

1 **TITLE: IMPACT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC ON ROUTINE HIV CARE AND**  
2 **ANTIRETROVIRAL TREATMENT OUTCOMES IN KENYA: A NATIONALLY**  
3 **REPRESENTATIVE ANALYSIS**

4

5 **Authors:** Davies O. Kimanga (1)\*<sup>§</sup>, Valeria N.B. Makory (2)\*, Amin S. Hassan (3), Faith Ngari (2),  
6 Margaret M. Ndisha (1), Kennedy J. Muthoka (4), Lydia Odero (5), Gonza O. Omoro (6), Appolonia  
7 Aoko (1) and Lucy Ng'ang'a (1).

8 \*Authors with equal contribution

9

10 **Author Affiliations:** (1) Division for Global HIV & TB (DGHT), Center for Global Health, US  
11 Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Nairobi, Kenya; (2) National AIDS and STI  
12 Control Program (NAS COP), Ministry of Health, Nairobi, Kenya; (3) KEMRI/Wellcome Trust  
13 Research Programme, Kilifi, Kenya; (4) Epidemiology and Data Use, Palladium Group, Nairobi,  
14 Kenya; (5) Health Population and Nutrition, United States Agency for International Development  
15 (USAID), Nairobi, Kenya; and, (6) Strategic Information, Military HIV Research Program/Walter  
16 Reed Army Institute of Research (MHRP/WRAIR), Nairobi, Kenya.

17

18 <sup>§</sup>**Corresponding Author:**

19 Dr. Davies O. Kimanga

20 P. O. Box 606 - 00621 Nairobi, Kenya

21 E-mail: [npml@cdc.gov](mailto:npml@cdc.gov)

22

23 **Key words:** HIV, COVID-19, antiretroviral therapy, test-and-treat, retention, virologic suppression.

24

25 **Word count and references:**

26 Abstract: 299 (limit, 300) words

27 Main text: 3476 (limit, none) words

28 References: 42 (limit, none)

29 **ABSTRACT**

30

31 **Background:** The COVID-19 pandemic adversely disrupted global health service delivery. We aimed  
32 to assess impact of the pandemic on same-day HIV diagnosis/ART initiation, six-months non-  
33 retention and initial virologic non-suppression (VnS) among individuals starting antiretroviral therapy  
34 (ART) in Kenya.

35 **Methods:** Individual-level longitudinal service delivery data were analysed. Random sampling of  
36 individuals aged >15 years starting ART between April 2018 – March 2021 was done. Date of ART  
37 initiation was stratified into pre-COVID-19 (April 2018 – March 2019 and April 2019 – March 2020)  
38 and COVID-19 (April 2020 – March 2021) periods. Mixed effects generalised linear, survival and  
39 logistic regression models were used to determine the effect of COVID-19 pandemic on same-day  
40 HIV diagnosis/ART initiation, six-months non-retention and VnS, respectively.

41 **Results:** Of 7,046 individuals sampled, 35.5%, 36.0% and 28.4% started ART during April 2018 –  
42 March 2019, April 2019 – March 2020 and April 2020 – March 2021, respectively. Compared to the  
43 pre-COVID-19 period, the COVID-19 period had higher same-day HIV diagnosis/ART initiation  
44 (adjusted risk ratio [95% CI]: 1.09 [1.04–1.13],  $p<0.001$ ) and lower six-months non-retention  
45 (adjusted hazard ratio [95% CI]: 0.66 [0.58–0.74],  $p<0.001$ ). Of those sampled, 3,296 (46.8%) had a  
46 viral load test done at a median 6.2 (IQR, 5.3–7.3) months after ART initiation. Compared to the pre-  
47 COVID-19 period, there was no significant difference in VnS during the COVID-19 period (adjusted  
48 odds ratio [95% CI]: 0.79 [95% CI: 0.52–1.20],  $p=0.264$ ).

49 **Conclusions:** In the short term, the COVID-19 pandemic did not have an adverse impact on HIV care  
50 and treatment outcomes in Kenya. Timely, strategic and sustained COVID-19 response may have  
51 played a critical role in mitigating adverse effects of the pandemic and point towards maturity,  
52 versatility and resilience of the HIV program in Kenya. Continued monitoring to assess long-term  
53 impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on HIV care and treatment program in Kenya is warranted.

54 **BACKGROUND**

55

56 In January 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) reported emergence of the novel severe  
57 acute respiratory coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the causative agent for COVID-19 [1]. By the end of  
58 2021, WHO estimated a global excess mortality of 14.9 million, representing 9.5 million more  
59 fatalities than those directly attributable to COVID-19 [2]. At onset of the pandemic and in the  
60 absence of efficacious prophylactic or therapeutic interventions, governments worldwide re-purposed  
61 already limited resources to enforce non-pharmaceutical interventions to limit spread. These included  
62 social-distancing, face-masking, handwashing, closure of learning institutions and places of worship,  
63 travel restrictions, quarantine for exposed, isolation for confirmed infections, curfews and partial or  
64 complete lockdowns. Whilst these measures had a positive effect on mitigating the spread of COVID-  
65 19 [3-6], they may have adversely disrupted health service delivery, including HIV care and treatment  
66 programs.

67 Disruptions in routine HIV care and treatment program may be disentangled into three domains: (i)  
68 disruption in supply-chain of commodities, either directly from enforcement of travel restrictions, or  
69 indirectly from re-purposing of fiscal and infrastructural resources for COVID-19 emergency  
70 response; (ii) disruptions in the workforce, either directly from deployments to COVID-19 related  
71 services and from avoidance of workplace due to fear of nosocomial SARS-CoV-2 acquisition, or  
72 indirectly from mandatory quarantine or isolation of frontline health care workers; and (iii) disruption  
73 in health-seeking behaviour, either directly from hesitancy to seek services from health facilities  
74 (perceived as hotspots for SARS-CoV-2 infections), or indirectly from inaccessibility of health  
75 facilities due to travel restrictions and lockdowns. Combined, these disruptions may have negatively  
76 impacted HIV care and treatment service delivery, including HIV testing and diagnosis, early linkage  
77 to care and continuity in supply of life-saving antiretroviral therapy (ART).

78 Early ART is associated with reduced HIV-related morbidity and mortality [7-10], rapid and sustained  
79 virologic suppression [8, 9, 11-13] and reduced risk of onward HIV transmission [14-16]. Benefits  
80 conferred by early ART motivated development of WHO guidelines recommending immediate ART  
81 to all HIV infected individuals regardless of clinical, immunological or virological status, commonly  
82 referred as the test-and-treat policy [17]. We recently demonstrated that same-day HIV

83 diagnosis/ART initiation increased from 15% in 2015 to 52% in 2018 [18], suggesting significant  
84 strides in scale up of the test-and-treat policy in Kenya. COVID-19 related disruptions threaten to  
85 reverse these gains, though its impact on time from HIV diagnosis to ART initiation in Kenya remains  
86 unknown.

87 Retention in the HIV care and treatment continuum is also critical towards achieving population-level  
88 virologic suppression. In a systematic review of 123 publications published between 2008 and 2013  
89 from low-and-middle-income countries (LMIC), retention at 12, 24 and 36 months after ART  
90 initiation was estimated at 78%, 71% and 69% respectively [19]. Early treatment interruptions not  
91 only result in selection of HIV drug resistance mutations [20], but also pose a threat for onward HIV  
92 transmission [21]. COVID-19 related disruptions may have negatively impacted early retention in  
93 Kenya, though this is not yet documented.

94 Emphasis on early ART and retention is aimed at attaining rapid and sustained virologic suppression.  
95 The UNAIDS has set ambitious 95-95-95 targets towards ending the HIV epidemic by 2030, with the  
96 last target aimed at achieving 95% virologic suppression amongst ART-experienced individuals [22].

97 In a systematic review of 49 studies from LMIC, virologic suppression after twelve months of ART  
98 was estimated at 84% [23]. In Kenya, data from population-based surveys suggest an increase in  
99 virologic suppression amongst ART-experienced adults, from an estimated 39% in 2012 to 91% in  
100 2018 [24, 25]. These estimates suggest Kenya is well on track towards achieving the UNAIDS targets  
101 on virologic suppression. However, COVID-19 related disruptions threaten to veer the country off the  
102 track towards attaining epidemic control.

103 Unintended disruptions from the COVID-19 pandemic threaten to erode gains made in the fight  
104 against the HIV epidemic. We aimed to assess impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on time from HIV  
105 diagnosis to ART initiation, six months non-retention and initial virologic non-suppression amongst  
106 individuals starting ART in Kenya.

107

108 **METHODS**

109

110 *Study setting*

111 In Kenya, the first case of SARS-CoV-2 infection was reported on March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2020 [26]. By the end  
112 of March 2021, the country had reported >130,000 confirmed cases and >2,000 COVID-19 associated  
113 fatalities [27]. During this time, the government enforced nation-wide non-pharmaceutical  
114 interventions including social distancing, face masking, hand washing, quarantine for the exposed,  
115 isolation for confirmed infections and dusk-to-dawn curfews. Initially, closure of learning institutions,  
116 restaurants, bars, religious places of worship and ban on international travel were also imposed [28].  
117 COVID-19 vaccinations started on March 08<sup>th</sup>, 2021, initially targeting health workers, teachers, and  
118 security personnel. Over time, the elderly, followed by the general adult population were eligible.  
119 By end of March 2021, Kenya had experienced two waves of the pandemic and was in the middle of  
120 the third wave. The two waves lasted between June to August 2020 and October to December 2020  
121 [27]. The waves affected counties differentially. The first wave adversely affected Nairobi, Mandera  
122 and Coastal Kenya counties including Kilifi, Mombasa and Kwale. The second wave adversely  
123 affected Nairobi and neighboring counties including Kiambu, Nakuru, Machakos and Kajiado.  
124 Affected counties were declared SARS-CoV-2 high infection zones (HIZ) (Figure 1 [a]). Additional  
125 interventions including stricter enforcement of COVID-19 protocols, longer curfew hours and partial  
126 lockdowns (restriction of movement into and out of HIZs) were imposed in HIZ. The first dose of the  
127 COVID-19 vaccine was introduced in March 2021.

128

129 **Figure 1.** (a) *Map showing the distribution of health facilities transmitting electronic medical records*  
130 *(EMR) data to the National Data Warehouse (NDW). Polygons represent the 47 counties (regional*  
131 *administrative units), with red colored polygons representing the high infection zone (HIZ) counties.*  
132 *(b) Graph showing the distribution of estimated number of people living with HIV (PLWH) in Kenya*  
133 *(n = 1,388,168), number of PLWH starting combination antiretroviral therapy between April 2018*  
134 *and March 2021 in the NDW (n = 352,322), and the number of PLWH randomly sampled and*  
135 *included in the analysis (n = 7,046).*

136

137 *Study design*

138 Longitudinal data archived at the national data warehouse (NDW) were analyzed. The NDW is a  
139 centralized repository of individual-level routine HIV program data transmitted from electronic  
140 medical records (EMR) deployed in health facilities offering HIV care and treatment services in  
141 Kenya. Routinely collected HIV service delivery data are extracted, checked for duplicate entries, de-  
142 identified and electronically transmitted to the NDW. By end of 2020, the NDW hosted data from ~2  
143 million individuals ever started on ART from ~1,500 health facilities covering 44 of the 47 counties  
144 in Kenya (Figure 1). The three counties that have never contributed data to the repository are from the  
145 historically marginalized North Eastern region of Kenya and were all estimated to have zero new HIV  
146 infections in 2018 [29].

147

148 *Eligibility criteria and sampling strategy*

149 The sampling framework comprised individuals age >15 years starting ART during April 2018 –  
150 March 2021. Volunteers starting ART after March 2021 were not considered to avoid potential  
151 confounding that may have resulted from introduction of the COVID-19 vaccines on analysis end-  
152 points. Two percent of the sampling framework was randomly sampled. A *post-hoc* sample size  
153 calculation was done. We assumed 52%, 78% and 90% of the randomized population had same-day  
154 HIV diagnosis/ART initiation, were retained in care six months after ART initiation and achieved  
155 virologic suppression within 12 months of ART initiation, respectively [18, 19, 25]. We also assumed  
156 one-third (33%) of the randomized population started ART during the COVID-19 period, defined as  
157 the period between April 20 – March 21. Based on these assumptions, the sampled population  
158 conferred 88%, 96% and 99% power to detect a conservative 4% relative difference in same-day HIV  
159 diagnosis/ART initiation, six-months retention and virologic suppression, respectively, between the  
160 pre-COVID-19 and the COVID-19-periods (two-sided alpha, 0.05). Further, we assumed 33% of the  
161 randomized population were from the nine counties that were declared HIZ [30]. Additional  
162 restrictions imposed on these counties were considered *a-priori* as effect modifying. Results were thus  
163 further stratified by whether individuals were from within or outside the HIZ. The sampled population  
164 from within the HIZ (the smaller stratum) conferred 76%, 90% and 99% power to detect a modest 6%  
165 relative difference in same-day HIV diagnosis/ART initiation, six-months retention and virologic

166 suppression, respectively, between the pre-COVID-19 and the COVID-19 periods (two-sided alpha,  
167 0.05).

168

#### 169 *Definition of indicators*

170 Calendar periods were defined according to when individuals started ART as follows: pre-COVID-19  
171 period (April 01st 2018 – March 31st 2019, and April 01st 2019 – March 31st 2020) and the COVID-  
172 19 period (April 01st 2020 – March 31st 2021). End-points included; (i) time from a HIV diagnosis to  
173 ART initiation, defined as same-day HIV diagnosis/ART initiation, (ii) short term non-retention,  
174 defined as individuals who were either dead or lost to follow up (LTFU, missed scheduled  
175 appointments plus three months grace period) within six months of ART initiation, and (iii) initial  
176 virologic non-suppression (VnS), based on the first viral load test done within 12 months of ART  
177 initiation and defined as HIV RNA >1000 copies/ml.

178

#### 179 *Data analysis*

180 Same-day HIV diagnosis/ART initiation is not a rare (>50%) endpoint. Thus, univariable and  
181 multivariable generalized linear models (glm) were used to determine effect of the COVID-19 period  
182 on same-day HIV diagnosis/ART initiation. Crude and adjusted risk ratios, 95% confidence intervals  
183 (CIs) and p-values were reported.

184 Time-to-event analyses were used to determine time from ART initiation to non-retention over a six-  
185 months follow-up period. Because some individuals started ART during the pre-COVID-19 period,  
186 but their follow-up crossed over into the COVID-19 period, Lexis expansion was applied and follow-  
187 up time split accordingly, either to pre-COVID-19 or COVID-19 periods [31]. Univariable and  
188 multivariable survival regression models were used to determine effect of COVID-19 period on non-  
189 retention. Crude and adjusted hazard ratios (HR), 95% CIs and p-values were reported.

190 Initial VnS may be considered a rare (<10%) endpoint. Thus, univariable and multivariable logistic  
191 regression models were used to determine effect of the COVID-19 period on initial VnS. Crude and  
192 adjusted odd ratios, 95% CIs and p-values were reported.

193 In all regression models, variables with a p-value <0.05 from the univariate analysis were carried  
194 forward to the multivariate models. Hierarchical mixed effect modeling was applied to control for  
195 within-and-between counties variations. All analyses were done using Stata I/C (version 15.1).

196

197 *Ethical considerations*

198 This retrospective analysis was part of a National HIV program evaluation exercise. Ethics approval  
199 to waive need for informed consenting was obtained from the Africa Medical Research Foundation  
200 (AMREF) Ethics Scientific Review Committee, Kenya (AMREF-ESRC P716/2019). The analysis  
201 was reviewed in accordance with the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) human  
202 research protection procedures and was determined to not meet the definition of research as defined in  
203 45CFR46.102. All the data used in the analysis were fully anonymized. Thus, authors did not have  
204 access to information that could identify individual participants during or after data collection.



205 **RESULTS**

206

207 *Characteristics of participants*

208 By end of March 2021, the NDW hosted individual-level data from ~2 million individuals ever started  
209 on ART. Of these, 352,322 were aged >15 years and started ART during April 2018 – March 2021  
210 (Figure 2).

211

212 **Figure 2.** *Flow chart showing distribution of HIV infected individuals starting combination*  
213 *antiretroviral therapy (ART) included in the national data warehouse (NDW) sampling framework*  
214 *and random selection of individuals included in the analysis.*

215

216 Of these, 7046 (2.0%) were randomly sampled. The proportional distribution of sampled individuals  
217 by counties was consistent with that from the NDW sampling frame and the most recent national HIV  
218 estimates report of 2018 (Figure 1 [b]). Compared to those that were not sampled, there were no  
219 differences in the characteristics of sampled individuals (Table 1).

220

221 **Table 1.** *A comparison of the general eligible and randomly sampled population of HIV infected*  
222 *individuals aged >15 years at the start of combination antiretroviral therapy using data from the*  
223 *national data warehouse (April 01<sup>st</sup> 2018 to March 31<sup>st</sup> 2021, N=352,322).*

224

225 Of those sampled, 2,505 (35.5%), 2,538 (36.0%) and 2,003 (28.4%) started ART during April 2018 –  
226 March 2019, April 2019 – March 2020 and April 2020 – March 2021, respectively. The majority were  
227 female (n=4,703 [66.7%]). The proportion of individuals started on a dolutegravir (DTG-based)  
228 regimen increased from 14.6% during April 2018 – March 2019 to 82.8% during April 2020 – March  
229 2021 (Table S1). Overall, 2,598 (36.9%) were from the HIZ. Compared to individuals from outside  
230 the HIZ, there were no major differences in the characteristics of those from the HIZ (Table 2).

231

232 **Table 2.** *Distribution of HIV infected individuals >15 years old, starting combination antiretroviral*  
233 *therapy, included in the national data warehouse sampling framework and randomly sampled, by*

234 *COVID-19 exposure status and high infection zones in Kenya (April 01<sup>st</sup> 2018 to March 31<sup>st</sup> 2021,*  
235 *N=7,046).*

236

237 *Effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on same-day HIV diagnosis and ART initiation*

238 Of those sampled, 5,393 (76.5%) had a date of HIV diagnosis and contributed data on time to ART  
239 initiation. Overall, same-day HIV diagnosis/ART initiation increased from 63.5% during April 2018 -  
240 March 2019 to 79.6% during April 2020-March 2021 (Figure 3 [a]). Same-day HIV diagnosis/ART  
241 initiation was significantly higher during the COVID-19 period compared to the pre-COVID-19  
242 period (adjusted risk ratio, aRR [95% CI], p-value: 1.09 [1.04–1.13], p<0.001) (Table S2).

243

244 **Figure 3.** (a) *Graph showing time from HIV diagnosis to ART initiation by COVID-19 exposure*  
245 *calendar period when compared to the period prior to the pandemic, and (b) by high infection zone*  
246 *counties, amongst HIV infected individuals >15 years using data from the national data warehouse*  
247 *sampling framework in Kenya (April 01<sup>st</sup> 2018 to March 31<sup>st</sup> 2021, N=7,046).*

248

249 From the HIZ, same-day HIV diagnosis/ART initiation increased from 53.2% during April 2018 –  
250 March 2019 to 77.1% during April 2020 – March 2021, while that from outside the HIZ increased  
251 from 68.1% to 80.9% during the same period (Figure 3 [b]). From outside the HIZ, same-day HIV  
252 diagnosis/ART initiation was significantly higher during the COVID-19 period compared to the pre-  
253 COVID-19 period (1.09 [1.04–1.14], p<0.001). Similarly, and from within the HIZ, same-day HIV  
254 diagnosis/ART initiation was significantly higher during the COVID-19 period compared to the pre-  
255 COVID-19 period (1.10 [1.01–1.19], p=0.020) (Table 3).

256

257 **Table 3.** *Effect of the COVID-19 pandemic, defined as the period after the first documented case*  
258 *when compared to the period prior to the pandemic, on time from a HIV diagnosis to combination*  
259 *antiretroviral therapy start (Same-day HIV diagnosis and ART initiation) amongst HIV infected*  
260 *individuals aged >15 years using data from the national data warehouse sampling framework in*  
261 *Kenya (April 01<sup>st</sup> 2018 to March 31<sup>st</sup> 2021, N=7,046)\*.*

262

263 *Effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on six months non-retention*

264 Of those sampled, 4,864 (69.0%), 340 (4.8%), 1,723 (24.4%) and 119 (1.7%) were actively on follow  
265 up, transferred, LTFU or reported dead, respectively, six months after ART initiation. Overall, non-  
266 retention (n=1,842 [26.1%]) reduced from 10.0/100 person-months-observations (pmo) during April  
267 2018 – March 2019 to 4.3/100 pmo during April 2020 – March 2021 (Figure 4 [a]). When compared  
268 to the pre-COVID-19 period, the COVID-19 period had a significantly lower non-retention rate  
269 (adjusted hazard ratio, aHR [95% CI], p-value: 0.66 [0.58–0.74], p<0.001) (Table S3).

270

271 **Figure 4.** (a) Graph showing six-months retention after ART initiation by COVID-19 exposure  
272 calendar period when compared to the period prior to the pandemic, and (b) by high infection zone  
273 counties, amongst HIV infected individuals >15 years using data from the national data warehouse  
274 sampling framework in Kenya (April 01<sup>st</sup> 2018 to March 31<sup>st</sup> 2021, N=7,046).

275

276 Non-retention from the HIZ reduced from 9.9/100 pmo during April 2018 – March 2019 to 6.4/100  
277 pmo during April 2020 – March 2021, while that from outside the HIZ reduced from 10.1/100 pmo to  
278 4.4/100 pmo during the same period (Figure 4 [b]). From outside the HIZ, non-retention during the  
279 COVID-19 period was significantly lower, compared to the pre-COVID-19 period (0.64 [95% CI:  
280 0.57–0.73], p<0.001). From the HIZ, there was no significant difference in non-retention during the  
281 COVID-19 pandemic, compared to the pre-COVID-19 period (0.88 [95% CI: 0.72-1.07], p=0.196)  
282 (Table 4).

283

284 **Table 4.** Effect of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, defined as defined as the period after the first  
285 documented case when compared to the period prior to the pandemic, on attrition from antiretroviral  
286 therapy care amongst HIV infected individuals >15 years using data from the national data  
287 warehouse sampling framework in Kenya (April 01<sup>st</sup> 2018 to March 31<sup>st</sup> 2021, N=7,046).

288

289 *Effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on initial virologic non- suppression*

290 Of those sampled, 3,296 (46.8%) had a viral load done within 12 months of ART initiation. Median  
291 time from ART initiation to initial viral load testing was 6.2 (IQR, 5.3-7.3) months. Overall, initial

292 VnS decreased from 9.3% during April 2018 – March 2019 to 5.4% during April 2020 – March 2021  
293 (Figure 5 [a]). There was no significant difference in initial VnS during the COVID-19 period,  
294 compared to the pre-COVID-19 period (adjusted Odd Ratio, aOR [95% CI], p-value: 0.79 [95% CI:  
295 0.52–1.20], p=0.264) (Table S4).

296

297 **Figure 5.** (a) Graph showing initial virologic non-suppression (viral load >1000 copies/ml) after  
298 ART initiation by COVID-19 exposure calendar period when compared to the period prior to the  
299 pandemic, and (b) by high infection zone counties, amongst HIV infected individuals >15 years using  
300 data from the national data warehouse sampling framework in Kenya (April 01<sup>st</sup> 2018 to March 31<sup>st</sup>  
301 2021, N=7,046).

302

303 From outside the HIZ, initial VnS reduced from 10.1% during April 2018 – March 2019 to 4.2%  
304 during April 2020 – March 2021, while that from the HIZ remained relatively stable from 7.9% to  
305 7.6% during the same period (Figure 5 [b]). From outside the HIZ, there was no significant difference  
306 in initial VnS during the COVID-19 period, compared to the pre-COVID-19 period (0.66 [0.38–1.16],  
307 p=0.137). Similarly, and from the HIZ, there were no significant differences in initial VnS during the  
308 COVID-19 period, compared to the pre-COVID-19 period (0.94 [0.53–1.65], p=0.827) (Table 5).

309

310 **Table 5.** Effect of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, defined as the period after the first documented case  
311 when compared to the period prior to the pandemic, on virologic non-suppression amongst HIV  
312 infected individuals >15 years starting combination antiretroviral therapy using data from the  
313 national data warehouse sampling framework in Kenya (April 01<sup>st</sup> 2018 to March 31<sup>st</sup> 2021,  
314 N=7,406)\*.

## 315 **DISCUSSION**

316

317 Unintended disruptions from the COVID-19 pandemic threatened to erode gains made in the fight  
318 against the HIV epidemic. We aimed to assess impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on HIV care and  
319 treatment outcomes amongst individuals starting ART in Kenya. A sampling framework of national  
320 routine individual-level service delivery data was randomly sampled. Characteristics of individuals  
321 from the sampled population were comparable to that from the sampling framework, and proportional  
322 distribution of counties from the sampling framework was reflective of that from the most recent  
323 national HIV/AIDS modelling estimates [29], suggesting that our findings maybe generalisable and  
324 representative at the national level.

325 Our findings suggest that same-day HIV diagnosis/ART initiation was on an increase before the  
326 COVID-19 pandemic, and that the upward trajectory was sustained despite the pandemic and  
327 regardless of whether individuals were from COVID-19 HIZ or not. To our knowledge, there is no  
328 literature that has assessed impact of COVID-19 pandemic on time from HIV diagnosis to ART  
329 initiation. Data from select health facilities in Nairobi, Kenya, suggest a 51% decline in HIV testing  
330 uptake during the COVID-19 period, compared to the pre-COVID-19 period [32]. However, the  
331 authors clarify that facility-based HIV testing was already on a steep decline before the COVID-19  
332 period for several reasons including promotion of HIV self-testing, and that the decline stabilized at  
333 onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, suggesting that the pandemic did not negatively impact HIV  
334 testing.

335 We observed an overall decline in six-months non-retention over calendar years in Kenya, with the  
336 COVID-19 period having significantly lower non-retention compared to the pre-COVID-19 period.  
337 The majority (95%) of individuals who had undergone non-retention were LTFU. In a meta-analysis  
338 of data to determine outcome of patients LTFU from Africa, the majority (54%) were either known to  
339 have died or could not be found (presumed dead) [33]. The decline in non-retention over calendar  
340 period in our findings may, therefore, be attributed to a decline in HIV-related mortality. This maybe  
341 a reflection of the scale-up of HIV programme interventions including universal test-and-treat, and the  
342 more efficacious integrase inhibitor-based first-line regimen. Indeed, our data confirm that during the  
343 periods April 2018 – March 2019 and April 2020 – March 2021, same-day HIV diagnosis/ART

344 initiation increased from 63.5% to 79.6%, while that of DTG-based regimen increased from 14.6% to  
345 82.8%, despite the COVID-19 pandemic.

346 We also observed an overall decline in initial VnS over calendar years, with the most recent (during  
347 the COVID-19 period) estimate suggesting 94.6% initial virologic suppression in Kenya. These  
348 results suggest that despite the COVID-19 pandemic, Kenya is well on track towards achieving the  
349 last milestone in the UNAIDS 95-95-95 targets [22]. Importantly, when compared with the pre-  
350 COVID-19 period, there was no significant difference in VnS during the COVID-19 period,  
351 suggesting that the pandemic has not yet negatively impacted VnS in Kenya. When compared to  
352 estimates from previous national surveys [24, 25], the low level of VnS may also reflect the scale up  
353 of more efficacious HIV programme interventions as described above. Early ART initiation [9, 11,  
354 12, 34-36] and the more efficacious DTG-based regimen [37-41] have both been shown to achieve  
355 rapid and sustained virologic suppression.

356 While the COVID-19 pandemic adversely disrupted global health service delivery, our data suggests  
357 that impact on HIV care and treatment outcomes in Kenya was less adverse. Within one month of the  
358 first reported case of SARS-CoV-2 infection, the Kenyan National AIDS and STI Control Program  
359 (NASCOP) had mapped out areas of HIV program concern and prepared a strategic response towards  
360 mitigating deleterious effects of the pandemic on HIV service delivery [42]. These included expedited  
361 efforts towards stocking up commodities at the county level, promotion and provision of HIV self-  
362 testing kits, provision of personal protective equipment to frontline service providers, three- to six-  
363 multi-month ART dispensing, promotion of flexible ART delivery models including community  
364 groups to distribute ART for decongestion of facilities, use of M-health applications to communicate  
365 with clients on continuity of HIV services and enhanced virtual coordination/supervision of HIV  
366 service delivery for a sustained response. This timely, strategic and sustained COVID-19 response  
367 may have played a critical role in mitigating the adverse effects of the pandemic on HIV care and  
368 treatment outcomes and point towards maturity, versatility and resilience of the HIV program in  
369 Kenya.

370 A major strength of our analysis is the use of routine service delivery data collected from health  
371 facilities from all over Kenya, suggesting that our findings are a good representation of impact of the  
372 COVID-19 pandemic on HIV care and treatment outcomes in the country. However, use of routine

373 service delivery data is not without limitations. First, about 23% and 53% of the study population  
374 were missing date of HIV diagnosis and had not received a viral load test since ART initiation,  
375 respectively. Unforeseen bias from missing data cannot be ruled out. Second, additional COVID-19  
376 mitigation measures in the HIZ counties were imposed at different times and over different durations.  
377 Grouping them may have resulted to a dilution effect in subtle differences between the most adversely  
378 affected counties (e.g. Nairobi), over shorter time frames and on the various endpoints. Effect of the  
379 COVID-19 pandemic on HIV service delivery at facility- or local-level can therefore not be ruled out,  
380 though these were likely transient. Importantly, these differences did not seem to have impacted  
381 findings at the national level.

382 In conclusion, we used nationally representative, routine, individual-level data to assess impact of the  
383 COVID-19 pandemic on HIV care and treatment outcomes in Kenya. Overall and when compared to  
384 the pre-COVID-19 period, we observed significantly higher levels of same-day HIV diagnosis/ART  
385 initiation, lower levels of six-months non-retention and no significant difference with initial VnS  
386 during the COVID-19 pandemic period. The higher levels of same-day HIV diagnosis/ART initiation  
387 and the lower levels of six-months non-retention were a continuation of a trend that was occurring  
388 even before the COVID-19 pandemic. While the COVID-19 pandemic adversely disrupted global  
389 health service delivery, our findings suggests that impact on HIV care and treatment outcomes in  
390 Kenya was less adverse. Timely, strategic and sustained COVID-19 response by the NASCOP may  
391 have played a critical role in mitigating adverse effects of the pandemic on HIV care and treatment  
392 services and point towards maturity, versatility and resilience of the HIV program in Kenya. Our  
393 findings underscore the value of routine program data for monitoring continuity of HIV care and  
394 treatment service delivery and the importance of evidence-based strategies to mitigate the undesired  
395 effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in the fight against the HIV epidemic in Kenya.

396 **Authors Contributions**

397 DOK, VNM, ASH and LN conceived the objectives of the manuscript. DOK, ASH, KJM and FN  
398 carried out the data analysis and generated outputs from the case examples. DOK, VNB, and ASH  
399 prepared the initial draft of the manuscript. LN, LO, AO, MMN and GO critically reviewed the initial  
400 draft and provided insightful feedback. All authors reviewed, proof-read and approved the final  
401 manuscript.

402

403 **Attribution of support**

404 This analysis is based on data from the national data warehouse (NDW) which is supported by the  
405 President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) through the Centers for Disease Control and  
406 Prevention (CDC) under the terms of mechanism ID 18214. At the time of the analysis, the NDW was  
407 under the technical management of the Palladium group with oversight from the National HIV/AIDS  
408 Strategic Information and Evaluation technical working group. Views expressed in this publication  
409 are those of the authors and not necessarily those of PEPFAR, CDC or the Palladium group.

410

411 **Acknowledgement**

412 We acknowledge the contribution of all HIV-infected individuals and health care providers from all  
413 the facilities that have uploaded data to the NDW. We are thankful to health facility administrators,  
414 service delivery partners, donor agencies and other stakeholders for their continued support with the  
415 NDW project. We are particularly grateful to the ministry of health at both national and county level  
416 for the oversight and leadership on the NDW project.

417

418 **Data availability**

419 De-identified data used in this analysis is available from the National EMR data warehouse in Kenya  
420 managed by the Ministry of Health.

421

422 **Conflict of interest**



423 The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent  
424 the official position of the funding agencies. The authors declare that they have no competing  
425 interests.

## REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV). SITUATION REPORT - 1. 21 JANUARY 2020. Accessed on September 01st, 2021; Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/330760/nCoVsitrep21Jan2020-eng.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y>.
2. World Health Organization. Global excess deaths associated with COVID-19, January 2020 - December 2021. May 2022. Accessed on June 07th, 2022; Available from: <https://www.who.int/data/stories/global-excess-deaths-associated-with-covid-19-january-2020-december-2021>.
3. Askitas N, Tatsiramos K, and Verheyden B, Estimating worldwide effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 incidence and population mobility patterns using a multiple-event study. *Sci Rep*, 2021. 11(1): p. 1972.
4. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, Unwin HJT, Mellan TA, Coupland H, et al., Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*, 2020. 584(7820): p. 257-261.
5. Gathungu DK, Ojiambo VN, Kimathi MEM, and Mwalili SM, Modeling the Effects of Nonpharmaceutical Interventions on COVID-19 Spread in Kenya. *Interdiscip Perspect Infect Dis*, 2020. 2020: p. 6231461.
6. Hong SH, Hwang H, and Park MH, Effect of COVID-19 Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions and the Implications for Human Rights. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 2020. 18(1).
7. Danel C, Moh R, Gabillard D, Badje A, Le Carrou J, Ouassa T, et al., A Trial of Early Antiretrovirals and Isoniazid Preventive Therapy in Africa. *N Engl J Med*, 2015. 373(9): p. 808-22.
8. Grinsztejn B, Hosseinipour MC, Ribaldo HJ, Swindells S, Eron J, Chen YQ, et al., Effects of early versus delayed initiation of antiretroviral treatment on clinical outcomes of HIV-1 infection: results from the phase 3 HPTN 052 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect Dis*, 2014. 14(4): p. 281-90.

9. Labhardt ND, Ringera I, Lejone TI, Klimkait T, Muhairwe J, Amstutz A, et al., Effect of Offering Same-Day ART vs Usual Health Facility Referral During Home-Based HIV Testing on Linkage to Care and Viral Suppression Among Adults With HIV in Lesotho: The CASCADE Randomized Clinical Trial. *Jama*, 2018. 319(11): p. 1103-1112.
10. Lundgren JD, Babiker AG, Gordin F, Emery S, Grund B, Sharma S, et al., Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy in Early Asymptomatic HIV Infection. *N Engl J Med*, 2015. 373(9): p. 795-807.
11. Pilcher CD, Ospina-Norvell C, Dasgupta A, Jones D, Hartogensis W, Torres S, et al., The Effect of Same-Day Observed Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy on HIV Viral Load and Treatment Outcomes in a US Public Health Setting. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*, 2017. 74(1): p. 44-51.
12. Rosen S, Maskew M, Fox MP, Nyoni C, Mongwenyana C, Maletle G, et al., Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy for HIV at a Patient's First Clinic Visit: The RapIT Randomized Controlled Trial. *PLoS Med*, 2016. 13(5): p. e1002015.
13. Tanser F, Bärnighausen T, Grapsa E, Zaidi J, and Newell ML, High coverage of ART associated with decline in risk of HIV acquisition in rural KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Science*, 2013. 339(6122): p. 966-71.
14. Cohen MS, Chen YQ, McCauley M, Gamble T, Hosseinipour MC, Kumarasamy N, et al., Antiretroviral Therapy for the Prevention of HIV-1 Transmission. *N Engl J Med*, 2016. 375(9): p. 830-9.
15. Hayes RJ, Donnell D, Floyd S, Mandla N, Bwalya J, Sabapathy K, et al., Effect of Universal Testing and Treatment on HIV Incidence - HPTN 071 (PopART). *N Engl J Med*, 2019. 381(3): p. 207-218.
16. Oldenburg CE, Bor J, Harling G, Tanser F, Mutevedzi T, Shahmanesh M, et al., Impact of early antiretroviral therapy eligibility on HIV acquisition: household-level evidence from rural South Africa. *Aids*, 2018. 32(5): p. 635-643.
17. World Health Organization. WHO Guideline on when to start antiretroviral therapy and on pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV. . Guidelines. September 2015. Accessed on September 01st,

- 2021; Available from:  
[https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/186275/9789241509565\\_eng.pdf;jsessionid=D95F5690AC992DCB82B673779D9EF5D9?sequence=1](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/186275/9789241509565_eng.pdf;jsessionid=D95F5690AC992DCB82B673779D9EF5D9?sequence=1).
18. Kimanga DO, Oramisi VA, Hassan AS, Mugambi MK, Miruka FO, Muthoka KJ, et al., Uptake and Effect of Universal Test-and-Treat on Twelve Months Retention and Initial Virologic Suppression in Routine HIV Program in Kenya: A Nationally Representative Analysis. (Manuscript under review).
  19. Fox MP and Rosen S, Retention of Adult Patients on Antiretroviral Therapy in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis 2008-2013. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*, 2015. 69(1): p. 98-108.
  20. Pennings PS, HIV Drug Resistance: Problems and Perspectives. *Infect Dis Rep*, 2013. 5(Suppl 1): p. e5.
  21. Mujugira A, Celum C, Coombs RW, Campbell JD, Ndase P, Ronald A, et al., HIV Transmission Risk Persists During the First 6 Months of Antiretroviral Therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*, 2016. 72(5): p. 579-84.
  22. (UNAIDS). JUNPoHA. Fast-Track: ending the AIDS epidemic by 2030. Accessed on September 01st, 2021; Available from:  
[https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media\\_asset/JC2686\\_WAD2014report\\_en.pdf](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/JC2686_WAD2014report_en.pdf).
  23. McMahon JH, Elliott JH, Bertagnolio S, Kubiak R, and Jordan MR, Viral suppression after 12 months of antiretroviral therapy in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Bull World Health Organ*, 2013. 91(5): p. 377-385e.
  24. Cherutich P, Kim AA, Kellogg TA, Sherr K, Waruru A, De Cock KM, et al., Detectable HIV Viral Load in Kenya: Data from a Population-Based Survey. *PLoS One*, 2016. 11(5): p. e0154318.
  25. National AIDS and STI Control Programme (NASCO) K. Kenya Population-based HIV Impact Assessment (KENPHIA) 2018. Accessed on September 01st, 2021; Available from:  
<https://www.health.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/KENPHIA-2018-PREL-REP-2020-HR3-final.pdf>.

26. Ministry of Health K. First Case of Coronavirus Disease Confirmed in Kenya. Accessed on September 01st, 2021; Available from: <https://www.health.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Statement-on-Confirmed-COVID-19-Case-13-March-2020-final-1.pdf>.
27. World Health Organization. WHO Health Emergency Dashboard: WHO (COVID-19) Homepage. Accessed on September 01st, 2021; Available from: <https://covid19.who.int/region/afro/country/ke>.
28. Barasa E, Kazungu J, Orangi S, Kabia E, Ogero M, and Kasera K, Indirect health effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in Kenya: a mixed methods assessment. BMC Health Serv Res, 2021. 21(1): p. 740.
29. National AIDS Control Council. Kenya HIV Estimates Report 2018. September 01st, 2021; Available from: <https://nacc.or.ke/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/HIV-estimates-report-Kenya-20182.pdf>.
30. Brand SPC, Ojal J, Aziza R, Were V, Okiro EA, Kombe IK, et al., COVID-19 transmission dynamics underlying epidemic waves in Kenya. Science, 2021. 374(6570): p. 989-994.
31. Nitika, Mishra SS, and Lohani P, Lexis Expansion: a prerequisite for analyzing time changing variables in a cohort study. Nepal J Epidemiol, 2017. 7(2): p. 681-684.
32. Mbithi I, Thekkur P, Chakaya JM, Onyango E, Owiti P, Njeri NC, et al., Assessing the Real-Time Impact of COVID-19 on TB and HIV Services: The Experience and Response from Selected Health Facilities in Nairobi, Kenya. Trop Med Infect Dis, 2021. 6(2).
33. Chammartin F, Zürcher K, Keiser O, Weigel R, Chu K, Kiragga AN, et al., Outcomes of Patients Lost to Follow-up in African Antiretroviral Therapy Programs: Individual Patient Data Meta-analysis. Clin Infect Dis, 2018. 67(11): p. 1643-1652.
34. Koenig SP, Dorvil N, Dévieux JG, Hedt-Gauthier BL, Riviere C, Faustin M, et al., Same-day HIV testing with initiation of antiretroviral therapy versus standard care for persons living with HIV: A randomized unblinded trial. PLoS Med, 2017. 14(7): p. e1002357.

35. Coffey S, Bacchetti P, Sachdev D, Bacon O, Jones D, Ospina-Norvell C, et al., RAPID antiretroviral therapy: high virologic suppression rates with immediate antiretroviral therapy initiation in a vulnerable urban clinic population. *Aids*, 2019. 33(5): p. 825-832.
36. Colasanti J, Sumitani J, Mehta CC, Zhang Y, Nguyen ML, Del Rio C, et al., Implementation of a Rapid Entry Program Decreases Time to Viral Suppression Among Vulnerable Persons Living With HIV in the Southern United States. *Open Forum Infect Dis*, 2018. 5(6): p. ofy104.
37. Cahn P, Madero JS, Arribas JR, Antinori A, Ortiz R, Clarke AE, et al., Durable Efficacy of Dolutegravir Plus Lamivudine in Antiretroviral Treatment-Naive Adults With HIV-1 Infection: 96-Week Results From the GEMINI-1 and GEMINI-2 Randomized Clinical Trials. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*, 2020. 83(3): p. 310-318.
38. Kanters S, Vitoria M, Doherty M, Socias ME, Ford N, Forrest JI, et al., Comparative efficacy and safety of first-line antiretroviral therapy for the treatment of HIV infection: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Lancet HIV*, 2016. 3(11): p. e510-e520.
39. Trottier B, Lake JE, Logue K, Brinson C, Santiago L, Brennan C, et al., Dolutegravir/abacavir/lamivudine versus current ART in virally suppressed patients (STRIIVING): a 48-week, randomized, non-inferiority, open-label, Phase IIIb study. *Antivir Ther*, 2017. 22(4): p. 295-305.
40. Stellbrink HJ, Reynes J, Lazzarin A, Voronin E, Pulido F, Felizarta F, et al., Dolutegravir in antiretroviral-naive adults with HIV-1: 96-week results from a randomized dose-ranging study. *Aids*, 2013. 27(11): p. 1771-8.
41. Walmsley SL, Antela A, Clumeck N, Duiculescu D, Eberhard A, Gutiérrez F, et al., Dolutegravir plus abacavir-lamivudine for the treatment of HIV-1 infection. *N Engl J Med*, 2013. 369(19): p. 1807-18.
42. National AIDS and STI Control Programme (NASCOP) K. COVID-19 Guidance on Comprehensive HIV Service Delivery. March 2020. Accessed on September 01st, 2021; Available from: <https://www.health.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Circular-on-COVID-19-Guidance-on-Comprehensive-HIV-Service-Delivery.pdf>.

## TABLES

**Table 1.**

Characteristics		Not sampled (N=345,276) n (%)	Random sampled (N=7,046) n (%)	Overall (N=352,322) n (%)
<b>COVID-19 Exposure</b>	Apr '18 to Mar '19	121,850 (35.3)	2,505 (35.6)	124,355 (35.3)
	Apr '19 to Mar' 20	127,967 (37.1)	2,538 (36.0)	130,505 (37.0)
	Apr '20 to Mar '21	95,459 (27.7)	2,003 (28.4)	97,462 (27.7)
<b>High infection zone</b>	No	220,088 (63.7)	4,448 (63.1)	224,536 (63.7)
	Yes	125,188 (36.3)	2,598 (36.9)	127,786 (36.3)
<b>Gender</b>	Female	229,511 (66.5)	4,703 (66.7)	234,214 (66.5)
	Male	115,765 (33.5)	2,343 (33.3)	118,108 (33.5)
<b>Age group (years)</b>	15.0 – 24.9	62,177 (18.0)	1,208 (17.1)	63,385 (18.0)
	25.0 – 34.9	126,051 (36.5)	2,558 (36.3)	128,609 (36.5)
	35.0 – 44.9	91,142 (26.4)	1,895 (26.9)	93,037 (26.4)
	45.0+	65,906 (19.1)	1,385 (19.7)	67,291 (19.1)
<b>First-line regimen</b>	<b>ART</b> NVP-based	2,394 (0.7)	55 (0.8)	2,449 (0.7)
	EFV-based	116,669 (33.8)	2,359 (33.5)	119,028 (33.8)
	DTG-based	151,877 (44.0)	3,111 (44.2)	154,988 (44.0)
	Others	2,819 (0.8)	61 (0.9)	2,880 (0.8)
	Missing	71,517 (20.7)	1,460 (20.7)	72,977 (20.7)
<b>HIV diagnosis to ART initiation (days)</b>	Same-day	193,339 (56.0)	3,837 (54.5)	197,176 (56.0)
	1-14 days	25,424 (7.4)	550 (7.8)	25,974 (7.4)
	15-90 days	17,553 (5.1)	379 (5.4)	17,932 (5.1)
	91+ days	30,630 (8.9)	627 (8.9)	31,257 (8.9)
	Missing	78,330 (22.7)	1,653 (23.5)	79,983 (22.7)
<b>Six months outcomes (after ART initiation)</b>	Active	238,738 (69.1)	4,864 (69.0)	243,602 (69.1)
	Transferred out	15,991 (4.6)	340 (4.8)	16,331 (4.6)
	Lost to follow up	84,799 (24.6)	1,723 (24.5)	86,522 (24.6)
	Died	5,748 (1.7)	119 (1.7)	5,867 (1.7)
<b>ART start to initial viral load (months)</b>	<3.0	14,802 (4.3)	292 (4.1)	15,094 (4.3)
	3.0 – 5.9	56,605 (16.4)	1,176 (16.7)	57,781 (16.4)
	6.0 – 8.9	70,788 (20.5)	1,464 (20.8)	72,252 (20.5)
	9.0 – 11.9	19,276 (5.6)	364 (5.2)	19,640 (5.6)
	<Missing	183,805 (53.2)	3,750 (53.2)	187,555 (53.2)
<b>Virologic suppression (&lt;1000 copies/ml)</b>	No	12,939 (3.8)	257 (3.7)	13,196 (3.8)
	Yes	148,532 (43.0)	3,039 (43.1)	151,571 (43.0)
	Missing	183,805 (53.2)	3,750 (53.2)	187,555 (53.2)

Table 2.

Characteristics		Pre-COVID-19 period				COVID-19 period		Overall	
		Apr '18 to Mar '19		Apr '19 to Mar '20		Apr '20 to Mar '21		HIZ, No (N=4448) n (%)	HIZ, Yes (Yes, N=2598) n (%)
		HIZ, No (N=1605) n (%)	HIZ, Yes (N=900) n (%)	HIZ, No (N=1582) n (%)	HIZ, Yes (N=956) n (%)	HIZ, No (N=1261) n (%)	HIZ, Yes (N=742) n (%)		
<b>Gender</b>	Female	1069 (66.6)	612 (68.0)	1039 (65.7)	653 (68.3)	848 (67.3)	482 (65.0)	1956 (66.5)	1747 (67.2)
	Male	536 (33.4)	288 (32.0)	543 (34.3)	303 (31.7)	413 (32.7)	260 (35.0)	1492 (33.5)	851 (32.8)
<b>Age group (years)</b>	15.0 – 24.9	304 (18.9)	126 (14.0)	279 (17.6)	155 (16.2)	230 (18.2)	114 (15.4)	813 (18.3)	395 (15.2)
	25.0 – 34.9	589 (36.7)	320 (35.6)	566 (35.8)	365 (38.2)	459 (36.4)	259 (34.9)	1614 (36.3)	944 (36.3)
	35.0 – 44.9	386 (24.1)	266 (29.6)	423 (26.7)	243 (25.4)	370 (29.3)	207 (27.9)	1179 (26.5)	716 (27.5)
	45.0+	326 (20.3)	188 (20.9)	314 (19.9)	193 (20.2)	202 (16.0)	162 (21.8)	842 (18.9)	543 (20.9)
<b>First-line ART regimen</b>	NVP-based	27 (1.7)	24 (2.7)	1 (0.1)	2 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	29 (0.7)	26 (1.0)
	EFV-based	857 (53.4)	518 (57.6)	533 (33.7)	330 (34.5)	75 (6.0)	46 (6.2)	1,465 (32.9)	894 (34.4)
	DTG-based	248 (15.5)	117 (13.0)	690 (43.6)	398 (41.6)	1038 (82.3)	620 (83.6)	1,976 (44.4)	1,135 (43.7)
	Others	12 (0.8)	22 (2.4)	10 (0.6)	10 (1.1)	4 (0.3)	3 (0.4)	26 (0.6)	35 (1.4)
	Missing	461 (28.7)	219 (24.3)	348 (22.0)	216 (22.6)	143 (11.3)	73 (9.8)	952 (21.4)	508 (19.6)
<b>HIV diagnosis to ART initiation (days)</b>	Same-day	915 (57.0)	320 (35.6)	897 (56.7)	411 (43.0)	870 (69.0)	424 (57.1)	2,682 (60.3)	1,155 (44.4)
	1-14 days	146 (9.1)	66 (7.3)	141 (8.9)	48 (5.0)	103 (8.2)	46 (6.2)	390 (8.8)	160 (6.2)
	15-90 days	99 (6.2)	66 (7.3)	82 (5.2)	46 (4.8)	46 (3.7)	40 (5.4)	227 (5.1)	152 (5.9)
	91+ days	183 (11.4)	150 (16.7)	111 (7.0)	86 (9.0)	57 (4.5)	40 (5.4)	351 (7.9)	276 (10.6)
	Missing	262 (16.3)	298 (33.1)	351 (22.2)	365 (38.2)	185 (14.7)	192 (25.9)	798 (17.9)	855 (32.9)
<b>ART start to initial viral load (months)</b>	<3.0	69 (4.3)	52 (5.8)	54 (3.4)	46 (4.8)	40 (3.2)	31 (4.2)	163 (3.7)	129 (5.0)
	3.0 – 5.9	306 (19.1)	153 (17.0)	276 (17.5)	188 (19.7)	161 (12.8)	92 (12.4)	743 (16.7)	433 (16.7)
	6.0 – 8.9	367 (22.9)	222 (24.7)	419 (26.5)	216 (22.6)	161 (12.8)	79 (10.7)	947 (21.3)	517 (19.9)
	9.0 – 11.9	103 (6.4)	41 (4.6)	123 (7.8)	64 (6.7)	23 (1.8)	10 (1.4)	249 (5.6)	115 (4.4)
	<Missing	760 (47.4)	432 (48.0)	710 (44.9)	442 (46.2)	876 (69.5)	530 (71.4)	2,346 (52.7)	1,404 (54.0)



**Table 3.**

Characteristics		High infection zone (No, n=3,650)				High infection zone (Yes, n=1,743)			
		Crude RR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted RR (95% CI)	p-value	Crude RR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted RR (95% CI)	p-value
<b>Pandemic periods</b>	Pre-COVID-19	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
	COVID-19	1.13 (1.09 – 1.18)	<0.001	1.09 (1.04 – 1.14)	<0.001	1.22 (1.14 – 1.30)	<0.001	1.10 (1.01 – 1.19)	0.020
<b>Gender</b>	Female	Ref				Ref			
	Male	0.97 (0.93 – 1.01)	0.146	-		0.96 (0.89 – 1.02)	0.243	-	
<b>Age group (years)</b>	15.0 – 24.9	1.21 (1.13 – 1.29)		1.18 (1.11 – 1.26)		1.13 (1.02 – 1.26)		1.16 (1.03 – 1.28)	
	25.0 – 34.9	1.12 (1.05 – 1.19)		1.10 (1.04 – 1.17)		1.01 (0.98 – 1.12)		1.10 (1.00 – 1.20)	
	35.0 – 44.9	1.11 (1.04 – 1.18)		1.10 (1.03 – 1.16)		0.94 (0.85 – 1.05)		0.97 (0.88 – 1.08)	
	45.0+	Ref	<0.001	Ref	<0.001	Ref	0.002	Ref	0.001
<b>First-line ART regimen</b>	EFV-based	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
	DTG-based	1.04 (1.00 – 1.08)		1.02 (0.97 – 1.07)		1.22 (1.13 – 1.32)		1.17 (1.06 – 1.28)	
	Others	0.17 (0.05 – 0.52)		0.17 (0.06 – 0.53)		0.22 (0.04 – 1.36)		0.22 (0.03 – 1.42)	
	Missing	0.89 (0.85 – 0.95)	<0.001	0.90 (0.86 – 0.96)	<0.001	0.97 (0.88 – 1.08)	<0.001	0.97 (0.88 – 1.07)	<0.001

\*Missing date of HIV diagnosis amongst individuals from infection zone (no, n=798 [17.9%]) and (yes, n=855 [32.9%]).

**Table 4.**

Characteristics		High infection zone (No, n=4,484)				High infection zone (Yes, n=2,466)			
		Crude HR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted HR (95% CI)	p-value	Crude HR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted HR (95% CI)	p-value
<b>Pandemic periods</b>	Pre-COVID-19	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
	COVID-19	0.47 (0.40 – 0.54)	<0.001	0.64 (0.57 – 0.73)	<0.001	0.70 (0.59 – 0.83)	<0.001	0.88 (0.72 – 1.07)	0.196
<b>Gender</b>	Female	Ref		-	-	Ref		Ref	
	Male	1.05 (0.93 – 1.19)	0.425	-	-	1.25 (1.07 – 1.46)	0.005	1.37 (1.16 – 1.63)	<0.001
<b>Age group (years)</b>	15.0 – 24.9	1.19 (0.99 – 1.45)				1.20 (0.93 – 1.54)			
	25.0 – 34.9	1.11 (0.94 – 1.31)				1.12 (0.91 – 1.38)			
	35.0 – 44.9	1.09 (0.92 – 1.30)				1.01 (0.81 – 1.27)			
	45.0+	Ref	0.339	-	-	Ref	0.412	-	-
<b>First-line ART regimen</b>	EFV-based	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
	DTG-based	0.70 (0.60 – 0.80)		0.89 (0.78 – 1.00)		0.76 (0.64 – 0.92)		0.72 (0.57 – 0.89)	
	Others	0.54 (0.28 – 1.05)		1.15 (0.81 – 1.62)		1.81 (1.19 – 2.74)		1.62 (1.06 – 2.46)	
	Missing	2.08 (1.80 – 2.40)	<0.001	1.98 (1.77 – 2.23)	<0.001	1.63 (1.34 – 1.98)	<0.001	1.60 (1.31 – 1.96)	<0.001
<b>Same-day HIV diagnosis and ART start</b>	No	Ref				Ref		Ref	
	Yes	1.15 (1.00 – 1.34)				1.19 (0.97 – 1.47)		1.37 (1.11 – 1.69)	
	Missing	1.16 (0.95 – 1.41)	0.159	-	-	1.53 (1.23 – 1.90)	<0.001	1.64 (1.32 – 2.04)	<0.001

**Table 5.**


Characteristics		High infection zone (No, n=2,102)				High infection zone (Yes, n=1,194)			
		Crude OR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p-value	Crude OR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p-value
<b>Pandemic periods</b>	Pre-COVID-19	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
	COVID-19	0.46 (0.27 – 0.77)	0.004	0.66 (0.38 – 1.16)	0.137	0.97 (0.56 – 1.70)	0.924	0.94 (0.53 – 1.65)	0.827
<b>Gender</b>	Female	Ref				Ref			
	Male	0.78 (0.55 – 1.10)	0.160	-	-	1.05 (0.66 – 1.66)	0.837	-	-
<b>Age group (years)</b>	15.0 – 24.9	1.45 (0.85 – 2.48)				2.99 (1.39 – 6.41)		3.00 (1.40 – 6.44)	
	25.0 – 34.9	1.30 (0.82 – 2.01)				1.98 (0.99 – 3.97)		1.98 (0.99 – 3.97)	
	35.0 – 44.9	1.08 (0.66 – 1.78)				1.98 (0.96 – 4.09)		1.98 (0.96 – 4.09)	
	45.0+	Ref	0.449	-	-	Ref	0.048	Ref	0.034
<b>First-line ART regimen</b>	EFV-based	Ref		Ref		Ref			
	DTG-based	0.40 (0.27 – 0.59)		0.45 (0.29 – 0.68)		0.74 (0.45 – 1.20)			
	Others	0.85 (0.25 – 2.86)		0.87 (0.26 – 2.92)		1.53 (0.43 – 5.37)			
	Missing	0.95 (0.64 – 1.40)	<0.001	0.98 (0.66 – 1.44)	0.001	0.75 (0.42 – 1.34)	0.446	-	-
<b>Same-day HIV diagnosis and ART start</b>	No	Ref				Ref			
	Yes	0.79 (0.55 – 1.15)				0.92 (0.53 – 1.60)			
	Missing	0.93 (0.57 – 1.51)	0.432	-	-	1.52 (0.87 – 2.65)	0.102	-	-
<b>ART start to initial viral load (months)</b>	<3.0	Ref				Ref			
	3.0 – 5.9	1.47 (0.74 – 2.92)				0.57 (0.29 – 1.11)			
	6.0 – 8.9	1.24 (0.63 – 2.46)				0.78 (0.42 – 1.48)			
	9.0 – 11.9	1.26 (0.57 – 2.79)	0.645	-	-	0.37 (0.13 – 1.07)	0.162	-	-

\*HIV viral load test not yet done (n=3,750 [53.2%])

# FIGURES

**Figure 1.**

(a)



(b)






Figure 2.



**Figure 3.**

**(a)**



**(b)**





Figure 4.

(a)



(b)





Figure 5.

(a)



(b)

