

Adherence to Pre-exposure Prophylaxis intervention by transgender women: A systematic review

Jorge Eduardo Moncayo-Quevedo^{1*}, María Del Mar Pérez-Arizabaleta^{1,2}, Lina María Villegas-Trujillo^{3,4}, Alejandra Rodríguez-Ortiz⁴

¹ Faculty of Psychology. Universidad Antonio Nariño. Cali, Colombia.

² Santamaría Fundación. Cali, Colombia.

³ Faculty of Health. Universidad del Valle. Cali, Colombia.

⁴ SIT Consulting-Science, Innovation & Technology. Cali, Colombia.

*Corresponding author:

Jorge Eduardo Moncayo-Quevedo. Faculty of Psychology. Universidad Antonio Nariño.
Kilómetro 18, vía Cali – Jamundí, Cali, Colombia.

E-mail: jomoncayo@uan.edu.co

Abstract

Background: The prevalence of HIV is higher in the transgender population. Recently, the preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP) intervention has been proven successful in reducing HIV acquisition in trials among men who have sex with men (MSM), and heterosexual couples. This research aims to investigate the adherence to PrEP by HIV-negative transgender women (TW).

Methods: Were followed the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions and the PRISMA Statement. Research in WoS, Ovid, Scopus, MEDLINE, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) electronic databases for studies that involved HIV-negative TW population and focused on their adherence to PrEP intervention and condom use after the treatment.

Results: 11 studies were included. TW sample sizes were low in comparison to the total sample, which often included men who have sex with men (MSM) population. The participation and adherence to the intervention was low compared to MSM, and it was measured mainly by self-report (72.7%) or by Tenofovir-diphosphate (TFV-DP)/ Emtricitabine triphosphate (FTC-TP) dried blood spot (DBS) (45.5%).

Conclusions: It is important to increase awareness and explain the effect of PrEP on feminizing hormone therapy at the beginning of the trials. Nevertheless, the low adherence may be affected by the interaction between drugs and the barriers faced to use the health services.

Keywords: Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis; transgender women; adherence; condom-use; HIV

Introduction

Transgender populations refer to individuals whose gender identity or expression differs from that associated with their sex at birth; hence, ‘transgender women’ can describe natal males who have a feminine gender identity or expression.¹ The prevalence of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) is higher in the transgender population than among the general population,² even among men who have sex with men (MSM), as seen in a meta-analysis made in the United States which reports a HIV prevalence rate among transgender women up to 27.7%.³ Operario et al.⁴ found in their systematic review that overall crude HIV prevalence among transgender women sex workers was 27.3%, meanwhile among transgender women not engaged in sex work was 14.7%. It has also been reported that transgender women who engage in sex work are at high risk for HIV compared to natal male and female sex workers. According to Poteat et al.⁵ by 2015, there were no evidence-based prevention interventions focused exclusively on transgender women. More recently, the preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP) intervention has been proven successful in reducing HIV acquisition in trials among MSM,⁶ and heterosexual couples,⁷ among others. PrEP consists of a daily drug regimen of tenofovir disoproxil fumarate and emtricitabine. However, there are concerns that the HIV prevention that benefits the population that uses PrEP might decline the widespread condom use across these populations at risk of HIV.^{8,9} An additional concern is a possible reduction in the use of PrEP due to a representation of reduced effectiveness of feminizing drugs when combined. In this context, in this systematic review, we aim to investigate about the adherence to PrEP by HIV-negative transgender women.

Methods

This systematic review followed the recommendations made by the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions,¹⁰ and the PRISMA Statement 2020.¹¹ The protocol for this study was registered in OSF (<https://osf.io/ukdyz/>)

Eligibility Criteria

We searched for randomized controlled trials and observational case-control studies that worked with the HIV-negative transgender women population and focused on their adherence to PrEP intervention, regardless of race or country. We selected articles that included transgender women in their samples either alone or in combination with MSM population as long as in the results section the data was separated for both. Only studies that had the purpose of reducing risky behavior and increasing safe behaviors were included. Studies that included only MSM population and transgender men were excluded.

Information sources and search

We conducted a systematic search in the WoS, Ovid, Scopus, MEDLINE, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) electronic databases, with no language restriction and no date restriction until March 2022. For the search of the literature, we used MeSH terms. We used a combination of MeSH terms and non-controlled vocabulary that we considered crucial to our objective in the equation:

((("HIV"[Title/Abstract] OR "human immunodeficiency virus" [Title/Abstract])

AND

"transgender women"[Title/Abstract])

AND

("Pre-exposure prophylaxis"[Title/Abstract] OR "PrEP"[Title/Abstract]))

AND

(Clinical study [Filter] OR clinical trial [Filter] OR comparative study [Filter] OR observational study [Filter] OR randomized controlled trial [Filter])

We also conducted a generic and academic Internet search and a metasearch to control publication bias. A search strategy defined for “gray literature” was included to gather information from Google Scholar.

Selection of studies

Eligibility assessment was performed independently in an unblinded standardized manner by two reviewers. Titles and abstracts of all citations were identified, and all the potentially eligible studies were selected. The same authors then independently evaluated the complete text versions of these articles to determine whether each study fulfilled the inclusion criteria. A two-reviewer dissolved conflict and disagreements were resolved by consensus, and where dissent could not be solved.

Data extraction and synthesis of results

The abstraction variables included author, year, country, study design, sample size, participant demographics, an additional type of interventions (besides PrEP), length of follow-up, prophylaxis, sex workers or stable partner, and Odds Ratio (OR) of adherence to PrEP. A data extraction table was made in Microsoft Excel to organize the results.

Two authors independently extracted data from eligible studies. The primary outcome sought for this review was the adherence to PrEP by HIV-negative transgender women. Two researchers reviewed each study found in the databases by title and abstract, selecting the more adequate ones. Subsequently, they reviewed full-texts of previously selected articles and screened them according to the inclusion criteria. With the studies finally set, we extracted the data. Disagreements were resolved by consensus.

Risk of bias assessment

Two authors independently assessed the methodological quality of data and risk of bias of the included studies using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS), including nine items. The selection criteria contain four items: 1) the adequate case definition, 2) representativeness of the cases, 3) controls selection, 4) controls definition. The comparability criteria include comparability of cases and controls according to the design or analysis. The exposure criteria contain three aspects: first, ascertainment of exposure; second, the same method of ascertainment for cases and controls and third, non-response rate. Disagreements were solved through discussion until consensus. A study scoring six or higher was considered to be of sufficient quality.

Strategy for data analysis

For dichotomous outcomes, the number of events and the number of participants in each group (intervention or control) were extracted. Odds ratios (OR) or hazard ratios (RR) (both raw and adjusted ratios, if available) were removed, along with their 95% confidence intervals (CI) and p-values. For continuous results, we extracted data from means, standard deviations, and the number of participants in each group. Data from medians, ranges, and p-

values were extracted from nonparametric tests for continuous asymmetric data. We took out percentages, mean or median scores for change from baseline for controlled before and after studies. If the change scores were not available, we extracted the post-intervention values. Any discrepancy between the two investigators was resolved by discussion or consultation with other co-authors of the systematic review.

Results

Selection of studies

The literature search strategy yielded 700 potentially eligible articles. Subsequently, after discarding duplicate and review full-text articles, 11 fulfilled the inclusion criteria and were included in the systematic review (Figure 1).




Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram 2020.

Characteristics of included studies

The predominant study design was prospective cohort studies (81.8%). Most included studies were from Thailand (36.4%), the United States (36.4%), and Brazil (27.3%) between 2014 and 2021 (Table 1). Transgender women's sample sizes from the studies were small compared to the total sample size, which often included the MSM population;

considering a total of 8261 participants, only 815 were transgender women, accounting for 9.9%. The age of the participants was 18 or older. However, we noticed that most studies reported the age of transgender women and MSM population combined. Only three studies reported separate age data for transgender women (27.3%), and the follow-up period went from 1 up to 18 months. We did not perform a meta-analysis due to the heterogeneity of the studies.

Table 1. Characteristics of studies included.

Author	Year	Country	Sudy design	Full sampl e size	TW Sampl e size	Mean Age (years)	Additional intervention s	Follow-up (months)
Connolly et al. ¹²	2020	United States	Cohort study	38	19	26*	No	3
Grant et al. ¹³	2014	United States, Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, South Africa	Retrospective cohort study	1225	58	>18*	No	3
Green et al. ¹⁴	2021	Vietnam	Cohort study	1131	62	-	No	18
Hoagland et al. ¹⁵	2017	Brazil	Cohort study	450	25	>18*	No	1
Seekaew et al. ¹⁶	2019	Thailand	Cohort study	653	89	28.9*	No	> 3
Spinelli et al. ¹⁷	2019	United States	Retrospective cohort study	364	45	>25*	No	12
Leu et al. ¹⁸	2019	South Africa, Thailand, Peru, United States, and Puerto Rico	Cohort study	187	23	31.4*	No	2
Kimani et al. ¹⁹	2021	Kenya	Cohort study	53	11	>18	No	-
Phanuphak et al. ²⁰	2018	Thailand	Cohort study	1697	230	26.1	No	12
Ramautarsing et al. ²¹	2020	Thailand	Cohort study	2088	232	26	No	3

*The reported age in the study was for all key populations evaluated, not exclusively for the transgender women population. TW: Transgender women. PrEP: Preexposure prophylaxis.

Outcome variables

Outcome variables are described in table 2. Most studies did not say if the participants were sex workers, three studies did, two of them from Thailand. The participants adherence to the intervention was low compared to the MSM population, and it was measured mainly in two forms: by self-report (72.7%) or by Tenofovir-diphosphate (TFV-DP)/ Emtricitabine triphosphate (FTC-TP) dried blood spot (DBS) (45.5%).

Table 2. Outcome variables from the included studies

Author	Year	TW Sex worker n (%)	Measurement of adherence	OR/RR Adherence
Connolly et al. ¹²	2020	14 (28%)	TFV-DP DBS assessment and self-reported PrEP adherence with a three-item validated measure.	RR 0.63 (0.20–1.95) P value 0.46
Grant et al. ¹³	2014	No	TFV-DP DBS assessment	OR 2.03 (1.27 to 3.25) P-value <0.0001
Green et al. ¹⁴	2021	-	Self-reported PrEP adherence	For TW, being aged >30 years was associated with continuing on PrEP (aOR 5.62 (95% CI: 1.05-29.9), P value 0.043).
Grinsztejn et al. ²²	2018	-	TFV-DP and FTC-TP DBS assessments	OR 0.83 (0.32–2.16) P-value 0.70
Hoagland et al. ¹⁵	2017	-	TFV-DP and FTC-TP DBS assessments using liquid chromatography and mass-spectroscopy (LC/MS/MS).	OR 0.75 (0.27-1.83) P-value 0.55
Seekaew et al. ¹⁶	2019	-	Self-reported PrEP adherence categorized into two levels: Low Adherence (no follow-up or ≤ 3 pills/week) and Good Adherence (≥ 4 pills/week).	Low adherence associated with TW (aOR: 2.2, 95% CI: 1.27–3.83, p = 0.005)
Spinelli et al. ¹⁷	2019	-	Self-reported PrEP adherence	Transgender women were more likely to discontinue PrEP early (aRR; 2.16; 95% confidence interval, 1.36–3.49). Late discontinuation: aRR 1.84 (.98–3.46)

Leu et al. ¹⁸	2019	-	Self-reported PrEP adherence by short message service (SMS)	In the Daily oral regimen, MSM was more likely to be high-adherers than TW (OR=4.76, 95% CI=1.35, 16.67, p=0.015).
Kimani et al. ¹⁹	2021		Self-reported PrEP adherence and TFV-DP DBS assessment	-
Phanuphak et al. ²⁰	2018	76 (33%)	Self-reported PrEP adherence	OR 1 (Reference) P-value <0.001
Ramautarsing et al. ²¹	2020	57 (24.6%)	Self-reported PrEP adherence	-

TFV-DP: Tenofovir-diphosphate. FTC-TP: Emtricitabine triphosphate. DBS: Dried blood spot. NR: Not reported. TW: Transgender women. PrEP: Preexposure prophylaxis.

Risk of bias assessment

Each study chosen for this systematic review was carefully evaluated according to the Newcastle-Ottawa scale, and the quality scores of the studies are shown in Table 3. All included studies showed moderate to high scores.

Table 3. Risk of bias assessment for included studies

Author	Year	Selection	Comparability	Outcome	Total
Connolly et al. ¹²	2020	3	1	3	7
Grant et al. ¹³	2014	4	1	3	8
Green et al. ¹⁴	2021	3	1	3	7
Grinsztejn et al. ²²	2018	3	1	3	7
Hoagland et al. ¹⁵	2017	3	1	3	7
Seekaew et al. ¹⁶	2019	3	1	3	7
Spinelli et al. ¹⁷	2019	3	1	3	7
Leu et al. ¹⁸	2019	3	1	3	7
Kimani et al. ¹⁹	2021	3	1	3	7
Phanuphak et al. ²⁰	2018	3	1	3	7
Ramautarsing et al. ²¹	2020	3	1	3	7

Discussion

This systematic review aimed to shed light on the adherence to PrEP by HIV-negative transgender women. Here we found lower participation in the studies¹⁵ and adherence to PrEP by transgender women than the MSM population. This could be explained by the concern that transgender women may have regarding the effect of PrEP on hormone therapy, as it was shown by Deutsch et al.²³ who found lower TDF-DP concentrations in DBS among transgender women used feminizing hormones in comparison to the other participants. The authors explained this finding by lacking knowledge regarding the drug-drug interactions during the trial. Even though the drugs used in PrEP treatment are

metabolized in the kidney, estrogens and progestogens are metabolized in the liver, no systemic drug-drug interactions are estimated,²⁴ at the moment of the trial, there were no specific studies that proved these expectations.²³ Marshall & Mimiaga²⁵ emphasize the need for investigations to address any effects of PrEP interventions and the feminizing hormone therapy. They would provide additional assurance to transgender women participating in PrEP trials. Another reason behind the low participation rate in intervention studies is the constant discrimination they face from healthcare workers that have been previously reported.²⁶ In this regard, education for healthcare providers on the LGBTQ+ community and their needs is key to gaining trust from transgender women,²⁷ and creating a safe and comfortable environment to be more willing to uptake PrEP.²⁸

Moreover, the PrEP awareness by transgender women is lower compared to the MSM population; according to the recent study by Wilson et al.²⁹ the authors found that only 79.1% of transgender women knew about PrEP vs. 96.7% MSM. Those with previous knowledge believed that the treatment was only for MSM, seemingly focused on them.³⁰ Likewise, Galka et al.³¹ found that only 20% of the Malaysian transgender women that partake in the investigation had previous knowledge of PrEP. Contrastingly, the study made by Horvath et al.³² in the United States found high awareness amongst transgender youth; however, only one participant was using PrEP.

From the results from this systematic review, we also noticed that it was more common than expected to see studies that did not differentiate the MSM population from the transgender women, clustering them as one population in the results section. Different authors have noticed this situation before, including Sevelius et al.³³ and Wilson et al.²⁹ and it is found in HIV research and the health care system.³⁴ There are several reasons behind

the need to differentiate both populations, including the unique barriers that transgender women encounter, such as lack of social support, anti-trans stigma, mental health issues, and gender-affirming hormones, among others that can affect negatively PrEP engagement.^{35–39} According to Sevelius et al.³⁴ negative experiences with clinics and providers unsupportive of transgender identities may influence the decision of transgender women to participate in PrEP programs.

Sevelius et al.³³ recently made one of the few studies that researched PrEP adherence in the transgender population exclusively and found that amongst this community, transgender women are more likely to adhere to the intervention during the follow-up. This is an interesting result, given that those differences cannot be found when combining the results from MSM with the transgender population. Another factor that differentiates the MSM population from transgender women is that amongst the latter, there is a high percentage of sex workers,⁴⁰ where they face a higher rate of exposition to HIV infection than other key populations. This factor alone should be a reason to involve more transgender women in specifically designed PrEP research, not adapted from studies of MSM.²³

Conclusions

Our results showed a tendency of the studies to present results from transgender women and MSM populations altogether. However, considering that both populations have different backgrounds, we suggest that further studies show the results from both populations separated, allowing us to draw more accurate conclusions. Moreover, our findings regarding the low participation and adherence of transgender women in PrEP

interventions suggest the importance of increasing awareness and give a clear explanation to this population concerning the effect of PrEP on feminizing hormone therapy at the beginning of the trials. However, further studies are needed to determine this potential effect. Furthermore, we suggest the inclusion of specific indicators of effectiveness, as the condom-use variable before and after the use of PrEP in future studies with transgender women.

Authors' Contributions

JEMQ, MDMPA, LMV, and ARO, contributed equally to the conception, design of the work, acquisition, analysis, interpretation of data, drafting the work, revising it critically for important intellectual content. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article

Funding

This work was supported by the Ministry of Science Technology and Innovation of Colombia under Grant N°123380763100

Data Availability Statement

The authors confirm that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article and its supplementary materials.

ORCID iDs

Jorge Eduardo Moncayo-Quevedo <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6458-4162>

María Del Mar Pérez-Arizabaleta <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8537-6696>

Lina María Villegas-Trujillo <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4568-6697>

Alejandra Rodríguez-Ortiz <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1369-2328>

Abbreviations used

CENTRAL: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials

CI: Confidence Interval

DBS: Dried Blood Spot

FTC-TP: Emtricitabine triphosphate

HIV: Human Immunodeficiency Virus

MSM: Men who have Sex with Men

OR: Odds Ratio

PrEP: Preexposure Prophylaxis

RR: Risk Ratio

TFV-DP: Tenofovir-diphosphate

References

1. Poteat T, Reisner SL, Radix A. HIV epidemics among transgender women. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS* 2014; 9 (2):168-73. DOI: 10.1097/COH.000000000000030.
2. Hoffman BR. The interaction of drug use, sex work, and HIV among transgender women. *Subst Use Misuse* 2014; 49(8): 1049–1053. DOI: 10.3109/10826084.2013.855787
3. Herbst JH, Jacobs ED, Finlayson TJ, et al. HIV/AIDS Prevention Research Synthesis Team Estimating HIV prevalence and risk behaviors of transgender persons in the United States: a systematic review. *AIDS Behav* 2008; 12(1): 1–17. DOI: 10.1007/s10461-007-9299-3
4. Operario D, Soma T, Underhill K. Sex work and HIV status among transgender women: systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2008; 48(1): 97–103. DOI: 10.1097/QAI.0b013e31816e3971
5. Poteat T, Wirtz AL, Radix A, et al. HIV risk and preventive interventions in transgender women sex workers. *Lancet* 2015; 385(9962): 274–286. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)60833-3
6. Kerrigan D, Mantsios A, Grant R, et al. Expanding the menu of HIV prevention options: a qualitative study of experiences with long-acting injectable cabotegravir as PrEP in the context of a phase II trial in the United States. *AIDS Behav* 2018(11); 22: 3540–3549. DOI: 10.1007/s10461-017-2017-x
7. Baeten JM, Donnell D, Ndase P, et al. Antiretroviral prophylaxis for HIV prevention in heterosexual men and women. *N Engl J Med* 2012; 367(5): 399–410. DOI:

10.1056/NEJMoa1108524

8. Chen Y-H, Guigayoma J, McFarland W, et al. Increases in pre-exposure prophylaxis use and decreases in condom use: Behavioral patterns among HIV-negative San Francisco men who have sex with men, 2004–2017. *AIDS Behav* 2019; 23(7): 1841–1845. DOI: 10.1007/s10461-018-2299-7
9. Traeger MW, Schroeder SE, Wright EJ, et al. Effects of pre-exposure prophylaxis for the prevention of HIV infection on sexual risk behavior in men who have sex with men: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2018; 67(5): 676–686. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciy182
10. Higgins JP. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. Version 5.1.0 2011*. The Cochrane Collaboration. <https://www.cochrane-handbook.org>
11. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2021; 10(1): 1–11. DOI: 10.1186/s13643-021-01626-4
12. Connolly MD, Dankerlui DN, Eljallad T, et al. Outcomes of a PrEP Demonstration Project with LGBTQ Youth in a Community-Based Clinic Setting with Integrated Gender-Affirming Care. *Transgender Heal* 2020; 5(2): 75–79. DOI: 10.1089/trgh.2019.0069
13. Grant RM, Anderson PL, McMahan V, et al. Uptake of pre-exposure prophylaxis, sexual practices, and HIV incidence in men and transgender women who have sex with men: a cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2014; 14(9): 820–829. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(14)70847-3

14. Green KE, Nguyen LH, Phan HTT, et al. Prepped for PrEP? Acceptability, continuation and adherence among men who have sex with men and transgender women enrolled as part of Vietnam’s first pre-exposure prophylaxis program. *Sex Health* 2021; 18(1): 104–115. DOI: 10.1071/SH20167
15. Hoagland B, Moreira RI, De Boni RB, et al. High pre-exposure prophylaxis uptake and early adherence among men who have sex with men and transgender women at risk for HIV Infection: the PrEP Brasil demonstration project. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2017; 20(1): 21472. DOI: 10.7448/IAS.20.1.21472
16. Seekaew P, Nguyen E, Sungsing T, et al. Correlates of nonadherence to key population-led HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis services among Thai men who have sex with men and transgender women. *BMC Public Health* 2019; 19(1): 1–11. DOI: 10.1186/s12889-019-6645-0
17. Spinelli MA, Scott HM, Vittinghoff E, et al. Missed visits associated with future preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP) discontinuation among PrEP users in a municipal primary care health network. In: *Open forum infectious diseases*. Oxford University Press US, 2019, 6(4): p. ofz101. DOI: 10.1093/ofid/ofz101
18. Leu C-S, Giguere R, Bauermeister JA, et al. Trajectory of use over time of an oral tablet and a rectal gel for HIV prevention among transgender women and men who have sex with men. *AIDS Care* 2019; 31(3): 379–387. DOI: 10.1080/09540121.2018.1533223
19. Kimani M, van der Elst EM, Chirro O, et al. “I wish to remain HIV negative”: pre-exposure prophylaxis adherence and persistence in transgender women and men who

have sex with men in coastal Kenya. *PLoS One* 2021; 16(1): e0244226. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0244226

20. Phanuphak N, Sungsing T, Jantarapakde J, et al. Princess PrEP program: the first key population-led model to deliver pre-exposure prophylaxis to key populations by key populations in Thailand. *Sex Health* 2018; 15(6): 542–555. DOI: 10.1071/SH18065
21. Ramautarsing RA, Meksen R, Sungsing T, et al. Evaluation of a pre-exposure prophylaxis programme for men who have sex with men and transgender women in Thailand: learning through the HIV prevention cascade lens. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2020; 23(S3): e25540. DOI: 10.1002/jia2.25540
22. Grinsztejn B, Hoagland B, Moreira RI, et al. Retention, engagement, and adherence to pre-exposure prophylaxis for men who have sex with men and transgender women in PrEP Brasil: 48 week results of a demonstration study. *lancet HIV* 2018; 5(3): e136–e145. DOI: 10.1016/S2352-3018(18)30008-0
23. Deutsch MB, Glidden D V, Sevelius J, et al. HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis in transgender women: a subgroup analysis of the iPrEx trial. *lancet HIV* 2015; 2(12): e512–e519. DOI: 10.1016/S2352-3018(15)00206-4
24. Murnane PM, Heffron R, Ronald A, et al. Pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV-1 prevention does not diminish the pregnancy prevention effectiveness of hormonal contraception. *AIDS* 2014; 28(12): 1825. DOI: 10.1097/QAD.0000000000000290
25. Marshall BDL, Mimiaga MJ. Uptake and effectiveness of PrEP for transgender women. *lancet HIV* 2015; 2(12): e502. DOI: 10.1016/S2352-3018(15)00224
26. Morris M, Cooper RL, Ramesh A, et al. Training to reduce LGBTQ-related bias

among medical, nursing, and dental students and providers: a systematic review.

BMC Med Educ 2019; 19(1): 1–13.

27. Sekoni AO, Gale NK, Manga-Atangana B, et al. The effects of educational curricula and training on LGBT-specific health issues for healthcare students and professionals: a mixed-method systematic review. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2017; 20(1): 21624. DOI: 10.7448/IAS.20.1.21624
28. Zalazar V, Arístegui I, Kerr T, et al. High willingness to use HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis among transgender women in Argentina. *Transgender Heal* 2016; 1(1): 266–273. DOI: 10.1089/trgh.2016.0033
29. Wilson EC, Turner CM, Arayasirikul S, et al. Disparities in the PrEP continuum for trans women compared to MSM in San Francisco, California: results from population-based cross-sectional behavioural surveillance studies. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2020; 23(S3): e25539. DOI: 10.1002/jia2.25539
30. Anderson PL, Reirden D, Castillo-Mancilla J. Pharmacologic considerations for preexposure prophylaxis in transgender women. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2016; 72(Suppl 3): S230–S234.. DOI: 10.1097/QAI.0000000000001105
31. Galka JM, Wang M, Azwa I, et al. Willingness to Use Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) for HIV Prevention and PrEP Implementation Preferences Among Transgender Women in Malaysia. *Transgender Heal* 2020; 5(4): 258–266. DOI: 10.1089/trgh.2020.0003
32. Horvath KJ, Todd K, Arayasirikul S, et al. Underutilization of pre-exposure prophylaxis services among transgender and nonbinary youth: findings from project

Moxie and TechStep. *Transgender Heal* 2019; 4(1): 217–221. DOI:

10.1089/trgh.2019.0027

33. Sevelius JM, Glidden D V, Deutsch M, et al. Uptake, retention, and adherence to pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in TRIUMPH: a peer-led PrEP demonstration project for transgender communities in Oakland and sacramento, California. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2021; 88(1): S27-S38. DOI: 10.1097/QAI.0000000000002808
34. Sevelius JM, Keatley J, Calma N, et al. ‘I am not a man’: Trans-specific barriers and facilitators to PrEP acceptability among transgender women. *Glob Public Health* 2016; 11(7-8): 1060–1075. DOI: 10.1080/17441692.2016.1154085
35. Kearns S, Kroll T, O ‘Shea D, et al. Experiences of transgender and non-binary youth accessing gender-affirming care: A systematic review and meta-ethnography. *PLoS One* 2021; 16(9): e0257194. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0257194
36. Oliveira L, de Medeiros DS, Magno L, et al. Association between gender-based discrimination and medical visits and HIV testing in a large sample of transgender women in northeast Brazil. *Int J Equity Health* 2021; 20(1): 1–11. DOI: 10.1186/s12939-021-01541-z
37. Mereish EH, O’Cleirigh C, Bradford JB. Interrelationships between LGBT-based victimization, suicide, and substance use problems in a diverse sample of sexual and gender minorities. *Psychol Health Med* 2014; 19(1): 1–13. DOI: 10.1080/13548506.2013.780129
38. Kosenko K, Rintamaki L, Raney S, et al. Transgender patient perceptions of stigma in health care contexts. *Med Care* 2013; 51(9): 819–822.

39. Lacombe-Duncan A, Logie CH, Persad Y, et al. Implementation and evaluation of the ‘Transgender Education for Affirmative and Competent HIV and Healthcare (TEACHH)’ provider education pilot. *BMC Med Educ* 2021; 21(1): 1–14. DOI: 10.1186/s12909-021-02991-3
40. Nadal KL, Davidoff KC, Fujii-Doe W. Transgender women and the sex work industry: Roots in systemic, institutional, and interpersonal discrimination. *J Trauma Dissociation* 2014; 15(2): 169–183. DOI: 10.1080/15299732.2014.867572