

HIV Risk and Intention to use PrEP among Sexually Active Female University Students in Zambia: A Cross-Sectional Survey to Understand Influential Factors

Hampanda K, Bolt M, Nayame L, Hamoonga T, Sehrt M, Thorne J, Harrison M, Pintye J, Amstutz A, Abuogi L, Mweemba O

ABSTRACT

Background

Limited research exists on pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) interest or use among female university students in high HIV-prevalence African settings. This study sought to establish the relationship between epidemiologic and perceived HIV risk and PrEP intention among Zambian female university students.

Methods

We recruited female students at an urban university to complete a survey on intention to use PrEP in the next year (primary outcome); other PrEP knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors; demographics; epidemiologic HIV risk and risk perception. Descriptive statistics, regression and mediation analyses were used.

Results

Of the 454 sexually active participants, 118 (26%) reported PrEP intention. Actual PrEP use was rare (< 5%). The odds of PrEP intention increased for those with perceived high HIV risk (aOR 3.08; 95% CI 1.71-5.55) and with each year at university (aOR 1.47; 95% CI 1.21-1.80) but decreased with higher PrEP stigma (aOR 0.91; 95% CI 0.86-0.96) and more negative PrEP perceptions (aOR 0.91; 95% CI 0.85-0.97). More epidemiologic risk factors were originally associated with PrEP intention (OR 1.24; 95% CI 1.01-1.53 for each risk factor), though this relationship weakened after adjustment for perceived HIV risk, which mediated 69% of the relationship between epidemiologic HIV risk and PrEP intention. Only 29% of high-risk participants recognized their high epidemiological HIV risk (3+ risk factors).

Conclusions

Along with PrEP education and stigma reduction, there is a need for approaches that help female university students in Zambia accurately identify their HIV risk to make informed PrEP decisions.

INTRODUCTION

In Zambia, HIV prevalence is four times higher among young women (9%) compared to young men (2%) ages 20 to 24 years.¹ Female university students in high HIV prevalence settings of Southern Africa, such as Zambia, are a neglected, high-risk sub-population for HIV acquisition.²⁻⁴ Out-of-school adolescent girls and young women (AGYW) have often been the target of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) promotion.^{5,6} There is growing recognition that in-school AGYW have similar risk factors as out-of-school AGYW, and may in fact, have increased risk of HIV exposure.⁷ In-school AGYW may have a greater number of lifetime sexual partners due to delayed marriage, and use transactional sex, often with older male partners, to subsidize education costs and living expenses.^{8,9} In Zambia, HIV prevalence is higher among women with higher education (16%) compared to those with no formal education (11%).⁷

Significant investment has been made to increase public education and the number of sites offering oral PrEP in Zambia, as well as create demand among priority populations, including AGYW. The little research that exists with Zambian AGYW indicates relatively high uptake but low continuation of oral PrEP.^{10,11} Outside of Zambia, programs delivering oral PrEP to AGYW, mainly in South Africa and Kenya, have reported low uptake, and poor adherence and persistence.¹²⁻¹⁷ There is a dearth of research on PrEP use or intention among female university students in high HIV prevalence settings of Africa, despite high HIV risk.^{18,19}

'Market segmentation' of AGYW at high risk of HIV is needed to characterize potential avenues for tailored interventions to improve PrEP uptake and persistence.²⁰ Numerous barriers to PrEP use among African AGYW have been established, including low risk perception, stigma, lack of partner support, and lack of access/delivery options.^{21,22} Yet, female university students have generally not been included or the focus of this prior research. To fill this gap and plan for a tailored intervention, we conducted a cross-sectional survey at a large university in Lusaka, Zambia. The primary objective of this study was to establish a profile of sexually active female university students who intend to use PrEP. In addition, we examined the relationship between HIV risk perception, epidemiological HIV risk, and PrEP intention to further characterize this understudied sub-population of AGYW.

METHODS

Setting

Zambia has a generalized HIV epidemic with a high HIV prevalence (9.9%) among those 15-49 years and annual incidence of 0.34%.²³ Lusaka province, the study setting, has the highest HIV prevalence (14.4%) in Zambia.²³ Oral PrEP is widely available in Lusaka free of charge at government-run health centers. The study was approved by relevant ethics committees in the United States and Zambia.

Sampling and Data Collection

From February to April 2022, we recruited a convenience sample of female university students (n=806). Currently enrolled female-identifying students ≥ 18 years of age completed an online survey in English (official Zambian language). We partnered with the university's medical services and peer educators to distribute flyers with the survey QR code/website link. A virtual flyer was distributed to student WhatsApp groups by university administration. After consent and screening questions (age, gender, current student), participants completed the online survey (~15 min). Data was collected and stored using REDCap.^{24,25}

Outcome of interest

The primary outcome (intention to use PrEP) was measured by asking "*How likely are you to use PrEP in the next year?*" with a 5-point Likert scale (definitely will not use; probably will not use; unsure; likely will use; definitely will use). The question was dichotomized to reflect those who intended to use PrEP (i.e. "likely/definitely will use") versus those who did not or were unsure.

Exposures of interest

Epidemiologic HIV risk was measured using the validated HIV Risk Index,^{26,27} which indicates AGYW with ≥ 3 risk factors are 15 times as likely to acquire HIV as those with <3 factors and meet a high-risk HIV threshold.^{27,28}

The index includes sociodemographic characteristics (age 20 to 24 years), sexual behavior and relationship characteristics (2 or more partners in the past year; ever exchanging sex for money or gifts; having recent sexual partner(s) who are 5 years or older; and suspected/known partner concurrency), sexually transmitted infection (STI) symptoms in the past 6 months (abnormal vaginal discharge or genital sores/ulcers), and prior pregnancy. Higher numbers indicate higher HIV risk. We dichotomized these risk scores into high epidemiologic HIV risk (3 or more risk factors) or low HIV risk (0-2 risk factors). Self-perceived HIV risk was measured by asking “*What do you think your risk is of getting HIV in the next year?*”. “No risk at all”, and “small risk” constituted low risk perception, with responses of “50/50 risk”, “high risk” and “very high risk” were labeled high risk perception. Negative PrEP perceptions were measured using established scales with Likert responses.^{29,30}

Data cleaning and multiple imputation for missing data

Survey deployment of demographics and PrEP intention commenced on February 15, 2022. From March 2, 2022 onward, additional questions on sexual behavior and history were added after an error in the survey skip pattern was identified. Since a substantial proportion of responses for sexual behavior and history were missing, multiple imputation was used to avoid substantial losses of power and biased estimation, as it has shown to be beneficial over complete-case analysis even in situations where the proportion of missing data for a covariate is large.³¹⁻³³ Multiple imputation was conducted with the mice package in R, using predictive mean matching.^{34,35} Epidemiological risk was calculated after imputation. Year in school was mean-centered for interpretability in regression modeling. Fifty imputations were utilized. A complete-case analysis was conducted for sensitivity analysis (see Appendix). We excluded participants who reported living with HIV, never had sex, or missing PrEP intention data (the primary outcome) from analysis.

Data analysis

Descriptive statistics (counts and proportions for categorical variables; means and standard deviations for continuous and Likert scale variables) were calculated for the original, pre-imputed data (i.e. complete case). All subsequent analyses were performed with multiply imputed datasets. Logistic regression was used for all regression modeling. Significant ($\alpha = .05$) variables in unadjusted models were included in multivariable models. Regression results from all imputed datasets were pooled together to create final parameter estimates using Rubin's rules.³⁶ All data cleaning and analyses were conducted in R (version 4.4.0) and associated R packages.^{34,37-43}

To evaluate the presence and magnitude of the relationship between epidemiological risk and intention of using PrEP mediated by perceived HIV risk, we followed classic mediation framework proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986). We fitted models between the predictor and mediator, and between the outcome with the predictor and mediator together, then following the recommendations of Rijnhart et al. (2019) to $a*b$ to calculate the indirect effect and $a*b/(ab + c')$ to calculate the proportion mediated (all letters represent log-odds of the appropriate mediation model pathways).^{44,45}

To evaluate whether participants accurately assessed their true HIV risk, McNemar's tests were performed on all imputed datasets on cross tabulations of dichotomized perceived HIV risk and dichotomized epidemiological risk.

RESULTS

Of 806 total survey responses, 454 sexually active (i.e., HIV at-risk) female students not living with HIV met final inclusion criteria. Table 1 presents the sample characteristics. The average age was 22.6 years old (SD 2.6) with 10% financially comfortable. Most (98%) were born in Zambia though 56% were born outside of Lusaka Province. Most (78%) were in their first to third year of university. Most (52%) lived on campus or in a rental house/room (36%). Very few were currently taking PrEP (<1%) or ever used PrEP (4.7%). Few (22%) knew someone taking PrEP. The majority (81%) perceived they were low HIV. Most (70%) reported knowing their last sexual partner's HIV status.

Table 1: Sample characteristics

Characteristic	Likelihood of using PrEP		
	Overall, N = 454 ¹	Likely, N = 118 ¹	Unlikely, N = 336 ¹
General demographics			
Age	22.57 (2.56)	22.55 (3.27)	22.58 (2.27)
(Missing)	2	1	1
Financial situation ²			
Comfortable	43 (10.0%)	15 (14%)	28 (8.7%)
Poor	389 (90%)	95 (86%)	294 (91%)
(Missing)	22	8	14
Location of birth			
Lusaka province	192 (42%)	48 (41%)	144 (43%)
Zambia	255 (56%)	70 (59%)	185 (55%)
International	5 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	5 (1.5%)
(Missing)	2	0	2
Year at University			
1st year	123 (27%)	45 (39%)	78 (23%)
2nd year	101 (22%)	28 (24%)	73 (22%)
3rd year	129 (29%)	33 (28%)	96 (29%)
4th year	65 (14%)	9 (7.8%)	56 (17%)
5th year	22 (4.9%)	0 (0%)	22 (6.6%)
6th year or more	11 (2.4%)	1 (0.9%)	10 (3.0%)
(Missing)	3	2	1
Living space			
A rental house/room	143 (36%)	47 (46%)	96 (33%)
Free housing with friend/relative	36 (9.1%)	10 (9.8%)	26 (8.9%)
On campus	204 (52%)	42 (41%)	162 (55%)
Own home	12 (3.0%)	3 (2.9%)	9 (3.1%)
(Missing)	59	16	43
Familiarity with PrEP			
Currently taking PrEP	4 (0.9%)	3 (2.6%)	1 (0.3%)
(Missing)	6	3	3
Has ever take PrEP before	21 (4.7%)	12 (10%)	9 (2.7%)
(Missing)	9	2	7
Know someone taking PrEP	97 (22%)	36 (32%)	61 (19%)
(Missing)	22	7	15
HIV and birth control familiarity			
Perceived HIV risk			
Low risk	324 (81%)	65 (63%)	259 (88%)
High risk	76 (19%)	39 (38%)	37 (13%)
(Missing)	54	14	40
Thought about getting HIV	237 (54%)	67 (58%)	170 (52%)

(Missing)	14	2	12
Knows HIV status of last partner			
Knew partner's HIV status	316 (70%)	76 (64%)	240 (71%)
Did not know	138 (30%)	42 (36%)	96 (29%)
Birth control used			
Condoms	317 (73%)	84 (75%)	233 (73%)
Other modern method	69 (16%)	21 (19%)	48 (15%)
Traditional method	17 (3.9%)	2 (1.8%)	15 (4.7%)
Don't use birth control	29 (6.7%)	5 (4.5%)	24 (7.5%)
(Missing)	22	6	16
Self-identified epidemiological risk factors			
Age 20 - 24	347 (76%)	87 (74%)	260 (77%)
Number of sex partners in last year	1.59 (1.79)	1.76 (1.49)	1.53 (1.88)
(Missing)	236	64	172
Had sex for money	17 (8.0%)	9 (17%)	8 (5.1%)
(Missing)	242	64	178
Had a partner 5 years older	82 (38%)	24 (45%)	58 (36%)
(Missing)	241	65	176
Know/suspect partner has other partners within 6 mo	153 (50%)	52 (61%)	101 (45%)
(Missing)	146	33	113
STI symptoms in last 6 months	74 (17%)	26 (23%)	48 (15%)
(Missing)	9	3	6
Have been pregnant	78 (18%)	19 (17%)	59 (18%)
(Missing)	9	3	6
Number of risk factors	2.33 (1.44)	2.61 (1.66)	2.22 (1.35)
(Missing)	320	82	238
Dichotomous risk variable			
Low risk	83 (62%)	21 (58%)	62 (63%)
High risk	51 (38%)	15 (42%)	36 (37%)
(Missing)	320	82	238
Any risk factors			
No risk factors	7 (5.2%)	1 (2.8%)	6 (6.1%)
At least 1 risk factor	127 (95%)	35 (97%)	92 (94%)
(Missing)	320	82	238

1 Mean (SD); n (%)

2 Question asked: 'How would you classify your financial situation these days?'

On average, participants without missing data reported 2.33 epidemiologic HIV risk factors (SD 1.44) and 1.6 sexual partners in the past year. Thirty eight percent reported having a sexual partner 5 years or older. Half knew or believed that their sexual partner had other sexual partners. Seventeen percent reported having STI symptoms in the past 6 months and 18% reported ever being pregnant. Almost all (95%) had at least one risk factor for HIV while 38% had ≥ 3 risk factors (i.e., high epidemiologic HIV risk), though the high proportion of the sample having at least one risk factor is partly explained by 76% being 20-24 years of age ²⁶.

Table 2 presents endorsement of each item and overall scores for the stigma and negative PrEP perceptions scales. With scales ranging from 0 (completely disagree) to 4 (completely agree), on average, there were low levels of negative PrEP perceptions (item scores of 0.49 - 1.99) and stigma (item scores of 0.83 - 2.07).

Table 2: PrEP Stigmas and Perceptions

Characteristic	Likelihood of using PrEP		
	Overall, N = 454 ¹	Likely, N = 118 ¹	Unlikely, N = 336 ¹
Stigma towards PrEP²			
Would feel ashamed of PrEP	1.11 (1.02)	0.81 (0.89)	1.21 (1.04)
Would feel embarrassed of PrEP	1.18 (1.07)	0.90 (0.97)	1.28 (1.08)
(Missing)	3	1	2
Would be teased if used PrEP	1.96 (1.24)	1.66 (1.26)	2.07 (1.22)
(Missing)	3	1	2
Would be judged if used PrEP	2.07 (1.25)	1.83 (1.30)	2.15 (1.22)
(Missing)	3	1	2
Would be at risk of rape/violence if used PrEP	0.83 (0.96)	0.84 (0.95)	0.83 (0.97)
(Missing)	2	0	2
Would feel empowered if used PrEP	1.71 (1.09)	1.50 (1.14)	1.79 (1.06)
(Missing)	2	1	1
Would be seen as responsible if used PrEP	1.92 (1.12)	1.65 (1.20)	2.02 (1.08)
(Missing)	3	0	3
Overall PrEP stigma score (scale out of 28)	10.8 (4.9)	9.2 (4.8)	11.4 (4.7)
(Missing)	13	4	9
Perception of PrEP²			
PrEP is for promiscuous people	1.42 (1.31)	1.10 (1.27)	1.52 (1.31)
(Missing)	1	1	0
PrEP will cause risky sex	1.99 (1.40)	1.72 (1.39)	2.08 (1.39)
(Missing)	2	1	1
Only sex workers need PrEP	0.49 (0.79)	0.43 (0.67)	0.51 (0.83)
(Missing)	3	1	2
Only people with HIV partners need PrEP	0.99 (1.19)	0.69 (1.03)	1.09 (1.23)
(Missing)	6	1	5

People should pick partners carefully rather than use PrEP	1.52 (1.33)	1.26 (1.31)	1.61 (1.33)
(Missing)	3	1	2
Overall perception of PrEP (scale out of 20)	6.4 (3.7)	5.2 (3.7)	6.8 (3.7)
(Missing)	8	1	7

¹ Mean (SD)
² Scale score ranged from 0 (completely disagree) to 4 (completely agree)

Characteristics Associated with Intention to Use PrEP

Overall, 118 (26%) reported they were highly likely/likely to use PrEP in the next year. In unadjusted analyses, there was a 35% increase in the odds of PrEP intention for each epidemiologic HIV risk factor (95% CI: [1.13, 1.62], $p < 0.01$; Table 3). Participants with high HIV risk perception had 3.46 times the odds of PrEP intention compared to those with low HIV risk perception (95% CI: [2.07, 5.79], $p < 0.01$). Participants who knew someone taking PrEP had 1.97 times the odds of PrEP intention compared to those who did not (95% CI: [1.21, 3.2], $p < 0.01$). For each additional year of university, participants had a 52% increase in the odds of PrEP intention (95% CI: [1.26, 1.83], $p < 0.01$). Those with prior PrEP use had 3.94 times the odds of PrEP intention (95% CI: [1.61, 9.6], $p < 0.01$). Conversely, the odds of PrEP intention significantly decreased for every one unit increase in score on the negative PrEP perceptions scale (OR 0.88, 95% CI: [0.83, 0.94], $p < 0.010$ and PrEP stigma scale (OR 0.91, 95% CI: [0.87, 0.95], $p < 0.01$). Students' financial status, whether the student had ever used condoms, their birth location, and whether they knew their partner's HIV status were not associated with PrEP intention.

After adjusting for all factors that were significantly associated with PrEP intention, except for perceived HIV risk (Table 3), participants with higher negative PrEP perception scores continued have reduced PrEP intention (aOR 0.9, 95% CI: [0.85, 0.97], $p < 0.01$), as well as those with high negative PrEP stigma scores (aOR 0.92, 95% CI: [0.87, 0.97], $p < 0.01$). The number of years a student had been in university continued to be associated with increased PrEP intention (aOR 1.48, 95% CI: [1.22, 1.8], $p < 0.01$), though knowing someone else taking became marginally associated with PrEP intention (2.93, 95% CI: [0.97, 8.83], $p = 0.06$). Lastly, the number of epidemiologic HIV risk factors continued to be positively associated with PrEP intention (1.24, 95% CI: [1.01, 1.53], $p = 0.04$).


Risk Perception as a Mediator in the Relationship Between Epidemiologic HIV Risk and PrEP Intention

The number of epidemiologic HIV risk factors was significantly associated with PrEP intention in both simple and adjusted logistic regression models (though without HIV risk perception included as a covariate; Table 3). However, when HIV risk perception was added to the adjusted model, the association between epidemiologic HIV risk and PrEP intention decreased in both magnitude and statistical significance, indicating that perceived HIV risk was a potential mediator between epidemiologic risk and PrEP intention (aOR: 1.24 dropping to 1.17, p -value: 0.04 increasing to 0.14, see Table 3). In this final model, the relationships between PrEP stigma, negative PrEP perceptions, year in university and PrEP intention were relatively unchanged from the previous adjusted model, though with the inclusion of self-perceived HIV risk, the association between having ever used PrEP and PrEP intention, having already been substantially weakened by the first set of covariates, basically disappeared (aOR 2.46, 95% CI: [0.83, 7.31], $p = 0.11$). Additionally, the relationship between perceived HIV risk and PrEP intention was the similar to the unadjusted model (aOR 3.08, 95% CI: [1.71, 5.55], $p < .01$). Lambda in Table 3 represents, for the final model, the proportion of the total variance of the aOR due to variance added by imputation of missing data: in this case, 28% of the variability in the estimate of the aOR of epidemiologic risk count on PrEP intention is due to multiple imputation. Analysis of the complete-case sample found similar associations except for a null association between the number of risk factors and PrEP intention (see Appendix).

Probabilistically speaking, a female student with one epidemiologic risk score, with the sample mean score for PrEP perception and PrEP stigma, who thinks her HIV risk is low, and has no other risk factors, has a hypothetical 13% probability of PrEP intention. If the same participant, however, believed she was at high risk of HIV, her probability of PrEP intention jumps to 32% (holding all other factors equal).

Given the change in the magnitude and significance of the association between epidemiologic risk count and PrEP intention after adjustment for perceived HIV risk, the association appears to be mediated by perceived HIV risk. Under a classic mediation framework, the odds ratio for the indirect effect of epidemiologic risk count on PrEP intention mediated by self-perceived HIV risk was 1.43 (Figure 1), and the proportion mediated of this relationship by self-perceived risk was 69%. These values were estimated with models that included PrEP stigma, PrEP perception, knowing a friend taking PrEP, and year in university as covariates.

Figure 1. Results of Mediation Analysis (all modeling includes adjusted for relevant covariates)



Alignment of Accurate Perceptions of HIV risk

Among those with low epidemiologic HIV risk, 86.1% accurately perceived their HIV risk to be low. However, among those with high epidemiologic HIV risk, only 28.6% accurately perceived their HIV risk to be high. McNemar's test indicates participants do not rank themselves as high epidemiological risk at the same rate that they actually are high epidemiologic risk (maximum p-value from all tests < .001).

DISCUSSION

This study contributes to the small body of research regarding female university students' willingness to use PrEP in high HIV-prevalence African settings^{18,19}. Over one-quarter of female students in this study reported being highly likely/likely to use PrEP in the next year. The adjusted odds of PrEP intention were higher for those with less negative PrEP perceptions, less PrEP stigma, and perceived high risk for HIV. Thirty-eight percent of the sample met the criteria for being high HIV risk (i.e., ≥ 3 or more risk factors on the HIV Risk Index)²⁶, but only 19% perceived they were high risk of acquiring HIV in the next year. A major contribution of this study is a better understanding of factors influencing intention to use PrEP among HIV at-risk female university students in Zambia, including the interconnected relationship of epidemiologic risk and perceived HIV risk.

Our findings indicate relatively high interest or PrEP intention but low actual use. We found that in our sample of sexually active female university students, 26% intended to use PrEP in the next year but less than 5% had or were currently using PrEP. A prior study from Zambia with both male and female university students who may or may not have been sexually active (n=346) found that 17% were willing to use PrEP and 4.9% had previously used PrEP¹⁹; the sample did not stratify outcomes by gender. A study with male and female first year university students in Namibia found that 45% had heard of PrEP and, of those (n =104), 88% indicated PrEP intention with 8% prior PrEP use.⁴⁶ A study with male and female South African university students found 19% of participants were aware of PrEP, 15% knew where and how to get PrEP, and 2% had used PrEP.⁴⁷ In Lesotho, a study with female university students found that 32% were strongly willing to use PrEP if it were available in their community.¹⁸ Taken together, this body of research, along with the present study findings, highlights the low use of PrEP among university students in several settings of Southern Africa, but opportunities to increase uptake given levels of interest.

In the present study, PrEP perceptions and PrEP stigma were significantly associated with participants' intention to use PrEP in the next year. We found low levels of negative PrEP perceptions and PrEP stigma in this sample of young women, which is promising. However, some of the young women in this study continue to endorse PrEP stigma and negative PrEP perceptions, particularly that they would be judged if they used PrEP and PrEP causes risky sex. While still emerging, prior literature supports the finding that stigma is a barrier to PrEP use⁴⁸⁻⁵⁰ Stigma may be especially problematic for PrEP use among AGYW whose identity is still forming as they transition to adulthood and have increased sensitivity to other's opinions.^{50,51}

Our findings align with the conceptual framework by Hartmann et al. (2024) on PrEP stigma among AGYW in sub-Saharan Africa, including how it manifests, its intersection with other stigmas and vulnerabilities, and individual and health system outcomes.⁵⁰ Our study supports the recommendations of Hartmann et al. (2024) that advocate for PrEP stigma reduction and mitigation among AGYW through, for example, increasing community-wide knowledge dissemination of PrEP in non-stigmatizing ways, building resilience and social support, and offering counselling to address challenges with PrEP disclosure.⁵⁰ However, the authors do not specifically reference in-school AGYW or female university student populations. Our findings indicate that negative perceptions of PrEP and PrEP stigma are also barriers to PrEP intention among at-risk female university students. There are no effective interventions to our knowledge from Southern Africa that have successfully promoted PrEP uptake via addressing PrEP stigma/perceptions among AGYW.

In the present study, perceived high HIV risk emerged as a key factor associated with the odds of PrEP intention. Perceived HIV risk additionally was a significant mediator in the relationship between epidemiologic HIV risk and PrEP intention. A similar relationship was found by a Ugandan study that reported AGYW with higher "HIV Salience and Perception" scale scores were more likely to initiate and obtain PrEP refills through 6 months.⁵² In Lesotho, a study with female university students reported increased willingness to use PrEP with perceived HIV risk.¹⁸ Similar to the present study, a study from Malawi reported that perceived HIV risk partially explained the relationship between epidemiologic HIV risk and PrEP interest among AGYW.²⁷ The prior research along with our findings highlight the importance of HIV risk perception and PrEP interest among AGYW, including female university students.

This study underscores the large, missed opportunity to prevent HIV among female university students at high risk of HIV acquisition who do not perceive themselves to be at risk. Similar to other studies from the region, we found that the female university students often underestimate their HIV risk.^{26,53} In fact, over two-thirds (of the complete case subset) with high HIV risk in this study did not accurately perceive themselves to be at high HIV risk. There is an apparent need to align AGYW's risk perception with their true HIV risk, including among female university students. Yet, the formation of HIV risk perceptions among AGYW is a complicated factor given that perceived risk is influenced by numerous internal (e.g., neurodevelopment, mental health) and external (duration, emotional attachment, and trust within a sexual relationship) factors, as well as biases including "optimism bias" where individuals tend to underestimate their own risk, and "present-bias" where individuals tend to focus on immediate rewards at the expense of long-term objectives.^{54,55} Despite the complexity of this phenomena, there is an urgent need find effective ways to help AGYW better align their HIV risk perception with actual HIV risk. This will be critical for AGYW to make informed decisions not only about the use of oral PrEP, but also other PrEP products beginning to be available to African AGYW, such long-acting injections and vaginal rings.⁵⁶

Limitations

The findings of this study should be interpreted within some limitations. The survey was based on a convenience sample of female university students who saw our advertisements and opted to take the online survey, making selection bias possible and not representative of all female university students in Zambia or other African higher education institutions. The study used self-report to collect data, which is vulnerable to social desirability and recall bias. This study was afflicted with a substantial amount of missing data, which was partly overcome with the aid of multiple imputation, still may have led to decreased accuracy for point estimates and wider confidence bands than what would be seen with complete data. Lastly, we recognize that PrEP intention does not always equate to PrEP uptake, and more studies are needed to examine PrEP uptake and persistence behaviors.

Conclusion

This study found that intention to use PrEP among sexually active female university students in Zambia is affected by perceived HIV risk, along with PrEP perceptions and stigma. Perceived HIV risk mediates the relationship between epidemiologic HIV risk and PrEP intention. Among those with high epidemiologic HIV risk, most underestimated their risk. Along with education and stigma reduction, there is a need for effective approaches for female university students to accurately assess HIV risk and make informed decisions about PrEP use.

APPENDIX 1

Table 1: Complete Case Regression Modeling Results

Variable	Simple models			Adjusted model			Final mediation model		
	OR	CI	p	aOR	CI	p	aOR	CI	p
# of risk factors	1.20	[0.92, 1.56]	0.17	1.02	[0.71, 1.45]	0.93	0.98	[0.65, 1.45]	0.92
PrEP stigma score	0.91	[0.86, 0.95]	< .01	0.97	[0.87, 1.08]	0.6	0.95	[0.83, 1.07]	0.39
PrEP perception score	0.88	[0.83, 0.94]	< .01	0.82	[0.7, 0.94]	< .01	0.88	[0.75, 1.03]	0.13
Knows a friend taking PrEP	2.05	[1.25, 3.32]	< .01	2.29	[0.63, 8.1]	0.2	2.63	[0.72, 9.25]	0.13
Poor financial situation	0.60	[0.31, 1.2]	0.14						
Uses condoms	1.12	[0.69, 1.86]	0.65						
Born in greater Zambia/international	1.11	[0.72, 1.7]	0.65						
Year in university	1.51	[1.26, 1.83]	< .01	1.73	[1.15, 2.76]	0.01	1.57	[1, 2.6]	0.06
Ever taken PrEP	4.10	[1.69, 10.31]	< .01	20.7	[1.92, 319.91]	0.02	9.34	[0.95, 138.13]	0.07
Did not know partner's HIV status	1.38	[0.88, 2.15]	0.15						
High self-perceived HIV risk	4.20	[2.49, 7.13]	< .01				4.01	[0.98, 17.61]	0.05

1. PHIA Project. *Zambia Population-Based HIV Impact Assessment (ZAMPHIA) 2015–2016*. 2016. https://phia.icap.columbia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/ZAMBIA-Factsheet.FIN_.pdf
2. ZSA, Zambia MoH, ICF. *Zambia Demographic and Health Survey 2018*. 2019. <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR361/FR361.pdf>
3. Zhang J, Jemmott JB, 3rd, Heeren GA. Sub-Saharan African University Students' Beliefs about Abstinence, Condom Use, and Limiting the Number of Sexual Partners. *Behav Med*. Jan-Mar 2017;43(1):9-20. doi:10.1080/08964289.2015.1028321
4. Yang XH, Yuan S, Zhang R, et al. Risky Sexual Behaviors and Associated Factors Among College Students in Lusaka, Zambia. *Arch Sex Behav*. Oct 2019;48(7):2117-2123. doi:10.1007/s10508-019-1442-5
5. Mathur S, Pilgrim N, Patel SK, et al. HIV vulnerability among adolescent girls and young women: a multi-country latent class analysis approach. *Int J Public Health*. May 2020;65(4):399-411. doi:10.1007/s00038-020-01350-1
6. Heck CJ, Reed DM, Okal J, Chipeta E, Mbizvo M, Mathur S. Examining concordance of sexual-related factors and PrEP eligibility with HIV risk perception among adolescent girls and young women: cross-sectional insights from DREAMS sites in Kenya, Malawi, and Zambia. *BMC Public Health*. Oct 12 2024;24(1):2793. doi:10.1186/s12889-024-20276-4
7. Zambia Statistics Agency et al. *Zambia Demographic and Health Survey 2018*. 2019.
8. *Sex Without Consent: Young People in Developing Countries*. Zed Books; 2006.
9. Mee P, Fearon E, Hassan S, et al. The association between being currently in school and HIV prevalence among young women in nine eastern and southern African countries. *PLoS one*. 2018;13(6):e0198898. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0198898
10. Ministry of Health Z. *National HIV and AIDS Communication and Advocacy Strategy*. 2019.
11. Claassen CW, Mumba D, Njelesani M, et al. Initial implementation of PrEP in Zambia: health policy development and service delivery scale-up. *BMJ Open*. Jul 9 2021;11(7):e047017. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-047017
12. Dunbar MS, Kripke K, Haberer J, et al. Understanding and measuring uptake and coverage of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis delivery among adolescent girls and young women in sub-Saharan Africa. *Sexual health*. Nov 2018;15(6):513-521. doi:10.1071/SH18061
13. Riddell Jt, Amico KR, Mayer KH. HIV Preexposure Prophylaxis: A Review. *JAMA : the journal of the American Medical Association*. Mar 27 2018;319(12):1261-1268. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.1917
14. Oluoch L, Roxby, A, Wald, A, Selke, S, Margaret, A, Micheni, M, Chohan, B, Ngure, K, Gakuo, S, Kiptinness, C, Mugo, N. Low Uptake of Preexposure Prophylaxis Among Kenyan Adolescent Girls at Risk of HIV. presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2019; Seattle, WA, USA. Session PrEP in Fits and Starts.
15. Kagaayi J, Batte J, Nakawooya H, et al. Uptake and retention on HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis among key and priority populations in South-Central Uganda. *J Int AIDS Soc*. Aug 2020;23(8):e25588. doi:10.1002/jia2.25588
16. Kyongo J. How long will they take it? Oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) retention for female sex workers, men who have sex with men and young women in a demonstration project in Kenya. presented at: International AIDS Conference; 2018; Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
17. Rousseau-Jemwa E, Bekker, LG., Bukusi, E, Delaney-Moretlwe, S, Omollo, V, Travill, D, Morton, J, Kidoguchi, L, van der Straten, A, O'Malley, G, Roberts, S, Haberer, JE, Johnson, R, Celum, C, Baeten, J. Early persistence of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in African adolescent girls and young women (AGYW) from Kenya and South Africa. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2018;34(68)
18. Karletsos D, Greenbaum CR, Kobayashi E, McConnell M. Willingness to use PrEP among female university students in Lesotho. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(3):e0230565. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0230565

19. Kampamba M, Nelumbu NN, Hikaambo CN, et al. Awareness and willingness to use pre-exposure prophylaxis among the University of Zambia students: A cross-sectional study. *Health Sci Rep*. Sep 2024;7(9):e70060. doi:10.1002/hsr2.70060
20. Crowley K, Dugas M, Gao GG, et al. Market segmentation of South African adolescent girls and young women to inform HIV prevention product marketing strategy: A mixed methods study. *Health Mark Q*. Apr-Jun 2022;39(2):159-172. doi:10.1080/07359683.2021.2007587
21. Celum CL, Delany-Moretlwe S, Baeten JM, et al. HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis for adolescent girls and young women in Africa: from efficacy trials to delivery. *J Int AIDS Soc*. Jul 2019;22 Suppl 4:e25298. doi:10.1002/jia2.25298
22. Bender SS, Fulbright YK. Content analysis: a review of perceived barriers to sexual and reproductive health services by young people. *Eur J Contracept Reprod Health Care*. Jun 2013;18(3):159-67. doi:10.3109/13625187.2013.776672
23. Zambia Statistics Agency. *ZAMPHIA Report 2021*. December 2022.
24. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform*. Jul 2019;95:103208. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208
25. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. Apr 2009;42(2):377-81. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
26. Price JT, Rosenberg NE, Vansia D, et al. Predictors of HIV, HIV Risk Perception, and HIV Worry Among Adolescent Girls and Young Women in Lilongwe, Malawi. *Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes*. Jan 1 2018;77(1):53-63. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000001567
27. Hill LM, Maseko B, Chagomerana M, et al. HIV risk, risk perception, and PrEP interest among adolescent girls and young women in Lilongwe, Malawi: operationalizing the PrEP cascade. *J Int AIDS Soc*. Jun 2020;23 Suppl 3(Suppl 3):e25502. doi:10.1002/jia2.25502
28. Kudowa E CM, Phanga T, Maseko B, Price JT, Hosseinipour MC, et al. Incidence rate and predictors of HIV incidence among adolescent girls and young women in Lilongwe, Malawi. . presented at: 10th IAS Conference on HIV Science; 2019; Mexico City, Mexico.
29. Napper LE, Fisher DG, Reynolds GL. Development of the perceived risk of HIV scale. *AIDS Behav*. May 2012;16(4):1075-83. doi:10.1007/s10.1-011-0003-2
30. Velloza J, Donnell D, Hosek S, et al. Alignment of PrEP adherence with periods of HIV risk among adolescent girls and young women in South Africa and Zimbabwe: a secondary analysis of the HPTN 082 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet HIV*. Oct 2022;9(10):e680-e689. doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(22)00195-3
31. Janssen KJ, Donders AR, Harrell FE, Jr., et al. Missing covariate data in medical research: to impute is better than to ignore. *J Clin Epidemiol*. Jul 2010;63(7):721-7. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.12.008
32. Madley-Dowd P, Hughes R, Tilling K, Heron J. The proportion of missing data should not be used to guide decisions on multiple imputation. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 06 2019;110:63-73. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.02.016
33. Lee KJ, Simpson JA. Introduction to multiple imputation for dealing with missing data. *Respirology*. Feb 2014;19(2):162-167. doi:10.1111/resp.12226
34. Stef van Buuren KG-O. Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2011;45(3):1-67. doi:10.18637/jss.v045.i03.
35. van Buuren S. Flexible Imputation of Missing Data. *Chapman and Hall/CRC*. 2018;(Second Edition (2nd ed.))doi:<https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429492259>
36. White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and guidance for practice. *Stat Med*. Feb 20 2011;30(4):377-99. doi:10.1002/sim.4067
37. Bache S WH. magrittr: A Forward-Pipe Operator for R. R package version 2.0.3. 2022;
38. K M. here: A Simpler Way to Find Your Files. R package version 1.0.1. 2020;
39. Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. . 2022;

40. Robinson D HA, Couch S. broom: Convert Statistical Objects into Tidy Tibbles. R package version 1.0.3. 2023;
41. Wickham H AM, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan LD, François R, Grolemund G, Hayes A, Henry L, Hester J, Kuhn M, Pedersen TL, Miller E, Bache SM, Müller K, Ooms J, Robinson D, Seidel DP, Spinu V, Takahashi K, Vaughan D, Wilke C, Woo K, Yutani H. "Welcome to the tidyverse.". *Journal of Open Source Software*. 2019;4(43):1686. doi:<https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>.
42. L Y. ggvenn: Draw Venn Diagram by 'ggplot2'. R package version 0.1.9. 2021;
43. Zhu H. ableExtra: Construct Complex Table with 'kable' and Pipe Syntax. R package version 1.3.4. 2021;
44. Baron RM, Kenny DA. The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. Dec 1986;51(6):1173-82.
45. Rijnhart JJM, Twisk JWR, Eekhout I, Heymans MW. Comparison of logistic-regression based methods for simple mediation analysis with a dichotomous outcome variable. *BMC medical research methodology*. Jan 21 2019;19(1):19. doi:10.1186/s12874-018-0654-z
46. Nakathingo FADIP. Knowledge, Awareness and Willingness to use HIV Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) Among Students at the University of Namibia. *Global Journal of Health Science*. 2021;13(3)doi:10.5539/gjhs.v13n3p48
47. Ajayi AI, Mudefi E, Yusuf MS, Adeniyi OV, Rala N, Goon DT. Low awareness and use of pre-exposure prophylaxis among adolescents and young adults in high HIV and sexual violence prevalence settings. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. Oct 2019;98(43):e17716. doi:10.1097/MD.00000000000017716
48. Golub SA. PrEP Stigma: Implicit and Explicit Drivers of Disparity. *Current HIV/AIDS reports*. Apr 2018;15(2):190-197. doi:10.1007/s11904-018-0385-0
49. Mack N, Odhiambo J, Wong C, Agot K. Barriers and facilitators to pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) eligibility screening and ongoing HIV testing among target populations in Bondo and Rarieda, Kenya: Results of a consultation with community stakeholders. Article. *Bmc Health Services Research*. MAY 21 2014 2014;14ARTN 231. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-14-231
50. Hartmann M, Nyblade L, Otticha S, Marton T, Agot K, Roberts ST. The development of a conceptual framework on PrEP stigma among adolescent girls and young women in sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. Feb 2024;27(2):e26213. doi:10.1002/jia2.26213
51. Sawyer SM, Afifi RA, Bearinger LH, et al. Adolescence: a foundation for future health. *Lancet*. Apr 28 2012;379(9826):1630-40. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60072-5
52. Velloza J, Mujugira A, Muwonge T, et al. A novel "HIV salience and Perception" scale is associated with PrEP dispensing and adherence among adolescent girls and young women in Kampala, Uganda. *AIDS and behavior*. Jan 2023;27(1):279-289. doi:10.1007/s10461-022-03762-x
53. Kamire V, Magut F, Khagayi S, et al. HIV Risk Factors and Risk Perception Among Adolescent Girls and Young Women: Results From a Population-Based Survey in Western Kenya, 2018. *Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes*. Sep 1 2022;91(1):17-25. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000003021
54. Celum C, Delany-Moretlwe S, McConnell M, et al. Rethinking HIV prevention to prepare for oral PrEP implementation for young African women. Editorial Material. *J Int AIDS Soc*. JUL 2015 2015;18:61-70. doi:10.7448/IAS.18.4.20227
55. <Hampanda_UCD Transcript.pdf>.
56. Agrahari V, Anderson SM, Peet MM, et al. Long-acting HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) approaches: recent advances, emerging technologies, and development challenges. *Expert Opin Drug Deliv*. Oct 2022;19(10):1365-1380. doi:10.1080/17425247.2022.2135699