

Preferences of people living with HIV for features of tuberculosis preventive treatment regimens – a discrete choice experiment

Hélène E. Aschmann^{1,2,3*}, Allan Musinguzi^{4*}, Jillian L. Kadota^{1,3}, Catherine Namale⁵, Juliet Kakeeto⁵, Jane Nakimuli⁴, Lydia Akello⁴, Fred Welishe⁴, Anne Nakitende⁴, Christopher Berger^{1,3}, David W. Dowdy^{5,6}, Adithya Cattamanchi^{3,5,7}, Fred C. Semitala^{4,8,9^}, Andrew D. Kerkhoff^{3,10^}

1. Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA USA
2. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA USA
3. Center for Tuberculosis, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA USA
4. Infectious Diseases Research Collaboration, Kampala, Uganda
5. Uganda Tuberculosis Implementation Research Consortium, Walimu, Kampala, Uganda
6. Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD USA
7. Division of Pulmonary Diseases and Critical Care Medicine, University of California Irvine, Irvine, CA USA
8. Department of Medicine, Makerere University College of Health Sciences, Kampala, Uganda
9. Makerere University Joint AIDS Program, Kampala, Uganda
10. Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases, and Global Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA USA

*co-first authors contributed equally

^co-senior authors contributed equally

1 **Abstract**

2 Background

3 Tuberculosis (TB) preventive treatment (TPT) is recommended for people living with HIV (PLHIV) in
4 high TB burden settings. While 6 months of daily isoniazid remains widely used, shorter regimens are
5 now available. However, little is known about preferences of PLHIV for key features of TPT regimens.

6 Methods

7 We conducted a discrete choice experiment among adult PLHIV engaged in care at an urban HIV clinic
8 in Kampala, Uganda. In nine random choice tasks, participants chose between two hypothetical TPT
9 regimens with different features (pills per dose, frequency, duration, need for adjusted antiretroviral
10 therapy [ART] dosage and side effects). We analyzed preferences using hierarchical Bayesian estimation,
11 latent class analysis, and willingness-to-trade simulations.

12 Results

13 Of 400 PLHIV, 392 (median age 44, 72% female, 91% TPT-experienced) had high quality choice task
14 responses. Pills per dose was the most important attribute (relative importance 32.4%, 95% confidence
15 interval [CI] 31.6 – 33.2), followed by frequency (20.5% [95% CI 19.7 – 21.3]), duration (19.5% [95% CI
16 18.6 – 20.5]), and need for ART dosage adjustment (18.2% [95% CI 17.2 – 19.2]). Latent class analysis
17 identified three preference groups: one prioritized less frequent, weekly dosing (N=222; 57%); another
18 was averse to ART dosage adjustment (N=107; 27%); and the last prioritized short and tolerable regimens
19 (N=63; 16%). All groups highly valued fewer pills per dose. Participants were willing to accept a regimen
20 of 2.8 months' additional duration [95% CI: 2.4 – 3.2] to reduce pills per dose from five to one, 3.6 [95%
21 CI 2.4 – 4.8] months for weekly rather than daily dosing, and 2.2 [95% CI 1.3 – 3.0] months to avoid
22 ART dosage adjustment.

23 Conclusions

24 To align with preferences of PLHIV, decision-makers should prioritize the development and
25 implementation of TPT regimens with fewer pills, less frequent dosing, and no need for ART dosage
26 adjustment, rather than focus primarily on duration of treatment.

27

28 Introduction

29 Tuberculosis (TB) preventive treatment (TPT) is strongly recommended to address the high disease
30 burden among people living with HIV (PLHIV) in TB endemic settings [1]. Short-course TPT regimens
31 have been shown to be similarly effective and better tolerated than the conventional 6 or 9 months of
32 daily isoniazid (6H or 9H) and are now recommended as options for TPT in updated World Health
33 Organization (WHO) guidelines [1]. These regimens include 3HP (three months of weekly isoniazid and
34 rifapentine), 1HP (one month of daily isoniazid and rifapentine), 3HR (three months of daily isoniazid
35 and rifampin), and 4R (four months of daily rifampin). However, data on the preferences of PLHIV for
36 key features that comprise and differentiate each of these regimens – such as treatment duration,
37 frequency of dosing, number of pills per dose – are lacking.

38 Current WHO guidelines on TB preventive treatment were informed by a single preference study
39 including only 10 participants living with HIV [2]. Preferences were assessed using Likert-scale questions
40 and participants rated all features evaluated as important (short duration, less frequent intake, fewer side-
41 effects, fewer clinic visits, fewer pills, no need for directly observed therapy (DOT), and no need to
42 change dosage of antiretroviral therapy [ART]). However, it remains unknown how PLHIV would value
43 individual features, make trade-offs between features, and ultimately choose between TPT regimens with
44 different features. Such data are critical to inform decisions on scaling up TPT regimens and to guide
45 future TPT regimen development.

46 Choice-based preference elicitation methods, including discrete choice experiments (DCEs), are
47 increasingly being utilized to more systematically characterize patients' healthcare preferences and
48 inform policy- and implementation-related decisions [3–6]. Compared to simple rating exercises such as
49 Likert scale questions, DCEs measure trade-offs through a series of repeated questions where participants
50 must choose between two or more hypothetical alternatives (e.g., “would you prefer option A or option
51 B?”). Notably, DCEs have been shown to have good predictive value for health-related choices [7],
52 including for TPT regimens in a low TB burden setting [8].

53 We therefore conducted a DCE among adult PLHIV accessing routine HIV care in Kampala, Uganda.
54 Our objectives were to 1) determine the relative importance of TPT regimen features; 2) simulate how
55 willing participants were to trade one TPT feature for another; and 3) assess the heterogeneity in
56 preferences and identify distinct subgroups of PLHIV with similar preferences.

57 **Methods**

58 **Setting and participants**

59 We conducted a cross-sectional survey that included a DCE from July to November 2022. The study took
60 place at the Mulago Immune Suppression Syndrome (i.e., HIV/AIDS) clinic, in Kampala, Uganda. The
61 clinic provides comprehensive HIV care to over 16,000 PLHIV and is the largest outpatient HIV clinic in
62 the country.

63 Individuals were eligible for study participation if they were receiving HIV/AIDS care at the clinic, were
64 18 years or older, had not initiated a TPT regimen in the past year, and were not currently receiving TB
65 treatment. People who were unable or unwilling to provide informed consent or were currently
66 incarcerated were excluded. We defined the inclusion criteria to include individuals eligible for initial
67 TPT or likely to qualify for repeated TPT in the future.

68 **Ethics, consents, and procedures**

69 The Makerere University School of Public Health Research and Ethics Committee, the University of San
70 Francisco Institutional Review Board and the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology
71 approved the study. All participants provided written informed consent.

72 **DCE design**

73 The DCE was designed using the “balanced overlap” method in Sawtooth Lighthouse Studio version
74 9.13.2 [9] to allow for analysis of interaction terms [10]. An initial list of DCE attributes and levels
75 reflecting key features of TPT regimens was generated based on a review of the literature, refined by an
76 interdisciplinary team, and further refined after pilot testing among 29 PLHIV (Appendix A). The final

77 design included six attributes with 3 levels each, except for “need to adjust dose of ART” which included
78 2 levels (Figure 1). Each participant was randomly allocated to one of 500 randomly generated sets of
79 nine random choice tasks. In addition, we included a dominant choice task to assess participant
80 comprehension of the DCE (Appendix Table 1). All choice tasks were unlabeled (named “Treatment A”
81 and “Treatment B”). Participants were first required to choose their preferred treatment (A or B), and then
82 between their preferred treatment and no treatment (Appendix Figure 1).

83 Procedures

84 The survey was administered one-on-one by a trained interviewer using an electronic tablet. Interviewers
85 first presented general information on TB prevention using a flipbook. Interviewers then explained the
86 DCE attributes and levels using a flipbook with icons from the DCE (Appendix B). In addition to the
87 DCE component, the survey collected information on demographics, multidimensional poverty index
88 [11], and TB/HIV history.

89 Sample size

90 We considered the minimum sample size for the DCE to be 250 PLHIV based on the formula $500c/ta$,
91 where ‘c’ is the product of the greatest number of levels for any two attributes, ‘t’ is the number of choice
92 tasks, and ‘a’ is the number of options per choice task [12]. To enable a pre-specified subgroup analysis
93 by sex, we targeted a sample size of 400 participants since a minimum of 200 participants per subgroup is
94 recommended [12].

95 Statistical analysis

96 All analyses were performed in Lighthouse Studio version 9.13.2 (Sawtooth Software) and R version
97 4.1.2. We excluded participants from analyses if: (1) the dominant fixed choice task was answered
98 incorrectly, (2) the no treatment option was always selected (indicating the participant was not interested
99 in TPT), or (3) participants showed two or more signs of inattention or lack of understanding including
100 ‘straight-lining’ (e.g., always choosing option A or option B), self-reported difficulty understanding the
101 tasks (“difficult” or “very difficult”) in a question at the end of the survey, and inconsistent choices

102 indicated by a root-likelihood (RLH) fit statistic below 0.651. The RLH threshold was selected based on
103 simulations of random answers as described previously [13].

104 We used a hierarchical Bayesian model to calculate mean preference weights (also known as part-worth
105 utilities) for each attribute level (along with 95% CIs) and the relative importance of attributes (which add
106 up to 100% across attributes). We used latent class multinomial logit to identify groups of participants
107 with distinct preferences and examined an elbow plot of the model fit criteria as well as average group
108 membership probability to determine the number of latent class groups [14–16]. We implemented a
109 Shares of Preference Model using the Sawtooth Choice Simulator tool to estimate participants’
110 willingness-to trade treatment duration (in months) and number of pills per dose for other regimen
111 features using 3HP (4 fixed-dose combination pills weekly for 3 months with 11.5% mild and 6.0%
112 moderate or severe side effects) and 6H (2 pills daily for 6 months with 36.1% mild and 8.2% moderate
113 or severe side effects) as competitors given their current availability as TPT options in Uganda. We
114 defined moderate or severe side effects as requiring a clinic visit, and used reported adverse event rates
115 for the simulations [17]. We calculated 95% CIs using 300 bootstrap samples and 30 competitive sets per
116 sample. We performed subgroup analyses according to preference groups identified from the latent class
117 analysis.

118 **Results**

119 **Participant characteristics**

120 Of 456 persons screened, 414 were invited and 401 consented (response rate of 97% [401/414]) (Figure
121 2). We excluded one person from the study who was erroneously enrolled three times, as well as eight
122 additional participants based on quality checks: three failed the dominant task, three had two signs of
123 inattention or difficulty understanding choice tasks, and two indicated no interest in taking TPT (always
124 selecting the no treatment option).

125 The majority of participants were female (72%), employed (80%), and ART-experienced, with a median
126 of 10.3 years on ART (Table 1). Most participants had previously taken TPT (91%), with either 6H (68%)
127 and/or 3HP (33%). Most participants found it easy or very easy to understand the DCE (88%) and to
128 choose between TPT options in each DCE choice task (77%). Non-participants (13 persons eligible and
129 invited but who did not consent) were similar to participants with respect to age (mean 46.9, interquartile
130 range (IQR): 41 to 54) and sex (77% female).

131 [Preferences for TPT regimen features](#)

132 Overall, participants assigned the highest relative importance to the number of pills per dose (32.4% [95%
133 CI 31.6 – 33.2]), with one pill per dose being strongly preferred compared to 10 pills per dose (Figure 3,
134 Appendix Table 2). Frequency of TPT dosing (relative importance 20.5% [95% CI 19.7 – 21.3]), duration
135 of TPT (relative importance 19.5% [95% CI 18.6 – 20.5]), and need for ART dosage adjustment (relative
136 importance 18.2% [95% CI 17.2 – 19.2]) were all similarly important. Weekly frequency was preferred
137 over twice per week and daily dosing, 1-month duration was preferred compared to 3 or 6 months, and
138 regimens not requiring ART dose adjustment were strongly preferred compared to those requiring ART
139 dose adjustment (Figure 3). Side effects were considered much less important than other attributes
140 (relative importance 5.0% [95% CI 4.6 – 5.4] for mild side effects and 4.4% [95% CI 4.1 – 4.7] for
141 moderate or severe side effects).

142 [Heterogeneity of preferences for TPT features](#)

143 Using latent class analysis, we identified three preference groups (Figure 4, Appendix Figure 2), all of
144 whom preferred fewer pills per dose. The largest group (N=222, 57%) also prioritized less frequent
145 dosing (“non-daily doses”). Another group (N=107, 27%) strongly preferred TPT regimens that required
146 no ART dosage adjustment (“keep ART as is”). Finally, the last group (N=63, 16%) preferred shorter
147 regimens with a lower risk of mild side effects (“short and tolerable”).

148 [Associations of preferences with baseline characteristics](#)

149 We explored the association of baseline characteristics with latent class membership and individual
150 preference weights. We found no association between sex, age, poverty, working status, prior history of
151 TB, and years on ART with individual preference weights for duration, number of pills per dose,
152 frequency of dosing and side effects (Appendix Table 3). However, participants with less ART experience
153 were more averse (i.e., had stronger negative preferences) to TPT regimens requiring ART dosage
154 adjustments (Appendix Table 3) and were more likely to be in the “keep ART as is” group (Appendix
155 Table 4). In addition, participants taking other medications were more averse to ART dosage adjustments,
156 and participants with any education were less averse to a high risk (90%) of mild side effects than
157 participants with no education (Appendix Table 3).

158 [Willingness-to-trade for more preferred TPT regimen features](#)

159 We simulated the tradeoff between treatment duration (in months) and other regimen features (Figure
160 5A). Participants were willing to take TPT for 2.7 [95% CI: 1.8 – 3.5] additional months in exchange for
161 reducing the number of pills per dose from 10 to 5. If the number of pills per dose could be further
162 reduced from 5 to 1, participants were willing to take TPT for another additional 2.8 [95% CI: 2.4 – 3.2]
163 months. Participants were willing to take TPT for 3.6 [95% CI 2.4 – 4.8] additional months in exchange
164 for weekly rather than daily dosing, and for 2.2 [95% CI 1.3 – 3.0] additional months in exchange for not
165 needing ART dosage adjustment. Participants were willing to take TPT for only 0.6 [95% CI 0.3 – 0.9]
166 additional months to reduce the risk of mild side effects from 90% to 10%, and were not willing to trade a
167 longer duration of treatment for a lower risk of moderate or severe side effects. For all regimen features
168 assessed except for moderate or severe side effects, willingness-to-trade varied between preference
169 groups identified by latent class analysis (Appendix Figures 3 and 4). Corresponding trade-offs for the
170 number of pills per dose are presented in Figure 5B.

171 Discussion

172 This DCE among adult PLHIV in Kampala, Uganda, provides important insights about what features of
173 TPT regimens patients value the most. Although there was substantial heterogeneity of preferences as
174 indicated by three distinct preference groups, all groups showed very strong preference for lower pill
175 burden. While TPT regimens as short as 1 month are now available, participants were willing to accept
176 TPT regimens approximately 3 months longer in order to take 4 fewer pills per dose, 4 months longer to
177 have weekly rather than daily dosing and 2 months longer to avoid ART dosage adjustment. Scale-up of
178 current regimens and future regimen development should consider pill burden, dosing frequency and
179 compatibility with ART rather than focus exclusively on treatment duration.

180 Previous studies have also suggested that pill burden, dosing frequency and compatibility with ART are
181 important considerations for TPT regimens. A study to characterize and understand gaps in the TPT care
182 cascade among PLHIV in Uganda found that pill burden was an important barrier for patients [18]. We
183 previously reported that 81% of PLHIV expressed a preference for 3HP over 1HP [19], supporting our
184 finding here that less frequent dosing is preferred. Similarly, two previous studies focusing on pediatric
185 TPT preferences in Eswatini and Peru found that less frequent dosing was valued [20,21] even though
186 daily dosing may be easier to remember [22]. Our DCE confirms weekly dosing is preferred among
187 adults, too, and adds nuance by demonstrating how PLHIV make trade-offs between these features and
188 how trade-offs differ between preference subgroups.

189 Notably, more than one-in-four participants (“keep ART as is” group) expressed strong for maintaining
190 their current ART regimen without adjustments. Participants with less ART experience were particularly
191 averse to dosage changes. Additionally, those taking other medications unrelated to HIV were also more
192 resistant changes in their ART dosage, possibly due to concerns about potential drug-drug interactions.
193 Since 2019, the WHO has recommended dolutegravir-based ART regimens as first-line therapy for all
194 PLHIV, and currently over 20 million PLHIV globally are receiving these regimens [23]. While no
195 adjustments to standard daily dolutegravir dosing are recommended for 3HP [24], preliminary data

196 suggest that an adjustment to twice daily dolutegravir dosing is likely necessary for 1HP [25]. Our
197 findings suggest that a significant subset of PLHIV may find the tradeoff of adjusting their ART to safely
198 accommodate 1HP (as well as 3HR and 4H) unpalatable, potentially leading to decreased acceptance of
199 TPT if only these regimens were offered.

200 Participants in our study generally placed a low value on avoiding mild and moderate or severe side
201 effects compared to other TPT features, a finding that aligns with a best-worst scaling (BWS) choice
202 exercise among PLHIV in South Africa [26]. We also found an association between higher education
203 levels and greater willingness to accept a high risk of mild side effects (90%), corroborating a qualitative
204 study from South Africa that highlighted the role of education in shaping perceptions of TPT risks and
205 benefits [27]. This underscores the importance of using culturally tailored, patient-friendly educational
206 materials in counseling, as we did prior to administering our DCE [28], to help especially those with
207 lower health literacy grasp the trade-offs involved in TPT acceptance. Our findings contrast with a DCE
208 conducted among individuals with latent TB infection in Canada, where liver damage concerns related to
209 TPT were prominent [29]. Differences in study populations, prior TPT experience, and TB risk may
210 explain these opposing findings. For example, most of our participants (91%) had prior TPT experience,
211 and only 24% reported experiencing any side effects.

212 Our study had several strengths, including an iterative DCE design process with pilot testing [30], a large
213 and representative sample of PLHIV in care in Kampala, Uganda, and the application of latent class
214 analysis to uncover preference heterogeneity [31]. However, our study does have some limitations. Only
215 9% of participants in our final sample had never taken TPT, although we found no association between
216 prior TPT experience or regimen type (3HP or 6H) and preferences. Second, participants with low
217 educational levels and limited health literacy might have had difficulty understanding the risks and
218 hypothetical choices involved in the DCE. However, most participants reported the DCE was easy to
219 understand (88%) and pilot testing had confirmed the DCE's relevance and comprehensibility. Finally,
220 DCEs present hypothetical choices ('stated preferences') that may differ from real-world decisions

221 ('revealed preferences'). However, their predictive value for actual health choices has been validated [8].

222 Moreover, they offer advantages over 'revealed preferences,' which are limited to existing options and
223 cannot predict the acceptability of future TPT regimens [29].

224 In conclusion, our study shows that while there are heterogeneous preferences for TPT-related features
225 among PLHIV in Uganda, there is a strong preference for regimens with lower pill burdens, less-frequent
226 dosing, and no need for ART regimen adjustments. Most participants exhibited a willingness to undergo
227 longer TPT regimens if they could access a TPT regimen with these preferred features. Collectively, our
228 findings suggest that, in order to align with the preferences of PLHIV, policymakers should prioritize the
229 implementation of fixed-dose combinations (FDC) of existing TPT regimens and that future TPT
230 regimens should prioritize reducing pill burden over further reducing treatment duration.

231 **Funding**


232 This study was supported by grants from the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (R01HL144406,
233 AC and DWD) and National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (K23AI157914, ADK) of the
234 National Institutes of Health, and by Early Postdoc.Mobility (191414, HEA) and Postdoc.Mobility
235 (214129, HEA) fellowships from the Swiss National Science Foundation.

236 **References**

- 237 1. World Health Organization. WHO consolidated guidelines on tuberculosis. Module 1, Prevention □:
238 tuberculosis preventive treatment. 2020.
- 239 2. World Health Organization. Annex 3. Values and preferences for the management of latent
240 tuberculosis infection: survey of populations affected by the recommendations. In: Latent tuberculosis
241 infection: updated and consolidated guidelines for programmatic management. Geneva; 2018.
- 242 3. Hollin IL, Paskett J, Schuster ALR, Crossnohere NL, Bridges JFP. Best–Worst Scaling and the
243 Prioritization of Objects in Health: A Systematic Review. *Pharmacoeconomics* [Internet]. Springer
244 International Publishing; 2022;40:883–99. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-022-01167-1>
- 245 4. Cheung KL, Wijnen BFM, Hollin IL, Janssen EM, Bridges JF, Evers SMAA, et al. Using Best–Worst
246 Scaling to Investigate Preferences in Health Care. *Pharmacoeconomics*. Springer International Publishing;
247 2016;34:1195–209.
- 248 5. Mühlbacher AC, Kaczynski A, Zweifel P, Johnson FR. Experimental measurement of preferences in
249 health and healthcare using best-worst scaling □: an overview. *Health Econ Rev*. Health Economics

- 250 Review; 2016;
- 251 6. Chachoua L, Dabbous M, François C, Dussart C, Aballéa S, Toumi M. Use of Patient Preference
252 Information in Benefit–Risk Assessment, Health Technology Assessment, and Pricing and
253 Reimbursement Decisions: A Systematic Literature Review of Attempts and Initiatives. *Front Med.*
254 2020;7:1–14.
- 255 7. Quaife M, Terris-Prestholt F, Di Tanna GL, Vickerman P. How well do discrete choice experiments
256 predict health choices? A systematic review and meta-analysis of external validity. *Eur J Heal Econ*
257 [Internet]. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2018;19:1053–66. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10198-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10198-018-0954-6)
258 018-0954-6
- 259 8. Mohammadi T, Bansback N, Marra F, Khakban A, Campbell JR, FitzGerald JM, et al. Testing the
260 External Validity of a Discrete Choice Experiment Method: An Application to Latent Tuberculosis
261 Infection Treatment. *Value Heal*; 2017;20:969–75.
- 262 9. Sawtooth Software. Sawtooth Software: The CBC System for Choice-Based Conjoint Analysis.
263 Sawtooth Softw Tech Pap Ser. 2017;Version 9:1–27.
- 264 10. Johnson FR, Lancsar E, Marshall D, Kilambi V, Mühlbacher A, Regier DA, et al. Constructing
265 experimental designs for discrete-choice experiments: Report of the ISPOR conjoint analysis
266 experimental design good research practices task force. *Value Heal.* 2013;16:3–13.
- 267 11. Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative. Global multidimensional poverty index 2018: the
268 most detailed picture to date of the world’s poorest people. Second edi. Oxford, United Kingdom; 2018.
- 269 12. Orme BK. Getting started with conjoint analysis: strategies for product design and pricing research.
270 Research Publishers, LLC Madison, WI; 2006;
- 271 13. Kerkhoff AD, Chilukutu L, Nyangu S, Kagujje M, Mateyo K, Sanjase N, et al. Patient Preferences for
272 Strategies to Improve Tuberculosis Diagnostic Services in Zambia. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2022;5:e2229091.
- 273 14. Weller BE, Bowen NK, Faubert SJ. Latent Class Analysis: A Guide to Best Practice. *J Black Psychol.*
274 2020;46:287–311.
- 275 15. Nylund-Gibson K, Choi AY. Ten Frequently Asked Questions About Latent Transition Analysis.
276 *Transl Issues Psychol Sci.* 2018;4:440–61.
- 277 16. Zhou M, Thayer WM, Bridges JFP. Using Latent Class Analysis to Model Preference Heterogeneity
278 in Health: A Systematic Review. *Pharmacoeconomics.* Springer International Publishing; 2018;36:175–
279 87.
- 280 17. Pease C, Hutton B, Yazdi F, Wolfe D, Hamel C, Barbeau P, et al. A systematic review of adverse
281 events of rifapentine and isoniazid compared to other treatments for latent tuberculosis infection.
282 *Pharmacoepidemiol. Drug Saf.* 2018. p. 557–66.
- 283 18. Kalema N, Semeere A, Banturaki G, Kyamugabwa A, Ssozi S, Ggita J, et al. Gaps in TB preventive
284 therapy for persons initiating antiretroviral therapy in Uganda: An explanatory sequential cascade
285 analysis. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis.* 2021;25:388–94.
- 286 19. Musinguzi A, Aschmann HE, Kadota JL, Nakimuli J, Welishe F, Kakeeto J, et al. Preference for daily
287 (1HP) versus weekly (3HP) isoniazid-rifapentine among people living with HIV in Uganda. *Int J Tuberc*
288 *Lung Dis.* 2023;in press.
- 289 20. Hirsch-Moverman Y, Strauss M, George G, Mutiti A, Mafukidze A, Shongwe S, et al. Paediatric
290 tuberculosis preventive treatment preferences among HIV-positive children, caregivers and healthcare

- 291 providers in Eswatini: A discrete choice experiment. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11:1–12.
- 292 21. Yuen CM, Millones AK, Galea JT, Puma D, Jimenez J, Lecca L, et al. Toward patient-centered
293 tuberculosis preventive treatment: preferences for regimens and formulations in Lima, Peru. *BMC Public*
294 *Health*. *BMC Public Health*; 2021;21:1–8.
- 295 22. Hirsch-Moverman Y, Mantell JE, Lebelo L, Wynn C, Hesselning AC, Howard AA, et al. Tuberculosis
296 preventive treatment preferences among care givers of children in Lesotho: a pilot study. 2018;22:858–
297 62.
- 298 23. World Health Organization. Update on the transition to dolutegravir-based antiretroviral therapy:
299 report of a WHO meeting, 29–30 March 2022 [Internet]. 2022. Available from:
300 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240053335>
- 301 24. World Health Organization. WHO operational handbook on tuberculosis. Module 1: prevention -
302 tuberculosis preventive treatment. Geneva; 2020.
- 303 25. Imperial MZ, Luetkemeyer A, Dawson R, Cramer Y, Rosenkranz S, Swindells S, et al. DTG PK in
304 people with HIV receiving daily 1HP for latent TB treatment (ACTG A5372). *CROI*. 2022. p. 78.
- 305 26. Kim H-Y, Hanrahan CF, Dowdy DW, Martinson NA, Golub JE, Bridges JFP. Priorities among HIV-
306 positive individuals for tuberculosis preventive therapies. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis*. 2020;24:396–402.
- 307 27. Lester R, Hamilton R, Charalambous S, Dwadwa T, Chandler C, Churchyard GJ, et al. Barriers to
308 implementation of isoniazid preventive therapy in HIV clinics: a qualitative study. *AIDS*. 2010;24:S45–8.
- 309 28. Kadota JL, Musinguzi A, Nabunje J, Welishe F, Ssemata JL, Bishop O, et al. Protocol for the 3HP
310 Options Trial: A hybrid type 3 implementation-effectiveness randomized trial of delivery strategies for
311 short-course tuberculosis preventive therapy among people living with HIV in Uganda. *Implement Sci*.
312 2020;15:1–12.
- 313 29. Guo N, Marra CA, Fitzgerald JM, Elwood RK, Anis AH, Marra F. Patient preference for latent
314 tuberculosis infection preventive treatment: A discrete choice experiment. *Value Heal*; 2011;14:937–43.
- 315 30. Mangham LJ, Hanson K, McPake B. How to do (or not to do)...Designing a discrete choice
316 experiment for application in a low-income country. *Health Policy Plan*. 2009;24:151–8.
- 317 31. Hauber AB, González JM, Groothuis-Oudshoorn CGM, Prior T, Marshall DA, Cunningham C, et al.
318 *Statistical Methods for the Analysis of Discrete Choice Experiments: A Report of the ISPOR Conjoint*
319 *Analysis Good Research Practices Task Force*. *Value Heal*; 2016;19:300–15.
- 320




328

329

Figure 2: Participants' study flow with 392 participants included in the final analysis.

330

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




331

332 Figure 3: Mean preference weights of attribute levels and relative importance of attributes among all
 333 participants. Bars indicate the mean preference weights for each level among 392 participants using
 334 hierarchical Bayesian estimation. Blue bars indicate levels with the strongest positive preference (most
 335 preferred) per attribute, orange bars indicate levels with negative preference (least preferred). The percentage
 336 on the right side indicates the mean relative importance for each attribute.

337

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



338


339

340

341

Figure 4: Mosaic plot showing the mean relative importance modeled using hierarchical Bayesian analysis among three groups identified by latent class analysis. The width of each column corresponds the proportion each group comprises of the overall population.

342



343

344 Figure 5: Willingness to trade (A) additional treatment duration months or (B) additional pills per dose for
 345 other improved regimen features. Results are truncated below zero months and above 5 months, and below
 346 zero pills and above 9 pills per dose (extrapolated values). The arrow in (A) indicates the upper confidence
 347 limit for 1 vs 10 pills was out of range. ART dosage adjustment was presented as requiring a second daily
 348 dose of ART. Moderate or severe side effects were described as side effects requiring medical care.
 349 ART: antiretroviral therapy


350


351 Tables


352 Table 1: Participant characteristics at baseline, based on medical records and self-report


Participants (N = 400)	N	(%)
	mean	(IQR)
Female sex	288	(72%)
Age	44.3	(IQR: 38, 51)
BMI	27.0	(IQR: 22.2, 30.1)
Education		
None	91	(23%)
Primary	150	(38%)
Secondary	116	(29%)
Tertiary or higher	43	(11%)
Work status		
Hired	76	(19%)
Self-employed	245	(61%)
Unemployed	45	(11%)
Not working	22	(6%)
Other	12	(3%)
Multidimensional poverty index¹		
Severely poor	11	(3%)
Poor	63	(16%)
Vulnerable	111	(28%)
Prior TPT²		
Prior 6H	247	(68%)
Prior 3HP	121	(33%)
TPT completion (N = 365)		
TPT completed	353	(97%)
Do not know / do not want to answer	1	(0%)
Did you experience side effects from TPT? (N=365)		
Yes, and I had to see my doctor about it.	28	(8%)
Yes, but only mild ones and I did not see my doctor about it.	58	(16%)
History of active tuberculosis	72	(18%)
Current antiretroviral therapy		
Dolutegravir-based	378	(95%)
Efavirenz-based	14	(4%)
Other	8	(2%)
Time on antiretroviral therapy (years)	10.4	(IQR: 7.2,14.1)
Viral load		
Suppressed	394	(99%)
Unsuppressed (≥ 1000 copies)	3	(1%)
Not yet done, recent HIV diagnosis	1	(0%)
Missing	2	(1%)
Taking other medications³	147	(37%)
Herbal medicine use		
Within last month	90	(23%)
Within last year	98	(24%)
Longer than a year ago	128	(32%)
Hormonal contraceptives among women (N=288)	52	(18%)

- 353 1. The multidimensional poverty index captures deprivations in health, education, and living standards.
 354 2. 3 persons answered that they had both previously taken 6H and 3HP.
 355 3. Currently taking other medications not including HIV medication or contraceptives.
 356 3HP: 3 months of isoniazid and rifampentine, 6H: 6 months of isoniazid, BMI: body mass index, HIV: human
 357 immunodeficiency virus, IQR: interquartile range, TPT: tuberculosis preventive therapy.











A: Duration



B: Pills per dose



If these two treatments were available, which one would you prefer?

Treatment A



3 months



Take 1 week



Adjust dose of your ART medication @ 1st treatment



Select

Treatment B



6 months



Daily



Adjust dose of your ART medication @ 1st treatment



Select

If the TB preventive treatment you have been available, would you actually take it?




Yes, I would take this treatment


- No treatment would occur.
- Your risk of developing TB is high. About 5 in 100 persons will get TB in the next three years.
- No additional tablets, just continue your usual ART.

No, I would not take this treatment


Group 1: Non-daily doses




Group 2: Keep ART as is




Group 3: Short and tolerable





Latent class ■ Non-daily doses (n=222) ■ Keep ART as is (n=107) ■ Short and tolerable (n=63)



Latent class Non-daily doses (n=222) Keep ART as is (n=107) Short and tolerable (n=63)