

1 **Female Sex Worker Preferences for HIV Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis Delivery in**
2 **Uganda: A Discrete Choice Experiment**

3
4 Ruth Mpirirwe^{1,2*}, Rita Makabayi-Mugabe⁴, Laban Muteebwa¹, Onesmus
5 Kamacooko¹, Felix Wamono², Mayanja M. Kajumba⁶, Joan Nangendo¹, Fred C.
6 Semitala¹, Peter Kyambadde³, Katumba James Davis¹, Joan Kalyango¹, Charles
7 Karamagi¹, Agnes Kiragga³, Mari Armstrong-Hough⁸, Sarah EG Moor⁹, Anne R.
8 Katahoire^{1,6}, Moses R Kanya¹, and Andrew Mujugira^{4,5}

9
10 **Author affiliations**

- 11 1. School of Medicine, College of Health Sciences, Makerere University,
12 Kampala, Uganda
13 2. School of Statistics, College of Business and Management Sciences, Makerere
14 University, Kampala, Uganda
15 3. STD/ACP, Ministry of Health, Uganda/MARPI
16 4. Infectious Diseases Institute, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda
17 5. Department of Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle, USA
18 6. School of Psychology, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Makerere
19 University, Kampala, Uganda
20 7. Infectious Diseases Research Collaboration
21 8. NYU School of Global Public Health, 708 Broadway, New York, NY, USA
22 9. Department of Pediatrics, University of Toronto,

23
24 ***Corresponding Author:** Ms. Ruth Mpirirwe, School of Medicine, College of Health
25 Sciences, Makerere University. Email: ruthmpirirwe@gmail.com. Tel: +256 772 322
26 421

27
28 **Keywords:** Female Sex Worker; Discrete Choice Experiment; Pre-Exposure
29 Prophylaxis; Delivery Models; Africa

30

31 **ABSTRACT**

32 **Background:** Cisgender female sex workers (FSWs) in sub-Saharan Africa have a
33 high risk of HIV acquisition, highlighting the need for innovative approaches to expand
34 coverage of evidence-based HIV prevention methods, including oral pre-exposure
35 prophylaxis (PrEP). Our study aimed to identify FSWs' preferences for a PrEP delivery
36 model with structured choices for delivery location, services offered, and adherence
37 support.

38 **Methods:** We conducted a discrete choice experiment (DCE) among FSWs ≥ 18 years
39 recruited from the Most At-Risk Population Initiative (MARPI) clinic in Kampala,
40 Uganda, between October and November 2023. FSWs were recruited using
41 consecutive sampling. To determine the most effective PrEP delivery method for
42 FSWs, we created eight choice sets, each with three alternative combinations of PrEP
43 service attributes and an opt-out using a D-efficient experimental design. Participants
44 were presented with three alternatives, the fourth being an opt-out (no model
45 selected), and asked to make selections based on four distinct attributes: the PrEP
46 provider, place of delivery, delivery channel, and support services. We assessed FSW
47 preferences and attribute trade-offs using a panel data mixed model and identified the
48 preferred PrEP delivery model using the highest median utility score.

49 **Results:** Overall, 203 participants completed the DCE. The median age was 24 years
50 (interquartile range [IQR] 20-32). Most FSWs preferred receiving PrEP from a
51 healthcare worker at the clinic with short message service (SMS) reminders for
52 adherence support (median utility score 0.87; interquartile range [IQR] 0.82, 0.94).
53 This preference remained consistent across all age groups, with a median utility score
54 of 0.88 for ages 15-19, 0.87 for ages 20-24, and 0.85 for ages ≥ 25 .

55 **Conclusion:** FSWs preferred to receive PrEP care directly from providers at
56 healthcare facilities and highlighted the need for additional support in the form of SMS
57 reminders to improve adherence and prevent HIV acquisition. This preferred model, if
58 implemented, could increase prevention coverage and inform future approaches to
59 delivering PrEP through the Uganda National PrEP Program.

60 INTRODUCTION

61 Cisgender female sex workers (FSWs) are at high risk of HIV acquisition but have
62 limited access to effective HIV prevention interventions⁽¹⁾. This underscores the
63 urgency for innovative strategies to increase the uptake of evidence-based biomedical
64 HIV prevention methods, including oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP)^(2, 3).
65 However, a one-size-fits-all- approach to HIV prevention may not effectively address
66 the diverse needs and preferences of key populations. Discrete choice experiments
67 (DCEs) have revealed diverse stated preferences for HIV prevention within individuals
68 and communities⁽⁴⁾. Person-centered care models may overcome these barriers, but
69 they are inconsistently implemented for key populations globally^{(5),(6)}. Therefore, it is
70 imperative to better understand how to effectively implement person-centered PrEP
71 care and optimize HIV prevention delivery approaches.

72

73 Uganda has established facility and community models for PrEP delivery, consisting
74 of four main components: the target population, infrastructure for providing PrEP,
75 trained PrEP providers, and designated delivery channels. However, these models do
76 not consider FSWs' unique needs and preferences⁽⁷⁾. As a result, FSWs who receive
77 PrEP through the facility model often face challenges such as long travel distances to
78 the clinic and lengthy waiting times. This can lead to significant direct costs, such as
79 transportation expenses, and indirect costs, like loss of work time. These barriers
80 hinder their ability to adhere to and remain in PrEP care⁽⁸⁻¹⁰⁾. Despite being an effective
81 biomedical intervention for reducing HIV transmission when taken correctly, PrEP
82 persistence among FSWs in Uganda is low⁽¹¹⁾. Given the high HIV prevalence
83 (37%)(¹²) among FSWs in Uganda, it is crucial to understand which PrEP delivery
84 model would best meet their specific needs and promote effective PrEP use and
85 retention in care to decrease HIV incidence^{(13),(14)}.

86

87 Prior research has emphasized incorporating choice within person-centered models
88 for HIV service delivery⁽¹⁵⁾ This includes providing additional support for medication
89 adherence and offering flexibility in clinic-based or off-site delivery. Despite this, there
90 is currently limited literature documenting the specific preferences of FSWs for PrEP
91 delivery options⁽⁸⁾. With the expansion of PrEP programs, it is crucial to establish
92 effective and feasible delivery models to ensure maximum coverage^{(16), (17)}. To
93 address these gaps, our study sought to identify Ugandan FSW preferences for a

94 PrEP delivery model that offered structured options for location, services provided,
95 and adherence support.

96

97 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

98 **Study population and setting**

99 We conducted a discrete choice experiment (DCE) at the Most at Risk Population
100 Initiative (MARPI) clinic within the Mulago National Referral Hospital complex in
101 Kampala, Uganda, from October to November 2023. A discrete choice design is a
102 research method used to understand and predict how people make decisions when
103 faced with a set of alternatives. We recruited 203 FSWs from the MARPI clinic, which
104 serves an estimated 10,000 FSWs annually. Before participation in the DCE, FSWs
105 received information about the study's objectives and procedures and were asked to
106 provide informed consent. They were informed that the DCE was a quantitative
107 research method that explored individual preferences by presenting hypothetical
108 options and evaluated responses to specific program, product, or service attributes⁽¹⁸⁾.
109 Eligibility criteria included being ≥ 18 years, on PrEP for at least two months, consent
110 to participate in the study, selling sex within Kampala, Mukono, or Wakiso districts in
111 Central Uganda, and receiving PrEP refills at the MARPI clinic. Participants were
112 excluded from the study if they met the following criteria: currently participating in
113 another PrEP or HIV prevention study, allergic to tenofovir, lamivudine, emtricitabine,
114 or other PrEP medication, being infected with Hepatitis B virus or having chronic
115 kidney disease (based on self-report or medical records), as these individuals would
116 eventually be discontinued from PrEP.

117

118 **Attributes and levels**

119 We conducted a systematic review and qualitative study to identify DCE attributes^{(19,}
120 20). These findings were used to inform our study's final selection of attributes (**Table**
121 **1**). To create the choice sets, we employed a fractional factorial design; fractional D-
122 deficiency designs are valuable for optimizing experimental efficiency when full
123 factorial designs are not feasible. We relied on assumptions about factorial structure,
124 D-efficiency, balance, confounding, additivity, variance homogeneity, and sample size,
125 which resulted in eight sets (**Table 2**). Previous studies have established that more
126 than eight choice tasks can impose cognitive and time limitations on participants^(21, 22).
127 We also included an opt-out response option where respondents could choose

128 "neither" to indicate their dissatisfaction with the provided PrEP delivery models. This
 129 resulted in a final design with a D-efficiency of 88.4%.

130 **Table 1: DCE attributes and levels based on a systematic review and qualitative**
 131 **findings and expert panel review**

No.	Attribute	Level	Attribute definition for this study
1.	PrEP provider	1. Health worker	This can be a doctor, nurse, PrEP counselor, or other healthcare provider
		2. Peer	An FSW who is on PrEP and serves as a role model to the other FSW
		3. None	No preference for either
2.	Place of PrEP delivery	1. Home	A place where the FSW lives
		2. Community	A designated place in the community where health workers come and offer HIV testing services and drug refills
		3. Health facility	Health care setting that provides PrEP
		4. Hotspot	A specific location where FSWs gather and transact sex
3.	Delivery channel	1. In-person visits	FSW picks their own PrEP drugs
		2. Family member	A brother, spouse, sister, or member of the extended family picks the drug
		3. Peer	An FSW who is on PrEP and serves as an example to the other FSW
4.	Additional support	1. Phone call reminder	A text message sent to a mobile phone 30 minutes before taking PrEP
		2. SMS reminder	A telephone call made to a mobile phone 30 minutes before taking PrEP
		3. None	No preference for either

132 SMS (Short message service)

133 **Table 2: DCE choice sets with neither option**

Choice set	Alternative	Place of PrEP Delivery	PrEP Provider	Delivery Channel	Additional support
1	I	Hotspot	None	Peer	SMS reminder
	II	Home	Peer	In-person	call reminder
	III	Community	Peer	Family member	SMS reminder
	IV	Neither			
2	I	Home	HW	Family member	call reminder
	II	Community	Peer	Family member	SMS reminder
	III	Health Facility	None	In-person	SMS reminder
	IV	Neither			
3	I	Hotspot	None	Family member	call reminder
	II	Health Facility	HW	Peer	SMS reminder
	III	Community	Peer	Family member	SMS reminder
	IV	Neither			

4	I	Home	HW	In-person	SMS reminder call reminder
	II	Community	None	Peer	
	III	Community	Peer	Family member	SMS reminder
	IV	Neither			
5	I	Health Facility	HW	Peer	call reminder
	II	Community	Peer	Family member	SMS reminder
	III	Hotspot	Peer	In-person	SMS reminder
	IV	Neither			
6	I	Health Facility	Peer	In-person	call reminder
	II	Hotspot	HW	Family member	None
	III	Community	Peer	Family member	SMS reminder
	IV	Neither			
7	I	Community	Peer	Family member	SMS reminder
	II	Home	Peer	Peer	None
	III	Hotspot	HW	Family member	call reminder
	IV	Neither			
8	I	Community	Peer	Family member	SMS reminder
	II	Hotspot	HW	In-person	SMS reminder
	III	Home	Peer	Peer	call reminder
	IV	Neither			

134 *The D-efficiency of the design was 88.4, % which is above the 80% recommended score*
 135 We developed visual aids for each choice set to accommodate individuals with limited
 136 literacy skills (**Supplementary File 1**). Data on age, marital status, education level,
 137 duration on PrEP, current method of obtaining PrEP, and underlying comorbidities
 138 were collected by trained research assistants experienced in quantitative research
 139 supervised by the Principal Investigator. Data was entered into Excel 2019 and
 140 exported to STATA version 17.0 for analysis.

141

142 DCE design

143 We employed a mixed methods design to sequentially determine an optimal PrEP
 144 delivery model. The first step involved analyzing previously collected qualitative data
 145 on barriers and facilitators faced by FSWs in Uganda when starting and adhering to
 146 PrEP(20). We used an inductive analytic approach to identify preferred attributes and
 147 desirable qualities of a PrEP delivery model based on input from current PrEP users.
 148 The second step involved a systematic review of PrEP uptake and retention among
 149 FSWs using various delivery approaches(19). The DCE design considered all factors
 150 that could impact the decision-making process regarding the choice of the PrEP

151 delivery model because failing to include crucial attributes in the study could introduce
152 bias into the results⁽²³⁾. This mixed-method approach informed the creation of a
153 comprehensive list of potential attributes and attribute levels that could influence the
154 optimal hypothetical PrEP delivery model(19, 20).

155

156 **Generation of choice sets**

157 We utilized a fractional factorial (D-efficient) design to generate choice sets that were
158 optimally balanced within the given constraints. This method was chosen due to the
159 large number of variable attributes, each with varying levels. Additionally, we did pilot
160 testing to reduce the number of hypothetical delivery models presented to participants
161 and avoid respondent fatigue. To ensure accuracy and effectiveness, the pilot testing
162 of the initial DCE utilized a "think aloud" approach guided by established best practice
163 guidelines(24). This allowed participants to verbalize their thought processes while
164 responding to the survey, thus identifying unclear or confusing questions and
165 addressing other potential issues⁽¹⁸⁾. The pilot phase further evaluated the attribute's
166 reliability among our target population. It permitted the assessment of participants'
167 comprehension and interpretation of the tasks and questions and estimated the
168 completion time for the survey. Based on feedback from the pilot, adjustments were
169 made to attribute design, question phrasing, and overall survey structure to ensure
170 accurate testing. The profiles identified by the experimental design were then grouped
171 into choice sets that were presented to the 203 FSWs in the form of a questionnaire
172 with three main sections: (i) an introduction of the purpose of the DCE and how to
173 respond correctly; (ii) questions about the participants' socio-demographic
174 characteristics that were expected to influence their preference for a particular PrEP
175 delivery model; (iii) the choice sets. The DCE survey questionnaire is attached as
176 **Supplementary File 1.**

177

178 **Statistical Analysis**

179 We analyzed the data using STATA 17.0 (Stata Corp, College Station, Texas, USA).
180 We used descriptive statistics to summarize participants' socio-demographic
181 characteristics. A panel-data mixed logit model was employed to assess FSW
182 preferences and attribute trade-offs, accounting for correlated choice sets and case-
183 specific covariates such as age, education level, current PrEP model, duration of
184 PrEP, and use of non-PrEP drugs. The PrEP delivery models were constructed using

185 a backward elimination approach, with the opt-out option (selecting none of the
186 alternative models) set as the baseline alternative. Models were compared using the
187 Akaike Information Criteria (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criteria (BIC). The model
188 with the lowest AIC and BIC values was determined to be superior. The finalized
189 model, which consisted of age, education level, and current PrEP delivery model as
190 case-specific covariates, was selected based on these criteria. The number of
191 simulations was increased from 300 to 1,000 to ensure robustness before the model
192 was finalized. The "margin" command was utilized to calculate expected probabilities
193 for selecting alternative PrEP delivery models.

194 Additionally, we evaluated the impact of increasing age and categorical variable levels
195 on the probabilities of choosing these alternative models through contrasts.
196 Subsequently, marginal utilities for each alternative PrEP delivery model were
197 calculated using linear predictions from the final model. Finally, based on the highest
198 median utility score and interquartile range (IQR), we identified our preferred option
199 among the alternative models for delivering PrEP.

200 **Validity and reliability of the experiment**

201 To ensure that the DCE accurately measured what it intended to measure and that the
202 results were reliable and applicable, we consulted with experts on the list of attributes
203 drawn from our prior qualitative research(20). This process ensured that the attributes
204 and levels included in the DCE were relevant to the decision-making process and
205 covered all important aspects of the choice context. We also conducted a pilot test
206 with a small sample of 20 FSWs to identify any issues with the design, such as
207 confusing questions or unrealistic choice scenarios. We used the feedback from the
208 pilot test to refine the DCE. We used the likelihood ratio test, AIC, and BIC to check
209 how well the choice model fit the data.

210 **Ethics approval**

211 The study was approved by the Makerere University School of Medicine Research
212 Ethics Committee (Mak-SOMREC-2022-299) and the Uganda National Council for
213 Science and Technology (SS1223ES). Administrative clearance was obtained from
214 Makerere University's Clinical Epidemiology Unit and Mulago National Referral
215 Hospital Ethics Committee. All participants provided written informed consent before

216 participating in the study. They received an IRB-approved reimbursement of 20,000
217 Uganda Shillings (\$5.30) for their time, effort, and transportation costs.

218

219 RESULTS

220 Participant characteristics

221 The median age of study participants was 24 years (IQR 20, 32), and 97.5% (198/203)
222 were single and living in Kampala. Forty-one percent (84/203) of FSWs received PrEP
223 from health facilities. Another 41% accessed PrEP through community delivery, while
224 37% (75/203) had been on PrEP for over one year. Nearly two-thirds of the participants
225 reported taking other medications in addition to their PrEP pills (**Table 3**).

226 **Table 3: Characteristics of study participants**

Variable	Categories	Frequency (N=203) (%)
Age	Median (IQR)	24 (20, 32)
Marital status	Married	5 (2.5)
	Not married	198 (97.5)
Residence	Outside Kampala	5 (2.5)
	Within Kampala	198 (97.5)
Education level	No Education	12 (5.9)
	Primary level	95 (46.8)
	Secondary level	86 (42.4)
	Post-secondary	10 (4.9)
Duration on PrEP	Less than six months	84 (41.4)
	>6months-1 year	44 (21.7)
	>1 year	75 (37.0)
Current PrEP model	Facility	84 (41.4)
	Community	84 (41.4)
	Both	35 (17.2)
Comorbidity	Present	128 (63.0)
	Absent	75 (37.0)

227

228 **PrEP delivery model preferences and attributes**

229
 230 Model 4 (health facility/HCW/in-person/SMS) had the highest utility score of being
 231 chosen (0.867), followed by utility scores for model 2 (home/peer/in-person/phone call)
 232 (0.749), and model 3 (Home/HCW/CHW/phone call) (0.727), (**Table 4**). Still, model 4
 233 (health facility/healthcare worker/in-person/short message service) was the preferred
 234 model for delivering PrEP services across the ages of 15-19, 20-24, and ≥ 25 years,
 235 with median utility scores of 0.88, 0.87, and 0.85, respectively (**Table 5**).

236 **Table 4: Utility scores of choosing PrEP delivery**

#	Model	Median utility	IQR
1	Health facility/HCW/in-person/SMS	0.867	0.823, 0.941
2	Home/peer/in-person/phone call	0.749	0.646, 0.787
3	Home/HCW/CHW/phone call	0.727	0.605, 0.800
4	Hotspot/HCW/CHW/phone call	0.678	0.490, 0.715
5	Home/HCW/in-person/SMS	0.674	0.617, 0.748
6	Health facility/peer/in-person/phone call	0.579	0.470, 0.661
7	Home/peer/in-person/None	0.568	0.311, 0.674
8	Health facility/HCW/peer/SMS	0.558	0.471, 0.608
9	Community/pharmacist/peer/SMS	0.547	0.320, 0.591
10	Health facility/HCW/peer/phone call	0.504	0.431, 0.538
11	Opt-out (None of the models)	0.500	0.500, 0.500
12	Hotspot/peer/in-person/SMS	0.478	0.246, 0.561
13	Community/HCW/CHW/None	0.470	0.280, 0.526
14	Hotspot/HCW/in-person/phone call	0.460	0.237, 0.564
15	Community/peer/in-person/ phone call	0.456	0.438, 0.610
16	Hotspot/HCW/in-person/SMS	0.448	0.383, 0.629

237 **Table 5: Utility scores of PrEP delivery models by age groups**

PrEP delivery model	15-19 years	20-24 years	≥ 25 years
	Median utility (IQR)	Median utility (IQR)	Median utility (IQR)
Health facility/HCW/in-person/SMS	0.88 (0.84, 0.95)	0.87 (0.85, 0.94)	0.85 (0.80, 0.93)
Home/peer/in-person/phone call	0.73 (0.61, 0.76)	0.74 (0.63, 0.77)	0.78 (0.68, 0.82)
Home/HCW/CHW/phone call	0.61 (0.56, 0.75)	0.66 (0.59, 0.78)	0.76 (0.67, 0.84)
Hotspot/HCW/CHW/phone call	0.67 (0.48, 0.69)	0.68 (0.49, 0.70)	0.69 (0.50, 0.73)
Home/HCW/in-person/SMS	0.67 (0.62, 0.74)	0.67 (0.62, 0.74)	0.68 (0.62, 0.76)
Health facility/peer/in-person/phone call	0.61 (0.59, 0.72)	0.58 (0.55, 0.67)	0.51 (0.43, 0.63)
Home/peer/in-person/None	0.53 (0.27, 0.62)	0.57 (0.25, 0.62)	0.63 (0.39, 0.71)
Health facility/HCW/peer/SMS	0.61 (0.54, 0.68)	0.59 (0.52, 0.61)	0.49 (0.43, 0.58)
Community/pharmacist/peer/SMS	0.53 (0.29, 0.55)	0.53 (0.30, 0.57)	0.58 (0.35, 0.63)

Opt-out (None of the models)	0.50 (0.50, 0.50)	0.50 (0.50, 0.50)	0.50 (0.50, 0.50)
Health facility/HCW/peer/phone call	0.50 (0.41, 0.50)	0.51 (0.42, 0.52)	0.52 (0.46,0.56)
Hotspot/peer/in-person/SMS	0.46 (0.27,0.50)	0.43 (0.29, 0.52)	0.54 (0.33, 0.62)
Community/HCW/CHW/None	0.44 (0.25, 0.49)	0.46 (0.26, 0.50)	0.51 (0.31, 0.58)
Hotspot/HCW/in-person/phone call	0.43 (0.20, 0.49)	0.43 (0.22, 0.53)	0.52 (0.28, 0.64)
Community/peer/in-person/ phone call	0.56 (0.44, 0.61)	0.53 (0.44, 0.61)	0.46 (0.44, 0.60)
Hotspot/HCW/in-person/SMS	0.35 (0.34, 0.37)	0.40 (0.38, 0.42)	0.55 (0.46, 0.67)

238

239 The study participants who had previously experienced health facility and community-
240 based PrEP delivery models generally preferred the health facility/healthcare
241 worker/in-person/short message service model. However, those who had not utilized
242 both health facility and community-based models simultaneously showed a greater
243 preference for the hotspot/healthcare worker/community health worker/phone call
244 model, although their perceived utility was similar to that of the health
245 facility/healthcare worker/in-person/short message service model (median utility
246 scores 0.94 and 0.81, respectively) (Table 6).

247 **Table 6: Utility scores by current PrEP model being utilized by FSW**

PrEP delivery model	Health Facility model	Community model	Both health facility & community
	Median utility (IQR)	Median utility (IQR)	Median utility (IQR)
Health facility/HCW/in-person/SMS	0.94 (0.94, 0.95)	0.81 (0.79, 0.85)	0.86 (0.84, 0.88)
Home/peer/in-person/phone call	0.64 (0.61, 0.68)	0.77 (0.75, 0.81)	0.79 (0.76, 0.82)
Home/HCW/CHW/phone call	0.66 (0.60,0.73)	0.81 (0.78, 0.85)	0.50 (0.43, 0.60)
Hotspot/HCW/CHW/phone call	0.49 (0.47, 0.50)	0.69 (0.68, 0.71)	0.88 (0.87, 0.89)
Home/HCW/in-person/SMS	0.59 (0.55, 0.62)	0.70 (0.67, 0.74)	0.80 (0.76, 0.81)
Health facility/peer/in-person/phone call	0.47 (0.43, 0.55)	0.60 (0.55, 0.67)	0.72 (0.66, 0.75)
Home/peer/in-person/None	0.29 (0.25, 0.36)	0.67 (0.61, 0.71)	0.62 (0.56, 0.69)
Health facility/HCW/peer/SMS	0.52 (0.47, 0.58)	0.62 (0.58, 0.67)	0.42 (0.38, 0.47)
Community/pharmacist/peer/SMS	0.31 (0.29, 0.35)	0.57 (0.55, 0.61)	0.60 (0.57, 0.64)
Health facility/HCW/peer/phone call	0.43 (0.42, 0.45)	0.52 (0.51, 0.53)	0.58 (0.57, 0.60)
Opt-out (None of the models)	0.50 (0.50, 0.50)	0.50 (0.50, 0.50)	0.50 (0.50, 0.50)
Hotspot/peer/in-person/SMS	0.30 (0.26, 0.35)	0.56 (0.52, 0.62)	0.51 (0.46, 0.57)
Community/HCW/CHW/None	0.27 (0.25, 0.30)	0.50 (0.48, 0.55)	0.54 (0.52, 0.60)
Hotspot/HCW/in-person/phone call	0.23 (0.19, 0.28)	0.56 (0.50, 0.62)	0.53 (0.47, 0.61)
Community/peer/in-person/ phone call	0.46 (0.45, 0.61)	0.44 (0.44, 0.60)	0.68 (0.53, 0.68)
Hotspot/HCW/in-person/SMS	0.42 (0.37, 0.53)	0.42 (0.37, 0.51)	0.78 (0.72, 0.84)

248

249 The preferred PrEP delivery model among participants with no primary and secondary
 250 education levels was health facility/healthcare worker/in-person/short message
 251 service (utility score 0.86). However, post-secondary education participants preferred
 252 the health facility/healthcare worker/peer/short message service model (utility score
 253 0.83). This choice closely aligned with participants' preferences in other education
 254 categories (**Table 7**).

255 **Table 7: Utility scores of PrEP delivery models by education level**

PrEP delivery model	No Education	Primary Education	Secondary education	Post-Secondary Education
	Median utility (IQR)	Median utility (IQR)	Median utility (IQR)	Median utility (IQR)
Health facility/HCW/in-person/SMS	0.85 (0.83, 0.91)	0.67 (0.55, 0.68)	0.86 (0.80, 0.94)	0.83 (0.78, 0.93)
Home/peer/in-person/phone call	0.63 (0.57, 0.67)	0.74 (0.65, 0.77)	0.77 (0.65, 0.79)	0.87 (0.79, 0.89)
Home/HCW/CHW/phone call	0.62 (0.44, 0.73)	0.52 (0.45, 0.59)	0.68 (0.61, 0.81)	0.75 (0.72, 0.84)
Hotspot/HCW/CHW/phone call	0.42 (0.28, 0.58)	0.67 (0.49, 0.69)	0.70 (0.50, 0.75)	0.68 (0.48, 0.70)
Home/HCW/in-person/SMS	0.72 (0.63, 0.76)	0.59 (0.51, 0.67)	0.74 (0.62, 0.76)	0.87 (0.79, 0.87)
Health facility/peer/in-person/phone call	0.58 (0.40, 0.69)	0.59 (0.51, 0.67)	0.50 (0.44, 0.60)	0.69 (0.63, 0.76)
Home/peer/in-person/None	0.76 (0.59, 0.81)	0.63 (0.35, 0.69)	0.57 (0.25, 0.62)	0.43 (0.16, 0.46)
Health facility/HCW/peer/SMS	0.47 (0.40, 0.61)	0.44 (0.44, 0.53)	0.59 (0.50, 0.64)	0.60 (0.58, 0.67)
Community/pharmacist/peer/SMS	0.39 (0.27, 0.46)	0.89 (0.85, 0.95)	0.56 (0.32, 0.60)	0.65 (0.40, 0.70)
Health facility/HCW/peer/phone call	0.46 (0.44, 0.53)	0.44 (0.44, 0.53)	0.51 (0.43, 0.57)	0.48 (0.41, 0.51)
Opt-out (None of the models)	0.50 (0.50, 0.50)	0.45 (0.23, 0.54)	0.50 (0.50, 0.50)	0.50 (0.50, 0.50)
Hotspot/peer/in-person/SMS	0.22 (0.17, 0.25)	0.48 (0.30, 0.54)	0.51 (0.31, 0.58)	0.62 (0.39, 0.63)
Community/HCW/CHW/None	0.51 (0.40, 0.59)	0.45 (0.27, 0.49)	0.50 (0.28, 0.54)	0.61 (0.39, 0.67)
Hotspot/HCW/in-person/phone call	0.36 (0.26, 0.45)	0.45 (0.44, 0.54)	0.54 (0.25, 0.61)	8.7X10 ⁻⁸ (2.3X10 ⁻⁸ , 1.0X10 ⁻⁷)
Community/peer/in-person/phone call	0.43 (0.41, 0.47)	0.45 (0.27, 0.49)	0.61 (0.60, 0.62)	7.7X10 ⁻⁸ (7.2X10 ⁻⁸ , 7.7X10 ⁻⁸)

Hotspot/HCW/in-person/SMS	0.18 (0.10, 0.34)	0.44 (0.37, 0.57)	0.45 (0.40, 0.68)	0.71 (0.68, 0.76)
---------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

256

257 **DISCUSSION**

258 This discrete choice experiment, conducted with cisgender FSWs in Kampala,
259 Uganda, utilized a cross-sectional survey to determine the most end-user-centric PrEP
260 delivery model. FSW preferred delivery through a health provider at the sex worker-
261 friendly MARPI clinic as the next best option, with additional support in the form of
262 SMS reminders. Findings from the qualitative phase revealed that healthcare
263 providers at the clinic were perceived as friendly and non-judgmental, creating a
264 comfortable environment for these women(20). They were also seen as capable of
265 maintaining confidentiality while delivering PrEP services. Participants reported feeling
266 welcomed, included, and safe at the MARPI clinic, which encouraged them to continue
267 utilizing its services(19, 20).

268

269 Prior studies have shown that FSWs appreciate PrEP introduction within familiar and
270 trusted "friendly" clinics tailored for sex workers and value positive encouragement
271 from clinic staff(25-27). In our study, healthcare workers were perceived as
272 knowledgeable individuals with specialized knowledge about PrEP. This preference
273 for healthcare workers as PrEP providers is consistent with previous research
274 conducted in Uganda, which found that PrEP delivery based at health facilities
275 required healthcare providers to have sufficient knowledge and confidence in
276 discussing antiretroviral medications for HIV prevention with clients(28). Similar results
277 have been demonstrated in family health programs in Brazil, Bangladesh, and Nepal,
278 in which health workers positively influenced health by serving as entry points, bridges,
279 and connectors to healthcare services, systems, and resources(29-31). Our results
280 emphasize the importance of involving healthcare workers in PrEP delivery for
281 FSWs(20).

282

283 In as much as most FSWs preferred healthy facility-based PrEP delivery, some
284 preferred community-based healthcare services that involve community providers and
285 peers rather than solely facility-based options, as this can help overcome stigma and
286 discrimination barriers(32). The World Health Organization recommends differentiated
287 approaches for delivering PrEP services, prioritizing the individual and community(33).

288 These approaches are adapted to the specific needs and preferences of individuals
289 who may benefit from PrEP. Implementing these differentiated services can improve
290 PrEP acceptability and accessibility and support its ongoing use and
291 effectiveness(34). Community-based delivery options such as pharmacies, community
292 organizations, drop-in centers, and mobile clinics complement facility-based care by
293 providing strong linkages and referral pathways for those seeking treatment(35). Our
294 findings underscore the importance of customizing differentiated service delivery
295 models for FSWs.

296

297 Research has demonstrated the effectiveness of SMS interventions in promoting
298 medication adherence. Clients who received SMS reminders reported higher
299 treatment adherence than those who did not(36, 37). This may be attributable to the
300 non-intrusive nature of text message reminders compared to other adherence
301 strategies(38). Furthermore, the simplicity and user satisfaction associated with such
302 reminders make them a valuable tool in healthcare services. A study on improving
303 medication adherence among type 2 diabetes patients through SMS reminders
304 showed that this method was relatively simple and had minimal impact on daily
305 routines (39). This review concluded that text messages increased adherence and
306 improved health outcomes(37, 40), although there were limitations for those without
307 access to a phone or reliable electricity.

308

309 **Strengths and limitations**

310 Our study has several strengths. We conducted a DCE in a busy health facility that
311 provides comprehensive HIV care and prevention services to more than 80% of FSWs
312 in Kampala. This approach allowed for a significant representation of FSWs'
313 preferences regarding PrEP delivery. Additionally, our results are based on a robust
314 sample size of >200 FSWs, surpassing the recommended number of 150 for DCEs.
315 We deliberately selected FSWs taking PrEP for at least two months, ensuring their
316 preferences were grounded in their firsthand experiences with current delivery
317 methods. Additionally, we used pictograms to aid participants' understanding of choice
318 sets and minimize strategic biases that may have skewed preferences. However, our
319 study had limitations. Notably, our sample did not include pregnant FSWs despite
320 being at twice the risk for HIV acquisition during pregnancy and postpartum compared
321 to non-pregnant periods. The highest probability was noted on the opt-out model,

322 perhaps due to a lack of optimal knowledge of PrEP delivery models. The other
323 limitation is that DCEs are theoretical in offering choices. Therefore, randomized
324 controlled trials should be done as part of person-centered care to assess the
325 effectiveness of various model preferences in prevention coverage. Future studies
326 should address this gap and include pregnant FSWs and other vulnerable populations
327 to gain a more comprehensive understanding of their perspectives.

328

329 **Conclusions and recommendations**

330 FSWs showed a clear preference for receiving PrEP directly from a health worker
331 within a friendly and supportive healthcare setting. To enhance adherence and
332 mitigate the risk of adverse health outcomes like HIV acquisition due to non-
333 adherence, there is a significant need for supplementary support mechanisms.
334 Implementing tools such as SMS reminders could improve adherence rates and
335 ensure better health outcomes for FSWs using PrEP. These preferences should be
336 considered when designing future approaches for delivering PrEP through the
337 National PrEP Program. As mentioned above, further evaluation of this PrEP delivery
338 model's feasibility and effectiveness is necessary, including vulnerable populations,
339 such as pregnant FSWs. A study is underway to determine the feasibility and
340 acceptability of our preferred PrEP delivery model for FSWs.

341

342

343

344 **Acknowledgments**

345 **Authors' contributions**

346 Study conceptualization - RM, KMM, JK, CK, AK, MAH, ARK, MRK, and AM. Protocol
347 development - RM, JN, FCS, and PK. DCE survey tool development, DCE data
348 collection process and analysis - RM, RMM, LM, FW, KJD, SEG, and OK. First
349 manuscript draft - RM and AM. Manuscript revisions - RM, SEG, RMM, FM, ARK,
350 MRK, and AM. Supervision of data collection process and data management - RM.
351 Overall study supervision - ARK, MRK, and AM. All authors read and approved the
352 final manuscript.

353

354 **Funding**

355 Fogarty International Center, National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism,
356 National Institute of Mental Health, of the National Institutes of Health under Award
357 Number D43 TW011304 supported the research reported in this publication. The
358 content is solely the authors' responsibility and does not necessarily represent the
359 official views of the National Institutes of Health.

360

361 **Availability of data and materials**

362 The datasets used and analyzed during the current study are available from the
363 the corresponding author on reasonable request.

364

365 **Consent for publication**

366 Not applicable

367

368 **Competing interests**

369 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

370







371 References

372

- 373 1. Kabami J, Kakande E, Chamie G, Balzer LB, Petersen ML, Camlin CS, et al. Uptake
374 of a patient-centred dynamic choice model for HIV prevention in rural Kenya and Uganda:
375 SEARCH SAPPHIRE study. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. 2023;26:e26121.
376 2. Chamie G, Napierala S, Agot K, Thirumurthy H. HIV testing approaches to reach the
377 first UNAIDS 95% target in sub-Saharan Africa. *The lancet HIV*. 2021;8(4):e225-e36.
378 3. Koss CA, Charlebois ED, Ayieko J, Kwarisiima D, Kabami J, Balzer LB, et al. Uptake,
379 engagement, and adherence to pre-exposure prophylaxis offered after population HIV
380 testing in rural Kenya and Uganda: 72-week interim analysis of observational data from the
381 SEARCH study. *Lancet HIV*. 2020;7(4):e249-e61.
382 4. Weberg D, Davidson S. Patient-centered care, evidence, and innovation. *Leadership*
383 *for evidence-based innovation in nursing and health professions*. 2017:111-42.
384 5. Huber A, Pascoe S, Nichols B, Long L, Kuchukhidze S, Phiri B, et al. Differentiated
385 service delivery models for HIV treatment in Malawi, South Africa, and Zambia: a landscape
386 analysis. *Global Health: Science and Practice*. 2021;9(2):296-307.
387 6. Lazarus JV, Janamnuaysook R, Caswell G. A people-centred health system must be
388 the foundation for person-centred care in the HIV response. *Journal of the International*
389 *AIDS Society*. 2023;26(Suppl 1).
390 7. Vanhamel J, Rotsaert A, Reyniers T, Nöstlinger C, Laga M, Van Landeghem E, et al.
391 The current landscape of pre-exposure prophylaxis service delivery models for HIV
392 prevention: a scoping review. *BMC health services research*. 2020;20(1):1-18.
393 8. Mugo NR, Ngure K, Kiragu M, Irungu E, Kilonzo N. PrEP for Africa: What we have
394 learnt and what is needed to move to program implementation. *Current Opinion in HIV and*
395 *AIDS*. 2016;11(1):80.
396 9. O'Malley G, Barnabee G, Mugwanya K. Scaling-up PrEP delivery in sub-Saharan
397 Africa: what can we learn from the scale-up of ART? *Current HIV/AIDS Reports*.
398 2019;16(2):141-50.
399 10. Ogunbajo A, Storholm ED, Ober AJ, Bogart LM, Reback CJ, Flynn R, et al. Multilevel
400 barriers to HIV PrEP uptake and adherence among black and Hispanic/Latinx transgender
401 women in southern California. *AIDS and Behavior*. 2021;25(7):2301-15.
402 11. Mujugira A, Nakyanzi A, Nabaggala MS, Muwonge TR, Ssebuliba T, Bagaya M, et al.
403 Effect of HIV Self-Testing on PrEP Adherence Among Gender-Diverse Sex Workers in
404 Uganda: A Randomized Trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2022;89(4):381-9.
405 12. Mutagoma M, Samuel MS, Kayitesi C, Gasasira AR, Chitou B, Boer K, et al. High
406 HIV prevalence and associated risk factors among female sex workers in Rwanda.
407 *International journal of STD & AIDS*. 2017;28(11):1082-9.
408 13. Bekker L-G, Johnson L, Cowan F, Overs C, Besada D, Hillier S, et al. Combination
409 HIV prevention for female sex workers: what is the evidence? *The Lancet*.
410 2015;385(9962):72-87.
411 14. Rugira E, Biracyaza E, Umubyeyi A. Uptake and Persistence on HIV Pre-Exposure
412 Prophylaxis Among Female Sex Workers and Men Having Sex with Men in Kigali, Rwanda:
413 A Retrospective Cross-Sectional Study Design. *Patient preference and adherence*.
414 2023:2353-64.
415 15. Vincent W, Peterson JL, Storholm ED, Huebner DM, Neilands TB, Calabrese SK, et al.
416 A person-centered approach to HIV-related protective and risk factors for young black
417 men who have sex with men: implications for pre-exposure prophylaxis and HIV treatment
418 as prevention. *AIDS and Behavior*. 2019;23:2803-15.
419 16. Greene GJ, Swann G, Fought AJ, Carballo-Diéguez A, Hope TJ, Kiser PF, et al.
420 Preferences for long-acting pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP), daily oral PrEP, or condoms
421 for HIV prevention among US men who have sex with men. *AIDS and Behavior*.
422 2017;21:1336-49.

- 423 17. Thomas D, Mujugira A, Ortblad K, Namanda S, Kibuuka J, Nakitende M, et al. A
424 pragmatic approach to identifying implementation barriers and facilitators for a novel pre-
425 exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) delivery model at public facilities in urban Uganda.
426 *Implementation Science Communications*. 2022;3(1):7.
- 427 18. Mangham LJ, Hanson K, McPake B. How to do (or not to do)... Designing a discrete
428 choice experiment for application in a low-income country. *Health policy and planning*.
429 2009;24(2):151-8.
- 430 19. Mpirirwe R, Segawa I, Ojiambo KO, Kamacooko O, Nangendo J, Semitala FC, et al.
431 HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis uptake, retention and adherence among female sex workers
432 in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review. *BMJ open*. 2024;14(4):e076545.
- 433 20. Mpirirwe R, Mujugira A, Walusaga H, Ayebare F, Musanje K, Ndugga P, et al.
434 Perspectives of female sex workers on HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis delivery in Uganda: A
435 qualitative study. *Research Square*. 2024.
- 436 21. Bridges JF, Hauber AB, Marshall D, Lloyd A, Prosser LA, Regier DA, et al. Conjoint
437 analysis applications in health—a checklist: a report of the ISPOR Good Research Practices
438 for Conjoint Analysis Task Force. *Value in health*. 2011;14(4):403-13.
- 439 22. Wong SF, Norman R, Dunning TL, Ashley DM, Lorgelly PK. A protocol for a discrete
440 choice experiment: understanding preferences of patients with cancer towards their cancer
441 care across metropolitan and rural regions in Australia. *BMJ open*. 2014;4(10):e006661.
- 442 23. Lancsar E, Louviere J. Conducting discrete choice experiments to inform healthcare
443 decision making. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2008;26(8):661-77.
- 444 24. Brain D, Jadambaa A, Kularatna S. Methodology to derive preference for health
445 screening programmes using discrete choice experiments: a scoping review. *BMC health
446 services research*. 2022;22(1):1079.
- 447 25. Busza J, Chiyaka T, Musemburi S, Fearon E, Davey C, Chabata S, et al. Enhancing
448 national prevention and treatment services for sex workers in Zimbabwe: a process
449 evaluation of the SAPPH-IRe trial. *Health policy and planning*. 2019;34(5):337-45.
- 450 26. Nakanwagi S, Matovu JK, Kintu BN, Kaharuza F, Wanyenze RK. Facilitators and
451 barriers to linkage to hiv care among female sex workers receiving hiv testing services at a
452 community-based organization in Periurban Uganda: A Qualitative Study. *Journal of sexually
453 transmitted diseases*. 2016;2016.
- 454 27. Nnko S, Kuringe E, Nyato D, Drake M, Casalini C, Shao A, et al. Determinants of
455 access to HIV testing and counselling services among female sex workers in sub-Saharan
456 Africa: a systematic review. *BMC public health*. 2019;19(1):1-12.
- 457 28. Muwonge TR, Nsubuga R, Ware NC, Wyatt MA, Pisarski E, Kamusiime B, et al.
458 Health care worker perspectives of HIV Pre-exposure prophylaxis service delivery in central
459 Uganda. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2022;10:658826.
- 460 29. Chen L, Evans T, Anand S, Boufford JI, Brown H, Chowdhury M, et al. Human
461 resources for health: overcoming the crisis. *The lancet*. 2004;364(9449):1984-90.
- 462 30. Haines A, Sanders D, Lehmann U, Rowe AK, Lawn JE, Jan S, et al. Achieving child
463 survival goals: potential contribution of community health workers. *The lancet*.
464 2007;369(9579):2121-31.
- 465 31. Macinko J, Guanais FC, De Souza MDFM. Evaluation of the impact of the Family
466 Health Program on infant mortality in Brazil, 1990–2002. *Journal of Epidemiology &
467 Community Health*. 2006;60(1):13-9.
- 468 32. Chautrakarn S, Rayanakorn A, Intawong K, Chariyalertsak C, Khemngern P,
469 Stonington S, et al. Prep stigma among current and non-current prep users in Thailand: a
470 comparison between hospital and key population-led health service settings. *Frontiers in
471 Public Health*. 2022;10:1019553.
- 472 33. Organization WH. Differentiated and simplified pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV
473 prevention: update to WHO implementation guidance: technical brief. 2022.
- 474 34. Lancaster KE, Lungu T, Bula A, Shea JM, Shoben A, Hosseinipour MC, et al.
475 Preferences for pre-exposure prophylaxis service delivery among female sex workers in
476 Malawi: a discrete choice experiment. *AIDS and Behavior*. 2020;24:1294-303.

- 477 35. Mugambi ML, Odhiambo BO, Dollah A, Marwa MM, Nyakina J, Kinuthia J, et al.
478 Women's preferences for HIV prevention service delivery in pharmacies during pregnancy in
479 Western Kenya: a discrete choice experiment. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*.
480 2024;27:e26301.
- 481 36. Diaz E, Levine HB, Sullivan MC, Sernyak MJ, Hawkins KA, Cramer JA, et al. Use of
482 the Medication Event Monitoring System to estimate medication compliance in patients with
483 schizophrenia. *Journal of Psychiatry and Neuroscience*. 2001;26(4):325.
- 484 37. Cocosila M, Archer N. A framework for mobile healthcare answers to chronically ill
485 outpatient non-adherence. *Informatics in Primary Care*. 2005;13(2).
- 486 38. Simpson SH, Eurich DT, Majumdar SR, Padwal RS, Tsuyuki RT, Varney J, et al. A
487 meta-analysis of the association between adherence to drug therapy and mortality. *Bmj*.
488 2006;333(7557):15.
- 489 39. Vervloet M, van Dijk L, Santen-Reestman J, van Vlijmen B, Bouvy ML, de Bakker
490 DH. Improving medication adherence in diabetes type 2 patients through Real Time
491 Medication Monitoring: a randomised controlled trial to evaluate the effect of monitoring
492 patients' medication use combined with short message service (SMS) reminders. *BMC*
493 *health services research*. 2011;11:1-8.
- 494 40. Haynes R, Ackloo E, Sahota N, McDonald H, Yao X. Interventions for enhancing
495 medication adherence *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2008.
- 496

Option 1 COMMUNITY	Option 2 HOME	Option 3 HOTSPOT	Option 4 NEITHER
 <p>Peer receiving PrEP from a pharmacist on behalf of the sex worker in the community.</p>	 <p>Peer delivering PrEP to a sex worker at her home.</p>	 <p>Healthworker delivering PrEP to a sex worker at a hotspot.</p>	
 <p>Sex worker receiving SMS reminders about taking PrEP.</p>	 <p>Sex worker receiving call reminders about taking PrEP.</p>	 <p>Sex worker receiving SMS reminders about taking PrEP.</p>	

Write in this box the option number for the preferred modality of extending PrEP to you.

497

CARD H