

1                   **Measures of retention in HIV care: A protocol for a mixed methods study**

2   Nadia Rehman<sup>1</sup>, Michael Cristian Garcia<sup>2¶</sup>, Aaron Jones<sup>1¶</sup>, Jinhui Ma<sup>1¶</sup>, Dominik Mertz<sup>1,3,4¶</sup>,  
3   Lawrence Mbuagbaw<sup>1,3,5,6,7,8\*</sup>

4

5

6

7

8   <sup>1</sup>Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton,  
9   Ontario, Canada

10   <sup>2</sup>Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada

11   <sup>3</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada,

12   <sup>4</sup>Department of Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

13   <sup>5</sup>Department of Anesthesia, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

14   <sup>6</sup> Centre for Development of Best Practices in Health (CDBPH), Yaoundé Central Hospital,  
15   Yaoundé, Cameroon

16   <sup>7</sup>Department of Pediatrics, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

17   <sup>8</sup> Biostatistics Unit, Father Sean O'Sullivan Research. Centre, St Joseph's Healthcare, Hamilton,  
18   Ontario, Canada

19 <sup>9</sup> Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Department of Global Health, Stellenbosch  
20 University, Cape Town, South Africa

21

22

23 **\*Corresponding Author:**

24 Email: [mbuagblc@mcmaster.ca](mailto:mbuagblc@mcmaster.ca) (LM)

25 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

26

27

## 28 **Abstract**

29

30 **Introduction:** Retention in HIV care is necessary to achieve adherence to antiretroviral

31 therapy, viral load suppression, and optimal health outcomes. There is no standard definition for

32 retention in HIV care, which compromises consistent and reliable reporting and comparison of

33 retention across facilities, jurisdictions, and studies.

34 **Objective:** The objective of this study is to explore how stakeholders involved in HIV care

35 define retention in HIV care and their preferences on measuring retention.

36 **Methods:** We will use an exploratory sequential mixed methods design involving HIV  
37 stakeholder groups such as people living with HIV , people involved in providing care for PLHIV,  
38 and people involved in decision-making about PLHIV. In the qualitative phase of the study, we  
39 with conduct 20-25 in-depth interviews to collect perspectives of HIV stakeholders on using their  
40 preferred retention measures. The interview guide has being provided as an online Supplementary  
41 Appendix 1.The findings from the qualitative phase will inform the development of survey items  
42 for the quantitative phase. Survey participants (n=385) will be invited to rate the importance of  
43 each approach to measuring retention on a seven-point Likert scale. We will merge the findings  
44 from the qualitative and quantitative findings phase to inform a consensus-building framework for  
45 a standard definition of retention in care.

46

47 **Ethical Issues and Dissemination:** This study has received ethics approval from the  
48 Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board. The findings will be disseminated through peer-  
49 reviewed publications, conference presentations, and among stakeholder groups.

50

## 51 **Limitations**

52 1. This study has limitation, we won't be able to arrive at a standard definition, a Delphi  
53 technique amongst the stakeholders will be utilized using the framework to reach a  
54 consensus globally accepted definition.

55

56

## 57 **Keywords**

58 HIV, retention in care, mixed-method, interviews, survey, PLHIV, standard, definition, HIV

59 stakeholders, consensus

60 **Word count:** 2808

61

## 62 **Introduction**

63 Globally, 38.4 million people are living with HIV, with 1.5 million new infections acquired in only  
64 in 2021[1]. In 2015, the United Nations set the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to end the  
65 HIV epidemic by 2030 [2]. To reach the SDGs, efforts have been made to make free antiretroviral  
66 therapy (ART), and quality care accessible for people living with HIV (PLHIV) on the global scale  
67 [3]. However, we are far from achieving the SDGs, and even though HIV care is available, PLHIV

68 are not retained in care owing to societal inequalities, lack of uniform policies, and HIV-related  
69 stigma [4].

70 To meet the SDGs, it is crucial to retain patients in every stage of the HIV care continuum. Even  
71 though ART helps prolong and improve the quality of life of PLHIV, poor adherence to ART can  
72 lead to virological failure, progression to AIDS, and the development of resistant strains [5].  
73 Retention in care is essential for ensuring consistent access to ART, monitoring of health  
74 outcomes, lowering mortality rates, and reducing new HIV infections [6-8]. Adequate retention in  
75 care is known to be cost-effective and maximize patient outcomes [9].

76 The public and individual health implications of retention in HIV care, necessitates an accurate  
77 estimate of retention in care. The lack of a standard and globally accepted definition of retention  
78 has been highlighted in the literature many times [10-16]. Consensus on a standard definition is  
79 compromised by the need for longitudinal assessment and the various socio-economic factors  
80 predicting retention in PLHIV [10, 16, 17]. In our recently published review of definitions of  
81 retention, we identified that trialists have used heterogeneous definitions of retention across studies  
82 [18]. This limits our ability to aggregate data for meta-analysis and to compare findings across  
83 studies. A standard definition must be in place to report and compare long-term retention across  
84 jurisdictions, settings, and studies [12]. A reliable and consistent measure of retention will be a

85 starting point to identify real-world gaps, evaluate program performance, make policies, and  
86 implement them to ensure equitable healthcare access [19].

87 A standard definition must include clinically relevant features and be adequately stable to predict  
88 long-term clinical outcomes. The definition should be easy to use, record and report across  
89 different settings, healthcare systems, and populations. Arriving at a consensus for a standard  
90 definition will require views and perspectives from stakeholders involved in HIV care, including  
91 PLHIV [18].

92

93 The purpose of this study is to develop a standard definition of retention in care with consensus  
94 from global stakeholders in HIV care. For this study, we will define HIV stakeholders in three  
95 main categories based on the evidence to inform policy (policymakers), health research  
96 (researchers and funding bodies), and practice (HIV clinicians, clinical guideline developers,  
97 public health professionals, and PLHIV) nationally and internationally [20]. The following  
98 research questions guide our study.

## 99 **Qualitative research questions**

100

- 101 ➤ What are the various perspectives of HIV stakeholders engaged in HIV care at national and  
102 international levels on measuring retention in HIV care?

103 ➤ How do the categories mentioned by the HIV stakeholders help to explain the need for a  
104 standard measure of retention in HIV care?

## 105 **Quantitative research questions**

106

107 ➤ What components used to define retention are most important to HIV care stakeholders in  
108 terms of ease to use, recording, and comparison across different settings, jurisdictions, and  
109 studies?

## 110 **Mixed method research questions**

111

112 ➤ To what extent and in what ways do qualitative interviews with stakeholders involved in HIV  
113 care services contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the various components used to  
114 define retention in care?

115 ➤ Are the views of HIV stakeholders about measuring retention in their specific context  
116 generalizable to HIV stakeholders in a broader context?

117

## 118 **Methods**

119 We will use the pragmatism paradigm as the epistemological framework for our research.

120 Pragmatism is an appropriate approach for our research as we will be examining diverse and  
121 complex contexts [21]. Pragmatism will provide us with the flexibility to build variations into  
122 techniques and analytic processes, resulting in the production of actionable knowledge [22].

123

## 124 **Study design**

125

126 We will conduct an exploratory sequential mixed methods study (QUAL → quan) [23]. The mixed  
127 method approach will comprise two phases. In the qualitative phase, we will conduct in-depth  
128 interviews building upon retention in care definitions identified in a prior review [18]. In the  
129 qualitative phase, we will explore participants' views on measuring retention with the intent of  
130 using this information to develop a survey. In the quantitative phase of the study, the key concepts  
131 identified from the qualitative data will be operationalized as quantitative items in a web-based  
132 survey. This survey will enable us to generalize the qualitative findings to a larger heterogeneous  
133 sample. To achieve complete and comprehensive answers to our research question, qualitative and  
134 quantitative findings will be merged for analysis and interpretation, reporting and development of  
135 the framework for consensus of the standard definition [23, 24].

## 136 **Rationale for design**

137

138 A mixed-method approach will address the complex and broader question of developing a standard  
139 and optimal measure of retention [25]. A mixed-method approach will enable us to use two  
140 sampling techniques [26].

141 Purposeful and probabilistic techniques will ensure data collection in breadth and depth [27]. A  
142 qualitative phase of individual interviews will help contextualize and elaborate findings from



143 different settings, populations, and professional backgrounds [28]. The quantitative data will  
144 inform us of the magnitude of the relevance of the retention measures [21]. This approach will  
145 generate findings that would not otherwise be obtainable when using only qualitative or  
146 quantitative methods alone. This mixed-method approach will increase the validity of our  
147 interpretations and generate reliable new knowledge [29].

## 148 **Study Timeline**

149  
150 The participants recruitment for the qualitative phase of the study will begin in November 2023  
151 and will continue until March 2024. The qualitative synthesis will occur between April 2024 and  
152 June 2024. From the qualitative findings we will develop the survey. The survey will be  
153 disseminated from August 2024 till November 2024. The quantitative findings and the integration  
154 of the qualitative and quantitative findings will be finalized from December 2024 till February  
155 2025.

156

## 157 **Sampling and sample size**

158

### 159 **Qualitative phase**

160

161 The qualitative phase of our study will draw on the principles of qualitative description  
162 methodology. This approach is suitable for mixed method study to address clinical questions. This  
163 approach is well suited here as this approach will enable us to gain perspectives from participants  
164 to understand and describe the phenomenon in terms of literal descriptions and dwell on practical  
165 relevance of the information for health care users [30].

166 The participants recruitment will begin in November 2023, and will continue until March 2024.  
167 Participants will be selected if they meet the following inclusion criteria: 1) able to understand  
168 both written and spoken English; 2) a minimum age of 18 years of age; 3) are willing to participate  
169 in a computer-based online interview about personal experiences with retention in care; and 3) can  
170 provide signed informed consent for study participation. Participants will be excluded if they do  
171 not participate in the interview or request that their data be withdrawn.

172

173 We will employ a combination of purposeful sampling techniques, including criterion-based,  
174 maximum variation, and snowballing sampling techniques, to seek an equally representative  
175 sample in terms of the HIV stakeholders groups (policy, research, practice) and across all WHO  
176 geographical regions (African Region, Region of the Americas, South-East Asia Region, European  
177 Region, Eastern Mediterranean Region, and Western Pacific Region) [31].

178 Based on sample size recommendations to reach theoretical sampling, we anticipate performing  
179 25-30 interviews, with 4-5 from each representative group. This sample size seems appropriate to  
180 capture information-rich data. This estimation of interview participants is based on a study  
181 involving key stakeholders' perspectives and experiences on defining and identifying health  
182 research gaps [20].

183

184 **Quantitative phase**

185

186 We will use the email listservs of organizations working in HIV care, such as the Ontario HIV  
187 Treatment Network (OHTN), World Health Organization (WHO) and Joint United Nations  
188 Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), Global Fund, International AIDS Society (IAS), Kaiser  
189 Family Foundation (KFF), Canadian Foundation for AIDS Research (CANFAR) and regional  
190 WHO groups. Researchers will be identified from publications on retention in care in the  
191 CASCADE database (a database of randomized trials on the HIV care cascade) [32]. We will also  
192 reach out to existing collaborations and professional associations such as the International AIDS  
193 Society (IAS), the Canadian Association for HIV Research (CAHR), and the International  
194 Association of Providers of AIDS Care (IAPAC).

195

196 To further supplement the recruitment process, we will publicize our study on social media  
197 platforms like Twitter and LinkedIn. Patients will be recruited and identified from online patient  
198 support groups and organizations serving those patients, such as REALIZE, POZ Community  
199 Forum [31]. We will submit an amendment to HiREB regarding any changes in recruitment  
200 methods based on guidance of the organizations.

201 We will disseminate the survey online in the stakeholders' groups. If response rates are lower than  
202 our calculated sample size, we will use a snowballing approach to include responses from  
203 participants interested in this topic [33].

204 We will use a proportional quota sampling method to achieve a diverse and representative sample  
205 of participants. We will divide the sample into our pre-defined three strata (policy, health research,  
206 and practice) so every HIV stakeholder group is equally represented.[34] People who belong to  
207 more than one group will be asked to declare the group they primarily identify with. We will obtain  
208 a pre-determined sample population of 385 based on the formula for proportions for a survey,  
209 which is the maximum sample size required to estimate a population proportion of 50% with a  
210 95% level of confidence and a 0.5% margin of error. These computations are performed with  
211 WINPEPI.[35]

## 212 **Data collection**

213

### 214 **Qualitative phase**

215

216 We will conduct in-depth semi-structured interviews following a piloted interview guide. A copy  
217 of the interview guide is provided in the Supplementary File. The interviews will be conducted  
218 over Zoom (a videoconferencing platform with real-time messaging and content sharing). The  
219 interview time will be booked according to the participants' preference and will last  
220 approximately one hour.

221 At the beginning of the session, the trained interviewers will cover the study's purpose, consent,  
222 and ethical issues, and establish rapport with the interviewees.

223 All the interviews will be recorded and transcribed verbatim by using a transcription service. About  
224 10% of the transcripts will be compared by two authors (NR, CG) to the data transcribed by the  
225 transcription service for congruence and inconsistencies. Interview data will be anonymized and  
226 stored on secure and password-protected servers at McMaster University.

## 227 **Quantitative phase**

228

229 This survey will be designed according to expert recommendations for electronic surveys [36]. The  
230 web-based quantitative survey for participants will be conducted on the Research Electronic Data  
231 Capture (REDCap) tool, a secure, web-based application hosted and stored on a secure server at  
232 McMaster University [37]. The survey will be piloted before deployment. Participants will be  
233 presented with an overview of the study, the study's purpose, the privacy and confidentiality of

234 their data, and the time required to complete the survey. Participants will be invited to complete a  
235 consent form. The survey will be a self-administered, structured questionnaire in English.  
236 The survey will consist of three parts: demographic information, professional information and  
237 questions related to measures of retention in HIV care. The themes identified in the qualitative  
238 interviews will serve as the survey items on the measures of retention. The participants will rate  
239 them on a 7-point Likert scale [38].  
240 To ensure an adequate response rate, email addresses will be updated, and at least two reminder  
241 emails will be sent to potential participants.

## 242 **Analysis**

243

### 244 **Qualitative phase**

245

246 We will conduct a qualitative content analysis [39]. Transcriptions will be analyzed using content  
247 analysis techniques supported NVivo 10.

248 Both deductive and inductive content analysis procedures will be used in the following steps: (1)  
249 the initial coding framework for the deductive analysis will be informed by definitions of retention  
250 identified in our previous work [40]; inductive codes will be derived from the data by iterative  
251 readings of the interview transcripts. Similar codes will be put into categories according to their  
252 similarities and differences. The responses along with the number of participants in each category

253 will be counted. The various categories will be organized in a table to create a visual and contextual  
254 interpretation [30].

255 After every seven to eight interviews, the two coders will meet to compare categories and arrive  
256 at an agreed-upon set of categories. Disagreement will be resolved by discussion to improve  
257 reliability between the two coders.

## 258 **Quantitative phase**

259  
260 We will compute the mean (standard deviation) or frequency (percent) based on the survey  
261 responses as appropriate for the data.

262 To determine the level of importance that participants allocate to each item we will compute the  
263 mean (SD) or median (quartiles). Only items with a mean of 4 or more out of seven will be  
264 considered as important. The mean will inform us which approaches to measuring retention are  
265 preferred by the participants. Results will be aggregated by stakeholders groups.

266 The results will be analyzed using IBM SPSS statistical software [41]. An outline of the study is  
267 shown in Figure 1. Study diagram of an exploratory sequential study with survey development on  
268 measures of retention in HIV.

269

270

## 271 **Data integration**

272

273 Data integration will occur at every stage of the study to answer our research question in depth and  
274 breadth:(1) connecting both the data through a sampling frame: participants are selected from the  
275 population of participants who responded to the survey (2) Typology development (building): the  
276 survey will be built on the themes identified in the qualitative data [21].

277 Three approaches will be used to integrate our qualitative and quantitative findings at the  
278 interpretation and reporting level: First we will transform the qualitative data into quantitative and  
279 the data will be displayed in a table [42]. This method will allow to inform the analysis of  
280 qualitative data to inform the quantitative finding [26].

281 Second, we will use joint displays to visually integrate and report the findings of both phases. The  
282 joint displays will allow the visual presentation of the data in matrix. The first joint display will  
283 show the link between the qualitative findings and how these findings tailored the methodology  
284 and development of the quantitative phase, including the survey items [43]. The second joint  
285 display will depict how the quantitative finding reflects and generalizes the qualitative context.  
286 The joint display tables will show the results together organized by common categories so that a  
287 comparison can be made to come to a final conclusion, i.e., ‘meta-inferences’[44].

288 Third, we will use contiguous narrative data integration and reporting approach, presenting  
289 qualitative and quantitative findings separately in the same paper.



## 290 **Validation checks**

291  
292 We will use the Lincoln and Guba theoretical framework for mixed-methods studies to include  
293 parallel quantitative and qualitative criteria for criteria appraisal to promote the rigor and  
294 trustworthiness of our procedures and findings strategies [25, 45]. In the qualitative strand, we will  
295 email the transcripts to the participants for member checking to ensure study credibility. We will  
296 enhance consistency in the qualitative phase by peer debriefing and involving other authors in the  
297 transcription and analysis procedure to identify any overlooked biases [27]. We will keep an audit  
298 trail of the decisions made in all the study steps [46]. We will maintain a reflexive journal to  
299 explore the researchers' subjectivity [47, 48]. For the quantitative phase, we will increase the  
300 accuracy and reliability of our findings by keeping the questionnaire clear and easy to read by pilot  
301 testing the questionnaire [26, 49].

302 We will check the internal consistency of survey responses with Cronbach Alpha coefficient  
303 (higher than 0.8), indicating high consistency across survey items [25].

## 304 **Discussion**

### 305 306 **Overview**

307 This study will provide important insights into HIV stakeholders' views and opinions on  
308 measuring retention best and overcoming the variability in the measures. This knowledge will add  
309 to the improvement of research, policy, and services and contribute to improvements in the quality  
310 of care for PLHIV.

311 This study is a follow-up study to a prior project. Previously we conducted a SWAR to identify  
312 definitions of retention used in RCTs. This review showed a wide heterogeneity in the definitions  
313 of retention [18]. We anticipate that this mixed-method approach will provide the breadth and  
314 depth of the topic and will advance efforts towards a standard measure of retention in care.

## 315 **Ethics**

316  
317 This research proposal has received ethics approval from the Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics  
318 Board ethics committee for approval (HiREB). Participants' confidentiality and anonymity will be  
319 respected at all times. Written informed consent will be obtained from all participants, however  
320 the participants can withdraw at any time. The transcripts of all interviews will be de-identified  
321 before analysis. No personally identifying data will be collected during the surveys. All  
322 recordings, transcripts and survey data will be stored in password-protected and encrypted servers  
323 at McMaster University. All data will be destroyed after ten years.

324

## 325 **Dissemination**

326  
327 Our study will be disseminated via three peer-reviewed publications (i.e., the study protocol, a  
328 qualitative study, and a mixed-method paper) and as part of a doctoral thesis. We will also  
329 disseminate this at relevant conferences and other stakeholder gatherings.

330

331 **Acknowledgements**

332

333 All the researchers (L.M., N.R., M.G.,J.M., D.M., A,J.) involved will be granted

334 authorship, because of their substantial contributions to the work.

335

336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357

## References

1. UNAIDS. Fact sheet 2020 - Latest statistics on the status of the AIDS epidemic. Secondary Fact. 2021.
2. UNAIDS. *Getting to Zero: How will we fast-track the AIDS response? Discussion paper for consultations on UNAIDS Strategy 2016-2021*. 2021.
3. United Nations. The Sustainable Development Goals Report. 2016.
4. United Nations. The Sustainable Development Goals Report. 2022.
5. Fogarty L, Roter D, Larson S, Burke J, Gillespie J, Levy R. Patient adherence to HIV medication regimens: a review of published and abstract reports. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2002;46(2):93-108.
6. Geng EH, Odeny TA, Lyamuya R, et al. Retention in Care and Patient-Reported Reasons for Undocumented Transfer or Stopping Care Among HIV-Infected Patients on Antiretroviral Therapy in Eastern Africa: Application of a Sampling-Based Approach. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;62(7):935-44.
7. Mugavero MJ, Westfall AO, Zinski A, et al. Measuring retention in HIV care: the elusive gold standard. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2012;61(5):574-80.
8. Giordano TP. Retention in HIV care: what the clinician needs to know. *Top Antivir Med*. 2011;19(1):12-6.
9. Shrestha RK, Gardner L, Marks G, Craw J, Malitz F, Giordano TP, et al. Estimating the cost of increasing retention in care for HIV-infected patients: results of the CDC/HRSA retention in care trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2015;68(3):345-50.

- 358 10. Mbuagbaw L, Mertz D, Lawson DO, et al. Strategies to improve adherence to antiretroviral  
359 therapy and retention in care for people living with HIV in high-income countries: a protocol  
360 for an overview of systematic reviews. *BMJ open*. 2018;8(9):e022982.
- 361 11. Bengtson AM, Colvin C, Kirwa K, Cornell M, Lurie MN. Estimating retention in HIV care  
362 accounting for clinic transfers using electronic medical records: evidence from a large  
363 antiretroviral treatment programme in the Western Cape, South Africa. *Trop Med Int Health*.  
364 2020;25(8):936-43.
- 365 12. Colasanti J, Kelly J, Pennisi E, Hu YJ, Root C, Hughes D, et al. Continuous Retention and  
366 Viral Suppression Provide Further Insights Into the HIV Care Continuum Compared to the  
367 Cross-sectional HIV Care Cascade. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;62(5):648-54.
- 368 13. Kay ES, Batey DS, Mugavero MJ. The HIV treatment cascade and care continuum: updates,  
369 goals, and recommendations for the future. *AIDS Res Ther*. 2016;13:35.
- 370 14. McClarty LM, Kasper K, Ireland L, Loeppky C, Blanchard JF, Becker ML. The HIV care  
371 cascade in Manitoba, Canada: Methods, measures, and estimates to meet local needs. *Journal*  
372 *of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2021;132:26-33.
- 373 15. Mugglin C, Klager D, Gueler A, Vanobberghen F, Rice B, Egger M, et al. The HIV care  
374 cascade in sub-Saharan Africa: systematic review of published criteria and definitions. *J Int*  
375 *AIDS Soc*. 2021;24(7):e25761.
- 376 16. Yehia BR, Stewart L, Momplaisir F, Mody A, Holtzman CW, Jacobs LM, et al. Barriers and  
377 facilitators to patient retention in HIV care. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2015;15:246.
- 378 17. Giordano TP, Gifford AL, White AC, Jr., Suarez-Almazor ME, Rabeneck L, Hartman C, et  
379 al. Retention in care: a challenge to survival with HIV infection. *Clin Infect Dis*.  
380 2007;44(11):1493-9.

- 381 18. Rehman N, Wu M, Garcia C, Leenus A, El-Kecheh H, Bhandari M, et al. Measures of  
382 Retention in HIV Care: A Study Within a Review. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*.  
383 2023;37(4):192-8.
- 384 19. Shah M, Risher K, Berry SA, Dowdy DW. The Epidemiologic and Economic Impact of  
385 Improving HIV Testing, Linkage, and Retention in Care in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis*.  
386 2016;62(2):220-9.
- 387 20. Nyanhoka L, Tudur-Smith C, Porcher R, Hren D. Key stakeholders' perspectives and  
388 experiences with defining, identifying and displaying gaps in health research: a qualitative  
389 study protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(8):e027926.
- 390 21. Creswell JW, Clark VLP. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*: Sage  
391 publications; 2017.
- 392 22. Kelly LM, Cordeiro M. Three principles of pragmatism for research on organizational  
393 processes. *Methodological innovations*. 2020;13(2):2059799120937242.
- 394 23. Schoonenboom J, Johnson RB. How to Construct a Mixed Methods Research Design. *Kolner*  
395 *Z Soz Sozpsychol*. 2017;69(Suppl 2):107-31.
- 396 24. Othman S, Steen M, Fleet J-A. A sequential explanatory mixed methods study design: An  
397 example of how to integrate data in a midwifery research project. *Journal of Nursing*  
398 *Education and Practice*. 2020;11(2).
- 399 25. Bowen P, Rose R, Pilkington A. MIXED METHODS-THEORY AND PRACTICE.  
400 SEQUENTIAL, EXPLANATORY APPROACH. 2017;5:10-27.
- 401 26. Mbuagbaw L, Ongolo-Zogo P, Thabane L. Investigating community ownership of a text  
402 message programme to improve adherence to antiretroviral therapy and provider-client  
403 communication: a mixed methods research protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3(6):e002816.

- 404 27. Mbuagbaw L, Thabane L, Ongolo-Zogo P, et al. The Cameroon Mobile Phone SMS (CAMPS)  
405 trial: a randomized trial of text messaging versus usual care for adherence to antiretroviral  
406 therapy. PLoS One. 2012;7(12):e46909.
- 407 28. Bowen GA. Naturalistic inquiry and the saturation concept: a research note. Qualitative  
408 research. 2008;8(1):137-52.
- 409 29. Fetters MD, Curry LA, Creswell JW. Achieving integration in mixed methods designs-  
410 principles and practices. Health Serv Res. 2013;48(6 Pt 2):2134-56.
- 411 30. Bradshaw C, Atkinson S, Doody O. Employing a qualitative description approach in health  
412 care research. Global qualitative nursing research. 2017;4:2333393617742282.
- 413 31. Classifications and standards - Country groupings. World Health Organization [Available  
414 from: [https://www.who.int/observatories/global-observatory-on-health-research-and-](https://www.who.int/observatories/global-observatory-on-health-research-and-development/classifications-and-standards/country-groupings)  
415 [development/classifications-and-standards/country-groupings](https://www.who.int/observatories/global-observatory-on-health-research-and-development/classifications-and-standards/country-groupings)
- 416 32. Mbuagbaw L, Jhuti D, Zakaryan G, El-Kechen H, Rehman N, Youssef M, et al. A Database  
417 of Randomized Trials on the HIV Care Cascade (CASCADE Database): Descriptive Study.  
418 JMIR Data. 2022;3(1):e36874.
- 419 33. Taherdoost H. Determining Sample Size; How to Calculate Survey Sample Size. International  
420 Journal of Economics and Management Systems. 2017;2.
- 421 34. Sedgwick P. Proportional quota sampling. Bmj. 2012;345.
- 422 35. Abramson JH. WINPEPI updated: computer programs for epidemiologists, and their teaching  
423 potential. Epidemiologic Perspectives & Innovations 2011, 8:1. 2011.
- 424 36. Shannon DM, Johnson TE, Searcy S, Lott A. Using electronic surveys: Advice from survey  
425 professionals. Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation. 2002;8(1):1.

- 426 37. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data  
427 capture (REDCap)—a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing  
428 translational research informatics support. *Journal of biomedical informatics*. 2009;42(2):377-  
429 81.
- 430 38. Nemoto T, Beglar D, editors. Likert-scale questionnaires. JALT 2013 conference proceedings;  
431 2014.
- 432 39. Rehman Y, Syed M, Wiercioch W, Rehman N, Drew B, Cenic A, et al. Discrepancies Between  
433 Patient and Surgeon Expectations of Surgery for Sciatica: A Challenge for Informed Decision  
434 Making? *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2019;44(10):740-6.
- 435 40. Rehman N, Mbuagbaw L. Measures of retention in HIV care: A study within a review.  
436 MacSphere: McMaster University; 2022.
- 437 41. IBM Corp. Released 2021. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 28.0. Armonk, NY:  
438 IBM Corp.
- 439 42. Andersson EK, Sjöström-Strand A, Willman A, Borglin G. Registered nurses views of caring  
440 in coronary care—a deductive and inductive content analysis. *Journal of clinical nursing*.  
441 2015;24(23-24):3481-93.
- 442 43. Fetters MD, Curry LA, Creswell JW. Achieving integration in mixed methods designs—  
443 principles and practices. *Health services research*. 2013;48(6pt2):2134-56.
- 444 44. Mbuagbaw L, Bonono-Momnougui R-C, Thabane L, Kouanfack C, Smieja M, Ongolo-Zogo  
445 P. A framework for community ownership of a text messaging programme to improve  
446 adherence to antiretroviral therapy and client-provider communication: a mixed methods  
447 study. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2014;14:1-12.



- 448 45. Mbuagbaw L, Ongolo-Zogo P, Thabane L. Investigating community ownership of a text  
449 message programme to improve adherence to antiretroviral therapy and provider-client  
450 communication: a mixed methods research protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3(6).
- 451 46. Given LM. *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*: Sage publications; 2008.
- 452 47. Bradbury-Jones C. Enhancing rigour in qualitative health research: exploring subjectivity  
453 through Peshkin's I's. *Journal of advanced nursing*. 2007;59(3):290-8.
- 454 48. Cypress BS. Qualitative research: the "what," "why," "who," and "how"! *Dimens Crit Care*  
455 *Nurs*. 2015;34(6):356-61.
- 456 49. Forero R, Nahidi S, De Costa J, Mohsin M, Fitzgerald G, Gibson N, et al. Application of four-  
457 dimension criteria to assess rigour of qualitative research in emergency medicine. *BMC*  
458 *Health Services Research*. 2018;18(1):120.

## 459 **Supporting information**

460 **S 1 Fig.** Study diagram of an exploratory sequential study with survey development on measures  
461 of retention in HIV.

462 **S2 Appendix.** Interview guide for the qualitative phase of the study.