

Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) knowledge, use, and discontinuation among Lake Victoria fisherfolk in Uganda: a cross-sectional population-based study

Kauthrah Ntabadde¹, Joseph Kagaayi^{2,3}, Victor Ssempijja^{2,4}, Xinyi Feng⁶, Robert Kairania², Joseph Lubwama², Robert Ssekubugu², Ping Teresa Yeh⁷, Joseph Ssekasanvu¹, Aaron A R Tobian⁶, Caitlin E. Kennedy⁷, Lisa A. Mills⁸, Stella Alamo⁸, Philip Kreniske⁹, John Santelli¹⁰, Lisa J. Nelson⁸, Steven J. Reynolds^{2,5,11}, Larry William Chang^{2,11}, Gertrude Nakigozi², M. Kate Grabowski^{1,2,6}

1. Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA
2. Rakai Health Sciences Program, Kalisizo, Uganda
3. Makerere University School of Public Health, Kampala, Uganda
4. Clinical Monitoring Research Program Directorate, Frederick National Laboratory for Cancer Research, Frederick, MD, USA
5. Division of Intramural Research, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA
6. Department of Pathology, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA
7. Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA
8. United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Uganda, Division of Global HIV & TB, Kampala Uganda
9. Community Health and Social Sciences Department, Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, City University of New York (CUNY)
10. Department of Population and Family Health and Pediatrics, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, New York, New York, USA
11. Division of Infectious Diseases, School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

Corresponding author: M. Kate Grabowski, 600 N. Wolfe Street, 446 Carnegie Building, Baltimore, Maryland 21205, Telephone: +1 (305) 331-5568, Email: mgrabow2@jhu.edu

Meetings at which parts of the data were presented: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections (CROI), Seattle, Feb 2023

Conflicts of Interest and Source of Funding: The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The Rakai Community Cohort Study round 19 was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health (R01MH099733, R01MH105313, R01MH107275, R01MH115799), National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (R01AI114438, K25AI114461, R01AI123002, K01AI125086, R01AI128779, R01AI143333), National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (K01AA024068), Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R01HD091003) and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (OPP1175094). The study was also supported in part by the Division of Intramural Research, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. KN received training and support from the National Institutes of Health Fogarty International Center (D43TW010557). The funders were not involved in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data or in writing the manuscript. This study has also been supported by the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) through CDC under the terms of NU2GGH002009.

Disclaimer: The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Running head (40 characters): PrEP implementation in Uganda

ABSTRACT

Background: There are limited population-level data on the pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) care continuum in eastern Africa. Here, we assessed the PrEP care continuum following PrEP rollout in a Ugandan community with ~40% HIV seroprevalence.

Methods: We used cross-sectional population-based data collected between September 3 and December 19, 2018 from a Lake Victoria fishing community in southern Uganda to measure levels of self-reported PrEP knowledge, ever use, and discontinuation following 2017 PrEP rollout via a U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR)-supported phased implementation program. Our analysis included HIV-seronegative persons reporting having ever received an HIV test result. We examined associations between demographic, behavioral, and health utilization factors with each outcome using age-adjusted modified Poisson regression.

Results: There were 1,401 HIV-seronegative participants, of whom 1,363 (97.3%) reported ever receiving an HIV test result. Median age was 29 years (IQR: 23-36), and 42.3% (n=577) were women. Most (85.5%; n=1,166) participants reported PrEP knowledge, but few (14.5%; n=197) reported ever using PrEP. Among 375 (47.7%) men and 169 (29.3%) women PrEP-eligible at time of survey, 18.9% (n=71) and 27.8% (n=47) reported ever using PrEP, respectively. Over half (52.3%, n=103) of those who had ever used PrEP, self-reported current use.

Conclusion: In this Lake Victoria fishing community, there were low levels of PrEP use despite high levels of PrEP awareness and eligibility, particularly among men. Efforts that enhance awareness of HIV risk and increase PrEP accessibility may help increase PrEP use among HIV-seronegative persons in African settings with high HIV burden.

Keywords: HIV, pre-exposure prophylaxis, PrEP, Africa, Uganda, Lake Victoria fisherfolk, key populations

INTRODUCTION

Despite major advances in the treatment and prevention of HIV, the virus remains a major public health threat, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa (1). Within Africa, the HIV epidemic is concentrated in the eastern and southern regions, which accounted for more than half of all new infections worldwide in 2020 (1). In 2015, the World Health Organization recommended the use of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) by people at substantial risk of HIV acquisition (2), following randomized studies demonstrating significant reductions in HIV incidence among persons adhering to oral PrEP (3–6). These guidelines were subsequently adopted by many African countries with high HIV burden, including Uganda (7). However, population-based data on PrEP uptake in African populations outside of PEPFAR program data since PrEP guidelines were adopted are rare.

Beginning in 2017, the United States Centers for Disease Control through the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) initiated PrEP implementation projects in selected African populations at high risk for HIV, including Lake Victoria fishing communities in eastern Africa. Fishing communities in the Lake Victoria basin have among the highest HIV incidence rates globally, with adult HIV seroprevalence typically exceeding 20% (8). While these communities were among those prioritized for early rollout of oral PrEP, limited available programmatic and qualitative data suggests major challenges with retaining eligible individuals in these communities in PrEP programs (9,10). For example, in a program evaluation among fisherfolk in southern Uganda, Kagaayi et al. reported >90% oral PrEP uptake among those screened and eligible, but median retention time among persons who initiated PrEP was only 45 days (10). It remains unclear to what extent PrEP screening programs have reached individuals at substantial risk of HIV in Lake Victoria fishing communities and how this may have affected overall population-level patterns of PrEP use and retention.

The Rakai Community Cohort Study (RCCS) is an ongoing population HIV surveillance cohort in southern Uganda, including four Lake Victoria fishing communities with ~40% HIV seroprevalence (11). The largest of these four fishing communities was the site of a PEPFAR-supported PrEP

implementation project, which began in October 2017. Here, we used cross-sectional population-level data from this fishing community to assess levels and factors associated with PrEP knowledge, ever use, and discontinuation following PrEP implementation in 2018. In contrast to prior programmatic and clinic-based assessments, we evaluated PrEP eligibility among HIV-seronegative persons at a population-level and estimated the extent to which individuals at substantial risk of HIV and therefore PrEP-eligible were aware of and engaged with PrEP services. Understanding patterns of PrEP knowledge, ever use, and discontinuation at a population-level may inform future PrEP implementation strategies in Lake Victoria fisherfolk and other populations at substantial risk of HIV acquisition in Africa (12).

METHODS

Study population and setting

This cross-sectional study was nested in the RCCS, an open population-based HIV census and surveillance cohort in south central Uganda, including four Lake Victoria fishing communities. The RCCS is conducted by the Rakai Health Sciences Program (RHSP), which is both an HIV research organization and implementer of PEPFAR -funded HIV prevention and treatment services. The RCCS has been described in detail elsewhere (10,11,13). In brief, a detailed household census is conducted prior to each RCCS survey. The census enumerates all household members irrespective of age and is followed by a survey of age-eligible persons 15-49 years and resident in study communities for ≥ 6 months. The RCCS survey obtains data on participant demographics, sexual behaviors, recent sexual partnerships, HIV service utilization, including information on past and current PrEP use, among other data. Consenting survey participants are also tested for HIV using a validated rapid HIV testing algorithm (7) with confirmation by an enzyme immunoassay for persons testing HIV-seropositive for the first time. All RCCS participants are linked to HIV prevention services, as well as care and treatment if HIV-seropositive per Uganda clinical guidelines.

Our analysis was restricted to HIV-seronegative adolescents and adults aged 15-49 years living in the largest of the four Lake Victoria fishing communities under RCCS surveillance. Data from this community were obtained between September 3, 2018 and December 19, 2018 as part of the nineteenth survey round of RCCS data collection. The analysis timeline was purposively selected to allow adequate time for PrEP implementation (~1 year) as well as to avoid possible confounding effect of COVID 19 pandemic, which began in March 2020 in Uganda. This particular fishing community is located along the banks of Lake Victoria in Kyotera district near Uganda's border with Tanzania, where the first HIV cases were identified in Eastern Africa (14).

Ethics

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Uganda Virus Research Institute (GC/127/08/12/137) and the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine Institutional Review Board (IRB00217467), and was registered with the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology (HS 540). All RCCS participants provide written informed consent (or assent with parental consent if <18 years) prior to survey participation. This project was reviewed in accordance with CDC human research protection procedures and was determined to be research, but CDC investigators did not interact with human subjects or have access to identifiable data or specimens for research purposes.

The oral PrEP programme

Oral PrEP (tenofovir disoproxil fumarate [TDF] and lamivudine [3TC]) was first rolled out among key and priority populations in southern Uganda, including among Lake Victoria fisherfolk in 2017. Details of its implementation have been described previously (10). In the Lake Victoria fishing community in this study, residents were initially mobilized and sensitized about PrEP through RHSP-supported community outreach efforts. As part of community outreach, residents were referred to health facilities for PrEP eligibility screening which was done using a risk-screening tool. Individuals were deemed PrEP-eligible if they reported at least one of the following risk factors: 1) vaginal sexual intercourse with more than one partner of unknown HIV status in the past six months; 2) vaginal sex without a condom in the past six months; 3) anal sexual intercourse in the past six months; 4) sex in exchange for money, goods or a service in the last six months; 5) injecting drugs in the past six months; 6) diagnosis with a sexually transmitted infection more than once in the past twelve months; 7) post-exposure prophylaxis for sexual exposure to HIV in the past six months; and 8) having a sexual partner with HIV who was not on ART. Eligible persons who initiated PrEP were then followed on a quarterly basis at health facilities for adherence counseling, HIV retesting, and evaluation of side effects.

In this current study, we assessed likely PrEP eligibility among RCCS participants by classifying them as having substantial HIV risk based on criteria previously described by Ssempijja et al (15). Criteria were analogous, though somewhat different, to the Uganda's national prep eligibility criteria above. Briefly, individuals were considered to have substantial HIV risk (i.e., likely PrEP eligible) if they were HIV-seronegative and reported at least one of the following risk behaviors in the last year: having multiple sexual partners of unknown HIV serostatus, having genital ulcer disease, having non-marital sex without a condom, or engaging in transactional sex (considered to be sexual exploitation for those <18 years by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child(16)).

Primary outcomes

Our primary outcomes included PrEP knowledge, PrEP ever use and PrEP discontinuation assessed by self-report at time of RCCS survey. PrEP knowledge and PrEP ever use were defined as self-reported “yes” responses to the questions: “Have you ever heard about a way to prevent HIV which involves an HIV-seronegative person taking a daily pill called PrEP to reduce their risk of acquiring HIV while in a sexual relationship with someone who might be HIV-positive?” and “Have you ever used PrEP?”. PrEP discontinuation was defined as a self-reported response “no” to current PrEP use but “yes” to PrEP ever use in the same survey. We ascertained reasons for PrEP discontinuation from a multiple response question that began by asking participants who had discontinued PrEP “Why did you stop using PrEP?”.

Statistical analysis

We first described baseline demographic and behavioral characteristics of study participants by gender, with categorical variables reported as frequencies and percentages and continuous variables as medians with interquartile ranges (IQR). Next, we assessed the proportion self-reporting PrEP knowledge and ever use by age and gender with proportions reported as percentages (i.e., prevalence). Individual-

level correlates of PrEP knowledge and ever use were evaluated for male and female participants separately using modified Poisson regression with robust variance estimators with and without adjustment for age. Associations were reported as unadjusted and age-adjusted prevalence ratios (PR) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). Correlates evaluated included age, educational level, occupation, recent in-migration to the community (since last RCCS survey; ~18 month interval), marital status, number of sexual partners in the past year, perceived HIV risk, intimate partner violence (i.e., self-reported experience of domestic and/or sexual abuse), substantial HIV risk/likely PrEP eligibility at time of survey, self-reported HIV test in the past year, use of at least one family planning method, and transactional sex with ≥ 1 of four most recent sexual partners in the past year. Given that PrEP use is driven by PrEP eligibility, we also conducted stratified analyses of PrEP ever use by substantial HIV risk/likely PrEP eligibility. We conducted similar analyses for PrEP discontinuation among those reporting having ever used PrEP; however, analyses were not stratified by gender due to limited sample size. Analyses were performed using Stata Version 17.

RESULTS

Study population

There were 2,701 survey participants, of whom 1,401 (64.4%) tested HIV seronegative, including 577 (42.3%) women. Of these 1,401 participants, 1,363 (97%) reported having ever been tested for HIV and were subsequently asked about their PrEP knowledge and use. Median age among HIV seronegative participants who reported ever testing for HIV was 31 (IQR: 25-38) and 27 (IQR: 22-33) years among male and female participants, respectively (Table 1). The majority had at least some primary education, an HIV test within the past 12 months, and were married. Nearly half (47.7%) of all male participants and 29.3% of female participants were classified as being PrEP-eligible; however, female participants were more likely to report that they were very likely to acquire HIV (51.5% vs. 36.8%, respectively).

Prevalence and correlates of PrEP knowledge

Overall, 85.5% (n=1166/1363) of participants self-reported knowledge of PrEP (Table 2). The proportion of participants with PrEP knowledge did not significantly vary by gender (86.5% [680/786] among male vs. 84.2% [486/577] among female participants), but tended to be lower among adolescents 15-19 years relative to older age groups (Figure 1). Among male participants, knowledge of PrEP was significantly lower among those who self-reported transactional sex in the last year, those who self-reported being not at risk or having unknown risk of HIV acquisition, and those who self-reported not having an HIV test in the past year (Table 2). Conversely, men who reported using a family planning method versus those who did not were more likely to have PrEP knowledge, as were currently married men compared to men who had never been married. Similar to men, PrEP knowledge was significantly lower among female participants with lower levels of HIV risk perception, but higher among those using family planning methods (Table 2). While PrEP knowledge was significantly higher among women who reported multiple sexual partners and who were likely PrEP eligible, this was not the case for men (Table 2).

Prevalence and Correlates of PrEP ever use

Prevalence of PrEP ever use was 14.5% (n=197/1363) and was generally similar between male and female participants (14.8% [116/786] versus 14% [81/577], respectively), but similar to PrEP knowledge, lower among adolescents (Figure 1). Participants classified as being at substantial HIV risk (i.e., likely PrEP eligible) at time of survey were significantly more likely to report having used PrEP compared to those who were not at substantial HIV risk (21.7% [n=118/544] vs 9.7% [79/819]; adjPR= 2.27; 95%CI: 1.75 – 2.95; p= <0.001). While proportionately more male than female participants were at substantial HIV risk and likely PrEP eligible (47.7% [n=375/786] versus 29.3% [n=169/577]; Supplemental Table 1), prevalence of PrEP ever use was significantly higher among female versus male participants likely PrEP eligible (27.8% [47/169] versus 18.9% [71/375]; PRR=1.47; 95%CI: 1.07 – 2.02; p= 0.019) (Fig 2).

Among male participants, having three or more sexual partners in the past year, higher HIV risk perception, or having an HIV test in the last year was significantly associated with higher levels of PrEP ever use (Table 3). This was also the case among female participants; however, girls and women were also significantly more likely to report having used PrEP if they reported intimate partner violence or transactional sex/sexual exploitation (Table 3). Female participants who reported using a family planning method also tended to have higher levels of PrEP ever use as compared to female participants who did not report using a family planning method (adjPR=1.58; 95%CI:0.99-2.52). Individual-level correlates of PrEP ever use were generally similar among participants at substantial HIV risk (Supplemental Table 1).

Prevalence and correlates of PrEP discontinuation

Among participants who reported ever using PrEP (n=197), 47.7% (n= 94) reported that they were not currently using PrEP at time of survey (i.e., discontinued PrEP). The most common reasons for reporting PrEP discontinuation were: side effects (39.4%; 37/94), pill burden (20.2%; 19/94), low risk perception (12.8%; 12/94), trouble transferring between clinics (9.6%; 9/94), not ready to take PrEP (7.5%; 7/94); and lack of pills (5.3%; 5/94). Other less common reasons included stigma (n=3), use of other HIV prevention methods (n=4), skepticism about the efficacy of PrEP (n=2), and long distance to the clinic

(n=2). With the exception of higher educational status, which was associated with higher levels of discontinuation, levels of PrEP discontinuation did not substantially vary by age or any other individual-level factors, including being at substantial HIV risk (Supplemental Table 2).

DISCUSSION

In this cross-sectional, population-based study of oral PrEP use in a Ugandan Lake Victoria fishing community following a community-based PrEP implementation project, we observed very high levels of PrEP knowledge, but low levels of PrEP use. PrEP knowledge and ever use tended to be lower among adolescents, while PrEP ever use was higher among those with elevated HIV risk perception, and persons reporting having had an HIV test in the last year. While male participants had higher levels of HIV-associated risk behaviors, they had significantly lower levels of PrEP use as compared to their female counterparts. Among those who reported having ever used PrEP, less than 50% were currently using PrEP at time of survey and most people at substantial HIV risk and likely PrEP eligible had never used PrEP.

More than 80% of participants in our study population were aware of PrEP. Although few prior studies have assessed PrEP knowledge at a community-level, our findings are consistent with a 2019 population-based survey of persons aged 18-24 in six counties in western Kenya (17), which similarly found that 84% of persons were aware of PrEP. However, studies of high-risk key populations in Uganda and other African countries have reported substantially lower levels of PrEP knowledge, with typically less than half of participants being PrEP-aware (18–20). Levels of PrEP knowledge in this study were likely high because of intensive community-based outreach done as part of the implementation project. Such activities have been previously shown to improve PrEP awareness and uptake in high burden areas such as Lake Victoria fishing communities (21).

While PrEP awareness was generally high, both awareness and use were lowest among adolescent boys and girls aged 15-19 years. Such relatively low levels of PrEP use among adolescents compared to other age groups also have been observed in other settings (22,23). Despite low PrEP use, we found that participants under 25 years of age had the highest prevalence of substantial HIV risk behaviors, and across Africa, adolescents girls are typically the age-group most at risk of HIV acquisition (24). Thus, our findings suggest that innovative approaches may be needed to improve the PrEP care continuum

among adolescents. Future research should identify barriers to PrEP awareness and use in this population to inform tailored outreach strategies.

Consistent with earlier studies in African populations at high risk for HIV (18,25,26), we found generally low levels of PrEP use despite high levels of PrEP awareness. Critically, the majority of participants at substantial HIV risk and likely PrEP eligible had never used PrEP. While men were more likely to be at substantial HIV risk than women, men were significantly less likely to have ever used PrEP compared to their female counterparts with similarly high levels of HIV-related risk factors. Notably, most men in our study were Lake Victoria fishermen, who are often highly mobile (27). Prior studies have linked higher levels of mobility to reduced PrEP uptake and retention (9). While most prior PrEP implementation studies in Africa have focused on girls and women, our findings underscore the need to tailor service delivery for men. Differentiated PrEP delivery models that include out-of-clinic options, event driven PrEP, multi-month dispensing and long-acting PrEP options (such as cabotegravir) could improve PrEP uptake among men, adolescents, and other mobile groups in Lake Victoria fishing communities (28,29).

We also observed that higher self-perceived HIV risk was associated with a higher propensity for PrEP ever use irrespective of gender. This finding is consistent with those from prior studies, which have similarly reported that HIV risk perception underpins PrEP use in African populations (22,30,31). We also found that PrEP use was strongly linked to recent HIV testing behavior. While this could be the result of HIV testing requirements for those who initiate and continue PrEP, an earlier study also conducted among Ugandan Lake Victoria fisherfolk observed that having tested for HIV within the last 6 months was associated with higher odds of willingness to use PrEP (32). Moreover, participants in a qualitative study conducted among adolescents in the Western Cape province of South Africa expressed that the availability of the PrEP option to protect themselves against HIV acquisition motivates them to be aware of their HIV status and therefore test regularly (33). In addition to recent HIV testing, those reporting using family planning also tended to have higher levels of PrEP awareness and PrEP ever use.

People using health services such as HIV testing and family planning may have more frequent contacts with the health care system, and thus, additional opportunities for exposure to PrEP. Better integration of HIV and sexual and reproductive services could improve PrEP use and other health outcomes (34,35).

Nearly half of the participants who had ever used PrEP in this study were no longer taking PrEP at time of survey. Although we were unable to specify the timing of PrEP initiation or discontinuation, our findings are congruent with those from a meta-analysis of longitudinal studies conducted in sub-Saharan Africa that found nearly half of individuals who initiated PrEP discontinued PrEP within 6 months (36). It is possible these high levels of PrEP discontinuation in African populations are a result of dynamic HIV risk within individuals. For example, a recent population-based study, nested in the same cohort as this study in Uganda, reported that HIV-risk waxes and wanes over time for many people (37). Prior qualitative studies in Uganda also have linked PrEP discontinuation to stigma, PrEP side effects, and transportation barriers, which we similarly observed in this study (9,32). In our study, the most common specified barriers were side effects and pill burden, rather than a change in self-perceived risk. Enhanced counseling for side effects, including that they wane over time, and expansion of event-driven PrEP to all persons with male sex at birth not on estradiol hormones, as well as prioritizing implementation of new PrEP agents including long acting cabotegravir and the dapivirine vaginal ring (38,39), may help attenuate these common reasons for discontinuation.

Our analysis has important limitations. First, this study was cross-sectional analysis and so our ability to infer temporal relationships between demographic, behavioral, and health utilization factors with PrEP outcomes was limited. For example, we do not know whether high levels of HIV testing among those who had reported PrEP ever use were a cause or consequence of PrEP initiation. We also do not know how changes in PrEP eligibility within individuals may have changed over time and impacted PrEP outcomes, particularly PrEP discontinuation. Second, most data in this study were self-reported, including primary study outcomes, and are likely subject to measurement bias. Third, our assessment of PrEP eligibility from self-reported HIV risk factors in the RCCS only approximated those used in

Uganda's national PrEP eligibility tool. Specifically, we considered only a subset of risk behaviors and these were measured over the last year rather than the prior 6 months. Fourth, we did not assess timing of PrEP discontinuation, and because only few people had ever reported PrEP use, we had limited power to detect factors associated with this outcome. Fifth, this study was conducted in only one Lake Victoria fishing community in Uganda with extremely high HIV burden, and so results may not be generalizable to other populations. Lastly, data for these analyses were collected in 2018. While this allowed us to avoid the confounding influence of COVID-19 lockdowns on PrEP programs, factors associated with PrEP use may have changed in the intervening years. For example, PrEP scale-up in Uganda has since expanded.

In conclusion, this Lake Victoria fishing community with extremely high HIV prevalence had low levels of PrEP use despite high levels of PrEP awareness and PrEP eligibility. At the population level, PrEP use is linked to higher perceived HIV risk, HIV-associated risk factors, and recent HIV testing. Efforts that enhance awareness of HIV risk and increase linkage to PrEP through integrated health services may help increase PrEP use among HIV-seronegative persons in African settings with high HIV burden. Newer PrEP options that are long-acting may also be more suitable for mobile populations. More implementation research is needed to improve PrEP uptake and persistence among eligible people.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by grants from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (grant numbers R01AI143333, R01AI155080, K01AI125086, P30AI094189); the National Institute of Mental Health (grant numbers R01MH107275, R01MH115799, D43TW010557); the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (grant number R01HD091003); the Division of Intramural Research of the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases; and the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (grant number NU2GGH000817). We thank the personnel at the Office of Cyberinfrastructure and Computational Biology at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases for data management support. Additionally, we thank the study participants and many staff and investigators who made this study possible.

REFERENCES

1. UNAIDS_FactSheet_en.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2022 Jan 8]. Available from: https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/UNAIDS_FactSheet_en.pdf
2. World Health Organization. Guideline on when to start antiretroviral therapy and on pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV [Internet]. [cited 2022 Jul 5]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789241509565>
3. Grant RM, Lama JR, Anderson PL, McMahan V, Liu AY, Vargas L, et al. Preexposure Chemoprophylaxis for HIV Prevention in Men Who Have Sex with Men. *N Engl J Med*. 2010 Dec 30;363(27):2587–99.
4. Choopanya K, Martin M, Suntharasamai P, Sangkum U, Mock PA, Leethochawalit M, et al. Antiretroviral prophylaxis for HIV infection in injecting drug users in Bangkok, Thailand (the Bangkok Tenofovir Study): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial. *The Lancet*. 2013 Jun;381(9883):2083–90.
5. Thigpen MC, Kebaabetswe PM, Paxton LA, Smith DK, Rose CE, Segolodi TM, et al. Antiretroviral Preexposure Prophylaxis for Heterosexual HIV Transmission in Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2012 Aug 2;367(5):423–34.
6. Baeten JM, Donnell D, Ndase P, Mugo NR, Campbell JD, Wangisi J, et al. Antiretroviral Prophylaxis for HIV-1 Prevention among Heterosexual Men and Women. *N Engl J Med*. 2012 Aug 2;367(5):399–410.
7. Uganda Ministry of Health. Consolidated Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of HIV in Uganda | Ministry of Health Knowledge Management Portal [Internet]. [cited 2021 Nov 5]. Available from: <http://library.health.go.ug/publications/hivaids/consolidated-guidelines-prevention-and-treatment-hiv-uganda>
8. Opio A, Muyonga M, Mulumba N. HIV Infection in Fishing Communities of Lake Victoria Basin of Uganda – A Cross-Sectional Sero-Behavioral Survey. *PLoS ONE*. 2013 Aug 5;8(8):e70770.
9. Ddaaki W, Strömdahl S, Yeh PT, Rosen JG, Jackson J, Nakyanjo N, et al. Qualitative Assessment of Barriers and Facilitators of PrEP Use Before and After Rollout of a PrEP Program for Priority Populations in South-central Uganda. *AIDS Behav*. 2021 Nov 1;25(11):3547–62.
10. Kagaayi J, Batte J, Nakawooya H, Kigozi B, Nakigozi G, Strömdahl S, et al. Uptake and retention on HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis among key and priority populations in South-Central Uganda. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2020;23(8):e25588.
11. Chang LW, Grabowski MK, Ssekubugu R, Nalugoda F, Kigozi G, Nantume B, et al. Heterogeneity of the HIV epidemic in agrarian, trading, and fishing communities in Rakai, Uganda: an observational epidemiological study. *Lancet HIV*. 2016 Aug;3(8):e388–96.
12. 2025 AIDS TARGETS - UNAIDS [Internet]. [cited 2021 Nov 6]. Available from: <https://aids2025.unaids.org/#section-targets>
13. Grabowski MK, Serwadda DM, Gray RH, Nakigozi G, Kigozi G, Kagaayi J, et al. HIV Prevention Efforts and Incidence of HIV in Uganda. *N Engl J Med*. 2017 Nov 30;377(22):2154–66.

14. Serwadda D, Sewankambo NK, Carswell JW, Bayley AC, Tedder RS, Weiss RA, et al. SLIM DISEASE: A NEW DISEASE IN UGANDA AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH HTLV-III INFECTION. *The Lancet*. 1985 Oct 19;326(8460):849–52.
15. Ssempijja V, Nakigozi G, Ssekubugu R, Kagaayi J, Kigozi G, Nalugoda F, et al. HIGH RATE OF PRE-EXPOSURE PROPHYLAXIS (PrEP) ELIGIBILITY AND ASSOCIATED HIV INCIDENCE IN A POPULATION WITH A GENERALIZED HIV EPIDEMIC IN RAKAI, UGANDA. *JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2022 Apr 13;10.1097/QAI.0000000000002946.
16. United Nations. OHCHR. [cited 2024 Mar 18]. Convention on the Rights of the Child. Available from: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child>
17. Begnel ER, Escudero J, Mugambi M, Mugwanya K, Kinuthia J, Beima-Sofie K, et al. High pre-exposure prophylaxis awareness and willingness to pay for pre-exposure prophylaxis among young adults in Western Kenya: results from a population-based survey. *Int J STD AIDS*. 2020 Apr;31(5):454–9.
18. Harling G, Muya A, Ortblad KF, Mashasi I, Dambach P, Ulenga N, et al. HIV risk and pre-exposure prophylaxis interest among female bar workers in Dar es Salaam: cross-sectional survey. *BMJ Open*. 2019 Mar;9(3):e023272.
19. Muwonge TR, Nsubuga R, Brown C, Nakyanzi A, Bagaya M, Bambia F, et al. Knowledge and barriers of PrEP delivery among diverse groups of potential PrEP users in Central Uganda. *PLOS ONE*. 2020 Oct 28;15(10):e0241399.
20. Hensen B, Machingura F, Busza J, Birdthistle I, Chabata ST, Chiyaka T, et al. How Can We Support the Use of Oral PrEP Among Young Women who Sell Sex? A PrEP Cascade Analysis. *JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2021 Sep 1;88(1):45–56.
21. Edwards AJ, Pollard R, Kennedy CE, Mulamba J, Mbabali I, Anok A, et al. Impact of community health worker intervention on PrEP knowledge and use in Rakai, Uganda: A mixed methods, implementation science evaluation. *Int J STD AIDS*. 2022 Oct;33(11):995–1004.
22. Koss CA, Ayieko J, Mwangwa F, Owaraganise A, Kwarisiima D, Balzer LB, et al. Early Adopters of Human Immunodeficiency Virus Preexposure Prophylaxis in a Population-based Combination Prevention Study in Rural Kenya and Uganda. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am*. 2018 Dec 12;67(12):1853.
23. Koss CA, Charlebois ED, Ayieko J, Kwarisiima D, Kabami J, Balzer LB, et al. Uptake, engagement, and adherence to pre-exposure prophylaxis offered after population HIV testing in rural Kenya and Uganda: 72-week interim analysis of observational data from the SEARCH study. *Lancet HIV*. 2020 Apr 1;7(4):e249–61.
24. UNAIDS. Uganda country factsheets [Internet]. [cited 2021 Nov 5]. Available from: <https://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/uganda>
25. Guure C, Afagbedzi S, Torpey K. Willingness to take and ever use of pre-exposure prophylaxis among female sex workers in Ghana. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2022 Feb 4;101(5):e28798.

26. Stephenson R, Darbes LA, Chavanduka T, Essack Z, van Rooyen H. HIV Testing, Knowledge and Willingness to Use PrEP Among Partnered Men Who Have Sex With Men in South Africa and Namibia. *AIDS Behav.* 2021 Jul 1;25(7):1993–2004.
27. Lubega M, Nakyaanjo N, Nansubuga S, Hiire E, Kigozi G, Nakigozi G, et al. Risk Denial and Socio-Economic Factors Related to High HIV Transmission in a Fishing Community in Rakai, Uganda: A Qualitative Study. *PLoS ONE.* 2015 Aug 26;10(8):e0132740.
28. Ortblad KF, Bardon AR, Mogere P, Kiptinness C, Gakuo S, Mbairi S, et al. Effect of 6-Month HIV Preexposure Prophylaxis Dispensing With Interim Self-testing on Preexposure Prophylaxis Continuation at 12 Months: A Randomized Noninferiority Trial. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2023 Jun 15;6(6):e2318590.
29. Ramraj T, Chirinda W, Jonas K, Govindasamy D, Jama N, Appollis TM, et al. Service delivery models that promote linkages to PrEP for adolescent girls and young women and men in sub-Saharan Africa: a scoping review. *BMJ Open.* 2023 Mar 1;13(3):e061503.
30. Gombe MM, Cakouros BE, Ncube G, Zwangobani N, Mareke P, Mkwamba A, et al. Key barriers and enablers associated with uptake and continuation of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in the public sector in Zimbabwe: Qualitative perspectives of general population clients at high risk for HIV. *PLOS ONE.* 2020 Jan 13;15(1):e0227632.
31. Sila J, Larsen AM, Kinuthia J, Owiti G, Abuna F, Kohler PK, et al. High Awareness, Yet Low Uptake, of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis Among Adolescent Girls and Young Women Within Family Planning Clinics in Kenya. *AIDS Patient Care STDs.* 2020 Aug 1;34(8):336–43.
32. Ssuna B, Katahoire A, Armstrong-Hough M, Kalibbala D, Kalyango JN, Kiweewa FM. Factors associated with willingness to use oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in a fisher-folk community in peri-urban Kampala, Uganda. *BMC Public Health.* 2022 Mar 9;22:468.
33. Yoshioka E, Giovenco D, Kuo C, Underhill K, Hoare J, Operario D. “I’m doing this test so I can benefit from PrEP”: exploring HIV testing barriers/facilitators and implementation of pre-exposure prophylaxis among South African adolescents. *Afr J AIDS Res AJAR.* 2020 Jul;19(2):101–8.
34. Haberlen SA, Narasimhan M, Beres LK, Kennedy CE. Integration of Family Planning Services into HIV Care and Treatment Services: A Systematic Review. *Stud Fam Plann.* 2017;48(2):153–77.
35. Askew I, Berer M. The Contribution of Sexual and Reproductive Health Services to the Fight against HIV/AIDS: A Review. *Reprod Health Matters.* 2003 Jan 1;11(22):51–73.
36. Zhang J, Li C, Xu J, Hu Z, Rutstein SE, Tucker JD, et al. Discontinuation, suboptimal adherence, and reinitiation of oral HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis: a global systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet HIV.* 2022 Apr 1;9(4):e254–68.
37. Ssempijja V, Ssekubugu R, Kigozi G, Nakigozi G, Kagaayi J, Ekstrom AM, et al. DYNAMICS OF PRE-EXPOSURE (PrEP) ELIGIBILITY DUE TO WAXING AND WANING OF HIV RISK IN RAKAI, UGANDA. *JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2022 May 13;10.1097/QAI.0000000000003182.
38. Ngure K, Friedland BA, Szydlow DW, Roberts ST, Garcia M, Levy L, et al. Baseline preferences for oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) or dapivirine intravaginal ring for HIV prevention among

adolescent girls and young women in South Africa, Uganda and Zimbabwe (MTN-034/IPM-045 study). PloS One. 2023;18(6):e0287525.

39. Wara NJ, Mvududu R, Marwa MM, Gómez L, Mashele N, Orrell C, et al. Preferences and acceptability for long-acting PrEP agents among pregnant and postpartum women with experience using daily oral PrEP in South Africa and Kenya. J Int AIDS Soc. 2023;26(5):e26088.

Table 1: Characteristics of male and female study participants in the largest of four Lake Victoria fishing communities under RCCS surveillance in south central Uganda, between September and December of 2018

	Male, N (%)	Female, N (%)
	786 (57.7%)	577 (42.3%)
Age, median (IQR)	31 (25 - 38)	27 (22 - 33)
Substantial HIV risk/likely PrEP eligible	375 (47.7%)	169 (29.3%)
Education level		
None	39 (5.0%)	32 (5.6%)
Primary	559 (71.1%)	336 (58.2%)
Secondary/Tertiary	188 (23.9%)	209 (36.2%)
Marital status		
Never married	157 (20.0%)	56 (9.7%)
Currently married	440 (56.0%)	390 (67.6%)
Previously married	189 (24.1%)	131 (22.7%)
Recent in-migrant*	126 (16.0%)	147 (25.5%)
HIV test within the last year	580 (73.8%)	486 (81.1%)
Using family planning**	239 (30.4%)	235 (45.7%)
Self-perceived HIV risk		
Very likely	297 (37.8%)	297 (51.5%)
Somewhat likely	289 (36.8%)	171 (29.6%)
Unlikely	109 (13.9%)	51 (8.4%)
Not at all/don't know	91 (11.6%)	58 (10.1%)

*Participant in-migrated to community since prior survey (~18-month survey interval between RCCS survey round 19 [current round] and RCCS survey round 18 [prior round]).

**Self-reported use of at least one family planning method at the time of the survey

Table 2: Individual-level correlates of PrEP knowledge among male and female RCCS participants in a Lake Victoria Fishing Community in southcentral Uganda in 2019.

	Male participants (N=786)				Female participants (N=577)			
	No. Reporting/Total (%)	Unadjusted PR (95%CI)	Age-adjusted PR (95%CI)	Age adjusted p-value	No. Reporting/Total (%)	Unadjusted PR (95% CI)	Age-adjusted PR (95%CI)	Age adjusted p-value
Age group (years)								
15-19	42/57 (73.7)	0.85 (0.72 - 1.00)	0.85 (0.72 - 1.00)	0.055	48/69 (69.6)	0.80 (0.67 - 0.94)	0.80 (0.67 - 0.94)	0.007
20-24	113/130 (86.9)	Ref	Ref		133/152 (87.5)	Ref	Ref	
25-29	148/166 (89.2)	1.03 (0.94 - 1.12)	1.03 (0.94 - 1.12)	0.560	110/131 (84)	0.96 (0.87 - 1.06)	0.96 (0.87 - 1.06)	0.401
30-34	131/155 (84.5)	0.97 (0.88 - 1.07)	0.97 (0.88 - 1.07)	0.562	82/94 (87.2)	1.00 (0.90 - 1.10)	1.00 (0.90 - 1.10)	0.951
35-39	117/130 (90.0)	1.04 (0.95 - 1.13)	1.04 (0.95 - 1.13)	0.438	54/59 (91.5)	1.05 (0.95 - 1.15)	1.05 (0.95 - 1.15)	0.370
40-44	83/92 (90.2)	1.04 (0.94 - 1.14)	1.04 (0.94 - 1.14)	0.442	39/47 (83)	0.95 (0.82 - 1.09)	0.95 (0.82 - 1.09)	0.467
45-49	46/56 (82.1)	0.95 (0.82 - 1.09)	0.95 (0.82 - 1.09)	0.426	20/25 (80)	0.91 (0.74 - 1.12)	0.91 (0.74 - 1.12)	0.392
Educational status								
None	32/39 (82.1)	0.93 (0.80 - 1.08)	0.91 (0.78 - 1.06)	0.232	26/32 (81.3)	0.97 (0.81 - 1.15)	0.96 (0.81 - 1.13)	0.598
Primary	492/599 (88.0)	Ref	Ref		282/336 (83.9)	Ref	Ref	
Secondary/Tertiary	156/188 (83.0)	0.94 (0.88- 1.01)	0.94 (0.88 - 1.01)	0.107	178/209 (85.2)	1.01 (0.94 - 1.09)	1.02 (0.94 - 1.10)	0.676
Primary occupation								
Other	119/154 (77.3)	0.86 (0.78 - 0.95)	0.88 (0.80 - 0.97)	0.010	106/129 (82.2)	0.95 (0.86 - 1.05)	0.97 (0.88 - 1.07)	0.600
Agrarian	38/47 (80.9)	0.90 (0.78 - 1.05)	0.91 (0.78 - 1.06)	0.226	43/51 (84.3)	0.97 (0.85 - 1.11)	0.97 (0.84 - 1.11)	0.639
Fishing	353/395 (89.4)	1.00 (0.94 - 1.06)	1.00 (0.94 - 1.06)	0.950				
Housework					112/136 (82.4)	0.95 (0.86 - 1.05)	0.96 (0.87 - 1.06)	0.470
Boda/automobile	23/26 (88.5)	0.99 (0.85 - 1.14)	0.99 (0.85 - 1.15)	0.877				
Waitress/Bartender					76/89 (85.4)	0.99 (0.89 - 1.09)	1.00 (0.90 - 1.11)	0.933
Trader/Shopkeeper	147/164 (89.6)	Ref	Ref		149/172 (86.6)	Ref	Ref	
Recent in-migrant*								
No	579/660 (87.7)	Ref	Ref		372/430 (86.5)	Ref	Ref	
Yes	101/126 (80.2)	0.91 (0.83 - 1.00)	0.92 (0.84 - 1.01)	0.073	114/147 (77.6)	0.90 (0.82 - 0.99)	0.91 (0.83 - 1.00)	0.062
Marital status								
Never married	124/157 (79)	Ref	Ref		40/56 (71.4)	Ref	Ref	
Currently married	394/440 (89.5)	1.13 (1.04 - 1.24)	1.11 (1.01 - 1.23)	0.037	328/390 (84.1)	1.18 (0.99 - 1.40)	1.08 (0.92 - 1.27)	0.331
Previously married	162/189 (85.7)	1.09 (0.98 - 1.20)	1.06 (0.95 - 1.19)	0.295	118/131 (90.1)	1.26 (1.06 - 1.50)	1.16 (0.99 - 1.37)	0.067
Number of sexual partners in last year								
0 or 1	289/338 (85.5)	Ref	Ref		387/467 (82.9)	Ref	Ref	

2	165/184 (89.7)	1.05 (0.98 - 1.12)	1.04 (0.98 - 1.12)	0.194	71/80 (88.8)	1.07 (0.98 - 1.17)	1.08 (0.99 - 1.18)	0.086
>=3	226/264 (85.6)	1.00(0.94 - 1.07)	0.98 (0.92 - 1.05)	0.617	28/30 (93.3)	1.13 (1.01 - 1.25)	1.13 (1.02 - 1.25)	0.023
Perceived HIV risk								
Very likely	260/297 (87.5)	Ref	Ref		258/297 (86.9)	Ref	Ref	
Somewhat likely	256/289 (88.6)	1.01 (0.95 - 1.07)	1.02 (0.96 - 1.09)	0.488	152/171 (88.9)	1.02 (0.95 - 1.10)	1.02 (0.95 - 1.10)	0.512
Unlikely	98/109 (89.9)	1.03 (0.95 - 1.11)	1.04 (0.97 - 1.12)	0.290	36/51 (70.6)	0.81 (0.68 - 0.98)	0.82 (0.68 - 0.99)	0.035
Not at all/Don't know	66/91 (72.5)	0.83 (0.72 - 0.95)	0.86 (0.75 - 0.98)	0.026	40/58 (69.0)	0.79 (0.66 - 0.95)	0.83 (0.70 - 0.99)	0.038
Intimate partner violence								
No	497/574 (86.6)	Ref	Ref		316/375 (84.3)	Ref	Ref	
Yes	151/168 (89.9)	1.04 (0.98 - 1.10)	1.03 (0.97 - 1.10)	0.270	141/158 (89.2)	1.06 (0.99 - 1.14)	1.07 (1.00 - 1.15)	0.068
Substantial HIV risk/likely PrEP eligible								
No	356/411 (86.6)	Ref	Ref		338/408 (82.8)	Ref	Ref	
Yes	324/375 (86.4)	1.00 (0.94 - 1.05)	0.99 (0.94 - 1.05)	0.828	148/169 (87.6)	1.06 (0.98 - 1.14)	1.08 (1.00 - 1.16)	0.044
Most recent HIV test								
< 1 year	514/580 (88.6)	Ref	Ref		399/468 (85.3)	Ref	Ref	
>=1 year	166/206 (80.6)	0.91 (0.85 - 0.98)	0.91 (0.85 - 0.98)	0.012	83/104 (79.8)	0.94 (0.84 - 1.04)	0.93 (0.84 - 1.03)	0.176
Current FP use**								
No	463/547 (84.6)	Ref	Ref		219/279 (78.5)	Ref	Ref	
Yes	217/239 (90.8)	1.07 (1.02 - 1.13)	1.06 (1.01 - 1.12)	0.030	213/235 (90.6)	1.15 (1.07 - 1.24)	1.15 (1.06 - 1.23)	<0.001
Transactional sex in last year***								
No	503/566 (88.9)	Ref	Ref		387/453 (85.4)	Ref	Ref	
Yes	152/187 (81.3)	0.91 (0.85 - 0.99)	0.91 (0.84 - 0.98)	0.009	75/87 (86.2)	1.01 (0.92 - 1.11)	1.02 (0.93 - 1.12)	0.671

PR=prevalence ratio; CI=confidence interval; FP=family planning; *Participant in-migrated to community since prior survey (~18-month survey interval between RCCS survey round 19 [current round] and RCCS survey round 18 [prior round]) **Self-reported use of at least one family planning method at the time of the survey ***Sexual exploitation for respondents < 18 years of age.

Table 3: Individual-level correlates of PrEP ever use among female and male RCCS participants in a Lake Victoria fishing community in southcentral Uganda in 2019

	Male participants (N=786)				Female participants (N=577)			
	No. Reporting/Total (%)	Unadjusted PR (95%CI)	Age-adjusted PR (95%CI)	Age adjusted p-value	No. Reporting/Total (%)	Unadjusted PR (95% CI)	Age-adjusted PR (95%CI)	Age adjusted p-value
Age group (years)								
15-19	7/57 (12.3)	1.00 (0.43 - 2.29)	1.00 (0.43 - 2.29)	0.996	6/69 (8.7)	0.51 (0.22 - 1.18)	0.51 (0.22 - 1.18)	0.115
20-24	16/130 (12.3)	Ref	Ref		26/152 (17.1)	Ref	Ref	
25-29	28/166 (16.9)	1.37 (0.77 - 2.42)	1.37 (0.77 - 2.42)	0.279	18/131 (13.7)	0.80 (0.46 - 1.40)	0.80 (0.46 - 1.40)	0.439
30-34	22/155 (14.2)	1.15 (0.63 - 2.10)	1.15 (0.63 - 2.10)	0.642	15/94 (16)	0.93 (0.52 - 1.67)	0.93 (0.52 - 1.67)	0.815
35-39	21/130 (16.2)	1.31 (0.72 - 2.40)	1.31 (0.72 - 2.40)	0.377	6/59 (10.2)	0.59 (0.26 - 1.37)	0.59 (0.26 - 1.37)	0.223
40-44	19/92 (20.7)	1.68 (0.91 - 3.09)	1.68 (0.91 - 3.09)	0.096	7/47 (14.9)	0.87 (0.40 - 1.88)	0.87 (0.40 - 1.88)	0.724
45-49	3/56 (5.4)	0.44 (0.13 - 1.44)	0.44 (0.13 - 1.44)	0.172	3/25 (12)	0.70 (0.23 - 2.15)	0.70 (0.23 - 2.15)	0.535
Educational Status								
None	9/39 (23.1)	1.59 (0.87 - 2.92)	1.45 (0.79 - 2.65)	0.230	6/32 (18.8)	1.31 (0.61 - 2.83)	1.42 (0.64 - 3.13)	0.386
Primary	81/559 (14.5)	Ref	Ref		48/336 (14.3)	Ref	Ref	
Sec/Tertiary	26/188 (13.8)	0.95 (0.63 - 1.44)	0.97 (0.64 - 1.46)	0.878	27/209 (12.9)	0.90 (0.58 - 1.40)	0.90 (0.57 - 1.41)	0.633
Primary occupation								
Other	17/154 (11.0)	0.79 (0.44 - 1.42)	0.80 (0.44 - 1.45)	0.453	18/129 (14)	0.89 (0.51 - 1.54)	0.96 (0.55 - 1.68)	0.888
Agrarian	3/47 (6.4)	0.46 (0.14 - 1.45)	0.45 (0.14 - 1.45)	0.182	10/51 (19.6)	1.25 (0.65 - 2.41)	1.30 (0.67 - 2.52)	0.443
Fishing	70/395 (17.7)	1.26 (0.82 - 1.95)	1.25 (0.81 - 1.93)	0.318				
Housework					14/136 (10.3)	0.66 (0.36 - 1.20)	0.63 (0.34 - 1.17)	0.142
Boda/automobile	3/26 (11.5)	0.82 (0.27 - 2.55)	0.83 (0.27 - 2.53)	0.739				
Waitress/Bartender					12/89 (13.5)	0.86 (0.46 - 1.61)	0.85 (0.45 - 1.58)	0.606
Trader/Shopkeeper	23/164 (14)	Ref	Ref		27/172 (15.7)	Ref	Ref	
Recent in-migrant*								
No	93/660 (14.1)	Ref	Ref		62/430 (14.4)	Ref	Ref	
Yes	23/126 (18.3)	1.30 (0.86 - 1.96)	1.38 (0.91 - 2.09)	0.133	19/147 (12.9)	0.90 (0.56 - 1.45)	0.89 (0.54 - 1.46)	0.653
Marital status								
Never married	19/157 (12.1)	Ref	Ref		5/56 (8.9)	Ref	Ref	
Currently married	57/440 (13)	1.07 (0.66 - 1.74)	0.98 (0.51 - 1.88)	0.953	52/390 (13.3)	1.49 (0.62 - 3.58)	1.29 (0.49 - 3.36)	0.608
Previously married	40/189 (21.2)	1.75 (1.06 - 2.89)	1.59 (0.83 - 3.05)	0.160	24/131 (18.3)	2.05 (0.82 - 5.11)	1.86 (0.67 - 5.16)	0.231
Number of sexual partners in last year								
0 or 1	38/338 (11.2)	Ref	Ref		50/467 (10.7)	Ref	Ref	

2	28/184 (15.2)	1.35 (0.86 - 2.13)	1.36 (0.86 - 2.15)	0.187	18/80 (22.5)	2.10 (1.29 - 3.41)	2.25 (1.39 - 3.66)	0.001
>=3	50/264 (18.9)	1.68 (1.14 - 2.49)	1.68 (1.13 - 2.51)	0.011	13/30 (43.3)	4.05 (2.49 - 6.58)	4.22 (2.56 - 6.96)	<0.001
Perceived HIV risk								
Very likely	60/297 (20.2)	Ref	Ref		58/297 (19.5)	Ref	Ref	
Somewhat likely	36/289 (12.5)	0.62 (0.42 - 0.90)	0.64 (0.43 - 0.93)	0.021	19/171 (11.1)	0.57 (0.35 - 0.92)	0.55 (0.34 - 0.90)	0.017
Unlikely	12/109 (11.0)	0.54 (0.31 - 0.97)	0.57 (0.32 - 1.00)	0.052	2/51 (3.9)	0.20 (0.05 - 0.80)	0.20 (0.05 - 0.79)	0.022
Not at all/Don't know	8/91 (8.8)	0.44 (0.22 - 0.88)	0.46 (0.21 - 0.99)	0.046	2/58 (3.5)	0.18 (0.04 - 0.70)	0.18 (0.04 - 0.73)	0.017
Intimate partner violence								
No	85/574 (14.8)	Ref	Ref		50/375 (13.3)	Ref	Ref	
Yes	30/168 (17.9)	1.21 (0.83 - 1.76)	1.19 (0.82 - 1.74)	0.367	31/158 (19.6)	1.47 (0.98 - 2.21)	1.52 (1.01 - 2.29)	0.044
Substantial HIV risk/likely PrEP eligible								
No	45/411 (11.0)	Ref	Ref		34/408 (8.3)	Ref	Ref	
Yes	71/375 (18.9)	1.73 (1.22 - 2.45)	1.76 (1.24 - 2.49)	0.002	47/169 (27.8)	3.34 (2.23 - 5.0)	3.45 (2.31 - 5.13)	<0.001
Most recent HIV test								
< 1 year	103/580 (17.8)	Ref	Ref		78/468 (16.7)	Ref	Ref	
>=1 year	13/206 (6.3)	0.36 (0.20 - 0.62)	0.36 (0.21 - 0.64)	<0.001	3/109 (2.8)	0.17 (0.05 - 0.51)	0.17 (0.05 - 0.52)	0.002
Current FP use**								
No	79/547 (14.4)	Ref	Ref		30/279 (10.8)	Ref	Ref	
Yes	37/239 (15.5)	1.07 (0.75 - 1.54)	1.03 (0.71 - 1.48)	0.885	41/235 (17.5)	1.62 (1.05 - 2.51)	1.58 (0.99 - 2.52)	0.054
Transactional sex in last year***								
No	87/566 (15.4)	Ref	Ref		49/453 (10.8)	Ref	Ref	
Yes	29/187 (15.5)	1.01 (0.69 - 1.49)	1.00 (0.69 - 1.47)	0.980	32/87 (36.8)	3.40 (2.32 - 4.98)	3.56 (2.43 - 5.22)	<0.000

PR=prevalence ratio; CI=confidence interval; FP=family planning; *Participant in-migrated to community since prior survey (~18-month survey interval between RCCS survey round 19 [current round] and RCCS survey round 18 [prior round]); **Self-reported use of at least one family planning method at the time of the survey ****Sexual exploitation for respondents under 18 years of age.

Supplemental Table 1: Individual-level correlates of PrEP ever use among 544 participants in a Lake Victoria Fishing community in southcentral Uganda in 2019 at substantial HIV risk/likely PrEP eligible stratified by gender.

Male participants (N=375)					Female participants (N=169)			
	No. Reporting/Total (%)	Unadjusted PR (95%CI)	Age-adjusted PR (95%CI)	p- value	No. Reporting/Total (%)	Unadjusted PR (95% CI)	Age-adjusted PR (95%CI)	p- value
Age								
15-19	4/24 (16.7)	1.17 (0.41 - 3.33)	1.17 (0.41 - 3.33)	0.774	5/30 (16.7)	0.46 (0.19 - 1.12)	0.46 (0.19 - 1.12)	0.088
20-24	11/77 (14.3)	Ref	Ref		18/50 (36.0)	Ref	Ref	
25-29	16/80 (20.0)	1.40 (0.69 - 2.82)	1.40 (0.69 - 2.82)	0.347	11/35 (31.4)	0.87 (0.47 - 1.61)	0.87 (0.47 - 1.61)	0.665
30-34	14/73 (19.2)	1.34 (0.65 - 2.77)	1.34 (0.65 - 2.77)	0.425	8/25 (32.0)	0.89 (0.45 - 1.76)	0.89 (0.45 - 1.76)	0.735
35-39	14/67 (20.9)	1.46 (0.71 - 3.00)	1.46 (0.71 - 3.00)	0.300	2/11 (18.2)	0.51 (0.14 - 1.87)	0.51 (0.14 - 1.87)	0.307
40-44	9/34 (26.5)	1.85 (0.85 - 4.06)	1.85 (0.85 - 4.06)	0.123	2/11 (18.2)	0.51 (0.14 - 1.87)	0.51 (0.14 - 1.88)	0.307
45-49	3/20 (15.0)	1.05 (0.32 - 3.42)	1.05 (0.32 - 3.42)	0.935	1/7 (14.3)	0.40 (0.06 - 2.54)	0.40 (0.06 - 2.54)	0.329
Educational Status								
None	4/17 (23.5)	1.29 (0.53 - 3.15)	1.19 (0.48 - 2.97)	0.710	4/12 (33.3)	1.19 (0.50 - 2.82)	1.29 (0.51 - 3.23)	0.588
Primary	51/279 (18.3)	Ref	Ref		28/100 (28.0)	Ref	Ref	
Secondary/Tertiary	16/79 (20.3)	1.11 (0.67 - 1.83)	1.18 (0.70 - 1.97)	0.536	15/57 (26.3)	0.94 (0.55 - 1.61)	0.87 (0.50 - 1.52)	0.628
Primary occupation								
Other	8/65 (12.3)	0.60 (0.27 - 1.33)	0.60 (0.27 - 1.31)	0.201	9/36 (25.0)	0.91 (0.44 - 1.88)	1.02 (0.50 - 2.09)	0.963
Agrarian	2/15 (13.3)	0.65 (0.16 - 2.56)	0.60 (0.16 - 2.34)	0.465	4/9 (44.4)	1.62 (0.69 - 3.82)	1.85 (0.73 - 4.67)	0.193
Fishing	46/214 (21.5)	1.04 (0.61 - 1.78)	1.02 (0.59 - 1.75)	0.948				
Housework					10/35 (28.6)	1.04 (0.52 - 2.08)	1.06 (0.54 - 2.08)	0.856
Boda/automobile	1/13 (7.7)	0.37 (0.05 - 2.61)	0.41 (0.06 - 2.86)	0.368				
Waitress/Bartender					10/38 (26.3)	0.96 (0.48 - 1.92)	1.02 (0.52 - 2.01)	0.956
Trader/Shopkeeper	14/68 (20.6)	Ref	Ref		14/51 (27.5)	Ref		
Recent in-migrant*								
No	55/306 (18.0)	Ref	Ref		34/111 (30.6)	Ref	Ref	
Yes	16/69 (23.2)	1.29 (0.79 - 2.11)	1.44 (0.87 - 2.40)	0.156	13/58 (22.4)	0.73 (0.42 - 1.28)	0.68 (0.39 - 1.18)	0.170
Marital status								
Never married	15/98 (15.3)	Ref	Ref		4/23 (17.4)	Ref		
Currently married	24/131 (18.3)	1.20 (0.66 - 2.16)	1.08 (0.55 - 2.12)	0.819	23/77 (29.9)	1.72 (0.66 - 4.47)	1.56 (0.60 - 4.06)	0.362
Previously married	32/146 (21.9)	1.43 (0.82 - 2.50)	1.30 (0.68 - 2.51)	0.429	20/69 (29.0)	1.67 (0.63 - 4.38)	1.52 (0.56 - 4.12)	0.411

Number of sexual partners in the past year								
0/1	10/66 (15.2)	Ref	Ref		19/93 (20.4)	Ref	Ref	
2	13/80 (16.3)	1.07 (0.50 - 2.29)	1.05 (0.48 - 2.26)	0.906	15/48 (31.3)	1.53 (0.85 - 2.74)	1.59 (0.89 - 2.85)	0.115
>=3	48/229 (21.0)	1.38 (0.74 - 2.58)	1.38 (0.72 - 2.62)	0.332	13/28 (46.4)	2.27 (1.29 - 4.00)	2.17 (1.22 - 3.88)	0.009
Perceived HIV risk								
Very likely	36/169 (21.3)	Ref	Ref		33/93 (35.5)	Ref	Ref	
Somewhat likely	23/137 (16.8)	0.79 (0.49 - 1.26)	0.81 (0.50 - 1.30)	0.376	12/59 (20.3)	0.57 (0.32 - 1.02)	0.55 (0.31 - 0.98)	0.042
Unlikely	8/41 (19.5)	0.92 (0.46 - 1.82)	0.99 (0.50 - 1.93)	0.968	1/9 (11.1)	0.31 (0.05 - 2.04)	0.37 (0.06 - 2.51)	0.311
Not at all/Don't know	4/28 (14.3)	0.67 (0.26 - 1.74)	0.74 (0.27 - 2.04)	0.565	1/8 (12.5)	0.35 (0.05 - 2.26)	0.37 (0.06 - 2.40)	0.295
Intimate partner violence								
No	53/288 (18.4)	Ref	Ref		32/115 (27.8)	Ref	Ref	
Yes	18/82 (22.0)	1.19 (0.74 - 1.92)	1.24 (0.76 - 2.00)	0.388	15/50 (30.0)	1.08 (0.64 - 1.81)	1.15 (0.68 - 1.93)	0.602
Most recent HIV test								
< 1 year	63/282 (22.3)	Ref	Ref		46/144 (31.9)	Ref		
>=1 year	8/93 (8.6)	0.39 (0.19 - 0.77)	0.38 (0.19 - 0.77)	0.007	1/25 (4.0)	0.13 (0.02 - 0.87)	0.13 (0.02 - 0.96)	0.045
Current FP use**								
No	49/267 (18.4)	Ref	Ref		21/91 (23.1)	Ref		
Yes	22/108 (20.4)	1.11 (0.71 - 1.74)	1.09 (0.68 - 1.72)	0.726	21/65 (32.3)	1.40 (0.84 - 2.35)	1.33 (0.78 - 2.26)	0.300
Transactional sex***								
No	42/185 (22.7)	Ref	Ref		15/81 (18.5)	Ref		
Yes	29/187 (15.5)	0.68 (0.45 - 1.05)	0.65 (0.43 - 1.00)	0.048	32/87 (36.8)	1.99 (1.16 - 3.39)	1.97 (1.16 - 3.34)	0.012

PR=prevalence ratio; CI=confidence interval; FP=family planning; *Participant in-migrated to community since prior survey (~18-month survey interval between RCCS survey round 19 [current round] and RCCS survey round 18 [prior round]); **Self-reported use of at least one family planning method at the time of the survey ***Sexual exploitation for respondents under 18 years of age.

Supplemental Table 2: Individual-level correlates of PrEP discontinuation use among female and male RCCS participants reporting PrEP ever use (n=197) in a Lake Victoria fishing community in southcentral Uganda in 2019

	Total participants (N=197)			Age-adjusted PR (95%CI)	
	No. Reporting/Total (%)	Unadjusted PR (95%CI)	p-value		p-value
Age group (years)					
15-19	4/13 (30.8)	0.59 (0.25 - 1.39)	0.228	0.59 (0.25 - 1.39)	0.228
20-24	22/42 (52.4)	Ref		Ref	
25-29	27/46 (58.7)	1.12 (0.77 - 1.63)	0.554	1.12 (0.77 - 1.63)	0.554
30-34	20/37 (54.1)	1.03 (0.68 - 1.56)	0.882	1.03 (0.68 - 1.56)	0.882
35-39	11/27 (40.7)	0.78 (0.45 - 1.33)	0.360	0.78 (0.45 - 1.33)	0.360
40-44	7/26 (26.9)	0.51 (0.26 - 1.03)	0.061	0.51 (0.26 - 1.03)	0.061
45-49	3/6 (50.0)	0.95 (0.41 - 2.23)	0.915	0.95 (0.41 - 2.23)	0.915
Sex					
Male	56/116 (48.3)	Ref		Ref	
Female	38/81 (46.9)	0.97 (0.72 - 1.31)	0.851	0.94 (0.69 - 1.27)	0.687
Educational Status					
None	7/15 (46.7)	1.11 (0.63 - 1.99)	0.712	1.19 (0.68 - 2.08)	0.538
Primary	54/129 (41.9)	Ref		Ref	
Sec/Tertiary	33/53 (62.3)	1.49 (1.11 - 1.99)	0.008	1.37 (1.02 - 1.84)	0.038
Recent in-migrant*					
No	72/155 (46.5)	Ref		Ref	
Yes	22/42 (52.4)	1.13 (0.81 - 1.58)	0.481	1.07 (0.77 - 1.49)	0.674
Marital status					
Never married	8/24 (33.3)	Ref		Ref	
Currently married	51/109 (46.8)	1.40 (0.77 - 2.56)	0.268	1.47 (0.79 - 2.75)	0.223
Previously married	35/64 (54.7)	1.64 (0.89 - 3.01)	0.111	1.76 (0.94 - 3.28)	0.077
Number of sexual partners in last year					
0 or 1	39/88 (44.3)	Ref		Ref	
2	28/46 (60.9)	1.37 (0.99 - 1.91)	0.059	1.36 (0.98 - 1.90)	0.068
>=3	27/63 (42.9)	0.97 (0.67 - 1.40)	0.859	0.96 (0.66 - 1.38)	0.813
Perceived HIV risk					
Very likely	57/118 (48.3)	Ref		Ref	
Somewhat likely	29/55 (52.7)	1.09 (0.80 - 1.49)	0.582	1.07 (0.79 - 1.45)	0.667

Unlikely	4/14 (28.6)	0.59 (0.25 - 1.38)	0.225	0.60 (0.25 - 1.43)	0.251
Not at all/Don't know	4/10 (40.0)	0.83 (0.38 - 1.81)	0.636	0.88 (0.41 - 1.90)	0.750
Intimate partner violence					
No	61/135 (45.2)	Ref		Ref	
Yes	33/61 (54.1)	1.20 (0.89 - 1.61)	0.234	1.17 (0.86 - 1.59)	0.308
Substantial HIV risk/likely PrEP eligible					
No	35/79 (44.3)	Ref		Ref	
Yes	59/118 (50.0)	1.13 (0.83 - 1.53)	0.439	1.11 (0.82 - 1.50)	0.496
Most recent HIV test					
< 1 year	85/181 (47)	Ref		Ref	
>=1 year	9/16 (56.3)	1.20 (0.76 - 1.90)	0.441	1.20 (0.76 - 1.89)	0.443
Current FP use**					
No	49/109 (45)	Ref		Ref	
Yes	38/78 (48.7)	1.08 (0.80 - 1.47)	0.609	1.07 (0.79 - 1.46)	0.652
Transactional sex in last year***					
No	67/136 (49.3)	Ref		Ref	
Yes	27/61 (44.3)	0.90 (0.65 - 1.25)	0.524	0.94 (0.68 - 1.30)	0.700

PR=prevalence ratio; CI=confidence interval; FP=family planning; *Participant in-migrated to community since prior survey (~18-month survey interval between RCCS survey round 19 [current round] and RCCS survey round 18 [prior round]); **Self-reported use of at least one family planning method at the time of the survey ***Sexual exploitation for respondents under 18 years of age.




Figure 1. Prevalence of self-reported PrEP knowledge and ever use by gender and age among RCCS participants in a Lake Victoria Fishing community in southcentral Uganda in 2019




Figure 2. Prevalence of self-reported PrEP ever use among RCSS participants with and without substantial HIV risk (i.e., likely PrEP eligibility) at time of survey in a Lake Victoria Fishing community in southcentral Uganda in 2019