

Note: HBsAg test for Hepatitis B; TPHA and VDRL tests for syphilis; and syndromic screening of other STIs

**Figure 1:** Initiation and follow up on timeline with minimum service package from initiation (M0) to month 12 (M12)

**Table 1:** Self-reported adherence questions and categorization for analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Question** | **Possible responses** | **Score assigned for analysis** | |
| Categorization | Score |
| 1 | In the last 30 days, on how many *days did you* *miss* at least one dose of any of your PrEP medication? | \_\_ \_\_ [0–30] | ≥6 | 0 |
| 2-5 | 1 |
| 0-1 | 2 |
| 2 | In the past 30 days, *how good a job did you do* at taking your PrEP medication in the way you were supposed to? | Very poor | Poor | 0 |
| Poor |
| Fair | Moderate | 1 |
| Good |
| Very good | Good | 2 |
| Excellent |
| 3 | In the last 30 days, *how often did you* take your PrEP medication in the way you were supposed to? | Never | Rarely/Never | 0 |
| Rarely |
| Sometimes | Sometimes | 1 |
| Usually |
| Almost always | Always | 2 |
| Always |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Overall adherence grade** | Average of Σ (scores) at previous visits | | |
|  |  |  | Poor | 0-2 |
|  |  |  | Moderate | 3-5 |
|  |  |  | Good | 6 |

**Figure 2:** Performance across the PrEP cascade
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**Figure 3:** Number of new PrEP enrollments by month over time

**Figure 4:** PrEP continuation among FSW and MSM over 12 months follow up period

**Table 2:** Characteristics of clients who continued PrEP at M3, M6 and M12 of follow up

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristics | M3 follow up visit  # eligible # (% of eligible) | | M6 follow up visit  # eligible # (% of eligible) | | M12 follow up visit  # eligible # (% of eligible) | |
| Age group |  | |  | |  | |
| 21-29yrs | 479 | 173 (36%) | 289 | 72 (25%) | 137 | 24 (18%) |
| 30-49yrs | 278 | 103 (37%) | 186 | 58 (31%) | 73 | 14 (19%) |
| 50yrs+ | 20 | 12 (60%) | 14 | 7 (50%) | 10 | 4 (40%) |
| Key population group |  | |  | |  | |
| MSM | 453 | 202 (45%) | 288 | 99 (34%) | 142 | 38 (27%) |
| FSW | 330 | 87 (26%) | 203 | 38 (19%) | 79 | 4 (5%) |
| City |  | |  | |  | |
| Yaoundé | 299 | 80 (27%) | 160 | 28 (18%) | 107 | 12 (11%) |
| Douala | 484 | 209 (43%) | 331 | 109 (33%) | 114 | 30 (26%) |
| Bertoua | 0 | 0 (-) | 0 | 0 (-) | 0 | 0 (-) |
| Bafoussam | 0 | 0 (-) | 0 | 0 (-) | 0 | 0 (-) |
| Experienced moderate-severe undesired effects during previous visit |  | |  | |  | |
| No | 84 | 51 (60%) | 43 | 33 (77%) | 3 | 3 (100) |
| Yes | 34 | 27 (79%) | 9 | 6 (67%) | 1 | 1 (100) |
| Missed ≥6 doses during previous visit\* |  | |  | |  | |
| No | 266 | 221 (83%) | 158 | 110 (70%) | 35 | 29 (83%) |
| Yes | 24 | 15 (63%) | 17 | 10 (59%) | 10 | 6 (60%) |
| No assessment | 493 | 53 (11%) | 316 | 17 (5%) | 176 | 7 (4%) |
| How well client did in taking PrEP medication in the way they were supposed to\* |  | |  | |  | |
| Good | 126 | 111 (88%) | 85 | 66 (78%) | 29 | 25 (86%) |
| Moderate | 156 | 121 (78%) | 87 | 55 (63%) | 20 | 13 (65%) |
| Poor | 24 | 9 (38%) | 12 | 6 (50%) | 0 | 0 (-) |
| No assessment | 477 | 48 (10%) | 307 | 10 (3%) | 172 | 4 (2%) |
| Frequency of taking PrEP medication in the way they were supposed to\* |  | |  | |  | |
| Always | 161 | 139 (86%) | 107 | 76 (71%) | 30 | 24 (80%) |
| Sometimes | 121 | 92 (76%) | 73 | 51 (70%) | 19 | 14 (74%) |
| Rarely/never | 20 | 9 (45%) | 5 | 2 (40%) | 0 | 0 (-) |
| No assessment | 481 | 49 (11%) | 306 | 8 (3%) | 172 | 4 (2%) |
| \* Self-reported based on 30 days before the previous visit, # (% of eligible) is the number of clients who continued PrEP & % of those eligible for follow up. | | | | | | |

**Table 3:** Cox regression of factors associated with PrEP discontinuation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model covariates | Unadjusted | | Adjusted | |
| **HR (95% CI)** | **P-value** | **aHR (95% CI)** | **P-value** |
| *Key population group* |  | <0.001 |  | < 0.001\* |
| FSW | 1.7 (1.5-1.9) |  | 1.5 (1.2-1.9) |  |
| MSM | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| *City* |  | <0.001 |  | <0.001\* |
| Yaoundé | 1.7 (1.4-1.9) |  | 1.5 (1.2-1.8) |  |
| Bafoussam/Bertoua | 1.9 (1.5-2.4) |  | 3.1 (2.2-4.5) |  |
| Douala | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| *Age group* |  | 0.349 |  | 0.511 |
| 21-29yrs | 1.3 (0.8-2.0) |  | 1.3 (0.8-2.3) |  |
| 30-49yrs | 1.3 (0.9-2.1) |  | 1.2 (0.7-2.1) |  |
| 50yrs+ | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| *Self-reported moderate/severe drug side effects* |  | <0.001 |  | 0.245 |
| No | 2.0 (1.6-2.5) |  | 1.2 (0.9-1.5) |  |
| Yes | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| *Completed adherence assessment at least once* |  | <0.001 |  | a\* |
| No | 8.2 (6.9-9.6) |  |  |  |
| Yes | 1 |  |  |  |
| *Average adherence level* |  | <0.001 |  | <0.001\* |
| Good | 0.4 (0.3-0.6) |  | 0.4 (0.3-0.6) |  |
| Moderate | 0.4 (0.3-0.5) |  | 0.3 (0.3-0.4) |  |
| Poor | 1 |  | 1 |  |

\* Significant when adjusted for all other covariates in the multivariable model

a\* Excluded as a degree of freedom reduced because of constant or linearly dependent covariates making model invalid

**Figure 5:** Doctor and beneficiary linked reasons for official interruption of PrEP