

1 **Title: Evaluation of the impact of PEPFAR transition on retention in care in South Africa's**  
2 **Western Cape**

3 **Authors' Information:** *Jessica Chiliza, Alana T Brennan, Richard Laing, Frank Goodrich*  
4 *Feeley, III,*

5 **Disclaimer:** The author(s) of this article are solely responsible for the content.

6 **1. Jessica Chiliza\* (Corresponding author)**

7 Affiliation: Department of Global Health, School of Public Health, Boston University,  
8 Massachusetts, Boston, USA

9 Email: [jchiliza@bu.edu](mailto:jchiliza@bu.edu)

10 ORCID: 0000-0002-7516-2827

11 Tel: +27 712078101

12 Address: 60 Stirling Crescent, Durban North 4051

13 **2. Alana T Brennan**

14 Affiliation: Department of Global Health, School of Public Health, Boston University,  
15 Massachusetts, Boston, USA

16 Email: [abrennan@bu.edu](mailto:abrennan@bu.edu)

17 ORCID: 0000-0002-7746-0668

18 **3. Richard Laing**

19 Affiliation: Department of Global Health, School of Public Health, Boston University,  
20 Massachusetts, Boston, USA and School of Public Health, University of Western Cape,  
21 Bellville, South Africa.

22 Email: [richardl@bu.edu](mailto:richardl@bu.edu)

23 ORCID: 0000-0002-3825-217X

24 **4. Frank Goodrich Feeley III**

25 Affiliation: Department of Global Health, School of Public Health, Boston University,  
26 Massachusetts, Boston, USA

27 Email: [ffeeley@bu.edu](mailto:ffeeley@bu.edu)

28 ORCID: 0000-0002-7176-5698

29 **Disclaimers:**

30 **Source(s) of support/funding:** ATB was funded by the National Institute of Diabetes and  
31 Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK) 1K01DK116929-01A1.

32 **Word count:** 3,495

33 **Disclosure of relationships and activities** (ie, conflict of interests): The authors have no  
34 conflicts of interest.

35

36

37

38 **ABSTRACT**

39 **Background:** Research on the impact of the PEPFAR transition in South Africa (SA) in 2012  
40 found varying results in retention in care (RIC) of people living with HIV (PLWH).

41 **Objectives:** We investigated the factors that impacted RIC during the U.S. President's  
42 Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) transition in Western Cape, South Africa in 2012.

43 **Methods:** We used aggregate data from 61 facilities supported by four non-governmental  
44 organizations from to 2007-2015. The main outcome was RIC at 12-months after antiretroviral  
45 therapy initiation for two time periods. We used quantile regression to estimate the effect of the  
46 PEPFAR pull-out and other predictors on RIC. The models were adjusted for various covariates.

47 **Results:** Regression models (50<sup>th</sup> quantile) for 12-month RIC showed a 4.6% (95% CI: -8.4, -  
48 0.8%) decline in RIC post direct service. Facilities supported by Anova/Kheth'impilo fared worst  
49 post PEPFAR; a decline in RIC of (-5.8%; 95% CI: -9.7, -1.8%), while that'sit fared best (6.3%  
50 increase in RIC; 95% CI:2.5,10.1%). There was a decrease in RIC when comparing urban to  
51 rural areas (-5.8%; 95% CI: -10.1, -1.5%). City of Cape town combined with Western Cape  
52 Government Health facilities showed a substantial decrease (-9.1%; 95% CI: -12.3, -5.9%),  
53 while community health clinic (vs. primary health clinic) declined slightly (-4.4; 95% CI: -9.6,  
54 0.9%) in RIC. We observed no RIC difference by facility size and a slight increase when two or  
55 more human resources transitioned from PEPFAR to the government.

56 **Conclusions:** When PEPFAR funding decreased in 2012, there was a decrease in RIC. To ensure  
57 the continuity of HIV care when a major funder withdraws sufficient and stable transition  
58 resources, investment in organizations that understand the local context, joint planning, and  
59 coordination are required.

60 **Key Words:** PEPFAR, HIV, retention, South Africa, low-and middle-income country

61

## 62 INTRODUCTION

63 Since 2003, President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) has been the United  
64 States' most ambitious initiative to combat the global burden of HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis.  
65 PEPFAR is the largest contributor to global HIV/AIDS efforts (1). From 2004 to 2016, PEPFAR  
66 invested \$72.7 billion globally in HIV and TB, including contributions to the Global Fund (2)  
67 PEPFAR has increased the number of people receiving HIV treatment globally,(3) and decreased  
68 HIV-related mortality by 10.5 % when compared to non-PEPFAR supported countries (4,5).

69 South Africa is the country with the highest number of people living with HIV (PLWH)  
70 globally (7.5 million).(6) By the end of 2017/2018 with 4.1 million adults on treatment (7),  
71 South Africa was running the largest HIV treatment program in the world (8). Due to the high  
72 burden of HIV/AIDS, South Africa was one of the first PEPFAR focus countries. In 2004, when  
73 PEPFAR began working in South Africa, the HIV prevalence among adults was 20% (9) and  
74 was a death sentence due to the lack of access to free care and treatment in public sector health  
75 facilities.

76 Initial PEPFAR funds were emergency funds spent on antiretroviral (ARV) treatment,  
77 using U.S. organizations based in South Africa (i.e., Population Services International, Family  
78 Health International) and private doctors (10) to roll out HIV treatment outside of the public  
79 health system (9). As time progressed during the direct service phase (2007-2012), PEPFAR  
80 supported local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that employed health workers to work  
81 within the public health system to strengthen HIV services. In May 2009, the South African  
82 government (SAG)(11) adopted World Health Organization (WHO) treatment guidelines to start  
83 patients on treatment early (at a CD4 count of 350 rather than 200) (12), boosted the HIV budget  
84 by R1.7 million, and rolled out an ambitious testing campaign which reached 14.7 million South  
85 Africans in one year (12). During this time, PEPFAR strengthened its relationship with the SAG.

86 Most PEPFAR funds in South Africa were distributed to NGOs that work within state health  
87 facilities to strengthen HIV/AIDS care and treatment programs. In addition, many local NGOs  
88 were sub-contracted to various other organizations, resulting in PEPFAR partnering with 120  
89 NGOs in South Africa by the end of 2013 (8).

#### 90 *PEPFAR Transition in South Africa*

91 SAG has been the main financial contributor to national HIV efforts. In 2012, to allow  
92 SAG to take greater financial responsibility for the South African HIV epidemic, the U.S  
93 government (USG) along with the SAG developed the Partnership Framework, which outlined  
94 an annual 48% funding decrease in PEPFAR funds (\$483 to \$250 million) by 2017 (13). The  
95 framework also outlined the transition of PEPFAR resources to the SAG and the USGs strategic  
96 shift from direct service (i.e., ARV roll out, purchasing ARV's and placing staff in SAG health  
97 facilities) to a focus on health systems strengthening, technical assistance, and sustaining health  
98 outcomes (14,15). In the Western Cape, human resource transition was a formalized process led  
99 by the Western Cape Government Health (WCGH) with input from health facilities. This  
100 resulted in the absorption of 78 HIV posts across the province (16).

101 There were multiple changes and challenges associated with this transition. Due to a  
102 change in PEPFAR leadership, the Partnership Framework did not develop as originally planned,  
103 PEPFAR's budget increased by 71%, from \$259 million in 2015, to \$443 million in 2016. The  
104 transition focused solely on care and treatment, and there was no plan for other PEPFAR-funded  
105 activities (i.e., prevention). Since the transition was negotiated at the national level, there was a  
106 lack of capacity at the provincial level to absorb PEPFAR-supported patients (17).

107 Literature on the impact of the PEPFAR transition in South Africa has found varying  
108 outcomes. Lince-Deroche et al. (18) looked at HIV service delivery post-PEPFAR in three

109 clinics in Johannesburg and found no reduction in service delivery post-PEPFAR, while Cloete  
110 et al. (14) found 20% loss to follow up (LTFU) of patients transferred from private to  
111 government health facilities. Katz et al.'s qualitative study found patients who were transferred  
112 to the public system were frustrated due to long queues and missed work opportunities,  
113 decreased quality of care, highlighting disrespectful staff, "low quality communication" and lack  
114 of holistic care (19). Kavanagh speculates approximately 50,000 to 200,000 people living with  
115 HIV were adversely affected by the PEPFAR transition (8). This high LTFU was a major  
116 concern due to lack of adherence and possible increase of drug resistant strains of the virus.

117         Retention in care (RIC) in South Africa (broadly defined as a patient's regular  
118 engagement with medical care at a health care facility after initial entry into the system) is a key  
119 indicator that demonstrates the long-term sustainability of ART programs. In 2015, the average  
120 RIC in Sub-Saharan Africa aligned with global RIC rates (74% RIC at 24 months).(20)  
121 However, in 2015, South African national RIC was slightly lower, at 57%) (21). More recent  
122 research using from South Africa's National Health Laboratory Service showed that HIV care  
123 retention was substantially higher (63.3%) when viewed from a national perspective than from a  
124 facility perspective (29%). Our results suggest that traditional clinical cohorts underestimate  
125 retention. Supporting the idea that failure to account for patient movement between clinics  
126 (sometimes referred to as a "silent transfer") can make estimates of retention in care seem worse  
127 than they really are. To the best of our knowledge, there has been no formal evaluation of the  
128 PEPFAR transition in South Africa. As such, our study sought to assess the impact of PEPFAR  
129 transition on RIC in 2012.

130

## 131 **METHODS**

132 *Data*

133 The aggregate data used for this study was retrieved from the WCGH's HIV data system,  
134 (Tier.net) (22). The primary purpose of Tier.net is to manage the HIV program at a facility level.  
135 Data from Tier.net aggregated at the facility level were collected for 61 health facilities  
136 supported by four local PEPFAR treatment non-governmental organizations (NGO) from to  
137 2007-2015: (1) Kheth'impilo (n=15); (2) Anova Health Institute (Anova) (n=23); (3) Right to  
138 Care (n=5); and (4) TB, HIV/AIDS, Treatment Support, and Integrated Therapy (that'sit) (n=11).  
139 There was a fifth category in our analysis of Anova/Kheth'impilo, as these two NGOs  
140 overlapped in their support of seven health facilities in the study sample. Raw RIC data per  
141 health facility were provided for the cohort initiated ART each year. A cohort was defined by the  
142 WCGH as the number of new HIV patients (including transfers in) initiating ART treatment at a  
143 particular facility in a specific year (January 1-December 31) from 2007-2015.

144 *PEPFAR NGO's*

145 The four NGOs used in this study were the main NGOs working in the Western Cape that  
146 received PEPFAR funding to support comprehensive HIV/AIDS care and treatment services at  
147 government facilities from 2007 to 2012 (Table 1). Note that Right to Care's timeline was  
148 slightly later, from 2009 to 2014. During this time, funding was used to scale up, support, and  
149 expand access to HIV services, including HIV testing and counselling, treatment, prevention of  
150 mother-to-child transmission, combination prevention and screening, and treatment of  
151 tuberculosis. In 2013, that'sit, Right to Care and Kheth'impilo received extension funds to close  
152 out projects and phase out direct service support starting in 2013 through 2015, while Anova and  
153 Kheth'impilo received new PEPFAR grants to support the Western Cape from 2013 to 2017 in  
154 the Metro and Winelands regions. Each NGO worked in a specific geographic region in the

155 province. As noted, Anova and Keth'impilo both worked in the Metro District, supporting seven  
156 of the same health facilities.

157 *Study variables*

158 The main outcome of interest was RIC at 12 and 24 months after ART initiation in each  
159 health facility from 2007 to 2015. RIC was analyzed for two separate time periods: (1) PEPFAR  
160 direct service (2007 to 2012) and (2) post-PEPFAR direct service (2013 to 2015). The study  
161 definition for RIC among adults (age >15 years) is as follows:

$$\text{Retention in Care} = \frac{\text{patients on ART} + \text{patients who stopped treatment}}{\text{total on treatment} - \text{total transferred out}}$$

165 Total on treatment includes HIV clients who are transferred to the health facility via a  
166 formal or silent transfer. Mortality was included in patients who stopped treatment. We  
167 conducted a sensitivity analysis by adding death to the definition, and the results did not change.  
168 Retention was calculated across the nine-year period (2007-2015) for each clinic. Other  
169 covariates of interest were patient volume for each clinic (stratified into quintiles, location (urban  
170 vs. rural), number of job posts transferred from PEPFAR NGOs to government (categorized as  
171  $\leq 1$  and  $\geq 2$ ), facility type (central day clinic (CDC), community health clinic (CHC), and primary  
172 health clinic (PHC)) and government (City of Cape Town, Western Cape Government and a  
173 combination where they both overlapped) and NGO (Anova, Anova/Kheth'impilo,  
174 Kheth'impilo, that'sit and Right to Care). RIC for each health facility supported by Anova,  
175 that'sit and Kheth'impilo were calculated at 12 and 24 months for the two time periods 2007 to  
176 2012 (during PEPFAR direct service) and 2013 to 2015 (post-PEPFAR direct service). Since the



177 Right to Care became active two years later, the average RIC cut-off was 2009 to 2012  
178 (PEPFAR direct service) and 2013 to 2015 (post-PEPFAR direct service).

179 Simple descriptive statistics were used to report the characteristics of the study sample  
180 and were stratified by NGO. We graphically displayed trends in 12- and 24-month retention, loss  
181 to follow-up (defined as clients who have not visited the health facility for more than 90 days),  
182 and total clients starting treatment at the start and end of the cohort by year overall and stratified  
183 by NGO.

184 Quantile regression was used to estimate the associations between PEPFAR pull-out and  
185 changes in 12-month retention in care at the 25<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> quantiles adjusted for covariates.  
186 The models contain the dependent variable (12-month retention), conditional on time (years),  
187 plus an indicator variable for PEPFAR pull-out (set to 0 for each year during PEPFAR funding  
188 and set to 1 for years post-PEPFAR), an interaction term between these two variables to display  
189 trends over time, and additional covariates (i.e., clinic volume, government, NGO, transfer in  
190 human resource posts, facility type, and location). The coefficient for the indicator variable for  
191 PEPFAR pullout can be interpreted as the quantile difference in retention between the PEPFAR  
192 and post-PEPFAR periods for the 25<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> quantiles of our study sample. We graphed  
193 the crude predicted results from the quantile regression models and overlaid scatter plots of  
194 retention by clinic overall and stratified by each NGO to show the intercept shift and trends in  
195 retention during and post-PEPFAR. We conducted quantile regression on 24-month retention as  
196 well but focused on the main results of this study on 12-month retention because they did not  
197 differ greatly and displayed 24-month retention as supplementary tables and figures. STATA 16  
198 and Excel 2016 were used to analyze the data.

199

## 200 **RESULTS**

### 201 *Characteristics of the study sample*

202           The 61 health facilities included in the study sample were predominately WCGH owned  
203 (77%), with a total of 190,343 patients, and equally split between rural and urban areas (Table 2).  
204 The majority of the clinics were supported by Anova (n=23, 38%) and Kheth'impilo (n=15,  
205 25%), while Right to Care had the lowest number (n=5, 8%). ART cohorts gradually increased in  
206 size, though in 2015, there was a dramatic increase in the number of HIV clients on treatment  
207 (Figure 1).

### 208 *Trends of retention over time*

209           When assessing the trends in 12-month retention overall, our results show an increase in  
210 the number of people starting ART from 8,338 in 2007 to 31,260 in 2015 (Figure 1), with Anova  
211 having the greatest increase in patients during that time period and Right to Care having the  
212 smallest (Supplemental Figure 2a-2e). The overall 12-month retention of the study sample was  
213 67.5% (95% confidence interval (CI): 67.2-67.8%) during PEPFAR and 60.8% (CI: 60.4-61.1%)  
214 post-PEPFAR. Retention for each NGO decreased post-PEPFAR direct service, with the  
215 exception of Anova, which observed an increase in RIC of 14.3% points post-PEPFAR. Overall,  
216 the graphs for each NGO showed a decrease in RIC in 2012/2013 (Supplemental Figure 2a-e).  
217 The mortality rate of the study sample substantially decreased post the PEPFAR transition,  
218 falling from 3.8% in 2007 to 0.7% in 2015 (post-PEPFAR) (Figure 1). This is most likely due to  
219 a delay in reporting of mortality, as previous research shows 50% of loss to follow-up is due to  
220 mortality.(23)

### 221 *Quantile regression*

222 We report the results for the 50<sup>th</sup> quantile for all models, as the 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles  
223 are displayed in the tables and figures. The median RIC for the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile was 66.0%  
224 (interquartile range (IQR): 57, 73%). We observed a decline of 4.0% (quantile difference (QD) -  
225 7.7, -0.4%) in 12-month RIC post-PEPFAR compared to during PEPFAR (Table 3 and Figure 2).  
226 Additionally, there was a slight decline in RIC in the PEPFAR era and a plateau in the post-  
227 PEPFAR period (indicated in the direction of the slopes), as shown in Table 3 and Figure 2. It is  
228 also important to note that, health facilities supported by Anova/Kheth'impilo fared worst with  
229 regard to RIC post PEPFAR (50<sup>th</sup> QD: -4.9%; 95% CI: -8.8, -1.0%), while that'sit fared best (50<sup>th</sup>  
230 QD: 3.6%; 95% CI: -0.2, 7.3%) when compared to Anova. We observed a larger decline post-  
231 PEPFAR in 24-month RIC (50<sup>th</sup> QD: -7.0%; 95% CI: -10.2, -3.9%) and all other NGO's  
232 performing slightly better post-PEPFAR when compared to Anova (Supplemental Table 1 and  
233 Supplemental Figure 2a-f.)

234 We also saw a large decrease of -7.8% (95%CI: -12.8, -2.9%) for the 50<sup>th</sup> quantile in RIC  
235 in urban health facilities when compared to rural areas, while City of Cape Town (CoCT)  
236 combined with WCGH had a substantial drop (50<sup>th</sup> QD: -6.1%; 95% CI: -10.6, -1.7%) in RIC  
237 when compared to CoCT alone, while CHCs (50<sup>th</sup> QD: -6.4%; 95% CI: -10.6, -2.1%) and PHCs  
238 (50<sup>th</sup> QD: -2.8%; 95% CI: -5.8, 0.1%) had a larger decline in RIC when compared to CDCs. We  
239 saw an increase of RIC in health facilities that had  $\geq 2$  posts transferred from PEPFAR to  
240 government (50<sup>th</sup> QD: 3.4%; 95% CI: -0.1, 7.0%) compared to  $\leq 1$ . There was no clear trend in  
241 RIC when assessing the relationship between health facility size, measured by total clients on  
242 ART, and RIC. With regard to the 24-month RIC, we saw a slight decline in RIC as health  
243 facility size increased, while trends in all other variables were consistent with the 12-month RIC  
244 (Supplemental Table 1 and Supplemental Figure 2a-e).

245 **DISCUSSION**

246 In this assessment of RIC post-PEPFAR in South Africa's Western Cape, we found a 12-  
247 month retention decline in the post-PEPFAR era. For all NGO supported clinics, RIC during  
248 PEPFAR was a 6.7% percentage point decrease from the PEPFAR direct service period. There  
249 are several explanations for these results. One explanation for the decline from 2012 could be the  
250 direct effect of PEPFAR, moving from direct service support to a focus on health systems  
251 strengthening. This change meant a decrease in human resources, supported by the local  
252 healthcare system. Much of PEPFAR's support was for HIV-specific community health workers,  
253 tracers, and data capturers, who were key for high performance and sustained HIV outcomes,  
254 particularly retention. The Western Cape PEPFAR transition did not prioritize the absorption of  
255 PEPFAR-supported community posts, which meant that in 2012/2013, the province lost 418  
256 community posts supported by PEPFAR (16).

257 Our findings are consistent with Kavanagh's (8) report on the South African transition.  
258 Owing to PEPFAR's transition strategy, health facilities lost close ties with the community, and  
259 HIV retention and prevention efforts fell off the priority list. If the government had made the  
260 decision to transition to more staff in smaller health facilities and prioritize community staff in  
261 the transition, they would have been more likely to see sustained retention in smaller health  
262 facilities. Another alternative explanation could be the 2010 change in HIV treatment policy,  
263 which increased the CD4 eligibility threshold for ART from 200 to 350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (24) The  
264 increase in eligibility threshold would have resulted in more patients accessing the health care  
265 system for monitoring and treatment of the HIV disease, stressing the health system and  
266 beginning ART with more patients who were not yet seriously symptomatic. Research from  
267 Cape Town, South Africa showed that LTFU and the risk of virological failure increased when

268 the ratio of patients per health worker increased (25). One explanation for this could be the  
269 increase in ARV treatment sites over time and that patients were able to move between facilities  
270 but would be recorded as LTFU in the original health facility where they were enrolled on  
271 treatment.

272 When stratifying our results by NGO, we showed that overall RIC at health facilities  
273 supported by Kheth'impilo was the highest, while Anova supported health facilities with the  
274 lowest RIC (Table 2). Kheth'impilo support was localized to urban areas, and even with high  
275 ART patient volumes, they were able to maintain high RIC throughout the transition.  
276 Kheth'impilo was also able to retain the largest number of PEPFAR posts (28) compared to the  
277 other NGOs. Sustaining former PEPFAR human resources in the health system likely facilitated  
278 high RIC (26).

279 The CoCT RIC performance was better than that of WCGH. CoCT may have performed  
280 better than WCGH health facilities because post-Apartheid or post 1994 they inherited a  
281 relatively strong health system that provided HIV services for longer than the WCGH and spent  
282 more funding per patient than WCGH (27). Pre-1994 and prior to PEPFAR, HIV care and  
283 treatment were not available. HIV treatment was initially rolled out in the Metro District, leaving  
284 the rural areas of the Western Cape with little access to HIV services. Additionally, because  
285 CoCT provides services in an urban area, there is easier access to healthcare services, allowing  
286 patients to stay on their treatment. HIV patients living in rural areas often lack transport and  
287 resources and fear loss of confidentiality, while rural health systems suffer more medication  
288 stockouts, which affect RIC (28).

289 Anova/Kheth'impilo were impacted more, with as high as a 7.5% decline in RIC post-  
290 PEPFAR in the 75<sup>th</sup> quantile vs. Anova alone, while Right to Care was the least impacted, with

291 as high as a 7.7% increase post-PEPFAR in the 75<sup>th</sup> quantile vs. Anova alone. We recently  
292 published a qualitative analysis of this work (26) which showed that established NGOs with a  
293 history of working in Western Cape supported facilities with higher RIC. Anova and  
294 Kheth'impilo had been working in Western Cape for many years, understood the health system  
295 gaps, had long-standing relationships with local officials, and produced high sustainability  
296 results. Qualitative data highlighted that stable staff and the consistency of patient/provider  
297 relationships were important for sustaining RIC. It is important that patients trust and feel  
298 understood by health facility staff. If donors flood the local health system with additional staff,  
299 withdrawing them will result in less sustainable outcomes (26).

### 300 **Limitations**

301 Our results should be considered, in addition to their limitations. First, our data are from  
302 government health facilities and NGOs operating in South Africa's Western Cape, which had the  
303 lowest estimated prevalence of HIV among 15-49-year-olds (9.4%; 95% CI: 8.5, 10.2%) in 2013,  
304 compared to the other provinces, such as KwaZulu-Natal (26.8%; 95% CI: 25.8%–27.6%).(29)  
305 Therefore, our results may not be generalizable to other provinces and/or other sub-Saharan  
306 African countries where PEPFAR was implemented. Second, our data was aggregate data that  
307 provided by Tier.net, a government-owned HIV electronic patient management system. As such,  
308 we run the risk of possible loss of information and are vulnerable to the ecological fallacy,  
309 resulting in false inferences about individual behavior on the basis of population-level data.  
310 However, our estimates of retention are consistent with previously published literature on  
311 retention in ART programs in South Africa's Western Cape during PEPFAR (74.2%; 95% CI:  
312 73.2%–75.2%) (30) and post-PEFAR 54.3% (95% CI:52.4%- 56.1%) at 36 months follow up  
313 that used individual patient level data in their analysis (31). Third, we could have unmeasured

314 confounding due to the inability to control for potential confounders due to missing information  
315 at the facility level (i.e., transfers, employee turnover rate). We attempted to minimize  
316 confounding by type of health facility by including only primary healthcare facilities (i.e.,  
317 clinics, community day centers, and community health centers) in our study.

## 318 **Conclusion**

319 Our results show that when donor funding decreased, there was a decline in RIC of  
320 patients in HIV care post-PEPFAR compared to the PEPFAR direct service era. To ensure that  
321 the RIC is high, the system needs to minimize loss to follow-up. Support from different  
322 government bodies and the size of health facilities had no effect on RIC, although additional  
323 human resources in the system and support from NGOs with a history in the province assisted in  
324 sustaining retention. Although it is unlikely that there would ever be as large a program as  
325 PEPFAR to support HIV care and treatment in the future, it would be valuable for donors  
326 working in government health facilities to allocate funding to support health facilities and NGOs  
327 as they transition out. These funds would help maintain quality patient care and sustain clinical  
328 outcomes during the transition. In conclusion, future donor transitions should prioritize close  
329 planning with local governments, together with stable human and financial resources, to ensure  
330 sustained health outcomes.

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

## References


- 341 1. Institute of Medicine. PEPFAR Evaluation [Internet]. The National Academies Press.  
342 2013 [cited 2016 Sep 7]. Available from: <https://www.nap.edu/read/18256/chapter/9>
- 343 2. amfAR. PEPFAR Country/Regional Operational Plans (COPs/ROPs) Database [Internet].  
344 [cited 2016 Jul 3]. Available from: <https://copsdata.amfar.org/>
- 345 3. Wools-Kaloustian K, Kimaiyo S, Musick B, Sidle J, Siika A, Nyandiko W, Einterz R,  
346 Tierney WM YCT. The Impact of the President's Emergency Fund for AIDS Relief on  
347 Expansion of HIV care services for adult patients in western Kenya. *Aids*. 2009;23:195–  
348 201.
- 349 4. Bendavid E, Bhattacharya J. The president's emergency plan for AIDS relief in Africa:  
350 An evaluation of outcomes. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;150(10):688–95.
- 351 5. Bendavid E, Holmes CB, Bhattacharya J, Miller G. HIV development assistance and adult  
352 mortality in Africa. *JAMA - J Am Med Assoc*. 2012;307(19):2060–7.
- 353 6. UNAIDS. South Africa Country Facts [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021 Apr 22]. Available  
354 from: <https://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/southafrica>
- 355 7. Health Systems Trust. District Health Barometer 2017/18: Section 11 [Internet].  
356 Westville, South Africa; Available from:  
357 <https://www.hst.org.za/publications/Pages/DHB20172018.aspx>
- 358 8. Kavanagh MM. The Politics of Transition & the Economics of HIV- AIDS & PEPFAR in  
359 South Africa. 2014;1–48. Available from: [http://www.health-e.org.za/wp-](http://www.health-e.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Politics-of-Transition-Report-AIDS-South-Africa.pdf)  
360 [content/uploads/2014/01/Politics-of-Transition-Report-AIDS-South-Africa.pdf](http://www.health-e.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Politics-of-Transition-Report-AIDS-South-Africa.pdf)
- 361 9. Katz I, Basset I V, Wright AA. PEPFAR in Transition — Implications for HIV Care in  
362 South Africa. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;369(15):1385–7.
- 363 10. Kavanagh MM. The politics and epidemiology of transition: PEPFAR and AIDS in South  
364 Africa. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* [Internet]. 2014;65(3):247–50. Available from:  
365 <http://europepmc.org/abstract/MED/24346642>
- 366 11. Simelela NP, Venter WDF. A brief history of South Africa's response to AIDS. *South*  
367 *African Med J*. 2014;104(3):249–51.
- 368 12. Brundage S. *Terra Nova: How to Achieve a Successful PEPFAR Transition in South*  
369 *Africa*. 2011.
- 370 13. PEPFAR. Partnership Framework Implementation Plan in Support of South Africa's  
371 National HIV , STI & TB Response between The Government of the Republic of South  
372 Africa and The Government of the United States of America [Internet]. 2012. Available  
373 from: <http://www.pepfar.gov/documents/organization/196651.pdf>
- 374 14. Cloete C, Regan S, Giddy J et al. The Linkage Outcomes of a Large-scale, Rapid Transfer




- 375 of HIV-infected Patients From Hospital-based to Community-based Clinics in South  
376 Africa. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 2014;1(2).
- 377 15. PEPFAR. Country Operational Plan Strategic Direction Summary [Internet]. 2015.  
378 Available from: <http://www.pepfar.gov/documents/organization/250290.pdf>
- 379 16. Chiliza J. Western Cape PEPFAR Transition: A Case Study. 2014.
- 380 17. Katz IT, Bogart LM, Cloete C, Crankshaw TL, Govender T, Gaynes MR, et al.  
381 Understanding HIV-Infected Patients' Experiences with PEPFAR-associated Transitions  
382 at a Centre of Excellence in Kwa-Zulu Natal, South Africa. *AIDS Care.* 2017;7(10):1298–  
383 303.
- 384 18. Lince-deroche N, Leuner R, Long L. When Donor Funding Leaves: The immediate  
385 impact on resources of withdrawal of support for direct HIV care and treatment at public  
386 health facilities in Johannesburg. In: IAS. 2017.
- 387 19. Bassett, Ingrid; Cloete, Christie; Regan, Susan; Giddy, Janet; Freedberg, Kenneth A. and  
388 RPW. Large scale, rapid transfer of HIV-infected patients from hospital-based to primary  
389 health clinics in South Africa: an assessment of self-reported linkage to care. In: 8th  
390 International Conference on HIV Treatment and Prevention Adherence. Miami; 2013.
- 391 20. Fox MP, Rosen S. Retention of Adult Patients on Antiretroviral Therapy in Low- and  
392 Middle-Income Countries. *JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2015;69(1):98–108.
- 393 21. Johnson LF, Dorrington RE, Moolla H. Progress towards the 2020 targets for HIV  
394 diagnosis and antiretroviral treatment in South Africa. *South Afr J HIV Med.*  
395 2017;18(1):1–8.
- 396 22. University of Washington. Paper Health Registers Project Case Study: South Africa's 3-  
397 Tiered Antiretroviral Treatment Monitoring System Country Profile [Internet].  
398 [www.Tech-21.org](http://technet-21.org). 2014. Available from: [http://technet-21.org/forums/performance-](http://technet-21.org/forums/performance-monitoring/8500-case-studies-on-paper-immunization-registers#12111)  
399 [monitoring/8500-case-studies-on-paper-immunization-registers#12111](http://technet-21.org/forums/performance-monitoring/8500-case-studies-on-paper-immunization-registers#12111)
- 400 23. Fox, Matthew P., Brennan, A., Maskew, M., MacPhail, P., Sanne, I. Using Vital  
401 Registration Data to Update Mortality among Patients Lost to Follow-up from ART  
402 Programs: Evidence from the Themba Lethu Clinic, South Africa. *Trop Med Int Heal.*  
403 2010;15(4):405–13.
- 404 24. National Department of Health. The South African Antiretroviral Treatment Guidelines  
405 2010 [Internet]. South African National AIDS Council. Pretoria; 2010. Available from:  
406 [https://sahivsoc.org/Files/Summary\\_The\\_South\\_African\\_Antiretroviral\\_Treatment\\_2010.](https://sahivsoc.org/Files/Summary_The_South_African_Antiretroviral_Treatment_2010.pdf)  
407 [pdf](https://sahivsoc.org/Files/Summary_The_South_African_Antiretroviral_Treatment_2010.pdf)
- 408 25. Nglazi MD, Lawn SD, Kaplan R, Kranzer K, Orrell C, Wood R, et al. Changes in  
409 programmatic outcomes during 7 years of scale-up at a community-based antiretroviral  
410 treatment service in South Africa. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2011;56(1):1–8.
- 411 26. Chiliza J, Laing R, Feeley FG, Borba CPC. Program sustainability post PEPFAR direct  
412 service support in the Western Cape, South Africa. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2021;16(5  
413 May):1–16. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251230>

- 414 27. Gilson L, Brady L, Naledi T, Schneider H, Pienaar D, Hawkrigde A, et al. Development  
415 of the health system in the Western Cape: experiences since 1994. 1994;59–70.
- 416 28. Julien A, Anthierens S, Van Rie A, West R, Maritze M, Twine R, et al. Health Care  
417 Providers’ Challenges to High-Quality HIV Care and Antiretroviral Treatment Retention  
418 in Rural South Africa. *Qual Health Res.* 2021;31(4):722–35.
- 419 29. Johnson LF, Dorrington RE, Moolla H. HIV epidemic drivers in South Africa: A model-  
420 based evaluation of factors accounting for inter-provincial differences in HIV prevalence  
421 and incidence trends. *South Afr J HIV Med.* 2017;18(1):1–9.
- 422 30. Fox MP, Bor J, Brennan AT, Macleod WB, Maskew M, Stevens WS, et al. Estimating  
423 retention in HIV care accounting for patient transfers□: A national laboratory cohort study  
424 in South Africa. 2018;3:30–43.
- 425 31. Bengtson AM, Colvin C, Kirwa K, Cornell M, Lurie MN. Estimating retention in HIV  
426 care accounting for clinic transfers using electronic medical records: evidence from a large  
427 antiretroviral treatment programme in the Western Cape, South Africa. *Trop Med Int*  
428 *Heal.* 2020;25(8):936–43.
- 429

**Figure 1. 12-month retention in care, loss to follow-up and death overlaid on total patients on ART at the start and end of the 12-month period.**



**Figure 2. Quantile regression estimates for 12-month retention stratified by NGO.**



**Table 1. Western Cape NGO PEPFAR Timeline of Grants**

NGO	District	Direct Service						Health Systems Strengthening		
		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>Kheth'impilo</b>	Metro	x	x	x	x	x	x	Extension + New Grant	x	x
<b>that'sit</b>	Eden	x	x	x	x	x	x	Extension	x	x
<b>Right to Care</b>	Overberg; Central Karoo			x	x	x	x	x	Extension	x
<b>Anova</b>	West Coast	x	x	x	x	x	x			
<b>Anova</b>	Winelands	x	x	x	x	x	x	New Grant	x	x
<b>Anova</b>	Metro	x	x	x	x	x	x	New Grant	x	x

**Table 2: Study characteristics stratified by NGO (N=61)**

		NGO (n=total facilities supported)					
		Anova n= 23 (37.7%)	Anova/Kheth'impilo n=7 (11.5%)	that'sit n=11 (18%)	Right to Care n=5 (8.2%)	Kheth'impilo n=15 (24.6%)	TOTAL
<b>Total facilities supported, n (%)</b>		23 (38%)	7 (11%)	11 (18%)	5 (8%)	15 (25%)	61 (100%)
<b>Total Clients on ART, n (%)</b>		84,610 (44%)	39,752 (21%)	13,202 (7%)	5,528 (3%)	47,251 (25%)	190,343 (100%)
<b>Government ownership of facilities, n (%)</b>	WCGH	20 (87%)	3 (43%)	11 (100%)	5 (100%)	8 (53%)	47 (77%)
	CoCT	2 (9%)	3 (43%)	-	-	7 (47%)	12 (20%)
	combined	1 (4%)	1 (14%)	-	-	-	2 (3%)
<b>Geographic area, n (%)</b>	rural	14 (61%)	-	11 (100%)	5 (100%)	-	30 (49%)
	urban	9 (39%)	7 (100%)	-	-	15 (100%)	31 (51%)
<b>12 month RIC PEPFAR Direct Service, % (95% CI)</b>		65% (64.6-65.5%)	67.8% (67.2%-68.5%)	69.1% (68%-70.1%)	75.8% (74.1%-77.4%)	70.4% (69.9%-71%)	67.5% (67.2-67.8%)
<b>12 month RIC Post PEPFAR Direct Service, % (95% CI)</b>		57.7% (57.1-58.2%)	60.8% (60.1%-61.6%)	60.4% (59.1%-61.6%)	66.4% (64.5%-68.2%)	66.2% (65.5%-66.8%)	61% (60.7%-61.4%)
<b>12 month Overall RIC (2007-2015), % (95% CI)</b>		62% (61.6%-62.3%)	64.7% (64.2%-65.2%)	65.3% (64.4%-66.1%)	71.1% (69.9%-72.4%)	68.5% (68.1%-69%)	64.7% (64.5-64.9%)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.20.23284819>; this version posted April 14, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under aCC-BY 4.0 International license.



**Table 3. Crude and adjusted quantile regression for the outcome of 12-month retention.**

	Crude quantile difference (95% CI)			Adjusted quantile difference (95% CI)		
	25%	50%	75%	25%	50%	75%
<b>post PEPFAR</b>	-4.2% (-11.6, 3.2%)	-5.6% (-10.4, -0.7%)	-4.5% (-8.6, -0.4%)	-5.2% (-12.4, 2.0%)	-4.6% (-8.4, -0.8%)	-4.8% (-9.2, -0.3%)
<b>slope during PEPFAR</b>	-0.2% (-1.7, 1.2%)	-1.0% (-1.9, 0.0%)	-1.6% (-2.4, -0.9%)	0.5% (-0.9, 2.0%)	-1.3% (-2.1, -0.6%)	-1.9% (-2.8, -1.0%)
<b>change in slope post-PEPFAR</b>	0.0% (-2.7, 5.7%)	-0.5% (-3.3, 4.3%)	-0.2% (-3.3, 3.0%)	0.0 (-5.7, 5.5%)	-0.3% (-3.3, 2.7%)	2.5% (-0.1, 5.0%)
<b>Constant</b>	59.8% (54.4, 65.2%)	66.4% (62.9, 70.0%)	72.0% (69.1, 75.0%)	57.3% (47.3, 67.3%)	73.2% (67.9, 78.5%)	81.9% (75.7, 88.1%)
<b>PEPFAR NGO</b>						
Anova	-	-	-	ref.	ref.	ref.
Kheth'impilo	-	-	-	6.1% (-0.6, 12.8%)	-1.6% (-5.2, 2.0%)	-1.2% (-5.3, 3.0%)
Anova/ Kheth'impilo	-	-	-	0.4% (-7.0, 7.9%)	-5.8% (-9.7, -1.8%)	-7.5% (-12.2, -2.9%)
Right to Care	-	-	-	7.7% (-1.9, 17.4%)	6.0% (0.8, 11.1%)	6.6% (0.6, 12.6%)
that'sit	-	-	-	1.9% (-5.2, 9.1%)	6.3% (2.5, 10.1%)	5.5% (1.1, 10.0%)
<b>clinic size</b>						
174-1020	-	-	-	ref.	ref.	ref.
1021-2562	-	-	-	6.6% (-0.6, 12.8%)	4.9% (1.1, 8.7%)	-0.0% (-4.5, 4.4%)
2563-4021	-	-	-	4.3% (-3.0, 11.7%)	1.6% (-2.3, 5.5%)	-3.6% (-8.1, 1.0%)
4022-5856	-	-	-	9.5% (2.0%, 16.9%)	3.5% (-0.5, 7.4%)	-0.3% (-4.9, 4.4%)
5857-9760	-	-	-	11.4% (2.5, 20.2%)	2.1% (-2.6, 6.8%)	-5.6% (-11.1, -0.1%)
<b>location</b>						
rural	-	-	-	ref.	ref.	ref.
urban	-	-	-	5.0% (-3.1, 13.0%)	-5.8% (-10.1, -1.5%)	-8.9% (-13.9, 3.9%)
<b>government support</b>						
City of Cape Town	-	-	-	ref.	ref.	ref.
Western Cape Government	-	-	-	2.7% (-8.6, 13.9%)	-3.2% (-9.2, 2.7%)	-4.6% (-11.6, 2.4%)
Combined	-	-	-	-8.3% (-14.3, -2.2%)	-9.1% (-12.3, -5.9%)	-7.5% (-11.2, -3.8%)