

**Increasing HIV Testing Among Sexual and Gender Expansive Men in Kazakhstan:
A Stepped-Wedge Randomized Trial of a Community-Level Intervention**

Elwin Wu, PhD^{1,2}, Yong Gun Lee, PhD^{2,3}, Vitaliy Vinogradov, BA², Gulnara Zhakupova, MS²,
Gaukhar Mergenova, MD², Alissa Davis, PhD^{1,2}, Emily A. Paine, PhD⁴, Timothy Hunt, PhD^{1,2},
Kelsey Reeder, LCSW-R¹, Sholpan Primbetova, MS², Assel Terlikbayeva, MD², Caitlin
Laughney, PhD⁴, Mingway Chang, PhD¹, Baurzhan Baiserkin MD/PhD⁵, Asylkhan Abishev,
MD⁵, Marat Tukeyev MD/PhD⁶, Sabit Abdraimov, MD⁷, Alfiya Denebayeva, MD⁶, Sairankul
Kasymbekova, MD⁵, Galiya Tazhibayeva, MD⁵, Mashirov Kozhakhmet, MD⁸

¹ Social Intervention Group, Columbia School of Social Work, New York, NY, USA

² Global Health Research Center of Central Asia, Almaty, Kazakhstan

³ Department of Social Work and Social Administration, The University of Hong Kong,
Pokfulam, Hong Kong

⁴ Department of Psychiatry, Columbia University, New York, NY USA; HIV Center for
Clinical and Behavioral Studies, New York State Psychiatric Institute, NY, USA

⁵ Kazakh Scientific Center of Dermatology and Infectious Diseases

⁶ Center of AIDS Prevention of Almaty

⁷ Center of AIDS Prevention of Astana

⁸ Center of AIDS Prevention of Shymkent

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Elwin Wu, Social
Intervention Group, Columbia University School of Social Work, 1255 Amsterdam Avenue,
New York, NY 10027. USA. Email: elwin.wu@columbia.edu

KEY POINTS

Question: Does the *PRIDE in HIV Care* intervention exert a community effect of increasing HIV testing among men who have sex with men (MSM) and transgender and nonbinary people who have sex with men (TSM) in Kazakhstan?

Findings: We employed a stepped-wedge, cluster-randomized controlled trial among three cities in Kazakhstan. There was a statistically significant increase in odds of recent HIV testing for every additional month the intervention was implemented in a respondent's city.

Meaning: The intervention increased HIV testing among MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan who had not directly received the intervention, providing support for a community-wide impact.

ABSTRACT

Importance: HIV transmission in Kazakhstan has increased among men who have sex with men (MSM) and transgender and nonbinary people who have sex with men (TSM), driven by low HIV testing rates.

Objective: To determine if the *PRIDE in HIV Care* intervention had a community effect of increasing HIV testing among MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan.

Design: We employed a stepped-wedge, cluster-randomized controlled trial with MSM and TSM community members recruited from three cities in Kazakhstan: Almaty, Astana, and Shymkent. We collected serial cross-sectional data where community members completed one assessment between 21 August 2018, and 30 March 2022.

Setting: We collected data from 629 MSM and TSM among the study cities. Community respondents were recruited from real-world (e.g., NGOs, bars, clubs) or virtual sites (e.g., social media, apps) where MSM and TSM in each of the three cities were known to frequent.

Participants: Eligibility criteria for community respondents were: (1) ≥ 18 years old; (2) identifying as male at any point in life or being assigned male at birth; (3) having consensual sex with another man in the past 12 months; (4) engaging in binge drinking (i.e., ≥ 5 drinks in a 2 hour period), illicit use of drugs, or both in the past 90 days; and (5) residing in one of the three study cities.

Intervention: The *PRIDE in HIV Care* intervention is a theory-driven “crowdsourcing and peer-actuated network intervention” designed to amplify community members’ successes and resilience via “influencers” who can strengthen and impart benefit to their networks and community.

Main outcome measures: Received an HIV test in the prior six months.

Results: There was a statistically significant increase in odds of recent HIV testing for every additional month the intervention was implemented in a respondent’s city ($AOR=1.08$, 95% $CI=1.05-1.12$; $p<.001$).

Conclusions: The *PRIDE in HIV Care* intervention appears to be efficacious in enacting a community wide increase—i.e., promoted HIV testing among those who did not go through the intervention itself—in HIV testing among MSM and TSM.

Trial Registration: This trial is registered with clinicaltrials.gov (NCT02786615).

Funding: National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), grant number R01DA040513.

Keywords: men who have sex with men, sexual and gender minorities, Kazakhstan, HIV, HIV testing, crowdsourcing, social marketing, social networks

Manuscript Word Count: 2,975

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Public health efforts to end the HIV epidemic have successfully reduced HIV incidence
3 and improved HIV care outcomes across many national contexts. In Kazakhstan, however, HIV
4 incidence has increased 88% from 2010 to 2021—the 7th highest increase in the world—and the
5 number of people living with HIV more than doubled.^{1,2} This trend is accelerated among gay,
6 bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (MSM), who experienced an increase in
7 prevalence from 1.2% in 2013³ to 6.5% in 2020.¹ Additional studies suggest higher prevalence
8 among some sub-groups of MSM and transgender and nonbinary people who have sex with men
9 (TSM),⁴⁻⁶ such as those who use substances and/or engage in binge drinking (15.6%).⁶ In 2019,
10 it was estimated that only 30% of MSM living with HIV knew their status,⁷ signaling a great
11 need to increase HIV testing.

12 MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan face significant barriers to HIV testing and engagement in
13 the HIV care continuum. Evidence suggests that HIV stigma as well as stigma arising from
14 homophobia and transphobia are pervasive and impede access to care.^{6,8-13} Resultant internalized
15 homophobia and transphobia compromise psychosocial wellbeing and have been associated with
16 lower rates of HIV testing among MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan.^{6,8,14}

17 Despite the demonstrated need, evidence-based HIV preventive interventions involving
18 MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan are scarce. To address this gap, we developed and tested an
19 intervention for increasing the number of MSM and TSM engaged in the HIV care continuum in
20 Kazakhstan. We built upon more than two decades of evidence-based social network
21 interventions,¹⁵ demonstrating their flexibility and utility in disseminating HIV information
22 among peers and leveraging social support to improve HIV outcomes. Given the longstanding
23 oppression and marginalization of MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan, we buttressed the peer

24 influence and social network approach with community empowerment.¹⁶ In particular, viewing
25 MSM and TSM as experts and catalysts of change, we utilized crowdsourcing, the process of
26 engaging the public to develop and share solutions.^{17,18} Finally, we drew upon social marketing
27 principles and practices^{19–27} to optimize promotion reach and impact within networks.

28 Synthesizing across these approaches, we conceptualized and developed the *Peer Reach*
29 *and Influencer-Driven Engagement in the HIV Care Continuum (PRIDE in HIV Care)*
30 intervention as a crowdsourcing and peer-actuated network intervention. We then employed a
31 stepped-wedge randomized clinical trial that utilized a serial cross-sectional data collection and
32 analysis to test its efficacy on increasing broader community-wide HIV testing. Specifically, we
33 hypothesized that the odds of MSM and TSM community members (who were not directly
34 participating in the intervention) having a recent HIV test would increase after the
35 implementation of the intervention in their city of residence.

36 **METHODS**

37 **Trial Design**

38 This study was an open-label stepped-wedge randomized trial focused on a target
39 population of MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan engaged in substance use; the trial period covered
40 21 August 2018 to 30 March 2022. Because the social networks of individuals are not known in
41 advance—hence cannot be reliably assigned to a single experimental condition—and the peer
42 influence mechanism can exert an influence over some geographical distance, we utilized a
43 design in which experimental control and random assignment were performed at the city level in
44 three geographically disparate cities: Almaty, Astana, and Shymkent. These cities were chosen
45 based on (1) being among the cities with the highest prevalence and incidence of HIV in the
46 country, and (2) having physical and digital infrastructures to access MSM and TSM residing

47 there.²⁸ Figure 1 presents a CONSORT diagram depicting the major aspects of trial design and
48 performance. The trial began with a 6-month “pre-implementation” period in which all cities had
49 no intervention delivered/available. Study steps were planned to be six months in duration, with
50 intervention delivery beginning in one new city each subsequent step until the intervention was
51 delivered/available in all three cities (total of 18 months). Data collection and analysis utilized a
52 serial cross-sectional design; all respondents were unique individuals.

53 Two unexpected changes to the trial design occurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
54 First, COVID-19 emergence and transmission mitigation measures resulted in a loss of
55 recruitment time and, consequently, a lower-than-targeted sample size. Second, intervention
56 delivery shifted from an in-person, group-based modality to a remotely delivered, individual
57 modality. The pause began in March 2020, initially involving a halt in participant-facing study
58 activities, while intervention delivery protocols were revised to be conducted remotely (e.g., via
59 internet or digital telecommunications apps); the study’s Institutional Review Boards (IRBs)
60 approved remote intervention delivery in December 2020. In-person activities, specifically the
61 main assessment—hence enrollment—were allowed to recommence in November 2021.

62 **Intervention**

63 The *PRIDE in HIV Care* intervention was a novel crowdsourcing and peer-actuated
64 network intervention designed to promote engagement in the HIV care continuum among MSM
65 and TSM in the community. The intervention drew upon Social Cognitive Theory (SCT)²⁹,
66 social marketing principles,¹⁹ and adult learning theories³⁰ to focus on facilitating intervention
67 recipients become “influencers” for HIV testing and treatment among MSM and TSM
68 community members.

69 Figure 2 presents the formal logic model for the intervention. Activities were specifically
70 designed to target intervention mediators and key clinical processes (e.g., attendance motivation,
71 safety). For instance, crowdsourcing prompted intervention recipients to share strategies for
72 effectively engaging in the HIV care continuum, including identifying MSM/TSM-friendly
73 providers, coping with stigma, and fostering or maintaining motivation for testing. Intervention
74 activities also encouraged recipients to use contemporary digital marketing approaches (e.g.,
75 influencer marketing, viral marketing) in social marketing. To aid in the application of social
76 marketing concepts, the intervention had recipients consider the following (with example
77 prompts):

- 78 • Behavior (What is the desired behavior? e.g., getting an HIV test)
- 79 • Location (Where might the behavior be performed?)
- 80 • Audience (Who are you targeting?)
- 81 • Strategy (How will you promote the behavior? e.g., tone of messaging)
- 82 • Tools (What do you need to execute your marketing strategy? e.g., social media account).

83 Prior to the COVID-19 study interruption, the intervention was delivered as a single one-
84 on-one orientation session followed by four facilitator-led group sessions. During the COVID-19
85 study pause, the intervention was adapted to be delivered remotely in a one-on-one fashion. This
86 allowed the study to resume in accordance with COVID-19 mitigation measures/requirements.
87 The adaptation method to ensure rigor and reproducibility have been published previously.³¹

88 Figure 3 presents representative examples of materials developed (i.e., crowdsourced)
89 and used by intervention recipients during the trial to influence and assist MSM and TSM
90 community members in their city to engage in HIV testing, prevention, and care.

91 **Community Respondents**

92 We underscore that the intervention was primarily designed to exert an impact in the
93 community rather than spur individual change among intervention recipients. Thus, we assess
94 primary outcomes among community respondents who were not involved in the intervention at
95 the time of assessment.

96 Starting six months before the trial, research staff recruited community respondents at
97 real-world (e.g., NGOs, bars, clubs) and virtual (e.g., Instagram, Grindr) sites where MSM and
98 TSM were known to frequent.²⁸ Respondents also referred people from their social networks to
99 the study team as potential respondents.

100 Eligibility criteria for community respondents were based on self-report and included: (1)
101 ≥ 18 years old; (2) identifying as male at any point in life or assigned male at birth (AMAB); (3)
102 having consensual sex with another man in the past 12 months; (4) engaging in binge drinking
103 (i.e., ≥ 5 drinks in a 2 hour period), illicit use of drugs, or both in the past 90 days; and (5)
104 residing in one of the three study cities. Individuals were excluded if language and/or cognitive
105 abilities prohibited providing informed consent. Eligibility was determined via a brief computer-
106 assisted structured interview (CASI) administered by a trained interviewer.

107 **Randomization**

108 Six months prior to the start of the trial, the investigative team used a computerized
109 random number generator to determine the order in which cities would enter the implementation
110 phase in the stepped-wedge design. Respondents were not informed about the implementation
111 status of their city at the time of data collection.

112 **Data Collection and Measurement**

113 Data collection followed a serial cross-sectional design. Each respondent completed a
114 survey at a single timepoint administered in Kazakh or Russian (at the preference of the

115 respondent) by trained interviewers. The survey consisted of questionnaires used in prior studies
116 focused on HIV and/or substance use by the investigative team, including studies with MSM.³²

117 *Primary Outcome*

118 Respondents reported if they ever had an HIV test (prior to this study) and the time
119 (month and year) of their most recent HIV test. For the primary outcome of this study,
120 respondents who had received an HIV test in the past six months were coded 1=yes, 0=no.

121 *Covariates*

122 Sociodemographic data included age, sex assigned at birth, current gender identity,
123 sexual orientation, marital status, employment, and monthly income.

124 Respondents self-reported lifetime binge drinking and use of marijuana/cannabinoids,
125 heroin/opioids, stimulants, cocaine, hallucinogens or psychedelics, inhalants, and club drugs. If a
126 respondent indicated lifetime use, they were asked about recent use (i.e., in the past 90 days).

127 Biological assays for HIV and STIs were conducted immediately after the survey.

128 Community respondents self-collected urine and rectal swab specimens, which were shipped to
129 certified laboratories in each city for testing of *Chlamydia trachomatis* and *Neisseria gonorrhoea*
130 (AmpliSense molecular/DNA amplification assay). Finger prick blood samples were used for
131 syphilis testing (Alere Determine Syphilis TP rapid screening test). For respondents with reactive
132 results, venous blood was collected for confirmatory testing using a non-treponemal test (test of
133 Venereal Diseases Research Laboratory [VDRL]) and a second treponemal test (*Treponema*
134 *pallidum* particles agglutination [TPHA]) when needed. The study also provided HIV testing, but
135 the study-provided HIV test was excluded from the analysis approach for the primary outcome of
136 recent HIV testing.

137 **Statistical Methods**

138 *Primary Outcome*

139 The primary outcome for the study was recent HIV testing (i.e., receiving an HIV test in
140 \leq six months). Respondents were instructed to not consider the study-provided HIV test. As
141 noted earlier, the intervention was designed to make an impact on engagement in the HIV care
142 continuum *among MSM and TSM in the community* (as opposed to increasing such behaviors
143 among intervention recipients themselves). Thus, efficacy analyses focused on HIV testing
144 behavior prior to a respondent being able receive the intervention to become an HIV care
145 continuum influencer.

146 *Sample Size*

147 Power analyses based on the original study design predicted that 1,000 participants would
148 provide 80% statistical power for the step in the HIV care continuum having the hardest-to-
149 detect outcome, which was ART adherence among those living with HIV. The unavoidable
150 pause in study activities due to COVID-19 resulted in a loss of about a third of the planned
151 recruitment time. We enrolled 629 participants, which was proportionate of the actual vs.
152 planned recruitment time; this was still adequately powered for HIV testing but not for the other
153 points in the HIV care continuum.

154 *Inferential hypothesis testing*

155 For the main analysis, we used a Generalized Linear Model with a logit link function to
156 test the hypothesis that the primary outcome of recent HIV testing would increase as a function
157 of time (measured in months) since the intervention began to be implemented in a respondent's
158 city. Models accounted for clustering within cities using random slopes and intercepts. To

159 account for secular trends, the initial model included time-in-months from start of study as a
160 constant, and time-in-months since the intervention was implemented in the respondent's city at
161 the time of data collection from the respondent (for periods before intervention implementation
162 in a city, the value of this variable was set to zero). This "bent stick" model has been used in
163 prior efficacy tests of stepped-wedge randomized trials.³³ The final model added covariance
164 adjustment for self-reported sociodemographics, recent binge drinking and illicit use of drugs,
165 and STI status (independently for Chlamydia, Gonorrhea, Syphilis) determined via biological
166 assay.

167 Post hoc analyses were conducted using the same analytic approach described above to
168 (1) restrict data to the period before COVID-19 and, hence, before the change of the intervention
169 delivery to the remote modality; and (2) gain preliminary insight into the impact of the substance
170 use criterion on the generalizability of the sample/findings.

171 **Research Ethics and Review**

172 All respondents provided informed consent at the start of screening and assessment visits.
173 Respondents were compensated with gift cards with 2000 and 6000 Kazakhstan Tenge (~\$5 and
174 ~\$15USD) for completion of the screening and main assessment respectively. All study
175 procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Boards at Columbia University and
176 Kazakhstan National University.

177 **RESULTS**

178 We conducted 1062 screening interviews across the three cities ($n=437$, 330, and 295 in
179 Almaty, Astana, and Shymkent respectively). Overall, 648 individuals screened eligible for the
180 study (Figure 1). We enrolled 629 (97%) of study-eligible individuals, which constitutes the
181 analytic sample for the primary outcome hypothesis testing.

182 There were significant differences for most of the sociodemographic characteristics by
183 city (Table 1). Shymkent had the highest proportion of participants who preferred to
184 communicate in Kazakh, were transgender, bisexual/pansexual/etc., married, did not complete a
185 high school education, and employed part-time or unemployed.

186 Among this sample, 254 (40%) reported having received an HIV test in the past six
187 months. These testing rates differed significantly ($p<.001$) by city, with 112 (46%), 91 (47%), and
188 51 (27%) of the participants from Almaty, Astana, and Shymkent respectively who underwent
189 HIV testing in the prior six months.

190 **Efficacy Outcomes**

191 Results from the primary outcome analyses (Table 2) indicate a statistically significant
192 increase in odds of recent HIV testing for every additional month the intervention was
193 implemented in a respondent's city ($AOR=1.08$, $95\% CI=1.05-1.12$; $p<.001$) and this offsets the
194 statistically significant estimated negative trend over time in HIV testing ($AOR=0.95$, 95%
195 $CI=0.93-0.97$; $p<.001$). These relationships remain significant and within their $95\% CIs$ with
196 covariance adjustment for sociodemographic factors, substance use behaviors, and STI status.

197 *Ancillary analyses*

198 We conducted an ancillary analysis restricting data to those collected pre-COVID-19; the
199 statistical significance remained unchanged. As an exploratory analysis regarding the impact of
200 the substance use eligibility criterion, we analyzed screening data for MSM and TSM regardless
201 of the substance use criterion (i.e., including MSM or TSM who did not engage in binge drinking
202 nor illicit drug use in the past 90 days) but met all the other eligibility criteria, albeit with
203 covariance adjustment with the variables available at screening (age, income, sexual orientation,
204 being cisgender, marital status, preferred language, employment, and recent binge drinking and

205 illicit use of drugs); the odds of having a recent HIV test among this larger sample ($N=849$) of
206 MSM and TSM for each month the intervention was implemented in the respondent's city was
207 statistically significant in a beneficial direction ($AOR=1.08$, $95\% CI=1.06-1.10$; $p<.001$); this
208 effect size offsets the statistically significant negative trend over time in HIV testing ($AOR=0.96$,
209 $95\% CI=0.95-0.96$; $p<.001$).

210 **DISCUSSION**

211 Results support *PRIDE in HIV Care* as an efficacious behavioral intervention that can
212 increase HIV testing among MSM and TSM communities in Kazakhstan. Of note and particular
213 value, the intervention was designed and assessed to have a community-level effect: *PRIDE in*
214 *HIV Care* can prompt behavior change among individuals who never directly received the
215 intervention.

216 The intervention was designed such that intervention effects would diffuse out through a
217 recipient's social networks. The stepped-wedge randomized trial design accommodated for
218 social networks within a city. It has limited ability to control for secular and external events that
219 exert non-linear temporal trends. Contamination across cities is still possible, especially given
220 digital social media which can have a wide geographical reach. Yet the use of three
221 socioeconomically varied cities geographically dispersed across the country is a strength. The
222 COVID-19-driven pause resulted in several unavoidable changes: a decrease in sample size and
223 loss of statistical power to detect secondary outcomes (e.g., receiving ART, achieving viral
224 suppression); and intervention delivery modality being confounded with time (i.e., all
225 intervention delivery starting in January 2021 was remote). However, even with the smaller-
226 than-planned sample size, we believe this is still considerably the largest sample of MSM and
227 TSM in Kazakhstan reported in the behavioral science literature to date.

228 Most of these limitations would result in decreasing the detectable effect and, thus,
229 increase Type II error. However, we were able to reject the null hypothesis for the primary
230 outcome, indicating that the substantial strengths of our study and the stepped-wedge design
231 outweigh the limitations. Given that HIV testing represents the greatest gap in the HIV care
232 continuum for MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan,²⁸ our findings have significant implications for
233 future HIV programs and research.

234 *Conclusions*

235 This clinical trial supports the addition of *PRIDE in HIV Care* to the set of evidence-
236 based HIV preventive interventions and advances evidence-based community-level, peer HIV
237 prevention in other ways. A new community-level intervention is a noteworthy advance given
238 the difficulties and accompanying scarcity of rigorous trials designed to change the social milieu
239 in ways that lead to HIV-protective behavior.^{34,35} This intervention also uses contemporary
240 digital social marketing, virtual social networks, and social media, whose importance took on
241 greater significance with disruptions to traditional intervention delivery venues due to COVID-
242 19 mitigation protocols that disrupted face-to-face delivery. With respect to cultivating peers for
243 promotion and/or social marketing, the crowdsourcing approach reduces the necessity of
244 ethnographic and social network mapping steps needed to identify popular and socially
245 influential members of the target population; these steps are not only time and resource intensive,
246 but also may prove particularly challenging for key populations experiencing oppression.
247 Crowdsourcing also ensures the ways to overcome challenges are ecologically valid for the local
248 service system, sociocultural milieu, and safety considerations. These benefits are buttressed by
249 *PRIDE in HIV Care*'s social marketing skill enhancement, which has been updated for current
250 social trends (e.g., influencers) and technologies (e.g., digital social media). Remote delivery of

251 the intervention also offered an important avenue for enhancing scale-up and increasing its
252 dissemination and reach. Given that *PRIDE in HIV Care* strengthens and amplifies the local
253 supports and strengths within a community, we hope that this intervention provides a valuable
254 program and template for community empowerment in addressing future psychosocial and health
255 issues.

256 **Contributors**

257 EW, TH, SP, AT, and BB contributed to study conceptualization, funding acquisition,
258 methodology, and investigation. YGL, VV, GZ, GM contributed to project administration and
259 data curation. EW, YGL, VV, GZ, GM, EAP, TH, KR, SP, and AT provided supervision of staff
260 and oversight of key areas of the study. EW and MC led the formal analyses. EW wrote the
261 initial draft and all authors contributed to manuscript review and editing. All authors contributed
262 to interpretation of the work and final approval of this manuscript.

263 **Acknowledgements**

264 In addition to the co-authors, this work was only made possible by the research staff and
265 allies who showed tremendous dedication, skill, and sensitivity—Gassan Akhmedov, Karina
266 Alipova, Farruh Aripov, Olga Balabekova, Daniyar Bekishev, Dilara Belkesheva, Valeriya
267 Davydova, Ferangiz Hasanova, Altynay Kambekova, Sultana Kali, Saltanat Kuskulova, Aitkul
268 Nazarova, Syrym Omirbek, Anna Ryl, Svyatoslav Suslov, Aizhan Toleuova, Aidar Yelkeyev,
269 and Saida Yessenova.—and, most importantly, the time and trust given by the participants and
270 many courageous MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan. We also thank Dr. Jeremy Sugarman for his
271 invaluable consultation throughout the study. The findings and conclusions in this report are
272 those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the NIDA or the Columbia
273 University School of Social Work.

274 **Registration**

275 This study is registered with clinicaltrials.gov, number NCT02786615.

276 **Protocol**

277 Protocol materials are available upon request.

278 **Role of the Funding Source**

279 This research was supported by grant number R01DA040513 from the National Institute
280 on Drug Abuse (NIDA). EAP was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health (grant
281 numbers K01MH128117 and P30MH43520). AD was supported by NIDA (grant number
282 K01DA044853). The funders had no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data
283 interpretation, writing of this report, or decision to submit the article for publication.

284 **Declaration of Interests**

285 We declare no competing interests.

286

287 **References**

- 288 1. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. *UNAIDS Data 2021*. UNAIDS; 2021.
289 Accessed December 30, 2022.
290 https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2021/2021_unaids_data
- 291 2. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. *N DANGER: UNAIDS Global AIDS Update*
292 *2022*. UNAIDS; 2022. Accessed April 6, 2023.
293 <https://www.aidsdatahub.org/sites/default/files/resource/2022-global-aids-update-en.pdf>
- 294 3. Eurasian Coalition on Male Health. *Brief on HIV among MSM in Kazakhstan: 2018.*; 2018.
295 Accessed December 30, 2022. <https://ecom.ngo/library/brief-kazakhstan-en>
- 296 4. Wu E, Lee, Yong Gun, Zhakupova G, et al. Prevalence and correlates of HIV infection and
297 unknown HIV infection among men who have sex with men (MSM) in Kazakhstan:
298 Evidence for a brewing syndemic from a multi-city study. In: ; 2020.
- 299 5. Berry M, Wirtz AL, Janayeva A, et al. Risk Factors for HIV and Unprotected Anal
300 Intercourse among Men Who Have Sex with Men (MSM) in Almaty, Kazakhstan. *PLOS*
301 *ONE*. 2012;7(8):e43071. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0043071
- 302 6. Paine EA, Lee YG, Mergenova G, et al. Compounding vulnerabilities: Victimization,
303 discrimination, and COVID-19 disruptions to HIV-related care among gay, bisexual, and
304 other men and transgender and nonbinary people who have sex with men in Kazakhstan.
305 *AIDS Care*. Published online in press.
- 306 7. unpublished. personal communication with Sairankul Zhuzbaevna Kasymbekova, Head of
307 Department of the clinical monitoring, Kazakh Scientific Center of Dermatology and
308 Infectious Diseases. Published online June 15, 2022.
- 309 8. Paine EA, Lee YG, Vinogradov V, et al. HIV stigma, homophobia, sexual and gender
310 minority community connectedness and HIV testing among gay, bisexual, and other men and
311 transgender people who have sex with men in Kazakhstan. *AIDS Behav*. 2021;25(8):2568-
312 2577.
- 313 9. Central Asian Association of People Living with HIV. *People Living with HIV Stigma Index*
314 *2.0: Kazakhstan 2022*. Central Asian Association of People Living with HIV; 2022.
315 [https://www.stigmaindex.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Kazakhstan-SI-2.0-Report-](https://www.stigmaindex.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Kazakhstan-SI-2.0-Report-2022_English.pdf)
316 [2022_English.pdf](https://www.stigmaindex.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Kazakhstan-SI-2.0-Report-2022_English.pdf)
- 317 10. Levitanus M. Regulation and negotiation of queer subjectivities in post-Soviet Kazakhstan.
318 Published online 2020.
- 319 11. Latypov A, Rhodes T, Reynolds L. Prohibition, stigma and violence against men who have
320 sex with men: effects on HIV in Central Asia. *Cent Asian Surv*. 2013;32(1):52-65.
- 321 12. Flores AR. Social acceptance of LGBT people in 174 countries: 1981 to 2017. Published
322 online 2019.

- 323 13. ECOM. *Report on Violations of LGBT People's Rights in Kazakhstan in 2022.*; 2023.
324 <https://ecom.ngo/news-ecom/report-violations-rightskazakhstan>
- 325 14. Latypov A, Rhodes T, Reynolds L. Prohibition, stigma and violence against men who have
326 sex with men: effects on HIV in Central Asia. *Cent Asian Surv.* 2013;32(1):52-65.
- 327 15. Tobin KE, Heidari O, Winiker A, et al. Peer Approaches to Improve HIV Care Cascade
328 Outcomes: a Scoping Review Focused on Peer Behavioral Mechanisms. *Curr HIV/AIDS*
329 *Rep.* 2022;19(4):251-264. doi:10.1007/s11904-022-00611-3
- 330 16. Ayala G, Sprague L, van der Merwe LLA, et al. Peer- and community-led responses to HIV:
331 A scoping review. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(12):e0260555. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0260555
- 332 17. Tang W, Ritchwood TD, Wu D, et al. Crowdsourcing to Improve HIV and Sexual Health
333 Outcomes: a Scoping Review. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep.* 2019;16(4):270-278.
334 doi:10.1007/s11904-019-00448-3
- 335 18. Wang C, Han L, Stein G, et al. Crowdsourcing in health and medical research: a systematic
336 review. *Infect Dis Poverty.* 2020;9(1):8. doi:10.1186/s40249-020-0622-9
- 337 19. Storey JD, Hess R, Saffitz G. Social marketing. In: Glanz K, Rimer BK, Viswanath K, eds.
338 *Health Behavior: Theory, Research, and Practice.* Jossey-Bass/Wiley; 2015:411-438.
- 339 20. Noar SM, Palmgreen P, Chabot M, Dobransky N, Zimmerman RS. A 10-year systematic
340 review of HIV/AIDS mass communication campaigns: Have we made progress? *J Health*
341 *Commun.* 2009;14(1):15-42. doi:10.1080/10810730802592239
- 342 21. Taggart T, Grewe ME, Conserve DF, Gliwa C, Roman Isler M. Social Media and HIV: A
343 Systematic Review of Uses of Social Media in HIV Communication. *J Med Internet Res.*
344 2015;17(11):e248. doi:10.2196/jmir.4387
- 345 22. Cao B, Gupta S, Wang J, et al. Social Media Interventions to Promote HIV Testing, Linkage,
346 Adherence, and Retention: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Med Internet Res.*
347 2017;19(11):e394. doi:10.2196/jmir.7997
- 348 23. Kudrati SZ, Hayashi K, Taggart T. Social Media & PrEP: A Systematic Review of Social
349 Media Campaigns to Increase PrEP Awareness & Uptake Among Young Black and Latinx
350 MSM and Women. *AIDS Behav.* 2021;25(12):4225-4234. doi:10.1007/s10461-021-03287-9
- 351 24. McDaid L, Riddell J, Teal G, Boydell N, Coia N, Flowers P. The Effectiveness of Social
352 Marketing Interventions to Improve HIV Testing Among Gay, Bisexual and Other Men Who
353 Have Sex with Men: A Systematic Review. *AIDS Behav.* 2019;23(9):2273-2303.
354 doi:10.1007/s10461-019-02507-7
- 355 25. Wei C, Herrick A, Raymond HF, Anglemeyer A, Gerbase A, Noar SM. Social marketing
356 interventions to increase HIV/STI testing uptake among men who have sex with men and
357 male-to-female transgender women. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2011;(9):CD009337.
358 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009337

- 359 26. Hightow-Weidman LB, Smith JC, Valera E, Matthews DD, Lyons P. Keeping them in
360 “STYLE”: finding, linking, and retaining young HIV-positive black and Latino men who
361 have sex with men in care. *AIDS Patient Care STDs*. 2011;25(1):37-45.
- 362 27. Tanner AE, Song EY, Mann-Jackson L, et al. Preliminary impact of the weCare social media
363 intervention to support health for young men who have sex with men and transgender
364 women with HIV. *AIDS Patient Care STDs*. 2018;32(11):450-458.
- 365 28. Wu, E. Using social media and social networks to increase access to HIV care among MSM
366 in three cities in Kazakhstan: Project UNI. In: ; 2018.
- 367 29. Bandura A. Social Cognitive Theory and Exercise of Control over HIV Infection. In:
368 DiClemente RJ, Peterson JL, eds. *Preventing AIDS: Theories and Methods of Behavioral*
369 *Interventions*. AIDS Prevention and Mental Health. Springer US; 1994:25-59.
370 doi:10.1007/978-1-4899-1193-3_3
- 371 30. Mukhalalati BA, Taylor A. Adult Learning Theories in Context: A Quick Guide for
372 Healthcare Professional Educators. *J Med Educ Curric Dev*. 2019;6:2382120519840332.
373 doi:10.1177/2382120519840332
- 374 31. Wu E, Lee YG, Vinogradov V, et al. Intervention Adaptation and Implementation Method
375 for Real-World Constraints and Using New Technologies. *Res Soc Work Pract*. Published
376 online August 22, 2022:10497315221120605. doi:10.1177/10497315221120605
- 377 32. Wu E, Terlikbayeva A, Hunt T, Primbetova S, Gun Lee Y, Berry M. Preliminary Population
378 Size Estimation of Men Who Have Sex with Men in Kazakhstan: Implications for HIV
379 Testing and Surveillance. *LGBT Health*. 2016;4(2):164-167. doi:10.1089/lgbt.2015.0152
- 380 33. Vousden N, Lawley E, Nathan HL, et al. Effect of a novel vital sign device on maternal
381 mortality and morbidity in low-resource settings: a pragmatic, stepped-wedge, cluster-
382 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2019;7(3):e347-e356. doi:10.1016/S2214-
383 109X(18)30526-6
- 384 34. Kelly JA. Community-level interventions are needed to prevent new HIV infections. *Am J*
385 *Public Health*. 1999;89(3):299-301. doi:10.2105/AJPH.89.3.299
- 386 35. Andersson GZ, Reinius M, Eriksson LE, et al. Stigma reduction interventions in people
387 living with HIV to improve health-related quality of life. *Lancet HIV*. 2020;7(2):e129-e140.
388 doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(19)30343-1

389

390

391 **Figure 1: CONSORT Diagram**




Figure 2: Logic model for the *PRIDE in HIV Care* intervention




Figure 3: Sample individual and crowdsourced items developed and social marketed by *PRIDE* in *HIV CARE* intervention recipients. From left to right: a crowdsourced map sharable for users to add and “pin” local resources for MSM and TSM; social media post promoting well-being of MSM (Red box: “*High risk group(s), groups with high-risk behavior*”, Green box: “*High risk behavior, community that suffered greatly, key population groups, key groups at increased risk*”, White box: “*These terms imply that membership in a particular group can lead to a positive HIV diagnosis. It is important to distinguish between high-risk behavior and the groups of people in whom it may occur, so that people do not get the impression that every person who associates with this group must be infected with HIV. These terms can also provide a false sense of security to those who do not identify with one of these groups.*”); social media post promoting HIV testing (“*Know your status, get tested for HIV*”); and a social media post promoting PrEP (“*PrEP – Safe, Effective, Modern*”); (Note: images have been edited, solely to preserve anonymity)




Table 1: Sociodemographic and clinical characteristics (N=629)

	Total sample (N=629)	Almaty (n=245)	Astana (n=194)	Shymkent (n=190)	p-value for difference among cities
Age (yrs.) \bar{x} (SD)	29.0 (9.0)	29.8 (7.9)	27.1 (7.0)	29.9 (8.6)	<.001
Preferred language n (%)					
Russian	553 (88%)	238 (97%)	182 (94%)	133 (70%)	<.001
Kazakh	76 (12%)	7 (2.9%)	12 (6.2%)	57 (30%)	
Cisgender man n (%)	560 (89%)	217 (89%)	179 (92%)	164 (86%)	.17
Sexual orientation n (%)					
Gay/homosexual/etc.	323 (51%)	134 (55%)	116 (60%)	73 (38%)	.002
Bisexual/pansexual/etc.	268 (43%)	101 (41%)	66 (34%)	101 (53%)	
Straight/heterosexual	11 (1.7%)	3 (1.2%)	3 (1.5%)	5 (2.6%)	
Other	27 (4.3%)	7 (2.9%)	9 (4.6%)	11 (5.8%)	
Marital status n (%)					
Single, never married	496 (79%)	202 (82%)	152 (78%)	142 (75%)	<.001
Married	49 (7.8%)	12 (4.9%)	9 (4.6%)	28 (15%)	
No longer with spouse	55 (8.7%)	26 (11%)	11 (5.7%)	18 (9.5%)	
Other	29 (4.6%)	5 (2.0%)	22 (11%)	2 (1.1%)	
Education ^a n (%)					
Less than high school	41 (6.7%)	6 (2.5%)	11 (6.1%)	24 (12.6%)	<.001
High school to some college	281 (46%)	106 (43%)	79 (44%)	96 (51%)	
Baccalaureate or higher degree	292 (48%)	132 (54%)	90 (50%)	70 (35%)	
Employment n (%)					
Working full-time	331 (53%)	134 (55%)	106 (55%)	91 (48%)	.001
Working part-time	153 (24%)	65 (27%)	33 (17%)	55 (29%)	
Student	67 (11%)	16 (6.6%)	34 (18%)	17 (8.9%)	
Unemployed	76 (12%)	29 (12%)	20 (10%)	27 (14%)	
Monthly income (KZT × 1000) \bar{x} (SD)	192 (332)	189 (192)	194 (179)	192 (534)	.99
Substance use (past 90 days) n (%)					
Binge drinking	532 (85%)	205 (84%)	160 (83%)	167 (88%)	.30
Illicit use of drugs	260 (41%)	111 (45%)	77 (40%)	72 (38%)	.25
Sexually transmitted infection n (%)					
Chlamydia	111 (18%)	34 (17%)	38 (20%)	39 (22%)	.39
Gonorrhea	48 (7.6%)	20 (9.9%)	10 (5.2%)	18 (10%)	.15
Syphilis	128 (20%)	42 (17%)	46 (24%)	40 (21%)	.22

^a N= 614 (15 missing observations due to “refuse to answer”)

Table 2: Adjusted Odds Ratios of Recent HIV Testing (primary outcome)

	<i>AOR (95% CI)</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>AOR (95% CI)</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Mos. of intervention implementation	1.08 (1.05-1.12)	<.001	1.07 (1.04-1.11)	<.001
Calendar time (mos.)	0.95 (0.93-0.97)	<.001	0.96 (0.95-0.98)	<.001
Constant	0.93 (0.67-1.31)	.67	0.69 (0.07-7.41)	.76
Age (yrs.)			0.99 (-.95-1.03)	.58
Preferred language				
Russian			2.17 (1.47-3.20)	<.001
Kazakh			ref.	
Cisgender man			1.62 (1.04-2.53)	.03
Sexual orientation				
Gay/homosexual/etc.			ref.	
Bisexual/pansexual/etc.			0.43 (0.29-0.64)	<.001
Straight/heterosexual			0.51 (0.39-0.68)	<.001
Other			0.87 (0.28-2.69)	.99
Marital status				
Single, never married			ref.	
Married			0.99 (0.55-1.77)	.96
No longer with spouse			0.72 (0.21-2.50)	.61
Other			0.93 (0.25-3.48)	.91
Education				
Less than high school			0.42 (0.23-0.77)	.01
High school to some college			1.02 (0.60-1.75)	.93
Baccalaureate or higher degree			ref.	
Employment <i>n</i> (%)				
Working full-time			ref.	
Working part-time			1.07 (0.70-1.62)	.76
Student			1.23 (0.47-3.23)	.67
Unemployed			1.10 (0.40-3.02)	.86
ln (Monthly income)			1.02 (0.88-1.18)	.82
Substance use (past 90 days)				
Binge drinking			0.51 (0.39-0.66)	<.001
Illicit use of drugs			1.24 (1.21-1.27)	<.001
Sexually transmitted infection				
Chlamydia			0.73 (0.46-1.15)	.17
Gonorrhea			1.31 (0.64-2.71)	.46
Syphilis			1.64 (1.25-2.14)	<.001

Adjusted odds ratios (*AORs*) and associated 95% confidence intervals (*95% CIs*) for the primary outcome measure of receiving an HIV test in the past 6 months estimated using multilevel logistic regression models with random slopes and intercepts for each study city.