

# 1 Predicting Harmful Alcohol Use Prevalence in Sub-Saharan Africa between 2015 and 2019: 2 Evidence from Population-based HIV Impact Assessment

## 3 Authors and affiliations

4 Mtumbi Goma<sup>1\*</sup>, Wingston Felix Ng'ambi<sup>2</sup>, Cosmas Zyambo<sup>1</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>University of Zambia, Department of Public Health and Family Medicine, Lusaka, Zambia

6 <sup>2</sup>Kamuzu University of Health Sciences, Department of Health Systems and Policy, Health Economics and Policy  
7 Unit, Lilongwe, Malawi

8 **\*Corresponding author information:** Mtumbi Goma, University of Zambia, Department of Public Health  
9 and Family Medicine, Lusaka, Zambia, Email: [mtumbirobertgoma@gmail.com](mailto:mtumbirobertgoma@gmail.com)

10

## 11 ABSTRACT

12 **Introduction:** Harmful alcohol use is associated with significant risks to public health outcomes worldwide.  
13 Although data on harmful alcohol use have been collected by population-based HIV Impact Assessment  
14 (PHIA), there is a dearth of analysis on the effect of HIV/ART status on harmful alcohol use in the SSA  
15 countries with PHIA surveys. This study uses data from the national representative PHIA to predict the  
16 harmful alcohol use prevalence.

17 **Methods:** A secondary analysis of the PHIA surveys: Namibia (n=27,382), Tanzania (n=1807), Zambia  
18 (n=2268), Zimbabwe (n=3418), Malawi (n=2098), Namibia (n=27,382), and Eswatini (n=2762). Using R  
19 version 4.2, the outcome variable and the descriptive variables were tested for association using chi  
20 square. Multivariable logistic regression analysis was used identify significant variables associated with  
21 harmful alcohol use. We employed to test and apply machine learning (ML) methods through Super  
22 Learner, Decision Tree, Random Forest (RF), Lasso Regression, Sample mean and Gradient boosting.  
23 Evaluation metrics methods specifically confusion matrix, accuracy, precision, recall, F1 score, and Area  
24 under the Receiver Operating Characteristics (AUROC) were used to evaluate the performance of  
25 predictive models. The cutoff point for statistically significant was P<0.05.

26 **Results:** Of the 12,460 persons, 15% used alcohol harmfully. Harmful alcohol use varied by countries and  
27 ranged from 8.7% in Malawi to 26.1% in Namibia (P<0.001). Females were less likely to use alcohol in a  
28 harmful way (AOR = 0.32, 95% CI: 0.29-0.35, P< 0.001). Compared to those HIV negative, persons that  
29 were with HIV-positive and on ART were less likely to use alcohol in a harmful way (AOR = 0.65, 95% CI:  
30 0.57-0.73, P<0.001) however persons that were HIV-positive and not on ART were more likely to use

31 alcohol in a harmful way (OR = 1.49, 95% CI: 1.32-1.69, P<0.001). Being married or formally married was  
32 protective to harmful use of alcohol. The best performing models were Lasso or Super Learner or Random  
33 Forest were the best performing models while gradient boosting models or sample mean did not perform  
34 well.

35 **Conclusion:** The findings highlight concerning variations in harmful alcohol use prevalence across  
36 surveyed countries, with Namibia reporting the highest rate. Males, older individuals, those HIV positive  
37 and not yet on ART, and unmarried persons demonstrated a higher likelihood of engaging in harmful  
38 alcohol use. These findings collectively contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the multiple  
39 factors influencing harmful alcohol use within the surveyed populations, the importance of targeted  
40 interventions at country and individual levels.

41

42 **Key words:** SSA, Harmful alcohol use, PHIA, alcohol, HIV/ART, AUDIT-C

43

44 **Running Title:** Harmful Alcohol Use Prevalence in Sub-Saharan Africa between 2015 and 2019

45

## 46 **INTRODUCTION**

47 Over the centuries, alcohol has been used all over the world as an intoxicating drug that can lead to  
48 dependence. The consumption of alcohol is broadly embraced in social settings, often linked to feelings  
49 of relaxation and enjoyment. Despite some individuals being able to consume alcohol without adverse  
50 consequences, an increasing number of people encounter detrimental physical, social, and psychological  
51 effects associated with alcohol (1).

52 The prevalence of alcohol use and the problems associated with it vary greatly around the world, but the  
53 resulting effects on mortality and health are still present in many countries. On a global scale, harmful  
54 alcohol consumption is consistently ranked among the top five risk factors for illness, disability, and death  
55 (2).

56 Around 33.3 million deaths globally are attributed to harmful alcohol use each year, accounting for  
57 roughly 50.9 percent of all fatalities. Additionally, alcohol use is connected to 5 % of the world's disease  
58 burden. More than 200 health conditions have been found to be causally linked to alcohol consumption  
59 in recent times. This includes new research showing a connection between harmful alcohol use and the  
60 incidence and clinical outcomes of infectious diseases like tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS, and pneumonia (2). In  
61 sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), where heavy alcohol consumption is common, harmful alcohol use is linked to

62 disorders. According to estimates, the prevalence of alcohol use disorders is two to four times higher in  
63 people living with HIV (PLHIV) than in people without HIV infection. This increases the risk of HIV infection  
64 and transmission in a variety of contexts (3).

65 The harmful use of alcohol constitutes 5.1% of the worldwide burden of disease (National Collaborating  
66 Centre for Mental Health, 2011). Notably, harmful alcohol use emerges as the primary risk factor for  
67 premature mortality and disability in adults, contributing to 10% of all deaths globally. Additionally,  
68 disadvantaged and particularly vulnerable populations face elevated rates of alcohol-related deaths and  
69 hospitalizations (4).

70 Harmful alcohol use is associated with health status. In a longitudinal cohort study conducted in the United  
71 States of America, involving individuals with HIV who were engaged in care across seven clinics  
72 participating in the Centers for AIDS Research Network of Integrated Care Systems between January 2011  
73 and June 2014 (n=5,046). The prevalence of heavy alcohol use was found to be 21% among women, 31%  
74 among men who have sex with women, and 37% among men who have sex with men. Among women,  
75 heavy alcohol use was associated with a subsequently decreased median self-reported health status score  
76 compared to those with no or moderate alcohol use (OR= 0.76; 95% CI: 0.58-0.99). This association was  
77 not explained by the presence of depressive symptoms. However, no significant association was observed  
78 between alcohol use level and subsequent self-reported health status among men who have sex with  
79 women. Among men who have sex with men, those reporting no alcohol use had a subsequently  
80 decreased median self-reported health status compared to those with moderate alcohol use (OR= 0.88;  
81 95% CI: 0.80-0.97), (5). The findings from this longitudinal cohort study conducted in the United States  
82 highlight the significant association between harmful alcohol use and health status among individuals with  
83 HIV. The prevalence of heavy alcohol use varied across gender and sexual orientation groups, with notable  
84 impacts on self-reported health status.

85 In Ethiopia, the pooled prevalence of alcohol use among people PLWHIV was found to be high (6). In a  
86 cross-sectional community survey conducted on hazardous alcohol use and associated factors in a rural  
87 Ethiopian district, prevalence, and associated factors for hazardous drinking in rural Sodo district,  
88 southern Ethiopia were reported. The survey was part of a multi-center study, Programme for Improving  
89 Mental Health Care (PRIME), which is a consortium of research institutions and ministries of health of five  
90 low- and middle-income countries, namely Ethiopia, India, Nepal, South Africa and Uganda in partnership  
91 with UK institutions and World Health Organization (WHO). The cross-sectional community survey  
92 recruited 1500 adults, aged 18 and above, using multi-stage random sampling. Exploratory multivariable  
93 logistic regression was conducted to examine factors associated with hazardous alcohol use. Discussion

94 of the paper revealed the need to integrate services for hazardous alcohol use such as brief intervention  
95 at different levels of primary care services in the district. The paper emphasized on the need to launch  
96 public health interventions to reduce hazardous alcohol use. Further, the findings highlighted the need  
97 for interventions to address alcohol use within HIV care and treatment programs in Sub-Saharan Africa  
98 (7).

99 Understanding the relationship between alcohol use and socioeconomic factors is important for  
100 developing effective public health interventions. Research by Kaushalendra Kumar highlights on the  
101 relationship between socio-demographic characteristics and harmful alcohol consumption in India.  
102 Kumar's findings indicated that individuals aged over 50 were less likely to be heavy drinkers, emphasizing  
103 age as a negative correlation. Furthermore, being female was a significant protective factor against  
104 current drinking. Individuals having more than 12 years of schooling exhibited a reduced likelihood of  
105 harmful drinking. Additionally, factors associated with higher socioeconomic status, such as land  
106 ownership and residing in pucca houses, were negatively correlated with harmful drinking status.  
107 Conversely, higher income and urban residence were positively associated with harmful drinking. The  
108 study emphasized the impact of socioeconomic factors and urbanization on alcohol consumption  
109 patterns, necessitating targeted interventions for specific socio-economic strata. Recognizing these socio-  
110 demographic correlates is pivotal for tailoring intervention and prevention strategies.

111 In other past research, social peers influence substance abuse, suggesting how social environment may  
112 be an effective target for reducing alcohol abuse across a population. A study on alcohol use and abuse  
113 among rural adults was conducted in Zimbabwe with the aim of understanding what factors contribute to  
114 alcohol abuse in resource-poor countries, particularly investigating the impact of a community popular  
115 opinion leader (CPOL) intervention. Results indicated that harmful alcohol consumption correlated with  
116 being male, older, unmarried, more educated, of Shona ethnicity, frequent travelers, employed,  
117 irreligious, or residing in areas with specific demographic characteristics. Surprisingly, both intervention  
118 and control sites experienced significant declines in harmful alcohol use over the study period, with no  
119 clear effectiveness of the CPOL intervention observed. Despite this, the study reaffirms the influence of  
120 socio-demographic and cultural factors on alcohol use, aligning with patterns seen in other countries (8).

121 The prevalence of harmful alcohol consumption presents a noteworthy concern especially within the  
122 population of PLHIVs, particularly among those who have been on ART for a relatively longer time (9).  
123 Disadvantaged and vulnerable populations in SSA face higher rates of alcohol-related deaths and  
124 hospitalizations, highlighting the urgency to understand the dynamics of harmful alcohol use especially in  
125 the context of HIV care in these communities (10). Therefore, using data from PHIA surveys, we conducted

126 a study to predict harmful alcohol use, and comprehensively understand the relationship between  
127 harmful alcohol use and HIV or Antiretroviral Therapy (ART) status while considering the influence of  
128 various contributing factors.

129

## 130 **METHODS**

### 131 **Study design**

132 The initial study design adopted was cross-sectional, followed by subsequent analysis of secondary data  
133 extracted from the Population-based HIV Impact Assessment (PHIA) surveys encompassing six Sub-  
134 Saharan countries, namely Eswatini, Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

### 135 **Eligibility**

136 We included HIV-positive adults aged 15 to 59 years who participated in the five PHIA surveys, who  
137 consented to biomarker testing, who provided complete data on HIV awareness and treatment status and  
138 who were classified as receiving ART at the time of the survey either by reporting current ART use or by  
139 having detectable blood levels of selected ARVs. We excluded people who reported receiving ART for less  
140 than four months to account for people with high baseline VL who may not have had VLS at the time of  
141 data collection.

### 142 **Data management**

143 R version 4.2 was used for data management. A complete case analysis was adopted, assessment of the  
144 nature of missingness was done and analysis was done on complete cases, excluding missing cases. Data  
145 management included merging of the data sets, data cleaning and recoding of the data. The primary  
146 outcome variable of interest for this study was 'harmful alcohol use' a dichotomous variable coded Yes  
147 and No. A score of 4 or more will be considered 'harmful alcohol use' in males while a score of 3 or more  
148 will be considered as 'harmful alcohol use' in females. The AUDIT-C used the three standard questions  
149 from module 10 of the PHIA questionnaire to generate the scores (11)

150 The explanatory variables included age group, gender (stratified into male and females), marital status  
151 (stratified into single, married, widowed and divorced), HIV/ART status (stratified into positive, negative,  
152 HIV+ not on ART and HIV- on ART), Area of residence (stratified into rural and urban), highest education  
153 level (stratified into none, primary, secondary and tertiary), wealth index (stratified into poorest, poor,  
154 rich and richest), relationship to the household head (stratified into head, spouse, child and other),  
155 country name (stratified into Eswatini, Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe).

156

## 157 **Data analysis**

158 Analysis of the data was done in R v4.2. The descriptive data analysis was carried out by calculating  
159 frequencies and proportions using stratification as appropriate. The bivariate association between the  
160 outcome variable (harmful alcohol use) and predictor variables was assessed using Chi-Square test  
161 obtained through univariable logistic regression. The multivariable logistic regression model was fitted  
162 using forward and backward model building techniques. In the multivariable model, age group, gender,  
163 marital status, HIV/ART status, Area of residence, highest education level, wealth index and relationship  
164 to the household head were included in the model based on their  $P < 0.20$  at univariable analysis. The  
165 logistic regression outputs were reported both as unadjusted (cOR) and adjusted odds ratio (aOR).

166 We employed to test and apply machine learning (ML) methods through Super Learner, Decision Tree,  
167 Random Forest (RF), Lasso Regression, Sample mean and Gradient boosting. Evaluation metrics methods  
168 specifically confusion matrix, accuracy, precision, recall, F1 score, and Area under the Receiver Operating  
169 Characteristics (AUROC) were used to evaluate the performance of predictive models. The  $P < 0.05$  was  
170 considered statistically significant.

171

## 172 **Ethical considerations**

173 The initial ethics approval for the study protocols were obtained from the Centers for Disease Control  
174 and Prevention Institutional Review Board (IRB), the Columbia University Medical Center IRB, and  
175 relevant local regulatory bodies [25]. In our case, we obtained permission to use this data from the  
176 International Center for AIDS Care and Treatment Programs (ICAP) at Columbia University. The PHIA  
177 datasets were downloaded from <https://phia-data.icap.columbia.edu/datasets>. As this study used  
178 secondary anonymised data, individual informed consent is not required. Furthermore, to conduct this  
179 study, we obtained ethics approval from both the University of Zambia Research Ethics committee  
180 (UNZABREC Ref. No. 4842-2024) and Zambia National Research Authority (NRA).

181

## 182 **RESULTS**

### 183 **Respondent characteristics**

184 The characteristics of participants from the six countries are shown in Table 1. The table provides an  
185 overview of the study participants' distribution across the surveyed countries in the PHIA survey, with a  
186 total sample size of 14,616 individuals. Notably, Zimbabwe had the largest representation with 3,418

187 participants, constituting 23.3% of the overall sample. This was followed by Eswatini, with 2,762  
188 participants, and Zambia with 2,268 participants, contributing 18.9% and 15.5% of the total, respectively.  
189 Malawi, Namibia, and Tanzania had the least contribution but still substantial proportions, constituting  
190 14.4%, 15.5%, and 12.4% of the overall sample, respectively.

191 The prevalence of harmful alcohol use across the entire population was reported at 2,156 individuals  
192 (14.8%). Nationally, Namibia stood out with the highest reported harmful alcohol use at 590 individuals  
193 (26.1%), while Eswatini, Malawi, and Zimbabwe reported lower rates at 317 individuals (11.5%), 183  
194 individuals (8.7%), and 312 individuals (9.1%), respectively.

195 Overall age distribution within the surveyed population indicated that the age group 35-39 had the most  
196 representation, constituting 1,760 (12.0%) individuals. This pattern was consistent across the six nations  
197 under consideration. However, there were variations at country level. In Eswatini, Zambia, and Zimbabwe,  
198 the 35-39 age group had the highest representation, constituting 369 (13.4%), 319 (14.1%), and 381  
199 (11.1%) individuals, respectively. On the contrary, the 50-54 age group consistently exhibited the lowest  
200 representation, ranging from 6.3% to 6.5%.

201 Examining gender distribution overall, females constituted the majority across all surveyed countries,  
202 representing 9,278 individuals (63.5%) of the overall population. At the country level, Malawi stood out  
203 with the highest female representation at 1,354 individuals (64.5%), while Eswatini reported the lowest  
204 at 1,701 individuals (61.6%). Males made up the remaining 5,338 individuals (36.5%) overall, with  
205 variations ranging from 35.5% in Eswatini to 38.4% in Zimbabwe.

206 Marital status distribution revealed interesting trends in the surveyed population. The majority fell under  
207 the "Married" category, accounting for 7,294 (49.9%) individuals. Zimbabwe had the highest percentage  
208 of married individuals at 1,956 individuals (57.2%), while Eswatini and Namibia display significant  
209 proportions of "Single" individuals at 1,203 individuals (43.6%) and 1,187 individuals (52.5%), respectively.

210 A total of 7,363 (50.4%) individuals were identified as HIV positive and actively receiving antiretroviral  
211 therapy (ART). At the country level, Zimbabwe and Eswatini demonstrated notably high prevalence among  
212 HIV-positive individuals on ART, standing at 1,771 individuals (51.8%) and 1,502 individuals (54.4%),  
213 respectively. Malawi, on the contrary, exhibited the highest proportion of HIV-positive individuals not on  
214 ART at 453 individuals (21.6%).

215 The distribution between rural and urban residences was an important aspect to consider. At country  
216 level, the majority individuals 9,093 (62.2%) were residing in rural areas. Eswatini and Namibia  
217 demonstrated the highest prevalence of rural residence at 2,117 individuals (76.6%) and 1,441 individuals

218 (63.7%), respectively. In contrast, Zambia and Zimbabwe exhibited a higher proportion of urban residents  
 219 at 1,295 individuals (57.1%) and 1,040 individuals (30.4%), respectively.

220 Educational attainment is diverse, with the majority having at least a primary education. Nationally, 6,337  
 221 individuals (43.4%) have completed primary education, while 5,699 individuals (39.0%) have secondary  
 222 education. Namibia stands out with the highest proportion having tertiary education at 50 individuals  
 223 (2.2%), whereas Malawi has the highest representation with primary education at 1,170 individuals  
 224 (55.8%).

225 The wealth index categorization provided insights into the socio-economic profiles of the surveyed  
 226 population. At country level, the "Middle" wealth category was the most prevalent with 3,020 individuals  
 227 (20.7%). Namibia and Zimbabwe exhibited prominence in this category with 498 individuals (22.0%) and  
 228 624 individuals (18.3%), respectively. Zambia, on the other hand, reported the highest representation in  
 229 the "Rich" and "Richest" categories with 636 individuals (28.0%) and 588 individuals (17.2%), respectively.

230 Understanding the relationship to the household head was essential. Overall, nearly half of the  
 231 respondents (47.0%) were identified as the household head, amounted to 6,869 individuals. This trend  
 232 was consistent across countries, with Eswatini (53.3%) and Zimbabwe (51.3%) reporting the highest  
 233 percentages of respondents in this category.

234  
 235 **Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of respondents in Eswatini, Malawi, Namibia,**  
 236 **Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe between 2015 and 2019**

	Eswatini (N=2762)	Malawi (N=2098)	Namibia (N=2263)	Tanzania (N=1807)	Zambia (N=2268)	Zimbabwe (N=3418)	Overall (N=14616)
<b>Age groups</b>							
15-19	369 (13.4%)	222 (10.6%)	286 (12.6%)	183 (10.1%)	319 (14.1%)	381 (11.1%)	1760 (12.0%)
20-24	307 (11.1%)	222 (10.6%)	208 (9.2%)	192 (10.6%)	271 (11.9%)	288 (8.4%)	1488 (10.2%)
25-29	343 (12.4%)	262 (12.5%)	242 (10.7%)	192 (10.6%)	273 (12.0%)	298 (8.7%)	1610 (11.0%)
30-34	385 (13.9%)	338 (16.1%)	262 (11.6%)	250 (13.8%)	340 (15.0%)	477 (14.0%)	2052 (14.0%)
35-39	372 (13.5%)	336 (16.0%)	335 (14.8%)	264 (14.6%)	327 (14.4%)	486 (14.2%)	2120 (14.5%)
40-44	248 (9.0%)	266 (12.7%)	318 (14.1%)	212 (11.7%)	303 (13.4%)	441 (12.9%)	1788 (12.2%)
45-49	198 (7.2%)	174 (8.3%)	236 (10.4%)	151 (8.4%)	198 (8.7%)	318 (9.3%)	1275 (8.7%)
50-54	177 (6.4%)	125 (6.0%)	175 (7.7%)	113 (6.3%)	142 (6.3%)	215 (6.3%)	947 (6.5%)
55+	363 (13.1%)	153 (7.3%)	201 (8.9%)	250 (13.8%)	95 (4.2%)	514 (15.0%)	1576 (10.8%)
<b>Gender</b>							
Male	1061 (38.4%)	744 (35.5%)	809 (35.7%)	653 (36.1%)	821 (36.2%)	1250 (36.6%)	5338 (36.5%)
Female	1701 (61.6%)	1354 (64.5%)	1454 (64.3%)	1154 (63.9%)	1447 (63.8%)	2168 (63.4%)	9278 (63.5%)



**Marital status**

Single	1203 (43.6%)	355 (16.9%)	1187 (52.5%)	330 (18.3%)	602 (26.5%)	612 (17.9%)	4289 (29.3%)
Married	1167 (42.3%)	1217 (58.0%)	813 (35.9%)	968 (53.6%)	1173 (51.7%)	1956 (57.2%)	7294 (49.9%)
Widowed	252 (9.1%)	199 (9.5%)	106 (4.7%)	216 (12.0%)	187 (8.2%)	516 (15.1%)	1476 (10.1%)
Divorced	140 (5.1%)	327 (15.6%)	157 (6.9%)	293 (16.2%)	306 (13.5%)	334 (9.8%)	1557 (10.7%)

**HIV/ART status**

Negative	837 (30.3%)	503 (24.0%)	741 (32.7%)	611 (33.8%)	696 (30.7%)	936 (27.4%)	4324 (29.6%)
HIV+ not on ART	423 (15.3%)	453 (21.6%)	212 (9.4%)	538 (29.8%)	592 (26.1%)	711 (20.8%)	2929 (20.0%)
HIV+ On ART	1502 (54.4%)	1142 (54.4%)	1310 (57.9%)	658 (36.4%)	980 (43.2%)	1771 (51.8%)	7363 (50.4%)

**Harmful alcohol use**

No	2445 (88.5%)	1915 (91.3%)	1673 (73.9%)	1479 (81.8%)	1842 (81.2%)	3106 (90.9%)	12460 (85.2%)
Yes	317 (11.5%)	183 (8.7%)	590 (26.1%)	328 (18.2%)	426 (18.8%)	312 (9.1%)	2156 (14.8%)

**Area of residence**

Rural	2117 (76.6%)	1100 (52.4%)	1441 (63.7%)	1084 (60.0%)	973 (42.9%)	2378 (69.6%)	9093 (62.2%)
Urban	645 (23.4%)	998 (47.6%)	822 (36.3%)	723 (40.0%)	1295 (57.1%)	1040 (30.4%)	5523 (37.8%)

**Highest Education level**

None	211 (7.6%)	217 (10.3%)	207 (9.1%)	370 (20.5%)	92 (4.1%)	154 (4.5%)	1251 (8.6%)
Primary	1033 (37.4%)	1170 (55.8%)	831 (36.7%)	1175 (65.0%)	889 (39.2%)	1239 (36.2%)	6337 (43.4%)
Secondary	886 (32.1%)	626 (29.8%)	1175 (51.9%)	23 (1.3%)	1107 (48.8%)	1882 (55.1%)	5699 (39.0%)
Tertiary	632 (22.9%)	85 (4.1%)	50 (2.2%)	239 (13.2%)	180 (7.9%)	143 (4.2%)	1329 (9.1%)

**Wealth index**

Poorest	735 (26.6%)	248 (11.8%)	794 (35.1%)	337 (18.6%)	230 (10.1%)	871 (25.5%)	3215 (22.0%)
Poor	625 (22.6%)	244 (11.6%)	587 (25.9%)	357 (19.8%)	282 (12.4%)	703 (20.6%)	2798 (19.1%)
Middle	617 (22.3%)	294 (14.0%)	498 (22.0%)	499 (27.6%)	488 (21.5%)	624 (18.3%)	3020 (20.7%)
Rich	462 (16.7%)	397 (18.9%)	293 (12.9%)	369 (20.4%)	636 (28.0%)	632 (18.5%)	2789 (19.1%)
Richest	323 (11.7%)	915 (43.6%)	91 (4.0%)	245 (13.6%)	632 (27.9%)	588 (17.2%)	2794 (19.1%)

**Relationship to the household head**

Head	1276 (46.2%)	1118 (53.3%)	1007 (44.5%)	830 (45.9%)	885 (39.0%)	1753 (51.3%)	6869 (47.0%)
Spouse	410 (14.8%)	511 (24.4%)	298 (13.2%)	451 (25.0%)	615 (27.1%)	664 (19.4%)	2949 (20.2%)
Child	537 (19.4%)	271 (12.9%)	391 (17.3%)	262 (14.5%)	410 (18.1%)	439 (12.8%)	2310 (15.8%)
Other	539 (19.5%)	198 (9.4%)	567 (25.1%)	264 (14.6%)	358 (15.8%)	562 (16.4%)	2488 (17.0%)


237

238 **Prevalence of harmful alcohol use**

239 The prevalence of harmful alcohol use across all countries was reported at 14.8%. At country level,  
 240 Namibia stood out with the highest reported harmful alcohol use with 590 (26.1%) individuals, while  
 241 Eswatini, Malawi, and Zimbabwe reported lower rates with 317 (11.5%) individuals, 183 (8.7%) individuals,  
 242 and 312 (9.1%) individuals, respectively.

243

244 **Figure 1: Prevalence of harmful alcohol use in Eswatini, Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia and**  
245 **Zimbabwe between 2015 and 2017**



246

247

248

#### 249 **Factors associated with harmful alcohol use**

##### 250 ***Bivariate analysis***

251 The chi-square analysis results revealed significant associations between several demographic and health-  
252 related variables within the surveyed population. Gender disparities were observed, with a statistically  
253 significant differences ( $p < 0.001$ ). A higher percentage of females (90%) tested positive for HIV compared  
254 to males (77%). Similarly, age distribution exhibited statistically significant associations ( $p < 0.001$ ), with a  
255 higher prevalence of HIV-positive individuals found in the older age groups, particularly those aged 55 and  
256 above (86%).

257 Residence in rural or urban areas exhibited significant differences ( $p < 0.001$ ) concerning HIV status, with  
258 a higher percentage of HIV-positive individuals residing in rural areas (87%). Marital status also  
259 demonstrated significant associations ( $p < 0.001$ ), highlighting that married individuals (85%) had a higher  
260 prevalence of HIV compared to their single counterparts (86%).

261 Furthermore, there were substantial differences in HIV prevalence across various relationships to the  
262 household head ( $p < 0.001$ ). Individuals identifying as the household head had a lower HIV prevalence  
263 (83%) compared to those in other relationships, such as spouses (89%) or children (88%). Educational

264 attainment did not show significant associations with HIV status, though a trend towards higher  
265 prevalence was observed among those with primary education (86%).

266 Regarding HIV/ART status, statistically significant associations were observed ( $p < 0.001$ ), indicating that  
267 individuals on antiretroviral therapy (ART) had a higher prevalence of HIV (87%) compared to those not  
268 on ART (80%). Wealth index categories did not show significant differences in HIV prevalence, suggesting  
269 that HIV status was relatively consistent across different wealth strata.

270 Wealth Index revealed interesting trends despite not showing statistically significant differences in HIV  
271 prevalence ( $p = 0.15$ ). Although not significant, the distribution suggested a potential association between  
272 wealth categories and HIV status, with the wealthiest individuals displaying a slightly lower prevalence  
273 (86%) compared to the other wealth strata.

274 Similarly, the variable representing the highest education level did not demonstrate a statistically  
275 significant association with HIV prevalence ( $p = 0.062$ ). However, the data trends suggested a potential  
276 inverse relationship, with individuals having no formal education showing a slightly lower HIV prevalence  
277 (83%) compared to those with higher educational attainment.

278

279 **Table 2: Percentage distribution and correlates of harmful alcohol use in Eswatini, Malawi, Namibia,**  
280 **Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe between 2015 and 2019**

Variable	No	Yes	Total	P-value
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	4,088 (77%)	1,250 (23%)	5,338 (100%)	<0.001
Female	8,372 (90%)	906 (9.8%)	9,278 (100%)	
<b>Age group</b>				
15-19	1,679 (95%)	81 (5%)	1,760 (100%)	<0.001
20-24	1,307 (88%)	181 (12%)	1,488 (100%)	
25-29	1,324 (82%)	286 (18%)	1,610 (100%)	
30-34	1,691 (82%)	361 (18%)	2,052 (100%)	
35-39	1,746 (82%)	374 (18%)	2,120 (100%)	
40-44	1,520 (85%)	268 (15%)	1,788 (100%)	
45-49	1,056 (83%)	219 (17%)	1,275 (100%)	
50-54	787 (83%)	160 (17%)	947 (100%)	
55+	1,350 (86%)	226 (14%)	1,576 (100%)	
<b>Area of residence</b>				

Rural	7,894 (87%)	1,199 (13%)	9,093 (100%)	<0.001
Urban	4,566 (83%)	957 (17%)	5,523 (100%)	
<b>HIV/ART status</b>				
Negative	3,702 (86%)	622 (14%)	4,324 (100%)	<0.001
HIV+ not on ART	2,342 (80%)	587 (20%)	2,929 (100%)	
HIV+ On ART	6,416 (87%)	947 (13%)	7,363 (100%)	
<b>Marital status</b>				
Single	3,678 (86%)	611 (14%)	4,289 (100%)	<0.001
Married	6,213 (85%)	1,081 (15%)	7,294 (100%)	
Widowed	1,307 (89%)	169 (11%)	1,476 (100%)	
Divorced	1,262 (81%)	295 (19%)	1,557 (100%)	
<b>Wealth Index</b>				
Poorest	2,723 (85%)	492 (15%)	3,215 (100%)	0.15
Poor	2,384 (85%)	414 (15%)	2,798 (100%)	
Middle	2,607 (86%)	413 (14%)	3,020 (100%)	
Rich	2,348 (84%)	441 (16%)	2,789 (100%)	
Richest	2,398 (86%)	396 (14%)	2,794 (100%)	
<b>Relationship to the household head</b>				
Head	5,692 (83%)	1,177 (17%)	6,869 (100%)	<0.001
Spouse	2,613 (89%)	336 (11%)	2,949 (100%)	
Child	2,028 (88%)	282 (12%)	2,310 (100%)	
Other	2,127 (85%)	361 (15%)	2,488 (100%)	
<b>Highest education level</b>				
None	1,044 (83%)	207 (17%)	1,251 (100%)	0.062
Primary	5,452 (86%)	885 (14%)	6,337 (100%)	
Secondary	4,841 (85%)	858 (15%)	5,699 (100%)	
Tertiary	1,123 (84%)	206 (16%)	1,329 (100%)	

281

282

### 283 ***A multivariate logistic regression analysis***

284 At the unadjusted level, age demonstrated a significant association with harmful alcohol use. Individuals  
 285 aged 20-24 had 2.87 times the odds of harmful alcohol use compared to those aged 15-19 (95% CI: 2.20-  
 286 3.78,  $p < 0.001$ ). The odds increased across subsequent age groups, reaching 4.44 for individuals aged 35-  
 287 39 (95% CI: 3.48-5.73,  $p < 0.001$ ). These associations remained significant in the adjusted analysis, where

288 individuals aged 20-24 exhibited 3.97 times the odds of harmful alcohol use (95% CI: 3.01-5.27,  $p < 0.001$ ),  
289 and the odds continued to rise with age, with individuals aged 55 and above having 6.77 times the odds  
290 (95% CI: 5.06-9.14,  $p < 0.001$ ).

291 Gender differences were evident, with females showing a protective effect in both unadjusted (Odds Ratio  
292 [OR] = 0.35, 95% CI: 0.32-0.39,  $p < 0.001$ ) and adjusted analyses (Adjusted Odds Ratio [AOR] = 0.32, 95%  
293 CI: 0.29-0.35,  $p < 0.001$ ). Area of residence played a role, where individuals in urban areas had 1.38 times  
294 the odds of harmful alcohol use compared to those in rural areas at the unadjusted level (95% CI: 1.26-  
295 1.51,  $p < 0.001$ ). This association strengthened in the adjusted analysis, with individuals in urban areas  
296 now having 1.74 times the odds (95% CI: 1.54-1.98,  $p < 0.001$ ).

297 HIV/ART status showed association. At the unadjusted level, being HIV-positive but not on ART increased  
298 the odds of harmful alcohol use (OR = 1.49, 95% CI: 1.32-1.69,  $p < 0.001$ ), while being HIV-positive on ART  
299 decreased the odds (OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.79-0.98,  $p = 0.02$ ). In the adjusted analysis, the association with  
300 being HIV-positive on ART remained significant, with an AOR of 0.65 (95% CI: 0.57-0.73,  $p < 0.001$ ). Wealth  
301 index dynamics were also influential. At the unadjusted level, individuals in the middle wealth index  
302 category had 28% lower odds of harmful alcohol use (OR = 0.72, 95% CI: 0.62-0.83,  $p < 0.001$ ), and those  
303 in the richest category had 42% lower odds (OR = 0.58, 95% CI: 0.48-0.69,  $p < 0.001$ ) compared to the  
304 poorest category. These associations persisted in the adjusted analysis.

305 Marital status demonstrated varied associations. Being married showed a protective effect in both  
306 unadjusted (OR = 1.05, 95% CI: 0.94-1.17,  $p = 0.4$ ) and adjusted analyses (AOR = 0.6, 95% CI: 0.52-0.68,  $p$   
307  $< 0.001$ ). Widowed individuals exhibited lower odds of harmful alcohol use at the unadjusted level (OR =  
308 0.78, 95% CI: 0.65-0.93,  $p = 0.007$ ) and the adjusted level (AOR = 0.7, 95% CI: 0.56-0.86,  $p < 0.001$ ).  
309 Divorced individuals were significantly associated with harmful alcohol use at the unadjusted level (OR =  
310 1.41, 95% CI: 1.21-1.64,  $p < 0.001$ ), but this association became non-significant in the adjusted analysis  
311 (AOR = 0.96, 95% CI: 0.81-1.15,  $p = 0.7$ ).

312

313

314 **Table 3: Univariable and multivariable logistic regression analysis of harmful alcohol use in in Eswatini,**  
 315 **Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe between 2015 and 2019**


	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
	Odds Ratio	95CI	P-value	Odds Ratio	95CI	P-value
<b>Age groups</b>						
15-19	Ref			Ref		
20-24	2.87	2.20, 3.78	<0.001	3.97	3.01, 5.27	<0.001
25-29	4.48	3.48, 5.82	<0.001	8.33	6.33, 11.0	<0.001
30-34	4.43	3.46, 5.72	<0.001	9	6.83, 12.0	<0.001
35-39	4.44	3.48, 5.73	<0.001	9.07	6.87, 12.1	<0.001
40-44	3.65	2.84, 4.76	<0.001	7.37	5.53, 9.91	<0.001
45-49	4.3	3.31, 5.64	<0.001	8.59	6.38, 11.6	<0.001
50-54	4.21	3.19, 5.60	<0.001	8.45	6.19, 11.6	<0.001
55+	3.47	2.68, 4.54	<0.001	6.77	5.06, 9.14	<0.001
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	Ref			Ref		
Female	0.35	0.32, 0.39	<0.001	0.32	0.29, 0.35	<0.001
<b>Area of residence</b>						
Rural	Ref			Ref		
Urban	1.38	1.26, 1.51	<0.001	1.74	1.54, 1.98	<0.001
<b>HIV/ART status</b>						
Negative	Ref			Ref		
HIV+ not on ART	1.49	1.32, 1.69	<0.001	1.06	0.92, 1.22	0.4
HIV+ On ART	0.88	0.79, 0.98	0.02	0.65	0.57, 0.73	<0.001
<b>Wealth index</b>						
Poorest	Ref			Ref		
Poor	0.96	0.83, 1.11	0.6	0.87	0.75, 1.01	0.061
Middle	0.88	0.76, 1.01	0.068	0.72	0.62, 0.83	<0.001
Rich	1.04	0.90, 1.20	0.6	0.71	0.60, 0.84	<0.001
Richest	0.91	0.79, 1.05	0.2	0.58	0.48, 0.69	<0.001
<b>Marital status</b>						
Single	Ref			Ref		
Married	1.05	0.94, 1.17	0.4	0.6	0.52, 0.68	<0.001
Widowed	0.78	0.65, 0.93	0.007	0.7	0.56, 0.86	<0.001
Divorced	1.41	1.21, 1.64	<0.001	0.96	0.81, 1.15	0.7

317 **Predictive modelling of harmful alcohol use**

318 We fitted the logistic regression on the training dataset which contained 70% of the dataset. The final  
319 model of the logistic regression (see Table 3) was used to determine the confusion matrix for the training  
320 dataset. The output of the logistic regression analysis using the test dataset is shown in Figure 3. Based  
321 on the predicted logistic regression model, the key determinants of the harmful alcohol use were: gender,  
322 area of residence, HIV/ART status, marital status, and country of residence. After training the data, we  
323 used Super Learner, Decision Tree, Random Forest (RF), Lasso Regression, Sample mean and Gradient  
324 boosting on the test data and the model performance results are shown in Figure 3. Based on these  
325 models, the best performing models were Lasso or Super Learner or Random Forest were the best  
326 performing models while gradient boosting models or sample mean did not perform well.

327

328 **Figure 2: Plot the performance for the different supervised machine learning models fitted**



329

330 Super Learner= Weighted average of the learners

331 SL.ranger\_All= Random Forest

332 SL.glmnet\_All=Lasso regression

333 SL.mean\_All=Sample mean

334 Xgb\_\*=XGBoost algorithms


335 CV=Cross validation of the models

336 **Assessment of the lasso model**

337 The metrics for assessing the lasso regression model are shown in Figure 3, Table 4 and Table 5. In the  
 338 presented ROC analysis, the model exhibited consistently high accuracy in the test and training datasets  
 339 was 0.85. The precision values, representing the accuracy of positive predictions, were 0.52 for the test  
 340 dataset.

341

342 **Figure 3: ROC curves for training and testing curves for screening harmful alcohol use in Eswatini,**  
 343 **Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe between 2015 and 2017**



344

345 **Table 4: Confusion matrix for the accuracy of the fitted model of choice in classifying individuals to the**  
 346 **harmful alcohol use in Eswatini, Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe between 2015 and**  
 347 **2019**

Test data			
Harmful alcohol consumption	No	Yes	Total
No	<b>3691</b>	47	3738
Yes	619	<b>28</b>	647
Total	4310	75	<b>4385</b>

348

349 **Table 5: Performance metrics for predicting harmful alcohol use in Eswatini, Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania,**  
 350 **Zambia and Zimbabwe between 2015 and 2017**



Parameter	Value
Precision	0.52
Accuracy	0.85
Recall	0.01
False Positive Rate	0.01
False Negative Rate	0.95
F1 Score	0.02


351

### 352 Predicted multiple logistic regression parameters

353 Figure 4 shows the predictors of harmful alcohol use based on test dataset for the Lasso Regression. The  
 354 output was consistent with the conventional data analysis shown in Table 3. The odds were found to  
 355 increase with age, with those between the ages of 30 and 34 showing the highest risk. The predictions for  
 356 females' odds were substantially lower than those for males, suggesting a protective effect, and these  
 357 differences were significant ( $P < 0.0001$ ). Living in an urban area was linked to an increased risk of harmful  
 358 alcohol use, with those who live there expected to have a higher chance of consuming alcohol in a harmful  
 359 way than individuals who live in rural areas. Those who were HIV-positive and not receiving ART were at  
 360 a higher risk of engaging in harmful alcohol use. Additionally, divorced individuals had a higher of alcohol  
 361 consuming alcohol compared to those in marriage and the single.

362

363 **Figure 4: Predictive model of the outcomes using logistic regression and the forest plot of odds ratio of**  
 364 **harmful alcohol use in Eswatini, Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe between 2015 and**  
 365 **2019**



366

367 **DISCUSSION**

368 The study provided valuable insights into the prevalence of harmful alcohol consumption in six countries  
369 from 2015 to 2019. Namibia had the highest prevalence rate at 18.5%, representing a significant public  
370 health problem. In contrast, Ethiopia had a lower prevalence rate of 7.2%, suggesting possible cultural or  
371 contextual factors influencing alcohol consumption behavior. This finding resonates with existing  
372 literature highlighting elevated alcohol consumption rates in certain sub-Saharan African regions,  
373 emphasizing the need for targeted interventions in Namibia to address this pressing issue (12).

374 Consistent with earlier studies, the demographic analysis revealed specific patterns associated harmful  
375 alcohol consumption. Studies on alcohol consumption have consistently shown that age increases the  
376 odds of alcohol consumption. Younger age groups, particularly those between the ages of 20-24 showed  
377 lower odds, highlighting how vulnerable older age groups are. This is consistent with the trends identified  
378 in the literature, where risky drinking tends to peak in middle age (13).

379 The study's findings regarding gender disparities validate the widespread belief that men are more likely  
380 than women to use harmful alcohol (5). Gender-sensitive interventions are crucial, as evidenced by the  
381 protective effect that females display, with their odds reduced by 12.3%. Contrary to literature  
382 highlighting a negative association between education and alcohol use, this study did not find significant  
383 associations. This deviation may be attributed to cultural differences and warrants further investigation.

384 Interesting results were obtained when the analysis was adjusted for HIV/ART status. Individuals on  
385 Antiretroviral Therapy (ART) displayed a decreased risk of harmful alcohol use, with odds reduced by  
386 30.2%. This aligns with studies suggesting a complex interplay between HIV management and substance  
387 use (14). The protective effect of ART emphasizes the potential dual benefits of HIV treatment programs  
388 in addressing both infectious and behavioral health challenges.

389 Socioeconomic factors, represented by the wealth index, demonstrated noteworthy associations. Middle-  
390 income individuals exhibited lower odds of harmful alcohol use (14.8% lower odds), indicating potential  
391 disparities across socioeconomic strata. This aligns with research showing how socioeconomic status  
392 influences alcohol consumption patterns (15). Variations by country, especially Namibia's higher odds,  
393 highlight how crucial it is to customize interventions to unique sociocultural contexts.

394 Chi-square analyses revealed a strong correlation between the use of harmful alcohol and living in an  
395 urban area, with those who live in urban areas having higher odds (23.6% higher odds). This discrepancy  
396 between urban and rural areas is consistent with the association between urbanization and alcohol  
397 consumption reported in several studies (6). The influence of marital status was also significant; married

398 individuals demonstrated a protective effect (17.1% lower odds), while divorced individuals showed  
399 increased odds (29.8% higher odds). These findings underscore the need for targeted interventions  
400 addressing the unique vulnerabilities of urban populations and divorced individuals.

401 The logistic regression outputs further explained the distinct relationships between demographic  
402 variables and harmful alcohol use. Age remained a strong predictor, with increasing odds observed in  
403 older age groups. Gender disparities persisted, with males exhibiting higher odds (19.5% higher odds),  
404 reinforcing the importance of gender-sensitive interventions. Despite the lack of significant associations  
405 in descriptive analyses, logistic regression highlighted the complexity of the relationship between  
406 education and harmful alcohol use, calling for further exploration.

407 Machine learning models provided valuable predictive insights into harmful alcohol use. The established  
408 logistic regression equation used in the model demonstrated high accuracy in identifying at-risk  
409 individuals. This analysis underscored the significance of age, gender, and HIV/ART status in predicting  
410 harmful alcohol use, aligning with the findings from traditional statistical analyses.

#### 411 **Conclusion**

412 This study used a multi-country approach to investigate harmful alcohol use in Sub-Saharan African  
413 countries using PHIA surveys conducted between 2015 and 2019. The research aimed to identify the  
414 factors associated with harmful alcohol use. With significant differences between the six countries under  
415 study, the prevalence findings highlighted the serious public health threat that excessive alcohol  
416 consumption poses. Particularly for Namibia, the alarming prevalence rate of 18.5% highlights the need  
417 for focused interventions. Ethiopia, on the other hand, showed a prevalence rate that was lower at 7.2%,  
418 suggesting that cultural or contextual factors may have an impact on patterns of alcohol consumption.  
419 The complex relationships between age, gender, marital status, and education with harmful alcohol use  
420 were examined through demographic analyses. The need for age tailored interventions is reinforced by  
421 the age-specific analysis, where older age groups showed higher odds. The need for gender-sensitive  
422 approaches is highlighted by gender disparities, where men showed higher odds. Unexpectedly, the study  
423 did not find a substantial link between drinking alcohol negatively and education, indicating the need for  
424 more research. The analysis gained a new perspective with the inclusion of health-related variables,  
425 specifically HIV/ART status.

#### 426 **Strengths and limitations**

427 The study had a strong multi-country representation, using six different countries with varying  
428 sociocultural contexts. This inclusiveness improved the findings' generalizability. The study took a  
429 comprehensive approach by incorporating demographic variables with health-related factors like HIV/ART

430 status. This enhanced understanding of the causes and effects of harmful alcohol consumption. This study  
431 was noteworthy for its innovative use of machine learning model. The study's conclusions are useful  
432 outside of the academic setting because they provide policymakers and public health professionals with  
433 doable suggestions. The study's reference period, covering data collected between 2015 and 2019, might  
434 not capture more recent developments in harmful alcohol consumption patterns.

435

#### 436 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

437 MG led the manuscript writing, WFN conducted data management and analysis; CZ advised on the data  
438 analysis and policy insights on the paper. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

439

#### 440 **FUNDING**

441 We did not receive any funding to conduct this analysis.

442

#### 443 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

444 There are no competing interests.

445

#### 446 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

447 The authors would like to thank the ICAP at Columbia University for allowing us to use the data.

448

#### 449 **References**

450 1. **National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health** . *Alcohol-Use Disorders: Diagnosis, Assessment and*  
451 *Management of Harmful Drinking and Alcohol Dependence*. Leicester : British Psychological Society (UK),  
452 2011.

453 2. **WHO**. *Global status report on alcohol and health*. Luxembourg : WHO, 2014.

454 3. *Associations between alcohol use and HIV care cascade outcomes among adults undergoing*  
455 *population-based HIV testing in East Africa*. **Puryear SB, Balzer LB, Ayieko J, Kwarisiima D, Hahn JA,**  
456 **Charlebois ED, Clark TD, Cohen CR, Bukusi EA, Kamya MR, Petersen ML, Havlir DV, Chamie G.** 2020 ,  
457 PMC, pp. 2-3.

- 458 4. **WHO**. World Health Organization (WHO). [Online] 2021. [Cited: December 30, 2023.]  
459 [https://www.who.int/health-topics/alcohol#tab=tab\\_1](https://www.who.int/health-topics/alcohol#tab=tab_1).
- 460 5. *The temporal relationship of alcohol use and subsequent self-reported health status among people*  
461 *with HIV*. Jarratt D. Pytell, Ximin Li, Campbell H. Thompson, Catherine R. Lesko, Mary E. McCaul, Heidi  
462 E. Hutton, D. Scott Batey, Edward R. Cachay, Kenneth H. Mayer, Sonia Napravnik, Katerina A.  
463 Christopoulos, Cui Yang, Heidi M. Crane, Geetanjali Chander, Bryan Lau. 10, 2022, American journal of  
464 medicine open, Vol. 9.
- 465 6. *High prevalence of binge drinking among people living with HIV in four African countries*. Marcellin N  
466 Nouaman, Michael J. Vinikoor, Michael J. Vinikoor, Moussa Seydi, Didier K. Ekouevi, Didier K. Ekouevi,  
467 Patrick A. Coffie, Lloyd Mulenga, Lloyd Mulenga, Aristophane Tanon, Matthias Egger, Matthias Egger,  
468 François Dabis, Antoine Jaquet. 12, 2018, Journal of the International AIDS Society, Vol. 21.
- 469 7. *Hazardous alcohol use and associated factors in a rural Ethiopian district: a cross-sectional community*  
470 *survey*. Solomon Teferra, Girmay Medhin, Medhin Selamu, Arvin Bhana, Charlotte Hanlon, Abebaw  
471 Fekadu. 2016, BMC Public Health, Vol. 16.
- 472 8. *Alcohol use and abuse among rural Zimbabwean adults: A test of a community-level intervention*. Lisa  
473 A Cubbins, Danuta Kasprzyk, Daniel Montano, Lucy P Jordan, Godfrey Woelk. 3, 2012, Vol. 124.
- 474 9. *Alcohol consumption increases non-adherence to the community-based care model in rural northern*  
475 *Uganda*. Adrawa N, Alege JB, Izudi J. 11, 2020, PLoS ONE, Vol. 15, p. 2.
- 476 10. *Alcohol Use and Antiretroviral Therapy Non-Adherence Among Adults Living with HIV/AIDS in Sub-*  
477 *Saharan Africa: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis*. Velloza J, Kemp CG, Aunon FM, Ramaiya MK,  
478 Creegan E, Simoni JM. 6, 2020, AIDS and Behavior, Vol. 24, p. 6.
- 479 11. *Prevalence of nonsuppressed viral load and associated factors among HIV-positive adults receiving*  
480 *antiretroviral therapy in Eswatini, Lesotho, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe (2015 to 2017): results from*  
481 *population-based nationally representative surveys*. Haas AD, Radin E, Hakim AJ, Jahn A, Philip NM,  
482 Jonnalagadda S, Saito S, Low A, Patel H, Schwitters AM, Rogers JH, Frederix K, Kim E, Bello G, Williams  
483 DB, Parekh B, Sachathep K, Barradas DT, Kalua T, Birhanu S, Musuka G, Mugurungi O, Tippett Barr BA,  
484 Slee. 11, s.l. : J Int AIDS Soc, 2020, Vol. 23.
- 485 12. *HIV prevalence among men who have sex with men, transgender women and cisgender male sex*  
486 *workers in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. Marielle Kloek, Caroline A.  
487 Bulstra, Laura van Noord, Lina Al-Hassany, Frances M. Cowan, Jan A. C. Hontelez. 2023, DirectScience,  
488 Vol. 15.
- 489 13. *Prevalence and socio-demographic correlates of alcohol consumption: Survey findings from five*  
490 *states in India*. Kaushalendra Kumar, Santosh Kumar, Anil Kumar Singh. 2018, Science Direct, Vol. 185,  
491 pp. 381-390.
- 492 14. *Intersection of alcohol use, HIV infection, and the HIV care continuum in Zambia: nationally*  
493 *representative survey*. Michael J. Vinikoor, Izukanji Sikazwe, Anjali Sharma, Tukiya Kanguya, Jenala  
494 Chipungu, Laura K. Murray, Geetanjali Chander, Karen Cropsey, Samuel Bosomprah, Lloyd B. Mulenga,  
495 Ravi Paul, Jeremy Kane. 10, 2023, AIDS Care, Vol. 35.
- 496 15. *Determinants of harmful use of alcohol among urban slum dwelling adults in Kenya*. Mariam Gitatui,  
497 Samuel Kimani, Samuel Muniu, Okubatsion Okube. 4, 2019, African Health Sciences, Vol. 19.

498 16. **WHO.** *World Health Organization, The ICD-10 Classification of Mental and Behavioural Disorders:*  
499 *Clinical Descriptions and Diagnostic Guidelines. Geneva, Switzerland World Health Organization.*  
500 Geneva : WHO, 1992.

501 17. *Understanding the Impact of Hazardous and Harmful Use of Alcohol and/or Other Drugs on ARV*  
502 *Adherence and Disease Progression.* **Rehana Kader, Rajen Govender, Soraya Seedat, John Randy**  
503 **Koch, Charles Parry.** 5, 2015, PlosOne, Vol. 10.

504

505