

Declines in HIV Incidence and Prevalence and Predictors Among Adolescents and Young Adults: An Observational Cohort Study, Rakai, Uganda, 2005-2020

Stephanie A Grilo¹, Julia Thompson¹, Ivy S Chen³, Fred Nalugoda⁴, Tom Lutalo⁴, Ying Wei³, Esther Spindler¹, Susie Hoffman^{8,9}, Philip Kreniske¹⁰, David Serwadda^{4,13}, Joseph Kagaayi^{4,12}, Mary Kate Grabowski^{4,5,7}, Maria J Wawer^{4,5,6}, Fred M Ssewamala¹¹, Larry W Chang^{5,6}, Aleya Khalifa⁹, Debbie Malden¹, John S Santelli^{1,2}

Corresponding Author and Request for Reprints:

John S Santelli, MD
Heilbrunn Dept of Population and Family Health
Columbia University
60 Haven Avenue, room B310
New York, NY 10032
917-846-3288
Js2637@columbia.edu

¹Department of Population and Family Health, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA [Stephanie Grilo, PhD; Julia Thompson, MS; Esther Spindler, MS; John Santelli, MD, MPH, full professor, Debbie Malden, DPhil]

²Department of Pediatrics, Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA [John Santelli, MD, MPH]

³Department of Biostatistics, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA [Ivy Chen, MPH; Ying Wei, PhD full professor]

⁴Rakai Health Sciences Program, Kalisizo, Uganda [Fred Nalugoda, PhD, MHSc; Tom Lutalo, PhD; David Serwadda, MD full professor; Joseph Kagaayi, MD, MPH; Mary Kate Graboski, PhD; Maria Wawer, MD, PhD full professor]

⁵Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA [Mary Kate Graboski, PhD; Maria Wawer, MD, PhD full professor; Larry Chang, MD, MPH full professor]

⁶Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA [Maria Wawer, MD, PhD; Larry Chang, MD, MPH]

⁷Department of Pathology, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA [Mary Kate Graboski, PhD]

⁸HIV Center for Clinical and Behavioral Studies, New York State Psychiatric Institute and Columbia University, New York, NY, USA [Susie Hoffman, DrPH, MPH]

⁹Department of Epidemiology, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA [Susie Hoffman, DrPH, MPH, Aleya Khalifa, MPH]

¹⁰Community Health and Social Sciences Department, Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, City University of New York (CUNY) [Phil Kreniske, PhD, MA, MEd]

¹¹Brown School, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA [Fred Ssewamala, PhD full professor]

¹²Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Makerere University School of Public Health, Kampala, Uganda [Joseph Kagaayi, MD, MPH]

¹³Department of Disease Control and Environmental Health, Makerere University School of Public Health, Kampala, Uganda [David Serwadda, MD]

ABSTRACT

Background:

HIV acquisition among adolescents and young adults (AYA, 15-24 years) is influenced by individual factors, community factors, and public policies and programs. We explored the association of HIV incidence and prevalence with these factors over time among AYA in Rakai, Uganda.

Methods:

We examined trends over nine survey rounds (2005-2020) of the Rakai Community Cohort Study (RCCS), an open population-based surveillance cohort of individuals living in 30 continuously followed communities in south-central Uganda (n= 35,938 person rounds). We evaluated the associations between individual and community-level factors including HIV community viremia (CV, a measure of community-level ART use and HIV prevalence) and HIV incidence and prevalence. Logistic GEE, Poisson GLM and univariate models were run for HIV prevalence, HIV incidence, and predictors of interest, respectively.

Findings:

HIV incidence and prevalence declined over time after round 14 (2010-2011) by 66% among AYA men and after round 17 (2015-16) by 60% among young women. Between survey round 11 (2007-2008) and round 19 (2017-2019), the proportions reporting being sexually experienced declined from 58% to 38% in adolescent men (15-19) and from 65% to 35% among adolescent women. The prevalence of VMMC among adolescent men increased from 20% in round 11 to 79% in round 19. At the community-level, we found substantial increases in ART use among PLHIV (5% in round 11 and 86% in round 19) with corresponding declines in community viremia. In multivariable analyses, a combination of individual and community-level factors were found to predict HIV incidence and prevalence among AYA, notably VMMC among young men and community viremia among young women.

Interpretation:

Declines in HIV incidence and prevalence occurred first among AYA men and later among AYA women. These coincided with declines in sexual experience and with public policies that increased access to VMMC and ART. Combination HIV prevention with AYA needs to address risk factors at multiple levels.

Funding:

This work was supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD, grants R01HD091003, R01HD070769, R01HD050180, R01 HD074949, and P2CHD058486), the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (grants R01AI143333, R01AI110324, U01AI100031, U01AI075115, R01AI110324, R01AI102939, and K01AI125086-01), the National Institute of Mental Health (grants R01MH115799, R01MH107275, R01 MH128232, F31MH134699), and the Division of Intramural Research of the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases.

Author Contributions:

SAG, JSS, ISC, TL, YW, ES, SH, AND PK conceived and designed the study. ISC, JT and YW oversaw data cleaning and statistical analysis and directly accessed and verified the underlying data reported in the manuscript. AK and DM accessed the data, created the figures for the resubmission and edited the text. AK and DTL, FN, DS, JK, MKG, MJW, LWC, FMS oversaw data collection. All authors had full access to the data in the study, participated in the interpretation of data and revising the manuscript, and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Research in context

Evidence before this study

Age-specific rates of HIV incidence are often highest among AYA and particularly young women. Risk factors for HIV infection among AYA include earlier sexual initiation, multiple partners, and inconsistent condom use. Combination prevention including community-wide uptake of ART and male medical circumcision has been associated with declines in HIV incidence in Rakai, Uganda in the overall population.^{1,2} A 2019 review of HIV incidence among adolescent girls and young women from 10 high-prevalence African countries found that few studies have examined incidence over time, and among those that there was limited evidence of incidence declines.³

Added value of this study

Using data from 2005-2020 and the Rakai Community Cohort Study (RCCS) in southcentral Uganda, we found evidence that community-level factors including community viremia and ART use, VMMC among young men, and declines in sexual experience were associated with lower risk of HIV acquisition and seroprevalent infection among AYA. Declining HIV incidence and prevalence over time among AYA coincided with policy changes expanding access to ART and VMMC.

Implications of all the available evidence

Age of sexual initiation and community-level factors play critical roles in HIV transmission in Rakai and in declines over time in youth HIV incidence and prevalence. HIV prevention for AYA needs to address individual factors and public policies to improve access to ART and VMMC.

INTRODUCTION

Globally, HIV incidence and prevalence are highest in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) with adolescent and young adults (AYA) at among the highest risk.^{4,5} Adolescent and young adult women (AYAW) accounted for 25% of new HIV infections in 2020, despite representing just 10% of the population.⁴ AYAW, 15-24 years are also at much higher risk compared to adolescent and young adult men (AYAM).

HIV prevention programs and policies should be guided by a nuanced understanding of HIV risk factors and how changes in risk factors and interventions over time may contribute to trends in HIV infection.^{6,7} Risk factors for HIV incident infection among AYA include individual biological and behavioral factors, social conditions, community-level factors including public policies and programs, and HIV prevalence within specific communities.⁷ Certain policies and programs protect individuals but may have community-wide impact; these include access to antiretroviral therapy (ART), voluntary male medical circumcision (VMMC), and PrEP.^{1,8-10} Among AYA, HIV infection may be influenced by social transitions such as leaving school, initiating sexual intercourse, marriage, and initiation of childbearing.¹¹ Social determinants of HIV infection include poverty, gender inequality, stigma, and public policies that promote access to education, sex education, and health services.^{7,12} School enrollment and higher educational attainment are key protective factors among AYA in preventing new HIV infection.^{7,13} Programs like the DREAMS initiative have focused on social and behavioral determinants of HIV transmission¹⁴

Much of the population level data on risk factors is cross-sectional and does not explain changes over time in HIV infection and doesn't include young men. Incidence is difficult to measure as it generally requires longitudinal data collection. Even well characterized risk and protective factors may not explain change over time, if those factors are not changing. For example, behavioral factors such as condom use or biological factors such as cervical ectopy increase infection risk but may show little change over time in a population. Moreover, considerable change in a risk factor may be needed to demonstrate change in HIV incidence within a population. Thus, countries may fail to detect declines in HIV incidence among AYA. A 2019 review by Birdthistle and colleagues of HIV incidence among adolescent girls and young women from ten high-prevalence African countries found evidence of declining incidence in only two cohorts (Manicaland, Zimbabwe and Rakai, Uganda).³ They found little evidence to suggest ART availability or other intervention efforts had slowed HIV transmission through 2016.

In Rakai, Uganda, HIV incidence among reproductive-age persons (15-49 years) declined after the scaling up of combination HIV prevention (CHP) including access to ART beginning in 2004 and VMMC in 2007.¹ Our prior analyses among AYA in Rakai (1999-2011 and 1994-2013) demonstrated that the decline in HIV incidence was associated with improvement in individual behavioral risk factors (declines in sexual experience, multiple partners, and sexual concurrency) and social factors (increases in school enrollment, availability of ART and VMMC, rising SES, declining orphanhood).^{1,2,11,13} Much of the decline in HIV incidence among adolescent women was attributable to increased school enrollment and delayed initiation of sexual intercourse following Uganda's 1997 national policy of universal primary education (UPE).¹³

This analysis extends our previous work in Rakai by quantitatively examining the relationship between community-level factors including ART use and VMMC and HIV incidence and prevalence and includes three additional survey rounds gathered over six years since our last analysis. We include both incidence and prevalence in the study because while HIV incidence reflects recent infections, it is difficult to measure, and most risk factor studies of HIV Infection have used prevalence. Thus, our prevalence analysis provides comparable data to other studies. The incidence analysis has a smaller sample and less power. Calculating both incidence and prevalence offers concordance in our findings. Our prior research comparing predictors of prevalent and incident HIV infection found that they are similar but not identical.¹⁵ We created a variable for "community viremia" which adjusts HIV prevalence in a community for the percentage of PLHIV on ART. Previous research on adolescents in Rakai in SSTAR did not examine community level factors and did not include the most recent year of data from the cohort.

Methods

Study Design, Procedures, and Population

We used data from 30 communities in rounds 11-19 (2005-2020) of the Rakai Community Cohort Study (RCCS), a population-based open cohort of individuals living in the Rakai District in south-central Uganda (n= 35,938 person rounds). Community-wide HIV education, individual and couple's HIV counseling and testing, referral for voluntary male medical circumcision (VMMC), and antiretroviral therapy (ART) are offered free of charge.¹ Currently, adolescents <15 years are not eligible to participate in the RCCS but are enumerated in the household census. Per Uganda's National Clinical guidelines, both written minor assent and parental/guardian permission are obtained for unemancipated minors (<18 years); 18+ year-olds and emancipated minors provide their own written informed consent. Emancipated minors are legally considered adults or have been granted independence from parental control - in this sample they were interviewed and are either household heads, or married, or have a living child. For context, in this sample in the last two survey rounds (rounds 19 and 20) the percentage of young people who were considered emancipated minors was right around 5%.

Each round of the RCCS takes 1-2 years and consists of a household census, enrollment and verification, individual survey interviews, and collection of blood for HIV testing.¹ All households within RCCS communities are included in the census, with data provided by the head of household. All individuals between the ages of 15 and 49 years within a household are eligible for an interview. Two to four weeks after the census, consenting residents (including both new members and those followed-up) are enrolled and asked to provide blood for HIV and sexually transmitted infection testing, treatment, and referral. Enrolled individuals are then interviewed extensively about sexual and reproductive health and HIV risk.

Data are entered electronically in the field and are immediately reviewed by supervisors/editors to ensure data integrity. RCCS participation rates are about 95% of those present at time of survey; about 25% of all censused residents are absent at each round. Acceptance of HIV testing among enrollees is high (>95%).

We used data from 30 RHSP communities which have been surveyed continuously over time (every survey round) from 2005 to 2020 (rounds 11-19). Our analyses focus on AYA age 15 to 24 years at the time of the survey. Data were selected to begin at round 11 (2005-2006) because key questions for our analysis were not asked consistently in earlier survey rounds. We note that round 19 (2018-2020) included data collection both before and during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Approvals were obtained from Uganda Virus Research Institute's REC, Uganda National Council for Science and Technology, and IRBs at Columbia University and Johns Hopkins University.

Variables

Data came from several sources described above including: the census, the RCCS questionnaire, and HIV testing. We used a combination of individual-level variables (age, marital status, VMMC, ART use, school enrollment, sexual initiation, condom use, and number of sex partners) and community-level variables (HIV prevalence, community viremia).

Individual-level variables:

Participant characteristics and other HIV risk factors (age, marital status, male medical circumcision (VMMC), ART use among people living with HIV, school enrollment, sexual initiation, condom use, and number of sex partners) were obtained through self-report from the survey questionnaire. Age is asked in the interview and is double-checked using the census. Participants are asked if they have ever been married and if they are currently married. Men are asked if they are circumcised, and ART use is asked if

a person reports being HIV positive. Self-report of ART use has been validated previously with a specificity of 99% and a sensitivity of 77%.¹⁶ A participant is considered to be enrolled in school if they answer “student” to the occupation question on the survey.¹¹ Educational attainment comes from asking the participant if they have ever attended school and to what level. The RCCS asks about the four most recent sexual partners and examines behaviors such as condom use within each partnership. Consistent condom use in the past 12 months is defined as answering “always” with all partners. The household socioeconomic status (SES) measure was derived from the census using principal component analysis. The census collects nine household assets (e.g., ownership of a bicycle, car, motorcycle) including home construction (e.g., metal roof). SES was standardized based on the distribution of scores over 19 rounds of RCCS data collection (1994-2018) using a z-transformation.

HIV infection was obtained through testing provided during the RCCS survey interview. HIV incidence analyses included participants who had at least two rounds of data and skipped no more than one round in between.¹ An incident case was a person who was HIV negative at the first round and then was HIV positive at the next round. Individuals who were HIV- positive at enrollment or had more than one intermediate round missing were removed from the incidence analysis.

Community-level variables:

People living with HIV who adhere to ART are much less likely to transmit HIV to others (Saag et al., 2019). By effectively blocking HIV replication, ART helps to reduce the viral load in PLWH, contributing to improved health outcomes and decreased transmission risk. Community viremia is the community HIV prevalence adjusted for the proportion of individuals within a community who have initiated ART. Community viremia was defined as community-level HIV prevalence minus 90% of the proportion of those individuals living with HIV who report being on ART, i.e.,: $\text{Viremia} = \text{HIV Prevalence} - (90\% * \text{ART Coverage} * \text{HIV Prevalence})$.¹ To estimate HIV risk among AGYW, we calculated community viremia based on data from men age 15-34 years and to estimate risk among ABYM we calculated community viremia based on data from women age 15-30 years. These age ranges were selected as they are the age groups most likely to transmit HIV to AYA.¹⁷ AYA women have somewhat older male partners up to approximately age 34, while AYA men have slightly younger female partners up to approximately age 30.^{11,18} These variables were computed at the community level, and each community was assigned a value for each round.

Analysis

The analysis was performed using R version 4.2.1 or later. Each factor of interest (participant characteristics, and HIV prevalence and incidence) was summarized by round and age group. Participant characteristics were examined separately by gender. Linear trends were fit for all factors to examine change over time. Quadratic trends for time were also fit for participant characteristics. Linear and quadratic provide different information. Over long periods of time, the direction of change over time may change. Quadratic (often curvilinear) suggests an inflection point in slope or non-linear change over time. A conceptual model) was created to conceptualize the relationships between variables and decide which variables should be included in the modeling (see Figure 1 in supplementary materials page 3). Models were selected according to the variable type. Logistic generalized estimating equations (GEE) was used for dichotomous outcomes, and Gaussian GEE for continuous outcomes. Multinomial or ordinal logistic regression with robust standard errors was used for multivariate outcomes (HIV prevalence). Poisson Generalized Linear Models (GLM) were used for HIV incidence.

Our primary outcomes were HIV seroprevalent infection and HIV seroincident infection. As described above, logistic GEE models were run for HIV prevalence and Poisson GLM were run for HIV incidence, separately by gender. Predictors were informed by knowledge of HIV prevalence and incidence among AYA, and included round, marriage status, number of sex partners, SES category, age group, community viremia, and VMMC for men.

Role of the funding source

The NIH had no role in study design, data analysis, writing, or manuscript submission.

Results

The data include 9 survey rounds, with an average of 2,164 young women and 1,834 young men participating per round. There are a total of 19,473 and 16,510 person-rounds of data for young women and young men, respectively.

HIV incidence declined after round 14 (2010-2011) among AYA men and after round 17 (2015-2016) among young women (Figure 1 and supplemental table 1 page 4). HIV incidence declined 60% among AYA women from round 17 (2015-2016) to round 19 (2018-2020) (12.1 to 4.9 per thousand, $p=0.09$) and 66% among AYA men from round 14 (2010-2011) to round 19 (2018-2020) (8.9 to 3.0 per thousand, $p=0.07$). The timing of declines in HIV prevalence had a similar pattern - declining first among young men and then among young women (Figure 1, Supplemental Table 1 page 4). Among young women, the decline was 51% from round 17 (2015-2016) to round 19 (2018-2020) (7.1% to 3.5%, $p<0.001$). Among young men, the decline in prevalence was 44% from round 14 (2010-2011) to round 19 (2018-2020) (2.5% to 1.4%, $p=0.03$). For young adult women, HIV prevalence increased over time and peaked in round 13 (2008-2009) before declining again (supplementary table 1 page 4, $p<0.001$). HIV incidence and prevalence were consistently higher among AYA women compared to AYA men and higher among 20-24-years-old compared to 15-19-year-olds.

Social and Behavioral HIV Risk Factors (Figures 2 and 3 and supplemental Table 2 and 3 pages 5-9)

Among women, school enrollment increased to round 14 (2010-2011), plateaued and then declined in round 19 (2018-2020) among both adolescents and young adults (quadratic trends, $p<0.001$ and $p<0.001$). Marriage (ever and current) decreased over time among both adolescent and young adult women. Household SES increased steadily over time, as we have previously reported.^{19, 20}

Reporting ever having had sex decreased among adolescents ($p<0.001$), from 65% in round 11 (2005-2006) to 35% in round 19 (2018-2020); ever sex also declined among young adults (98% in round 11 (2005-2006) to 90% in round 19 (2018-2020)). However, among those sexually experienced, having two or more sexual partners increased among both adolescent (10% to 14%, $p<0.001$) and young adult women (8% to 12%, $p<0.001$). Consistent condom use with most recent partner declined from 25% to 17% ($p<0.001$) among adolescents and from 9% to 5% ($p=0.001$) among young adults.

Among adolescent men, trends in school enrollment were similar to those among adolescent women; enrollment increased through round 14 (2010-2011) and then decreased (linear and quadratic trends ($p<0.001$, Table 2). Marriage was not common among adolescent men; among young adult men, the proportion who were never married increased from 63% to 73% while that of those currently married decreased from 34% to 21%. Household SES increased steadily over time.

Among men, reporting ever had sexual experience declined from 58% to 38% among adolescents and from 95% to 87% from young adult men. VMMC increased considerably over time across both age groups, from 20% in round 11 (2005-2006) to 79% at round 19 (2018-2020) among adolescents and from 22% to 72% among young adult men. Having two or more sex partners in the past year showed a

quadratic trend among both adolescent and young adult men, decreasing to the lowest level at round 15 (2011-2013) and then increasing. Consistent condom use with most recent partner did not change for adolescents but decreased for young adult men from 34% to 25%. Condom use with 2-4th partners showed no change over time.

Community Level HIV Risk Factors (Figure 4 and supplemental table 4 page 10)

Population-wide, ART use among PLHIV in Rakai rose from 5% in round 11 (2005-2006) to 86% in round 19 (2018-2020) (Supplemental Table 4 page 10), while HIV prevalence did not change over the same time period. Community viremia which is based on both ART use and HIV declined by 70%, from 14.6% to 4.4%. The population prevalence of MCC rose from 24% in round 11 (2005-2006) to 66% in round 19 (2018-2020). Trends in VMMC accelerated over time among adolescent men (quadratic trend, $p < 0.001$); this pattern corresponds to both the randomized control trial of VMMC in Rakai (2003-2007) and to the roll out of VMMC as a routine service after 2007.

Supplementary figure 2 (page 13) displays the univariate associations between selected individual- and community-level factors and HIV prevalence among AYA women and men. In univariate models, being previously married and older were the strongest risk factors for HIV prevalence. Being previously married was associated with 5.44 (95% CI: 3.65-8.13) and 3.36 (95% CI: 2.61-4.34) greater odds of prevalent HIV infection compared to never having been married among AYA men and women, respectively. Compared to 15-19-year-olds, persons aged 20-24 years had approximately 4-fold greater odds of prevalent HIV infection among AYA men (OR: 4.04, 95% CI: 2.88-5.64) and 2-fold greater odds of prevalent HIV infection among AYA women (OR: 2.01, 95% CI: 1.81-2.23), respectively. Multiple sexual partners in the previous year, and increased community viremia were also associated with higher risk of prevalent HIV infection compared to 0-1 sexual partners and lower community viremia. Before adjustment, VMMC and high SES were associated with reduced HIV risk compared to no VMMC and lower SES categories. Although there was less statistical power to detect an association, in general, univariate associations were similar for HIV incidence (Supplementary figure 3 page 14).

In multivariable analyses, a combination of individual and community-level factors were found to predict HIV incidence and prevalence among AYA, notably VMMC among young men and community viremia among young women. **Figure 5** summarizes the associations between VMMC and community viremia and risk of HIV prevalence and incidence among AGYW and ABYM. Measures of association were adjusted for survey round, age group, marital status, household SES, school enrollment, and number of sexual partners. Full models are found in Supplemental Materials, Tables 5 and 6. Among ABYM, VMMC was associated with a 58% reduction in HIV incidence (IRR: 0.42, 95% CI: 0.23-0.76) and a 36% reduction in HIV prevalence (OR: 0.64, 95% CI: 0.48-0.86). Each 10% increase in community viremia was associated with 73% increased risk of HIV prevalent infection (OR: 1.73, 95% CI: 1.21-2.47) and 85% increased risk of HIV incident infection (IRR: 1.85, 95% CI: 0.90-3.81) among ABYM. Although the same increase in community viremia among AGYW was still associated with increased HIV prevalence (OR: 1.39, 95% CI: 1.17-1.65) and HIV incidence (IRR: 1.71, 95% CI: 1.03-2.84), associations were weaker than among AYA men, respectively. Risk estimates were generally similar and directionally concordant for both HIV prevalence and incidence.

Discussion

We found substantial declines in both HIV incidence and prevalence among AYA in Rakai - first among young men after 2011 and then among young women after 2016. The current findings align with World Bank estimates for Uganda, showing that AGYW have been disproportionately affected by the HIV epidemic, with consistently higher incidence and prevalence than ABYM. Both groups experienced declines in HIV prevalence and incidence over the study period, consistent with World Bank data.

Alongside these declines were community-wide increases in use of ART and VMMC and decreases in sexual experience among adolescents. Declines in HIV incidence and prevalence coincided with the implementation of public policies and resources to increase access to VMMC and ART.^{1,2,21}

We identified a number of well-characterized risk factors for HIV incidence or prevalence which are unlikely to explain the declines in HIV incidence and prevalence in Rakai beginning after round 14 (2010-2011) for young men and after round 17 (2015-2016) for AYA women. Condom use (a protective factor) decreased over time and thus cannot explain a decrease in HIV incidence and prevalence. Likewise, having multiple partners is a well described risk factor for HIV and other STIs. However, the prevalence of multiple partners among sexually experienced AYA increased over time - making it unlikely to explain decreases in HIV incidence or prevalence. Similarly, household socioeconomic status increased linearly from 2005 to 2020 and thus the trajectory of SES increases was not consistent with timing of the decline in incidence and prevalence - after rounds 14 (2010-2011) and 17 (2015-2016) for men and women, respectively.

While both individual and community-level factors were predictors of HIV incidence and prevalence most did not explain change over time. VMMC and ART use emerged as potential drivers of the decline in HIV infection among AYA in Rakai, warranting future causal analyses to estimate each of their effects on the youth epidemic. Both are well-established factors in preventing HIV transmission. The timing of the declines in HIV incidence and prevalence also follows closely upon the roll out of ART after 2004 within Rakai communities and the corresponding decline in community viremia. The pattern of increasing VMMC among AYA men (which began in 2005 and accelerated after 2009) corresponds to both the randomized controlled trial of VMMC in Rakai and to the roll out of VMMC as a routine service after 2007.^{1,2,21}

VMMC directly protects men and - over time - may indirectly protect women by lowering prevalence among men.^{21,22} The earlier decline in HIV incidence and prevalence among AYA men compared to AYA women is consistent with this pattern of direct and indirect protection. These patterns of change in our data from AYA are similar to the declines reported among the entire Rakai cohort (men and women 15-49 years).^{1,2} Those analyses demonstrated that the incidence of HIV infection declined significantly following the scaling up of combination HIV prevention.¹

The decline in sexual experience among Rakai adolescents was sizable and may have contributed to the decline in HIV incidence and prevalence for adolescent women and men, though more research is needed to determine its effect. It may have a much smaller impact among young adults as most had initiated sex by the early 20s. Delaying initiation of sex among adolescents can be effective in reducing HIV transmission.²³

Explaining the decline in sexual experience is more complicated. In our prior research on HIV trends among Rakai adolescents through 2011, decline in sexual experience was highly associated with rising school enrollment.¹³ In these newer data, we note that school enrollment among adolescents plateaued after 2011 and declined in round 19 (2018-2020) during COVID-19 school closures. Similar patterns in school enrollment have been reported for Uganda since 2007.²⁴ Thus, school enrollment may no longer be the primary driver of trends in sexual initiation in Rakai. Our updated analysis through 2020 strongly suggests a change in our understanding of HIV risk among AYA. The new data suggest that ART and VMMC may now be major drivers of the decline in HIV infection among AYA in Rakai. This is consistent with findings from other studies that have demonstrated the role of both community level as well as individual level risk factors for HIV incidence.²⁵

An important contribution of this analysis is the inclusion of community-level risk factors for HIV incident and prevalent infections among AYA. The creation and inclusion of a community viremia

variable, and the ability to look at VMMC at both the individual and community level allowed us to explore temporal trends of combination prevention and how they relate to trends of individual risk of HIV incidence and prevalence. Another contribution of this analysis is the modeling of both HIV incidence and prevalence. By examining both outcomes, we were able to understand epidemiologic trends more completely.

Limitations

These analyses have several limitations. First, the majority of our measures, aside from HIV infection, were based on self-reported survey data. With this type of sensitive self-reported data, there may be a risk of social desirability bias and recall error. However, the RCCS, as one of the oldest and largest population-based studies in Southern Africa, has extensive procedures to assure validity and reliability. For example, ART self-report use has high specificity and moderate sensitivity in this population.¹⁶ Likewise, participant-reported circumcision status has been validated previously from Rakai clinical records, with a specificity of 90%.²¹ Second, because the RCCS is an open cohort, participants may move in and out of the study area and therefore the sample. Mobility is high, and in-migrants may differ meaningfully from out-migrants. Third, selection bias should be considered – participation is high (~95%) in the RCCS of individuals present at the time of the survey, however about 25% are absent at a specific round, typically due to work or school. Fourth, the Rakai district is primarily rural and RCCS findings may not be generalizable to other settings. However, prior studies have found that the RCCS is representative of the broader Ugandan population.²⁶ Finally, we do not have data to assess the impact of other interventions such as DREAMS on this population.

Implications

This analysis suggests that individual risk behaviors may continue to play a role in HIV incident and prevalent infection. Thus, it remains important to have conversations with adolescents about their individual behaviors. However, community level factors may play an important role and therefore these conversations should occur within the context of larger social forces of transmission risk.

Thus, it is not sufficient to focus on individual behaviors to prevent HIV infection among AYA. HIV prevention with AYA needs to consider community access to ART and VMMC across the lifespan, and policies and programs that delay initiation of sex. More analysis is needed to understand the proportion of HIV risk among AYA attributable to each of these factors. Future research could employ causal inference methods and leverage longitudinal population-based data sources like the RCCS to determine causal effects.

Acknowledgements

We thank the NIH for funding this research. We would like to thank the participants of the RCCS and the Rakai Health Sciences researchers for their invaluable contributions. We would also like to thank Kate Hicks and Meg Nolte for their assistance with the preparation of this manuscript.

Data Sharing:

A deidentified version of the RCCS data may be provided to interested parties subject to completion of the Rakai Health Sciences Program data request form and signing of a Data Transfer Agreement. Inquiries should be directed to datarequests@rhsp.org.


References

1. Grabowski MK, Serwadda DM, Gray RH, et al. HIV Prevention Efforts and Incidence of HIV in Uganda. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377(22):2154-2166. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1702150

2. Gertrude Nakigozi, Larry W. Chang, Steven J. Reynolds, et al. Rapidly Declining HIV Incidence Among Men and Women in Rakai, Uganda. In: CROI Foundation; 2020. <https://www.croiconference.org/croi-2020/>
3. Birdthistle I, Tanton C, Tomita A, et al. Recent levels and trends in HIV incidence rates among adolescent girls and young women in ten high-prevalence African countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2019;7(11):e1521-e1540. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(19)30410-3
4. UNAIDS. *UNAIDS Data 2021*. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS; 2021. https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2021/2021_unaids_data
5. Jahagirdar D, Walters MK, Novotney A, et al. Global, regional, and national sex-specific burden and control of the HIV epidemic, 1990–2019, for 204 countries and territories: the Global Burden of Diseases Study 2019. *Lancet HIV*. 2021;8(10):e633-e651. doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(21)00152-1
6. Mavedzenge SN, Luecke E, Ross DA. Effective Approaches for Programming to Reduce Adolescent Vulnerability to HIV Infection, HIV Risk, and HIV-Related Morbidity and Mortality: A Systematic Review of Systematic Reviews. *JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2014;66(Supplement 2):S154-S169. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000000178
7. Mmari K, Blum RW. Risk and protective factors that affect adolescent reproductive health in developing countries: A structured literature review. *Glob Public Health*. 2009;4(4):350-366. doi:10.1080/17441690701664418
8. Kurth AE, Celum C, Baeten JM, Vermund SH, Wasserheit JN. Combination HIV Prevention: Significance, Challenges, and Opportunities. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2011;8(1):62-72. doi:10.1007/s11904-010-0063-3
9. Buchbinder SP, Liu A. Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis and the Promise of Combination Prevention Approaches. *AIDS Behav*. 2011;15(S1):72-79. doi:10.1007/s10461-011-9894-1
10. Padian NS, Buvé A, Balkus J, Serwadda D, Cates W. Biomedical interventions to prevent HIV infection: evidence, challenges, and way forward. *The Lancet*. 2008;372(9638):585-599. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60885-5
11. Hoffman S, Zhang A, Nguyen N, et al. Incident HIV Infection Among Young Men Associated With Female Sexual Partner Types Identified Through Latent Class Analysis, Rakai, Uganda. *JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2022;90(2):124-131. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000002928
12. Viner RM, Ozer EM, Denny S, et al. Adolescence and the social determinants of health. *The Lancet*. 2012;379(9826):1641-1652. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60149-4
13. Santelli JS, Edelstein ZR, Wei Y, et al. Trends in HIV acquisition, risk factors and prevention policies among youth in Uganda, 1999–2011. *AIDS*. 2015;29(2):211-219. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000000533
14. Saul, J., Bachman, G., Allen, S., Toiv, N. F., Cooney, C., & Beamon, T. (2018). The DREAMS core package of interventions: A comprehensive approach to preventing HIV among adolescent girls and young women. *PloS one*, 13(12), e0208167. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0208167>
15. Edelstein ZR, Santelli JS, Helleringer S, et al. Factors associated with incident HIV infection versus prevalent infection among youth in Rakai, Uganda. *J Epidemiol Glob Health*. 2014;5(1):85. doi:10.1016/j.jegh.2014.09.003


16. Grabowski MK, Reynolds SJ, Kagaayi J, et al. The validity of self-reported antiretroviral use in persons living with HIV: a population-based study. *AIDS*. 2018;32(3):363-369. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000001706
17. Monod M, Brizzi A, Galiwango RM, et al. *Longitudinal Population-Level HIV Epidemiological and Genomic Surveillance Highlights Growing Gender Disparity of HIV Transmission in Uganda*. Epidemiology; 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.03.16.23287351
18. N. Nguyen, R. Tsong, T. Lutalo, et al. Sexual partner types of adolescent girls and young women identified from latent class analysis (LCA) and incident HIV-infection in Rakai, Uganda. In: ; 2020. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7350918/>
19. Santelli JS, Chen I, Makumbi F, et al. Household wealth and HIV incidence over time, rural Uganda, 1994–2018. *AIDS*. 2021;35(11):1835-1843. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000002989
20. Esther J. Spindler. “*Child Marriage*” Declines as Social Change? *The Influence of Global Priorities, Social Determinants and Norms in Changing Adolescent Marriages in Southcentral Uganda, 1999-2018*. Columbia University; 2022.
21. Gray RH, Kigozi G, Serwadda D, et al. Male circumcision for HIV prevention in men in Rakai, Uganda: a randomised trial. *The Lancet*. 2007;369(9562):657-666. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(07)60313-4
22. Wawer MJ, Makumbi F, Kigozi G, et al. Circumcision in HIV-infected men and its effect on HIV transmission to female partners in Rakai, Uganda: a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2009;374(9685):229-237. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60998-3
23. Patton GC, Sawyer SM, Santelli JS, et al. Our future: a Lancet commission on adolescent health and wellbeing. *The Lancet*. 2016;387(10036):2423-2478. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)00579-1
24. Maurice Mbuanya Mamba. *Do Tuition Elimination Policies in Sub-Saharan Africa Matter? Evidence from the Universal Secondary Education Policy in Uganda*. Doctoral Dissertation. Columbia University; 2020.
25. Skalland T, Ayles H, Bock P, et al. Community- and individual-level correlates of HIV incidence in HPTN 071 (PopART). *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2023;26(8):e26155. doi:10.1002/jia2.26155
26. Grabowski MK, Lessler J, Redd AD, et al. The Role of Viral Introductions in Sustaining Community-Based HIV Epidemics in Rural Uganda: Evidence from Spatial Clustering, Phylogenetics, and Egocentric Transmission Models. Hallett T, ed. *PLoS Med*. 2014;11(3):e1001610. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001610

Figure 1. Trends in HIV among Adolescents and Young People in 30 Communities, Rakai District, Uganda, 2005–2020



HIV prevalence and incidence are shown using a moving average based on 2 rounds, starting in round 11. The moving average represents the unweighted mean value across two rounds. Starting in Round 11, we average Round 11 and Round 12 which is represented at the R12 timepoint in Figure 1. Then, R12 and 13 are represented at 13, and so on. This serves to smooth the curve across time.


Figure 2. Trends of Community-level HIV Indicators among Adolescents and Young People in 30 Communities, Rakai District, Uganda, 2005–2020




Values displayed are averages of all community-level values. Community level variables are calculated among men ages 15–34.

Figure 3. Trends in Social HIV Risk Factors among Adolescents and Young People in 30 Communities, Rakai District, Uganda, 2005–2020


School Enrollment



Marital Status



Socioeconomic Status



Enrolled

Currently married

Never married

Previously married

High-medium

Highest

Low-medium

Lowest

Figure 4. Trends in Behavioral HIV Risk Factors in 10 Communities, Rakai District, Uganda, 2005–2020





Figure 5. Comparison of community-level predictors for HIV prevalence and incidence among adolescents and young adults, Rakai District, Uganda, 2005-2020.



*Multivariable models for HIV prevalence show adjusted odds ratios. Multivariable models for HIV incidence show adjusted incidence rate ratios. Each model adjusted for survey round, age group, marital status, household SES, school enrollment, number of sexual partners, community viremia and VMMC for men. Full models found in Supplemental Materials, Tables 5 and 6.

Supplementary Material

Declines in HIV Incidence and Prevalence and Predictors Among Adolescents and Young Adults: An Observational Cohort Study, Rakai, Uganda, 2005-2020

Stephanie A Grilo¹, Julia Thompson¹, Ivy S Chen³, Fred Nalugoda⁴, Tom Lutalo⁴, Ying Wei³, Esther Spindler¹, Susie Hoffman^{8,9}, Philip Kreniske¹⁰, David Serwadda^{4,13}, Joseph Kagaayi^{4,12}, Mary Kate Grabowski^{4,5,7}, Maria J Wawer^{4,5,6}, Fred M Ssewamala¹¹, Larry W Chang^{5,6}, Aleya Khalifa⁹, Debbie Malden¹, John S Santelli^{1,2}

Corresponding Author and Request for Reprints:

John S Santelli, MD
Heilbrunn Dept of Population and Family Health
Columbia University
60 Haven Avenue, room B310
New York, NY 10032
917-846-3288
Js2637@columbia.edu

¹Department of Population and Family Health, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

²Department of Pediatrics, Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

³Department of Biostatistics, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

⁴Rakai Health Sciences Program, Kalisizo, Uganda

⁵Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

⁶Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA

⁷Department of Pathology, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA

⁸HIV Center for Clinical and Behavioral Studies, New York State Psychiatric Institute and Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

⁹Department of Epidemiology, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA


¹⁰Community Health and Social Sciences Department, Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, City University of New York (CUNY)

¹¹Brown School, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA

¹²Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Makerere University School of Public Health, Kampala, Uganda

¹³Department of Disease Control and Environmental Health, Makerere University School of Public Health, Kampala, Uganda

Supplemental Figure 1. Conceptual Model



Supplemental Table 1. HIV Prevalence and HIV Incidence Among Young Women and Young Men 15-24 Years, Rakai District, Uganda, 2005-2020.

			RCCS Round										
Model Type	Gender	Age Group	N	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	P-value
Prevalence	Males	15-24	22942	2.4	1.9	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.0	1.6	1.5	1.4	0.590
		15-19	12338	0.0	0.7	0.8	1.1	1.3	0.4	0.4	0.9	1.1	0.017
		20-24	10604	4.6	3.3	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.1	3.2	2.3	2.0	0.033
	Females	15-24	29250	7.9	7.9	7.4	7.1	7.7	7.0	7.1	5.3	3.5	0.073
		15-19	13935	4.6	2.6	2.2	2.5	3.3	2.3	3.3	1.9	1.3	0.002
		20-24	15315	10.3	12.1	12.3	12.1	12.1	11.8	11.2	9.2	6.1	0.500
Incidence	Males	15-24	10668	4.2	6.8	6.4	8.9	4.5	2.1	2.5	2.8	3.0	0.008
		15-19	4677	0.0	4.7	3.4	3.1	3.9	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.019
		20-24	5991	6.3	8.0	8.6	13.6	5.1	2.9	4.4	5.2	5.1	0.095
	Females	15-24	11761	14.2	14.1	10.9	13.8	10.2	12.7	12.1	2.1	4.9	<0.001
		15-19	4298	23.7	9.8	6.4	5.2	6.8	7.0	4.3	0.0	1.2	<0.001
		20-24	7463	10.5	16.0	13.0	20.0	12.6	15.5	17.3	3.6	7.7	0.085

P-values for prevalence models were estimated using GEE (binary with logit link); p-values for incidence models were estimated using GLM Poisson regression, offset log(time)

HIV prevalence is percentage.

HIV incidence per 1000 person-year (no. of new HIV-positive)

Supplemental Table 2. Trends in HIV Prevalence, Social Factors, and Behavioral Factors among Young Women 15–24 Years, Rakai District, Uganda, 2005-2020

	Survey Round									P-Value	
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	Linear Trend, Rounds 11-19	Quadratic Trend, Rounds 11-19
Start Date	2/2005	8/2006	6/2008	1/2010	8/2011	7/2013	2/2015	10/2016	6/2018		
End Date	6/2006	4/2008	11/2009	6/2011	5/2013	1/2015	9/2016	5/2018	10/2020		

Sample of young women (15–24 years)												
15–19 years old	735	837	851	970	1086	1228	1283	1372	1369	0.004	0.001	
20–24 years old	1058	1039	885	908	1101	1219	1215	1176	1141			
HIV Prevalence												
Number of HIV+ young women 15–24 years	140	147	128	134	169	172	178	134	87			
% HIV+ among 15–24 years old	7.9	7.9	7.4	7.1	7.7	7.0	7.1	5.3	3.5	0.073	<0.001	
% HIV+ among 15–19 years old	4.6	2.6	2.2	2.5	3.3	2.3	3.3	1.9	1.3	0.002	0.165	
% HIV+ among 20–24 years old	10.3	12.1	12.3	12.1	12.1	11.8	11.2	9.2	6.1	0.503	<0.001	
Social Factors												
Enrolled in school												
% of 15–19 years old	48.8	52.0	58.8	59.5	56.2	56.4	52.3	60.7	53.5	0.373	<0.001	
% of 20–24 years old	5.3	6.3	4.9	5.1	4.3	3.4	1.3	7.0	8.9	0.126	<0.001	
Marital status												
% of 15–19 years old												
Never married	72.1	74.6	78.5	77.8	75.3	78.8	81.1	82.2	85.2			
Previously married	1.2	0.5	0.9	1.3	1.6	2.1	1.6	1.3	1.1	0.523	<0.001	
Currently married	26.7	25.0	20.6	20.8	23.1	19.1	17.3	16.5	13.7	<0.001	<0.001	
% of 20–24 years old												
Never married	24.0	24.4	21.2	21.3	21.9	24.9	23.6	25.2	31.0			
Previously married	5.7	5.3	7.1	6.1	6.8	8.3	8.5	10.5	7.3	0.031	<0.001	
Currently married	70.3	70.3	71.6	72.7	71.3	66.8	67.9	64.4	61.7	<0.001	<0.001	
SES category												
% of 15–19 years old										<0.001	<0.001	
Lowest	14.8	9.8	8.7	6.9	5.4	4.7	3.7	3.4	3.4			
Low-medium	24.8	23.1	22.5	19.3	17.1	15.1	11.5	11.3	10.1			
High-medium	30.3	32.9	34.9	33.4	33.3	32.1	32.0	31.0	27.6			
Highest	30.1	34.1	33.9	40.4	44.2	48.1	52.8	54.2	58.9			
% of 20–24 years old										<0.001	<0.001	
Lowest	11.5	7.8	6.9	7.1	4.7	3.8	3.1	2.5	1.5			
Low-medium	21.2	20.4	18.3	15.5	16.3	13.9	9.5	8.7	8.7			
High-medium	38.8	41.1	40.2	38.4	40.4	35.4	34.0	35.0	30.8			

Highest	28.5	30.7	34.6	39.0	38.6	46.9	53.4	53.8	59.1		
Behavioral Factors, Among All Women 15-24											
Ever had sexual experience											
% of 15–19 years old	65.4	63.6	55.2	50.6	54.1	47.7	47.2	39.7	34.6	<0.001	0.254
% of 20–24 years old	97.8	98.0	98.4	97.8	98.3	96.6	96.8	95.7	90.4	<0.001	<0.001
Behavioral Factors, Among Sexually Experienced Women 15-24											
Number of sexual partners, last 12 months											
15–19 years old											
0-1	89.6	90.2	88.6	93.5	87.4	88.2	84.9	86.2	85.6		
2 or more	10.4	9.8	11.4	6.5	12.6	11.8	15.1	13.8	14.4	<0.001	0.451
20-24 years old											
0-1	91.9	92.2	94.5	94.2	92.1	89.5	89.6	88.0	88.2		
2 or more	8.1	7.8	5.5	5.8	7.9	10.5	10.4	12.0	11.8	<0.001	0.059
Always used condoms, most recent partner in last 12 months											
% of 15–19 years old	25.2	28.2	28.5	24.4	18.3	23.7	22.9	20.2	17.1	<0.001	0.540
% of 20–24 years old	8.5	9.5	7.0	6.2	5.8	5.6	7.7	6.9	5.2	0.001	0.365
Always used condom with 2–4 partners, last 12 months											
% of 15–19 years old	48.6	45.5	57.1	55.0	51.4	47.8	52.9	72.1	62.9	0.051	0.393
% of 20–24 years old	50.7	57.4	46.7	52.9	32.7	38.6	44.3	34.1	60.0	0.219	0.012

P-values for linear and quadratic trends were calculated according to the outcome variable type. Generalized Estimating Equations with Logit link were used for bivariate outcomes; Multinomial or Ordinal Logistic Regression were used for multivariate outcomes

Supplemental Table 3. Trends in HIV Prevalence, Social Factors, and HIV Risk Factors in Young Men 15–24 Years in 30 Communities, Rakai District, Uganda, 2005-2020

	Survey Round									P-Value	
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	Linear Trend, Rounds 11-19	Quadratic Trend, Rounds 11-19
Start Date	2/2005	8/2006	6/2008	1/2010	8/2011	7/2013	2/2015	10/2016	6/2018		
End Date	6/2006	4/2008	11/2009	6/2011	5/2013	1/2015	9/2016	5/2018	10/2020		
Sample of young men (15–24 years)											
15–19 years old	602	778	799	934	1120	1215	1265	1289	1334	0.718	<0.001
20-24 years old	691	640	599	682	794	877	972	963	956		
HIV Prevalence											
HIV prevalence, % (no. of HIV-positive)											
Number of HIV+ young men 15-24 years	29	26	32	40	48	41	36	33	33		
% of HIV+ 15–24 years old	2.4	1.9	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.0	1.6	1.5	1.4	0.592	0.025
% of HIV+ 15–19 years old	0.0	0.7	0.8	1.1	1.3	0.4	0.4	0.9	1.1	0.017	0.014
% of HIV+ 20–24 years old	4.6	3.3	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.1	3.2	2.3	2.0	0.033	0.055
Social Factors											
Enrolled in school											
% of 15–19 years old	59.1	61.5	63.3	68.2	66.8	62.9	65.4	60.0	55.5	<0.001	<0.001
% of 20–24 years old	14.5	12.9	12.9	14.4	14.1	11.4	5.2	13.8	13.7	0.025	0.151
Marital status											
% of 15–19 years old											
Never married	97.2	97.7	98.5	99.3	98.8	99.0	98.8	98.7	98.4		
Previously married	0.0	0.8	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.386	<0.001
Currently married	2.8	1.5	1.4	0.5	1.1	1.0	0.8	1.0	1.1	0.015	<0.001
% of 20–24 years old											
Never married	63.1	63.4	62.9	65.8	66.1	69.8	70.8	72.9	72.7		
Previously married	3.2	2.8	4.5	3.5	2.9	5.2	5.3	4.4	6.6	0.005	<0.001
Currently married	33.7	33.7	32.6	30.6	31.0	25.0	23.9	22.7	20.7	<0.001	<0.001

SES category											
% of 15–19 years old										<0.001	<0.001
Lowest	13.8	11.2	8.9	6.6	5.6	5.0	3.8	3.3	2.1		
Low-medium	25.4	22.1	21.5	19.9	14.9	16.8	14.5	12.6	8.6		
High-medium	28.7	33.6	31.8	31.3	33.8	30.3	29.4	29.3	26.5		
Highest	32.1	33.1	37.8	42.1	45.7	47.9	52.3	54.7	62.7		
% of 20–24 years old										<0.001	<0.001
Lowest	14.2	10.6	11.7	7.2	4.9	2.9	3.4	2.8	2.5		
Low-medium	24.5	22.7	24.5	18.1	18.8	15.4	10.4	11.0	7.5		
High-medium	32.2	34.3	33.1	32.2	32.9	34.1	32.4	32.0	28.6		
Highest	29.0	32.4	30.7	42.6	43.4	47.6	53.8	54.2	61.4		
Behavioral Factors, Among All Men 15-24											
Ever had sexual experience											
% of 15–19 years old	58.0	51.4	45.3	39.6	40.5	40.2	44.0	36.1	38.3	<0.001	<0.001
% of 20–24 years old	95.0	93.4	91.7	91.3	91.7	91.2	90.8	89.7	87.4	<0.001	0.776
Behavioral Factors Among Sexually Experienced Men 15-24											
Male medical circumcision											
% of 15–19 years old	20.2	22.1	25.4	31.4	33.0	49.5	64.2	73.4	79.2	<0.001	<0.001
% of 20–24 years old	21.9	30.3	35.2	38.6	45.7	54.4	61.5	68.5	72.3	<0.001	0.245
Number of sex partners, last 12 months											
15–19 years old											
0-1	67.6	62.8	67.6	73.1	73.6	73.8	67.6	61.4	53.5		
2 or more	32.4	37.2	32.4	26.9	26.4	26.2	32.4	38.6	46.5	<0.001	<0.001
20-24 years old											
0-1	52.4	50.5	53.3	62.3	63.7	55.7	53.9	52.2	48.3		
2 or more	47.6	49.5	46.7	37.7	36.3	44.3	46.1	47.8	51.7	0.107	<0.001
Always used condoms, most recent partner in last 12 months											
% of 15–19 years old	45.7	45.5	49.8	46.8	46.5	49.1	43.5	46.3	43.4	0.366	0.279
% of 20–24 years old	34.0	31.9	30.2	31.1	28.0	31.1	28.3	29.6	25.1	<0.001	0.564
Always used condom with 2–4 partners, last 12 months											
% of 15–19 years old	57.3	56.4	63.5	63.0	66.1	55.7	70.8	58.8	62.8	0.408	0.435

% of 20–24 years old	51·1	53·7	54·8	53·3	55·2	57·4	55·8	52·8	48·4	0·615	0·031
----------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	-------	-------

P-values for linear and quadratic trends were calculated according to the outcome variable type. Generalized Estimating Equations with Logit link were used for bivariate outcomes; Multinomial or Ordinal Logistic Regression were used for multivariate outcomes

Supplemental Table 4. Trends in Community Level HIV Risk Factors in 30 Communities, Rakai District, Uganda, 2005-2020

										P-Value	
										Linear Trend	Quadratic Trend
Women	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19		
Community HIV Prevalence	11.9	11.4	11.8	11.6	12.3	11.4	11.4	9.5	8.2	<0.001	0.007
% ART among people living with HIV	6.5	5.9	9.8	11.5	18.4	46.9	62.7	67.6	72.8	<0.001	<0.001
Community Viremia	11.2	10.7	10.8	10.3	10.1	6.7	5.1	3.8	2.9	<0.001	0.001
										P-Value	
										Linear Trend	Quadratic Trend
Men	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19		
Community HIV Prevalence	8.1	7.0	8.4	7.6	7.4	6.6	5.8	5.1	4.2	<0.001	0.040
% ART among people living with HIV	4.0	5.9	9.5	10.5	19.1	34.7	50.0	55.8	65.8	<0.001	<0.001
Community Viremia	8.0	6.9	7.9	7.1	6.1	4.6	3.3	2.6	1.8	<0.001	0.230
Community Prevalence Male Medical Circumcision	21.8	29.7	34.6	39.6	42.8	55.8	62.8	70.2	73.8	<0.001	0.029

Community level variables are calculated among men ages 15-34

P-values for linear and quadratic trends were calculated using Generalized Estimating Equations with Gaussian link

Supplemental Table 5. Predictors of HIV Prevalence Among Young Adults, Rakai District, Uganda, Ages 15-24, 2005-2020

	Men					Women				
	N	OR	CI Low	CI High	P-value	N	OR	CI Low	CI High	P-value
<i>Individual Level Variables</i>										
Survey Round	8508	1.06	0.99	1.13	0.1201	12963	1.00	0.98	1.03	0.8081
Age Group										
15-19	2798	1.00				4087	1.00			
20-24	5710	2.84	1.90	4.25	<0.0001	8876	1.82	1.63	2.04	<0.0001
Marriage Status										
Never Married	6168	1.00				3765	1.00			
Previously Married	312	4.08	2.70	6.17	<0.0001	751	2.55	1.97	3.28	<0.0001
Currently Married	2028	2.36	1.79	3.10	<0.0001	8447	1.57	1.33	1.85	<0.0001
Number of Sex Partners in Past 12 Months										
0-1	4944	1.00				11680	1.00			
2 or More	3564	1.39	1.12	1.73	0.0028	1283	1.52	1.30	1.78	<0.0001
SES Category										
Lowest	533	1.00				774	1.00			
Low-Middle	1449	1.07	0.66	1.73	0.7798	2047	1.04	0.86	1.27	0.6734
High-Middle	2806	0.83	0.52	1.34	0.4550	4711	0.94	0.77	1.13	0.4925
Highest	3720	0.62	0.38	1.01	0.0546	5431	0.78	0.64	0.95	0.0163
Male Medical Circumcision										
No	4234	1.00								
Yes	4274	0.64	0.48	0.86	0.0026					
<i>Community Level Variables</i>										
Community Viremia		1.06	1.02	1.09	0.0027		1.03	1.02	1.05	<0.0001

Community Viremia is calculated from (HIV Prevalence) - 0.9(ART Coverage)*(HIV Prevalence)*


In models for men, we use community viremia among women 15-30; in models for women, we use community viremia among men 15-34. These ranges were selected as they are the most likely groups to transmit HIV to AYA. AYA women tend to have somewhat older male partners up to approximately age 34, while AYA men have slightly younger female partners up to approximately age 30.

Supplemental Table 6. Predictors of HIV Incidence Among Young Adults, Rakai District, Uganda, Ages 15-24, 2005-2020


	Men					Women				
	<i>N</i>	<i>IRR</i>	<i>CI Low</i>	<i>CI High</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>IRR</i>	<i>CI Low</i>	<i>CI High</i>	<i>P-value</i>
<i>Individual Level Variables</i>										
Survey Round	4877	1.05	0.93	1.18	0.4590	5767	0.94	0.87	1.03	0.1725
Age Group										
15-19	1431	1.00				1335	1.00			
20-24	3446	1.15	0.50	2.65	0.7472	4432	1.31	0.80	2.13	0.2786
Marriage Status										
Never Married	3561	1.00				1745	1.00			
Previously Married	178	5.89	2.66	13.04	<0.0001	231	2.76	1.58	4.80	0.0003
Currently Married	1138	2.63	1.40	4.95	0.0027	3791	0.58	0.37	0.90	0.0144
Number of Sex Partners in Past 12 Months										
0-1	2809	1.00				5390	1.00			
2 or More	2068	2.41	1.36	4.27	0.0025	377	1.76	1.04	2.97	0.0356
SES Category										
Lowest	319					353	1.00			
Low-Middle	865	0.66	0.27	1.62	0.3604	974	2.23	0.94	5.28	0.0677
High-Middle	1605	0.59	0.25	1.39	0.2266	2003	1.54	0.66	3.62	0.3213
Highest	2088	0.45	0.19	1.08	0.0750	2437	1.13	0.47	2.74	0.7844
Male Medical Circumcision										
No	2300	1.00								
Yes	2577	0.42	0.23	0.76	0.0046					
<i>Community Level Variables</i>										
Community Viremia		1.06	0.99	1.14	0.0967		1.05	1.00	1.11	0.0387

Community Viremia is calculated from (HIV Prevalence) - 0.9(ART Coverage)*(HIV Prevalence)*

In models for men, we use community viremia among women 15-30; in models for women, we use community viremia among men 15-34. These ranges were selected as they are the most likely groups to transmit HIV to AYA. AYA women tend to have somewhat older male partners up to approximately age 34, while AYA men have slightly younger female partners up to approximately age 30.

Supplementary Figure 2. Univariate associations between selected individual-level risk factors and HIV prevalence, by gender

ABYM = Adolescent boys and young men, AGYW = Adolescent girls and young women, CI = Confidence intervals, OR = Odds Ratio, SES = Socio-economic status, VMMC = Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision. Community Viremia was calculated from $(\text{HIV Prevalence}) - 0.9 \times (\text{ART Coverage}) \times (\text{HIV Prevalence})$. In models for ABYM, community viremia among AGYW aged 15-30 years was used; in models for AGYW, community viremia among ABYM aged 15-34 years was used. Number of sex partners refers to the last 12 months prior to the interview date.

Supplementary Figure 3. Univariate associations between selected individual-level risk factors and HIV incidence, by gender

ABYM = Adolescent boys and young men, AGYW = Adolescent girls and young women, CI = Confidence intervals, SES = Socio-economic status, VMMC = Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision. Community Viremia was calculated from $(\text{HIV Prevalence}) - 0.9 \times (\text{ART Coverage}) \times (\text{HIV Prevalence})$. Associations with HIV prevalence are adjusted odds ratios. Associations with HIV incidence are adjusted incidence rate ratios. In models for ABYM, community viremia among AGYW aged 15-30 years was used; in models for AGYW, community viremia among ABYM aged 15-34 years was used. Number of sex partners refers to the last 12 months prior to the interview date.