

**Title:** Exploring Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) modality preferences among Black cisgender women attending family planning clinics in Chicago

**Author names and affiliations:**

Amy K. Johnson, PhD, MSW<sup>a,b</sup>  
Emily Ott, MS  
Eleanor E. Friedman, PhD<sup>c</sup>  
Amy Moore, MS<sup>c</sup>  
Isa Alvarez, BS<sup>c</sup>  
Agustina Pandiani, BS<sup>c</sup>  
Catherine Desmarais, DrPH  
Sadia Haider, MD, MPH<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Division of Adolescent Medicine, Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

<sup>b</sup>Department of Pediatrics, Northwestern Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA

<sup>c</sup>University of Chicago, Chicago IL, USA

<sup>d</sup>Rush University, Chicago IL, USA

**Conflicts of Interest and Source of Funding:** This work was supported by funding received from the Society of Family Planning Research Fund (#SFPFR11-II5-2) and The University of Chicago Women's Board. The authors of this manuscript declare no conflicting interests.

**Abbreviations:** HIV: Human Immunodeficiency Virus; PrEP: Pre-exposure prophylaxis; STIs: Sexually Transmitted Infections; FDA: Food and Drug Administration; CAB-LAI: Cabotegravir long-acting injectable; MSM: Men who have sex with men

## PrEP modality preferences among women

### ABSTRACT

**Background:** Despite Pre-exposure prophylaxis's (PrEP) demonstrated effectiveness, Black cisgender women continue to be at an elevated risk for HIV acquisition and uptake of daily oral PrEP is low in this population in the US. As advancements in PrEP delivery options continue, it is important to understand women's acceptability of these additional options, specifically Black cisgender women, in order to inform uptake and adherence among this population at increased need of HIV prevention options.

**Setting:** A cross-sectional survey among Black cisgender women ages 13-45 (inclusive) attending women's health clinics in Chicago, IL, prior to the approval of CAB-LA.

**Methods:** Descriptive statistics were used to describe the sample and bivariate analysis was used to detect differences between categorical and outcome variables using chi-square test. Responses to open-ended questions were thematically coded to explore Black cisgender women's attitudes and preferences between the three methods of PrEP delivery including: vaginal ring, long-acting injectable, and a combined method that would prevent both pregnancy and HIV.

**Results:** In total, 211 cisgender women and adolescents responded to the survey. Both injections and combination pills were popular among participants, with 64.5% and 67.3% expressing interest in these forms of PrEP, respectively. The least popular method was the vaginal ring option, with 75.4% of respondents indicating that they would not consider using this modality. Overall, responses were not statistically different between the two surveys administered (Chi square p-values for injection PrEP method 0.66, combination PrEP method 0.93, and ring PrEP method 0.66) suggesting that the popularity of each method was not dependent on clinic location or age of participants.

**Conclusion:** This research provides important insights into the preferences and attitudes of different PrEP modalities among Black cisgender women. As different modalities continue to be approved for use among cisgender women, more research is needed to investigate the acceptability and preferences of these different modalities in order to improve uptake and adherence among this population.

PrEP modality preferences among women

**Key words:** HIV, Prevention, Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis, Modalities

## PrEP modality preferences among women

### INTRODUCTION

Despite major advances in HIV prevention and treatment, racial and gender disparities in HIV/AIDS incidence continue to persist. Of the 36,801 new HIV cases in the U.S. in 2019, nearly 16% of all new HIV infections occurred among heterosexual women. In particular, Black cisgender women in the U.S. are disproportionately affected by HIV and although annual infections remained stable overall from 2015 to 2019 among this population, the rate of new HIV infections among Black women is 11 times that of white women and four times that of Latina women . Specific to Chicago, 85% of new HIV infections among heterosexual women in Chicago were among Non-Hispanic Blacks (Chicago Department of Public Health, 2016). This shows us that effective prevention methods are not adequately reaching people who could benefit most and underscores the need to develop and implement effective HIV prevention strategies for women, with a specific focus on advancing strategies among the Black community.

Approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in 2012 for adult populations and then in May 2018 for high-risk adolescents, pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) is a promising biomedical prevention strategy that has the potential to reduce HIV infection among HIV negative populations who are at risk for acquisition (Hosek et al., 2016; Machado et al., 2017; Pilgrim et al., 2016). Despite previous studies demonstrating that oral HIV-PrEP can reduce HIV incidence among women who are adherent to PrEP, awareness and uptake is particularly low among Black women (Auerbach et al., 2015). Barriers to oral PrEP uptake and adherence include cost, the burden of taking a daily pill, and concerns about potential health effects (both long-term and short-term effects) and have led to an underutilization of PrEP among eligible groups (Golub et al., 2013; Krakower & Mayer, 2015; Wilton et al., 2015; Young & McDaid, 2014). Most importantly, studies have focused primarily on its use for MSM with a lack of data for cisgender women (Anderson et al., 2016).

Given the under-representation of cisgender women in PrEP research efforts (Bailey et al., 2017), there is an urgent need to better understand the unique factors that influence Black cisgender women's

## PrEP modality preferences among women

uptake and acceptance of PrEP in order to curtail HIV-related health inequities in this population. In order to better understand women's preferences for delivery methods of PrEP we conducted a survey of reproductive-aged women (ages 13-45 years) attending family planning clinics and explored HIV prevention behavior, awareness, and acceptability of PrEP. Using semi-structured interview format, we assessed attitudes and preferences across three different PrEP delivery strategies, including: vaginal ring, long-acting injectable, and a combined method that would prevent both pregnancy and HIV. Participants were also asked how these modalities compared to the daily pill option, since at the time of this study was conducted this modality was the only currently approved option. It is important to note, as of December 2021, the FDA approved the first injectable therapy for use in both adults and adolescents, cabotegravir long-acting injectable (CAB-LA) (LaPreze, 2022).

## **METHODS**

### *Setting*

To examine PrEP preferences among Black cisgender women in Chicago, we conducted a survey among patients at two care locations: University of Chicago Ryan Center and Planned Parenthood of Illinois family planning clinic. All participants completed informed consent procedures, and this study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards at the University of Chicago (IRB17-0984; IRB18-0901), and Lurie Children's Hospital (IRB2017-1410). Data was collected between January to August of 2019.

### *Study population*

Eligibility was as follows: English-speaking, self-identify as African American and/or Black, 13-45 years old (inclusive), live in Chicago, and report recent sexual activity (within the last 6-12 months). All participants over 18 years completed oral informed consent prior to engaging in the study. Oral informed assent was obtained for participants under the age of 18 years and a parental waiver of consent for minor participants was granted to protect privacy of participants.

### *Measures*

## PrEP modality preferences among women

Participants completed a quantitative survey followed by a brief semi-structured qualitative interview. All survey data were self-reported. The survey captured information about PrEP awareness, acceptability, barriers and facilitators to uptake, PrEP modality preferences and demographic and behavioral domains. We have previously described many of the questions used in this survey (Haider, et al. 2022; Johnson et al. 2020). Finally, participants were asked their opinions on other ways to take PrEP (i.e., long-acting injectable, vaginal ring, combined with a birth control pill) and how these different methods compared to the daily pill option, the only current FDA-approved method at the time of survey administration (e.g., “If a long-acting injectable (a shot that lasts a while, like the depo shot for birth control) version of PrEP was available, would you consider taking it? Why or why not? How does the injectable compare to a daily pill?”).

### *Data Analysis*

Descriptive statistics were used to describe the sample and bivariate analysis was used to detect differences between categorical and outcome variables using chi-square test. Quantitative analysis was conducted in SAS 9.4 (Cary, North Carolina). Responses to open-ended questions were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim; responses were thematically coded by the first author and themes were discussed with the study team to ensure consensus of code application.

## **RESULTS**

In total 211 cisgender women and adolescents responded to the survey. Responses were not statistically different between the survey location or age of participants (chi-square p-values for injection PrEP method 0.66, combination PrEP method 0.93, and ring PrEP method 0.66) suggesting that the popularity of each method was independent on location and age of participants.

Long acting injectables were a popular choice among participants with 64.5% expressing interest in this form of PrEP. Common themes that emerged from semi-structured responses in favor of injectable PrEP included not having to take a daily pill (86.8% of favorable responses), and general preference for an

## PrEP modality preferences among women

injection (11.0%). Most common themes for disinterest in an injectable form of PrEP included not liking shots (53.3% of negative responses) and having previously had a negative experience with Depo-Provera (21.3%). Similarly, combination pills that combined PrEP and birth control were also popular with 67.3% of participants willing to consider this method should it become available. Common thematic reasons why a combination pill was considered included a single pill with dual prevention effects (54.9% of favorable responses) general favourability (24.7%) and convenience (16.9%). Common reasons for disinterest included a desire to keep the prevention methods separate (34.6% of negative responses), general disinterest (23.2%) and currently trying to conceive or otherwise have no need for birth control (23.2%). Far less popular was the vaginal ring option, with 75.4% of respondents indicating that they would not consider using this modality if it became available. Favorable themes for vaginal ring PrEP delivery systems included not having to take a daily pill (67.3% of favorable responses) and general interest (13.2%). Common areas of disinterest included not wanting the ring in their body (60.4%) and general negative feelings about the ring (13.2%) (Table 1).

Previous experiences, both positive and negative with birth control modalities also were distinctly listed as reasons for and against different PrEP modalities. Birth control pills, the Nuva ring, and Depo-Provera were all cited as explaining participants preferences for, or against similar delivery devices.

There was high overlap between those who were interested in combination and injection prevention methods (66.9%). For those interested in the ring method, high interest in both the injection and combination methods were seen (67.3% for both) but for those interested in either injection or combination methods, significantly lower interest in the ring method was seen (25.7%) (Table 2).

When demographic and behavioral or sexual history factors were examined for associations with each PrEP modality no significant relationships were identified. Factors that were similar across preference for PrEP modalities included Sexually Transmitted Infection (STI) testing and treatment in the last three months, vaginal or anal sex in the last three months, use of condoms for either vaginal or anal

## PrEP modality preferences among women

sex, having heard of PrEP prior to the study and interest in starting PrEP (pill method). Participants who indicated that they were not interested in using PrEP as a daily pill did express interest in other forms of PrEP delivery, for example among those interested in the injection method, 37.0% of women originally expressed disinterest in using a separate PrEP pill. Similar results were seen for women interested in the combination pill but not the single use pill (40.3%), while fewer women were interested in the ring but not the daily separate pill (13.7%).

## DISCUSSION

HIV prevention efforts to date in the U.S., specifically PrEP scale-up initiatives, have not had a sufficient impact on uptake among Black cisgender women (Hodder et al., 2013). In the context of sustained rates of HIV among Black cisgender women and low uptake of daily oral PrEP, additional effective and desirable HIV prevention tools are needed. This study contributes data on Black cisgender women's preferences for PrEP modalities, including the daily oral pill, LAI, ring, and combination methods. At the time this study was conducted the only approved method was the daily oral pill, so the other options, despite currently in development, were presented as theoretical options.

Popularity for each PrEP modality among Black cisgender women in our study were consistent with prior studies among women in the U.S. (Irie, 2022; Eloppe, 2022). In our study, most women preferred injections (64.5%) and combination pills (67.3%) while majority of participants (75.4%) cited the vaginal ring as being their least preferred option. Based on responses in our study, women's previous experiences with birth control methods were commonly cited as reasons for and against different PrEP modalities. Given the research on acceptability and implementation of contraceptive modalities over the past several decades (Delany-Moretlwe et al., 2016; Myers et al., 2015; Myers & Sepkowitz, 2013), it is possible that offering various delivery options of PrEP may improve uptake and adherence among ciswomen and perhaps even align with contraceptive preferences.

### *Limitations*



## PrEP modality preferences among women

These results should be considered in light of the study's limitations. First, our sample size is small which limited statistical power, variability in responses, and the inability to detect subgroup differences. Second, participants were recruited from two sexual health centers in an urban area and therefore our findings should not be interpreted as generalizable to Black cisgender women in totality. For instance, participants in this study may be better connected to sexual health information and as a result, have more knowledge and acceptability of PrEP overall compared to Black cisgender women not attending a sexual health center. Third, all data were self-reported and may be subject to social desirability; however, to mitigate socially desirable responses, quantitative data was collected via computer-assisted self-interviewing. Finally, at the time of survey administration participants were informed that the only currently approved and recommended form of PrEP was the daily oral pill. As stated above, in December 2021 (after the study was conducted), the FDA approved the first LAI PrEP (LaPreze, et al., 2022; FDA 2021). Had this information been available and known to participants at the time of survey administration, it is possible that acceptability and preferences toward the LAI PrEP modality may have been different. In addition, since we explored theoretical preferences for the various PrEP modalities and did not provide information about their relative costs or efficacy, our findings should be replicated in order to impact PrEP uptake.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study is one of the first of its kind to provide insight into preferences for and attitudes of PrEP modalities among Black cisgender women, including adolescent and young women. As advancements in PrEP delivery options continue, it is important to understand acceptability of additional options among subpopulations with disparate rates of HIV. Study findings have the potential to inform PrEP uptake and adherence as well as development, research, and clinical implementation for Black cisgender women.

PrEP modality preferences among women

**Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to thank the women who participated in the study and acknowledge Amber Olson, BS, for her assistance and support with recruitment.

PrEP modality preferences among women

**TABLE 1.** Qualitative Assessment of Themes Related to Modalities of PrEP

<b>Modality and disposition</b>	<b>Thematic category</b>	<b>Frequency, (%)</b>	<b>illustrative quote</b>
Injectable positive	not having to take a daily pill	118 (86.8%)	<i>"I think the injection would be better, it's not something you have to remember everyday to get up and take it."</i>  <i>"Everyday is too much. I can't remember stuff like that as I have a job and a lot going on. Shot will be better."</i>
Injectable positive	general- no reason	15 (11.0%)	<i>"I would rather take the shot"</i>
Injectable negative	doesn't like shots	40 (53.3%)	<i>"I wouldn't take it because I don't like shots. And I don't like that in my body"</i>
Injectable negative	negative reaction because of experience with Depo-Provera	16 (21.3%)	<i>"I don't like needles. Yea, I don't like needles."</i> <i>"Me personally, no. Because the depo shot didn't work for me, that's how I got pregnant. So injections, that wouldn't be something I'd consider. Yea."</i>  <i>"Um, just because what I know about depo, it made me gain a whole bunch of weight. And I don't know it was an injection, or what, but yea. Yea."</i>
Vaginal ring positive	not having to take a daily pill	35 (67.3%)	<i>Yeah, because it's more easy, like to deal with...instead of like forgetting like, 'oh I forgot to take my pill"</i>  <i>"Probably the ring, because I won't remember to take the pill everyday"</i>
Vaginal ring positive	General- no reason	14 (26.9%)	<i>"of course!"</i>
Vaginal ring negative	does not want ring in body	96 (60.4%)	<i>"I don't want to take pills."</i> <i>"the ring just seems too uncomfortable"</i>  <i>"I am just not comfortable inserting things down there. It wouldn't be bad, but what about if you can feel it? I rather do the pill"</i>
Vaginal ring negative	general- no reason	21 (13.2%)	<i>"No, nope."</i>
Combination pill positive	dual prevention	78 (54.9%)	<i>"I don't like the vaginal ring. I don't like it."</i> <i>"Yea. Because that's killing two birds with one stone. You don't have to worry about HIV, and then it's a birth control too. So, it's really like, you're getting two things out of one."</i>

PrEP modality preferences among women

				<i>"That is a double whammy, yes! Cause instead of taking two pills a day for two different cause, you can do it in one."</i>
Combination pill positive	general	35 (24.7%)		<i>"I would definitely take it. I don't have to worry about getting pregnant or getting a disease, that's beautiful."</i>
Combination pill positive	convenience	24 (16.9%)		<i>"It won't be a problem with taking it" "Yes. More convenient; It's practical."</i>
Combination pill negative	want separated	17 (24.6%)		<i>"Time-wise it will be effective, it's easier to have one thing over two things." "No because I am worried about the combination of the drugs"</i>
Combination pill negative	trying to conceive/no need for BC	16 (23.2%)		<i>"It should be separate, because women might not take it" "Well me, for myself, my tubes are tied, so it really wouldn't make a difference with the pregnancy part"</i>
Combination pill negative	general	16 (23.2%)		<i>"Because for me personally, I know this when I go to the doctor that they pushed birth control on me, but now since I am getting a little bit older and I feel like I am a lot stable than most people my age, I am not really concerned. If I was to get pregnant today, It wouldn't be harm. I not 15 or nothing, I have my own place, my own car and I wouldn't feel bad about getting pregnant" "No- not interested"</i>
				<i>"I would take the HIV prevention pill only"</i>

PrEP modality preferences among women

**TABLE 2.** Modalities of PrEP and Associations with Demographic and Behavioral Characteristics

<b>Answered yes to:</b>	<b>Interested in combination prevention (N, %) Chisq p-value 142 (67.3%)</b>	<b>Interested in injection prevention (N, %) Chisq p-value 136 (64.5%)</b>	<b>Interested in ring prevention (N, %) Chisq p-value 52 (24.6%)</b>
Interested in combination prevention	NA	95 (69.9%) 0.29	35 (67.3%) 0.99
Interested in injection prevention	95 (66.9%) 0.29	NA	35 (67.3%) 0.62
Interested in ring prevention	35 (25.7%) 0.99	35 (25.7%) 0.62	NA
STI testing in last 3months	91 (65.5%) 0.56	95 (70.9%) 0.09	32 (64.0%) 0.63
STI treatment in last 3 months	17 (12.1%) 0.63	19 (14.1%) 0.50	6 (12.0%) 0.82
Partner with HIV last three months	3 (2.1%) 0.99**	3 (2.2%) 0.99**	2 (3.9%) 0.26**
Vaginal sex	134 (94.4%) 0.65	127 (93.4%) 0.71	48 (92.3%) 0.60
Anal sex	16 (11.3%) 0.57	15 (11.0%) 0.70	5 (9.6%) 0.83
Use of condoms with vaginal sex (of those who had vaginal sex)	25 (18.7%) 0.50	23 (18.1%) 0.72	6 (%) 0.59
Use of condoms with anal sex (of those who had anal sex)	1 (6.25%) 0.71	1 (6.7%) 0.74	0 (0.0%) 0.84
Previously heard of PrEP	62 (44.0%) 0.90	58 (43.0%) 0.61	27 (52.9%) 0.15
Interested in starting PrEP	55 (39.3%) 0.51	56 (41.8%) 0.72	22 (43.1%) 0.70
Age categories			
<18	4 (2.9%)	6 (4.5%)	3 (6.0%)
Between 18-24	62 (44.6%)	54 (40.6%)	24 (48.0%)
Between 25-30	46 (33.1%)	44 (33.1%)	13 (26.0%)
≥30	27 (19.42%) 0.77	29 (21.8%) 0.47	20 (20.0%) 0.58
Had an abortion in the last year	30 (21.3%) 0.32	35 (25.9%) 0.23	17 (33.3%) 0.052

\*\*fishers exact test used

## PrEP modality preferences among women

### References

- Anderson, P. L., García-Lerma, J. G., & Heneine, W. (2016). Non-daily pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention. *Current Opinion in HIV and AIDS*, 11(1), 94.
- Auerbach, J. D., Kinsky, S., Brown, G., & Charles, V. (2015). Knowledge, Attitudes, and Likelihood of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) Use Among US Women at Risk of Acquiring HIV. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, 29(2), 102–110. <https://doi.org/10.1089/apc.2014.0142>
- Bailey, J. L., Molino, S. T., Vega, A. D., & Badowski, M. (2017). A Review of HIV Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis: The Female Perspective. In *Infectious Diseases and Therapy* (Vol. 6, Issue 3, pp. 363–382). Springer Healthcare. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40121-017-0159-9>
- Bradley, E., Forsberg, K., Betts, J. E., DeLuca, J. B., Kamitani, E., Porter, S. E., Sipe, T. A., & Hoover, K. W. (2019). Factors Affecting Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis Implementation for Women in the United States: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Women's Health*, 28(9), 1272–1285. <https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2018.7353>
- CDC. (2018). *HIV Surveillance Report, 2018 (Preliminary)*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/library/reports/hiv-surveillance.html>.
- Chicago Department of Public Health. (2016). *HIV/STI Surveillance Report 2016*.
- Delany-Moretlwe, S., Mullick, S., Eakle, R., & Rees, H. (2016). Planning for HIV preexposure prophylaxis introduction. *Current Opinion in HIV and AIDS*, 11(1), 87–93. <https://doi.org/10.1097/COH.0000000000000221>
- Elopre, L., Boutwell, A., Gordon, B., Johnson, B., Marrazzo, J., Van Der Pol, B., & Mugavero, M. J. (2022). PrEP service delivery preferences of black Cis-gender women living in the Southern United States. *AIDS and Behavior*, 26(11), 3469-3479.
- FDA U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA approves first injectable treatment for HIV pre-exposure prevention. FDA News Release. FDA; 2021. <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-injectable-treatment-hiv-pre-exposure-prevention>. Accessed 20 Dec 2021
- Garfinkel, D. B., Alexander, K. A., McDonald-Mosley, R., Willie, T. C., & Decker, M. R. (2017). Predictors of HIV-related risk perception and PrEP acceptability among young adult female family planning patients. *AIDS Care*, 29(6), 751–758. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540121.2016.1234679>
- Golub, S. A., Gamarel, K. E., Rendina, H. J., Surace, A., & Lelutiu-Weinberger, C. L. (2013). From efficacy to effectiveness: facilitators and barriers to PrEP acceptability and motivations for adherence among MSM and transgender women in New York City. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, 27(4), 248–254.
- Haider, S., Friedman, E. E., Ott, E., Moore, A., Pandiani, A., Desmarais, C., & Johnson, A. K. (2022). Knowledgeable, aware/interested: Young black women's perceptions of pre-exposure prophylaxis. *Frontiers in Reproductive Health*, 4, 671009.
- Hess, K. L., Johnson, S. D., Hu, X., Li, J., Wu, B., Yu, C., Zhu, H., Jin, C., Chen, M., & Gerstle, J. (2018). *Diagnoses of HIV infection in the United States and dependent areas, 2017*.
- Hodder, S. L., Justman, J., Hughes, J. P., Wang, J., Haley, D. F., Adimora, A. A., Del Rio, C., Golin, C. E., Kuo, I., & Rompalo, A. (2013). HIV acquisition among women from selected areas of the United States: a cohort study. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 158(1), 10–18.
- Hosek, S., Celum, C., Wilson, C. M., Kapogiannis, B., Delany-Moretlwe, S., & Bekker, L.-G. (2016). Preventing HIV among adolescents with oral PrEP: observations and challenges in the United States and South Africa. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*, 19, 21107. <https://doi.org/10.7448/IAS.19.7.21107>
- Irie, W. C., Calabrese, S. K., Patel, R. R., Mayer, K. H., Geng, E. H., & Marcus, J. L. (2022). Preferences for HIV preexposure prophylaxis products among black women in the US. *AIDS and*

## PrEP modality preferences among women

- Behavior*, 26(7), 2212-2223.
- Johnson, A. K., Fletcher, F. E., Ott, E., Wishart, M., Friedman, E. E., Terlikowski, J., & Haider, S. (2020). Awareness and intent to use pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) among African American women in a family planning clinic. *Journal of racial and ethnic health disparities*, 7, 550-554.
- Kay, E. S., & Pinto, R. M. (2020). Is Insurance a Barrier to HIV Preexposure Prophylaxis? Clarifying the Issue. *American Journal of Public Health*, 110(1), 61–64.  
<https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2019.305389>
- Koren, D. E., Nichols, J. S., & Simoncini, G. M. (2018). HIV Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis and Women: Survey of the Knowledge, Attitudes, and Beliefs in an Urban Obstetrics/Gynecology Clinic. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, 32(12), 490–494.  
<https://doi.org/10.1089/apc.2018.0030>
- Krakower, D. S., & Mayer, K. H. (2015). Pre-exposure prophylaxis to prevent HIV infection: current status, future opportunities and challenges. *Drugs*, 75(3), 243–251.
- LaPreze J, CDCES C, Nowicki B. Current and Evolving Treatments for HIV PrEP. *US Pharm*. 2022;47(3):38-42.
- Machado, D. M., de Sant' Anna Carvalho, A. M., & Riera, R. (2017). Adolescent pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention: current perspectives. *Adolescent Health, Medicine and Therapeutics, Volume 8*, 137–148. <https://doi.org/10.2147/AHMT.S112757>
- Marcus, J. L., Hurley, L. B., Hare, C. B., Nguyen, D. P., Phengrasamy, T., Silverberg, M. J., Stoltey, J. E., & Volk, J. E. (2016). Preexposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention in a large integrated health care system: adherence, renal safety, and discontinuation. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes (1999)*, 73(5), 540.
- Myers, J. E., Ellman, T. M., & Westhoff, C. (2015). Injectable agents for pre-exposure prophylaxis. *Current Opinion in HIV and AIDS*, 10(4), 271–277.  
<https://doi.org/10.1097/COH.0000000000000166>
- Myers, J. E., & Sepkowitz, K. A. (2013). A pill for HIV prevention: Déjà vu all over again? In *Clinical Infectious Diseases* (Vol. 56, Issue 11, pp. 1604–1612).  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cit085>
- Pilgrim, N., Mathur, S., Gottert, A., Rutenberg, N., & Pulerwitz, J. (2016). *Building evidence to guide PrEP introduction for adolescent girls and young women*.  
<https://doi.org/10.31899/hiv7.1008>
- Tims-Cook, Z. (2019). A Retrospective Assessment of Antecedent Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis Eligibility of HIV-Positive Women in the South. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, 33(9), 384–387. <https://doi.org/10.1089/apc.2019.0046>
- UNAIDS. (2017). *AIDSinfo*.
- Wilton, J., Senn, H., Sharma, M., & Tan, D. H. S. (2015). Pre-exposure prophylaxis for sexually-acquired HIV risk management: a review. *Hiv/Aids (Auckland, NZ)*, 7, 125.
- Young, I., & McDaid, L. (2014). How Acceptable are Antiretrovirals for the Prevention of Sexually Transmitted HIV?: A Review of Research on the Acceptability of Oral Pre-exposure Prophylaxis and Treatment as Prevention. *AIDS and Behavior*, 18(2), 195–216.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-013-0560-7>

## PrEP modality preferences among women