

1 TITLE: Follow-up after post-exposure prophylaxis before and during the COVID-
2 19 pandemic in Brazil

3

4 RUNNING TITLE: Adherence to serological follow-up in PEP

5

6 KEYWORDS

7 HIV-1, post-exposure prophylaxis, HIV Testing, Occupational Exposure,
8 Treatment Adherence and Compliance

9

10 AUTHORS:

11 Elaine Monteiro Matsuda¹,
12 elainematsuda@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0254-4154>

13
14 Ivana Barros de Campos²,
15 ivanacamp@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0334-0572>

16
17 Luís Fernando de Macedo Brígido³,
18 lubrigido@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1022-7837>

19

20 ¹Secretaria da Saúde de Santo André. Santo André, São Paulo, Brasil

21 ²Instituto Adolfo Lutz. Centro Regional de Santo André. Santo André, São Paulo, Brasil

22 ³Instituto Adolfo Lutz. Centro de Virologia. São Paulo, São Paulo, Brasil

23

24 ABSTRACT

25 Although post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) is a powerful tool to abort HIV
26 infection within 72 hours of exposure, blocking the establishment of chronic
27 infection, follow-up metrics of this intervention are scarce. As antiretroviral use
28 delays diagnosis biomarkers, the moment to perform serological evaluations
29 must be considered this to avoid missed diagnosis opportunities. We assessed
30 the return adherence after PEP dispensation in service in the Sao Paulo
31 metropolitan area and reviewed the literature, both showing limited adherence
32 to current protocols and leading to difficulties in diagnosing early HIV infection.
33 The current proposed date for the first return after PEP is associated with low
34 adherence and may have limited capability to detect antibodies if the infection is
35 present. Guidelines should allow a longer time after PEP discontinuation along
36 with message reminders to encourage adherence and avoid false negative
37 results that can be detrimental both to the patient and to the community.

38 INTRODUCTION

39 The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) leads and
40 inspires the world to achieve its shared vision of zero new HIV infections, zero
41 discrimination, and zero AIDS-related deaths. Since 2010, new HIV infections
42 have declined by 32%, from 2.2 million to 1.5 million in 2021¹.

43 Combination prevention programs include a mix of evidence-based biomedical,
44 behavioral, and structural interventions to meet the current HIV prevention
45 needs of individuals and communities, aiming for the greatest possible impact
46 on reducing the number of people newly infected². They must be appropriate to
47 each individual's circumstances and HIV vulnerability³. Globally, gay men and
48 other men who have sex with men are 28 times more likely to be infected with
49 HIV. People who inject drugs have 35 times the risk, sex workers 30 times, and
50 transgender women 14 times the risk¹.

51 Antiretrovirals can provide not only treatment but also act as a preventive
52 intervention through viral suppression that makes the individual undetectable =
53 untransmissible⁴. Moreover, antiretroviral has been shown to be effective in pre-
54 exposure prophylaxis (PrEP)⁵ and post-exposure (PEP)^{6,7} and is part of the
55 main core of strategies for controlling the HIV epidemic⁸. The preferred regimen
56 to the first line of treatment in Brazil is the same as that used for PEP and
57 consists of tenofovir 300mg/lamivudine 300mg (TDF/3TC) associated with
58 dolutegravir 50mg (DTG) daily⁹.

59 Brazilian as well as other guidelines recommend PEP with 3 drugs, prescribed
60 after a point-of-care serological HIV test and dispensed for 28 days. PEP is
61 recommended only within 72 hours of exposure, with guidance to repeat the
62 HIV test^{9,10,11,12,13}. The timing of this follow-up testing varies between four to six
63 weeks and 12 weeks after exposure^{9,10}, at the end of PEP and 10 to 12 weeks
64 after exposure¹², at a minimum of 45 days after completion of the PEP course, if
65 the 28-day PEP course is completed, this is 73 days (10.5 weeks) post
66 exposure¹¹, and at 3 months after exposure¹³. CDC (USA) and the UK
67 recommend the use of a fourth-generation test at the beginning of PEP, and if
68 not used, the CDC recommends an additional serological follow-up 6 months
69 after exposure^{10,11}. The seroreactivity of the rapid test depends on the

70 sensitivity of the test in relation to previous exposures (immunological window).
71 The fourth-generation rapid test is more efficient in detecting very recent
72 infections, even detecting antibodies not detected in the third-generation rapid
73 test, as well as acute infection with the detection of the p24 antigen¹⁴.

74 The efficacy of PEP depends on the timing and proper use of the regimen.
75 Delayed initiation of PEP, poor/non-adherence to the regimen, especially in the
76 first days, and further high-risk sexual exposures after cessation of PEP may
77 compromise the outcome. Moreover, early/primary HIV infection already
78 established at the time of PEP initiation is a possibility in many situations¹¹.
79 Diagnosis of acute/early HIV infection, proper adherence to PEP protocols, as
80 well as, laboratory follow-up are constant challenges to this policy^{9,10,11,15,16}.

81 To evaluate the issue of post-PEP serological monitoring we carried out this
82 study in a reference service that cares for people living with HIV and provides
83 antiretroviral prophylaxis, PEP, and PrEP, to those who seek it spontaneously
84 or were referred from other services, in Santo André, a metropolitan area of São
85 Paulo/Brazil.

86

87 METHODOLOGY

88 The Medication Logistic Control System (SICLOM) provided information on
89 users with PEP dispensation between 2019 and 2021. Medical records were
90 consulted in order to assess adherence to the recommended 30 and 120-day
91 returns after risk exposure and other variables such as sex (female or male),
92 gender (cis or transgender), men who have sex with men (MSM), sex worker
93 (yes or not) and category of risk exposure (biological material exposition,
94 occupational or not, sexual consent or not and others). Return after starting
95 PEP between 26 and 40 days was considered for this study as a 30-day return
96 and between 110 and 130 days as a 120-day return. Return on any date within
97 180 days was also evaluated.

98 Data obtained from electronic databases were anonymized before analysis.
99 Statistical analyzes were performed with Stata version 14.2 (Stata Corp LLC,
100 College Station, Texas, USA) and IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version

101 24.0. (Armonk, NY, USA). The age (years) was expressed in medians, with the
102 25th and 75th percentiles (IQR). A significant level of $p < 0.05$, two-tailed, was
103 applied to all analyses. Variables were compared using Mann-Whitney or
104 Kruskal-Wallis test for continuous variables and chi-squared (χ^2) or Fisher's
105 exact tests for categorical variables, as appropriate.

106

107 RESULTS

108 During the study period, we obtained 2168 PEP events recorded at SICLOM,
109 dispensed for 1468 users. Additional information could be obtained only from
110 1281/1468 users. The median age of these users was 31 years (IQR25-75 24-
111 39), with 6/1281 0.3% being under 14 years and 17/1281 0.8% above 60 years.

112 Table 1 describes demographic characteristics by year of study. Most were
113 male (853/1281 67%), with 368/853 43% of this reporting being MSM, 39/853
114 4.6% identified as transgender women (TW), which corresponds to 27/931 2.9%
115 among all users. Almost all TW were sex workers, 90% 35/39 versus 2.4%
116 29/1207 among ciswomen ($p < 0.0001$). Among cisgender, the proportion of sex
117 workers among women was higher than among men, 5.4% 23/428 versus 0.7%
118 6/808 ($p < 0.0001$).

119 We verified a change in the profile of PEP users who sought the service, still
120 young adults, but with increasing age, with a median of 30, 31, and 32 years, in
121 2019, 2020, and 2021, respectively ($p = 0.02$) and a proportional increase of
122 women 31%, 28% and 51% ($p < 0.0001$), which may be due in part to the
123 increase of occupational accidents during the study period 27%, 33% and 53%,
124 mostly women 70%, 74%, 76%.

125 Information regarding the category of risk exposure that motivated the search
126 for PEP referred to in the medical records and in which group (female sex,
127 MSM, TW, and/or sex worker) are summarized in Table 2.

128 Table 3 demonstrates adherence to returns of 30 and 120 days isolated and
129 associated, and any time up to 180 days. There was a reduction in returns at
130 any time after PEP during the COVID-19 pandemic, from 39.5% in 2019 to

131 12.8% (2020) and 20.2% (2021), ($p < 0.001$). The adherence to the 30-day return
132 was also smaller in the years 2020 and 2021 compared to the year 2019
133 ($p = 0.0001$). However, from 2019 to 2021, if we analyze the 30-day versus 120-
134 day returns separately, the adherence was greater in the 30-day return,
135 315/1281 24,6% versus 103/1281 8% ($p < 0.0001$).

136

137 DISCUSSION

138 PEP is an efficacious HIV prevention option that has been underutilized,
139 representing a missed opportunity to prevent or abort HIV infection associated
140 with high-risk exposures^{10,17,18}.

141 Ruling out acute HIV infection prior to prophylactic antiretroviral use is
142 particularly challenging in low- and middle-income settings, where there is
143 limited access to advanced laboratory testing and infrastructure¹⁵. As the 3-drug
144 PEP regimen is the same as that used in first-line treatment
145 (tenofovir/lamivudine + dolutegravir), when the HIV infection is not blocked by
146 PEP (viral infection is established), or starting PEP in a patient in the
147 acute/early phase, both cases, will be on early therapy. This very early
148 treatment has been suggested as potentially beneficial to the patient^{19,20} and
149 avoids further viral transmission at this highly infectious phase^{20,21}. However,
150 recognition of infection is cumbersome at this stage, and several studies
151 demonstrate a delay in seroconversion and viremia detection of HIV-1, due to
152 the use of antiretroviral drugs, preventing proper use of serological and other
153 biomarkers of infection^{15,16}. This increases the probability of negative false
154 results in HIV testing, allowing an undiagnosed patient to return to the
155 community with an uncontrolled viremia. Better diagnosis approaches to this
156 situation are clearly needed. This delay in seroconversion becomes even more
157 worrying in cases where PrEP is prescribed, in which the two-drug scheme
158 used in PrEP will be a sub-optimal treatment regimen that, as a consequence of
159 an undocumented infection, implies the risk of inducing resistance mutations
160 and virological failure²².

161 Manak et al. evaluated the performance of HIV antigen/antibody combination at
162 weeks 12 and 24 following the initiation of antiretroviral therapy (ART) at Fiebig
163 stage I (FI), FII, or FIII/IV in comparison to samples from untreated cases, who
164 demonstrated robust reactivity, while 52.2% of samples from individuals
165 initiating ART at FI, 7.7% at FII, and 4.5% at FIII/IV were nonreactive by the HIV
166 Ag/Ab Combo assays¹⁶. Although the first evaluation in the use of ART was at
167 12 weeks, it would be expected that there would also be this delay with 4 weeks
168 of the use PEP or PrEP.

169 While excellent, well-tolerated treatment regimens are available, adherence to
170 PEP medications and attendance at clinical visits may be sub-optimal in certain
171 groups of individuals⁸. In an Australian cohort of mainly MSM, only 34% of 1864
172 had follow-up testing at 12 weeks after initiation of PEP²³. Several studies in the
173 UK report that attendance at the 12-week follow-up HIV test is poor (30–67%)¹¹.

174 In our service, the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic, assistance to PEP
175 cases was slightly lower compared to 2019 (-4%), with a 10% decrease in 2021
176 compared to 2020²⁴. The recommended follow-up routine testing was 30 and
177 120 days after starting PEP. However, in 2020, with the limitations imposed by
178 the COVID-19 pandemic, a self-test was requested to be carried out in 30 days
179 and a return to the service only in 120 days. Despite this guidance, the 30-day
180 return occurred, showing a greater adherence than the 120-day return. Even
181 before the pandemic, we found that adherence to the 120-day return (12.2%)
182 was very low and worse than in other studies¹¹, perhaps due to the fact that an
183 only approximate return date of 30 days was provided and, in case of absence,
184 the user had no other suggested date to return. Even in cases where a later,
185 (e.g. 120 days) return is emphasized, the patient may feel that the 30-day
186 evaluation is sufficient, disregarding further follow-up. In view of this and the
187 possibility of delay in seroconversion, in 2023 we started to orient the first return
188 within 45 days after the start of the PEP (the current limit for the first return
189 according to the Brazilian guideline)⁹ and, if unable to attend, the return within 4
190 months, both with approximate dates. The UK guideline seems more coherent
191 to this view when considering the delay of a possible seroconversion using
192 antiretrovirals, as it waits at a minimum of 45 days after completion of the PEP

193 course. If the 28-day PEP course is completed, this is 73 days (10.5 weeks)
194 post-exposure¹¹.

195 By evaluating the adherence of those who sought the service and obtained PEP
196 release, we intend to propose a more feasible returns scheme that makes it
197 possible to reduce the loss of opportunities for proper HIV infection diagnosis in
198 these individuals that used PEP, avoiding missed diagnosis due to PEP
199 suppression of biomarkers of infection.

200 In conclusion, the PEP return protocol in 30 and 120 days did not seem
201 adequate with low adherence at all dates. As the highest adherence is still
202 verified in the first follow-up, very close to the end of the PEP, testing only at
203 this time may increase the chances of false negative results. The second return
204 in 120 days seems very distant from the event, and the user may not return. It is
205 of paramount importance in this scenario to identify a new infection if present
206 and offer proper treatment and consequently break the chain of transmission.
207 We strongly suggest the incorporation of some recommendations of the UK
208 Guideline which suggests that services use local mechanisms, including
209 text/email reminders, to encourage adherence to post-exposure HIV testing¹¹.
210 Studies are needed to define a better time that can reconcile test capabilities to
211 detect infection to greater adherence. Strategies to identify infections occurring
212 before or during PEP need to be implemented to avoid discontinuation of a PEP
213 regimen that can be providing viral control and potentially favor future cure
214 strategies.

215

216 REFERENCES

- 217 1. UNAIDS. Global HIV & AIDS statistics — Fact sheet. 2022; Available from:
218 <https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/fact-sheet>; Accessed on 05/13/2023
219
- 220 2. Global AIDS Strategy 2021–2026. End Inequalities. End AIDS. Geneva:
221 Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS; 2021. Available from:
222 [https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2021/2021-2026-global-](https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2021/2021-2026-global-AIDS-strategy)
223 [AIDS-strategy](https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2021/2021-2026-global-AIDS-strategy). Accessed on 05/13/2023
224
- 225 3. Godfrey-Faussett P, Frescura L, Abdool Karim Q, Clayton M, Ghys PD; (on
226 behalf of the 2025 prevention targets working group). HIV prevention for the

- 227 next decade: Appropriate, person-centred, prioritised, effective, combination
228 prevention. *PLoS Med.* 2022;19(9):e1004102.
229 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1004102>. Erratum in: *PLoS Med.*
230 2022;19(11):e1004131. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1004131>
231
- 232 4. Rodger AJ, Cambiano V, Bruun T, Vernazza P, Collins S, Degen O,
233 PARTNER Study Group. Risk of HIV transmission through condomless sex
234 in serodifferent gay couples with the HIV-positive partner taking suppressive
235 antiretroviral therapy (PARTNER): final results of a multicentre, prospective,
236 observational study. *Lancet.* 2019;393:2428-2438.
237 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)30418-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30418-0)
238
- 239 5. Anderson PL, Glidden D V, Liu A, Buchbinder S, Lama JR, Guanira JV, et
240 al. Emtricitabine-tenofovir concentrations and pre-exposure prophylaxis
241 efficacy in men who have sex with men. *Sci Transl Med.* 2012; 4(151):151–
242 125. <https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.3004006>
243
- 244 6. Cardo DM, Culver DH, Ciesielski CA, Srivastava PU, Marcus R, Abiteboul
245 D, et al. A Case– Control Study of HIV Seroconversion in Health Care
246 Workers after Percutaneous Exposure. *New England Journal of Medicine.*
247 1997; 337:1485–1490. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199711203372101>
248
- 249 7. Gokengin D, Bursa D, Skrzat-Klapaczynska A, Alexiev I, Arsikj E, Balayan
250 T, Begovac J, Cicic A, Dragovic G, Harxhi A, Aimla K, Lakatos B,
251 Matulionyte R, Mulabdic V, Oprea C, Papadopoulos A, Rukhadze N,
252 Sedlacek D, Sojak L, Tomazic J, Vassilenko A, Vasylyev M, Verhaz A,
253 Yancheva N, Yurin O, Kowalska J; Euroguidelines in Central and Eastern
254 Europe (ECEE) Network Group. PrEP Scale-Up and PEP in Central and
255 Eastern Europe: Changes in Time and the Challenges We Face with No
256 Expected HIV Vaccine in the near Future. *Vaccines (Basel).*
257 2023;11(1):122. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines11010122>
258
- 259 8. Krakower DS, Jain S, Mayer KH. Antiretrovirals for primary HIV prevention:
260 the current status of pre- and post-exposure prophylaxis. *Curr HIV/AIDS*
261 *Rep.* 2015;12(1):127-38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11904-014-0253>
262
- 263 9. Ministério da Saúde (BR), Secretaria de Vigilância em Saúde,
264 Departamento de HIV/Aids, Tuberculose, Hepatites Virais e Infecções
265 Sexualmente Transmissíveis. Protocolo Clínico e Diretrizes Terapêuticas
266 para Profilaxia Pós-Exposição (PEP) de Risco à Infecção pelo HIV, IST e
267 Hepatites Virais. Updated on 07/29/2022. Available from:
268 [https://www.gov.br/aids/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/pcdts/2021/hiv-](https://www.gov.br/aids/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/pcdts/2021/hiv-aids/prot_clinico_diretrizes_terap_peg_risco_infeccao_hiv_ist_hv_2021.pdf/view)
269 [aids/prot_clinico_diretrizes_terap_peg_-](https://www.gov.br/aids/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/pcdts/2021/hiv-aids/prot_clinico_diretrizes_terap_peg_risco_infeccao_hiv_ist_hv_2021.pdf/view)
270 [risco_infeccao_hiv_ist_hv_2021.pdf/view](https://www.gov.br/aids/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/pcdts/2021/hiv-aids/prot_clinico_diretrizes_terap_peg_risco_infeccao_hiv_ist_hv_2021.pdf/view). Accessed on 05/13/2023
271

- 272 10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Department of Health and
273 Human Services. Updated Guidelines for Antiretroviral Postexposure
274 Prophylaxis After Sexual, Injection-Drug Use, or Other Nonoccupational
275 Exposure to HIV—United States, 2016. Available from:
276 <https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/programresources/cdc-hiv-npep-guidelines.pdf>.
277 Accessed on 05/13/2023
278
- 279 11. Cresswell F, Asanati K, Bhagani S, Boffito M, Delpech V, Ellis J, Fox J,
280 Furness L, Kingston M, Mansouri M, Samarawickrama A, Smithson K,
281 Sparrowhawk A, Rafferty P, Roper T, Waters L, Rodger A, Gupta N. UK
282 guideline for the use of HIV post-exposure prophylaxis 2021. *HIV Med.*
283 2022;23(5):494-545. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hiv.13208>. Erratum in: *HIV*
284 *Med.* 2022 Jul;23(6):701. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hiv.13327>
285
- 286 12. European AIDS Clinical Society (EACS) Guidelines. Post-exposure
287 Prophylaxis (PEP). Available from: [https://eacs.sanfordguide.com/art/post-](https://eacs.sanfordguide.com/art/post-exposure-prophylaxis)
288 [exposure-prophylaxis](https://eacs.sanfordguide.com/art/post-exposure-prophylaxis). Accessed on 05/13/2023
289
- 290 13. World Health Organization. Guidelines on post-exposure prophylaxis for
291 HIV and the use of co-trimoxazole prophylaxis for HIV-related infections
292 among adults, adolescents and children: recommendations for a public
293 health approach: December 2014 supplement to the 2013 consolidated
294 guidelines on the use of antiretroviral drugs for treating and preventing HIV
295 infection. 2014 Available from:
296 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/145719>. Accessed on 05/13/2023
297
- 298 14. Matsuda EM, Ahagon CM, Coelho LPO, Campos IB, Colpas DR, Campos
299 NC, López-Lopes GIS, Silva VO, de Oliveira IP, Brígido LFM. A simple
300 algorithm for selecting cases to investigate acute and early HIV infections in
301 low- and middle-income countries. *J Med Virol.* 2022;94(2):791-794.
302 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.27398>
303
- 304 15. Elliott T, Sanders EJ, Doherty M, Ndung'u T, Cohen M, Patel P, Cairns G,
305 Rutstein SE, Ananworanich J, Brown C, Fidler S. Challenges of HIV
306 diagnosis and management in the context of pre-exposure prophylaxis
307 (PrEP), post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP), test and start and acute HIV
308 infection: a scoping review. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2019;22(12):e25419.
309 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jia2.25419>
310
- 311 16. Manak MM, Jagodzinski LL, Shutt A, Malia JA, Leos M, Ouellette J,
312 Akapirat S, Colby DL, Phanuphak N, Eller LA, Robb ML, de Souza M,
313 Ananworanich J, Peel SA; RV254/SEARCH010 and the RV217 Study
314 Teams. Decreased Seroreactivity in Individuals Initiating Antiretroviral
315 Therapy during Acute HIV Infection. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2019;57(10):e00757-
316 19. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00757-19>
317

- 318 17. Ayieko J, Petersen ML, Kanya MR, Havlir DV. PEP for HIV prevention: are
319 we missing opportunities to reduce new infections? *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2022
320 May;25(5):e25942. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jia2.25942>
321
- 322 18. Puro V, Calcagno G, Anselmo M, Benvenuto G, Trabattoni D, Clerici M,
323 Ippolito G. Transient detection of plasma HIV-1 RNA during postexposure
324 prophylaxis. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2000;21(8):529-31.
325 <https://doi.org/10.1086/501801>
326
- 327 19. Chen J, Ramendra R, Lu H, Routy JP. The early bird gets the worm:
328 benefits and future directions with early antiretroviral therapy initiation in
329 primary HIV infection. *Future Medicine Ltd; Future Virology.*
330 2018;13(11):779-786. <https://doi.org/10.2217/fvl-2018-0110>
331
- 332 20. Takata H, Kakazu JC, Mitchell JL, Kroon E, Colby DJ, Sacdalan C, Bai H,
333 Ehrenberg PK, Geretz A, Buranapraditkun S, Pinyakorn S, Intasan J,
334 Tipsuk S, Suttichom D, Prueksakaew P, Chalermchai T, Chomchey N,
335 Phanuphak N, de Souza M, Michael NL, Robb ML, Haddad EK, Crowell TA,
336 Vasan S, Valcour VG, Douek DC, Thomas R, Rolland M, Chomont N,
337 Ananworanich J, Trautmann L; RV254/SEARCH010, RV304/ SEARCH013,
338 and SEARCH011 study groups. Long-term antiretroviral therapy initiated in
339 acute HIV infection prevents residual dysfunction of HIV-specific CD8⁺ T
340 cells. *EBioMedicine.* 2022;84:104253.
341 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2022.104253>
342
- 343 21. Cohen MS, Shaw GM, McMichael AJ, Haynes BF. Acute HIV-1 Infection. *N*
344 *Engl J Med.* 2011;364(20):1943-54.
345 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1011874>
346
- 347 22. Celum CL, Bukusi EA, Bekker LG, Delany-Moretlwe S, Kidoguchi L, Omollo
348 V, Rousseau E, Travill D, Morton JF, Mogaka F, O'Malley G, Barnabee G,
349 van der Straten A, Donnell D, Parikh UM, Kudrick L, Anderson PL, Haberer
350 JE, Wu L, Heffron R, Johnson R, Morrison S, Baeten JM; POWER Study
351 Team. PrEP use and HIV seroconversion rates in adolescent girls and
352 young women from Kenya and South Africa: the POWER demonstration
353 project. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2022;25(7):e25962.
354 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jia2.25962>
355
- 356 23. Armishaw J, Hoy JF, Watson KM, Wright EJ, Price BG, Pierce AB. Non-
357 occupational post-exposure prophylaxis in Victoria, Australia: responding to
358 high rates of re-presentation and low rates of follow-up. *Int J STD AIDS.*
359 2011;22(12):714-8. <https://doi.org/10.1258/ijsa.2011.011174>
360
- 361 24. Matsuda EM, Oliveira IP, Bao LB, Manzoni FM, Campos NC, Varejão BB,
362 Leal MP, Nascimento VB, Brígido LFM. Impact of covid-19 on people living

363 with HIV-1: care and prevention indicators at a local and nationwide level,
364 Santo André, Brazil. Rev Saude Publica. 2022;56:37.
365 <https://doi.org/10.11606/s1518-8787.2022056004314>
366

367

Table 1 – Demographic characteristics among cases with the dispensation of post-exposure prophylaxis in each year of the study

	ALL	2019	2020	2021	p
N	1281	636 (49.6%)	422 (32.9%)	223 (17.4%)	1
Age (n years)	31 (IQR25-75 24-39)	30 (IQR 23-38)	31 (IQR 25-38)	32 (IQR 25-41)	0.02
Female	428/1281 33.4%	199/636 31.3%	116/422 27.5%	113/223 50.7%	0.0001
Male	853/1281 66.6%	437/636 68.7%	306/422 72.5%	110/223 49.3%	
MSM	368/853 43.1%	198/437 45,3%	127/306 41,5%	43/110 39,1%	0.36
Transwoman	39/853 4.6%	20/437 4,58%	13/306 4,25%	6/110 5,46%	0.87
Sex workers	64/1275 5%	42/631 6.7%	17/422 4%	5/222 2.3%	0.02

MSM, man who have sex with man

Table 2 – Type of risk exposure for HIV infection that motivated the dispensation of post-exposure prophylaxis in the different risk exposure categories and in each year of the study

	ALL n=1276	2019 635/1281 (49.6%)	2020 419/1281 (32.9%)	2021 222/1281 (17.4%)
Accident with biological material				
Occupational	389/1276 30.5% 283/389 72.8% female 0 MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker	169/635 26.91% 118/169 69.8% female 0 MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker	103/419 32.7% 76/103 73.8% female 0 MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker	117/222 52.7% 89/117 76.1% female 0 MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker
Non-occupational	12/1276 0.9% 6/12 50% female 2/6 33.4% male MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker	6/635 0.9% 3/6 female 50% 1/3 33.4% male MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker	5/419 1.2% 2/5 female 40% 1/3 33.4% male MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker	1/222 0.5 % 1/1 female 100% 0 MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker
Sexual				
Sexual Consent	831/1276 65.1% 101/831 12% female 364/730 49.9% male MSM 39/730 5.3% male TW 64/830 7.7% sex worker	436/635 68.7% 60/436 13.8% female 196/376 52.1% male MSM 20/376 5.3% male TW 42/436 9.6% sex worker	300/419 71.6% 27/300 9% female 125/273 45.8% male MSM 13/273 4.8% male TW 17/300 5.7% sex worker	95/222 42.8% 14/95 14.8% female 43/81 53% male MSM 6/81 7.4% male TW 5/94 5.3% sex worker
Sexual Assault	38/1276 2.98% 36/38 94.7% female 1/2 50% male MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker	18/635 2.83% 17/18 94.5% female 0 MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker	11/419 2.6% 10/11 90.9% female 1/1 100% male MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker	9/222 4.1% 9/9 100% female 0 MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker
Other	6/1276 0.47 % 1/6 16.7% female 1/5 20% male MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker	6/635 0.94% 1/6 16.7% female 1/5 20% male MSM 0 TW 0 sex worker	0	0

370 MSM, man who have sex with man; TW, transgender woman

71

Table 3 - Adherence to the 30 and 120-day returns, isolated and in different associations, or at any time within 180 days after exposure to risk for HIV infection

Adherence		ALL	2019	2020	2021	p
30-day return	yes	315 24.6%	230 36.3%	45 10.7%	38 17%	0.0001
	no	966 75.4%	404 63.7%	377 54.7%	185 83%	
Return between 30 and 120 days, median of 57days (IQR25-75 43-67)	yes	79 6.2%	60 9.4%	9 2.1%	10 4.5%	0.12
	no	1202 93.8%	576 90.6%	413 97.9%	213 95.5%	
120-day return	yes	103 8%	77 12.2%	13 3.1%	12 5.4%	0.03
	no	1178 92%	557 87.8%	409 96.9%	211 94.6%	
Return of 30 and 120 days	yes	65 5.1%	56 8.8%	4 0.9%	5 2.2%	0.07
	no	1216 94.9%	580 8.8%	418 99.1%	218 97.8%	
Return 30 and absence 120 days	yes	247 19.3%	173 27.2%	41 9.7%	33 14.8%	0.0001
	no	1034 80.7%	463 72.8%	381 90.3%	190 85.2%	
Absence in 30 and return in 120	yes	37 2.9%	21 2.6%	9 2.1%	7 3.1%	0.95
	no	1244 97.1%	615 96.7%	413 97.9%	96.90%	
Absence in 30 and return 120 days	yes	931 72.7%	385 60.5%	368 87.2%	178 79.8%	0.0001
	no	350 16.1%	251 39.5%	54 12.8%	45 20.2%	
Return at any time	yes	350 27.3%	251 39.5%	54 12.8%	45 20.2%	<0.001
	no	931 72.7%	385 60.5%	368 87.3%	178 79.8%	

72

73