**BMC Infectious Diseases** 

**Open Access** 

# Demand creation and retention strategies for oral pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention among men who have sex with men and transgender women: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Nathalia Sernizon Guimarães<sup>1,2,3,4</sup><sup>\*</sup>, Laio Magno<sup>5</sup>, Gabriel Marinho Bahia Monteiro<sup>2,4</sup>, Izabel Cristina Neves Ramos<sup>2,4</sup>, Caroline Tianeze de Castro<sup>1</sup>, Thais Regis Aranha-Rossi<sup>5</sup>, Marcos Pereira<sup>4</sup>, and Inês Dourado<sup>4</sup>

# Abstract

**Background** Men who have sex with men (MSM) and transgender women (TGW) have a disproportionately higher risk of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection than other groups. Oral HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) is an effective prevention tool and should be offered to those at higher risk. Identifying demand creation strategies (DCS) and retention strategies (RS) to improve PrEP persistence is essential to control the HIV epidemic.

Aim We aimed to identify the (DCS and RS with higher proportions among MSM and TGW.

**Methods** A systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies were conducted, with studies retrieved from five databases until November, 2022 following the Cochrane and PRISMA guidelines. The study protocol was registered in PROSPERO (CRD42022323220). The outcomes were DCS and RS for PrEP use among MSM and TGW. Strategies used for users enrolled in the PrEP-recruited (DCS) were classified as face-to-face (peer educator recruitment at social venues, nongovernmental organizations, and parties; direct referrals by health services; friends and/or sexual partners); online (chatbot or peer educator recruitment on social media [e.g., , Instagram or Facebook] or dating/ hook-up apps [e.g., Grindr, Tinder, Badoo, and Scruff]); and mixed (face-to-face and online). RS was classified as provider counseling (face-to-face by a health professional; prevention of HIV risk counseling, distribution of condoms, lubricants, and testing for HIV or other sexually transmitted infections); online counseling (text messages, chatbots, telephone calls, social media, and peer educators); and mixed (all previous strategies). Subgroup analyses were conducted for each treatment strategy. Meta-analyses were performed using the R software version 4.2.1.

**Results** A total of 1, 129 studies were retrieved from the five databases. After eligibility, 46 studies were included. For MSM, most DCS and RS were online at 91% (95% CI: 0.85-0.97;  $I^2=53\%$ ), and 83% (95% CI: 0.80-0.85;  $I^2=17\%$ ) respectively. For TGW, mixed DCS and RS were the most frequent at85% (95% CI: 0.60-1.00;  $I^2=91\%$ ) and online counseling at 84% (95% CI: 0.64-0.95) compared to other strategies.

\*Correspondence: Nathalia Sernizon Guimarães nasernizon@gmail.com Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.gr/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.gr/licenses/by/4.0/.

**Conclusion** Critical issues play. Pivotal role in increasing PrEP awareness among MSM and TGW, minimizing access gaps, and ensuring retention of PrEP services. Offering oral PrEP using online DCS and RS can reach and retain high numbers of MSM and TGW, and reduce HIV incidence in these populations.

**Keywords** Demand creation to PrEP access, Retention in PrEP services, Men who have sex with men, Transgender women, Prevention of HIV infection

# Introduction

Men who have sex with men (MSM) and transgender women (TGW) are considered key populations in the HIV epidemic in many countries [1, 2]. They have a 25–34 times higher risk of HIV infection than men and women in the general population [3]. HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) is an effective prevention tool that should be offered to high-risk individuals [4].

PrEP effectiveness was established ten years ago, and its use is predicted to substantially decrease the number of new HIV infections [5]. The daily oral use of the pills combined with tenofovir and emtricitabine is highly effective in preventing sexual exposure to HIV infection and injection drug use (at least 74%) [6–8].

Although MSM and TGW are considered target populations for PrEP use, significant challenges exist in accessing and retaining the use of prophylaxis by these groups [9]. These include difficulties in obtaining funding for healthcare [10], lack of adequate guidance on the prevention of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) [11], low self-perception of HIV risk [12], and family issues such as lack of communication on sex and sexuality as well as lack of family support [13, 14]. Furthermore, stigma and discrimination associated with HIV and AIDS and the use of prophylactics are barriers to PrEP initiation among MSM and TGW [15, 16].

The high PrEP discontinuation rates in MSM and TGW represent a significant challenge in controlling the HIV epidemic, negatively influencing PrEP coverage [17]. A cohort study conducted in Brazil with adolescent MSM and TGW (aMSM and aTGW, respectively) aged 15–19 years indicated a 51.8% probability of discontinuation in the first year of PrEP use, with an increased risk of discontinuation in aTGW compared to aMSM [18]. Individual, structural, and logistic factors have been linked to the discontinuation of PrEP [19], which magnifies the challenge by requiring different approaches and involvement from other sectors. Similar barriers to PrEP access hinder PrEP continuation, which include low perception of risk for HIV [18–20], cost [17, 19], and difficulty navigating intricate medical systems [19]. Thus, identifying retention strategies (RS) to improve PrEP persistence among MSM and TGW is essential for controlling HIV epidemics.

Demand creation strategies (DCS) and RS for PrEP use should be developed to improve PrEP access and coverage among sexual minority adolescents. This study aimed to identify, synthesize, and determine the overall effect size through meta-analysis while critically evaluating the most effective DCS and RS for PrEP among MSM and TGW.

# Methods

This systematic review and meta-analysis followed the Cochrane Guidelines for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, and was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) [21, 22]. The study protocol was registered in PROSPERO (number: CRD42022323220).

# **Eligibility criteria**

We included cross-sectional studies, cohort studies, and randomized control trials [RCTs] that followed MSM, regardless of sexual orientation (e.g., homosexual and bisexual), and TGW aged  $\geq$  18 years and assessed the PrEP DCS and/or PrEP RS.

Studies that did not describe PrEP DCS and/or PrEP RS, prior public protocols, retrospective studies, real-world settings, qualitative studies, reviews, case series, editorials (letters or commentaries), and those focused on assessing participants' intentions rather than actual PreP use, were excluded. Studies that focused on PrEP adoption intentions or interest in future PrEP use, participant's awareness, knowledge and willingness of PrEP use, HIV risk perception, cases where participants were already using PrEP at the beginning of the research or had reported previous use of the medication (past year PrEP use), and studies specifically related to injectable PrEP use, were excluded. Furthermore, studies that assessed adherence as the only outcome, health economic evaluation (effectiveness and cost or modeling framework), ecologic studies, transgender male and female sex workers, or men who did not have sex with men or outside the theme were excluded.

### Search strategy

To answer the question "What are the best DCS and RS for MSM and TGW on PrEP?," We searched five independent databases, namely PubMed/Medline, Embase, Web of Science, Central (Cochrane Library), and Latin American and Caribbean Health Science Information (LILACS) for relevant literature. Additionally, we manually searched the reference lists of the included studies.

There were no language, date, document type, publication status, or geographic restrictions in the records. The last search was conducted in April 2022 and updated on November 2022. Descriptors were identified using the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH), *Descritores em Ciências da Saúde* (DeCS), and Embase Subject Headings (Emtree). Subsequently, they were combined with the Boolean operator "AND", whereas their synonyms were combined with "OR". The following meshes formed the herein-used search strategy, which was adapted based on descriptors in each database: "Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis"; "Homosexuality, Male"; "Transgender Persons". The search strategy adopted in each database is presented in Appendix 1.

### Study selection and data extraction

Electronic search results from the defined databases were uploaded to the Rayyan Qatar Computing Research Institute [23].

The study selection and data extraction were independently performed by three investigators (NSG, GMBM, and ICNR). Any discrepancies were resolved by consensus. We adopted the following steps in the study selection: initial screening of article based on title and abstract, and thorough examination of the full-text of the selected articles. Articles that did not meet the eligibility criteria were excluded.

Information extracted from the selected studies was encoded in Excel 2019<sup>®</sup> electronic form comprising the following fields: reference, title, source, journal, impact factor, location of the study conducted, study design, follow-up period, monitoring, number of centers or health services evaluated, setting, participants' age, population, PrEP DCS type, PrEP RS, enrolled and numbers, PrEP retention barriers, and PrEP retention facilitators.

### **Quality assessment**

Three investigators (NSG, GMBM, and ICNR) independently assessed the risk of bias in the selected studies according to the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) for determining the risk of bias. The checklists included analytical cross-sectional studies, cohort studies, and RCTs (https:// jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools). Disagreements were resolved through discussions among the three evaluators.

The overall certainty of the body of evidence was rated using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach, while considering the overall risk of bias, consistency of effect, imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias to assess Page 3 of 20

the certainty of the body of evidence [24, 25]. In the event of serious concerns in any of these domains, we rated down the quality of the evidence.

### Outcomes

The primary outcomes were the PrEP DCS and PrEP RS. Secondary outcomes were the facilitators and barriers to the retention of this population group in PrEP services.

PrEP DCS were strategies used to increase demand by delivering positive messages about the benefits of PrEP as a component of the HIV combination, and the DCS % was calculated using the following formula: people enrolled in the study/people reached by DCS. The PrEP RS was used to keep users on the PrEP services during the study period. The RS proportion was calculated as the percentage of individuals who remained in the study/ the total number study / total of individuals. For the RS proportion, only studies with follow-up assessments were considered.

The PrEP DCS were classified into three groups according to Magno et al. [26]: (1) face-to-face (i.e., peereducator recruitment at social venues, nongovernmental organizations, and parties,direct referrals by health services; friends and/or sexual partners); (2) online (i.e., chatbot or peer-educator recruitment on social media [e.g.,, Instagram or Facebook] or dating/hook-up apps [e.g., Grindr, Tinder, Badoo, and Scruff]), and mixed when both strategies were employed.

PrEP RS was used to retain users on PrEP services during the study period, which were classified as: (1) provider counseling (i.e., face-to-face by a health professional; prevention of HIV risk counseling, distribution of condoms, lubricants, and testing for HIV or other STIs; (2) online counseling (i.e., text messages, chatbot, telephone calls, social media, and peer educator); (3) cash transfer; and (4) mixed when both strategies were employed.

### Statistical analysis

We conducted a meta-analysis of the prevalence estimates that were transformed using the raw proportion (PRAW) method. The final pooled results and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were back-transformed for ease of interpretation [27], and when the estimate for a study tended toward either 0% or 100%, the variance for that study moved toward zero. Consequently, its weight was overestimated in the present meta-analysis.

Subgroup analyses for demand creation strategies were performed considering the three strategy types (online, face-to-face, and mixed) to determine whether a strategy type could clarify our results and explain the heterogeneity. For retention, subgroup analyses were performed considering professional counseling (in-person), online counseling, and cash transfer or mixed.

A meta-regression analysis was conducted to explore the potential sources of heterogeneity for each outcome, including the study design (trial, cohort, cross-sectional), sample size ( $\leq$ 400, > 400), study place (Asia, Western), setting (HIV prevention and care, population), monitoring (monthly, 2–3 months, 6 months), and risk of bias (low, moderate, and high).

Forest plots were used to visually assess the pooled estimates and the corresponding 95% CIs. We calculated the Q (significance level of p<0.1) and I<sup>2</sup> statistics, and a random-effects model was applied to assess heterogeneity.

*P*-values <0.05 were considered statistically significant in all analyses. Publication bias analysis was not performed if this measure was inappropriate for prevalence meta-analysis [28]. Analyses were performed in the R software, version 4.2.1 (R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria), using the 'Meta' packages, versions 6.0-0.

# Results

### Search results

Our search retrieved 1,129 studies from the four selected databases. After excluding 213 duplicate articles, 916 titles and abstracts were screened. Full-text articles of the remaining 169 records were retrieved, of which 138 were excluded (Appendices 2 and 3). Additionally, through a manual search, seven studies were selected [29–35] and nine studies were updated [26, 36–43]. Therefore, 46 studies conducted between 2013 and 2022 were eligible for inclusion in this systematic review [26, 29–62, 62–70].

### Studies and users characteristics

The main characteristics of the included studies are summarized in Table 1.

Of the 46 included studies, 24 were cohort studies [29, 32, 36–42, 44, 48–50, 52, 53, 58–66], 16 were conducted through randomized and non-randomized clinical trials [30, 31, 33–35, 43, 45–47, 51, 62, 67–70] and six had cross-sectional design [26, 50, 54–57].

Nineteen studies were conducted in North America [31, 33, 34, 38, 45–47, 49, 51–53, 55, 56, 60, 61, 66, 69, 70]; seven in South America [26, 37, 44, 50, 54, 57], nine in Asia [29, 35, 40–42, 48, 62, 63], four in Africa [32, 58, 64, 65], and seven in Europe [30, 36, 39, 43, 59, 67, 68].

The number of health services offering PrEP included in each study ranged from 1 to 21. Six studies did not report their funding sources [40, 42, 47, 48, 62, 63].

The maximum follow-up time registered in the cohort studies and trials were as follows : 90 days [42], 120 days [41], 168 days [45], 180 days [32, 39, 40, 48, 51, 62, 63], 252 days [33], 270 days [30], 283 days [34], 336 days [37,

44, 46, 49, 50, 52], 365 days [29, 38, 47, 64–66], 385 days [69, 70], 620 days [59], 672 days [43], 730 days [31, 35, 53, 60, 61] and 1,095 days [36].

Twenty-four studies focused their assessments on MSM [30, 31, 37, 39–42, 45–47, 51–53, 55–58, 60, 61, 64–70] and nineteen focused on both population subgroups [26, 29, 32–36, 43, 44, 48–50, 50, 54, 59, 62, 63] (Table 1).

In total, 36,792 individuals were included in this review. Tables 2 and 3 describe the classifications of the studies based on PrEP DCS and RS outcomes. The most common DCS was face-to-face (n=16) (i.e., through peer educator recruitment at social venues, nongovernmental organizations, and parties; direct referrals by health services; friends and/or sexual partners), followed by online strategies (n=4), such as Chabot or peer-educator recruitment on social media [e.g., Instagram or Facebook] or dating/hook-up apps [e.g., Grindr, Tinder, Badoo, and Scruff]). The DCS that recruited the fewest participants was mixed (face-to-face and online) (n=10).

The retention of health services providing PrEP was observed in 28 studies. The retention strategies were online counseling (text messages, chatbot, telephone calls, social media, and peer-educator) [39, 44, 69], mixed strategy [29, 31–33, 41, 45, 46, 58, 62, 64], provider counseling (face-to-face by a health professional; prevention to HIV-risk counseling, distribution of condoms, lubricants, and testing for HIV or other STIs) [30, 36–38, 40, 43, 49, 51–53, 66, 68], peer educators [63], and cash transfer [35]. The last two alone.

# **Quality assessment**

Of the 46 studies included in this systematic review, 29 were evaluated and included in the meta-analysis. Regarding DCS outcomes, six observational studies and four trials presented a high risk of bias, seven observational studies and six trials were identified as having a moderate risk of bias, and four observational studies and two trials were identified as having a low risk of bias. Regarding retention outcome, one observational study and three trials presented a high risk of bias, 11 observational studies and six trials were identified as having a moderate risk of bias, and four observational study are trials were identified as having a moderate risk of bias, and four observational studies and two trials were identified as having a low risk of bias. The individual studies' risks of bias for each study are presented in Appendices 4–7.

### Meta-analysis results

# Prevalence of users enrolled in PrEP recruited by DCS

The overall prevalence of users enrolled in PrEP recruited by demand creation strategy among the entire sample evaluated was 53% (95% CI: 0.33-0.73) with a high level of heterogeneity (I <sup>2</sup>=100%) (Fig. 1).

# Table 1 Characteristics of individual studies included on systematic review, 2023

Reference	Country study	Study design	Follow-up	Population		
Grinztejn et al. 2018 [44]	Brazil	Cohort	48 weeks = 336 days	MSM (94.4%) +TGW (5.6%)		
Hosek et al. 2017 [71]	United States of America	RCT	48 weeks = 336 days	yMSM (100.0%)		
Songtaweesin et al. 2020 [62, 72]	Thailand	RCT	6 months = 180 days	yMSM (74.0%) + yTGW (26.0%)		
Hosek et al. 2013 [45]	United States of America	RCT	24 weeks = 168 days	yMSM (100.0%)		
Ferreira et al. 2018 [47]	United States of America	RCT	12 months = 365 days	ybMSM (100.0%)		
Kung et al. 2018 [ <mark>48</mark> ]	Bangkok, Thailand	Cohort	6 months = 180 days	MSM (98.0%) + TGW (2.0%)		
Lalley-Chareczko et al. 2018 [49]	United States of America	Cohort	48 weeks = 336 days	yMSM (90.0%) + yTGW (10.0%)		
Liu et al. 2019 [33]	United States	RCT	36 weeks = 252 days	yMSM (96.0%) + yTGW (4.0%)		
Marins et al. 2019 [50]	Brazil	Cohort	48 weeks = 336 days	MSM (94.4%) +TGW (5.6%)		
Mayer et al. 2016 [51]	United States	pRCT	6 months = 180 days	MSM (100.0%)		
Myers et al. 2019 [52]	United States of America	Cohort	48 weeks = 336 days	MSM (100.0%)		
Rolle et al, 2017 [53]	United States of America	Cohort	24 months = 730 days	ybMSM (100.0%)		
Dourado et al. 2021 [54]	Brazil	Cross-sectional	-	yMSM + yTGW		
Fennel et al. 2019 [55]	United States of America	Cross-sectional	-	Young (13-24) black men who have sex with men (YBMSM)		
Fields et al. 2019 [56]	United States of America	Cross-sectional	-	bMSM (100.0%)		
Hoagland et al. 2017 [57]	Brazil	Cross-sectional	at 4 weeks = 28 days	MSM (94.7%) + TGW (5.3%)		
Laurent et al. 2021 [58]	dbidjan (Côte d'Ivoire),Bamako (Mali), Lomé (Togo), and 119 Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso)	Cohort	-	MSM (100%) - 337 partici- pants (57.6%) self-276 defined as bisexual		
Marins et al. 2019 [50]	Brazil	Cross-sectional	at 48 weeks	MSM (94.4%) +TGW (5.6%)		
Molina et al. 2017 [59]	France and Canada	Cohort	20 months = 620 days	MSM (99.0%) + TGW (1.0%)		
Serota et al. 2019 [61]	United States of America	Cohort	24 months = 730 days	bMSM (100.0%)		
Serota et al. 2020 [60]	United States of America	Cohort	24 months = 730 days	bMSM (100.0%)		
Songtaweesin et al. 2020 [62, 72]	Thailand	Cohort	6 months = 180 days	MSM (74.0%) + TGW (26.0%)		
Tun et al. 2021 [63]	Myanmar	Cohort	6 months = 180 days	MSM (92.0%) + TGW (8.0%)		
Wahome et al. 2020 [64, 65]	Kenya	Cohort	12 months = 365 days	MSM (100.0%)		
Wahome et al. 2020 [64, 65]	Kenya	Cohort	12 months = 365 days	MSM (100.0%)		
Wheeler et al. 2019 [66]	United States of America	Cohort	52 weeks = 365 days	bMSM (100.0%)		
Liu et al. 2019 [33]	United States	RCT	36 weeks = 252 days	yMSM (96%) + yTGW (4%)		
Phanuphak et al. 2018 [29]	Thailand	Cohort	12 months = 365 days	MSM (86.4%) + TGW (13.6%)		
Molina et al. 2015 [30]	France and Canada	RCT	9.3 months	MSM (100.0%)		
Hovaguimian et al. 2022 [36]	Switzerland	Cohort	3 years	MSM (99.7%) + TGW (0.3%)		
Jallil et al. 2022 [37]	Brazil	Cohort	48 weeks = 336 days	TGW (100.0%)		
Magno et al. 2022 [26]	Brazil	Cross-sectional	-	MSM (92.0%) + TGW(8.0%)		
Konda et al. 2022 [38]	Brazil, Mexico and Peru	Cohort	52 weeks = 365 days	TGW (100.0%)		
Traikiatphum et al. 2022 [39]	Thailand	Cohort	6 months = 180 days	vMSM (100.0%)		
Antoni et al. 2020 [34]	France and Canada	RCT	9 months = 283 days	MSM (?) + TGW (?)		
Thongsak et al. 2022 [40]	Thailand	Cohort	6 months = 180 days	TGW (100.0%)		
Wu et al. 2022 [41]	Taiwan	Cohort	4  months = 120  days	MSM (100.0%)		
Lin et al. 2022 [42]	China	Cohort	3 months = 90 days	MSM (100.0%)		
Mayer et al. 2020 [43]	(Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, and the UK) and (Canada and the USA).	RCT	96 weeks = 672 days	MSM (98.6%) + TGW (1.4%)		
Grohskopf et al. 2013 [31]	USA	RCT	24 months = 730 days	MSM (100.0%)		
Kimani et al. 2021 [32]	Kenya	Cohort	6 months = 180 days	MSM (79.2%) + TGW (20.7%)		
Wirtz et al. 2020 [35]	Thailand	RCT	24 months = 730 days	MSM (93.7%) + TGW (6.3%)		
Dolling et al. 2016 [67]	England	RCT baseline	-	MSM (100.0%)		

Table 1 (continued)

Reference	Country study	Study design	Follow-up	Population MSM (100.0%)	
McCormack et al. 2016 [68]	England	RCT	24 months = 730 days		
Schneider et al. 2021 [69]	USA	RCT baseline	55 weeks = 385 days	MSM (100.0%)	
Young et al. 2018 [70]	USA	RCT	55 weeks = 385 days	MSM (100.0%)	

The analysis of subgroups by types of PrEP DCS for the overall population revealed that face-to-face, online, and mixed recruited 53% (95% CI: 0.33–0.74;  $I^2=100\%$ ); 51% (95% CI: 0.00–1.00;  $I^2=100\%$ ); 50% (95% CI: 0.21–0.79;  $I^2=100\%$ ), of the population respectively (Fig. 2).

Of the 36 included studies, 19 assessed the percentage of MSM users enrolled in PrEP recruited. The combined proportion of MSM was 64% (95% CI: 0.54–0.74;  $I^2=100\%$ ) (Fig. 3).

Among the studies which discriminated against the number of MSM users enrolled in PrEP recruited by demand creation strategy, four, thirteen, and two studies evaluated mixed, face-to-face, and online DCS, respectively. The subgroup analysis by DCS type showed that 91% of MSM (95% CI: 0.85–0.97;  $I^2$ =53%) were recruited through online, 74% (95% CI: 0.56–0.91;  $I^2$ =99%) through mixed, and 57% through face-to-face (95% CI: 0.46–0.68;  $I^2$ =99%) strategies (Fig. 4).

Regarding TGW, four studies presented information on users enrolled in PrEP recruited. The pooled proportions of DCS for PrEP use among TGW was 83% (95% CI: 0.71-0.95; I<sup>2</sup>=100%) (Fig. 5).

In the subgroup analysis by DCS, we observed that 85% of the TGW were recruited via mixed(95% CI: 0.60–1.00;  $I^2$ =91%) and 79% via face-to-face (95% CI: 0.73–0.85) strategies (Fig. 6).

### **PrEP** retention strategies

Ten studies assessed the prevalence of PrEP service retention in the overall sample. The global estimate of prevalence was 68% (95% CI: 0.51-0.85) with a high level of heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup>=100%) (Fig. 7).

The subgroup analysis revealed a retention proportion of 57% [95% CI: 0.38–0.75] for mixed and 83% [95% CI: 0.52–1.00] for professional counseling (Fig. 8).

The pooled proportions of retention to PrEP service among MSM was 73% (95% CI: 0.62–0.83;  $I^2$ =100%) (Fig. 9).

Of these, 83% (95% CI: 0.80–0.85;  $I^2=17\%$ ) were retained in PrEP provision services by online counseling; 68% (95% CI: 0.54–0.81; I <sup>2</sup>=98%) by mixed and 74% 95% CI: 0.52–096; I<sup>2</sup>=100%) by professional counseling strategies (Fig. 10).

Eighteen studies presented the retention data for TGW. The prevalence of retention to the PrEP service by TGW was 65% (95% CI: 0.47-0.83; I<sup>2</sup>=98%) (Fig. 11).

In the subgroup analysis, we observed that 84% of the TGW were retained in PrEP provision services through online (95% CI: 0.64–0.95); 68% (95% CI: 0.41–0.96;  $I^2$ =51.8%) through professional counseling, and 54% (95% CI: 0.23–0.84) through mixed strategies (Fig. 12).

### Meta-regression

In the meta-regression analysis, the studies were grouped according to study design (trial, cohort, cross-sectional), sample size ( $\leq$ 400; >400), study place (Asia; Western), setting (HIV prevention and care; population), monitoring (monthly; 2–3 months; 6 months), and risk of bias (low, moderate, and high) (Appendix 8). The covariates for the outcome of PrEP DCS did not differ significantly. However, there was a significant difference in the study design; the longer the study duration (cohort versus cross-sectional or RCT), the lower the proportions observed.

### **Barriers and facilitators to PrEP retention**

Of the 46 studies included, two described the barriers [37, 38], and three presented the facilitators [37, 62] (Grinztejn et al. 2018) to retaining this population in health services offering PrEP. Among the studies reporting barriers to retention in PrEP services, two focused on TGW [37, 38]. The barriers highlighted in these studies were social determinants of health [37], reporting condom-less anal sex (CAS) with partner(s) of unknown HIV status [38] and being an immigrant [38]. Studies reporting the facilitators for retaining this population in PrEP services include one study focused on TGW [37], and two on the total population (MSM and TGW) [44, 62], which highlighted facilitators, including PrEP offered at public health-care clinics in a middle-income setting [44], approach to counseling [62], multidisciplinary care [62], and gender-affirming settings [37].

### Discussion

Herein, we conducted a comprehensive search to identify DCS and RS with higher proportions among MSM and TGW to improve PrEP persistence, which is crucial for reducing the HIV epidemic. As a main result, online

# Table 2 Characteristics of recruitment and retention strategies in PrEP services

Reference	Description of the article's strategy	Strategy [26]		
Grinztejn et al. 2018 [44]	In RJ, individuals seeking testing at Arco Iris, a lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgen- der (LGBT) non-governmental organization (NGO), and at a mobile testing unit located at a LGBT friendly venue were also assessed for potential eligibil- ity for PrEP Brasil and subsequently referred to FIOCRUZ for screening. Social media and other media were used by the 3 sites to advertise the project and a website was constructed.	Mixed: (1) face-to-face and (2) online		
Hosek et al. 2017 [71]	Multiple recruitment methods were used across sites, including street and venue-based outreach, community and school presentations, and online advertising on social media Web sites and social networking applications (apps).	Mixed: (1) face-to-face and (2) online		
Songtaweesin et al. 2020 [62, 72]	voluntary HIV testing centres via counsellors, online advertising, peer recruiters and word of mouth	Mixed: (1) face-to-face and (2) online		
Hosek et al. 2013 [45]	approached by study staff at community based agencies and youth venues for a brief eligibility screening via handheld personalized digital assistant	Face-to-face		
Mayer et al. 2016 [51] by community outreach by the staff of Fenway Health, a Boston community ( health center with expertise in sexual and gender minority health. Participants were recruited via advertisements on social media, including several sites where MSM meet sexual partners, and flyers posted within the waiting areas of Fenway Health's clinical care sites.		Online		
Myers et al. 2019 [52]	Individuals attending the clinic who were interested in participating (Most HIV-negative participants came to the clinic because they had heard about the sexual health services and about PrEP in particular. Recruitment was targeted toward sexually active YMSM of color, although the sexual health clinic was open to cisgender women and transgender women and men, and to individuals of all races and ethnicities) Those who chose to participate in the study did receive a small (\$25) cash incentive to complete study assessments.	Face-to-face		
Rolle et al, 2017 [53]	MSM are recruited through venue-day-time-space sampling and advertise- ments posted on Facebook, Grindr, and MARTA.	Mixed: (1) face-to-face and (2) online		
Dourado et al. 2021 [54]	Peer-recruited by peer educators (PE) who engage with AKP at venues and schools, at online platforms/apps/transgender chatbot, a NGO/health services	Mixed: (1) face-to-face and (2) online		
Fennel et al. 2019 [55]	Individuals attending the clinic who were interested in participating	Face-to-face		
Fields et al. 2019 [56]	Individuals attending the clinic who were interested in participating	Face-to-face		
Serota et al. 2019 [61]	Of the 298 YBMSM enrolled in EleMENt, 154 (52%) attended a PrEP clinician visit and received a PrEP prescription. At the end of follow-up, 131 (44%) reported taking a first dose of PrEP.	Face-to-face		
Songtaweesin et al. 2020 [62, 72]	counselors, online advertising, peer recruiters and word of mouth.	Mixed: (1) face-to-face and (2) online		
Tun et al. 2021 [63]	community-based peer educators personally and through social medias	Mixed: (1) face-to-face and (2) online		
Wahome et al. 2020 [65]	10-15 peer recruiters through their personal networks and venues where sex workers meet to stablish contact with clients.	Face-to-face		
Wheeler et al. 2019 [66]	peer referral, venue-based sampling, local media and word of mouth often conveyed by local health providers ir others engaged with PrEP and/or black MSM communities.	Face-to-face		
Liu et al. 2019 [33]	STI screening clinic, online ads, primary care providers (participants from EPIC program)	Online		
Phanuphak et al. 2018 [29]	website (www.adamslove.org) + peer recruiters	Mixed: (1) face-to-face and (2) online		
Molina et al. 2015 [30]	The gay media and, especially, the Internet will be widely used with a web- site dedicated to the trial. A call for volunteers will be relayed by the ANRS, in the gay press and to the general public, on Internet dating sites and in clubs	Online		
Jallil et al. 2022 [37]	peer referral, by our community education team, and from the HIV testing and post-exposure prophylaxis services available at our site.	Face-to-face		
Magno et al. 2022 [26]	Peer-educator recruitment through dating apps (Grindr, Badoo, Tinder and Scruff), social media (Instagram)	Online		
Magno et al. 2022 [26]	face-to-face in social venues, schools, non-governmental organizations (NGO) and parties.	Face-to-face		
Konda et al. 2022 [38]	social media advertisements, peer/healthcare provider referrals and through MSM/TGW peer-educators at each site	Mixed: (1) face to face and (2) online		

### Table 2 (continued)

Reference	Description of the article's strategy	Strategy [26]
Wu et al. 2022 [41]	physicians; PrEP navigators	face-to-face
Lin et al. 2022 [42]	local nongovernment organizations and peer recommendations.	face-to-face
Mayer et al. 2020 [43]	Active (outreach in person or via social media) and passive (fliers, advertise- ments, and radio spots) recruitment methods were customised for local cultural context and language by site.	Mixed: (1) face to face and (2) online
Grohskopf et al. 2013 [31]	recruitment on 3 sites	face-to-face
Kimani et al. 2021 [32]	Through a partnership with the community-based organization AMKENI supporting MSM and TGW members, participants were contacted to enroll in the PrEP cohort	face-to-face
Wirtz et al. 2020 [35]	Community engagement principles and mobilization activities are intended to create an enabling HIV prevention environment for young MSM and TGW. For this study, our partners SWING and RSAT serve as the initial conduit for community engagement. These partners have extensive experience in providing HIV prevention programs to gay, bisexual, transgender, and other MSM, including those who exchange sex. The chief community mobiliza- tion activity is an ongoing series of forums targeting various venue types, age groups, and geographic subzones that are led by CBO staff in conjunc- tion with young MSM and TGW. Point persons at participating venues who introduce the study also aid in raising awareness about and invite participants to community engagement activities.	face-to-face
McCormack et al. 2016 [68] .Potentially eligible GMSM were identified during routine attendances at 13 sexual health clinics in England, 8 in London and 5 outside. Participants with regular sexual partners (in the opinion of the potential volunteer) who also met eligibility requirements were encouraged TO ENROL. Post- ers and electronic screens in participating sexual health clinics, as well as advertisements on social media, helped to promote the study. Business cards and leaflets advertising the study were also handed out by communi organisations during outreach activities, including efforts to raise awareness of PrEP amongst GMSM. There was no financial payment for participants jo ing the study, nor were travel costs or other expenses paid for		Mixed: (1) face to face and (2) online
Schneider et al. 2021 [69]	respondent-driven sampling	face-to-face
Young et al. 2018 [70]	respondent-driven sampling	face-to-face

counseling had the highest proportions for DCS and RS. Meanwhile, mixed DCS and RS were the most frequent for TGW.

The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the way interviews are conducted in the health area, causing a significant increase in the use of online approaches [73, 74]. Online research methodologies may serve as an important mechanism for population-focused data collection among young individual and have been acknowledged for their potential in investigating understudied and marginalized populations and subpopulations, permitting increased access to communities that tend to be less visible and, consequently, less studied in offline contexts [75, 76].

Online interviews present several advantages over face-to-face interviews, particularly when engaging with hard-to-reach populations such as MSM and TGW. These advantages include anonymity, instant access to services, peer-to-peer models of online outreach, and reduced barriers such as geography and time. However, online approaches require reading, technological literacy of participants, and access to technology, which may limit relationship-building between participants and researchers [77].

The COVID-19 pandemic has reinforced the need to diversify the strategies for recruiting and retaining in PrEP services [26] (Dourado et al. 2020). The pandemic context, which negatively impacts access of MSM and TGW to HIV testing and prevention services in multiple countries [78, 79], demonstrates the need to readapt strategies, aiming for more online resources due to the facilitation of communication between users and services through the use of various platforms, such as social networks, dating applications, and chatbots [26, 80].

Furthermore, although our systematic review and meta-analysis revealed an 84% DCS rate of PrEP use (95% CI: 77–91%), we observed a 62% retention rate of PrEP use (95% CI: 50–74%). HIV infection is disproportionally more frequent among MSM and TGW, and new infections are increasing in this population [81]. Therefore, PrEP is a critical prevention strategy among populations at substantial risk of HIV to reduce new infections [82]. According to RCTs results, once-daily and on-demand PrEP are effective among MSM and TGW. Nonetheless,

# Table 3 Characteristics of retention strategies at PrEP services

Reference	Description of the article's strategy	Class
Grinztejn et al. 2018 [44]	interactive text messages + brief paper questionnaire on mobile phone use and texting practices	Online counseling
Marins et al. 2019 [50]	interactive text messages + brief paper questionnaire on mobile phone use and texting practices	Online counseling
Hosek et al. 2017 [71]	All participants received a comprehensive package of HIV prevention services at each visit (i.e., risk reduction counseling, condoms, symptomatic STI screening and treatment) and met with a study counselor to complete an Integrated Next Step Counseling (iNSC) session.21 The iNSC approach includes exploration, problem solving and skills building around non-biomedical strategies to prevent HIV, and for those receiving PrEP, assesses participant's desire to remain on PrEP and strategies to improve or maintain adherence. At each study visit, participants completed behavioral assessments via audio computer-assisted self-interview (ACASI), received condoms, and were dispensed study visit as determined by each local IRB. \$50 per visit for transportation	Professional counseling + cash transfer
Songtaweesin et al. 2020 [62, 72]	n=100 to receive youth friendly services (YFS) + n=100 YFS plus use of a PrEP adherence supporting mobile phone app (YFS + APP). Voucher: 100 points = \$3	Mixed = professional counseling + online counseling + cash transfer
Hosek et al. 2013 [45]	All participants received a comprehensive package of HIV prevention services at each visit (risk reduction, condoms, sexually transmitted infection (STI) screening, treatment, etc). Behavioral assessments were conducted via audio computer-assisted self-interview at each study visit along with risk reduction counseling, condom distribution, and drug dispensation. No specific adherence counseling was offered to participants because insuring the ability to analyze for product efficacy was not an aim of the study. Participants were provided a \$50 incentive for each study visit and fare for round-trip public transportation.	Mixed = Professional counseling + cash transfer
Ferreira et al. 2018 [47]	monthly check-in booster calls	Online counseling
Kung et al. 2018 [48]	N.I.	N.I.
Lalley-Chareczko et al. 2018 [49]	All participants received standard HIV-prevention services including condom provision, risk reduction counseling, HIV testing, and STI screening and treatment in addition to basic medical care. In accordance with CDC guidelines, participants were screened for HIV, STIs, and renal function at baseline and every 3 months during the study protocol period. Participants were also offered rapid tests for HIV on a monthly basis. Treatment was provided for STIs diagnosed during this study, and nonimmune subjects were offered vaccines against hepatitis A and B. Study staff provided standard of care adherence counseling to all participants at each visit.	Professional counseling
Liu et al. 2019 [33]	SMS-based adherence support + HIV testing was completed at each visit per clinic protocol. Urine specimens and rectal and pharyngeal swabs were tested quarterly for Neisseria gonorrhoeae and Chlamydia trachomatis using a nucleic acid amplification test. Participants were provided \$30 at each visit for completion of study procedures.	Mixed = Professional counseling + online + cash transfer
Marins et al. 2019 [50]	interactive text messages + brief paper questionnaire on mobile phone use and texting practices	Online counseling
Mayer et al. 2016 [51]	counseling session	Professional counseling
Myers et al. 2019 [52]	A clinician performed adherence counseling as part of each clinic visit. PrEP counseling was modeled on existing clinic practices for counseling HIV-infected patients on antiretro- viral adherence. Brief counseling at each visit encompassed 4 steps—assessment of adherence and factors related to it, strengthening of the therapeutic alliance, and recommen- dation of targeted interventions as appropriate (eg, alarm setting, pill boxes, treatment for substance use, or mental health disorders).	Professional counseling

# Table 3 (continued)

Reference	Description of the article's strategy	Class
Rolle et al, 2017 [53]	All participants receive comprehensive HIV/STI risk-reduction counseling which includes the provision of condoms and lubricants. Free transportation to all visits is available for all participants. And are invited to sign-up for medication reminders using free electronic apps and reminder services. Participants with health insurance use their insurance plan to pay for TDF/FTC and manufacturer co-pay cards are provided by the study to minimize associated prescription costs. Study staff provide assistance for uninsured men to enroll in the manufacturer patient assistance program (PAP) and receive TDF/FTC free of charge. One month after PrEP initiation, study clinicians phone participants to ensure that they have obtained TDF/FTC and perform an initial adherence and safety assessment.	Professional counseling
Laurent et al. 2021 [58]	At each scheduled visit, participants received a medical interview and examination, HIV testing, screening and treat- ment for other STI (syndromic approach), peer-led counselling (prevention and adherence) and psychosocial support, condoms and lubricants, and a refill of their PrEP prescription. Blood creatinine was measured at enrolment and every six months thereafter. Vaccination against hepatitis B was offered to participants who tested negative for both HBsAg and anti- HBs. Finally, peer-educators contacted participants by phone (with prior consent) if they were 15 days late for their sched- uled visits. All services were free of charge. Participants were compensated US\$5 for transport costs for each scheduled follow-up visit.	Mixed = Professional counseling + peer-educators + cash transfer
Molina et al. 2017 [59]	At every visit, we offered participants a comprehensive package of prevention services as previously described,13 including face-to-face risk-reduction counselling done by a peer community member, free condoms and gel, and testing and treatment of STIs. Postexposure prophy- laxis was also available at study sites free of charge in case of unprotected exposure to a partner possibly infected with HIV, but only if PrEP had not been taken as recom- mended, because of the favourable results of the placebo- controlled phase of the study. We hired peer counsellors from the AIDES advocacy group. Each counsellor was respon- sible for 50 participants and was also tasked with recruitment in gay venues (eg, bars, saunas, and sex clubs). Each counsel- lor gave their professional mobile phone number and email to participants and could be contacted anytime to answer participants' questions. Peer counsellors reminded partici- pants of their appointments at study sites and to complete questionnaires just before the visits (or helped them on site when this was not done before). When the medical team needed participants to come back for the treatment of an STI or for an abnormal blood test (although the reason why participants had to come back was not known to the peer counsellors) peer counsellors contacted participants. Peer counsellors also attended all participants' visits on site and provided adherence and risk-reduction counselling.	Professional counseling
Songtaweesin et al. 2020 [62, 72]	youth friendly services (YFS) or YFS plus use of a PrEP adher- ence supporting mobile phone app (YFS + APP) + telephone contact at months 2, 4 and 5 + counselling online and face- to-face + condoms and lubricants offered + STI screening.	Mixed = Professional counseling + peer-educators + cash transfer
Tun et al. 2021 [63]	counselling from peer-educators	Peer-educators
Wahome et al. 2020 [65]	during the visits, participants were counselled about benefits and risks of PrEP and the importance of adherence. During monthly visits, participants taking PrEP completed a ques- tionnaire on PrEP knowledge, motivation to PrEP and PrEP adherence via audio computer-assisted self-interview (ACASI). Retention was acessed by refills and a one-time dried blood spot sample was collected for assessment of substance concentration levels.	Mixed = Professional counseling + online counseling

# Table 3 (continued)

Reference	Description of the article's strategy	Class
Wahome et al. 2020 [64]	during the visits, participants were counselled about benefits and risks of PrEP and the importance of adherence. During monthly visits, participants taking PrEP completed a ques- tionnaire on PrEP knowledge, motivation to PrEP and PrEP adherence via audio computer-assisted self-interview (ACASI). Retention was acessed by refills and a one-time dried blood spot sample was collected for assessment of substance concentration levels.	Mixed = Professional counseling + online counseling
Wheeler et al. 2019 [66]	counselling, care coordination, referrals and follow-up care (C4 Intervention - sessions at each visit) + AEs (Assessment for adverse events) at each follow-up visit + measure of. 52 weeks of follow-up.	Professional counseling
Liu et al. 2019 [33]	SMS-based PrEP support intervention (Prepmate) + risk assessment, PrEP education and brief adherence counselling by health educator. Adherence measured by blood spots and STI screening.	Mixed = Professional counseling + online
Phanuphak et al. 2018 [29]	counselling, visit reminders via social media, and calls every week for a month and then 1 month after that if participants didn't show up at a follow-up visit	Mixed = Professional counseling + online
Molina et al. 2015 [30]	pill count + adherence counselling, HIV testing and bio- chemichal analyses. Before each visit, participants were asked to complete at home a computer-assisted structured interview to collect information about sociodemographic characteristics, use of alcohol and recreational drugs, sexual behavior, and adherence to preexposure prophylaxis dur- ing their most recent sexual intercourse.	Professional counseling
Hovaguimian et al. 2022 [36]	counselling + STI screening	Professional counseling
Jallil et al. 2022 [37]	risk reduction counselling and clinical and safety laboratory evaluations (including HIV testing and pooled or individual HIV viral load) at every study visit. As needed, TGW had access to mental health and endocrinological care and could receive FHT available at the site (estradiol valerate 2 mg plus spironol- actone 100 mg), with doses adjusted by the study endocrinolo- gist.	Professional counseling
Konda et al. 2022 [38]	Refills of PrEP and assessment concerning sexual behavior at enrollment and quarterly visits	Professional counseling
Traikiatphum et al. 2022 [39]	All participants were advised to download the mobile application "Raincoat", produced by Focal Intelligence Co., Ltd. Based on the information-motivation-behavioral (IMB) skills model, which consists of (1) information need related to HIV prevention (2) motivation of attitudes and intentions for HIV prevention by self-assessment of HIV risk acquisition, and (3) behavioral skills necessary for HIV prevention. It is aimed to sup- port participants to regularly assess their HIV acquisition risk and to provide a schedule of taking ED-PrEP and appointment reminders. The application included a self-evaluation feature for users to log numbers of sex acts, sexual partners, pills taken, and condom use, which were used to auto calculate HIV risk. To facilitate ED-PrEP use, participants could record when they take the first two pills, which would then auto-generate reminders for the next two pills as notifications on their mobile phone. Reminder messages were customizable, not explicitly mention- ing PrEP or HIV or taking medicine but a sentence such as "We have an appointment," and users were able to set a password to ensure privacy. The Raincoat application was available on both Android OS and iOS mobile platforms.	Online counseling
Antoni et al. 2020 [34]	HIV testing on clinical visit	Professional counseling
Thongsak et al. 2022 [40]	HIV testing and laboratorial exams on clinical visit	Professional counseling
Wu et al. 2022 [41]	social media app (UPrEPU app's) + visit included rapid testing for HIV antigen and antibodies	Mixed = Professional counseling + online

### Table 3 (continued)

Reference	Description of the article's strategy	Class		
Mayer et al. 2020 [43] HIV testing; Sites provided local standard-of-care risk reduc- tion counseling, adherence counseling, and condoms and lubricant. Treatment for STIs and HIV post-exposure prophylaxis was offered as per local quidelines.		Professional counseling		
Grohskopf et al. 2013 [31]	Visits included AE assessment, symptom-directed physical examination, blood and urine collection, sexually transmitted infection testing, behavioral assessment via audio computer- assisted self-interview, and risk reduction and adherence counseling.	Mixed = Professional counseling + online		
Kimani et al. 2021 [32]	Participants received 350 KSh (3.5 US\$) to cover participation costs for each scheduled visit. PrEP initiation and maintenance followed national guidelines, including a one-month PrEP-supply (irrespective of creatinine result); a two-month supply for the next two months, and a quarterly supply thereafter. Participants were reminded of their upcoming clinic visit 24 hours before the visit date. Physical tracing was done for those who did not attend their assigned visit or who were unreachable on phone. At each visit, participants were provided with standardized PrEP adherence counselling, supporting participants to take PrEP at a regular moment in the day and discussing possible adherence challenges. Participants who had stopped taking PrEP were encouraged to re-start.	Professional counseling + cash transfer		
Wirtz et al. 2020 [35]	Participants are offered a modest reimbursement for travel and their time, 800 Thai Baht (THB) per session (approximately US \$25)	Cash transfer		
McCormack et al. 2016 [68]	attend clinic every 3 months + HIV and STI testing	Professional counseling		
Schneider et al. 2021 [69]	digital network (by Facebook) - (1) HIV facts and myths; (2) background on PrEP; (3) role playing conversations about motivating peers to engage in PrEP care; and (4) leveraging social media to spread awareness about PrEP.	Online		
Hoagland et al. 2017 [57]	interactive text messages + brief paper questionnaire on mobile phone use and texting practices	Online		





adherence and retention to this therapy are significant challenges for effective PrEP implementation and are important determinants of the effectiveness of this pharmacotherapy in preventing HIV in clinical practice [44].

The PrEP DCS and RS were relatively similar among the populations studied. Specifically, the PrEP DCS was 92% (95% CI: 0.87–0.97) among MSM and 95% (95% CI: 0.84–1.00) among TGW; while the retention rate to PrEP service was 90% (95% CI: 0.84–0.96) and 91% (95% CI: 0.74–1.00) among MSM and TGW, respectively. The secondary outcome of this review was to assess the barriers to and facilitators of MSM and TGW retention in PrEP provision services. Four studies provided data on this outcome [37, 38, 44, 62]. Socioeconomic factors play an important role in retaining MSM and TGW in PrEP provision services. PrEP offered in public health clinics was a facilitator [44], which is an important finding, particularly in middleincome countries. A study with MSM conducted in the United States suggested that affordable PrEP and care were relevant factors for PrEP retention and continuum care [83].

Study	Events	Total					Pro	portion	95% CI	Weight
Mixed Grinztejn et al., 2018 Songtaweesin et al., 2020 Tun et al., 2021 Phanuphak et al., 2018 Mayer et al., 2020 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 100\%$ [1	450 200 243 1697 5387 00%; 100%	753 462 695 14951 5399		=				0.60 0.43 0.35 0.11 1.00 0.50	[0.56; 0.63] [0.39; 0.48] [0.31; 0.39] [0.11; 0.12] [1.00; 1.00] [0.21; 0.79]	10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 50.1%
Online Liu et al., 2017 Magno et al., 2022 Random effects model Heterogeneity: J <sup>2</sup> = 100% [1	121 420	134 3342  6], <i>p</i> < 0.0	•			-=	+ 	0.90 0.13 0.51	[0.84; 0.95] [0.11; 0.14] [0.00; 1.00]	10.0% 10.0% 20.0%
Face-to-face Magno et al., 2022 Kimani et al., 2021 Wirtz et al., 2020 Random effects model Heterogeneity: J <sup>2</sup> = 99% [ 98	515 53 330 3%; 99%], ,	1187 126 445 p < 0.01				-		0.43 0.42 0.74 0.53	[0.41; 0.46] [0.33; 0.51] [0.70; 0.78] [0.33; 0.74]	10.0% 9.8% 10.0% 29.9%
<b>Random effects model</b> Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 100\%$ [1] Test for subgroup difference	00%; 100% s: p = 0.9	6], p = 0 <sup>[</sup> 98 0	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1	0.51	[0.33; 0.70]	100.0%

Fig. 2 Forest plot of pooled proportions of PrEP DCS among the entire sample (MSM and TGW) (n=10 report and 09 studies because of difference strategies)

Moreover, multidisciplinary care [62] and genderaffirming settings [37] appear to be facilitators, as corroborated by Rogers [83], who presented culturally tailored (LGBTQ+) clinical services as an alternative for enhancing PrEP persistence. In a qualitative study with transwomen in Brazil on barriers to and facilitators of PrEP, discrimination in the public health system (SUS) was identified as a barrier to PrEP, and misgendering was identified as a specific form of discrimination, reinforcing the findings of the studies included in this review [9]. Previous data indicate the importance of addressing the social determinants of health and economic barriers, such as the cost of PrEP medication and care, discrimination in health facilities, and the lack of multidisciplinary care. Alternative options include the provision of PrEP in public health services with a multidisciplinary

Study	Events	Total						Proportion	95% CI	Weight
Grinztejn et al., 2018	425	703			-+			0.60	[0.57; 0.64]	5.3%
Hosek et al., 2017	200	277			1	+		0.72	[0.67; 0.77]	5.3%
Hosek et al., 2013	58	241						0.24	[0.19; 0.30]	5.3%
Mayer et al., 2016	50	58					-	0.86	[0.75; 0.94]	5.1%
Myers et al., 2019	257	378			÷.	F		0.68	[0.63; 0.73]	5.3%
Rolle et al, 2017	116	184						0.63	[0.56; 0.70]	5.2%
Fennel et al., 2019	90	189		-	-			0.48	[0.40; 0.55]	5.2%
Fields et al., 2019	137	826	-+					0.17	[0.14; 0.19]	5.3%
Serota et al., 2019	154	298		-				0.52	[0.46; 0.57]	5.3%
Wahome et al., 2020 (2)	140	170					-1	0.82	[0.76; 0.88]	5.3%
Wheeler et al., 2019	226	344			- + -			0.66	[0.60; 0.71]	5.3%
Molina et al., 2015	414	445					-+-	0.93	[0.90; 0.95]	5.3%
Wu et al., 2022	35	46			-		-	0.76	[0.61; 0.87]	4.9%
Lin et al., 2022	716	928				-+		0.77	[0.74; 0.80]	5.3%
Grohskopf et al., 2013	400	679						0.59	[0.55; 0.63]	5.3%
Kimani et al., 2021	42	112	-	•				0.38	[0.29; 0.47]	5.1%
McCormack et al., 2016	540	546					+	0.99	[0.98; 1.00]	5.4%
Schneider et al., 2021	423	615				-		0.69	[0.65; 0.72]	5.3%
Young et al., 2017	423	615			-+	+		0.69	[0.65; 0.72]	5.3%
Random effects model					-	<b>-</b>		0.64	[0.54: 0.74]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 100\%$ [1]	100%: 100	0%1. p =	= 0		1					
		, P	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8				

Fig. 3 Forest plot of pooled proportions of PrEP DCS among MSM (n=19)

Study	Events Total	Proportion	95% CI Weight					
Mixed Grinztejn et al., 2018 Hosek et al., 2017 Rolle et al, 2017 McCormack et al., 2016 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$ [9	425 703 200 277 116 184 540 546 9%; 100%], <i>p</i> < 0.01	0.60 0.72 0.63 + 0.99 0.74	[0.57; 0.64]         5.3%           [0.67; 0.77]         5.3%           [0.56; 0.70]         5.2%           [0.98; 1.00]         5.4%           [0.56; 0.91]         21.2%					
Face-to-face Hosek et al., 2013 Myers et al., 2019 Fennel et al., 2019 Fields et al., 2019 Serota et al., 2019 Wahome et al., 2020 (2) Wheeler et al., 2020 (2) Wheeler et al., 2021 Grohskopf et al., 2021 Schneider et al., 2021 Young et al., 2021 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$ [9	58 241 257 378 90 189 137 826 154 298 140 170 226 344 35 46 716 928 400 679 42 112 423 615 423 615 423 615 9%; 99%], p < 0.01	0.24 0.68 0.48 0.17 0.52 0.66 0.77 0.59 0.38 0.69 0.69 0.57						
Online Mayer et al., 2016 Molina et al., 2015 Random effects model Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 53% [ (	50 58 414 445 1%; 88%], <i>p</i> = 0.15	0.86 0.93 0.91	[0.75; 0.94] 5.1% [0.90; 0.95] 5.3% [0.85; 0.97] 10.5%					
Random effects model       .       0.64 [0.54; 0.74] 100.0%         Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 100\% [100\%; 100\%], p = 0$ .       0.64 [0.54; 0.74] 100.0%         Test for subgroup differences: $p < 0.01$ 0.2       0.4       0.6       0.8								

Fig. 4 Forest plot of pooled proportions of PrEP DCS among MSM (n=19)



Fig. 5 Forest plot of pooled proportions of PrEP DCS among TGW (n=04)



Fig. 6 Forest plot of pooled proportions of PrEP DCS among TGW (n=04)



Fig. 7 Forest plot of pooled proportions of retention to pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) service among the entire sample (MSM and TGW) (n=10)

Study	Events	Total				Proportion	95% CI	Weight
Online counseling Grinztejn et al., 2018	375	450			=	0.83	[0.80; 0.87]	10.1%
Mixed Songtaweesin et al., 2020 Liu et al., 2017 Phanuphak et al., 2018 Kimani et al., 2021 Random effects model Heterogeneity: J <sup>2</sup> = 97% [95%; s	145 88 745 19 98%], p <	200 121 1697 53 0.01	-	-		0.72 0.73 0.44 0.36 0.57	[0.66; 0.79] [0.64; 0.80] [0.42; 0.46] [0.23; 0.50] [0.38; 0.75]	10.0% 10.0% 10.1% 9.6% 39.8%
Professional counseling Lalley-Chareczko et al., 2018 Hovaguimian et al., 2022 Mayer et al., 2020 Random effects model Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 96% [92%; {	25 866 5335 98%], p <	50 886 5387 0.01				0.50 + 0.98 • 0.99 - 0.83	[0.36; 0.64] [0.97; 0.99] [0.99; 0.99] [0.52; 1.00]	9.5% 10.2% 10.2% 29.9%
Peer-educators Tun et al., 2021	239	243				+ 0.98	[0.96; 1.00]	10.2%
Cash transfer Wirtz et al., 2020	77	330 -	<b>1</b> -			0.23	[0.19; 0.28]	10.1%
<b>Random effects model</b> Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 100\%$ [100% Test for subgroup differences:	6; 100%], j p < 0.01	p = 0	2 0.4	0.6	0.8	<b>0.68</b>	[0.51; 0.85]	100.0%



care and the training of health care workers to provide gender-affirming care with sensibility.

This systematic review and meta-analysis had several strengths, including the availability of subgroup analyses by interview strategy and meta-regression to identify possible sources of heterogeneity. Nonetheless, some limitations should be considered. The risk of bias assessment showed that the main problems were related to the measurement of outcomes, participants, and study selection. Furthermore, high heterogeneity exists among the studies in the meta-analyses, which remained high after subgroup and meta-regression analyses. This high heterogeneity can be explained by differences in the study designs, selection bias in some studies, and differences in some population characteristics, such as age and educational level. Another potential limitation of our study is are the limited number of included studies focusing on the description of strategies for DCS on TGW and online strategy-isolating forms.

Raising PrEP awareness among MSM and TGW, minimizing gaps in access, and ensuring retention of



Fig. 9 Forest plot of pooled proportions of retention to pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) service among MSM (n=19)

Study	Events	Total				Proportion	95% CI	Weight
Online counseling Grinztejn et al., 2018 Traikiatphum et al., 2022 Schneider et al., 2021 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 17\%$ [ 0%	354 32 342 6; 91%], p	425 36 423 			# # •	0.83 0.89 0.81 0.83	[0.79; 0.87] [0.74; 0.97] [0.77; 0.84] [0.80; 0.85]	5.4% 5.1% 5.4% 15.8%
Mixed Hosek et al., 2017 Songtaweesin et al., 2020 Hosek et al., 2013 Laurent et al., 2021 Wahome et al., 2020 (2) Phanuphak et al., 2018 Wu et al., 2022 Grohskopf et al., 2013 Kimani et al., 2021 Random effects model Heterogeneity: / <sup>2</sup> = 98% [ 97	142 109 51 439 74 685 32 331 11 %; 99%],	200 147 58 598 140 1467 35 400 42 p < 0.0	1	*	** ** ** ** **	0.71 0.74 0.88 0.73 0.53 0.47 0.91 0.83 0.26 0.68	$\begin{matrix} [0.64; 0.77] \\ [0.66; 0.81] \\ [0.77; 0.95] \\ [0.70; 0.77] \\ [0.44; 0.61] \\ [0.44; 0.49] \\ [0.77; 0.98] \\ [0.77; 0.98] \\ [0.79; 0.86] \\ [0.14; 0.42] \\ [0.54; 0.81] \end{matrix}$	5.3% 5.2% 5.4% 5.2% 5.4% 5.2% 5.4% 5.4% 4.9% 47.1%
Professional counseling Mayer et al., 2016 Myers et al., 2019 Rolle et al, 2017 Wheeler et al., 2019 Molina et al., 2015 Hovaguimian et al., 2022 McCormack et al., 2016 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 100\%$ [10]	39 243 52 209 88 857 482	50 257 116 226 414 877 540 	0.01	-=-	* * *	0.78 0.95 0.45 0.92 0.21 0.98 0.89 0.74	[0.64; 0.88] [0.91; 0.97] [0.36; 0.54] [0.88; 0.96] [0.17; 0.26] [0.96; 0.99] [0.86; 0.92] [0.52; 0.96]	5.1% 5.4% 5.2% 5.4% 5.3% 5.4% 5.4% 37.0%
<b>Random effects model</b> Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$ [999 Test for subgroup difference	%; 99%], / s: p = 0.0	p = 0 08	0.2	0.4 0.6	0.8	0.73	[0.62; 0.83]	100.0%

Fig. 10 Forest plot of pooled proportions of retention to pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) service among MSM by demand creation strategies (n=19)



Fig. 11 Forest plot of pooled proportions of retention to pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) service among TGW (n=08)

Study	Events	Total		Proportion	95% CI	Weight
Online counseling Grinztejn et al., 2018	21	25		0.84	[0.64; 0.95]	12.3%
Mixed Songtaweesin et al., 2020 Phanuphak et al., 2018 Kimani et al., 2021 Random effects model Heterogenetty: <i>I</i> <sup>2</sup> = 96% [907	36 58 8 %; 98%],	53 230 11 p < 0.01	*	0.68 0.25 0.73 0.54	[0.54; 0.80] [0.20; 0.31] [0.39; 0.94] [0.23; 0.84]	12.5% 13.1% 10.4% 36.0%
Professional counseling Hovaguimian et al., 2022 Jallil et al., 2022 Konda et al., 2022 Thongsak et al., 2022 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 98\%$ [97	9 111 237 108 %; 99%],	9 130 543 235 p < 0.01	*	1.00 0.85 0.44 0.46 0.68	[0.66; 1.00] [0.78; 0.91] [0.39; 0.48] [0.39; 0.53] [0.41; 0.96]	12.4% 13.1% 13.2% 13.1% 51.8%
<b>Random effects model</b> Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$ [97' Test for subgroup difference	%; 98%], s: p = 0.	p < 0.01 17 0	2 04 06 08 1	0.65	[0.47; 0.83]	100.0%

Fig. 12 Forest plot of pooled proportions of retention to pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) service among TGW by DCS (n=08)

PrEP services are critical issues. Offering PrEP through online DCS and RS can reach and retain high numbers of MSM and TGW, and reduce HIV incidence in these populations.

# **Supplementary Information**

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi. org/10.1186/s12879-023-08693-z.

Additional file 1: Appendix 1. Search strategy. Appendix 2. PRISMA flow-chart of this systematic review. Appendix 3. Excluded studies on full text lecture with respective reason for exclusion of search strategy (*N*=139). Appendix 4. Risk of bias recruitment of observational studies included studies at systematic review, 2022. Appendix 5. Risk of bias recruitment of interventional studies (trials) included studies at systematic review, 2022. Appendix 6. Risk of bias retention of observational studies included studies at systematic review, 2022. Appendix 7. Risk of bias retention of interventional studies (trials) included studies at systematic review, 2022. Appendix 8. Meta-regression according to selected covariates.

### Acknowledgements

NSG thanks the CNPq scholarship.

#### Authors' contributions

NSG, LM and ID developed the study concept and designed the study. NSG designed the investigation. NSG, GMBM and ICNR designed the data analysis. NSG wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to data interpretation, reviewed and edited the manuscript. ID supervised the study process. All authors had full access to all data in the study and had the final responsability for the decision to submit for publication.

### Funding

Not applicable.

### Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article [and its supplementary information files].

### Declarations

### Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study protocol was registered in PROSPERO (number CRD42022323220).

#### **Consent for publication**

Not applicable.

### Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

### Author details

<sup>1</sup> Faculdade Ciências Médicas de Minas Gerais, R. Basílio da Gama, Canela, Salvador, Bahia 40110-040, Brazil. <sup>2</sup>Fundação de apoio à Fiocruz (FIOTEC) Scholarship, Avenida, Brazil. <sup>3</sup>Departamento Ciências da Vida, Universidade do Estado da Bahia, Salvador, Brazil. <sup>4</sup>Instituto de Saúde Coletiva, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, Bahia, Brazil. <sup>5</sup>Life Sciences Departament, Universidade do Estado do Estado da Bahia, Salvador, Bahia, Brazil.

### Received: 27 March 2023 Accepted: 11 October 2023 Published online: 14 November 2023

#### References

- Baral SD, Poteat T, Strömdahl S, Wirtz AL, Guadamuz TE, Beyrer C. Worldwide burden of HIV in transgender women: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Infect Dis. 2013;13(3):214–22. https://doi.org/10. 1016/S1473-3099(12)70315-8.
- Beyrer C, Baral SD, van Griensven F, Goodreau SM, Chariyalertsak S, Wirtz AL, et al. Global epidemiology of HIV infection in men who have sex with men. The Lancet. 2012;380(9839):367–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60821-6.
- UNAIDS, 2021 https://unaids.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/ 2021\_12\_01\_UNAIDS\_2021\_FactSheet\_DadosTB\_Traduzido.pdf.
- WHO, 2022. https://www.who.int/teams/global-hiv-hepatitis-and-stisprogrammes/hiv/prevention/pre-exposure-prophylaxis.
- Park C, Taylor T, Rios N, Khedimi R, Weiss C, Dolce E, et al. Perspectives of women prescribed HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP). Open Forum Infectious Dis. 2017;4(Suppl 1):S440. https://doi.org/10.1093/ofid/ofx163.1115.
- Grant RM, Lama JR, Anderson PL, McMahan V, Liu AY, Vargas L, et al. Preexposure chemoprophylaxis for HIV prevention in men who have sex with men external icon. N Engl J Med. 2010;363(27):2587–99. https://doi. org/10.1056/NEJMoa1011205.
- Grant RM, Anderson PL, McMahan V, Liu A, Amico KR, Mehrotra M, et al. Uptake of pre-exposure prophylaxis, sexual practices, and HIV incidence in men and transgender women who have sex with men: a cohort study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2014;14(9):820–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(14)70847-3.
- Golub Sk, Gamarel KE, Rendina HJ, Surace A, Lelutiu-Weinberger CL. From efficacy to effectiveness: facilitators and barriers to PrEP acceptability and motivations for adherence among MSM and transgender women in New York City. AIDS Patient Care and STDs. 2013;27(4):248–54. https://doi.org/ 10.1089/apc.2012.0419.
- Wilson EC, Jalil EM, Castro C, Martinez Fernandez N, Kamel L, Grinsztejn B. Barriers and facilitators to PrEP for transwomen in Brazil. Glob Public Health. 2019;14(2):300–8. https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2018. 1505933.
- Pleuhs B, Quinn KG, Walsh JL, Petroll AE, John SA. Health care provider barriers to HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis in the United States: a systematic review. AIDS Patient Care STDS. 2020;34(3):111–23. https://doi.org/10. 1089/apc.2019.0189. (Epub 2020 Feb 28).
- Watson CW, Pasipanodya E, Savin MJ, Ellorin EE, Corado KC, Flynn RP, et al. Barriers and facilitators to PrEP initiation and adherence among transgender and gender non-binary individuals in Southern California. AIDS Educ Prev. 2020;32(6):472–85. https://doi.org/10.1521/aeap.2020.32.6.472.
- Soares F, Magno L, da Silva LAV, Guimarães MDC, Leal AF, Knauth D, et al. Perceived risk of HIV infection and acceptability of PrEP among men who have sex with men in Brazil. Arch Sex Behav. 2023;52(2):773–82. https:// doi.org/10.1007/s10508-022-02342-3.
- Moskowitz DA, Macapagal K, Mongrella M, Pérez-Cardona L, Newcomb ME, Mustanski B. What if my dad finds out!?: assessing adolescent men who have sex with men's perceptions about parents as barriers to PrEP uptake. AIDS Behav. 2020;24(9):2703–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10461-020-02827-z.

- Boyd DT, Quinn CR, Aquino GA. the inescapable effects of parent support on black males and HIV testing. J Racial Ethn Health Disparities. 2020;7(3):563–70. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40615-019-00685-7.
- Quinn K, Bowleg L, Dickson-Gomez J. "The fear of being Black plus the fear of being gay": the effects of intersectional stigma on PrEP use among young Black gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men. Soc Sci Med. 2019;232:86–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.04.042.
- Hannaford A, Lipshie-Williams M, Starrels JL, Arnsten JH, Rizzuto J, Cohen P, et al. The Use of Online Posts to Identify Barriers to and Facilitators of HIV Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) among men who have sex with men: a comparison to a systematic review of the peer-reviewed literature. AIDS Behav. 2018;22(4):1080–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-017-2011-3.
- Morgan E, Ryan DT, Newcomb ME, Mustanski B. High rate of discontinuation may diminish PrEP coverage among young men who have sex with men. AIDS Behav. 2018;22(11):3645–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10461-018-2125-2.
- Rivas DRZ, Soares F, Magno L, Eustorgio M, Amorim L, Greco D, et al. PrEP discontinuation among adolescents PrEP users in Brazil. In: Conference On Retroviruses And Opportunistic Infections (CROI). 2022; Abstract 843. Available on: <a href="https://www.croiconference.org/abstract/prep-discontinuation-among-adolescents-prep-users-in-brazil/">https://www.croiconference.org/abstract/prep-discontinuation-among-adolescents-prep-users-in-brazil/</a>.
- Nieto O, Brooks RA, Landrian A, Cabral A, Fehrenbacher AE. PrEP discontinuation among Latino/a and Black MSM and transgender women: a need for PrEP support services. PLoS One. 2020;15(11):e0241340. https:// doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0241340.
- Ongolly FK, Dolla A, Ngure K, Irungu EM, Odoyo J, Wamoni E, et al. "I just decided to stop:" understanding PrEP discontinuation among individuals initiating PrEP in HIV care centers in Kenya. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2021;87(1):e150–8. https://doi.org/10.1097/QAI.00000000002625.
- 21. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.2 (updated February 2021). Cochrane, 2021. www.training.cochrane.org/ handbook.
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;29(372): n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71.
- Ouzzani M, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. Syst Rev. 2016;5:210. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s13643-016-0384-4.
- 24. Schünemann HJ, Vist GE, Higgins JPT, et al. Chapter 15: Interpreting results and concluding. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.2 (updated February 2021). Cochrane, 2021. Available from www. training.cochrane.org/handbook.
- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE Working Group. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ. 2008;336(7650):924– 6. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD.
- Magno L, Soares F, Zucchi EM, Eustórgio M, Grangeiro A, Ferraz D, et al. Reaching Out to Adolescents at High Risk of HIV Infection in Brazil: Demand Creation Strategies for PrEP and Other HIV Combination Prevention Methods. Arch Sex Behav. 2022;25:1–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10508-022-02371-y.
- Barendregt JJ, Doi SA, Lee YY, Norman RE, Vos T. Meta-analysis of prevalence. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2013;67:974–8.
- Hunter JP, Saratzis A, Sutton AJ, Boucher RH, Sayers RD, Bown MJ. In meta-analyses of proportion studies, funnel plots were found to be an inaccurate method of assessing publication bias. J Clin Epidemiol. 2014;67(8):897–903. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.03.003. (Epub 2014/05/06).
- Phanuphak N, Sungsing T, Jantarapakde J, Pengnonyang S, Trachunthong D, Mingkwanrungruang P, et al. Princess PrEP program: the first key population-led model to deliver pre-exposure prophylaxis to key populations by key populations in Thailand. Sex Health. 2018;15(6):542–55. https://doi. org/10.1071/SH18065.
- Molina JM, Capitant C, Spire B, Pialoux G, Cotte L, Charreau I, et al. On-Demand preexposure prophylaxis in men at high risk for HIV-1 infection. N Engl J Med. 2015;373(23):2237–46. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMo a1506273.
- 31. Grohskopf LA, Chillag KL, Gvetadze R, Liu AY, Thompson M, Mayer KH, et al. Randomized trial of clinical safety of daily oral tenofovir disoproxil

fumarate among HIV-uninfected men who have sex with men in the United States. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2013;64(1):79–86. https://doi. org/10.1097/QAI.0b013e31828ece33.

- 32. Kimani M, van der Elst EM, Chirro O, Wahome E, Ibrahim F, Mukuria N, et al. "I wish to remain HIV negative": Pre-exposure prophylaxis adherence and persistence in transgender women and men who have sex with men in coastal Kenya. PLoS One. 2021;16(1):e0244226. https://doi.org/10.1371/ journal.pone.0244226.
- 33. Liu AY, Vittinghoff E, von Felten P, Amico KR, Anderson PL, Lester R. Randomized controlled trial of a mobile health intervention to promote retention and adherence to preexposure prophylaxis among young people at risk for human immunodeficiency virus: the EPIC study. Clin Infect Dis. 2019;68(12):2010–7.
- 34. Antoni G, Tremblay C, Delaugerre C, Charreau I, Cua E, Castro DR, et al. On-demand pre-exposure prophylaxis with tenofovir disoproxil fumarate plus emtricitabine among men who have sex with men with less frequent sexual intercourse: a post-hoc analysis of the ANRS IPERGAY trial. Lancet HIV. 2020;7(2):e113–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3018(19) 30341-8.
- 35. Wirtz AL, Weir BW, Mon SHH, Sirivongrangson P, Chemnasiri T, Dunne EF, et al. Combination Prevention Effectiveness (COPE) Study Team. Testing the Effectiveness and Cost-Effectiveness of a Combination HIV Prevention Intervention Among Young Cisgender Men Who Have Sex With Men and Transgender Women Who Sell or Exchange Sex in Thailand: Protocol for the Combination Prevention Effectiveness Study. JMIR Res Protoc. 2020;9(1):e15354. https://doi.org/10.2196/15354.
- Hovaguimian F, Martin E, Reinacher M, Rasi M, Schmidt AJ, Bernasconi E, et al. Participation, retention and uptake in a multicentre pre-exposure prophylaxis cohort using online, smartphone-compatible data collection. HIV Med. 2022;23(2):146–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/hiv.13175.
- Jalil EM, Torres TS, Luz PM, Monteiro L, Moreira RI, de Castro CRV, et al. Low PrEP adherence despite high retention among transgender women in Brazil: the PrEParadas study. J Int AIDS Soc. 2022;25(3):e25896. https://doi. org/10.1002/jia2.25896.
- 38. Konda KA, Torres TS, Mariño G, Ramos A, Moreira RI, Leite IC, et al. Factors associated with long-term HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis engagement and adherence among transgender women in Brazil, Mexico and Peru: results from the ImPrEP study. J Int AIDS Soc. 2022;25(5):e25974. https:// doi.org/10.1002/jia2.25974.
- Traikiatphum J, Wongharn P, Moonwong J, Songtaweesin WN, Vitsupakorn S, Premgamone A, et al. Retention in event-driven PrEP among young Thai men who have sex with men at risk of HIV acquisition. Int J STD AIDS. 2022;33(8):799–805. https://doi.org/10.1177/095646242211065 27.
- Thongsak N, Manojai N, Apiputhipan R, Rongram N, Mattawanon N, Bunyatisai W, et al. Risk factors associated with loss to follow-up among transgender women receiving HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis in Chiang Mai province. Thailand AIDS Behav. 2022;5:1–11. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10461-022-03782-7.
- Wu HJ, Yu YF, Ku SW, Tseng YC, Yuan CW, Li CW, et al. Usability and effectiveness of adherence monitoring of a mobile app designed to monitor and improve adherence to event-driven and daily HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men in Taiwan. Digit Health. 2022;22(8):20552076221102770. https://doi.org/10.1177/2055207622 1102770.
- 42. Lin B, Liu J, He W, Pan H, Ma Y, Zhong X. Effect of a reminder system on pre-exposure prophylaxis adherence in men who have sex with men: prospective cohort study based on WeChat intervention. J Med Internet Res. 2022;24(8):e37936. https://doi.org/10.2196/37936.
- Mayer KH, Molina JM, Thompson MA, Anderson PL, Mounzer KC, De Wet JJ, et al. Emtricitabine and tenofovir alafenamide vs emtricitabine and tenofovir disoproxil fumarate for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (DISCOVER): primary results from a randomised, double-blind, multicentre, active-controlled, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. Lancet. 2020;396(10246):239–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20) 31065-5.
- 44. Grinsztejn B, Hoagland B, Moreira RI, Kallas EG, Madruga JV, Goulart S, et al. Retention, engagement, and adherence to pre-exposure prophylaxis for men who have sex with men and transgender women in PrEP Brasil: 48-week results of a demonstration study. Lancet. 2018. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3018(18)30011-0.

- 45. Hosek SG, Siberry G, Bell M, Lally M, Kapogiannis B, Green K, et al. The acceptability and feasibility of an HIV preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP) trial with young men who have sex with men. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2013;62(4):447–56.
- Hosek SG, Rudy B, Landovitz R, Kapogiannis B, Siberry G, Rutledge B, et al. An HIV preexposure prophylaxis demonstration project and safety study for young MSM. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2017;74(1):21–9.
- Ferreira M, Young L, Schneider J. Increasing PrEP Uptake: a diffusionbased network intervention for HIV prevention among young Black men who have sex with men. OFID. 2018;5(Suppl 1):S21.
- Kung V, Pattanasin S, Ungsedhapand C, Wimonsate W, Thigpen M, Dunne E. HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) implementation at silom community clinic in Bangkok, Thailand, 2016–2018. OFID. 2018;5(Suppl 1):S394.
- Lalley-Chareczko L, Clark D, Conyngham C. Delivery of TDF/FTC for Preexposure prophylaxis to prevent HIV-1 acquisition in young adult men who have sex with men and transgender women of color using a urine adherence assay. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2018;79(2):173–8.
- Marins LMS, Torres TS, Leite IC, Moreira RI, Luz LM, Hoagland B. Performance of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis indirect adherence measures among men who have sex with men and transgender women: Results from the PrEP Brasil Study. PLoS ONE. 2019;14(8):e0221281. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0221281.
- Mayer KH, Safren SA, Elsesser SA, Psaros C, Tinsley JP, Marzinke M. Optimizing pre-exposure antiretroviral prophylaxis adherence in men who have sex with men: results of a pilot randomized controlled trial of "Life-Steps for PrEP. AIDS Behav. 2016;21:1–11. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10461-016-1606-4.
- Myers JJ, Dufour MK, Koester KA, Udoh I, Frazier R, Packard R. Adherence to PrEP among young men who have sex with men participating in a sexual health services demonstration project in Alameda county California. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2019;81(4):406–13.
- Rolle CP, Rosenberg ES, Siegler AJ, Sanchez TH, Luisi N, Weiss K, et al. Challenges in translating PrEP interest into uptake in an observational study of young Black MSM. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2017;76(3):250–8. https://doi.org/10.1097/QAI.000000000001497.
- Dourado I, Magno L, Soares F, Caires P, Eustórgio M, Tupinambás U. PrEP initiation and continuation among adolescent key population in Br cascade analysis. HIV r4p. 2021;1:1219.
- 55. Fennell C, Fields E, Schumacher C, Chandran A, Price A, McClarin L, et al. HIV among young black men who have sex with men in Baltimore city: where are we with pre-exposure prophylaxis delivery and uptake? Platform Research Presentations. J Adolescent Health. 2019;64:S1eS22.
- 56. Fields EL, Fennell C, Wagner J, Schumacher C, Chandran A, Price A, et al. HIV risk factors associated with the pre-exposure prophylaxis cascade among young and adult black men who have sex with men in Baltimore City. J Adolescent Health. 2019;64:47.
- 57. Hoagland B, Moreira RI, De Boni RB, Kallas EG, Madruga JV. High preexposure prophylaxis uptake and early adherence among men who have sex with men and transgender women at risk for HIV Infection: the PrEP Brasil demonstration project. J Intern AIDS Soc. 2017;20:21472.
- Laurent C, Keita BP, Yaya I, Guicher GL, Sagaon-Teyssier L, Agboyibor MK, et al. HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis for men who have sex with men in west Africa: a multicountry demonstration study. The Lancet HIV. 2021;8(7):420–8.
- Molina JM, Charreau I, Spire B, Cotte L, Chas J, Capitant C, et al. Efficacy, safety, and effect on sexual behaviour of on-demand pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV in men who have sex with men: an observational cohort study. Lancet HIV. 2017;4(9):e402–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/ S2352-3018(17)30089-9.
- Serota DP, Rosenberg ES, Sullivan PS, Thorne AL, Rolle CM, Del Rio C, et al. Pre-exposure prophylaxis uptake and discontinuation among young Black men who have sex with men in Atlanta, Georgia: a prospective cohort study. Clin Infect Dis. 2020;71(3):574–82. https://doi.org/10.1093/ cid/ciz894.
- Serota DP, Rosenberg ES, Thorne AL, Sullivan PS, Kelley CF. Lack of health insurance is associated with delays in PrEP initiation among young black men who have sex with men in Atlanta, US: a longitudinal cohort study. J Int AIDS Soc. 2019;22(10):e25399. https://doi.org/10.1002/jia2.25399.
- 62. Songtaweesin WN, Puthanakit T, Kawichai S, Cressey TR, Wongharn P, Theerawit T, et al. High adherence based on and transwomen topics in antiviral medicine. AIDS Behav. 2020;28(1):387.

- Tun NN, Gils T, Lynen L, Min M, Aung MY, Smithuis SF, et al. Uptake of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV infection among men who have sex with men and transgender: lessons learned during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic from the first PrEP project in Myanmar. J Intern AIDS Soc. 2021;24(S4):e25755.
- 64. Wahome EW, Graham SM, Thiong'o AN, Mohamed K, Oduor T, Gichuru E, et al. Risk factors for loss to follow-up among at-risk HIV negative men who have sex with men participating in a research cohort with access to pre-exposure prophylaxis in coastal Kenya. J Int AIDS Soc. 2020;23(Suppl 6):e25593. https://doi.org/10.1002/jia2.25593.
- Wahome EW, Graham SM, Thiong'o AN, Mohamed K, Oduor T, Gichuru E, et al. PrEP uptake and adherence in relation to HIV-1 incidence among Kenyan men who have sex with men. EClinicalMedicine. 2020;9(26):100541.
- Wheeler DP, Fields SD, Beauchamp G, Chen YQ, Emel LM, Hightow-Weidman L, et al. Pre-exposure prophylaxis initiation and adherence among Black men who have sex with men (MSM) in three US cities: results from the HPTN 073 study. J Int AIDS Soc. 2019;22(2):e25223. https://doi.org/10. 1002/jia2.25223.
- Dolling DI, Desai M, McOwan A, Gilson R, Clarke A, PROUD Study Group, et al. An analysis of baseline data from the PROUD study: an open-label randomised trial of pre-exposure prophylaxis. Trials. 2016;17:163. https:// doi.org/10.1186/s13063-016-1286-4.
- McCormack S, Dunn DT, Desai M, Dolling DI, Gafos M, Gilson R, et al. Pre-exposure prophylaxis to prevent the acquisition of HIV-1 infection (PROUD): effectiveness results from the pilot phase of a pragmatic openlabel randomised trial. Lancet. 2016;387(10013):53–60. https://doi.org/10. 1016/S0140-6736(15)00056-2.
- 69. Schneider JA, Young L, Ramachandran A, Michaels S, Cohen H, PrEP Chicago Network Intervention Team, et al. A Pragmatic Randomized Controlled Trial to Increase PrEP Uptake for HIV Prevention: 55-Week Results From PrEPChicago. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2021;86(1):31–7. https://doi.org/10.1097/QAI.00000000002518.
- Young LE, Schumm P, Alon L, Bouris A, Ferreira M, Hill B, et al. PrEP Chicago: A randomized controlled peer change agent intervention to promote the adoption of pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention among young Black men who have sex with men. Clin Trials. 2018;15(1):44–52. https://doi.org/10.1177/1740774517730012.
- Hosek SG, Landovitz RJ, Kapogiannis B, Siberry GK, Rudy B, Rutledge B, et al. Safety and feasibility of antiretroviral preexposure prophylaxis for adolescent men who have sex with men aged 15 to 17 years in the United States. JAMA Pediatr. 2017;171:E1–9. https://doi.org/10.1001/ jamapediatrics.2017.200.
- 72. Songtaweesin WN, Kawichai S, Phanuphak N, Cressey TR, Wongharn P, Saisaengjan C, et al. Youth-friendly services and a mobile phone application to promote adherence to pre-exposure prophylaxis among adolescent men who have sex with men and transgender women at-risk for HIV in Thailand: a randomized control trial. J Intern AIDS Soc. 2020;23(S5):e25564. https://doi.org/10.1002/jia2.25564.
- Witarto BS, Visuddho V, Witarto AP, Bestari D, Sawitri B, Melapi TAS, et al. Effectiveness of online mindfulness-based interventions in improving mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. PLoS One. 2022;17(9):e0274177. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0274177.
- Stark AL, Geukes C, Dockweiler C. Digital Health Promotion and Prevention in Settings: Scoping Review. J Med Internet Res. 2022;24(1):e21063. https://doi.org/10.2196/21063.
- McInroy LB. Pitfalls, potentials, and ethics of online survey research: LGBTQ and other marginalized and hard-to-access youths. Soc Work Res. 2016;40(2):83–94. https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svw005.
- Loomis DK, Petterson S. A comparison of data collection methods: mail versus online surveys. J Leisure Res. 2018;18(2):133–46. https://doi.org/10. 1080/00222216.2018.1494418.
- Davies L, LeClair KL, Bagley P, Blunt H, Hinton L, Ryan S, et al. Face-to-face compared with online collected accounts of health and illness experiences: a scoping review. Qual Health Res. 2020;30(13):2092–102. https:// doi.org/10.1177/1049732320935835.
- Santos GM, Ackerman B, Rao A, Wallach S, Ayala G, Lamontage E, et al. Economic, mental health, HIV prevention and HIV treatment impacts of COVID-19 and the COVID-19 response on a global sample of

- 79. Sanchez TH, Zlotorzynska M, Rai M, Baral SD. Characterizing the impact of COVID-19 on men who have sex with men across the United States in April, 2020. Aids Behav. 2020;24(7):2024–32.
- Zlotorzynska M, Bauermeister JA, Golinkoff JM, Lin W, Sanchez TH, Hightow-Weidman L. Online recruitment of youth for mHealth studies. Mhealth. 2021;20(7):27. https://doi.org/10.21037/mhealth-20-64.
- 81. de Aguiar Pereira CC, Torres TS, Luz PM, Hoagland B, Farias A, Brito JD, et al. Preferences for pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) among men who have sex with men and transgender women at risk of HIV infection: a multicentre protocol for a discrete choice experiment in Brazil. BMJ Open. 2021;11:e049011. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-049011.
- Green KE, Nguyen LH, Phan HT, Vu BN, Tran MH, Ngo H, et al. Prepped for PrEP? Acceptability, continuation and adherence among men who have sex with men and transgender women enrolled as part of Vietnam's first pre-exposure prophylaxis program. Sexual Health. 2021;18:104–15.
- Rogers BG, Sosnowy C, Zanowick-Marr A, Chan PA, Mena LA, Patel RR, et al. Facilitators for retaining men who have sex with men in pre-exposure prophylaxis care in real world clinic settings within the United States. BMC Infect Dis. 2022;22(1):673. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s12879-022-07658-y.

# **Publisher's Note**

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

### Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

#### At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

