

1 **"We have our reasons": Exploring the acceptability of pre-exposure prophylaxis among gay,**
2 **bisexual, and other men who have sex with men in Ghana**

3 Authors: Gloria Aidoo-Frimpong^{1*}, Gamji Rabiou Abu-Ba'are^{1,2}, Amos Apreku³, Richard Panix
4 Amoh-Otu⁴ Edem Zigah⁵, Prince Amu-Adu⁵, Samuel Amuah⁴, Laura Nyblade⁶, Kwasi Torpey³,
5 LaRon E. Nelson^{1,7,8}

6

7 ¹Center for Interdisciplinary Research on AIDS, School of Public Health, Yale University, New
8 Haven, CT

9 ² Behavioral, Sexual, and Global Health Lab, School of Nursing, University of Rochester,
10 Rochester, New York, USA

11 ³Department of Population, Family & Reproductive Health, School of Public Health, University
12 of Ghana, Legon-Accra, Ghana

13 ⁴Youth Alliance for Health and Human Rights, Kumasi, Ghana

14 ⁵Priorities on Rights and Sexual Health, Accra, Ghana,

15 ⁶RTI International, Washington DC 20005, USA

16 ⁷School of Nursing, Yale University, New Haven CT, USA

17 ⁸Social and Behavioral Sciences Division, School of Public Health, Yale University, New Haven
18 CT, USA

19

20 *Corresponding Author

21 Email: gloria.aidoo-frimpong@yale.edu

22

23 **Abstract**

24 Ghanaian men who have sex with men (MSM) face significant HIV disparities. Pre-exposure
25 prophylaxis (PrEP) is a highly effective tool for HIV prevention. Previous studies on the
26 perspectives of PrEP use among Ghanaian MSM identified high interest in PrEP among this
27 population. However, the knowledge from the previous research, which was the best available
28 evidence at the time, was primarily hypothetical because those data were collected before any real-
29 world implementation of PrEP in Ghana. The purpose of the analysis is to identify and understand
30 the factors currently influencing PrEP acceptance. We conducted a secondary analysis of focus
31 group (n=8) data with Ghanaian MSM. Audio transcripts were subjected to descriptive thematic
32 analysis. There was an almost universal awareness of PrEP, but inaccuracies about PrEP were
33 common. PrEP acceptability was influenced by a mix of individual and intrapersonal factors. To
34 bridge the gap between awareness, knowledge, and acceptability, HIV prevention programs should
35 address access barriers and incorporate community-derived strategies.

36

37 **Introduction**

38 Globally, HIV prevalence has decreased over the past decade, yet it remains
39 disproportionately high among key populations, notably men who have sex with men (MSM).
40 Key populations, including MSM, account for 70% of the global HIV burden, facing a risk 28
41 times greater than that of adult men who do not have sex with men (1). In sub-Saharan Africa
42 alone, where 60% of the new 1.7 million HIV infections occurred in 2018 (2), Ghana presents a
43 generalized HIV epidemic with prevalence rates 18.1% among MSM (3-5), compared to the
44 1.7% reported among the general population (6).

45 In response to this crisis, the global health community has embraced antiretroviral
46 medications for pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) as a preventive measure. The World Health
47 Organization recommends PrEP as a highly effective biomedical prevention strategy for
48 individuals at high risk of HIV exposure (7). The introduction of oral PrEP has been a significant
49 advancement in the prevention of HIV (8), and more recently, the development of an injectable
50 platform – which offers a sustained release formulation and was shown to be superior to oral
51 PrEP in a randomized controlled trial, mainly due to its reduced reliance on daily adherence (9)
52 – has broadened prevention strategies. Despite its promise, the uptake of PrEP is hindered by
53 challenges at various levels, including provider, patient, and healthcare system (10, 11). The
54 persistent barriers and lack of comprehensive knowledge among MSM significantly impede both
55 the implementation and utilization of PrEP as an HIV prevention strategy.

56 In Ghana, the National AIDS/STI Control Program (NACP) under the auspices of the
57 Ghana Health Service laid the groundwork for PrEP delivery by incorporating it into the
58 Consolidated Guidelines for HIV Care in Ghana as early as August 2019 (12). This proactive
59 step paved the way for the commencement of PrEP services to key populations a year later, in
60 August 2020, with a particular emphasis on MSM (13). Research conducted in Ghana before the
61 rollout of PrEP consistently indicated that a lack of awareness and knowledge among Ghanaian
62 MSM was a significant barrier to PrEP's acceptance(14, 15).

63 To maximize the effectiveness of PrEP in reducing HIV incidence among key
64 populations in Ghana, particularly as access to this preventive measure expands, it is crucial to
65 understand what factors influence both the awareness, knowledge and the acceptability of PrEP
66 among Ghanaian MSM. This study's primary goal was to explore the determinants of PrEP
67 acceptability within a cohort of gay and bisexual men, as well as other men who engage in same-

68 gender sexual relations in Ghana. Our research was driven by two principal questions: Firstly,
69 what levels of knowledge, awareness, and attitudes do these men hold regarding PrEP?
70 Secondly, do they view PrEP as an acceptable and efficient means of preventing HIV?
71 Understanding the awareness, knowledge, attitudes, and acceptability of PrEP among MSM in
72 Ghana is vital for the design of tailored educational and health promotion programs. This
73 investigation aimed to reveal these factors to inform strategies that could bridge gaps in PrEP
74 utilization. By identifying the current factors to PrEP uptake, this study could lead to the
75 development of targeted interventions that enhance PrEP adherence and persistence, ultimately
76 contributing to the reduction of new HIV infections among MSM in Ghana.

77 **Material and methods**

78 This study was a qualitative description, using secondary data obtained from focus groups (FG)
79 FGs are a type of group discussion that are used to elicit detailed descriptions of the shared
80 experiences of those participating in the conversation(16). The social interaction that influences
81 that discussion is a key advantage to understanding the general social perspective on a topic, which
82 is not reliably achieved in an in-depth interview—which centers the individual’s perspective (17).
83 These group discussions were conducted as part of formative research aimed at informing the
84 adaptation of a multi-level intersectional stigma-reduction intervention. A comprehensive report
85 on the recruitment methodology utilized in the parent study has been previously published (18).
86 We provide a summary below.

87 **Study settings and sites**

88 The parent study was conducted in Accra, the administrative capital, commercial hub, and
89 largest city of Ghana, as well as in Kumasi, the second largest city in the country. These locations

90 exhibit a rich blend of ethnicities, religions, and cultural diversity, including migrants from various
91 regions within Ghana and neighboring countries. Further, these cities are located in the Greater
92 Accra Region and Ashanti Region which were selected due to their high prevalence of HIV among
93 MSM and their relatively larger populations of men with histories of same-gender sex, compared
94 to other regions in Ghana.

95 **Study population and recruitment**

96 Eligibility for participation in the FGs was limited to individuals who were 18 years of age
97 or older, designated male at birth, currently self-identified as cisgender men, and reported engaging
98 in sexual activity with another man (cisgender and transgender inclusive) at least once within the
99 previous six months. Convenience sampling methods were utilized in partnership with two
100 community partner organizations providing services to gender and sexual minorities to recruit
101 study participants, who were recruited from September 1st, 2020 to October 30th, 2020.

102 **Focus Group Guides**

103 The guides used for focus groups (FGs) contained open-ended questions covering ten main
104 domains. The focus of the secondary analysis is on participants responses to the following
105 questions used to stimulate discussion in the "Attitudes towards PrEP domain" Sample questions
106 include (1) "Were you aware of PrEP before this study? (2) Describe what you know about PrEP,
107 (3) If PrEP were available would you use it? (4) What will prevent or aid you in using PrEP for
108 HIV prevention?

109 **Data Collection**

110 The FG moderators involved in the study were individuals who self-identified as gay and
111 bisexual men and were employees of LGBTQ+ serving partner organizations in their respective

112 cities. These individuals were trained in data collection and the responsible conduct of research
113 with human participants. A total of six FGs were conducted in English. Two FGs were conducted
114 in Twi which is the predominant language spoken in Kumasi, which is the seat of the Twi-speaking
115 Ashanti Kingdom. Providing participants with a non-English language option allowed for the
116 narration of certain experiences that could only be effectively described in their local indigenous
117 language. Participants were informed about the study, its voluntary nature, and the option to
118 withdraw without consequences. Once a participant verbally indicated to the research assistant that
119 all their questions had been satisfactorily answered, we documented that they had given informed
120 consent by having the participant sign an informed consent form. FGs lasted for approximately
121 90-120 minutes. All FGs were digitally recorded and transcribed. The research team, including
122 bilingual research assistants reviewed both English and Twi audio files to ensure consistency of
123 translation and accuracy of the transcription.

124 **Data analysis**

125 Seven research team members with diverse expertise and cultural backgrounds analyzed
126 the data transcripts. The team began by individually analyzing six randomly selected transcripts
127 from the FGs, then identifying and labeling relevant concepts. This was the first step in the coding
128 process. The team then convened to construct a coding schema by defining and categorizing these
129 individual codes. The team used the resultant schema to code the rest of the transcripts. Any
130 discrepancies between coded text were discussed and addressed through discussion with the larger
131 group of analysts and revision of the coding schema to include any new codes. We then combined
132 all codes into code clusters. Clusters were then grouped together into broad categories of
133 participants' experiences and perspectives. The research team examined the resulting broad
134 categories across all transcripts and reviewed them to confirm their comprehensiveness and

135 representativeness. Finally, we identified themes by determining the main message(s) across the
136 broad categories (19).

137 **Ethical Review**

138 Approval for this study was obtained from the institutional review boards of Yale
139 University, Noguchi Medical Research Institute (which serves as the IRB for the University of
140 Ghana), the Ghana Health Service, and the University of Toronto. Before their participation, all
141 study participants who agreed to participate signed an informed consent form. As a token of
142 appreciation for their participation, study participants received a small gratuity of 100 Ghanaian
143 Cedis (approximately \$10 USD) for participating in focus group discussions.

144 **RESULTS**

145 Two overarching themes were identified that characterized the men’s awareness, knowledge and
146 acceptability of PrEP. Awareness was conceptualized as the conscious recognition of the existence
147 of PrEP. Knowledge pertained to the accuracy of details about how it works and how it’s supposed
148 to be used, including its contraindications (e.g., don’t take if you have a suspected HIV infection
149 because of the risk of developing ARV resistance) and limits (e.g., doesn’t prevent STIs). Each of
150 the two themes is built on four categories. The first theme, “almost universal awareness of PrEP
151 but inaccuracies about PrEP were common” are underpinned by these categories: 1) confusion
152 between pre-exposure prophylaxis and post-exposure prophylaxis, 2) event-driven perceptions of
153 PrEP usage, 3) misaligned analogies: equating PrEP with ARVs, and 4) advocacy for a
154 comprehensive educational approach. The second theme was PrEP acceptability was influenced
155 by a mix of individual and intrapersonal factors. The corresponding categories were: 1) Hesitancy
156 towards PrEP uptake due to perceived limited benefit, 2) Extending HIV, sex, and same-sex
157 relations stigma to PrEP affects PrEP uptake, 3) Perceived lack of information, concerns about

158 side effects, and cost act as barriers to PrEP acceptability. These identified themes highlight the
159 importance of addressing gaps in awareness and knowledge of PrEP while acknowledging the
160 complex and diverse factors that influence PrEP's acceptability.

161 **Theme 1: There was an almost universal awareness of PrEP but**
162 **inaccuracies about PrEP were common.**

163

164 *Confusion between pre-exposure prophylaxis and post-exposure prophylaxis*

165 All the participants in the FGs had heard of PrEP prior to the interview, with participants
166 in two FGS indicating that they knew what PrEP was used for. Among those who indicated
167 knowledge of PrEP, it was generally understood as a medication you take after exposure to HIV,
168 thus describing post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP), and not PrEP, which is for pre-exposure. In the
169 except below, a participant reveals a notable misconception surrounding PrEP (pre-exposure
170 prophylaxis) and its confusion with post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP). The participant's comment
171 reflects a context where PrEP is associated with a specific use case – providing medication to staff
172 who have been exposed to potential HIV transmission sources like blood or blood products.

173 *"We use it for our staff, any staff who get infected, you get exposed to blood or blood*
174 *products, PrEP or blood splash , we test you and give you PrEP then three months later*
175 *we test you again , if you are fine , fine. (Group 3, Accra).*

176 This misunderstanding indicates that some individuals might perceive PrEP as a form of
177 "emergency" or "post-exposure" treatment, rather than its intended use as a preventive measure
178 before potential exposure. This perception could stem from inaccurate information dissemination.
179 This highlights a crucial need for educational interventions to clarify the distinct purposes of PrEP
180 and PEP among the target population. Additionally, it underlines the significance of accurate

181 communication about PrEP's pre-exposure nature to maximize its effectiveness in HIV prevention
182 efforts.

183 ***Event-Driven Perceptions of PrEP Usage***

184 In two focus groups in Kumasi, the men discussed their knowledge on PrEP, describing it
185 as an event-driven prevention method. The perspectives shared underscored a mixture of
186 awareness and misperception. As highlighted by a participant: "*What I know about PrEP is that*
187 *you need to take it for about a month for prevention and after the month you take it when you are*
188 *ready for sex*" (FG4, Kumasi). While correctly acknowledging the need to take PrEP for
189 prevention, there was an apparent misunderstanding regarding the timing of its consumption. The
190 idea of taking PrEP "for about a month" may stem from the initial period required for the
191 medication to establish its protective effects. However, the belief that PrEP is only taken "when
192 you are ready for sex" suggests a misconception about its continuous daily use, irrespective of
193 sexual activity timing.

194 ***Misaligned Analogies: Equating PrEP with ARVs***

195 Regarding the participants' awareness of PrEP availability in Ghana, a consensus emerged
196 that PrEP was indeed available within the country. However, an interesting perception was
197 highlighted during the discussions – some participants drew parallels between PrEP and
198 antiretroviral medications (ARVs). This analogy revealed a belief that, akin to ARVs, PrEP is
199 tailored to individual needs. This sentiment was captured by a participant's comment: "*As it is*
200 *PrEP is now becoming common. PrEP is just not like paracetamol, it's a variety of medications.*
201 *The PrEP you will take will be different from the PrEP I may take.*" (Group 3 Accra) This
202 perspective unveils a potential misinterpretation, as PrEP is generally standardized regardless of

203 personal differences. This misconception underlines the significance of clarifying PrEP's
204 uniformity and its distinct nature from ARVs.

205 A group emphasized the necessity of simplifying the description of PrEP to enhance
206 comprehension. This entailed equating PrEP to antiretroviral medications (ARVs) and offering a
207 level of education comparable to that provided to individuals living with HIV. The sentiment was
208 articulated by a participant who remarked, "*The thing is that, we need to admit that PrEP currently
209 in Ghana is simply ARVs for all of us to understand. It's the same medication that people living
210 with HIV take. The only difference here is that, we use three different medicines for people who
211 are HIV positive but if you are taking it for PrEP, we use two combinations, so instead of three
212 medicines, if you want to take PrEP, you just take two. That is basically PrEP.*" (Group 4, Accra).

213 Discussions highlighted the importance of providing clear, relatable information to dispel
214 misconceptions and promote accurate comprehension among the population.

215 ***Advocacy for a Comprehensive Educational Approach***

216 Participants emphasized the pressing need for intensified education to enhance PrEP
217 awareness and understanding, acknowledging the prevalent lack of knowledge. The consensus was
218 that delivering comprehensive information was pivotal, and should include all aspects such as
219 dosage, potential side effects, long-term implications, and general information about PrEP
220 including where to access it. Participants believed that increasing knowledge may lead to increased
221 acceptability among MSM in Ghana. One participant shared: "*We talked about PrEP. I think the
222 education on PrEP is not that strong, I think we should do more education on PrEP because it
223 seems like people don't understand and don't know the reason why they will be taking drugs to
224 prevent only HIV because I am a case manager, I test people who tend to be negative and I try to
225 preach the gospel to them about PrEP but you can see that the community is not accepting it. I*

226 *can see that the education is not that strong, so I think we have a lot to do about PrEP issue"*
227 (Group 4, Accra). This perspective underscored the pivotal role of informative campaigns that
228 dispelled misunderstandings, addressed concerns, and cultivated a deeper understanding of PrEP's
229 purpose and benefits. By bolstering education initiatives, the participants envisioned the potential
230 to positively shape the community's perception of PrEP and ultimately foster its wider acceptance
231 and uptake.

232 **Theme 2: PrEP acceptability was influenced by a mix of individual** 233 **and intrapersonal factors.**

234

235 *Hesitancy towards PrEP uptake due to perceived limited benefit*

236 In all eight FGs, participants were quite hesitant about PrEP uptake. The most recurring
237 reason shared by participants was the limited benefit of PrEP in preventing HIV only and not other
238 STIs. Participants felt that it was quite limiting to take a medication daily to prevent only one
239 disease when usually the concern is more about pregnancy with their female partners and STIs
240 such as gonorrhea and syphilis with their male partners. They described taking PrEP as an
241 inconvenience, especially if they would need to take other actions to prevent other STIs. The
242 statement from a participant: *"I cannot waste my time taking drugs every day to prevent me from*
243 *HIV, only HIV, for me [to be] catching other STIs so it's better for me to leave this PrEP and*
244 *concentrate on my condom use.* (Group 4, Accra) presents a compelling perspective on the
245 perceived drawbacks of using PrEP as a HIV prevention strategy. This discussion highlights
246 several important insights. Firstly, it underscores the commitment required for PrEP use, as it
247 involves daily medication adherence. For some individuals, this daily regimen may be perceived
248 as inconvenient or unnecessary, particularly if they believe they are still at risk of contracting other
249 sexually transmitted infections (STIs). This perception of inconvenience may deter them from

250 utilizing PrEP consistently. Secondly, the discussions reflect concerns about the limited scope of
251 PrEP in preventing only HIV. They expressed a preference for using condoms as a comprehensive
252 prevention method against both HIV and STIs. This viewpoint aligns with the importance of
253 emphasizing that PrEP is not a substitute for safer sex practices but rather a complement to them.
254 It highlights the need for comprehensive sexual health education to clarify PrEP's role in a broader
255 prevention strategy. Finally, the discussions underline the fact that individuals have different risk
256 perceptions and preferences when it comes to HIV prevention. Some may prioritize condom use
257 due to its dual protection against HIV and STIs, while others may find PrEP more suitable for their
258 lifestyle.

259 While the most frequent preference was not to use PrEP because it only protects against
260 HIV, participants in one focus group in Kumasi differed. In this group, participants acknowledged
261 the limitation of PrEP in protecting against other sexually transmitted infections (STIs). However,
262 they introduced a unique perspective driven by their motivations for considering PrEP. The
263 statement from Group 3 in Kumasi, "*We have our reasons though, we understand PrEP doesn't*
264 *prevent other STIs but at least you have HIV to not worry about,*" offers a nuanced perspective on
265 the decision to adopt PrEP despite its limitations. This viewpoint sheds light on the trade-offs
266 individuals may consider when making choices about their sexual health. Group 3's
267 acknowledgment that PrEP doesn't provide protection against other STIs demonstrates a clear
268 understanding of PrEP's scope and limitations. However, their willingness to use PrEP primarily
269 to prevent HIV suggests that they prioritize this particular concern above others. This choice
270 reflects a calculated decision based on perceived risk and priorities. The phrase "*at least you have*
271 *HIV to not worry about*" underscores the significance of HIV as a major health concern. For some
272 individuals, the peace of mind that comes from knowing they are protected against HIV may

273 outweigh the concern of contracting other STIs. It's important to note that this perspective may
274 vary among individuals, and their risk perceptions and priorities can influence their choices
275 regarding prevention methods. The insights generated from this discussion highlights the
276 complexity of sexual health decision-making and the importance of offering a range of prevention
277 options that cater to individual preferences and risk perceptions.

278 There was strong preference for condom use overall as the preferred HIV prevention
279 method. Condoms were characterized as a routine part of sexual encounters and remained the
280 primary HIV prevention strategy they were most familiar with. Participants discussed condoms as
281 convenient, and less burdensome compared with "*the stress of taking a pill every day*" (Group 1,
282 Kumasi). Additionally, discussion revealed a firm decision against taking PrEP, underpinned by
283 their current practices of using condoms and lubricants as preventive measures against both HIV
284 and sexually transmitted infections (STIs). Their decision on emerged from their confidence in
285 their existing practices, specifically the use of condoms and lubricants, as effective measures
286 against both HIV and STIs. The collective sentiment, which was echoed by a participant, "*I will*
287 *not take it. Since I am still using condoms and lubricant, I'm using them correctly and I am using*
288 *them to prevent HIV and STI's already, so I am not going to double protect myself.*" (Group 2,
289 Accra) signifies their belief in their method's sufficiency. This shared viewpoint reflected the
290 group's understanding of layered preventive strategies and their perception that adding PrEP would
291 be redundant.

292 Within the discussions of two focus groups in Accra and one in Kumasi, a shared
293 perspective emerged regarding the necessity of using condoms for protection, even in the presence
294 of PrEP availability. Participants exhibited a degree of skepticism towards the standalone
295 effectiveness of PrEP, suggesting that its protective capability might be insufficient when

296 considered alone. This skepticism led participants to favor condoms as a more reliable option for
297 ensuring their sexual health. As explained by this participant: "*I am just getting the information*
298 *that even with the PrEP you still need to, there is a bigger possibility of you still using a condom,*
299 *which means that PrEP doesn't really do anything. Let me go for the condom and know I am safe"*
300 (Group 1, Accra). This collective viewpoint underscores the participants' cautious approach to
301 preventive measures, revealing an inclination to adopt multiple strategies for added reassurance.
302 The participants' stance highlights the importance of addressing concerns about PrEP's
303 effectiveness and promoting comprehensive education about its intended role as part of a multi-
304 faceted approach to HIV prevention.

305 ***Extending HIV, sex, and same-sex intercourse stigma to PrEP affects PrEP***
306 ***uptake.***

307 Stigma emerged as a notable barrier to PrEP acceptability, with a particular focus on the
308 stigma associated with individuals who are living with HIV. The participants' perspectives
309 unveiled two main points. Firstly, a prevailing assumption arose that individuals taking PrEP were
310 already living with HIV. Secondly, a perception existed that those living with HIV were subjected
311 to stigma and discrimination. Despite recognizing the potential of PrEP to prevent HIV acquisition,
312 participants expressed concerns that using PrEP might imply living with HIV. A participant
313 succinctly shared: "*Trust me, if it [PrEP] is being advertised and made public for everyone to*
314 *know in Ghana where we are, anyone who sees you holding the drug [PrEP] would say you are*
315 *positive and won't even come closer to you again"* (Group 2, Kumasi) This highlights the profound
316 impact of HIV stigma on individuals' perceptions of and willingness to use PrEP. It serves as a
317 reminder of the ongoing challenges in combating stigma and the need for comprehensive strategies

318 that not only provide access to prevention methods but also address the social and cultural factors
319 that affect their adoption.

320 In all of the group discussions, there were concerns with being identified as living with
321 HIV, an identity which is currently stigmatized. Participants were concerned about having a similar
322 medication schedule with persons living with HIV, in which they both had to take a pill daily: "*I*
323 *think there is no different the one who has HIV and the one who doesn't have. This is because the*
324 *one with HIV takes drugs everyday as well as the one who takes PrEP"* (Group 4, Accra). This
325 raises an important perspective regarding the perceived similarity between individuals taking
326 antiretroviral therapy (ART) for HIV treatment and those using PrEP for HIV prevention. This
327 viewpoint suggests a fundamental misconception that exists in some communities, equating PrEP
328 use with being a person living with HIV. It highlights the need for effective public health
329 communication to distinguish between the two scenarios. While both individuals may take daily
330 medications, their reasons for doing so differ significantly. ART is used to manage and control
331 HIV in individuals who are already HIV-positive, while PrEP is a preventive measure for those at
332 risk of HIV infection.

333 Moreover, the study identified a third reason for potential stigmatization—people
334 assuming PrEP usage as indicative of engaging in "risky" sexual behaviors, primarily among men
335 who have sex with men (MSM). As described by one participant: "*even in the hospital, to get a*
336 *PrEP thing, it's a 'eiiii' why do you need PrEP, why are you asking of PrEP, they have already*
337 *perceived you to be going to do something so you need PrEP"* (Group 3, Accra). This perspective
338 highlights a deep-seated bias and misunderstanding surrounding PrEP and the individuals who
339 might benefit from it. The perception that merely inquiring about or seeking PrEP is met with
340 judgment and suspicion indicates a prejudiced mindset prevalent in healthcare settings. This

341 stereotype assumes that anyone interested in PrEP must already be engaging in behaviors that put
342 them at risk for HIV, which can lead to discrimination and stigmatization. This type of
343 stigmatization poses a significant barrier to HIV prevention efforts, particularly among vulnerable
344 populations like MSM. It discourages individuals from seeking the necessary healthcare services,
345 including PrEP, due to fear of being unfairly judged or stigmatized by healthcare providers and
346 the broader community.

347 Discussions among the groups emphasized a complex web of stigma and barriers
348 associated with seeking PrEP in Ghana. One significant concern raised by focus groups is the fear
349 that seeking PrEP within healthcare settings may inadvertently lead to self-identification as an
350 LGBTQ+ individual, which can further contribute to stigmatization. As described by a participant:
351 *“In government hospital, it will take a lot of push and pull before we will give it to you, even that,*
352 *they will ask, are you MSM?”* (Group 3, Accra). This highlights the challenging dynamics within
353 healthcare settings. The requirement to visit a hospital to access PrEP can be viewed as a source
354 of stigma itself, as it may expose individuals to judgment and scrutiny. The mention of healthcare
355 providers asking, *“are you MSM?”* underscores the added layer of stigma faced by LGBTQ+
356 individuals. This line of questioning can make individuals feel uncomfortable, potentially leading
357 them to withhold information about their sexual orientation or behaviors, which is detrimental to
358 their overall healthcare. Furthermore, the fear of being publicly identified as a PrEP user and
359 having one's sexual identity and behaviors recorded can be a significant deterrent to accessing care,
360 especially in environments where same-gender sexual relationships are criminalized. This concern
361 is rooted in the very real fear of legal repercussions and societal discrimination faced by LGBTQ+
362 individuals in such context.

363 A prevailing sentiment across the groups was the apprehension that introducing PrEP into
364 the MSM community might inadvertently encourage a surge in high-risk sexual behavior and the
365 development of multiple sexual partnerships. These concerns, voiced by all but one focus group
366 (Group 1, Kumasi) revolved around the potential negative consequences such behavior might
367 entail within the MSM community. Participants expressed reservations that the availability of
368 PrEP, while aiming to prevent HIV among individuals engaging in risky behaviors, could
369 inadvertently promote such behaviors by providing a sense of protection. A participant's
370 perspective, "*Since PrEP prevents HIV in people who live risky behaviors, thus encouraging*
371 *people to live that risky lifestyle and this will prevent me from using it*" (Group 3, Kumasi)
372 succinctly captures this sentiment. The apprehension expressed by the men underscores the
373 intricate relationship between preventive measures like PrEP and individuals' behavioral patterns.
374 It highlights the importance of education and communication strategies that clarify PrEP's role
375 within a comprehensive sexual health strategy and address concerns about its potential impact on
376 behavior.

377 ***Perceived lack of information, concerns about side effects, and cost act as barriers***
378 ***to PrEP acceptability***

379 Amid the various themes discussed, a common thread of confusion and insufficient
380 information about PrEP dosing, processes, and side effects emerged across all focus groups. While
381 not as widespread as other concerns, this lack of clarity was evident. Participants consistently
382 expressed a sense of inadequate awareness surrounding PrEP, with misconceptions particularly
383 noticeable in relation to dosing schedules and potential ramifications of missed dosages. A
384 participant's question, "*Does that mean that I may contract the virus when I fail to take PrEP even*
385 *for a day?*" (Group 4, Kumasi), exemplifies this uncertainty. This prevailing sentiment highlights

386 the critical need for comprehensive educational campaigns that provide accurate and transparent
387 information about PrEP, addressing its dosing regimens and clarifying misconceptions regarding
388 missed doses. The participants' shared confusion underlines the importance of cultivating an
389 informed population that can make sound decisions about PrEP usage, maximizing its
390 effectiveness as an HIV prevention strategy.

391 The participants consistently highlighted concerns regarding potential side effects,
392 particularly those related to kidney health, as well as perceived complications associated with PrEP
393 usage. The participants' apprehension was rooted in the fear that the medication could exacerbate
394 pre-existing health conditions, causing complications. A participant's remark, "*With the PrEP I*
395 *think, if you have some kind of underlying illnesses and all of that, it would give you complications*"
396 (Group 1, Kumasi), encapsulates this viewpoint. The participants' anxieties were further reinforced
397 by the knowledge that PrEP might impact kidney function, as indicated by another participant's
398 statement, "*Knowing right now that it affects the kidney, no*" (Group 4, Accra). This shared
399 apprehension unveils a significant information gap that needs to be addressed during education
400 campaigns and interventions. The participants' collective perspective underscores the importance
401 of providing transparent and accurate information about PrEP's potential side effects, its impact
402 on existing health conditions, and the specific medical considerations that individuals should take
403 into account before opting for PrEP.

404 The issue of cost was a concern raised by participants in one FGD (Kumasi), who were
405 worried that PrEP might be prohibitively expensive. Participants voiced worries that the expense
406 associated with PrEP could render it financially inaccessible for many individuals. The perceived
407 high cost of PrEP raised fears that it might pose a substantial barrier to access, potentially
408 preventing a considerable portion of the population from benefiting from the medication. A

409 participant succinctly captured this sentiment with the statement, "*The price may scare me from*
410 *using it*" (Group 1, Kumasi). The participants' collective viewpoint underscores the importance of
411 addressing cost-related apprehensions during awareness campaigns and intervention strategies. It
412 emphasizes the necessity of providing clear information about the affordability of PrEP, including
413 potential subsidies or cost-reduction mechanisms, to ensure that individuals are well-informed and
414 empowered to make decisions based on accurate information rather than financial constraints.

415 ***Varied reasons for participant acceptability of PrEP***

416 Amid these findings, select focus groups (three) highlighted potential determinants that
417 could influence PrEP acceptability. Participants' motivations for considering PrEP usage
418 encompassed various factors, including HIV prevention, addressing Hepatitis B concerns,
419 maintaining intimacy in serodiscordant relationships, and navigating issues of trust within
420 partnerships. Participants engaged in discussions regarding their readiness to embrace PrEP for
421 HIV prevention, centering their considerations on personal safety and a strong desire to remain
422 HIV-free. The conversations also underscored the added advantage of PrEP in treating Hepatitis
423 B, which contributed to participants' inclination to opt for PrEP. This perspective is succinctly
424 expressed by a participant's comment, "*the PrEP medication also treats Hepatitis B alongside, So*
425 *I will use it*" (Group 1, Accra). Additionally, participants echoed their willingness to adopt PrEP,
426 emphasizing its role in averting HIV transmission: "*Yes, I will use it because it will help me prevent*
427 *HIV*" (Group 4, Kumasi). This sentiment was reinforced by participants who viewed PrEP as an
428 additional safety measure: "*I think I would like to use it just to be safe*" (Group 2, Kumasi). These
429 shared viewpoints illuminate the multifaceted considerations that influence PrEP acceptability.
430 They underline the significance of a holistic approach to PrEP awareness and education that
431 addresses various motivating factors, including personal health safety and the potential for treating

432 co-occurring conditions like Hepatitis B, ultimately contributing to informed and comprehensive
433 HIV prevention decisions.

434 Several participants voiced a perspective that PrEP holds substantial value for HIV
435 serodiscordant couples, as it enables a level of sexual intimacy that might otherwise be hindered
436 by concerns about HIV transmission. This concern is particularly significant when the uninfected
437 partner is uncertain about their partner's viral suppression or treatment adherence. These
438 participants emphasized their anxieties about their partner's fidelity and commitment to
439 monogamy. In response, they expressed a willingness to utilize PrEP as a means of self-protection
440 against potential transmission risks. A participant explained: *"I would like to use it because being
441 with my "beef" and not knowing whether he is faithful, I would love to take it just to prevent myself
442 from anything"* (Group 2, Accra). This viewpoint reflected a complex interplay between sexual
443 health, trust within relationships, and PrEP acceptability. The participants' shared perspective
444 highlights the role of PrEP in facilitating open communication about trust, fidelity, and safety
445 within partnerships. It also underscores the significance of providing tailored support and
446 information to couples navigating serodiscordant relationships, ultimately promoting the holistic
447 well-being of both partners.

448 **DISCUSSION**

449 PrEP is a proven effective method for preventing HIV acquisition, particularly for
450 individuals with high odds of being exposed to the virus(20). Although PrEP was introduced in
451 Ghana and other West African countries in recent years, there exists a limited understanding of its
452 acceptability among Ghanaian MSM. This article, therefore, provides qualitative insights into
453 awareness, knowledge, and perspectives of the acceptability of PrEP uptake among MSM in
454 Ghana. The findings will contribute to shaping interventions to increase their PrEP uptake and

455 ultimately reduce HIV incidence in the country. In this study, we observed that 1) There was an
456 almost universal awareness of PrEP, but inaccuracies about PrEP were common, and 2) PrEP
457 acceptability was influenced by a mix of individual and intrapersonal factors.

458 Our previous research in Ghana found a low awareness of PrEP among MSM(15). Our
459 current results after the introduction of PrEP in Ghana indicate an almost universal awareness of
460 PrEP among MSM. However, like other studies elsewhere, we observed a misunderstanding of the
461 basics of PrEP, including its purpose, dosage, and effects (21-24). For instance, in explaining their
462 reasons for taking or not taking PrEP, many participants equated PrEP to PEP, indicating that PrEP
463 is taken after exposure (which is PEP in true definition). They also described that there is no
464 difference between PrEP and ARVs as they are both daily pills; however, while oral PrEP is based
465 on the daily use of an ARV combination, it is not a treatment for HIV. Additionally, their
466 explanations suggest that they heightened fears of harm from taking PrEP medication, for example
467 side effects such as impaired kidney functions and complications associated with pre-existing
468 conditions. Whereas no other studies exist on PrEP among MSM after it was introduced in Ghana,
469 our findings corresponds with a study among sex workers in Ghana, that show that low knowledge
470 of PrEP affected interest in its uptake (14).

471 Similar to Ahouada et al.'s (25) finding among MSM in Benin, MSM in this study held
472 mixed individual and intrapersonal perspectives that inform the acceptability or unacceptability of
473 PrEP. For those who accepted to take PrEP, they pointed to critical issues regarding known HIV
474 risk behaviors such as multiple sex partnerships, low condom use, and general risk behaviors
475 among MSM and sexual partners. As such, MSM find PrEP a vital prevention option, as it will
476 prevent them from contracting HIV even if their sexual partners are living with HIV. Those who
477 indicated a lack of acceptability of PrEP cited factors such as the daily uptake of PrEP as

478 inconvenient and not different from someone living with HIV and that PrEP does not prevent any
479 other condition besides HIV. Hence, they do not think it's worth the inconvenience.

480 Participants demonstrated a preference for traditional prevention methods like condom use,
481 which they perceive as more accessible and straightforward compared to PrEP. The convenience
482 of condoms, their effectiveness against a broad spectrum of STIs, and the immediacy of their
483 protection are factors that underscore their continued favorability within the MSM community.
484 This preference is further rooted in the practical challenges associated with PrEP, such as the daily
485 commitment to medication adherence and confusion over dosing schedules, which could
486 potentially diminish its preventive efficacy if doses are missed. These concerns reflect a broader
487 need for clear, practical guidance on PrEP use to ensure that it becomes a more user-friendly option
488 for those at high risk of HIV exposure.

489 There is an opportunity to explore the use of injectable PrEP in Ghana as it has the potential
490 to address the desire for a more convenient option that did not require daily dosing among MSM.
491 It is also possible that despite the concerns of side effects, MSM will still take PrEP if its injectable
492 because of convenience. A qualitative study among men in Los Angeles in the US reported that
493 despite many participants experiencing side effects, they found injectable PrEP more convenient
494 to use as they do not have to worry about taking pills daily and also the advantage of not worrying
495 about adherence to PrEP (26).

496 A noteworthy issue is the extension of HIV stigma, medication stigma, and sexual stigma
497 to PrEP and the potential for such stigmas to affect PrEP uptake (27). The participants in this study
498 indicated not taking PrEP because it will be equated to HIV treatment if others see it. Hence, others
499 will avoid them because they assume they are living with HIV, thus expressing a fear (anticipation)
500 of HIV stigma if using PrEP, which affects willingness to take PrEP. Some participants do not

501 want to be associated with PrEP because it will be assumed that they are engaging in same-gender
502 sex, especially if they must go to a healthcare setting for PrEP. Similar to reasons provided in our
503 previous studies for not testing for HIV in healthcare facilities (28), participants expressed fear of
504 disclosing their sexual behavior at healthcare facilities during PrEP enrolment. The fear of
505 disclosure is expected as many Ghanaian MSM have expressed strong reservations about
506 confidentiality in facilities in several studies (28-32). This echoes previous finding elsewhere that
507 stigma and discrimination associated with HIV and sexuality plays a significant barrier to PrEP
508 uptake among MSM (33, 34). For instance, a study conducted in West Africa found that societal
509 attitudes towards homosexuality significantly hindered PrEP uptake among MSM (35). Similarly,
510 a study in Thailand found that cultural norms and taboos surrounding same-sex behavior were
511 significant barriers to PrEP uptake among MSM(36). Addressing these complex issues is essential
512 for improving PrEP awareness and uptake among MSM in Ghana.

513 The participants highlighted the importance of upscaling comprehensive PrEP education
514 among MSM in Ghana that will tackle areas such as dosage, side effects, and general information
515 about PrEP. They recognized the lack of understanding of PrEP among themselves and other
516 Ghanaian men who share similar sexual histories, despite its potential to reduce HIV acquisition.
517 Thus, supporting previous calls for the scale up of interventions to address PrEP uptake among
518 men who may be exposed to HIV through sexual contact with other men(37-40). Although
519 research on interventions to promote PrEP use among MSM is limited, recent studies have
520 explored the use of social networks to improve PrEP initiation and other forms of HIV prevention
521 in this population. These interventions have aimed to leverage the power of social networks to
522 increase awareness, promote education and reduce barriers to accessing PrEP and other forms of
523 HIV prevention (39, 40). We encourage researchers and HIV prevention program implementers to

524 explore these approaches, considering that it has been successful in previous studies in reaching
525 MSM for intersectional stigma, HIV prevention, and testing interventions in Ghana (32, 41-43)
526 and has been successful in contributing to an increase in PrEP uptake elsewhere (44, 45).

527 **Strengths and Limitations**

528 A major strength of this study is its pioneering role in examining the knowledge,
529 awareness, and acceptability of PrEP among MSM in Ghana following its introduction. This timely
530 research fills a critical gap in the literature by providing fresh insights into the perceptions and
531 experiences of this key population at a significant juncture in the local HIV prevention landscape.
532 The qualitative design allows for an in-depth exploration of individual and collective attitudes
533 toward PrEP, capturing the complexities and subtleties of these perceptions. Engagement with
534 MSM through advocacy organizations offers informed perspectives that may indicate a higher
535 baseline understanding of PrEP-related issues. The study's limitations, however, must be
536 acknowledged. It focuses solely on oral PrEP, overlooking the nascent but potentially
537 transformative role of injectable PrEP, which could offer alternative adherence models and
538 convenience. The recruitment strategy, centered on connections with advocacy organizations, may
539 limit the representativeness of the sample, potentially excluding the voices of those with less
540 support or awareness about PrEP.

541 With a modest focus group size and a lack of comprehensive sociodemographic data, the
542 ability to extrapolate these findings to the wider MSM population in Ghana is limited.
543 Furthermore, the absence of a quantitative measure constrains the ability to assess the prevalence
544 of the observed attitudes and knowledge gaps, which would be beneficial for public health
545 planning and intervention design. Given the recency of PrEP's introduction in Ghana, the study

546 does not capture longitudinal data, which would provide insights into the evolution of PrEP
547 knowledge and attitudes over time, as well as the impact of ongoing educational efforts.

548 **Conclusions**

549 PrEP stands as a pivotal intervention for the prevention of HIV, with clear efficacy for
550 those at substantial risk of contracting the virus. Its introduction in Ghana and other regions of
551 West Africa marks a crucial step in broadening HIV preventive measures. However, our
552 understanding of its acceptability among Ghanaian men who have sex with men (MSM) remains
553 nascent. This study contributes qualitative insights into the awareness, knowledge, and
554 acceptability of PrEP among this group. The increased understanding gained here is instrumental
555 in shaping targeted interventions to enhance PrEP uptake, which could play a significant role in
556 reducing HIV incidence in Ghana. In light of these findings and limitations, future research should
557 include an examination of the acceptability and feasibility of injectable PrEP among MSM in
558 Ghana. As the healthcare landscape evolves to potentially include injectable options,
559 understanding preferences and barriers to this modality will be crucial. This knowledge could
560 inform the development of tailored interventions that accommodate the specific needs and
561 preferences of this high-risk population, ultimately contributing to a more effective HIV
562 prevention strategy in Ghana and similar contexts.

563

564

565

566

567 **Acknowledgements**

568 This study would not have been possible without the generosity of the study participants and their
569 willingness to share their knowledge and experiences with us, and the expertise of our partner
570 organizations and their staff: Priorities on Rights and Sexual Health (PORSH) in Accra, Youth
571 Alliance for Health and Human Rights (YAHR), in Kumasi, and Educational Assessment Research
572 Centre (EARC) in Accra. This study is sponsored by the National Institute of Nursing Research
573 R01 NR019009, which provides direct financial support for the research. The study is also made
574 possible through core services and support from the Yale Center for Interdisciplinary Research on
575 AIDS (P30 MH06224), which provides ongoing consultation on research design and methods,
576 including on methods to facilitate continuity of HIV/AIDS research operations during the COVID-
577 19 pandemic. The Yale AIDS Prevention Training program (T32 MH020031) provides
578 postdoctoral trainees to assist with research project coordination.

579

580

581

582 References

- 583 1. UNAIDS. Global HIV & AIDS statistics — Fact sheet 2023 [Available from:
584 <https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/fact-sheet>.
- 585 2. UNAIDS. World AIDS Day Report Geneva2018 [Available from:
586 https://www.unaids.org/en/knowledge_is_power/share-graphics.
- 587 3. Aberle-Grasse J, McFarland W, El-Adas A, Quaye S, Atuahene K, Adanu R, et al.,
588 editors. HIV prevalence and correlates of infection among MSM: 4 areas in Ghana, the Ghana
589 Men's Health Study 2010-2011. 20th Conference on Retroviral and Opportunistic Infections
590 (CROI 2013), Atlanta, GA; 2013.
- 591 4. Ghana AIDS Commission. GHANA MEN'S STUDY : Mapping and population size
592 estimation (MPSE) and integrated bio-behavioral surveillance survey (IBBSS) amongst men who
593 have sex with men (MSM) in Ghana (Round II). Accra. Ghana. 2017.
- 594 5. Phaswana-Mafuya N, Simbayi L, Wabiri N, Cloete A, Commission GA. The Ghana
595 men's study II: mapping and population size estimation (MPSE) and integrated bio-behavioral
596 surveillance survey (IBBSS) amongst men who have sex with men (MSM) in Ghana. 2020.
- 597 6. Ghana AIDS Commission. GHANA'S HIV FACT SHEET 2021 2021 [Available from:
598 <https://www.ghanaims.gov.gh/>.
- 599 7. World Health Organization. Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) 2021 [Available from:
600 [https://www.who.int/teams/global-hiv-hepatitis-and-stis-programmes/hiv/prevention/pre-
601 exposure-
602 prophylaxis#:~:text=As%20of%20September%202015%2C%20WHO,drug%20is%20used%20as%20directed](https://www.who.int/teams/global-hiv-hepatitis-and-stis-programmes/hiv/prevention/pre-exposure-prophylaxis#:~:text=As%20of%20September%202015%2C%20WHO,drug%20is%20used%20as%20directed).
- 603 [s%20directed](https://www.who.int/teams/global-hiv-hepatitis-and-stis-programmes/hiv/prevention/pre-exposure-prophylaxis#:~:text=As%20of%20September%202015%2C%20WHO,drug%20is%20used%20as%20directed).
- 604 8. Grant RM, Anderson PL, McMahan V, Liu A, Amico KR, Mehrotra M, et al. An
605 observational study of preexposure prophylaxis uptake, sexual practices, and HIV incidence
606 among men and transgender women who have sex with men. *The Lancet Infectious diseases*.
607 2014;14(9):820.
- 608 9. Landovitz RJ, Donnell D, Clement ME, Hanscom B, Cottle L, Coelho L, et al.
609 Cabotegravir for HIV prevention in cisgender men and transgender women. *New England
610 Journal of Medicine*. 2021;385(7):595-608.

- 611 10. Cowan FM, Delany-Moretlwe S, Sanders EJ, Mugo NR, Guedou FA, Alary M, et al.
612 PrEP implementation research in Africa: what is new? *Journal of the International AIDS Society*.
613 2016;19:21101.
- 614 11. Mayer KH, Agwu A, Malebranche D. Barriers to the Wider Use of Pre-exposure
615 Prophylaxis in the United States: A Narrative Review. *Advances in Therapy*. 2020;37(5):1778-
616 811.
- 617 12. Ghana Health Service, National AIDS Control Programme. CONSOLIDATED
618 GUIDELINES FOR HIV CARE IN GHANA: Test, Treat & Track. 2022.
- 619 13. Success Story: EpiC and Partners Introduce Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis in Ghana [press
620 release]. 2021.
- 621 14. Guure C, Afagbedzi S, Torpey K. Willingness to take and ever use of pre-exposure
622 prophylaxis among female sex workers in Ghana. *Medicine*. 2022;101(5).
- 623 15. Ogunbajo A, Leblanc NM, Kushwaha S, Boakye F, Hanson S, Smith MDR, et al.
624 Knowledge and Acceptability of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) among men who have
625 sex with men (MSM) in Ghana. *AIDS Care*. 2020;32(3):330-6.
- 626 16. Morrison-Beedy D, Côté-Arsenault D, Feinstein NF. Maximizing results with focus
627 groups: moderator and analysis issues. *Appl Nurs Res*. 2001;14(1):48-53.
- 628 17. Côté-Arsenault D, Morrison-Beedy D. Maintaining your focus in focus groups: avoiding
629 common mistakes. *Res Nurs Health*. 2005;28(2):172-9.
- 630 18. Nelson LE, Nyblade L, Torpey K, Logie CH, Qian H-Z, Manu A, et al. Multi-level
631 intersectional stigma reduction intervention to increase HIV testing among men who have sex
632 with men in Ghana: Protocol for a cluster randomized controlled trial. *PloS one*.
633 2021;16(11):e0259324-e.
- 634 19. Morse JM. Confusing categories and themes. *Qual Health Res*. 2008;18(6):727-8.
- 635 20. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. PrEP for HIV Prevention in the U.S. 2023 [
- 636 21. Aidoo-Frimpong G, Orom H, Agbemenu K, Collins RL, Morse GD, Nelson LE.
637 Exploring Awareness, Perceptions, and Willingness to Use HIV Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis: A
638 Qualitative Study of Ghanaian Immigrants in the United States. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*.
639 2022;36(1):8-16.

- 640 22. Yu S, Cross W, Lam LLY, Zhang K, Banik B, Li X, et al. Willingness, preferred ways
641 and potential barriers to use pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention among men who have
642 sex with men in China. *BMJ open*. 2021;11(10):e053634.
- 643 23. Iniesta C, Álvarez-del Arco D, García-Sousa LM, Alejos B, Díaz A, Sanz N, et al.
644 Awareness, knowledge, use, willingness to use and need of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP)
645 during World Gay Pride 2017. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(10):e0204738.
- 646 24. Kahle EM, Sullivan S, Stephenson R. Functional knowledge of pre-exposure prophylaxis
647 for HIV prevention among participants in a web-based survey of sexually active gay, bisexual,
648 and other men who have sex with men: Cross-sectional study. *JMIR public health and*
649 *surveillance*. 2018;4(1):e8089.
- 650 25. Ahouada C, Diabaté S, Mondor M, Hessou S, Guédou FA, Béhanzin L, et al.
651 Acceptability of pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention: facilitators, barriers and impact
652 on sexual risk behaviors among men who have sex with men in Benin. *BMC Public Health*.
653 2020;20(1):1267.
- 654 26. Kerrigan D, Mantsios A, Grant R, Markowitz M, Defechereux P, La Mar M, et al.
655 Expanding the menu of HIV prevention options: a qualitative study of experiences with long-
656 acting injectable cabotegravir as PrEP in the context of a phase II trial in the United States. *AIDS*
657 *and Behavior*. 2018;22:3540-9.
- 658 27. Dubov A, Galbo P, Jr., Altice FL, Fraenkel L. Stigma and Shame Experiences by MSM
659 Who Take PrEP for HIV Prevention: A Qualitative Study. *Am J Mens Health*. 2018;12(6):1843-
660 54.
- 661 28. Zigah EY, Abu-Ba'are GR, Shamrock OW, Dakpui HD, Apreku A, Boyd DT, et al. “For
662 my safety and wellbeing, I always travel to seek health care in a distant facility”—the role of
663 place and stigma in HIV testing decisions among GBMSM–BSGH 002. *Health Place*.
664 2023;83:103076.
- 665 29. Kushwaha S, Lalani Y, Maina G, Ogunbajo A, Wilton L, Agyarko-Poku T, et al. “But the
666 moment they find out that you are MSM...”: a qualitative investigation of HIV prevention
667 experiences among men who have sex with men (MSM) in Ghana’s health care system. *BMC*
668 *Public Health*. 2017;17(1):770.

- 669 30. Ogunbajo A, Kershaw T, Kushwaha S, Boakye F, Wallace-Atiapah N-D, Nelson LE.
670 Barriers, motivators, and facilitators to engagement in HIV care among HIV-infected Ghanaian
671 men who have sex with men (MSM). *AIDS and Behavior*. 2018;22(3):829-39.
- 672 31. Saalim K, Amu-Adu P, Amoh-Otu RP, Akrong R, Abu-Ba'are GR, Stockton MA, et al.
673 Multi-level manifestations of sexual stigma among men with same-gender sexual experience in
674 Ghana. *BMC Public Health*. 2023;23(1):166.
- 675 32. Nyblade L, Stockton MA, Saalim K, Rabiou Abu-Ba'are G, Clay S, Chonta M, et al. Using
676 a mixed-methods approach to adapt an HIV stigma reduction intervention to address
677 intersectional stigma faced by men who have sex with men in Ghana. *Journal of the International
678 AIDS Society*. 2022;25:e25908.
- 679 33. Chakrapani V, Newman PA, Shunmugam M, Mengle S, Varghese J, Nelson R, et al.
680 Acceptability of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) and implementation challenges among
681 men who have sex with men in India: a qualitative investigation. *AIDS patient care and STDs*.
682 2015;29(10):569-77.
- 683 34. Jackson GY, Darlington CK, Van Tieu H, Brawner BM, Flores DD, Bannon JA, et al.
684 Women's views on communication with health care providers about pre-exposure prophylaxis
685 (PrEP) for HIV prevention. *Cult Health Sex*. 2021:1-16.
- 686 35. Eubanks A, Coulibaly B, Dembélé Keita B, Anoma C, Dah TTE, Mensah E, et al. Socio-
687 behavioral correlates of pre-exposure prophylaxis use and correct adherence in men who have
688 sex with men in West Africa. *BMC Public Health*. 2022;22(1):1832.
- 689 36. Yang D, Chariyalertsak C, Wongthanee A, Kawichai S, Yotruan K, Saokhieo P, et al.
690 Acceptability of pre-exposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men and transgender
691 women in Northern Thailand. *PloS one*. 2013;8(10):e76650.
- 692 37. Hotton AL, Keene L, Corbin DE, Schneider J, Voisin DR. The relationship between
693 Black and gay community involvement and HIV-related risk behaviors among Black men who
694 have sex with men. *Journal of gay & lesbian social services*. 2018;30(1):64-81.
- 695 38. Patel RR, Chan PA, Harrison LC, Mayer KH, Nunn A, Mena LA, et al. Missed
696 Opportunities to Prescribe HIV Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis by Primary Care Providers in Saint
697 Louis, Missouri. *LGBT Health*. 2018;5(4):25-256.

- 698 39. Quinn KG, Christenson E, Spector A, Amir Khanian Y, Kelly JA. The influence of peers
699 on PrEP perceptions and use among young black gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex
700 with men: a qualitative examination. *Archives of sexual behavior*. 2020;49:2129-43.
- 701 40. Quinn KG, Zarwell M, John SA, Christenson E, Walsh JL. Perceptions of PrEP use
702 within primary relationships among young black gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with
703 men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2020;49:2117-28.
- 704 41. Nelson LE, Ogunbajo A, Abu-Ba'are GR, Conserve DF, Wilton L, Ndenkeh JJ, et al.
705 Using the implementation research logic model as a lens to view experiences of implementing
706 HIV prevention and care interventions with adolescent sexual minority men—A global
707 perspective. *AIDS and Behavior*. 2023;27(Suppl 1):128-43.
- 708 42. Abubakari GMR, Owusu-Dampare F, Ogunbajo A, Gyasi J, Adu M, Appiah P, et al. HIV
709 Education, Empathy, and Empowerment (HIVE 3): A Peer Support Intervention for Reducing
710 Intersectional Stigma as a Barrier to HIV Testing among Men Who Have Sex with Men in
711 Ghana. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2021;18(24):13103.
- 712 43. Abubakari GMR, Turner D, Nelson LE, Odhiambo AJ, Boakye F, Manu A, et al. An
713 application of the ADAPT-ITT model to an evidence-based behavioral HIV prevention
714 intervention for men who have sex with men in Ghana. *International Health Trends and
715 Perspectives*. 2021;1(1):1-16.
- 716 44. Walters SM, Platt J, Anakaraonye A, Golub SA, Cunningham CO, Norton BL, et al.
717 Considerations for the design of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) interventions for women:
718 lessons learned from the implementation of a novel PrEP intervention. *AIDS and Behavior*.
719 2021;25(12):3987-99.
- 720 45. Newman PA, Akkakanjanasupar P, Tepjan S, Boborakhimov S, van Wijngaarden JWdL,
721 Chonwanarat N. Peer education interventions for HIV prevention and sexual health with young
722 people in Mekong Region countries: a scoping review and conceptual framework. *Sexual and
723 Reproductive Health Matters*. 2022;30(1):2129374.