

1 **Title:** Costs and outcomes of routine HIV oral pre-exposure prophylaxis  
2 implementation across different service delivery models and key populations  
3 in South Africa  
4

5 **Authors:**

Order	Name	Email	Preferred degree	Affiliation
1	Cheryl Hendrickson	<a href="mailto:chendrickson@heroza.org">chendrickson@heroza.org</a>	MPH	a, b
2	Kamban Hirasen	<a href="mailto:khirasen@heroza.org">khirasen@heroza.org</a>	MA	a
3	Constance Mongwenyana	<a href="mailto:cmongwenyana@heroza.org">cmongwenyana@heroza.org</a>	MA	a
4	Mariet Benade	<a href="mailto:m benade@bu.edu">m benade@bu.edu</a>	MBCbB	c
5	Rutendo Bothma	<a href="mailto:rbothma@wrhi.ac.za">rbothma@wrhi.ac.za</a>	MPH	d
6	Chantal Smith	<a href="mailto:csmith@match.org.za">csmith@match.org.za</a>	MBCbB	e
7	Johan Meyer	<a href="mailto:meyerj@out.org.za">meyerj@out.org.za</a>	BA Theology	f
8	Brooke Nichols	<a href="mailto:brooken@bu.edu">brooken@bu.edu</a>	PhD	a, b, c
9	Lawrence Long	<a href="mailto:lclong@bu.edu">lclong@bu.edu</a>	PhD	a, c

6

7 **Affiliations:**

8 <sup>a</sup> Health Economics and Epidemiology Research Office, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the  
9 Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

10

11 <sup>b</sup> Department of Medical Microbiology, Academic Medical Center, University of Amsterdam,  
12 Amsterdam, Netherlands

13

14 <sup>c</sup> Department of Global Health, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

15

16 <sup>d</sup> Wits RHI, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

17

18 <sup>e</sup> MatCH Maternal, Adolescent and Child Health Institute, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

19

20 <sup>f</sup> OUT LGBT Well-Being, Johannesburg, South Africa

21

22 **Running title:** Cost and outcomes of PrEP in SA

23

24 **Address correspondence:** Cheryl Hendrickson  
25 [chendrickson@heroza.org](mailto:chendrickson@heroza.org)  
26 32 Princess Terrace  
27 Parktown, 2193  
28 Johannesburg, South Africa.

29

**NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

30 **Supported by:** USAID 72067419CA00004  
31 LL time NIMH K01MH119923  
32 CH time D43 TW010543  
33  
34 **Key words:** South Africa, HIV, pre-exposure prophylaxis, costs and cost  
35 analysis  
36  
37 **Word count:** 3812

## 38 Abstract

39

40 **Background:** Oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) is a highly efficacious biomedical HIV prevention  
41 tool, yet despite being recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO) since 2015, uptake  
42 and persistence remain limited in much of the world, including sub Saharan Africa (SSA). There is a  
43 dearth of evidence-based interventions to improve PrEP uptake and persistence in SSA, and the full  
44 costs of PrEP programs implemented in routine care settings remain largely unknown. This study  
45 aimed to evaluate the cost of delivery of daily oral PrEP, and associated outcomes, to different key  
46 and priority populations across different service delivery models (SDMs) in South Africa.

47

48 **Methods:** We conducted bottom-up micro-costing of PrEP service delivery from the provider  
49 perspective within twelve urban SDMs providing routine PrEP services to various key and propriety  
50 populations in Gauteng and KwaZulu-Natal provinces in South Africa. The SDMs included in-facility  
51 and outreach models that focused on men who have sex with men (MSM), female sex workers (FSW)  
52 and adolescent girls and young women (AGYW). We identified all within- and above-facility activities  
53 supporting PrEP delivery, obtained input costs from program budgets, expenditure records and staff  
54 interviews, and determined individual resource usage between February 2019 and February 2020  
55 through retrospective medical record review. Our primary outcome was PrEP coverage at six months  
56 (defined as having sufficient PrEP drug dispensed at the last visit to be covered at six months post  
57 PrEP-initiation). A subset (N=633) of all enrolled subjects had the potential for 12 months of follow-  
58 up and were included in a 12-month outcome analysis. We report the cost per client initiated on PrEP  
59 in 2021 United States Dollars (USD).

60

61 **Findings:** We collected medical record data from 1,281 people who initiated PrEP at 12 SDMs between  
62 February and August 2019 and had at least six months of potential follow-up. The average number of  
63 visits was 2.3 for in-facility models and 1.5 for outreach models and 3,086 months of PrEP was  
64 dispensed. PrEP coverage at six months varied greatly across SDMs, from 41.8% at one MSM-focused  
65 fixed clinic to 0% in an MSM-focused outreach model. In general, in-facility programs had higher six-  
66 month coverage than outreach programs. Across all SDMs with PrEP clients with potential for 12  
67 months of follow-up (n=633), PrEP coverage at 12 months was 13.6%, with variability between SDMs.  
68 The average six-month cost per client initiated on PrEP ranged from \$29 to \$590, with higher average  
69 costs generally observed for the in-facility programs (\$152 in-facility versus \$84 for outreach). The  
70 average monthly cost per PrEP client who had six-month PrEP coverage ranged from \$18 to \$160  
71 dependent on SDM.

72

73 **Interpretation:** This study is an important addition to the PrEP outcome and cost literature in the SSA  
74 region. Results show that costs and outcomes vary considerably across different SDMs and  
75 populations in real world PrEP programs and provide crucial information for further scale-up of the  
76 oral PrEP program in South Africa and the greater SSA region.

77

78 **Word count (abstract):** 483

79

## 80 **Research in context**

81

### 82 **Evidence before this study**

83 Although there have been several modelling studies conducted to investigate the cost and cost  
84 outcomes of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in sub Saharan Africa, there is a dearth of evidence on  
85 the real-world costs of providing PrEP in this region. A search of PubMed conducted before  
86 commencement of this study using the terms “PrEP” AND “cost analysis” AND “sub Saharan Africa”  
87 for studies published in English between 2016 and 2022 along with the exclusion of publications whose  
88 results stemmed from models or that were irrelevant, showed that only nine studies covering four  
89 countries have been published that present primary costs of PrEP in this region. Those that have been  
90 published generally focus on one population group, are costing particular interventions in a research  
91 setting or only use ingredients-based methodology without associated outcomes.

92

### 93 **Added value of this study**

94 We include cost and cost outcomes from a large cohort of PrEP-clients who initiated PrEP across  
95 twelve models of care and have at least six months of potential follow-up. Costs are based on actual  
96 individual resource utilization data and program expenses, which differentiate it from modelling and  
97 ingredients-based costing studies. These results add to the growing body of evidence on the outcomes  
98 and associated costs of routine implementation of PrEP programs in the sub Saharan African region,  
99 which can be used to strengthen budget impact analyses which will, in turn, assist policy makers in  
100 program scale up decisions.

101

### 102 **Implications of all the available evidence**

103 This study provides evidence needed to inform the scale up of PrEP service delivery models. Through  
104 the micro-costing approach across several service delivery models, we cost the real-world  
105 implementation of these models, which will feed into the evidence needed for HIV prevention scale  
106 up and budget planning in South Africa and the wider SSA region. Estimates of provider costs for large  
107 scale, routine, effective PrEP delivery platforms that take into account economies of scale, changes in  
108 marginal costs as programs expand, understanding the differences in costs and benefits for different  
109 populations and risk groups will be vital to the success and sustainability of PrEP programs in SSA.

## 110 **Introduction**

111 The HIV epidemic continues to impact millions of people globally, particularly in sub Saharan Africa  
112 (SSA), where 60% of new infections occurred in 2020 (1). South Africa is particularly hard hit, with an  
113 estimated 210,000 new HIV infections in 2021 and an HIV incidence of 4.19 per 1,000 population (2).  
114 Progress on the prevention of HIV infection remains largely stagnant; the global annual number of  
115 new infections among adults has hardly changed over the past four years, with the total new infections  
116 having declined by 38% from 2.1 million (1.6 million-2.8 million) in 2010 to 1.3 million (1 million-1.7  
117 million) in 2022 (1, 3). This is far short of the 2016 United Nations General Assembly target of 75% for  
118 2020 (4).

119 Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) is a highly effective biomedical HIV prevention tool, reducing the risk  
120 of HIV-1 acquisition by more than 95% in studies with high adherence (5). However, there are still  
121 substantial gaps in the availability of PrEP, with the total number of people using this prevention  
122 option at just 28% of the 2020 UNAIDS target of 3 million individuals accessing PrEP in low- and middle-  
123 income countries; and just 8% of the new global 2025 target (4, 6). South Africa adopted the World  
124 Health Organization's recommendation to offer PrEP to those at "substantial risk of HIV infection" in  
125 2016, beginning PrEP rollout to select key populations at pilot sites and expanding nationally  
126 thereafter (7). Despite this national rollout, PrEP uptake has been slow, with approximately 106,400  
127 people at risk of HIV infection who received PrEP at least once in 2020 (1). This has increased, with  
128 almost 350,000 people receiving PrEP in 2021 (2); however, these numbers are still suboptimal. Until  
129 recently, the PrEP drug procurement program had been mostly donor funded, however, this is  
130 changing such that the South Africa PrEP program is now largely government funded. As South Africa  
131 continues to scale-up PrEP provision, data are needed to inform the total cost and affordability of the  
132 various service delivery models (SDMs). There is little information, however, to support evidence-  
133 based resource allocation decisions in the public sector thus far.

134  
135 Several modelling studies have investigated the cost-effectiveness of PrEP provision in SSA, and the  
136 results are mixed, with large variations in assumed costs of PrEP provision (8-14). Similarly, in South  
137 Africa, modelling studies also present results that only show cost-effectiveness under certain  
138 conditions such as population-targeted programs, whether PrEP-clients self-select or have high  
139 assumed rates of uptake and persistence. These results are largely dependent on the cost estimates  
140 used as well as the assumptions around PrEP uptake and persistence (15-20). While modelled  
141 estimates provide useful approximations, the most accurate cost estimates are based on actual client  
142 resource usage in routine implementation and are critical to determining true cost-effectiveness.

143

144 An understanding of the true resource utilization, cost, and expected outcomes of different PrEP  
145 service delivery models in South Africa is currently lacking. We have therefore conducted a cost  
146 outcomes study to evaluate the cost of delivering daily oral PrEP to different populations across  
147 different SDMs in South Africa by estimating the average cost and associated outcomes of PrEP  
148 provision in routine settings. These results may serve to inform the expansion of PrEP programs both  
149 within South Africa and the greater SSA region and to provide evidence on how to optimize service  
150 delivery to improve cost-effectiveness and provide data to conduct budget impact analyses for future  
151 policy decisions and implementation strategies in HIV prevention programming.

152

## 153 **Methods**

154

### 155 **Study sites and population**

156 We conducted bottom-up micro-costing of PrEP service delivery within twelve urban SDMs providing  
157 routine PrEP services in Gauteng and KwaZulu-Natal provinces in South Africa. These models  
158 comprised of PrEP services delivered by seven public, multiservice clinics, specialized clinics and  
159 community outreach programs, including Technical and Vocational Education and Training colleges  
160 (Table 1). Most of the seven sites had both an in-facility and an out-reach model, while some sites  
161 were limited to a single model of PrEP provision. The selected SDMs were focused on reaching specific  
162 populations considered to be at increased risk for HIV acquisition, including female sex workers (FSW),  
163 men who have sex with men (MSM), adolescent girls and young women (AGYW) as well as students  
164 at tertiary institutions. All PrEP service delivery was provided per South African national guidelines  
165 (21). We intentionally selected SDMs that had been routinely providing PrEP for at least nine months  
166 prior to data collection and that had initiated at least 25 people on PrEP with at least six months of  
167 potential follow-up prior to data collection.

168

169 We enrolled a cohort of clients screened for HIV, found eligible for, and initiated on PrEP, and with at  
170 least six months of potential follow-up time between February 2019 to February 2020. We included  
171 PrEP-clients who were  $\geq 18$  years old and who were recorded as having initiated PrEP within the  
172 respective SDM. We excluded PrEP-clients who had missing files, incomplete data, or if they had been  
173 transferred out of PrEP care at the selected site within six months of PrEP initiation. Although models  
174 focused on specific populations, we did not limit enrolment based on target population. For example,  
175 a program focused on MSM may have provided services to a male who did not identify as MSM and  
176 this man would have been eligible for inclusion in the costing cohort providing they met the other  
177 inclusion/exclusion criteria.

178

179 There was no contact with any of the PrEP-clients whose data were used in the study. Data on their  
180 medical history, enrolment into PrEP and resource usage during the follow-up period since PrEP  
181 initiation was retrospectively extracted from routine client medical records. Within each SDM, we  
182 enrolled the most recently initiated PrEP clients who had at least six months of potential follow-up  
183 post PrEP initiation. The target enrolment per study population and service delivery model was 200,  
184 based on a t-test for sample means, using modelled results of cost estimates for PrEP service delivery  
185 in South Africa (16). We estimated that with this sample size, an alpha error rate of 0.05 and 80%  
186 power, we would be able to detect at least a 10% difference in cost between SDMs, provided the  
187 standard deviation did not exceed 25% of the current modelled cost.

188

### 189 **Data Collection**

190 Routinely collected client-level data from clients' medical records, including hard copy client files, and  
191 both hard copy and electronic client registers, were extracted and managed using REDCap electronic  
192 data capture tools hosted at the University of Witwatersrand (22, 23). These data provided individual  
193 resource utilization, such as number of clinic visits, service and medications provided, and laboratory  
194 tests performed. Facility-level data, such as client headcounts, were extracted from clinic registers.  
195 Client-level data for the period February 2019 to February 2020 were collected from September 2020  
196 to March 2021. Facility-level data for the 2019 calendar period were collected from February to August  
197 2021.

198

### 199 **Costing**

200 We estimated the economic costs of PrEP provision from the provider perspective using previously  
201 described micro-costing methods (24, 25). We used routine client records to estimate resource  
202 utilization for each client over the study period and then multiplied the resource usage by the unit  
203 cost. Specific methods and sources for the unit costs for drugs, laboratory tests, clinical staff time,  
204 buildings and equipment as well as management and administration costs are shown in Table 2.  
205 Resources captured included drugs, diagnostic and laboratory tests, clinical staff time, buildings,  
206 equipment, supplies and other shared services, such as utilities and non-clinical staff time. Shared  
207 resource costs were collected using facility-level financial records as well as price lists from suppliers  
208 and these were proportionally allocated according to the fraction of total visits that were dedicated  
209 to PrEP provision. Above site-level management staff salaries were excluded from the main analysis.  
210 We collected all costs in South African Rand (ZAR) and inflated the costs to 2021 prices (where  
211 necessary) using the South African Consumer Price Index (26). Costs are reported in United States



212 Dollars (USD) using the average 2021 exchange rate of 14.78 ZAR:USD and we assumed a useful life of  
213 five years for all capital items (27).

214

## 215 **Outcomes**

216 Our primary outcome (PrEP coverage at six months) for this study was defined as having sufficient  
217 PrEP drug dispensed at the last visit to be covered at six months post PrEP-initiation. PrEP outcomes  
218 available from routine medical records are difficult to interpret as they do not typically speak directly  
219 to adherence. To help understand what is happening in each program we report a number of  
220 additional outcomes (same-day initiation, engagement in care, time in care) at various time points, if  
221 available. Nine and twelve month outcomes were only reported from the subset of sites that had PrEP  
222 clients with 12-months of follow-up. Definitions of each outcome are reported in Table 3.

223

## 224 **Data Analysis**

225 All enrolled study participants were included in a six-month cost and outcome analysis. A subset  
226 (N=633) of all enrolled subjects across eight SDMs had the potential for 12 months of follow-up and  
227 were included in a 12-month outcome analysis. We describe baseline characteristics and outcomes  
228 across the study sites, SDM and study population. We also estimated average PrEP-client resource  
229 utilization over the six-month study period and the average cost per PrEP-client by SDM and primary  
230 outcome and disaggregated by cost category (drugs, laboratory testing, visit costs and fixed costs).  
231 Aggregate results are presented in the text, while results disaggregated by site and SDM are reported  
232 in the text and tables. Additionally, we also estimated the production cost, a calculation that takes the  
233 costs of services to all clients and divides it by only those achieving the primary outcome of PrEP  
234 coverage at six months post PrEP-initiation; this incorporates effectiveness into the cost estimates.  
235 We also conducted an additional analysis to estimate an average 'above site' management cost that  
236 can be used as an estimate of costs across the SDMs. All analyses were conducted in Excel (Microsoft  
237 Office Standard 2019) using the Healthcare Cost and Outcomes Model to estimate the cost per patient  
238 (28) and Rstudio version 1.4.1106.

239

## 240 **Ethics approval**

241 This study was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee (Medical) of the University of the  
242 Witwatersrand (M190621) and the Boston University IRB (H-39120). Data was collected  
243 retrospectively and a waiver of informed consent was granted by the ethics review boards.

244

## 245 **Results**

246

## 247 **Sample characteristics**

248 We collected data from 1,281 people who initiated PrEP between February and August 2019 across  
249 seven sites and 12 SDMs, about half (633/1281) of whom had the potential for 12 months of follow-  
250 up across eight of the SDMs (Table 4). This included 1,281 initiation visits and 1,245 follow-up visits  
251 amounting to more than 3,000 months of PrEP dispensed. The majority of PrEP-clients were initiated  
252 in 2019 (994/1281, 77.6%) while the remainder initiated in 2018. On average, participants were young,  
253 with a median age of 27 (IQR: 23-33); this was even lower among the AGYW-focused outreach  
254 programs which had a median age of 22 (IQR: 21.0-24.8). About a sixth (63.7%) of PrEP-clients were  
255 female with the sex distribution largely influenced by the population the site focused on; however,  
256 8.3% (74/889) of the PrEP initiates at the FSW- and AGYW-focused programs were male.

257

258 In general, the SDMs largely served the population group that they were focusing on (i.e. an MSM-  
259 focused program mostly initiated MSM clients on PrEP); however there is variability in population  
260 within sites and SDMs. The MSM-focused outreach programs reported that one in five initiates  
261 identified as heterosexual men (40/192, 20.8%) compared to the in-facility MSM programs which  
262 reported only 1.5% heterosexual males (3/200, 1.5%). Other SDMs showed more heterogeneity in  
263 their PrEP-client populations, with the AGYW in-facility sites initiating older women (aged  $\geq 25$ ,  
264 114/368, 31.0%), FSW (2/368, 0.5%), heterosexual males (22/368, 6.0%) and one MSM in addition to  
265 the 60.1% AGYW. The AGYW outreach sites were similar, with the majority of PrEP initiates in the  
266 AGYW population category (51/90, 56.7%); however, almost one in five persons (17/90, 18.9%)  
267 initiated on PrEP were women older than 24 years of age as well as five? (5.6%) heterosexual males.  
268 In this AGYW outreach group 16/90 (17.8%) did not indicate which population group they were in. The  
269 FSW sites largely initiated FSW (106/138 (76.8%) in-facility and 275/293 (93.9%) outreach); however,  
270 a few AGYW, MSM and Transgender women also initiated at these FSW-focused programs.

271

272 We observed variability across sites and SDMs on PrEP-clients indication for PrEP, with most sites and  
273 SDMs showing a combination of PrEP-clients both initiating PrEP at their request and due to formal  
274 risk assessments. However, some were more skewed, for example one MSM-focused outreach model  
275 (MSM Site 2) indicated that almost all clients (132/139, 95.0%) requested PrEP, while one FSW-focused  
276 outreach model (FSW Site 3) had the inverse with the majority (77/96, 80.2%) initiated based on the  
277 risk assessment. Within most SDMs, almost all PrEP-clients (1191/1281, 93.0%) had a formal risk  
278 assessment done prior to, or at, PrEP initiation. Exceptions to this were the two MSM-focused

279 outreach programs (Site 1: 86.3% and Site 2: 54.7%), the FSW-focused clinic (84.4%) and outreach  
280 (86.7%) (Site 3) and the TVET-focused outreach program (Site 6, 86.7%).

281

## 282 **Resource utilization and unit costs**

283 The average six-month resource utilization by site and service delivery model is shown in Table 5. In  
284 general, there was higher resource utilization in the in-facility SDMs than in the outreach SDMs. The  
285 average number of visits was 2.3 (standard deviation (SD) of 1.7) for the in-facility models and 1.5 (SD:  
286 1.0) for the outreach models. This varied for the specific sites, with MSM Site 2 (in-facility) having the  
287 highest average number of visits of 3.0 (SD: 1.5) and the affiliated outreach program having the lowest  
288 at 1.0 (SD: 0.1) over the six month period. Across all population groups, the average number of days  
289 PrEP was dispensed was higher in the in-facility models (mean: 83, SD: 65) than in the outreach models  
290 (mean: 51, SD: 42); this difference between models was greatest among the MSM-focused programs  
291 with the outreach programs having the least PrEP dispensed on average (mean: 32; SD: 15) and in-  
292 facility having the most (mean: 124; SD: 61). Drug dispensing for sexually transmitted infections and  
293 other conditions were also observed, with 121 (9.4%) of PrEP-clients receiving STI treatment and 221  
294 (17.3%) receiving other medication during the first six months post PrEP initiation. Higher proportions  
295 of PrEP-clients received STI treatment in the FSW-focused models (14.1-33.3%) compared to the  
296 AGYW-focused models (0-4.2%). The mean number of HIV tests administered over the six months post  
297 PrEP initiation was 1.87 (SD: 1.22) and 1.43 (SD: 0.84) for in-facility and outreach models respectively.  
298 About one creatinine test was done per PrEP-client over the same period, while the other laboratory  
299 tests were done less frequently.

300

## 301 **PrEP-client outcomes**

302 Overall, the majority (1,191/1,281, 93.0%) of PrEP-clients initiated PrEP the same day as their negative  
303 HIV test. One notable exception was the MSM-focused clinic (Site 1), where only a third (32/98, 32.7%)  
304 of clients were same-day initiators (Table 6). The proportion of PrEP-clients returning for at least one  
305 follow-up visit varied greatly, from only 1.9% at one MSM-focused outreach program to 90.5% at an  
306 FSW-focused clinic. Similarly, time in care at six months ranged from an average of 28.9 days (SD: 8.2)  
307 to 126 (SD: 61.2) across sites. Our primary outcome, PrEP coverage at six months, varied greatly across  
308 SDMs, but was low overall; the highest coverage observed was in an in-facility program focused on  
309 reaching MSM (41.8%) while an MSM-focused outreach program had no PrEP-clients with coverage  
310 at six months. In general, in-facility programs had higher six-month coverage than the outreach  
311 programs, with the exception of one of the FSW-focused programs where the outreach program had  
312 a higher coverage (22.4%) compared to the in-facility program (13.5%). The AGYW-focused programs

313 had low coverage, ranging from 4.4% to 15.5% at six months. Three clients (two at an FSW-focused  
314 clinic and one at an AGYW-focused clinic) acquired HIV during the study six-month follow-up period.

315  
316 Similar patterns are observed among the PrEP clients with 12 months of potential follow-up (n=633),  
317 with average time in care ranging from 41 days (SD: 42) to 221 (SD: 127). Across all included programs,  
318 PrEP coverage at 12 months was 13.6% (86/633), with variability across sites and programs. The MSM-  
319 focused clinic had 12-month PrEP coverage of 35.1%, while its accompanying outreach program had  
320 no PrEP-clients with this coverage. The two FSW-focused clinics and outreach programs ranged from  
321 9.7% to 19.5% coverage at 12 months, while the AGYW-focused site had 4.4% and 6.1% coverage for  
322 the in-facility and outreach programs respectively.

323

### 324 **Costs and cost outcomes**

325 When considering all included clients initiated on PrEP, the average cost per PrEP-client ranged from  
326 \$29 for an MSM-focused outreach program to \$590 for an FSW-focused in-facility program, with  
327 higher average costs generally observed for the in-facility programs (Table 7). When estimating the  
328 costs for only those who achieved the primary outcome (PrEP coverage at six months), the average  
329 cost per PrEP client ranged from \$108 at one of the FSW-focused outreach programs to \$959 at an  
330 FSW-focused in-facility program. Overall, the in-facility programs resulted in higher average costs per  
331 PrEP client compared to the accompanying outreach program. This trend held when considering the  
332 average cost per PrEP-client among those with PrEP coverage at six months, with the in-facility  
333 programs ranging from \$159 to \$920 and the outreach programs from \$108 to \$220 over six months.  
334 While the average costs might have been lower for outreach programs, the production costs, or six-  
335 month costs to produce one client with six-month PrEP coverage were, on average, much higher. The  
336 exception to this were the FSW-outreach programs which had lower production costs than the  
337 corresponding in-facility programs.

338

### 339 **Discussion**

340

341 In this micro-costing study, we estimated the real-world outcomes and costs of PrEP provision across  
342 seven sites that made up 12 SDMs reaching MSM, FSW and AGYW populations. The costs of six months  
343 of PrEP provision varied widely across sites and service delivery models from \$29 to \$590 per client  
344 initiated and \$108 to \$959 among those who achieved PrEP coverage at six months. These costs were  
345 largely driven by clinic personnel and fixed costs, which is similar to costs published from other studies  
346 in the region (29-31). Meyer-Rath et al. (32) used an ingredients-based approach relying on expert

347 opinion, available literature and several assumptions to estimate the cost per client year for the first  
348 year on PrEP for young women in South Africa, obtaining an estimate of approximately US\$124; no  
349 specific SDM was indicated. This is generally lower than estimated through this costing of real-world  
350 service delivery, highlighting the importance of micro-costing in providing a more granular view of  
351 costs and associated outcomes of PrEP provision, which is key for future program, intervention and  
352 budget planning. When compared to the published costs of providing PrEP in other micro-costing  
353 studies done in the region, the costs observed in these SDMs are generally higher, with annual costs  
354 ranging from \$92 to \$943 per year in these studies (31, 33-39). Two possible explanations for these  
355 differing results are the more extensive inclusion of programmatic costs and relatively low PrEP client  
356 volumes in the SDMs with particularly high costs. Some of the SDMs were still within their first year  
357 or two of PrEP provision and this may have contributed to both low client volumes and low PrEP  
358 persistence as models were still learning how to effectively promote PrEP among those who might  
359 benefit from it.

360

361 Overall, in-facility programs were costlier per person on PrEP than the outreach programs, however,  
362 they generally had better PrEP coverage at six months, resulting in lower production costs. A notable  
363 exception to this were the FSW outreach programs which had lower production costs than the in-  
364 facility programs, highlighting the need for differentiated programs that focus on PrEP-client needs –  
365 in this case, PrEP service delivery offered at the FSWs places of work. Some of the high costs can be  
366 attributed to the low PrEP-client volume and we observe patterns of lower costs with higher client  
367 volumes. This could indicate potential for economies of scale for these programs.

368

369 Across all sites and service delivery models we observed low PrEP coverage over time, ranging from  
370 0% to 50% at six months post PrEP initiation. This is in line with other literature from the region (31,  
371 40). This is concerning given that these groups are disproportionately affected by HIV. AGYW accounted  
372 for 25% of new HIV infections in 2020, despite representing just 10% of the population in SSA with an  
373 estimated 4,200 AGYW infected with HIV every week in 2020 (1, 6). Additionally, in 2020, key  
374 populations (sex workers and their clients, gay men and other men who have sex with men, people  
375 who inject drugs, transgender people) and their sexual partners accounted for 65% of HIV infections  
376 globally, and accounted for 39% of new HIV infections in sub-Saharan Africa (6). The associated costs  
377 presented here will be helpful in future budget planning for interventions aimed at improving the low  
378 PrEP coverage among populations at risk of HIV acquisition in the SSA region.

379

380 There are several limitations in this study. Firstly, the limited information available around ongoing  
381 risk in the PrEP cohort limits any conclusions about who is persisting versus discontinuing on PrEP.  
382 Risk assessments were not captured at all visits and the reasons for stopping PrEP and changes in risk  
383 cannot be determined. Therefore, apart from three clients who seroconverted during the six month  
384 follow-up period, it is not known whether PrEP-client changes in outcomes were due to changes in  
385 risk, adoption of other HIV prevention mechanisms or simply discontinuation of PrEP with no change  
386 in HIV acquisition risk. Additionally, the documentation of risk or reason for PrEP initiation at first visit  
387 was not standardized and, as such we are unable to say whether these programs were initiating the  
388 people who would most benefit from being on PrEP. We were also not able to trace the movement of  
389 clients from one site or model to another. We therefore are not able to accurately distinguish transfer  
390 of PrEP care to another facility from loss-to-follow-up. With regards to costing, demand creation  
391 efforts were not captured in a systematic and measurable way so we are unable to differentiate those  
392 costs from the broader fixed costs of the program. Additionally, we only captured resource utilization  
393 from the point of PrEP initiation, so we are unable to attribute any costs associated with PrEP demand  
394 creation and screening at the individual level. It is becoming increasingly clear that these are important  
395 components of PrEP provision programs that need to be included when considering PrEP program  
396 scale-up.

397  
398 Despite these limitations, our study is an important addition to the PrEP cost literature in the SSA  
399 region, providing vital outcome and unit cost data on real world PrEP provision in South Africa across  
400 a diverse set of service delivery models and populations. These data may be used to strengthen budget  
401 impact and cost-effectiveness analyses, providing crucial information for further scale-up of the oral  
402 PrEP program in South Africa and the greater SSA region.

## 403 **Acknowledgements**

404 We are grateful to the men and women who contributed their data to this study. We thank the  
405 implementing partners and clinic staff for their time and efforts in providing us with the data required  
406 to carry out this analysis. Additionally, we thank the study staff (Nkamoheleng Mokhesi, Nonhlanhla  
407 Tshabalala, Portia Ngwenya, William Magolego and Lerato Molapo) for their excellent assistance in  
408 data collection.

409

## 410 **Funding**

411 This study has been made possible by the generous support of the American People and the  
412 President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) through US Agency for International  
413 Development (USAID) under the terms of Cooperative Agreement 72067419CA00004 to HE<sup>2</sup>RO. CH  
414 was supported by the Fogarty International Center and National Institute of Mental Health through  
415 the National Institutes of Health award number D43 TW010543. LL was supported by the National  
416 Institute of Mental Health of the National Institutes of Health award number K01MH119923. The  
417 contents are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of PEPFAR,  
418 USAID, NIH or the US Government.

419

## 420 **Competing interests**

421 All authors declare that they have no competing interests.

422

## 423 **Author contributions**

424 CH and LCL led conception of the manuscript, design as well as drafting the manuscript, data analysis  
425 and interpretation of results with contributions from KH, CM and MB. KH, CM and MB contributed to  
426 the acquisition of the data, analysis and interpretation of the data and critical revision of the  
427 manuscript. RB, JM, and CS contributed by providing site and resource utilization data. BN contributed  
428 in the critical revision of the manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the  
429 manuscript.

430

## 431 **Data sharing statement**

432 The underlying individual level patient resource data and costs remain the property of the study sites.  
433 On application to the study team specific site level and ethics approval can be obtained as required.

434

435 **Figure legends**

436 *No figures included*

437

438



## Tables

**Table 1: Site and service delivery model descriptions**

Site	Delivery model	Management type	Location	Services offered	Population targeted	PrEP program start date	Total 2019 patient volume	Total 2019 PrEP volume	Proportion PrEP
MSM Site 1	Standalone specialised clinic	NGO	Johannesburg, Gauteng	PrEP, HCT, HIV treatment (ARV) and management, STI screening and treatment, TB screening and referral, Sexual health and lifestyle education and awareness; Community workshops and events; Provision of services at events and venues	MSM	2019	1681	716	43%
MSM Site 1	Mobile outreach	NGO	Johannesburg, Gauteng	PrEP, HCT, HIV treatment (ARV) and management, STI screening and treatment, TB screening and referral, Sexual health and lifestyle education and awareness; Community workshops and events; Provision of services at events and venues	MSM	2019	19966	728	4%
MSM Site 2	Standalone specialised clinic	NGO	Tshwane, Gauteng	PrEP, HCT, HIV treatment (ARV) and management, STI screening and treatment, TB screening and referral, Sexual health and lifestyle education and awareness; Community workshops and events; Provision of services at events and venues	MSM	2017	4720	1908	40%
MSM Site 2	Mobile outreach	NGO	Tshwane, Gauteng	PrEP, HCT, HIV treatment (ARV) and management, STI screening and treatment, TB screening and referral, Sexual health and lifestyle education and awareness; Community workshops and events; Provision of services at events and venues	MSM	2017	3705	942	25%
FSW Site 1	Standalone specialised clinic	NGO	Johannesburg, Gauteng	PrEP, ART, STI's, Family Planning, TB and HCT	SW	2015	1339	424	32%
FSW Site 1	Mobile outreach	NGO	Johannesburg, Gauteng	PrEP, ART, STI's, Family Planning, TB and HCT	SW	2015	16535	1253	8%
FSW Site 2	Standalone specialised clinic	NGO	Tshwane, Gauteng	PrEP, ART, STI's, Family Planning, TB and HCT	SW	2015	632	159	25%
FSW Site 2	Mobile outreach	NGO	Tshwane, Gauteng	PrEP, ART, STI's, Family Planning, TB and HCT	SW	2015	10472	823	8%
FSW Site 3	Mobile outreach	NGO	Ekurhuleni, Gauteng	PrEP, ART, STI's, Family Planning, TB and HCT	SW	2015	9454	858	9%
AGYW Site 1	Community Health Center (CHC)	Government	eThekwini, KwaZulu-Natal	PrEP, ART, SRH, Maternal, Mental health, Youth services and Child Health	AGYW	2017	367811	3025	1%
AGYW Site 1	Outreach to TVET campuses	NGO	eThekwini, KwaZulu-Natal	PrEP, ART, SRH, Maternal, Mental health, Youth services and Child Health	Tertiary students	2017	2030	2030	100%
AGYW Site 2	Standalone specialised clinic	Government	eThekwini, KwaZulu-Natal	PrEP, ART, SRH, Maternal, Youth services and Child Health	AGYW	2017	47139	3294	7%

**Abbreviations:** MSM: Men who have sex with men; SW: Sex worker; AGYW: Adolescent girls and young women; PHC: primary healthcare; TVET: Technical and vocational educational training; NGO: Non-governmental organisation; PrEP: Preexposure prophylaxis; ART: antiretroviral therapy; SRH: Sexual and reproductive health; TB: Tuberculosis; HCT: HIV counselling and testing; STI: Sexually transmitted infection

**Table 2: Costing methods and unit costs**

Resource	Method for estimating cost	Item	Unit	Cost (USD)	Source
Drugs	Pre-exposure prophylaxis and other drugs dispensed per PrEP-client during the study period were extracted from the individual client's clinic record. The published national drug unit costs were applied to determine total drug cost per client.	TDF/FTC	Tablet	0.14	Master Procurement Catalogue
Diagnostic and monitoring laboratory tests	Diagnostic tests included pregnancy tests, urine dipsticks, HIV tests. The actual number of tests performed per PrEP-client during the study period was extracted from the individual client's clinic record. The published unit cost per test was applied to determine the laboratory cost per PrEP-client.  All laboratory and monitoring tests after PrEP initiation were performed off site by the National Health Laboratory Service. The actual number of tests performed per PrEP-client during the study period was extracted from the individual client's clinic record. The published unit cost per test was applied to determine the laboratory cost per PrEP-client.	HIV Rapid Screen Test	Test	3.05	Department of Health National Laboratory price lists
		HIV Serology	Test	3.82	
		Alanine Transaminase	Test	3.14	
		Hepatitis B Surface Ag Rapid	Test	8.71	
		Hepatitis B Surface Ab	Test	8.71	
		Urine Dipstick	Test	0.89	
		RPR*	Test	1.48	
		Treponema Hemagglutination	Test	5.95	
		Latex Test for Pregnancy	Test	2.33	
		BHCG Qualitative	Test	5.87	
		Aspartate Transaminase	Test	3.14	
Alanine Transaminase	Test	3.14			
Haemoglobin	Test	1.25			
Clinical staff time for PrEP-client care	Clinical staff time was defined as including any doctor, nurse, and HIV lay counselor time spent with the PrEP-client. The clinical staff time cost was calculated by taking the total PrEP clinical staff cost per month and dividing it by the total PrEP visits to the clinic per month to get the average clinical staff cost per visit. Clinical staff salaries were obtained from the site and/or implementing partner salary scales for that cadre.	Not applicable (site specific)	N/A	N/A	Site and/or implementing partner salary scales

Buildings and equipment	<p>The total floor space allocated to the PrEP program was calculated by measuring the PrEP care floor space and adding on a proportion of floor space shared by different services (i.e. waiting rooms). A market related average rental cost per square meter was applied to estimate the cost of the building. Electricity costs were obtained for the facility and applied by square meter. Water and effluent costs were not available for the facility and cost per square meter was estimated based on a similar building. The replacement cost of equipment was obtained and a working life of 5 years applied to obtain a cost per month. All PrEP specific equipment was included and a proportion of equipment from shared spaces was included. The building and equipment costs were apportioned to each PrEP-client based on a per-visit cost.</p>	Not applicable (site specific)	N/A	N/A	Site and/or implementing partner financial records
Management and administration costs	<p>All staff members who did not provide direct patient care but provided some support to the PrEP program (i.e. clinic manager, data clerks) were included. Staff salaries were obtained from published public sector salaries for that cadre. The cost of all general supplies (i.e. not related to a particular service) was obtained from facility financial reports. Management and administration costs were apportioned to each PrEP-client based on a per visit cost. All costs for management and administration incurred at the site level (i.e. the primary health clinic) were included. Costs incurred above the level of the site were excluded.</p>	Not applicable (site specific)	N/A	N/A	Site and/or implementing partner financial records

**Table 3: Outcome definitions**

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Time points</b>
Same-day initiation (percentage)	Participant initiated PrEP on the day of presentation for HIV test. Participants that did not initiate on the same day would have had separate visits for HIV testing and PrEP initiation.	Singular
Engaged in care after PrEP initiation visit (percentage)	Participant attended at least one visit after PrEP initiation within the follow up period. This is a measure of short-term persistence. Many studies have reported rapid attrition after initiation, which this outcome measures.	Singular
Engaged in care (percentage)	Participant attended at least one visit at, or after, specific time point post PrEP initiation. This cannot be reported at 12 months as we did not collect any data related >12 months after PrEP initiation.	3, 6, 9 months
Time in care (days)	Total number of PrEP tablets dispensed during the follow up period. We excluded any tablets dispensed at the last visit which would have covered time outside the follow up period. For example, a participant has 5 visits within 12 months. At the first 4 visits a total of 300 tablets are dispensed. Visit 5 occurs at 330 days and 90 tablets are dispensed, but only 35 of those tablets are counted towards time in care. Time in care for this participant is 335 at 12 months.	6, 12 months
PrEP Coverage	At the PrEP client's last visit in the follow up period, they were dispensed sufficient drug to cover them to the end of the follow up period.	3, 6, 9, 12 months

1 **Table 4: Characteristics of PrEP clients at PrEP initiation by site type and service delivery model (n=1,281)**

		MSM Site 1		MSM Site 2		FSW Site 1		FSW Site 2		FSW Site 3	AGYW Site 1		AGYW Site 2
		In-facility (n=98)	Outreach (n=139)	In-facility (n=102)	Outreach (n=53)	In-facility (n=96)	Outreach (n=98)	In-facility (n=42)	Outreach (n=99)	Outreach (n=96)	In-facility (n=168)	Outreach (n=90)	In-facility (n=200)
<b>Potential for 12-month follow up</b>	Yes (%)	97 (99.0)	71 (51.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	93 (96.9)	98 (100)	41 (97.6)	99 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	68 (40.5)	66 (73.3)	0 (0)
<b>Age at PrEP initiation</b>	Mean (SD)	35.6 (11.5)	30.4 (8.0)	32.1 (9.5)	31.6 (8.3)	30.3 (6.1)	29.5 (5.5)	30.7 (7.6)	29.7 (6.7)	28.9 (6.2)	23.1 (7.5)	23.3 (5.3)	25.1 (6.92)
	Median [IQR]	34 [26, 42]	29 [25, 35]	30 [25, 36]	31 [25, 36]	30 [26, 35]	29 [26, 33]	30 [26, 34]	29 [25, 34]	28 [25, 32]	21 [17, 26]	22 [21, 25]	24 [19, 29]
<b>Sex</b>	Male (%)	98 (100.0)	139 (100.0)	101 (99.0)	53 (100.0)	16 (16.7)	7 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	4 (4.0)	0 (0.0)	27 (16.1)	16 (17.8)	4 (2.0)
	Female (%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)	80 (83.3)	91 (92.9)	42 (100.0)	95 (96.0)	96 (100.0)	141 (83.9)	74 (82.2)	196 (98.0)
<b>Population<sup>a</sup></b>	MSM (%)	92 (93.9)	61 (43.9)	94 (92.2)	10 (18.9)	6 (6.2)	4 (4.1)	0 (0.0)	4 (4.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5)
	FSW (%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	66 (68.8)	86 (87.8)	40 (95.2)	93 (93.9)	96 (100)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.0)
	AGYW (%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.0)	0 (0.0)	111 (66.1)	51 (56.7)	110 (55.0)
	PWID, SDC, TGW, TGM or MSW (%)	2 (2.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (2.9)	1 (1.9)	0 (0.0)	3 (3.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)
	Heterosexual males (%)	1 (1.0)	40 (28.8)	2 (2.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	19 (11.3)	5 (5.6)	3 (1.5)
	Females >24 years of age (%)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	30 (17.9)	17 (18.9)	84 (42.0)
	Not indicated (%)	3 (3.1)	38 (27.3)	3 (2.9)	42 (79.2)	19 (19.8)	5 (5.1)	2 (4.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (4.8)	16 (17.8)	0 (0.0)
<b>Year of PrEP initiation</b>	2018 (%)	61 (62.2)	57 (41.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	52 (54.2)	19 (19.4)	34 (81.0)	8 (8.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	55 (61.1)	1 (0.5)
	2019 (%)	37 (37.8)	82 (59.0)	102 (100.0)	53 (100.0)	44 (45.8)	79 (80.6)	8 (19.0)	91 (91.9)	96 (100.0)	168 (100.0)	35 (38.9)	199 (99.5)
<b>Indication for PrEP</b>	Risk assessment by HCW (%)	34 (34.7)	6 (4.3)	81 (79.4)	9 (17.0)	42 (43.8)	65 (66.3)	9 (21.4)	33 (33.3)	77 (80.2)	120 (71.4)	52 (57.8)	165 (82.5)
	Requested by client (%)	62 (63.3)	132 (95.0)	16 (15.7)	29 (54.7)	31 (32.3)	30 (30.6)	33 (78.6)	65 (65.7)	13 (13.5)	48 (28.6)	27 (30.0)	34 (17.0)
	No reason provided (%)	2 (2.0)	1 (0.7)	5 (4.9)	15 (28.3)	23 (24.0)	3 (3.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.0)	6 (6.2)	0 (0.0)	11 (12.2)	1 (0.5)
<b>Risk assessment completed prior to or at PrEP initiation</b>	Yes (%)	95 (96.9)	120 (86.3)	100 (98.0)	29 (54.7)	81 (84.4)	85 (86.7)	42 (100.0)	99 (100.0)	95 (99.0)	168 (100.0)	78 (86.7)	199 (99.5)

<sup>a</sup>MSM includes 8 participants who indicated that they are bisexual

2  
3

4 **Table 5: Six-month resource utilisation by site and service delivery model**

		MSM Site 1		MSM Site 2		FSW Site 1		FSW Site 2		FSW Site 3	AGYW Site 1		AGYW Site 2
6-month cohort (n=1,281)		In-facility (N=98)	Outreach (N=139)	In-facility (N=102)	Outreach (N=53)	In-facility (N=96)	Outreach (N=98)	In-facility (N=42)	Outreach (N=99)	Outreach (N=96)	In-facility (N=168)	Outreach (N=90)	In-facility (N=200)
<b>Visits and healthcare worker interactions</b>													
Number of visits	Mean (SD)	2.7 (1.1)	1.0 (0.2)	3.0 (1.5)	1.0 (0.1)	1.6 (1.0)	1.9 (1.0)	3.1 (2.0)	2.2 (1.5)	1.7 (1.0)	2.1 (1.7)	1.3 (0.7)	2.2 (1.9)
	Median [Q1, Q3]	3 [2, 3]	1 [1, 1]	3 [2, 4]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 2]	2 [1, 2]	3 [2, 5]	2 [1, 3]	1 [1, 2]	1 [1, 3]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 3]
Number of nurse interactions	Mean (SD)	2.7 (1.1)	1.1 (0.2)	3.0 (1.5)	1.1 (0.3)	1.6 (1.0)	1.9 (1.0)	2.9 (1.6)	2.2 (1.5)	1.7 (1.0)	2.1 (1.7)	1.3 (0.7)	2.2 (1.9)
	Median [Q1, Q3]	3 [2, 3]	1 [1, 1]	3 [2, 4]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 2]	2 [1, 2]	3 [2, 4]	2 [1, 3]	1 [1, 2]	1 [1, 3]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 3]
Number of counsellor interactions	Mean (SD)	2.6 (1.1)	1.1 (0.2)	2.6 (1.2)	0.9 (0.5)	1.5 (0.8)	1.8 (1.0)	2.7 (1.6)	2.2 (1.3)	1.7 (1.0)	1.3 (1.7)	1.0 (0.8)	1.7 (1.6)
	Median [Q1, Q3]	3 [2, 3]	1 [1, 1]	3 [2, 4]	1 [1, 1]	1 [1, 2]	2 [1, 2]	2 [2, 4]	2 [1, 3]	1 [1, 2]	1 [0, 1]	1 [0.3, 1]	1 [1, 2]
<b>Drugs, medications or devices dispensed</b>													
Days of PrEP dispensed	Mean (SD)	130.0 (62.8)	32.9 (16.9)	119.0 (59.6)	30.6 (4.12)	68.3 (58.9)	79.6 (63.1)	79.6 (54.1)	66.0 (44.3)	57.8 (42.5)	65.2 (65.3)	37.4 (19.7)	64.5 (55.3)
	Median	120	30	120	30	30	59	60	60	30	30	30	30
	[Q1, Q3]	[120, 186]	[30, 30]	[60, 163]	[30, 30]	[30, 120]	[30, 120]	[30, 120]	[30, 120]	[30, 90]	[30, 90]	[30, 90]	[30, 30]
Number of PrEP-clients who had STI medication dispensed <sup>a</sup>	n (%)	4 (4.1%)	0 (0.0%)	15 (14.7%)	2 (3.8%)	18 (18.8%)	19 (19.4%)	10 (23.8%)	14 (14.1%)	32 (33.3%)	7 (4.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Number of PrEP-clients who had any other medication dispensed <sup>b</sup>	n (%)	5 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	20 (19.6%)	2 (3.8%)	26 (27.1%)	41 (41.8%)	21 (50.0%)	42 (42.4%)	53 (55.2%)	9 (5.4%)	2 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>Laboratory tests conducted</b>													
HIV test	Mean (SD)	2.0 (1.0)	1.0 (0.2)	2.6 (1.2)	1.0 (0.2)	1.4 (0.7)	1.7 (1.0)	2.2 (1.2)	1.9 (1.1)	1.6 (1.0)	1.9 (1.5)	1.3 (0.6)	1.6 (1.1)
Creatinine test	Mean (SD)	1.2 (1.0)	1.0 (0.2)	1.0 (0.7)	0.2 (0.5)	1.2 (0.6)	1.2 (0.6)	1.6 (0.7)	1.4 (0.7)	0.8 (0.5)	1.0 (0.4)	0.8 (0.5)	1.0 (0.3)
HBsAg test <sup>c</sup>	Mean (SD)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.2 (0.5)	0.0 (0.1)	0.0 (0.1)	0.0 (0.1)	0.1 (0.4)	0.0 (0.2)	0.0 (0.0)	0.7 (0.5)	0.5 (0.5)	0.0 (0.1)
HBsAb test <sup>d</sup>	Mean (SD)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.9 (0.6)	0.1 (0.3)	0.8 (0.6)	0.9 (0.4)	0.9 (0.5)	0.8 (0.4)	0.8 (0.5)	1.0 (0.3)	0.7 (0.4)	1.0 (0.2)
Syphilis rapid test	Mean (SD)	0.0 (0.2)	0.0 (0.0)	0.5 (0.9)	0.1 (0.4)	0.5 (0.5)	0.5 (0.5)	0.9 (0.4)	0.8 (0.5)	0.0 (0.1)	0.9 (0.3)	0.7 (0.4)	0.9 (0.3)
Pregnancy test	Mean (SD)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.1 (0.4)	0.3 (0.8)	0.5 (0.9)	0.4 (0.9)	1.2 (0.9)	1.3 (1.4)	0.7 (0.8)	0.9 (0.4)
Other <sup>e</sup>	Mean (SD)	0.2 (0.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.5 (0.7)	0.2 (0.4)	0.2 (0.5)	0.1 (0.4)	0.2 (0.4)	0.1 (0.3)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.2)	0.1 (0.3)	0.0 (0.0)

<sup>a</sup>STI medications include: Ceftriaxone, Cefuroxime, Metronidazole, Doxycycline, Azithromycin, Benzathine Penicillin, Flucloxacillin and Acyclovir.

<sup>b</sup>Other medications include: Paracetamol, Ibuprofen, Diclofenac, Amlodipine, Augmentin, Ciprofloxacin, Bactrim, Allergex, Amoxicillin, Illiadin, Combined Oral contraceptives, Progesterone injection, Saline nasal spray.

<sup>c</sup>Hepatitis B surface antigen

<sup>d</sup>Hepatitis B antibody to surface antigen

<sup>e</sup>Other laboratory tests conducted include: AST, ALT, Hb, Urine dipstix, Papsmear, Hepatitis A IgM, Hepatitis C Antibody, GeneXpert

5

6

**Table 6: Six- and 12-month outcomes by site and service delivery model**

		MSM Site 1		MSM Site 2		FSW Site 1		FSW Site 2		FSW Site 3	AGYW Site 1		AGYW Site 2	Overall	
		In facility	Outreach	In facility	Outreach	In facility	Outreach	In facility	Outreach	Outreach	In facility	Outreach	In facility	In facility	Outreach
		(N=98)	(N=139)	(N=102)	(N=53)	(N=96)	(N=98)	(N=42)	(N=99)	(N=96)	(N=168)	(N=90)	(N=200)	(N=706)	(N=575)
<b>6-month cohort (n=1281)</b>															
<b>Same-day PrEP initiation</b>	Yes (%)	32 (32.7%)	135 (97.1%)	100 (98.0%)	50 (94.3%)	92 (95.8%)	97 (99.0%)	42 (100%)	98 (99.0%)	96 (100%)	164 (97.6%)	89 (98.9%)	196 (98.0%)	626 (88.7%)	565 (98.3%)
<b>PrEP-client had at least one follow up visit<sup>a</sup></b>	Yes (%)	82 (83.7%)	6 (4.3%)	82 (80.4%)	1 (1.9%)	35 (36.5%)	53 (54.1%)	33 (78.6%)	58 (58.6%)	38 (39.6%)	68 (40.5%)	16 (17.8%)	76 (38.0%)	376 (53.3%)	172 (29.9%)
<b>Time between PrEP initiation and first follow-up (days)<sup>b</sup></b>	Mean (SD)	31.2 (21.6)	71.8 (56.5)	32.0 (18.1)	NA	59.1 (45.4)	67.3 (51.4)	48.4 (32.2)	49.6 (36.6)	62.0 (36.3)	36.6 (25.4)	55.2 (49.0)	36.8 (17.4)	37.5 (26.3)	58.8 (43.7)
	Median (IQR)	25.0 [21.0,29.8]	48.5 [43.5,83.5]	28.0 [27.0,29.0]	0.0 [0.0,0.0]	35.0 [28.0,74.0]	29.0 [28.0,115.0]	32.0 [28.0,59.0]	28.0 [28.0,77.8]	58.5 [28.0,83.5]	28.0 [28.0,33.0]	34.5 [28.0,55.8]	28.0 [28.0,37.0]	28.0 [27.0,34.0]	33.0 [28.0,84.5]
<b>Time in care at 6 months (days)<sup>c</sup></b>	Mean (SD)	132 (57.4)	36.1 (25.0)	128 (59.8)	32.3 (9.88)	97.0 (54.7)	108 (60.9)	121 (63.3)	90.3 (63.9)	78.3 (60.9)	72.5 (61.4)	47.4 (44.2)	70.1 (59.5)	94.3 (64.6)	66.2 (56.6)
	Median (IQR)	142 [104,183]	30.0 [30.0,30.0]	146 [67.3,183]	30.0 [30.0,30.0]	90.0 [30.0,144]	116 [30.0,183]	143 [58.3,183]	58.0 [30.0,166]	30.0 [30.0,136]	30.0 [30.0,118]	30.0 [30.0,30.0]	30.0 [30.0,92.5]	88.0 [30.0,182]	30.0 [30.0,90.0]
<b>Engaged in care<sup>d</sup></b>	At 3 months (%)	55 (56.1%)	4 (2.9%)	53 (52.0%)	0 (0%)	29 (30.2%)	41 (41.8%)	30 (71.4%)	38 (38.4%)	22 (22.9%)	40 (23.8%)	11 (12.2%)	41 (20.5%)	248 (35.1%)	116 (20.2%)
<b>PrEP coverage<sup>e</sup></b>	At 3 months (%)	78 (79.6%)	6 (4.3%)	69 (67.6%)	0 (0%)	36 (37.5%)	52 (53.1%)	25 (59.5%)	38 (38.4%)	33 (34.4%)	48 (28.6%)	9 (10.0%)	51 (25.5%)	307 (43.5%)	138 (24.0%)
	At 6 months (%)	41 (41.8%)	1 (0.7%)	38 (37.3%)	0 (0%)	13 (13.5%)	22 (22.4%)	9 (21.4%)	13 (13.1%)	9 (9.4%)	22 (13.1%)	4 (4.4%)	31 (15.5%)	154 (21.8%)	49 (8.5%)
<b>Reason for not being covered with PrEP at 6 months<sup>f</sup></b>	Death (%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	HIV seroconversion (%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.4%)	0 (0%)
	Reported as having stopped PrEP (%)	2 (2.0%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (1.0%)	5 (9.4%)	1 (1.0%)	3 (3.1%)	2 (4.8%)	5 (5.1%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (0.6%)	1 (1.1%)	7 (3.5%)	14 (2.0%)	16 (2.8%)
	Reason unknown (%)	33 (33.7%)	21 (15.1%)	15 (14.7%)	45 (84.9%)	41 (42.7%)	53 (54.1%)	6 (14.3%)	12 (12.1%)	51 (53.1%)	105 (62.5%)	39 (43.3%)	61 (30.5%)	261 (37.0%)	221 (38.4%)
<b>12-month cohort (n=633)</b>															
<b>Same-day PrEP initiation</b>	Yes (%)	32 (33.0%)	68 (95.8%)	-	-	90 (96.8%)	97 (99.0%)	41 (100%)	98 (99.0%)	-	66 (97.1%)	66 (100%)	-	229 (76.6%)	329 (98.5%)
<b>PrEP-client had at least one follow up visit<sup>a</sup></b>	Yes (%)	83 (85.6%)	6 (8.5%)	-	-	37 (39.8%)	58 (59.2%)	37 (90.2%)	59 (59.6%)	-	27 (39.7%)	14 (21.2%)	-	184 (61.5%)	137 (41.0%)
<b>Time between PrEP initiation and first follow-up (days)<sup>b</sup></b>	Mean (SD)	32.3 (30.1)	71.8 (56.5)	-	-	79.3 (75.0)	80.5 (68.9)	79.4 (78.9)	52.1 (41.0)	-	49.5 (50.5)	102 (114)	-	53.7 (59.8)	70.1 (66.1)
	Median (IQR)	25.0 [21.0,29.5]	48.5 [43.5,83.5]	-	-	41.0 [28.0,111]	29.5 [28.0,127]	34.0 [29.0,96.0]	28.0 [28.0,83.5]	-	29.0 [28.0,37.5]	35.0 [28.0,149]	-	29.0 [25.0,49.3]	31.0 [28.0,106]
<b>Time in care at 12 months (days)<sup>c</sup></b>	Mean (SD)	220 (133)	41 (42)	-	-	122 (126)	155 (129)	221 (127)	137 (128)	-	88 (104)	69 (95)	-	160 (136)	108 (118)
	Median (IQR)	201 [113,365]	30 [30,30]	-	-	30 [30,209]	118 [30,262]	227 [114,352]	58 [30,259]	-	30 [30,98]	30 [30,30]	-	114 [30,320]	140 [30,146]
<b>Engaged in care<sup>d</sup></b>	At 9 months (%)	38 (39.2%)	0 (0%)	-	-	12 (12.9%)	16 (16.3%)	15 (36.6%)	17 (17.2%)	-	6 (8.8%)	4 (6.1%)	-	71 (23.7%)	37 (11.1%)
<b>PrEP coverage<sup>e</sup></b>	At 9 months (%)	44 (45.4%)	1 (1.4%)	-	-	21 (22.6%)	22 (22.4%)	18 (43.9%)	24 (24.2%)	-	8 (11.8%)	6 (9.1%)	-	91 (30.4%)	53 (15.9%)
	At 12 months (%)	34 (35.1%)	0 (0%)	-	-	9 (9.7%)	15 (15.3%)	8 (19.5%)	13 (13.1%)	-	3 (4.4%)	4 (6.1%)	-	54 (18.1%)	32 (9.6%)
<b>Reason for not being covered with PrEP at 12 months<sup>f</sup></b>	Death (%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	-	-	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	-	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	-	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	HIV seroconversion (%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	-	-	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.1%)	0 (0%)	-	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	-	3 (1.2%)	0 (0%)
	Reported as having stopped PrEP (%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (1.4%)	-	-	1 (1.2%)	4 (4.8%)	4 (12.1%)	4 (4.7%)	-	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.6%)	-	7 (2.9%)	10 (3.3%)

Reason unknown (%)	62 (98.4%)	70 (98.6%)	-	-	83 (98.8%)	79 (95.2%)	27 (81.8%)	82 (95.3%)	-	63 (96.9%)	61 (98.4%)	-	235 (95.9%)	292 (96.7%)
--------------------	---------------	---------------	---	---	---------------	------------	---------------	---------------	---	------------	---------------	---	-------------	-------------

<sup>a</sup>In addition to the PrEP initiation visit, the PrEP client had at least one additional visit within the time period (6 months or 12 months).  
<sup>b</sup>Among those who had at least one follow up visit within the time period (6 months or 12 months).  
<sup>c</sup>Total number of PrEP tablets dispensed excluding any over dispensing at the last visit - capped at the maximum follow up period (180 or 365).  
<sup>d</sup>Attended a visit at or past stipulated time period following PrEP initiation.  
<sup>e</sup>At the PrEP client's last visit in the follow up period, they were dispensed sufficient drug to cover them to the end of the follow up period.  
<sup>f</sup>Among those who were not dispensed sufficient drug to cover them to the end of the follow up period.  
Abbreviations: MSM: men-who-have-sex-with-men; FSW: female sex workers; AGYW: adolescent girls and young women; IQR: interquartile range.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14



15 **Table 7: Estimated costs per PrEP-client of six months of PrEP provision by site and service delivery model. Costs reported in 2021 USD (95% CI).**

Service delivery model	MSM Site 1		MSM Site 2		FSW Site 1		FSW Site 2		FSW Site 3	AGYW Site 1		AGYW Site 2
	In-facility	Outreach	In-facility	Outreach	In-facility	Outreach	In-facility	Outreach	Outreach	In-facility	Outreach	In-facility
<b>Proportion of clients with PrEP coverage at 6 months</b>	41/98 (41.8%)	1/139 (0.7%)	38/102 (37.3%)	0/53 (0%)	13/96 (13.5%)	22/98 (22.4%)	9/42 (21.4%)	13/99 (13.1%)	9/96 (9.4%)	22/168 (13.1%)	4/90 (4.4%)	31/200 (15.5%)
<b>Average 6-month cost per PrEP-client</b>												
All PrEP-clients	228 (208-248)	76 (73-79)	191 (175-208)	29 (26-31)	125 (111-140)	75 (68-83)	590 (488-692)	105 (93-117)	131 (116-147)	84 (76-92)	61 (55-68)	73 (66-80)
PrEP clients with PrEP coverage at 6 months	312 (293-332)	140	248 (236-262)	-	236 (204-268)	108 (92-125)	959 (753-1164)	220 (190-250)	276 (231-320)	179 (155-203)	132 (43-220)	170 (160-181)
<b>Average cost per person-month per PrEP-client<sup>a</sup></b>												
All PrEP-clients	58 (53-63)	71 (70-73)	53 (49-58)	28 (26-31)	68 (62-74)	32 (29-34)	182 (159-204)	44 (41-47)	66 (62-70)	47 (42-52)	48 (45-51)	37 (36-39)
PrEP clients with PrEP coverage at 6 months	52 (49-55)	23	142 (39-44)	-	39 (34-45)	18 (15-21)	160 (126-195)	37 (32-42)	46 (39-53)	30 (26-34)	22 (7-39)	28 (27-30)
<b>Cost breakdown for PrEP-clients with PrEP coverage at 6 months</b>												
Drugs	26 (24-28)	5	24 (23-26)	-	13 (13-13)	18 (14-22)	20 (13-26)	21 (17-25)	16 (11-21)	24 (17-31)	10 (1-19)	24 (22-26)
Lab tests	16 (14-19)	12	35 (30-39)	-	31 (24-38)	26 (21-30)	32 (28-37)	33 (27-39)	28 (23-34)	43 (38-49)	35 (6-63)	28 (25-30)
Clinic staff visit cost	133 (124-142)	47	127 (120-135)	-	89 (77-102)	15 (13-17)	744 (573-915)	60 (51-69)	23 (19-28)	69 (56-82)	45 (17-73)	61 (57-65)
Fixed costs (buildings, equipment, management, admin)	136 (128-146)	75	63 (58-67)	-	103 (89-117)	50 (43-57)	163 (130-196)	107 (90-124)	208 (170-245)	42 (37-48)	42 (16-67)	58 (54-62)
<b>Production cost of PrEP coverage at 6 months</b>	545	10,537	514	-	929	336	2,754	780	1,403	643	1,379	470

<sup>a</sup> Total cost per month divided by the total number of PrEP tablets dispensed excluding any over dispensing at the last visit - capped at the maximum follow up period (180 or 365).

<sup>b</sup> Above-site costs were collected for two sites and an 'above-site cost' was estimated for each PrEP-client in our sample at these sites. We then averaged this amount to determine an average 'above-site cost' for each PrEP-client overall and applied this cost over-and-above the costs collected at the other sites.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## References

1. UNAIDS. UNAIDS Data 2021 2021 [Available from: [https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media\\_asset/JC3032\\_AIDS\\_Data\\_book\\_2021\\_En.pdf](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/JC3032_AIDS_Data_book_2021_En.pdf).
2. UNAIDS. UNAIDS Data 2022 2022 [Available from: [https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media\\_asset/data-book-2022\\_en.pdf](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/data-book-2022_en.pdf).
3. UNAIDS. UNAIDS Factsheet 2022. 2022.
4. United Nations General Assembly. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 8 June 2016. 70/266 Political Declaration on HIV and AIDS: On the Fast Track to Accelerating the Fight against HIV and to Ending the AIDS Epidemic by 2030. 97th plenary meeting; 2016 8 June 2016.
5. Baeten JM, Donnell D, Ndase P, Mugo NR, Campbell JD, Wangisi J, et al. Antiretroviral Prophylaxis for HIV Prevention in Heterosexual Men and Women. *NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL OF MEDICINE*. 2012;367(5):399-410.
6. UNAIDS. Global AIDS Update 2021 2021 [Available from: [https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media\\_asset/JC3032\\_AIDS\\_Data\\_book\\_2021\\_En.pdf](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/JC3032_AIDS_Data_book_2021_En.pdf).
7. World Health Organization. Policy brief: pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP): WHO expands recommendation on oral pre-exposure prophylaxis of HIV infection (PrEP). Geneva: World Health Organization; 2015 2015. Contract No.: WHO/HIV/2015.48.
8. Case KK, Gomez GB, Hallett TB. The impact, cost and cost-effectiveness of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis in sub-Saharan Africa: a scoping review of modelling contributions and way forward. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. 2019;22(9):e25390.
9. Bershteyn A, Sharma M, Akullian AN, Peebles K, Sarkar S, Braithwaite RS, et al. Impact along the HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis "cascade of prevention" in western Kenya: a mathematical modelling study. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. 2020;23 Suppl 3(Suppl 3):e25527.
10. Pretorius C, Schnure M, Dent J, Glaubius R, Mahiane G, Hamilton M, et al. Modelling impact and cost-effectiveness of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis in 13 low-resource countries. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. 2020;23(2).
11. Price JT, Wheeler SB, Stranix-Chibanda L, Hosek SG, Watts DH, Siberry GK, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of Pre-exposure HIV Prophylaxis During Pregnancy and Breastfeeding in Sub-Saharan Africa. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;72 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S145-53.
12. Phillips AN, Bershteyn A, Revill P, Bansi-Matharu L, Kripke K, Boily M. C., Martin-Hughes R, Johnson L. F., Mukandavire Z, Jamieson L, Meyer-Rath G, Hallett T. B., Ten Brink D, Kelly S. L., Nichols B. E., Bendavid E, Mudimu E, Taramusi I, Smith J, Dalal S, Baggaley R, Crowley T, Terris-Prestholt F, Godfrey-Faussett P, Mukui I, Jahn A, Case K. K., Havlir D, Petersen M, Kanya M, Koss C. A., Balzer L. B., Apollo T, Chidarikire T, Mellors J. W., Parikh U. M., Godfrey C, Cambiano V. Cost-effectiveness of easy-access, risk-informed oral pre-exposure prophylaxis in HIV epidemics in sub-Saharan Africa: a modelling study. *The lancet HIV*. 2022;9(5):e353-e62.
13. Nichols BE, Baltussen R, van Dijk JH, Thuma PE, Nouwen JL, Boucher CA, et al. Cost-effectiveness of PrEP in HIV/AIDS control in Zambia: a stochastic league approach. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2014;66(2):221-8.
14. Nichols BE, Boucher CA, van Dijk JH, Thuma PE, Nouwen JL, Baltussen R, et al. Cost-effectiveness of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in preventing HIV-1 infections in rural Zambia: a modeling study. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(3):e59549.
15. Alistar SS, Grant PM, Bendavid E. Comparative effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of antiretroviral therapy and pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention in South Africa. *BMC medicine*. 2014;12:46.
16. Jamieson L, Gomez GB, Rebe K, Brown B, Subedar H, Jenkins S, et al. The impact of self-selection based on HIV risk on the cost-effectiveness of preexposure prophylaxis in South Africa. *Aids*. 2020;34(6):883-91.
17. van Vliet MM, Hendrickson C, Nichols BE, Boucher CA, Peters RP, van de Vijver DA. Epidemiological impact and cost-effectiveness of providing long-acting pre-exposure prophylaxis to injectable contraceptive users for HIV prevention in South Africa: a modelling study. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. 2019;22(12):e25427.
18. Vogelzang M, Terris-Prestholt F, Vickerman P, Delany-Moretlwe S, Travill D, Quaife M. Cost-Effectiveness of HIV Pre-exposure Prophylaxis Among Heterosexual Men in South Africa: A Cost-Utility Modeling Analysis. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2020;84(2):173-81.

- 76 19. Walensky RP, Park JE, Wood R, Freedberg KA, Scott CA, Bekker LG, et al. The cost-effectiveness  
77 of pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV infection in South African women. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*.  
78 2012;54(10):1504-13.
- 79 20. Phillips AN, Cambiano V, Johnson L, Nakagawa F, Homan R, Meyer-Rath G, et al. Potential Impact  
80 and Cost-Effectiveness of Condomless-Sex-Concentrated PrEP in KwaZulu-Natal Accounting for Drug  
81 Resistance. *The Journal of infectious diseases*. 2021;223(8):1345-55.
- 82 21. South African Department of Health. Guidelines for the provision of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP)  
83 to persons at substantial risk of HIV infection. 2020.
- 84 22. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap consortium:  
85 Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform*. 2019;95:103208.
- 86 23. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture  
87 (REDCap)—a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research  
88 informatics support. *Journal of biomedical informatics*. 2009;42(2):377-81.
- 89 24. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Global Health Cost Consortium [Available from:  
90 <https://ghcosting.org/>
- 91 25. Vassall A, Sweeney, S., Kahn, J.G., Gomez, G., Bollinger, L., Marseille, E., Herzel, B., DeCormier  
92 Plosky, W., Cunnam, L., Sinanovic, E., Bautista, S., GHCC Technical Advisory Group, GHCC Stakeholder  
93 Group, Harris, K., Lev C. Reference Case for Estimating the Costs of Global Health Services and  
94 Interventions. 2017.
- 95 26. Statistics South Africa. Consumer Price Index (CPI), March 2022 2022 [Available from:  
96 [https://www.statssa.gov.za/?page\\_id=1854&PPN=P0141&SCH=73029](https://www.statssa.gov.za/?page_id=1854&PPN=P0141&SCH=73029).
- 97 27. Earnst and Young. Worldwide Capital and Fixed Assets Guide. 2018.
- 98 28. Long L, Rosen, S., Girdwood, S. The Healthcare Cost and Outcomes Model. 2017.
- 99 29. Peebles K, Mugwanya KK, Irungu E, Odoyo J, Wamoni E, Morton JF, et al. Low costs and  
100 opportunities for efficiency: a cost analysis of the first year of programmatic PrEP delivery in Kenya's public  
101 sector. *BMC health services research*. 2021;21(1):823.
- 102 30. Roberts DA, Barnabas RV, Abuna F, Lagat H, Kinuthia J, Pintye J, et al. The role of costing in the  
103 introduction and scale-up of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis: evidence from integrating PrEP into routine  
104 maternal and child health and family planning clinics in western Kenya. *Journal of the International AIDS  
105 Society*. 2019;22 Suppl 4:e25296.
- 106 31. Wanga V, Peebles K, Obiero A, Mogaka F, Omollo V, Odoyo JB, et al. Cost of pre-exposure  
107 prophylaxis delivery in family planning clinics to prevent HIV acquisition among adolescent girls and young  
108 women in Kisumu, Kenya. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(4):e0249625.
- 109 32. Meyer-Rath G, van Rensburg C, Chiu C, Leuner R, Jamieson L, Cohen S. The per-patient costs of  
110 HIV services in South Africa: Systematic review and application in the South African HIV Investment Case.  
111 *PLoS One*. 2019;14(2):e0210497.
- 112 33. Eakle R, Gomez GB, Naicker N, Bothma R, Mbogua J, Cabrera Escobar MA, et al. HIV pre-exposure  
113 prophylaxis and early antiretroviral treatment among female sex workers in South Africa: Results from a  
114 prospective observational demonstration project. *PLoS medicine*. 2017;14(11):e1002444.
- 115 34. Irungu EM, Sharma M, Maronga C, Mugo N, Ngure K, Celum C, et al. The Incremental Cost of  
116 Delivering PrEP as a Bridge to ART for HIV Serodiscordant Couples in Public HIV Care Clinics in Kenya.  
117 *AIDS research and treatment*. 2019;2019:4170615.
- 118 35. Mangenah C, Nhamo D, Gudukeya S, Gwavava E, Gavi C, Chiwawa P, et al. Efficiency in PrEP  
119 Delivery: Estimating the Annual Costs of Oral PrEP in Zimbabwe. *AIDS and behavior*. 2021.
- 120 36. Mutuku U, Forsythe, S., Glaubius, R., Were, D., Musau, A. Estimating the Costs of PrE-exposure  
121 Prophylaxis (PrEP) in Ten Counties of Kenya. *International Conference for AIDS and STIs in Africa*2019.
- 122 37. Peebles K, Mugwanya KK, Irungu E, Odoyo J, Wamoni E, Morton JF, et al. Low costs and  
123 opportunities for efficiency: a cost analysis of the first year of programmatic PrEP delivery in Kenya's public  
124 sector. *BMC health services research*. 2021;21(1):823.
- 125 38. Roberts A, Barnabas, RV., Abuna, F., Lagat, H., Kinuthia, J., Pintye, J., Bochner, A., Baeten, J.,  
126 John-Stewart, G., Levine, C. The Cost of PrEP Delivery in Kenyan Antenatal, Postnatal, and Family  
127 Planning Clinics. *Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections*; March 4-7 2019; Seattle, WA,  
128 USA2019.

- 129 39. Ying R, Sharma M, Heffron R, Celum CL, Baeten JM, Katabira E, et al. Cost-effectiveness of pre-  
130 exposure prophylaxis targeted to high-risk serodiscordant couples as a bridge to sustained ART use in  
131 Kampala, Uganda. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. 2015;18(4 Suppl 3):20013.
- 132 40. Mudimu E, Sardinia J, Momin S, Medina-Marino A, Bezuidenhout C, Bekker LG, et al. Incremental  
133 costs of integrated PrEP provision and effective use counselling in community-based platforms for  
134 adolescent girls and young women in South Africa: an observational study. *Journal of the International AIDS*  
135 *Society*. 2022;25(2):e25875.
- 136