### Implementation of evidencebased interventions in HIV prevention and care: from Malawi to North Carolina

Sarah Rutstein, MD, PhD Assistant Professor of Medicine Division of Infectious Diseases University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

#### Acknowledgements

#### **Funding:**

UNC CFAR (P30 Al050410) UNC PSTP/UNC DoM OGHE/Global Health Scholars NIH NIAID (R61 Al174285; T32 Al007001; R01 Al114320) NC TraCS (UL1T4002489) PO21000539/UM1 Al068619 (HPTN Leadership)

#### HPTN HIV Prevention Trials Network





#### Special thanks to:

Jane Chen Irving Hoffman Vivian Go Edward Jere Denzel Matiya Mitch Matoga Bill Miller Kate Muessig Mike Owino Emily Ciccone Mina Hosseinipour Ella Ferguson Claire Pederson Michael Herce Christopher Hurt









THE NORTH CAROLINA TRANSLATIONAL & CLINICAL SCIENCES INSTITUTE



÷



#### Malawi's HIV epidemic





#### Malawi's HIV epidemic





Source: PEPFAR (2016) 'PEPFAR Latest Global Results'

#### The HIV cascade – a roadmap



#### Increasing HIV status awareness: AHI



#### Acute HIV infection (AHI)







2016, Chen et al, 2021

STI clinic EMR, Malawi DHHS

## Syndemic "classical" STI/HIV: stronger together

Biological, behavioral, and epidemiological interactions

STIs enhancing efficiency of transmission via infectiousness (higher genital VL) or susceptibility

Mucosal inflammation and ulceration → exposed epithelium with concentrated inflammatory cells

AHI Risk Score:	Points
Discordant rapid antibody tests	s: 4
Fever, body ache, >1 partner:	1 (each)
Diarrhea, GUD :	<b>2</b> (each)



Powers et al., Improved detection of acute HIV-1 infection in sub-Saharan Africa: development of a risk score algorithm, *AIDS*, 2007

Weiler et al., Genital Ulcers Facilitate Rapid Viral Entry and Dissemination following Intravaginal Inoculation with Cell-Associated Simian Immunodeficiency Virus SIVmac239, *Journal of Virology*, 2008

#### Leveraging AHI for contact tracing

*Recent* exposure to person with HIV

High risk of onward transmission



Evaluating social contact tracing from STI clinic, 30% of contacts of persons with AHI had HIV

Rosenberg et al, STI Patients Are Effective Recruiters of Undiagnosed Cases of HIV: Results of a Social Contact Recruitment Study in Malawi, *JAIDS*, 2014

#### Increasing HIV status awareness: aPN



### Spectrum of partner notification

**Provider Referral =** A counsellor or other health care provider will call or visit your partner and offer them HIV testing services.

**Contract Referral =** You and the counsellor will work together to notify your partner. You will have 14 days to tell your partner. After which, the counsellor will contact your partner and offer them HIV testing services.

**Dual Referral =** The counsellor/provider will sit with you and your partner and support you as you tell your partner about your HIV.

**Passive Referral =** You tell your partner about your HIV and encourage him or her to come to the health facility for an HIV test. Can be done with a referral slip

"Assisted" notification

"Passive" notification

## Provider assisted notification 2x as effective as passive referral

Enrolled 245 index patients

302 names sexual partners (252 with locator information)

Active notification arms 2x as likely to have returning partners

Contract notification likely costeffective (4080 USD per transmission averted)



**FIGURE 1.** Shows the cumulative proportion of partners of partners presenting for testing for each method of partner notification. Time to partner visit is the number of days following the index patient enrollment visit.

Brown, L. et al., HIV Partner Notification Is Effective and Feasible in Sub-Saharan Africa: Opportunities for HIV Treatment and Prevention, JAIDS, 2011

Rutstein, SE et al, Health Policy & Planning, 2014;29:115-126

#### **2016 WHO Recommendations**



Voluntary assisted partner notification services should be offered as part of a comprehensive package of testing and care offered to people with HIV (strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence).

#### aPN: One size fits...most?



Courtney Maierhofer

aPN promotes earlier HIV testing among partners, but is resource intensive

In Kenya, differences in partner HIV testing uptake according to index rurality, sex, HIV status (new vs previously diagnosed)

Analysis of aPN by referring participant characteristics at Malawi STI clinic (iKnow study)

Contract notification may increase referrals for women and those with previously diagnosed infection

Masyuko et al, JIAS, 2019

## Efficient use of resource intensive strategies to improve HIV case finding





### PrEP drugs

Nucleotide/nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs)

**TDF/FTC** (Truvada): Tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF) + Emtricitabine (FTC)

**TAF/FTC** (Descovy): Tenofovir alafenamide fumarate (TAF) + Emtricitabine (FTC)

Non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NNRTI)

#### Dapivirine

Integrase strand inhibitors Cabotegravir (Apretude)

#### Disruptions in mucosal linings are "portals of entry" for HIV



## Cells beneath the mucosal lining are the first to become infected



## HIV medicines administered <u>before</u> an exposure can prevent systemic infection



#### Effectiveness in randomized clinical trials



Thigpen et al. NEJM 2012. 3.

6. McCormack et al. Lancet 2016

8. Molina et al. NEJM. 2015 9. Baeten et al. NEJM. 2016 12. Landovitz et al. NEJM. 2021

#### Daily oral tenofovir works...if you take it



Trials of oral and topical tenofovir-based PrEP show that these strategies reduce risk of HIV infection if they are used correctly and consistently. Higher adherence is directly linked to greater levels of protection.

Source: Salim S. Abdool Karim, CAPRISA

### Early discontinuation is the rule, not the exception

	Individuals who discontinued PrEP (n/N)		Proportion (95% Cl)	Weight (%)
≤6 months				
Blackstock et al (2017) <sup>47</sup>	8/21		0.38 (0.17-0.59)	1.59
Blaylock et al (2018) <sup>31</sup>	34/159		0.21 (0.15-0.28)	1.70
Clement et al (2019) <sup>48</sup>	10/84		0.12 (0.05-0.19)	1.69
Doblecki-Lewis et al (2017) <sup>32</sup>	102/173		0.59 (0.52-0.66)	1.69
Fina et al (2019) <sup>49</sup>	38/141		0.27 (0.20-0.34)	1.69
Kagaayi et al (2020) <sup>50</sup>	2491/2536		0.98 (0.98-0.99)	1.71
Kinuthia et al (2020) <sup>21</sup>	1244/2030	*	0.61 (0.59-0.63)	1.71
Lahuerta et al (2017) <sup>51</sup>	7/72		0.10 (0.03-0.17)	1.70
Lankowski et al (2019) <sup>52</sup>	62/107	_ <b>*</b> _	0.58 (0.49-0.67)	1.68
Montgomery et al (2016)53	15/50		0.30 (0.17-0.43)	1.66
Morgan et al (2018) <sup>33</sup>	65/197		0.33 (0.26-0.40)	1.70
Mugwanya et al (2019) <sup>54</sup>	164/278		0.59 (0.53-0.65)	1.70
Noret et al (2018)55	134/1049	*	0.13 (0.11-0.15)	1.71
O'Byrne et al (2020) <sup>56</sup>	7/21		0.33 (0.13-0.53)	1.60
Reback et al (2019) <sup>57</sup>	70/187		0.37 (0.30-0.44)	1.69
Rolle et al (2019) <sup>58</sup>	147/216		0.68 (0.62-0.74)	1.70
Subtotal (I <sup>2</sup> =99·8%, p<0·0001)			0.41 (0.19-0.64)	26.92

#### 41% (95% CI: 18.8-63.5) of participants discontinued PrEP within the first 6 months

Zhang, Li, Xu, Hu, Rutstein et al, Lancet HIV, 2022; Rutstein, Smith, Dalal, Baggaley, Cohen, Lancet HIV, 2020



#### Who needs PrEP (and when)?

### PrEP: right place at the right time

#### An implementation problem...

#### Implementation science terminology decoder:

The intervention/practice/innovation is THE THING

*Effectiveness* research looks at whether THE THING works

Implementation research looks at how best to help people/places DO THE THING

Implementation strategies are the stuff we do to try and help people/places DO THE THING better

*Implementation outcomes* are <u>how much</u> and <u>how well</u> they do THE THING

Curran, Implementation Science Communications, 2020

### A unifying HIV prevention cascade



### A unifying HIV prevention cascade



## Nearly half of persons who stopped PrEP, restarted within 1 year



Among those who discontinued, 47.3% (95% CI: 31.5 - 63.2) restarted within 1 year

Zhang, Li, Xu, Hu, Rutstein et al, Lancet HIV, 2022

### A unifying HIV prevention cascade



### Integrating services – PrEP & STI clinics



Current PrEP screening uses epidemiologic/self-reported risk profiling In high HIV incidence settings, incident STI  $\rightarrow$  objective indicator of HIV risk

Logical (and efficient?) extension of existing sexual health services

## Integrating PrEP and STI services in Malawi: the ePrEP study

Examine the <u>acceptability</u>, <u>feasibility</u>, and <u>effectiveness</u> of enhanced PrEP implementation strategy into an STI clinic in Lilongwe, Malawi

"Enhanced PrEP" → use of aPN, AHI screening, etiologic STI testing, and co-located services (STI + PrEP)

#### ePrEP patient participant groups

**Group 1**: Primary index participants initiating PrEP

Group 2: Named sexual partners

Group 3: PrEP eligible patients declining PrEP initiation N≈50

N≈200

Followed for 6-months

"Effectiveness" outcome: persistent PrEP use

#### **Cohort timeline**

Presents to STI clinic for syndromic management, confirmed HIV seronegative

#### Enrolled $\rightarrow$

AHI screening STI testing Behavioral survey Named sexual partners



HIV antibody test PrEP use, side effects Behavioral survey

\*only if initiated PrEP at enrollment (Group 1 and 2)







Behavioral survey

#### **Cohort timeline**





#### Embracing integrated services

It is like when you want to kill birds, you set a trap where the birds gather, and you can easily trap them. So, at STI clinics is where the people who are at risk of getting HIV are found and they need to be prevented from HIV from there. – *provider participant* 

PrEP is best provided at the STI clinic because that is where people who suffer STIs are found...[PrEP] is not supposed to be provided in the community because people treat the symptoms with traditional medicine but there can be no one to diagnose the STIs there...the STI clinic is ideal because everyone who goes there has a problem...all of us who go there are STI patients so there is no stigma. – *patient participant* 

Characteristic	Index participants
Sex	
Male	110 (63)
Age	
15-24	70 (40)
25-34	78 (45)
>34	27 (15)
Marital status	
Never married	65 (37)
Married	56 (32)
Other	54 (31)
Additional HIV risk factor	
Buy/sell sex	72 (41)
HIV+ partner	19 (11)
Older partner	51 (29)
Primary partner (last month)	93 (53)
Aware of 1° partner HIV status	56 (32)

## ePrEP by the numbers (March – Dec 2022)

PrEP refusers: n=37

Screened partners: 58 Enrolled partners: 27 Previously HIV+: 16 (3 no ART) Newly diagnosed with HIV: 4 Not interested in PrEP: 5 Not interested in *study:* 2 Other ineligibility: 4





Edward Jere; Esther Mathiya; Mercy Tsidya

Claire Pedersen

#### Partner type switching



Jane Chen





#### Complex partner switching

175 index participants

No primary partner Same primary partner Unknown primary partner New primary partner No visit

## Risk aligned PrEP: beyond detectable drug levels

Unique longitudinal insight into fluctuations of risk, perceived risk, and PrEP use among understudied population

Frequent discontinuations and "restarts"

aPN may help extend PrEP reach (and could influence persistence)

Poor daily oral PrEP adherence likely addressed with long-acting injectable PrEP, but...

Who needs AHI screening for injections?

How do we bridge gaps in PrEP use or intentional stops/starts?



Funding Opportunity Title

Innovative Models for Delivering PrEP and STI Services to Stop HIV in the United States (R61/R33 Clinical Trial Optional)



### PrEP in rural North Carolina



Kate Muessig

#### Disparities of PrEP in the Southern US Accounts for >50% of new HIV, but 33% of PrEP users

STI	NC National ranking (2019)
HIV	6 <sup>th</sup>
Chlamydia	6 <sup>th</sup>
Gonorrhea	9 <sup>th</sup>
Syphilis	15 <sup>th</sup>

Uptake disparities among young sexual and gender minority (YSGM) men of color, particularly in rural counties

STI/HIV syndemics track along demographics and geography, with high burden among rural YSGM

### Supporting Tailored And Responsive PrEP in Rural North Carolina – STARR NC

"... support the development of effective strategies for expanding the provision of HIV PrEP for people at increased risk but currently lacking these services by leveraging existing STI programs."

Three-year "formative" (R61) phase Randomized clinical trial Primary outcome: PrEP uptake within 3 months of STI clinic visit

Additional two-year "implementation trial" (R33) phase based on meeting milestones



#### Multilevel intervention





# Clinic training & capacity building

On-site trainings to orient staff to PrEP prescribing



#### Telehealth option for PrEP

Facilitated by PrEP navigator

Convenient, discrete, secure

Continuity of care beyond study

Some clinics may opt to offer PrEP providers on-site



Image from: https://www.statnews.com/2020/08/17/telehealth-new-choreography-anywhere-care/

#### Digital health platform: HealthMpowerment (HMP)



#### Fig 2: HMP app screenshots

#### PrEP navigator roles



### Sounds great! What'll it cost?

Costing embedded into trial

Decision analysis from health system perspective



## Implementing HIV prevention services: right place, right time.

Leveraging existing infrastructure and targeting resourceintensive interventions to improve *effective use of PrEP*:

...in urban public STI clinics in Malawi

...in rural health department STI clinics in NC

Adapting metrics and outcomes to accommodate fluctuating HIV prevention needs

...support continuous/protective use while on PrEP

...and bringing folks back to PrEP when they are at risk

#### Thank you!

Questions? <a href="mailto:srutstein@unc.edu">srutstein@unc.edu</a>