73%) and young adults (75%). Among retained ALHIV who had viral load testing, the viral suppression rate (the proportion that was virally suppressed) was lowest among young adolescents (49%) compared to older adolescents (84%) and young adults (90%).

For ALHIV lost to follow up, the proportion who had viral load testing was similar across the age-groups, ranging between 4-6%. Among ALHIV lost to follow up who had viral load testing young adolescents had the lowest viral suppression rate (44%) compared to older adolescents (55%) and young adults (75%).

For ALHIV who had interrupted care, the proportion who had viral load testing was highest among young adolescents (45%) compared to older adolescents (40%) and young adults (40%). Among ALHIV with interrupted care who had viral load testing young adolescents had the lowest proportion with viral suppression or viral suppression rate (48%) compared to older adolescents (69%) and young adults (79%).

Figure 1 Retention in care and viral outcomes.

Measures of associations (fixed effects)

Continuity in care

Table 2 shows both fixed-effect (measures of association) and random-effects (measures of variation) from the multilevel analysis by age-group with non-retention in care as the outcome.

Young adolescents: After controlling for both individual and facility characteristics the likelihood for non-retention was lower among young adolescents initiated on the ART regimen category ‘Others’ compared to young adolescents initiated on a regimen consisting of ABC or AZT/3TC/ATVr or LPVr (aOR=0.25; $p < 0.05$). The likelihood of non-retention in care reduced with increasing viral load testing coverage among young adolescents ALHIV. For each one-unit increase in health facility viral load test coverage, the odds of non-retention in this group decreased by 1% (aOR=0.99; $p < 0.001$).

Older adolescents: In this group non-retention was less likely among those enrolled in 2017 compared to enrollees in 2015 (aOR=0.74; $p<0.001$); no significant association between retention and any other individual-level factor was observed. At the level of health facility, the likelihood of non-retention in care reduced with increasing viral load testing coverage among enrolled AYLHIV. For each one-unit increase in health facility viral load test coverage, the odds of non-retention among older adolescents decreased by 7% (aOR=0.93; $p<0.001$).

Young adults: In this group, the odds of non-retention was higher among males (aOR=1.28; $p<0.001$) compared to females; the odds for non-retention was lower among those initiated on the ART regimen category ‘Others’ compared to those initiated on regimen ABC or AZT/3TC/ATVr or LPVr (aOR=0.15; $p<0.05$). At the level of the health facility, the likelihood of non-retention in care reduced with increasing viral load testing coverage among enrolled AYLHIV. For each one-unit increase in health facility viral load test coverage, the odds of non-retention among young adults decreased by 2% (aOR=0.98; $p<0.001$).

Viral suppression

Table 3 shows both fixed-effect (measures of association) and random-effects (measures of variation) from the multilevel analysis by age-group with viral suppression as the outcome.

Young adolescents: After controlling for both individual and facility-level characteristics, young adolescents who interrupted care were less likely to achieve viral suppression, compared to those retained (aOR=0.4; $p<0.001$). No facility-level characteristic was significantly associated with viral suppression in the age group.

Older adolescent ALHIV: The odds for viral suppression was higher among married, compared to single older adolescents (aOR=1.74; $p<0.05$). Compared to older adolescents with no immune suppression at baseline, those with severe immune suppression at baseline had a reduced likelihood of achieving viral suppression (aOR= 0.54; $p<0.05$). Compared to older adolescents retained in care, the odds for viral suppression was lower among older adolescents who were lost to follow up (aOR=0.19; $p<0.001$) or who interrupted care (aOR=0.41; $p<0.001$).

Young adults: Compared to young adults with no immune suppression at baseline, those with severe immune suppression at baseline had a reduced likelihood of achieving viral suppression (aOR= 0.55; $p<0.001$). Young adults initiated on ART regimen TDF/3TC/EFV or NVP had higher odds of achieving viral suppression compared to young adults initiated on ABC or AZT/3TC/ATVr or LPVr (aOR= 6.47; $p<0.05$). Compared to young adults retained in care, the odds for viral suppression was lower among those who were lost to follow up (aOR=0.35; $p<0.001$) or who interrupted care (aOR=0.42; $p<0.001$).

Measures of variations (random effects)

Retention in care

The results of the null models (Model 1) across ALHIV age-groups showed significant variance of 12-14% in the log-odds of non-retention in care attributed to health facilities [$\tau = 0.47$; $p<0.0001$ (young adolescents), $\tau = 0.52$; $p<0.0001$ (older adolescents), $\tau = 0.54$; $p<0.0001$ (young adults)]. The variations at health facility level remained statistically significant even after controlling for individual-level (Model 2) and facility-level characteristics (Model 3), thereby lending support for the use of multilevel modeling to account for variations at the two levels. As judged by the proportional change in variance among young adolescents 4.26% of the variance in retention across health facilities was explained by individual factors (Model 2) and 22.223% of the variation explained by facility factors (Model 3). For older adolescents, 3.84% of this variance in retention was explained by individual factors alone (Model 2) and 14% explained by facility factors (Model 3). For young adults, none of the variations in retention was explained by individual factors alone (Model 2) while 16.67% was explained by both individual and facility factors (Model 3)

Viral suppression

The results of the null models (Model 1) across ALHIV age-groups show significant variance of 9-13% in the log-odds of viral suppression attributed to health facilities [$\tau = 0.39$; $p<0.05$ (young adolescents), $\tau = 0.49$; $p<0.0001$ (older adolescents), $\tau = 0.34$; $p<0.0001$ (young adults)]. The variations at the health facility level also remained statistically significant even after controlling for individual-level and facility-level factors. As judged by the proportional change in variance among young adolescents 2.56% of the variance in viral suppression across health facilities was

explained by individual factors alone (Model 2) and 15.79% of the variation explained by facility factors (Model 3). For older adolescents, 10.2% of this variance in viral suppression was explained by individual factors alone (Model 2), while facility factors did not explain any of the variance (Model 3). For young adults, 14.71% of the variation was explained by individual factors alone (Model 2) and 3.45% by facility factors (Model 3).

Multiple-group analysis

We detected statistically significant group differences in the association between retention in care and two variables: sex and ART regimen at baseline (Table 2).

The association between sex and retention in care differed in magnitude and direction of effects across the age-groups, reaching statistical significance only among young adults. with male young adults having an increased likelihood of not being retained in care (aOR 1.28, $p < 0.00$).

The association between ART regimen at baseline and retention in care had similar direction but differed in the magnitude of effects across the age-groups. Initiation of regimen baseline ‘Others’ was associated with a reduced likelihood of not being retained in care in the three age-groups, with effect highest among young adults and lowest among older adolescents.

We did not find any significant group differences in the association between any of the explanatory variables and viral suppression (Table 3).

Characteristics	Young Adolescents (10-14 years)			Older Adolescents (15-19 years)			Young Adults (20-24 years)			Equality of Coefficient (p-value)
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	
	OR	aOR	aOR	OR	aOR	aOR	OR	aOR	aOR	
LEVEL 1: INDIVIDUALS										
Sex										5.02 (0.00)
Female										
Male		0.86	0.86		0.90	0.89		1.28**	1.28**	
Marital Status										0.44(0.65)
Single										
Married		1.15	1.14		0.85	0.85		0.89	0.89	
Others		1.13	1.12		0.91	0.90		0.97	0.96	
Education level										0.11(0.89)
None/Informal										
Primary		0.89	0.89		1.03	1.03		1.01	1.00	
Secondary and higher		1.01	1.01		0.92	0.92		0.95	0.94	
Year of ART initiation										1.37(0.25)
2015										
2016		0.83	0.83		0.91	0.90		0.99	0.99	
2017		0.85	0.86		0.75**	0.74**		0.91	0.91	
WHO Stage										0.42(0.66)
1										
2		0.83	0.83		0.96	0.96		0.92	0.91	
3		0.82	0.82		0.94	0.94		1.01	1.01	
4		1.25	1.27		1.13	1.12		1.02	1.02	
Baseline immunosuppression										0.23(0.79)
None (CD4≥500cells/ml)										
Mild (CD4≥350-499cells/ml)		1.09	1.09		1.03	1.03		1.08	1.08	
Advanced (CD4≥200-349cells/ml)		1.24	1.24		1.02	1.03		1.09	1.09	
Severe (CD4 < 200cells/ml)		1.31	1.31		1.13	1.15		1.17	1.17	
Baseline TB status										0.11 (0.89)
No signs or symptoms of TB										
Presumptive or confirmed TB		1.01	1.01		0.96	0.94		1.02	1.01	
On IPT		0.88	0.89		1.25	1.26		0.82	0.82	
ART regimen at baseline										6.23 (0.00)
ABC or AZT/3TC/ ATVr or LPVr										
ABC or AZT/3TC/EFV or NVP		1.47	1.48		2.36	2.36		2.04	2.18	
TDF/3TC/EFV or NVP		1.52	1.50		2.79	2.79		1.82	1.87	
TDF/3TC/ATVr or LPVr		1.04	1.06		1.07	1.07		3.34	3.39	
Others		0.23*	0.25*		1	1		0.14*	0.15*	
LEVEL 2: Health Facility										
Level of care										2.55(0.08)
Secondary										
Tertiary			1.10			0.93			1.38	
Patient volume (AYLHIV)										1.48(0.23)
<200										
200-400			1.07			1.20			1.29	
>500			1.03			0.65			0.67	
Designated AYFS facility										1.38 (0.25)
Yes										
No			0.85			1.04			0.93	
Viral load testing coverage			0.99**			0.93**			0.98**	0.79(0.45)
Random effects model										
Health Facility level										
Variance estimate	0.47**	0.45**	0.35**	0.52**	0.50**	0.43**	0.54**	0.54**	0.45**	
Explained variation (%)	Ref	4.26 ^a	22.22 ^b	Ref	3.84 ^c	14 ^d	Ref	0 ^e	16.67 ^f	
ICC (%)	0.12	0.12	0.10	0.14	0.13	0.12	0.14	0.14	0.12	

410 * p<0.05; ** p<0.00

411 Model 1 is the null model; baseline model without any variable

412 Model 2 is model adjusted for individual-level variables,

413 Model 3 is additionally adjusted for facility-level covariates

414 a: Explained facility-level variance due to individual factors alone = (.47-.45)/.47 = 4.26%

415 b: Explained facility-level variance due to facility characteristics= (.45-.35)/.45 = 22.22%

416 c: Explained facility-level variance due to individual factors = (.52-.50)/.52 = 3.84%

417 d: Explained facility-level variance due to facility characteristics= (.50-.43)/.50 = 14%

418 e: Explained facility-level variance due to individual factors alone = (.54-.54)/.54 = 0%

419 f: Explained facility-level variance due to facility characteristics= (.54-.45)/.54 = 16.67%

Characteristics	Young Adolescents (10-14 years)			Older Adolescents (15-19 years)			Young Adults (20-24 years)			Equality of Coefficient (p-value)
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	
LEVEL 1: INDIVIDUALS	OR	aOR	aOR	OR	aOR	aOR	OR	aOR	aOR	
Sex										1.12(0.33)
Female										
Male		0.73	0.73		0.69*	0.69*		0.93	0.94	
Marital Status										0.67(0.51)
Single										
Married		1.77	1.77		1.74*	1.7*		1.36	1.35	
Others		1.23	1.23		1.44	1.4		1.03	1.03	
Education level										0.02(0.98)
None/Informal										
Primary		0.85	0.85		0.73	0.73		0.69	0.69	
Secondary and higher		0.82	0.82		0.76	0.76		0.74	0.73	
Year of ART initiation										0.7(0.49)
2015										
2016		1.54	1.54		0.81	0.81		1.13	1.15	
2017		1.43	1.4		0.99	0.99		1.02	1.04	
WHO Stage										0.21(0.81)
1										
2		0.79	0.79		0.79	0.80		1.04	1.04	
3		1.73	1.73		0.69	0.70		0.78	0.78	
4		0.60	0.60		0.82	0.80		0.87	0.90	
Baseline immunosuppression										0.14(0.87)
None (CD4≥500cells/ml)										
Mild (CD4≥350-499cells/ml)		1.18	1.1		0.82	0.82		0.91	0.91	
Advanced(CD4≥200-349cells/ml)		0.89	0.89		0.69	0.69		0.70	0.70	
Severe (CD4 < 200cells/ml)		0.64	0.64		0.55*	0.54 *		0.55*	0.55 **	
Baseline TB status										0.22 (0.80)
No signs or symptoms of TB										
Presumptive or confirmed TB		0.69	0.69		1.19	1.18		1.160	1.19	
On IPT		0.83	0.83		0.77	0.79		0.89	0.92	
ART regimen at baseline										0.58(0.56)
ABC or AZT/3TC/ ATVr or LPVr										
ABC or AZT/3TC/ EFV or NVP		2.19	2.19		1.46	1.47		3.19	3.20	
TDF/3TC/EFV or NVP		3.66	3.66		3.49	3.55		6.4*	6.47 *	
TDF/3TC/ATVr or LPVr		0.15	0.15		2.25	2.27		0.74	0.81	
Others		0.99	0.99		1.31	1.34		5.2	5.4	
Continuity of care										0.1 (0.90)
Retained										
LTF		0.35	0.35		0.19 **	0.19**		0.35 **	0.35**	
Interrupted care		0.40**	0.42**		0.41 **	0.41**		0.42 **	0.42**	
LEVEL 2: Health facility										
Level of care										0.39 (0.68)
Secondary										
Tertiary			0.90			0.90			0.80	
Patient volume (AYLHIV)										0.12 (0.89)
<200										
200-400			1.24			1.02			1.14	
>500			0.77			0.89			0.93	
Designated AYFS facility										0.91(0.40)
No										
Yes			1.33			0.92			1.06	
Viral load testing coverage			0.99			1.00			1.10	1.57(0.21)
Random effects model										
Health facility level										
Variance estimate (Facility level)	0.39*	0.38*	0.32	0.49**	0.44 **	0.44 **	0.34**	0.29 **	0.28 **	
Explained variation (%)	Ref	2.56 ^a	15.79 ^b	Ref	10.2 ^c	0 ^d	Ref	14.71 ^e	3.45 ^f	
Intra-facility ICC	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.13	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.08	0.08	

421 *p<0.05, **p<0.00; Model 1 is the null model; baseline model without any variable; Model 2 is model adjusted for
 422 individual-level variables, Model 3 is additionally adjusted for facility-level covariates
 423 a: Explained facility-level variance due to individual factors alone = (.39-.38)/.39 = 2.56%
 424 b: Explained facility-level variance due to facility characteristics= (.38-.32)/.38 =15.79 %
 425 c: Explained facility-level variance due to individual factors = (.49-.44)/.49 = 10.2%
 426 d: Explained facility-level variance due to facility characteristics= (.44-.44)/.44 = 0%
 427 e: Explained facility-level variance due to individual factors alone = (.34-.29)/.34 = 14.71%
 428 f: Explained facility-level variance due to facility characteristics= (.29-.28)/.29 = 3.45%

4. Discussion

In this multi-level and multiple group study, we estimated the relative contributions of individual-level and facility-level determinants to retention in care and viral suppression across ALHIV age-groups. We showed similarities and differences in magnitude and direction of effects across age-groups for individual level (age group, sex, ART regimen, and pattern of care continuity) and facility-level factors (viral load testing coverage) associated with retention in care and viral suppression. We discuss these findings according to the levels of influence.

Individual-level factors

Although we found differences in the magnitude and direction of effects for the individual-level variables, two factors emerged as consistent predictors across age-groups: Baseline ART regimen and pattern of retention.

Similar to other study findings (8,11,12,18), higher proportions (64.7%) of young adolescents were retained in care compared to older adolescents (56.4%) and young adults living with HIV (58.7%). Despite their higher rates of retention, young adolescents had comparatively much lower viral suppression rates (63.5%) compared to older adolescents (81.2%) and young adults (88.3%). Also, while the odds for viral suppression reduced with lower levels of retention with increasing age, there was no significant difference in odds for viral suppression among young adolescents retained in care and those who were lost to follow-up. Although these findings seem counterintuitive since better retention in care is expected to lead to higher rates of viral suppression, it corroborates findings from other studies (30–35) showing high rates of viral non-suppression among young adolescents despite perfect adherence, most notably among young adolescents initiated on AZT + 3TC + NVP/EFV. Young adolescents in our study were initiated predominantly on ART regimen AZT + 3TC + NVP/EFV (63.2%), in contrast to older adolescents and young adults who were initiated predominantly on TDF/3TC/EFV or NVP (83.9 and 90.1% respectively). Moreover, the likelihood of achieving viral suppression irrespective of age-groups was highest with initiation on TDF/3TC/EFV or NVP regimen, reaching significance only among young adults ALHIV. These findings suggest a rise in regimen-specific disparity in viral outcomes, with increasing rates of viral non-suppression despite levels of adherence that should normally guarantee viral suppression. Such increases if not addressed could undermine other HIV prevention interventions.

Another reason we considered for the differential viral suppression between our age groups may be that substantial age-group differences exist by mode of HIV infection. Although we did not have enough information to characterize our cohort by mode of HIV infection, we speculate that the majority of younger adolescents in our study are adolescents perinatally infected with HIV compared to older adolescents and younger adults who we assume to be mostly behaviorally infected. Studies have shown that perinatally infected ALHIV are unique in their life-long experience with HIV infection, with many of them born in the era of mono- and dual-antiretroviral therapy, thus facing an increased likelihood of drug resistance (5,8,11,12)

We observed ART regimen specific effect differences on retention in care. Compared to ALHIV initiated on regimen ABC or AZT/3TC/ ATVr or LPVr, ALHIV initiated on other regimens than the previous ones, were less likely to be LTF or have interrupted care (i.e. not retained) in the three age groups. We speculate these differences to be due to drug side effects from ART which studies have shown to be a major barrier to adherence. Studies have suggested that, compared to patients who initiate ART after experiencing prior sicknesses, patients feeling healthy before commencing ART can have less motivation to tolerate the side effects associated with ART at different stages of care. The scenario is more likely to trigger disengagement with care among ALHIV who in the era of test and treat are generally more likely to initiate ART feeling healthy. The current HIV policy climate of “test and start” where laboratory and clinical assessments are no longer eligibility requirements for ART initiation may lead to an under-emphasis on clinical assessment processes including the management of side effects in favor of quicker ART initiations (36). While our study shows the benefit of early ART initiation to viral outcomes among ALHIV (i.e. likelihood of achieving viral suppression reduced with increasing immune-suppression at baseline, reaching statistical significance among older adolescent and young adults with severe baseline immune suppression) this finding points to an increased need to support ALHIV in balancing immediate needs and desires to live their normal lives with meeting the biomedical requirements for achieving viral suppression (clinic visits and treatment adherence).

We observed a preponderance of female ALHIV among our cohort with age, suggesting that female adolescents and young adult women represent a behaviorally vulnerable population. This supports previous findings from sub-Saharan Africa countries, where being young, female, and less-educated increases the chances for transgenerational HIV transmission (36). Combined with high

adolescent fertility rates in Nigeria, poor retention, and low viral suppression rates among older adolescents and young adults in our study might undermine ongoing efforts at eliminating HIV mother-to-child transmission. However, we also found other gender-specific disparities within our cohort in which male young adult ALHIVs had a higher likelihood of interrupting care or being LTF, and male older adolescent ALHIV being less likely to achieve viral suppression.

Our findings on sex differences suggest the need to factor in gender considerations as services become increasingly differentiated for ALHIV. Studies have shown promising practices among the different approaches targeting men/male for improved HIV testing, prevention, treatment, care and support services(37–47)

Health facility level factors

We found significant variation in outcomes attributable to differences at the health facility level. The variations across facilities remained statistically significant, even after controlling for individual- and facility-level factors (Models 2 and 3).

Although compared to individual-level factors facility-level characteristics accounted for a higher proportion of the total variance observed, the magnitude of this facility-level contribution to variance (i.e. facility effects) differed between ALHIV age-groups. For retention in care, higher increases due to facility effects were observed among young adolescents and young adults than among older adolescents. For viral suppression, there was no change in variance from facility effect, only a modest increase among young adults and a much higher increase in young adolescents. These differences suggest that interventions at the level of health services may be less effective than those targeting individual-level determinants for improving viral outcomes among older adolescents. This supports other studies showing that adolescent-focused health services interventions, though desirable, are not uniformly effective across all adolescent age-groups (48).

We found that an increase in viral-load testing at facility-level reduced the likelihood of non-retention among ALHIV. This might be explained by the high benefit perception of PLHIV concerning laboratory indicator measures (e.g. CD4, viral load test) for health status assessment. Some studies have shown that inability to access such tests often triggers disengagement with care (49–51). As the role of CD4 counts become increasingly outdated with the implementation of test

and treat policies, increased coverage of routine viral load testing is necessary to encourage and sustain this positive health-seeking behavior. Furthermore, given disproportionately high rates of virological failure and sub-optimal retention among ALHIV, scale-up for viral load testing would allow providers to make informed decisions on counseling, support, and the management of treatment regimens(52).

Clinical implications

Taken together, our study shows the need for both individual and health services interventions for ALHIV to be both broad-based and targeted. We showed that some factors at the individual and facility level (ART regimen, the pattern of retention in care, baseline immune suppression, viral load testing coverage) appear to be important predictors of outcomes in all ALHIV age-groups. These common factors appear to represent the base of a hierarchy of factors driving outcomes across all ALHIV and might be important entry points for modifying health services to better respond to ALHIV needs as part of a minimum package of services. This would include improving responsiveness to gender and age-specific needs, improving capacity for active case-finding and monitoring for retention in care, increased capacity for viral load testing, capacity building for all care providers to provide clinical care including pharmacovigilance, and monitoring of ART side effects.

Study limitations

Our findings should be interpreted in light of some important limitations. Although we imputed for missing information to minimize bias, the possibility of non-differential errors cannot be ruled out. Due to differences in the age-group cohort sizes, there was greater power to detect covariate effect sizes among older adolescents and young adults age-groups, compared to young adolescents. Although case-finding was conducted for those ALHIV who were not retained in care, the percentage of these patients who returned to clinical care and had viral load assessment was low and may not be representative of their respective categories. We also lacked information to categorize our adolescent cohort by modes of transmission (perinatal vs behavioral infected) and previous exposure to antiretrovirals. Despite our use of multiple imputations to address missing

data, we still cannot completely rule out some bias in our estimates given that health facilities with more missing data may also be the ones with poorer outcomes on the aggregate. Lastly, our study was carried out within the context of healthcare facilities receiving PEPFAR support. Findings may therefore not be generalizable to other ALHIV receiving care at health facilities not supported by PEPFAR who may differ in patient outcomes. Despite attempting to delineate the different levels of effects in our multilevel modeling our study still did not fully account for variations in outcomes at facility levels. This unobserved heterogeneity suggests the existence of other important explanatory factors that were not measured in our study.

Conclusions

Our study supports our hypothesis that important differences exist in health service conditions between healthcare facilities that can explain variations in treatment outcomes among ALHIV. We also demonstrate key individual (ART regimen, baseline immune suppression, sex) and facility-level factors (facility-level viral-load testing) that may serve as entry points for both broad-based and targeted interventions to improve outcomes among ALHIV. Despite limited data to explore the whole range of factors at individual and service delivery levels potentially affecting treatment continuity and viral load suppression, we demonstrate a need to better understand and unpack these potentially modifiable factors at the individual- and facility-level to design interventions that ensure equity of among all ALHIV groups and ensure that no one is left behind.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interest

Authors' contributions

OAB conceived the study, conducted the analysis, and wrote all drafts of the manuscript. All authors provided critical reviews of the draft. All authors read and approved of the final draft

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge enabling support from APIN management during the conduct of this study. We also thank program managers and health workers who provide services to people living

with HIV. Finally, we thank all adolescents and youths living with HIV whose consent to having their information used for research purposes has made this study possible

Funding

The data on which this study is based is from a project funded by the US Presidents Emergency Plan for AIDS (PEPFAR), awarded through the Center for Disease Control. The funder had no role in the conduct and writing of this study. OAB received doctoral research funding from the Belgium Directorate-General for Development Cooperation (DGD) awarded through the Institute of Tropical Medicine Antwerp, Belgium

References

1. Tsondai PR, Sohn AH, Phiri S, Sikombe K, Sawry S, Chimbetete C, et al. Characterizing the double-sided cascade of care for adolescents living with HIV transitioning to adulthood across Southern Africa. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020;23(1):e25447.
2. WHO. UNAIDS Update: active involvement of young people is key to ending the AIDS epidemic by 2030. WHO Geneva; 2017.
3. Zandoni BC, Mayer KH. The adolescent and young adult HIV cascade of care in the United States: exaggerated health disparities. *AIDS Patient Care STDs.* 2014 Mar;28(3):128–35.
4. Said M, Bartlett AW. Immune Dysfunction and Antiretroviral Therapy Challenges in Children and Adolescents Living with Human Immunodeficiency Virus. *Innate Immun Health Dis* [Internet]. 2020 Apr 27 [cited 2020 May 29]; Available from: <https://www.intechopen.com/online-first/immune-dysfunction-and-antiretroviral-therapy-challenges-in-children-and-adolescents-living-with-hum>
5. Nachega JB, Hislop M, Nguyen H, Dowdy DW, Chaisson RE, Regensberg L, et al. Antiretroviral therapy adherence, virologic and immunologic outcomes in adolescents compared with adults in southern Africa. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 1999. 2009 May 1;51(1):65–71.
6. Ending the AIDS epidemic for adolescents, with adolescents. :32.
7. Wang H, Wolock TM, Carter A, Nguyen G, Kyu HH, Gakidou E, et al. Estimates of global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and mortality of HIV, 1980–2015: the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *Lancet HIV.* 2016 Aug 1;3(8):e361–87.
8. Slogrove AL, Sohn AH. The global epidemiology of adolescents living with HIV: Time for more granular data to improve adolescent health outcomes. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS.* 2018 May;13(3):170–8.

9. Fast-track commitments to end AIDS by 2030 [Internet]. [cited 2020 May 29]. Available from: <https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2016/fast-track-commitments>
10. Young people, HIV and AIDS [Internet]. Avert. 2015 [cited 2020 Jun 21]. Available from: <https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-social-issues/key-affected-populations/young-people>
11. Collaboration TCI for PHE and R (CIPHER) GC, Slogrove AL, Schomaker M, Davies M-A, Williams P, Balkan S, et al. The epidemiology of adolescents living with perinatally acquired HIV: A cross-region global cohort analysis. *PLOS Med*. 2018 Mar 1;15(3):e1002514.
12. Slogrove AL, Mahy M, Armstrong A, Davies M-A. Living and dying to be counted: What we know about the epidemiology of the global adolescent HIV epidemic. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2017;20(S3):21520.
13. Reif LK, Abrams EJ, Arpad S, Elul B, McNairy ML, Fitzgerald DW, et al. Interventions to Improve Antiretroviral Therapy Adherence Among Adolescents and Youth in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review 2015–2019. *AIDS Behav* [Internet]. 2020 Mar 9 [cited 2020 May 29]; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-020-02822-4>
14. Kranzer K, Simms V, Bandason T, Dauya E, McHugh G, Munyati S, et al. Economic incentives for HIV testing by adolescents in Zimbabwe: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2018 Feb;5(2):e79–86.
15. Reif LK, Bertrand R, Benedict C, Lamb MR, Rouzier V, Verdier R, et al. Impact of a youth-friendly HIV clinic: 10 years of adolescent outcomes in Port-au-Prince, Haiti. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2016;19(1):20859.
16. Ruria EC, Masaba R, Kose J, Woelk G, Mwangi E, Matu L, et al. Optimizing linkage to care and initiation and retention on treatment of adolescents with newly diagnosed HIV infection: *AIDS*. 2017 Jul;31:S253–60.
17. Teasdale CA, Alwar T, Chege D, Fayorsey R, Hawken MP, Abrams EJ. Impact of Youth and Adolescent Friendly Services on Retention of 10–24-Year-Olds in HIV Care and Treatment Programs in Nyanza, Kenya. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 1999. 2016 Feb 1;71(2):e56–9.
18. Lamb MR, Fayorsey R, Nuwagaba-Biribonwoha H, Viola V, Mutabazi V, Alwar T, et al. High attrition before and after ART initiation among youth (15–24 years of age) enrolled in HIV care. *AIDS Lond Engl*. 2014 Feb 20;28(4):559–68.
19. Rongkavilit C, Naar-King S, Wang B, Panthong A, Bunupuradah T, Parsons JT, et al. Motivational interviewing targeting risk behaviors for youth living with HIV in Thailand. *AIDS Behav*. 2013 Jul;17(6):2063–74.
20. Kaihin R, Kasatpibal N, Chitreechuer J, Grimes RM. Effect of an Empowerment Intervention on Antiretroviral Drug Adherence in Thai Youth. *Behav Med Wash DC*. 2015;41(4):186–94.

21. Bhana A, Mellins CA, Petersen I, Alicea S, Myeza N, Holst H, et al. The VUKA Family Program: Piloting a family-based psychosocial intervention to promote health and mental health among HIV infected early adolescents in South Africa. *AIDS Care* [Internet]. 2014 Jan [cited 2020 Feb 8];26(1). Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3838445/>
22. Black RE, Allen LH, Bhutta ZA, Caulfield LE, de Onis M, Ezzati M, et al. Maternal and child undernutrition: global and regional exposures and health consequences. *The Lancet*. 2008 Jan 19;371(9608):243–60.
23. Smith P, Wallace M, Bekker L-G. Adolescents' experience of a rapid HIV self-testing device in youth-friendly clinic settings in Cape Town South Africa: a cross-sectional community based usability study. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2016;19(1):21111.
24. Mavhu W, Willis N, Mufuka J, Bernays S, Tshuma M, Mangenah C, et al. Effect of a differentiated service delivery model on virological failure in adolescents with HIV in Zimbabwe (Zvandiri): a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2020 Feb 1;8(2):e264–75.
25. Badejo OA, Menson WNA, Sam-Agudu NA, Pharr J, Ereka S, Bruno T, et al. Pediatric to adult healthcare transitioning for adolescents living with HIV in Nigeria: A national survey. *PLOS ONE*. 2018 Jun 12;13(6):e0198802.
26. Oladele EA, Badejo OA, Obanubi C, Okechukwu EF, James E, Ow'honda G, et al. Bridging the HIV treatment gap in Nigeria: examining community antiretroviral treatment models. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2018;21(4):e25108.
27. Global AIDS Monitoring 2020 -- Indicators for monitoring the 2016 Political Declaration on Ending AIDS. :176.
28. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). 90-90-90: an ambitious treatment target to help end the AIDS epidemic [Internet]. UNAIDS; 2014. Available from: https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/90-90-90_en_0.pdf
29. von Hippel P. HOW_MANY_IMPUTATIONS: Stata module to determine required number of imputations [Internet]. 2018. Available from: <https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:boc:bocode:s458452>
30. Natukunda J, Kirabira P, Ong KIC, Shibanuma A, Jimba M. Virologic failure in HIV-positive adolescents with perfect adherence in Uganda: a cross-sectional study. *Trop Med Health*. 2019 Jan 17;47(1):8.
31. Sovershaeva E, Shamu T, Wilsgaard T, Bandason T, Flægstad T, Katzenstein D, et al. Patterns of detectable viraemia among children and adults with HIV infection taking antiretroviral therapy in Zimbabwe. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2019 Jan 1;78:65–71.

32. McHugh G, Simms V, Dauya E, Bandason T, Chonzi P, Metaxa D, et al. Clinical outcomes in children and adolescents initiating antiretroviral therapy in decentralized healthcare settings in Zimbabwe. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2017 Jan 1;20(1):21843.
33. Mossoro-Kpinde CD, Gody J-C, Mboumba Bouassa R-S, Mbitikon O, Jenabian M-A, Robin L, et al. High levels of virological failure with major genotypic resistance mutations in HIV-1-infected children after 5 years of care according to WHO-recommended 1st-line and 2nd-line antiretroviral regimens in the Central African Republic: A cross-sectional study. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2017 Mar;96(10):e6282.
34. Chimukangara B, Manasa J, Mitchell R, Nyabadza G, Katzenstein D, Masimirembwa C. Community Based Antiretroviral Treatment in Rural Zimbabwe. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses.* 2017 Sep 13;33(12):1185–91.
35. Muri L, Gamell A, Ntamatungiro A, Glass T, Luwanda L, Battegay M, et al. Development of HIV drug resistance and therapeutic failure in children and adolescents in rural Tanzania: an emerging public health concern. *Aids.* 2017 Jan 2;31(1):61–70.
36. Adeola J, Badejo OA, Ahonkhai A, Okonkwo P, Aboh Akande P, Evans CT, et al. Effect of Baseline Symptom Manifestations on Retention in Care and Treatment among HIV-Infected Patients in Nigeria. *J Int Assoc Provid AIDS Care JIAPAC.* 2020 Jan 1;19:2325958220903575.
37. Stender SC, Rozario A. “Khotla Bophelong Bo Botle”: a gathering of men for health. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020 Jun 1;23(S2):e25511.
38. Shapiro AE, van Heerden A, Krows M, Sausi K, Sithole N, Schaafsma TT, et al. An implementation study of oral and blood-based HIV self-testing and linkage to care among men in rural and peri-urban KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020 Jun 1;23(S2):e25514.
39. Gottert A, Pulerwitz J, Heck CJ, Cawood C, Mathur S. Creating HIV risk profiles for men in South Africa: a latent class approach using cross-sectional survey data. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020 Jun 1;23(S2):e25518.
40. Dovel K, Dworkin SL, Cornell M, Coates TJ, Yeatman S. Gendered health institutions: examining the organization of health services and men’s use of HIV testing in Malawi. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020 Jun 1;23(S2):e25517.
41. Bhattacharjee P, Isac S, Musyoki H, Emmanuel F, Olango K, Kuria S, et al. HIV prevalence, testing and treatment among men who have sex with men through engagement in virtual sexual networks in Kenya: a cross-sectional bio-behavioural study. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020 Jun 1;23(S2):e25516.
42. Mwango LK, Stafford KA, Blanco NC, Lavoie M-C, Mujansi M, Nyirongo N, et al. Index and targeted community-based testing to optimize HIV case finding and ART linkage among men in Zambia. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020 Jun 1;23(S2):e25520.

43. Barnabas RV, van Heerden A, McConnell M, Szpiro AA, Krows ML, Schaafsma TT, et al. Lottery incentives have short-term impact on ART initiation among men: results from a randomized pilot study. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020 Jun 1;23(S2):e25519.
44. Napierala S, Bair EF, Marcus N, Ochwal P, Maman S, Agot K, et al. Male partner testing and sexual behaviour following provision of multiple HIV self-tests to Kenyan women at higher risk of HIV infection in a cluster randomized trial. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020 Jun 1;23(S2):e25515.
45. Osler M, Cornell M, Ford N, Hilderbrand K, Goemaere E, Boule A. Population-wide differentials in HIV service access and outcomes in the Western Cape for men as compared to women, South Africa: 2008 to 2018: a cohort analysis. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020 Jun 1;23(S2):e25530.
46. Makusha T, van Rooyen H, Cornell M. Reframing the approach to heterosexual men in the HIV epidemic in sub-Saharan Africa. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020 Jun 1;23(S2):e25510.
47. Grimsrud A, Ameyan W, Ayieko J, Shewchuk T. Shifting the narrative: from “the missing men” to “we are missing the men.” *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020 Jun 1;23(S2):e25526.
48. Sam-Agudu NA, Folayan MO, Haire BG. Program implementation gaps and ethical issues in the prevention of HIV infection among infants, children, and adolescents in sub-Saharan Africa. *Pediatr Res.* 2020 Jan 1;87(2):406–13.
49. Rachlis B, Bakoyannis G, Easterbrook P, Genberg B, Braithwaite RS, Cohen CR, et al. Facility-Level Factors Influencing Retention of Patients in HIV Care in East Africa. *PLOS ONE.* 2016 Aug 10;11(8):e0159994.
50. Renju J, Moshabela M, McLean E, Ddaaki W, Skovdal M, Odongo F, et al. ‘Side effects’ are ‘central effects’ that challenge retention in HIV treatment programmes in six sub-Saharan African countries: a multicountry qualitative study. *Sex Transm Infect* [Internet]. 2017 Jul 1 [cited 2020 May 30];93(Suppl 3). Available from: https://sti.bmj.com/content/93/Suppl_3/e052971
51. Cluver L, Pantelic M, Toska E, Orkin M, Casale M, Bungane N, et al. STACKing the odds for adolescent survival: health service factors associated with full retention in care and adherence amongst adolescents living with HIV in South Africa. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2018 Sep;21(9):e25176–e25176.
52. Marcus R, Ferrand RA, Kranzer K, Bekker L-G. The case for viral load testing in adolescents in resource-limited settings. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2017 Nov;20:e25002.

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762