

1 **Monitoring socioeconomic inequalities across HIV knowledge, attitudes,**
2 **behaviours and prevention in 18 sub-Saharan African countries**

3

4 *Mohamed Hamidouche^{1,2}, Pearl Anne Ante-Testard^{1,2}, Rachel Baggaley³, Laura Temime^{1,2}, Kévin*
5 *Jean^{1,2,4*}*

6

7 ¹Laboratoire MESuRS, Conservatoire national des Arts et Métiers, Paris, France ;

8 ²Unité PACRI, Institut Pasteur, Conservatoire national des Arts et Métiers, Paris, France ;

9 ³World Health Organization, Global HIV, Hepatitis and STI Programmes, Geneva, Switzerland

10 ⁴MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology,
11 Imperial College London, London W2 1PG, United Kingdom.

12

13

14 * Correspondance to:

15 Kévin Jean

16 Laboratoire MESuRS, Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, 292 rue Saint Martin, 75003, Paris, France

17 kevin.jean@lecnam.net

18

19 Running head: Monitoring inequalities in HIV prevention

20

21 Keywords: HIV; health inequalities; epidemiology; sub-Saharan Africa; HIV prevention;
22 social epidemiology

23

24 Word count:

25 Abstract: 244/250

26 Main text: 3162/3500

27

28 **Objectives:** Socioeconomic inequalities in HIV prevention services coverage constitute
29 important barriers to global prevention targets, especially in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). We
30 aimed at monitoring these inequalities from population-based survey data in 18 SSA countries
31 between 2010 and 2018.

32 **Methods:** We defined eight HIV indicators aimed at capturing uptake of HIV prevention services
33 among adult participants. Country-specific wealth-related inequalities were measured using the
34 Relative and Slope Index of Inequalities (RII and SII, respectively) and then pooled using
35 random-effects meta-analyses. We compared inequalities between African regions using the
36 Wilcoxon rank-sum test.

37 **Results:** The sample consisted of 358,591 participants (66% women). Despite variability
38 between countries and indicators, the meta-analysis revealed significant levels of relative and
39 absolute inequalities in 6 out of 8 indicators: HIV-related knowledge, positive attitudes toward
40 people living with HIV (PLHIV), condom use at last sexual intercourse, participation to
41 prevention of mother-to-child transmission programs, medical male circumcision and recent
42 HIV testing. The largest inequalities were reported in condom use, with condom use reported 5
43 times more among the richest versus the poorest (RII=5.02, 95% Confidence interval, CI: 2.79-
44 9.05) and in positive attitudes toward PLHIV, with a 32-percentage point difference between the
45 richest and poorest (SII=0.32, 95% CI: 0.26-0.39). Conversely, no significant inequalities were
46 observed in multi-partnership and HIV seropositivity among youth. Overall, inequalities tended
47 to be larger in West and Central vs. East and Southern African countries.

48 **Conclusions:** Despite efforts to scale-up HIV-prevention programs, socioeconomic inequalities
49 remain substantial over the continuum of HIV primary and secondary prevention in several SSA
50 countries.

51 **Introduction**

52 Despite a sustained decrease over the last decade, sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) continues to bear a
53 disproportionate burden of the global HIV epidemic, with about two thirds of the worldwide
54 number of HIV infections [1]. Many SSA countries are not on track to meet global targets of 90%
55 reduction of new HIV infections by 2030 compared to 2010 [2,3]. There is however a large body
56 of literature supporting the fact that these targets could be reached by effectively combining
57 existing prevention interventions and tools, including behavioural prevention, condoms,
58 voluntary male medical circumcision (VMMC), pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP), HIV testing,
59 and prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT), alongside increased antiretroviral
60 coverage [4].

61 HIV risk, knowledge and attitudes, access to services and HIV outcomes vary largely across
62 gender, age, location or social status. Inequalities, including socio-economic inequalities, have
63 been recognized as a contributor in the failure to meet the UNAIDS 90-90-90 testing and
64 treatment 2020 targets [5], and may also be a factor in the disappointing progress in effective
65 prevention coverage. Indeed, socio-economic inequalities have been reported across HIV
66 knowledge [6], HIV testing [7-9], PMTCT [10], and VMMC [11]. However, there has not been to
67 date a comprehensive large-scale assessment of socioeconomic inequalities across the major
68 prevention pillars to guide the focus of future programming to overcome current gaps. Such an
69 assessment would be valuable, though. Firstly, it would allow to identify, within the main HIV
70 prevention pillars, those that could potentially be at specific risk of generating socioeconomic
71 inequalities in HIV infections. Secondly, a monitoring of national HIV prevention indicators
72 focusing on inequalities would potentially allow to identify and then learn from settings that are
73 specifically performant in terms of equity.

74 In this paper, we used nationally representative surveys conducted across 18 sub-Saharan
75 African countries between 2010 and 2018 to quantify wealth-related inequalities in several
76 indicators aiming at capturing HIV prevention elements.

77

78 **Methods**

79 *Study population and data*

80 We analysed data from the most recent Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) in 18 Sub-
81 Saharan African countries (based on data availability as of November 2020). The country
82 sample was a convenience sample based, and slightly extended, from an earlier research
83 project [9]. The sample included Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic
84 Republic of Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, Guinea, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Niger,
85 Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

86 DHS are nationally representative surveys based on a multistage design with households as
87 sampling units. They collect a wide range of demographic and reproduction health indicators
88 among consenting adults that are interviewed face-to-face by trained interviewers using
89 standardized questionnaires [12]. The collected data notably include age and gender, as well
90 as specific data on HIV/AIDS. In particular, some DHS include an HIV serological survey,
91 for which participants are asked to consent to be tested for HIV (anonymously in most of the
92 surveys included here). Household wealth was assessed using the DHS wealth index, a
93 composite measure of living standards that is based on the household's assets (e.g.
94 refrigerators) and characteristics (e.g., sanitation facilities) [13].

95 All DHS were conducted by national central statistics agencies or research institutes. The
96 institutions that approved, implemented, or provided funding for the surveys were responsible
97 for ethical clearance, which guaranteed informed consent and confidentiality of participant's
98 information.

99

100 *HIV indicators*

101 We defined and analysed a set of eight HIV indicators aimed at capturing HIV knowledge,
102 attitudes, behaviours and access to and uptake of HIV prevention services. These indicators
103 were chosen and designed in a pragmatic way based on the information collected in the DHS
104 across all countries selected for this analysis. These HIV indicators were consistently coded as
105 binary variables with the level 1 (the level 0, respectively) reflecting a favourable
106 (unfavourable, respectively) condition regarding HIV. These HIV indicators were:

- 107 i) *HIV-related knowledge*: based on the responses to a set of seven questions related to
108 HIV transmission and prevention, we defined a categorical indicator reflecting good
109 HIV-related knowledge (coded as 1 for those answering all questions correctly, 0
110 otherwise).
- 111 ii) *Positive attitudes towards PLHIV*: based on a set of two questions related to stigma
112 towards PLHIV, we defined a categorical indicator reflecting positive attitudes
113 towards PLHIV (coded as 1 for those answering positively to both questions, 0
114 otherwise).
- 115 iii) *No multipartnership (no or one sexual partner) in the past year*: based on the number
116 of sexual partners reported in the last 12 months (self-reported, coded as 1 for those
117 reporting no or one sexual partner, 0 otherwise)
- 118 iv) *Condom use at last sexual intercourse* (self-reported, coded as 1 for those reporting
119 having used a condom during their last intercourse, 0 otherwise).
- 120 v) *VMMC (among men only)*: based on the self-reported circumcision status and the
121 qualification of the person who performed the circumcision (health
122 worker/professional). We only analysed VMMC in 7 countries among of 14 that have

123 been prioritized for the implementation of VMMC as HIV-prevention intervention in
124 2007 (mainly in Eastern and Southern Africa) [14].

125 vi) *Participation in Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission (PMTCT*, among women
126 only): based on self-reported HIV testing during antenatal care among women who
127 gave birth in the 12 months preceding the survey (coded as 1 for those reporting
128 having been tested, 0 otherwise).

129 vii) *Recent HIV testing*: based on self-reported HIV testing within the past 12 months
130 (coded as 1 for those reporting having been recently tested, 0 otherwise).

131 viii) *HIV seronegativity among youth*: based on the result of the HIV serological survey
132 among 15-24 years old participants (coded as 1 in seronegative youths, 0 otherwise).

133 trends in HIV prevalence among youth (aged 15-24 years) have been documented to
134 be a surrogate reflecting trends in HIV incidence [15,16]. As the onset of sexual
135 activity in this group is likely to be recent, prevalence reflects recent infection and
136 therefore incidence. We thus used the socioeconomic gradient in HIV seroprevalence
137 among the 15-24 years old as a proxy for the socioeconomic gradient in HIV
138 incidence. To consistently consider a level 1 reflecting a favourable condition and
139 therefore facilitate the interpretation and comparison of inequalities across indicators,
140 the level 1 was chosen to code HIV seronegativity.

141 Further details on the construction of these HIV-related indicators are provided in Appendix 1

142

143 *Statistical analysis*

144 For each country survey and each HIV indicator, we calculated percentages of positivity
145 taking into account the survey design and sampling weights. We then assessed within-country
146 socioeconomic inequalities related to each indicator based on participants' relative rank in the

147 cumulative distribution of the wealth index. Inequalities were measured on both relative and
148 absolute scales using the relative index of inequality (RII) and the slope index of inequality
149 (SII), respectively [17]. The RII expresses the ratio of the predicted outcomes between the
150 richest and the poorest people in the wealth distribution. The SII represents the absolute
151 difference in the predicted proportions of these two extremes. For instance, a RII value of 2
152 indicates that individuals at the upper extreme of the wealth distribution (the richest) are twice
153 more likely to report the outcome than individuals at the lower extreme (the poorest). A SII
154 value of 0.2 means that the proportion of the outcome is higher by 0.2 (or higher by 20
155 percentage-points) in the upper extreme of the wealth distribution (the richest) versus the
156 lower extreme (the poorest). Reporting inequalities on both scales is recommended, because
157 conclusions can be skewed when only one or the other is used [18]. Furthermore, the choice
158 of a relative scale over an absolute scale or vice versa carries an implicit normative judgment
159 on what a fair and socially just distribution of health should be [19].

160 Both RII and SII were obtained by fitting a modified Poisson regression with a robust
161 variance and a log link function to estimate the association between participants' relative
162 wealth rank and each indicator, and by using generalised estimating equations to account for
163 the clustering of observations [20]. We used the Wilcoxon rank-sum test to compare indices
164 of inequalities between West and Central Africa (WCA) versus East and Southern African
165 (ESA) countries (except for *VMMC*, which was studied in ESA only). Lastly, we used
166 random-effects meta-analysis to average inequality estimates across countries [21].

167


168 **Results**

169 *Study population*

170 DHS included in the present work were conducted between 2010 and 2018 (Figure 1), with
171 participation rates ranging from 90% (Ethiopia 2016) to 100% (Rwanda 2014-15) (Table 1).
172 Overall, these studies represented 358,591 participants, (238,055 women and 120,536 men).

173

174



175

176 **Figure 1: Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) year (left) and adult HIV prevalence (right) of the**
177 **18 Sub-Saharan African countries (NB: For Kenya, HIV prevalence is unavailable in its last DHS 2014).**

8 **Table 1: Distribution of HIV-related indicators for 18 Sub-Saharan African countries (Demographic and Health Surveys).** PLHIV: People living with HIV; PMTCT : Prevention
9 of Mother-to-Child Transmission; VMMC: Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision; NA: Not Available. ¹: as reported in the country's DHS final report ; ²: within the past year; ³:
0 at last sexual intercourse; ⁴: among those aged 15-24 y. Countries are ordered west to east.

	West and Central Africa									
	Senegal (2017)	Sierra Leone (2013)	Guinea (2018)	Liberia (2013)	Côte d'Ivoire (2011-12)	Mali (2012- 13)	Burkina Faso (2010)	Niger (2012)	Cameroon (2018)	DR Congo (2013-14)
Response rate (%) ¹	92%	96%	98%	96%	92%	94%	97%	91%	97%	98%
Sample size	23 764	23 920	14 991	13 357	15 195	14 823	24 394	15 088	20 505	27 483
HIV-related knowledge	17.7%	19.5%	15.8%	6.2%	14.0%	19.9%	22.7%	11.0%	30.3%	12.5%
Positive Attitude towards PLHIV	32.9%	34.1%	16.0%	34.7%	47.0%	45.1%	34.5%	20.1%	55.1%	35.7%
No multipartnership ²	97.1%	88.1%	95.4%	90.1%	88.1%	95.2%	94.2%	95.6%	90.1%	91.1%
Condom use ³	6.5%	5.0%	8.3%	12.8%	18.5%	3.6%	12.7%	1.1%	29.7%	9.2%
Participation to PMTCT (Females)	67.0%	72.2%	30.7%	76.4%	50.0%	23.2%	40.3%	33.5%	89.4%	25.0%
VMMC (Males)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recent HIV-Testing ²	18.6	14.7%	8.4%	19.1%	13.5%	6.8%	10.3%	6.9%	57.7%	8.6%
HIV-seronegativity among youth ⁴	99.8%	98.9%	99.1%	98.9%	98.7%	99.2%	99.7%	100%	98.7%	99.3%
	East and Southern Africa									
	Zambia (2018)	Lesotho (2014)	Zimbabwe (2015)	Rwanda (2014-15)	Malawi (2015- 16)	Tanzania (2011-12)	Kenya (2014)	Ethiopia (2016)		
Response rate (%) ¹	94%	95%	94%	100%	96%	97%	92%	90%		
Sample size	25 815	9 552	18 351	19 714	32 040	19 319	11 909	28 371		
HIV-related knowledge	29.6%	23.8%	40.2%	43.4%	34.7%	28.3%	27.2%	22.2%		
Positive Attitude towards PLHIV	72.8%	80.5%	77.9%	84.3%	81.6%	61.5%	75.2%	39.7%		
No multipartnership ²	92.1%	87.6%	92.9%	98.0%	96.1%	88.9%	93.4%	98.2%		
Condom use ³	18.8%	51.3%	23.4%	12.4%	14.6%	19.3%	21.6%	3.0%		
Participation to PMTCT (Females)	97.3%	98.4%	97.9%	99.4%	97.2%	80.5%	98.0%	57.2%		
VMMC (Males)	40.4%	NA	11.3%	85.4%	9.0%	40.7%	60.0%	15.8%		
Recent HIV-Testing ²	59.8%	52.6%	43.6%	38.8%	43.9%	30.4%	64.9%	20.6%		
HIV-seronegativity among youth ⁴	96.1%	90.3%	95.0%	99.0%	96.9%	98.0%	NA	99.8%		

181 *HIV indicators*

182 Country-specific percentages of positivity for each HIV indicator are presented in Table 1. In ESA
183 countries, good HIV-related knowledge ranged from 22% (Ethiopia) to 43 % (Rwanda) while it
184 was $\leq 20\%$ in 8 out of 10 WCA countries (with the exception of Cameroon, 30% and Burkina
185 Faso, 23%). Similarly, positive attitudes toward PLHIV were $>60\%$ in 7 out of 8 ESA countries
186 (with the exception of Ethiopia, 40%) while the highest level in WCA was 55% (Cameroon).
187 Reporting no multipartnership in the past 12 months was consistently high across countries,
188 ranging from 88% (Sierra Leone, Côte d'Ivoire and Lesotho) to 98% (Rwanda and Ethiopia).
189 Reported condom use at last sexual intercourse was highest in Lesotho (51%). In other
190 countries reported condom use was lower, ranging from 1% (Niger) to 23% (Zimbabwe).
191 Overall, higher uptake of HIV testing in the past 12 months was observed in ESA, with uptake
192 $>20\%$ in all countries, as compared to in WCA, where uptake was $<20\%$ in 9 out of 10 countries.
193 Similarly, ESA countries reported levels of participation to PMTCT $>95\%$ in 6 out of 8 countries
194 (with the exception of Ethiopia, 57% and Tanzania, 81%), while it was $<90\%$ in all WCA
195 countries, with large heterogeneity (from 23% in Mali to 89% in Cameroon). As mentioned
196 earlier, VMMC was reported in ESA countries only, with levels ranging from 9% (Malawi) to 85%
197 (Rwanda).

198

199 *Socioeconomic inequalities in the HIV indicators*

200 Measures of relative and absolute inequalities pooled across countries are presented in Table 2.
201 Significant levels of relative and absolute inequalities in favour of the richest were observed for
202 HIV-related knowledge, positive attitudes toward PLHIV, condom use at last sex, participation to
203 PMTCT, VMMC and recent HIV testing. In contrast, we observed inequalities in the other
204 direction in reporting no multipartnership and in HIV-seronegativity among youth (that is, the
205 poorest reported lower levels of multipartnership and exhibited lower levels of HIV
206 seropositivity), although these inequalities were borderline significant and of low magnitude as

207 compared to the other indicators. The ranking of the indicators by level of inequalities varied
208 between the relative and the absolute scales. On the relative scale, the highest level was
209 observed for condom use, with the richest being approximately 5 times more likely (RII = 5.02;
210 95 Confidence interval, CI, 2.79-9.05) to use condom than the poorest people. In the absolute
211 scales, the largest gap between the richest and the poorest people was observed in positive
212 attitudes toward PLHIV, with a difference of 32 percentage-points (SII=0.32; 95% CI 0.26-0.39).

213 On the relative scale, levels of inequalities were significantly higher in WCA as compared to ESA
214 countries for the following indicators: HIV-related knowledge, positive attitude towards PLHIV,
215 condom use, participation to PMTCT and recent HIV testing (all rank-sum test p -values <0.05).
216 Absolute levels of inequalities were also higher in WCA versus ESA countries for participation to
217 PMTCT (0.43 versus 0.12, respectively, $p=0.009$) and for recent HIV testing, although this was
218 borderline significant (0.16 versus 0.09, respectively, $p=0.06$).

219 A more detailed comparison of the levels of inequalities across indicators and across countries is
220 displayed in Figure 2. In WCA countries, the countries exhibiting the higher levels of inequalities
221 were generally not the same when considering the relative or the absolute scale. In contrast, in
222 ESA countries, Ethiopia tended to exhibit the highest levels of inequalities on both the relative
223 and absolute scales. We also observed significant inequalities in favour of the poor in HIV-
224 seronegativity among youth in some countries, especially on the absolute scale (for example in
225 Sierra Leone, Zambia, Rwanda), although their magnitudes were lower than for other indicators.

226 Table 3 presents the correlations between RII (log-transformed) and SII values across HIV-
227 related indicators. We observed significant positive correlations between relative- and absolute
228 inequalities metrics for most of the indicators (Pearson correlation coefficients >0.6 in 6 out of 8
229 indicators), apart from condom use and VMMC presenting no evidence of correlation.

230

Table 2: Pooled relative and absolute wealth-related inequalities in various HIV-related indicators in sub-Saharan Africa, per region and overall. RII: relative index of inequality; SII : slope index of inequality; PLHIV: People living with HIV; PMTCT : Prevention of Mother-to-Child Transmission; VMMC: Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision. ¹: rank-sum test p-value; ²: within the past year; ³: at last sexual intercourse; ⁴: among those aged 15-24 y.

	West and Central Africa		East and Southern Africa		<i>P-value</i> ¹	Overall (all countries)	
	Pooled RII [95% CI]	I2	Pooled RII [95% CI]	I2		Pooled RII [95% CI]	I2
HIV-related knowledge	3.13 [2.26;4.34]	52%	1.89 [1.33;2.69]	70%	p = 0.0145	2.45 [1.91;3.14]	72%
Positive Attitude towards PLHIV	2.49 [1.74;3.56]	78%	1.60 [1.19;2.15]	76%	p = 0.016	1.99 [1.57;2.53]	81%
No multipartnership ²	0.99 [0.97;1.00]	0%	0.99 [0.98;1.01]	0%	p = 0.32	0.99 [0.98;1.00]	0%
Condom use ³	8.08 [3.87;16.87]	77%	2.80 [1.13;6.95]	88%	p = 0.007	5.02 [2.79;9.05]	88%
Participation to PMTCT (Females)	2.87 [1.60;5.15]	82%	1.09 [0.90;1.33]	51%	p = 0.002	1.70 [1.20;2.43]	85%
VMMC (Males)	-	-	2.08 [1.38;3.15]	59%	-	-	-
Recent HIV-Testing ²	4.47 [2.13;9.40]	90%	1.24 [0.85;1.81]	76%	p = 0.003	2.43 [1.47;4.04]	92%
HIV-seronegativity among youth ⁴	0.99 [0.98;0.99]	0%	0.98 [0.95;1.02]	0%	p = 0.45	0.99 [0.98;1.00]	0%

	West and Central Africa		East and Southern Africa		<i>P-value</i> ¹	Overall (all countries)	
	Pooled SII [95% CI]	I2	Pooled SII [95% CI]	I2		Pooled SII [95% CI]	I2
HIV-related knowledge	0.18 [0.13;0.23]	98%	0.18 [0.11;0.25]	98%	p = 0.89	0.18 [0.14;0.22]	98%
Positive Attitude towards PLHIV	0.33 [0.23;0.43]	99%	0.31 [0.19;0.44]	100%	p = 0.76	0.32 [0.26;0.39]	99%
No multipartnership ²	-0.02 [-0.04;-0.00]	98%	-0.01 [-0.02;0.01]	96%	p = 0.32	-0.01 [-0.03;-0.00]	97%
Condom use ³	0.17 [0.11;0.23]	98%	0.15 [0.10;0.20]	96%	p = 0.69	0.16 [0.12;0.20]	98%
Participation to PMTCT (Females)	0.43 [0.31;0.55]	97%	0.12 [-0.07;0.32]	99%	p = 0.009	0.29 [0.17;0.42]	99%
VMMC (Males)	-	-	0.20 [0.11;0.29]	97%	-	-	-
Recent HIV-Testing ²	0.16 [0.11;0.21]	97%	0.09 [-0.01;0.19]	99%	p = 0.06	0.13 [0.08;0.18]	99%
HIV-seronegativity among youth ⁴	-0.01 [-0.02;-0.01]	92%	-0.01 [-0.05;0.03]	98%	p = 1.00	-0.01 [-0.03;0.00]	97%



246

247 **Figure 2 : Relative (top) and absolute (bottom) wealth-related inequalities in various HIV-related**
 248 **indicators across 18 sub-Saharan African countries.** Countries are ordered west to east. RII: relative
 249 index of inequality; SII : slope index of inequality; PLHIV: People living with HIV; PMTCT : Prevention
 250 of Mother-to-Child Transmission; VM/C: Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision.

251 **Table 3 : Correlation between country-level relative and absolute wealth-related inequalities, per**
 252 **HIV indicator.** RII: relative index of inequality; SII: slope index of inequality; PLHIV: People living with
 253 HIV; PMTCT : Prevention of Mother-to-Child Transmission; VMMC: Voluntary Medical Male
 254 Circumcision. 1: log-transformed; 2: within the past year; 3: at last sexual intercourse; 4: among
 255 those aged 15-24 y.

	Correlation between RII ¹ and SII values,	
	Pearson r	p-value
HIV-related knowledge	0.607	0.0075
Positive Attitude towards PLHIV	0.716	<0.001
No multipartnership ²	0.992	<0.001
Condom use ³	0.064	0.7996
Participation to PMTCT (Females)	0.809	<0.001
VMMC (Males)	-0.098	0.8347
Recent HIV-Testing ²	0.641	0.0041
HIV-seronegativity among youth ⁴	1.000	<0.001

256

257

258 **DISCUSSION**

259 In this study, relying on cross-sectional population-based surveys, we provide an extensive
 260 assessment of socio-economic inequalities in various HIV indicators capturing knowledge,
 261 attitudes, behaviours and access to and uptake of prevention services in a large set of sub-
 262 Saharan African countries. We document important levels of wealth-related inequalities, both on
 263 the relative and absolute scales, in HIV-related knowledge, positive attitudes toward PLHIV,
 264 condom use, participation to PMTCT, uptake of VMMC and recent HIV testing. The magnitude of
 265 these inequalities varies across countries and indicators. However, inequalities tend to be more
 266 marked in WCA than in ESA countries. In contrast, we document low overall levels of
 267 inequalities in multi-partnership and HIV seropositivity among youth, a surrogate of HIV
 268 incidence.

269 ***The arithmetic behind inequality measures***

270 The results we provide here allow two types of comparisons: cross-country comparisons of
 271 inequalities given a specific HIV indicator, and within-country comparisons of inequalities

272 across HIV indicators. However, first bearing in mind some arithmetic considerations is
273 important when comparing RII and SII across indicators and countries [22,23]. Indeed, for any
274 indicator, the overall level in the population should be considered when interpreting relative
275 and absolute inequalities measures. Relative inequalities tend to be larger at low overall levels
276 of the considered indicator, while absolute inequalities tend to be larger at intermediate levels.
277 This arithmetic explains, for instance, why condom use in Niger (overall self-reported level:
278 1.1%) acknowledges dramatic relative inequalities (RII >100) but relatively limited absolute
279 inequalities (SII = 0.07). This illustrates the importance of reporting both relative and absolute
280 measures when reporting inequalities, as conclusions would be quite different if based on only
281 one or the other indicators in this single example. However, our analysis of correlation showed
282 that the levels of inequalities tended to correlate across both scales for most of the indicators we
283 used.

284 ***Cross-country comparisons of inequalities***

285 Heterogeneity across countries regarding the inequalities reported here may be driven by a
286 potentially large spectrum of socioeconomic, epidemiological or healthcare-related factors.
287 Nevertheless, we observed that geography explained some of this heterogeneity: higher levels of
288 wealth-related inequalities were observed in countries in WCA compared to those in ESA,
289 especially on the relative scale. Several factors may explain higher levels of inequalities in WCA.
290 This may be related to the historical prominence of the private healthcare sector in this region,
291 which generally implies user fees that may act as a barrier to access to care for the poorest [24].
292 Higher levels of inequalities are also possibly linked to the smaller overall HIV epidemics in WCA
293 compared to ESA. Indeed, ESA countries had higher HIV prevalence than WCA countries in our
294 sample, except for Ethiopia, which precisely had the highest levels of wealth-related inequalities
295 within ESA countries. Previous results suggested that HIV-related inequalities correlated with
296 epidemiological rather than macro-economic factors [25]. In addition, the country-level HIV
297 prevalence has been reported to correlate with levels of HIV donor and national funding for HIV

298 prevention services [26]. Moreover, donor funding tended to prioritise prevention programs
299 targeting key populations in WCA, as new HIV infections are often predominantly in these
300 populations in the region, whilst in ESA HIV prevention efforts are broader encompassing both
301 key populations and the general populations [27]. While key populations deserve a priority
302 focus for HIV prevention in WCA, additional efforts should be considered to overcome the
303 socioeconomic disparities in knowledge and access to HIV testing and prevention services more
304 broadly.

305 ***Comparisons of inequalities across HIV indicators***

306 Overall, we did not observe large socioeconomic disparities in reporting having multiple sexual
307 partners, consistently with recent results [28]. Large absolute and relative inequalities, overall,
308 remain regarding lack of knowledge and stigmatizing attitudes toward PLHIV, and this may
309 undermine HIV prevention, care and treatment [29]. Concerning inequalities are observed in
310 condom use, PMTCT, VMMC and HIV testing, especially in WCA countries. This is of particular
311 concern because these are interventions that can prevent new infections, directly for condom
312 use and VMMC, or when linked to care and treatment for PMTCT and HIV testing. Large
313 inequalities in condom use may reflect difficulties to access condoms free of charge. However,
314 PMTCT, VMMC and HIV testing are also interventions that are usually provided at no direct cost
315 for the individual, which underlines that providing these services without cost to clients is not
316 the only factor to ensure equitable access to prevention interventions. Lessons should be drawn
317 from the experiences of PMTCT or HIV testing programs in ESA countries that are currently
318 offered to all at no cost, without producing measurable health inequalities. For instance, Rwanda
319 has successfully integrated HIV services within the existing health system and assured delivery
320 of services in remote areas. These strategy have strengthened the country response to HIV and
321 have most probably contributed to limiting health inequalities [30].

322 Contrary to what one could expect considering the inequalities disfavouring the poorest in terms
323 of access to HIV prevention service that we report here, we did not find any evidence of

324 socioeconomic inequalities regarding HIV prevalence among the youth, an indicator we used as
325 a proxy for HIV incidence. This apparently inconsistent result may however be linked to the
326 complex and changing social epidemiology of HIV. Many early studies reported that higher SEP
327 tended to be associated with a higher prevalence of HIV infection, making this distribution
328 unusual as compared to many health outcomes [31,32]. The absence of overall socioeconomic
329 gradient we report here may represent a transient state where inequalities are inverting, from a
330 higher risk for the wealthiest to a higher risk for the poorest [33,34]. Indeed, a recent study
331 relying on a >20-years follow-up among a population-based open cohort in rural Uganda
332 documented a widening socioeconomic gradient over time, with a higher risk of incident HIV
333 infection among the poorest [35]. An effort to more systematically monitor socio-economic
334 inequalities in HIV incidence is thus of high importance to detect possibly changing SEP
335 gradients. It is anticipated that the newer-generation surveys, such as the population-based HIV
336 impact assessment surveys (<https://phia.icap.columbia.edu/>) which integrate HIV incidence
337 assays, may provide useful data for this monitoring.

338 ***Main strengths and limitations of the study***

339 This study has several limitations and strengths. The between-country comparison may be
340 affected by the period of data collection for each national survey (from 2010 to 2018). Large HIV
341 programs have been implemented over this study period and may have reduced inequalities
342 over time [9]. Our analysis was limited to indicators pragmatically built on data collected as part
343 of the DHS. As such, it matches only partially the recently proposed unifying framework of the
344 HIV prevention cascade [36]. For instance, an important aspect absent from the DHS data, and
345 therefore from our analysis, relates to knowledge and use of antiretroviral treatment for
346 individual and collective health benefits. For the same reason, our analysis ignores important
347 prevention interventions, such as pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP), or interventions targeted to
348 key populations. However, to our knowledge, this study constitutes the first effort to quantify

349 both relative and absolute socioeconomic inequalities on a large set of HIV-related indicators
350 collected from large, representative surveys conducted in numerous SSA countries.

351 **Conclusions**

352 In conclusion, this study provides a comprehensive monitoring of socioeconomic inequalities in
353 HIV knowledge, attitudes, behaviours and prevention in sub-Saharan Africa. In other fields such
354 as child health, such monitoring has provided important insight in the way policies may be
355 tailored to the patterns of inequalities in order to best address them [37]. We hope that this
356 study will help in the strategical articulation of HIV prevention approaches that is required for
357 fulfilling the focus on reducing inequalities that the renewed 2021-2026 Global AIDS Strategy
358 adopted [38].

359

360 **Authors' contributions**

361 MH, PAA-T and KJ conceived and planned the study with input from LT. MH and PAA-T collated
362 and processed DHS data. MH and KJ conducted the analysis and produced output figures and
363 tables with input from PAA-T and LT. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the results.
364 MH and KJ wrote the first draft of the report and all authors contributed to subsequent revisions.

365

366 **REFERENCES**

- 367 1 GBD 2017 HIV collaborators. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and mortality
368 of HIV, 1980-2017, and forecasts to 2030, for 195 countries and territories: a systematic analysis
369 for the Global Burden of Diseases, Injuries, and Risk Factors Study 2017. *Lancet HIV* 2019;
370 6:e831–e859.
- 371 2 2020 Global AIDS Update — Seizing the moment — Tackling entrenched inequalities to end
372 epidemics. <https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2020/global-aids-report> (accessed
373 8 Mar2021).
- 374 3 Sartorius B, VanderHeide JD, Yang M, Goosmann EA, Hon J, Haeuser E, *et al.* Subnational
375 mapping of HIV incidence and mortality among individuals aged 15–49 years in sub-Saharan
376 Africa, 2000–18: a modelling study. *The Lancet HIV* 2021; 8:e363–e375.

- 377 4 Krishnaratne S, Hensen B, Cordes J, Enstone J, Hargreaves JR. Interventions to strengthen the HIV
378 prevention cascade: a systematic review of reviews. *The Lancet HIV* 2016; 3:e307–e317.
- 379 5 Evidence review: Implementation of the 2016–2021 UNAIDS strategy: on the fast-track to end
380 aids. Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS; 2020. [https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/UNAIDS-](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/UNAIDS-2016-2021-Strategy-Evidence-review_en.pdf)
381 [2016-2021-Strategy-Evidence-review_en.pdf](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/UNAIDS-2016-2021-Strategy-Evidence-review_en.pdf) (accessed 28 May2021).
- 382 6 Burgoyne AD, Drummond PD. Knowledge of HIV and AIDS in women in sub-Saharan Africa. *Afr J*
383 *Reprod Health* 2008; 12:14–31.
- 384 7 Jean K, Anglaret X, Moh R, Lert F, Dray-Spira R. Barriers to HIV Testing in Côte d’Ivoire: The Role
385 of Individual Characteristics and Testing Modalities. *PLoS ONE* 2012; 7:e41353.
- 386 8 Kirakoya-Samadoulougou F, Jean K, Maheu. Uptake of HIV Testing in Burkina Faso: An
387 Assessment of Individual and Community-level Determinants. *BMC Public Health* 2017; (In
388 revision).
- 389 9 Ante-Testard PA, Benmarhnia T, Bekelync A, Baggaley R, Ouattara E, Temime L, *et al.* Temporal
390 trends in socioeconomic inequalities in HIV testing: an analysis of cross-sectional surveys from 16
391 sub-Saharan African countries. *The Lancet Global Health* 2020; 8:e808–e818.
- 392 10 Hlarlaithe MO, Grede N, de Pee S, Bloem M. Economic and Social Factors are Some of the Most
393 Common Barriers Preventing Women from Accessing Maternal and Newborn Child Health
394 (MNCH) and Prevention of Mother-to-Child Transmission (PMTCT) Services: A Literature Review.
395 *AIDS Behav* 2014; 18:516–530.
- 396 11 Gummerson E, Maughan-Brown B, Venkataramani A. Who is taking up voluntary medical male
397 circumcision? Early evidence from Tanzania. *AIDS* 2013; 27:2657–2659.
- 398 12 Corsi DJ, Neuman M, Finlay JE, Subramanian SV. Demographic and health surveys: a profile. *Int J*
399 *Epidemiol* 2012; 41:1602–1613.
- 400 13 Rutstein SO, Johnson K. DHS Comparative Reports. The DHS Wealth Index. Calverton, Maryland,
401 U.S.A: ORC Macro; 2004.
- 402 14 Njeuhmeli E, Schnure M, Vazzano A, Gold E, Stegman P, Kripke K, *et al.* Using mathematical
403 modeling to inform health policy: A case study from voluntary medical male circumcision scale-
404 up in eastern and southern Africa and proposed framework for success. *PLOS ONE* 2019;
405 14:e0213605.
- 406 15 Kim AA, Hallett T, Stover J, Gouws E, Musinguzi J, Mureithi PK, *et al.* Estimating HIV Incidence
407 among Adults in Kenya and Uganda: A Systematic Comparison of Multiple Methods. *PLoS One*
408 2011; 6. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0017535
- 409 16 Mahy M, Garcia-Calleja JM, Marsh KA. Trends in HIV prevalence among young people in
410 generalised epidemics: implications for monitoring the HIV epidemic. *Sex Transm Infect* 2012;
411 88:i65–i75.
- 412 17 Moreno-Betancur M, Latouche A, Menvielle G, Kunst AE, Rey G. Relative index of inequality and
413 slope index of inequality: a structured regression framework for estimation. *Epidemiology* 2015;
414 26:518–527.

- 415 18 King NB, Harper S, Young ME. Use of relative and absolute effect measures in reporting health
416 inequalities: structured review. *BMJ* 2012; 345:e5774.
- 417 19 Harper S, King NB, Meersman SC, Reichman ME, Breen N, Lynch J. Implicit Value Judgments in
418 the Measurement of Health Inequalities. *Milbank Q* 2010; 88:4–29.
- 419 20 Zou G. A Modified Poisson Regression Approach to Prospective Studies with Binary Data. *Am J*
420 *Epidemiol* 2004; 159:702–706.
- 421 21 Viechtbauer W. Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. *Journal of Statistical*
422 *Software* 2010; 36:1–48.
- 423 22 Houweling TA, Kunst AE, Huisman M, Mackenbach JP. Using relative and absolute measures for
424 monitoring health inequalities: experiences from cross-national analyses on maternal and child
425 health. *Int J Equity Health* 2007; 6:15.
- 426 23 Mackenbach JP, Martikainen P, Menvielle G, Gelder R de. The arithmetic of reducing relative and
427 absolute inequalities in health: a theoretical analysis illustrated with European mortality data. *J*
428 *Epidemiol Community Health* 2016; 70:730–736.
- 429 24 Ridde V. From institutionalization of user fees to their abolition in West Africa: a story of pilot
430 projects and public policies. *BMC Health Services Research* 2015; 15:S6.
- 431 25 Ante-Testard PA, Temime L, Jean K. Epidemiological rather than macro-economic factors
432 correlate with socioeconomic inequalities in HIV testing in 16 sub-Saharan African countries.
433 *medRxiv* 2021; :2021.09.22.21263940.
- 434 26 Amico P, Aran C, Avila C. HIV Spending as a Share of Total Health Expenditure: An Analysis of
435 Regional Variation in a Multi-Country Study. *PLoS One* 2010; 5.
436 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0012997
- 437 27 Funding for HIV and AIDS. Avert. 2021. [https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-](https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/global-response/funding)
438 [world/global-response/funding](https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/global-response/funding) (accessed 23 Jul2021).
- 439 28 Ali MM, Merdad L, Bellizzi S. Socioeconomic variations in risky sexual behavior among
440 adolescents in 14 sub-Saharan Africa countries who report ever having had sex. *Int J Equity*
441 *Health* 2021; 20:11.
- 442 29 Nyblade L, Mingkwan P, Stockton MA. Stigma reduction: an essential ingredient to ending AIDS
443 by 2030. *Lancet HIV* 2021; 8:e106–e113.
- 444 30 Binagwaho A, Kankindi I, Kayirangwa E, Nyemazi JP, Nsanzimana S, Morales F, *et al.* Transitioning
445 to Country Ownership of HIV Programs in Rwanda. *PLOS Medicine* 2016; 13:e1002075.
- 446 31 Hargreaves JR, Glynn JR. Educational attainment and HIV-1 infection in developing countries: a
447 systematic review. *Trop Med Int Health* 2002; 7:489–498.
- 448 32 Fox AM. The social determinants of HIV serostatus in sub-Saharan Africa: an inverse relationship
449 between poverty and HIV? *Public Health Rep* 2010; 125 Suppl 4:16–24.
- 450 33 Hargreaves JR, Davey C, White RG. Does the “inverse equity hypothesis” explain how both
451 poverty and wealth can be associated with HIV prevalence in sub-Saharan Africa? *J Epidemiol*
452 *Community Health* 2013; 67:526–529.

- 453 34 Hargreaves JR, Davey C, Fearon E, Hensen B, Krishnaratne S. Trends in Socioeconomic
454 Inequalities in HIV Prevalence among Young People in Seven Countries in Eastern and Southern
455 Africa. *PLoS ONE* 2015; 10:e0121775.
- 456 35 Santelli JS, Chen I, Makumbi F, Wei Y, Nalugoda F, Lutalo T, *et al.* Household wealth and HIV
457 incidence over time, rural Uganda, 1994–2018. *AIDS* 2021; 35:1835–1843.
- 458 36 Hargreaves JR, Delany-Moretlwe S, Hallett TB, Johnson S, Kapiga S, Bhattacharjee P, *et al.* The
459 HIV prevention cascade: integrating theories of epidemiological, behavioural, and social science
460 into programme design and monitoring. *The Lancet HIV* 2016; 3:e318–e322.
- 461 37 Victora CG, Joseph G, Silva ICM, Maia FS, Vaughan JP, Barros FC, *et al.* The Inverse Equity
462 Hypothesis: Analyses of Institutional Deliveries in 286 National Surveys. *Am J Public Health* 2018;
463 108:464–471.
- 464 38 End Inequalities. End AIDS. Global AIDS Strategy 2021-2026. Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS; 2021.
465 <https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2021/2021-2026-global-AIDS-strategy>
466 (accessed 28 May2021).
- 467