

1 **Same-day ART initiation as a predictor of loss to follow-up and viral suppression among people living**  
2 **with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa**

3  
4 Jonathan Ross\*<sup>1</sup>, Division of General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine, Albert Einstein College of  
5 Medicine, Bronx, NY, USA and Montefiore Health System, Bronx, NY, USA;

6 Ellen Brazier\*, Institute for Implementation Science in Population Health, City University of New York, New  
7 York, NY, USA and Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, City University of New York,  
8 New York, NY, USA;

9 Geoffrey Fatti, Kheth'Impilo AIDS Free Living, Cape Town, South Africa and Division of Epidemiology and  
10 Biostatistics, Department of Global Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Stellenbosch  
11 University, Cape Town, South Africa;

12 Antoine Jaquet, University of Bordeaux, National Institute for Health and Medical Research (INSERM) UMR  
13 1219, Research Institute for Sustainable Development (IRD) EMR 271, Bordeaux Population Health Centre,  
14 Bordeaux, France;

15 Aristophane Tanon, Service de Maladies Infectieuses et Tropicales (SMIT), Treichville Teaching Hospital,  
16 Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire;

17 Andreas D. Haas, Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine (ISPM), University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland;  
18 Lameck Diero, Department of Medicine, Moi University School of Medicine and Moi Teaching and Referral  
19 Hospital, Eldoret, Kenya;

20 Barbara Castelnovo, Department of Medicine, Moi University School of Medicine and Moi Teaching and  
21 Referral Hospital, Eldoret, Kenya;

22 Constantin T Yiannoutsos, Fairbanks School of Public Health, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN, USA;

23 Denis Nash, Institute for Implementation Science in Population Health, City University of New York, New  
24 York, NY, USA and Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, City University of New York,  
25 New York, NY, USA;

26 Kathryn M. Anastos, Division of General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine, Albert Einstein College  
27 of Medicine, Bronx, NY, USA and Montefiore Health System, Bronx, NY, USA;

28 Marcel Yotebieng, Division of General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine, Albert Einstein College of  
29 Medicine, Bronx, NY, USA and Montefiore Health System, Bronx, NY, USA;

30 On behalf of International epidemiology Databases to Evaluate AIDS (IeDEA)<sup>^</sup>

31  
32 \* contributed equally to this manuscript

33  
34 <sup>1</sup> Corresponding author: 3300 Kossuth Avenue, Bronx, NY 10467 USA; 718-920-7064 (p); 718-561-5165 (f);  
35 joross@montefiore.org

36  
37  
38 <sup>^</sup> IeDEA study group members are listed in Acknowledgments

39  
40 **Running title:** Same-day ART initiation and loss to follow-up

## 1 **ABSTRACT**

### 2 **Background**

3 Treat-All guidelines recommend initiation of antiretroviral therapy (ART) for all people living  
4 with HIV (PLHIV) on the day of diagnosis when possible, yet uncertainty exists about the  
5 impact of same-day ART initiation on subsequent care engagement. We examined the  
6 association of same-day ART initiation with loss to follow-up and viral suppression among  
7 patients in 11 sub-Saharan African countries.

### 8 **Methods**

9 We included ART-naïve adult PLHIV from sites participating in the International epidemiology  
10 Databases to Evaluate AIDS consortium (IeDEA) who enrolled in care after Treat-All  
11 implementation and prior to January 2019. We used multivariable Cox regression to estimate the  
12 association between same-day ART initiation and loss to follow-up, and Poisson regression to  
13 estimate the association between same-day ART initiation and 6-month viral suppression.

### 14 **Results**

15 Among 29,017 patients from 63 sites, 18,584 (64.0%) initiated ART on the day of enrollment.  
16 Same-day ART initiation was less likely among those with advanced HIV disease versus early-  
17 stage disease. Loss to follow-up was significantly lower among those initiating ART  $\geq 1$  day of  
18 enrollment, compared with same-day ART initiators (20.6% vs 27.7%; adjusted hazard ratio  
19 0.66, 95% CI 0.57-0.76). No difference in viral suppression was observed by time to ART  
20 initiation (adjusted rate ratio 1.00, 95% CI 0.98-1.02).

### 21 **Conclusions**

22 Patients initiating ART on the day of enrollment were more frequently lost to follow-up than  
23 those initiating later but were equally likely to be virally suppressed. Our findings support recent

1 WHO recommendations for providing tailored counseling and support to patients who accept an  
2 offer of same-day ART.

3  
4 **Keywords:** antiretroviral therapy, Treat-All, sub-Saharan Africa, loss to follow-up  
5

6

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Initiation of antiretroviral therapy (ART) soon after HIV diagnosis improves clinical outcomes  
3 for people living with HIV (PLHIV) and reduces HIV transmission [1–3]. Accordingly, the  
4 World Health Organization (WHO) 2015 “Treat-All” guidelines recommend rapid ART  
5 initiation ART for all PLHIV as soon as possible after diagnosis, ideally within 7 days, and on  
6 the same day when possible [4].

7  
8 While nearly all countries have adopted Treat-All guidelines [5], uncertainty exists about the  
9 impact of same-day ART (SDA) initiation on subsequent engagement in care including care  
10 retention and viral suppression. Randomized controlled trials of SDA have demonstrated  
11 outcomes that are as good as, or better than, later ART initiation among PLHIV [6–8], findings  
12 replicated in a recent, large regression discontinuity analysis of routine clinical data in Zambia  
13 [9]. However, several observational studies examining outcomes after Treat-All implementation  
14 have found that SDA is associated with higher rates of loss to care [10–12]. Accordingly,  
15 recently updated WHO guidelines now emphasize that an offer of SDA should include  
16 approaches to improve uptake, treatment adherence and retention [13].

17  
18 Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), where Treat-All implementation occurred later than other global  
19 regions, continues to be disproportionately impacted by HIV [14]. While virtually all countries in  
20 SSA have adopted Treat-All policies, investigations of SDA in this region have been limited to  
21 single-country studies, with most studying relatively small cohorts [10–12,15–18], and few  
22 reporting on viral suppression [8,17,18]. A more generalizable understanding of whether SDA  
23 has impacted clinical outcomes for patients in SSA is critical for reaching regional goals for

1 epidemic control. We therefore examined the association between SDA and both loss to follow-  
2 up (LTFU) and viral suppression among patients enrolled in HIV care at clinics participating in  
3 the global International epidemiologic Databases to Evaluate AIDS (IeDEA) consortium in 11  
4 African countries.

## 6 **METHODS**

### 8 *Data sources and management*

9 We used data from HIV programs in SSA that participate in the global IeDEA consortium.  
10 IeDEA pools clinical data on approximately 2.2 million PLWH enrolling in HIV care since 2004  
11 in 44 countries globally, including 240 care and treatment sites in 23 countries in SSA [19,20].  
12 Comprising public and private primary, secondary and tertiary-level health facilities, IeDEA is a  
13 purely observational cohort reflecting real-world service delivery across diverse settings.

14  
15 Prior to analysis, data from IeDEA regions were standardized in accordance with IeDEA data  
16 definitions and formatting standards [21]. Data were de-identified before extraction into regional  
17 databases and approved for use by local research ethics committees in each IeDEA region as  
18 well as the institutional review boards of regional data management centers.

### 20 *Inclusion and exclusion criteria*

21 All patients who enrolled in HIV care at an IeDEA site after the Treat-All adoption date in each  
22 country and before January 2019 were eligible for inclusion (N=241,723). We excluded patients  
23 who: 1) were in care at sites that did not provide pre-ART care (i.e., only served patients already

1 initiated on ART) or that did not consistently report data on pre-ART care (N=107,245); 2)  
2 enrolled in care before national adoption of Treat-All (N=97,801); 3) were ART experienced at  
3 enrollment (3,324); 4) had <12 months of potential follow-up time between enrollment and  
4 database close (N=2,030); 5) were <15 years of age at enrollment (N=1,286); or 6) never  
5 initiated ART (N=946) (**Supplemental Figure 1**). We excluded 74 patients with missing or  
6 illogical data related to sex or dates of birth or death (e.g., recorded date of death that preceded  
7 the date of HIV care enrollment).

8  
9 Countries where WHO's Treat-All recommendation was not officially reflected in national  
10 guidelines by December 2018 were excluded. As noted above, HIV programs were excluded if  
11 they did not provide any pre-ART care to patients or did not consistently report pre-ART data.  
12 To identify such clinics, we examined the proportion of patients whose date of ART initiation  
13 matched their date of enrollment in the two years prior to national Treat-All adoption, when  
14 CD4-based or other clinical criteria were used to determine ART eligibility. Clinics in which  
15  $\geq 75\%$  of patients had matching enrollment and ART initiation dates in the pre-Treat-All period  
16 were considered not to report data on patients' pre-ART care and therefore excluded.

### 18 *Measures*

19 The primary exposure was time from care enrollment to initiation of a combined ART regimen.  
20 Because the large majority (84%) of patients initiating ART within 1 week did so on the day of  
21 enrollment, we classified timing of ART initiation as *same-day ART* (i.e., initiation of ART on  
22 the same day as enrollment) versus  $\geq 1$  day after enrollment. The primary outcome of interest was  
23 *loss to follow-up*, defined as no contact with the health center for >180 days among patients not

1 known to have died or transferred to another facility [22]. We also examined *viral suppression*  
2 at 6 months after ART initiation, defined as <1000 copies/mL, among patients with available  
3 viral load (VL) test data from assays performed between 4 and 8 months after ART initiation.

4  
5 Additional enrollment characteristics included age, sex, body mass index (BMI; classified as  
6 <18.5 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, ≥18.5, unknown/missing), WHO stage (I or II, III or IV, unknown/missing), AIDS  
7 diagnosis at enrollment, and CD4 count in cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (<200, 200-349, 350-499, ≥500,  
8 unknown/missing). Data were used if recorded within 90 days of enrollment; for patients with  
9 more than one measure within 90 days, the observation closest to enrollment date was used. We  
10 restricted CD4 measures to those within 30 days after ART initiation, given that CD4 counts  
11 rebound rapidly after ART initiation [23]. Because of high levels of missingness in CD4 and  
12 WHO staging data, we created a composite measure of advanced HIV disease at enrollment,  
13 based on either CD4 cell counts <200 cells/μL or WHO stage 3 or 4.

14  
15 Site characteristics (e.g., urban vs. rural location, facility type) were extracted from IeDEA  
16 databases. Information on HIV spending per prevalent case in 2017 was compiled from the  
17 Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation's Global Burden of Disease databases [24].

### 18 19 *Statistical analysis*

20 All analyses were performed using SAS v9.4 (Cary, NC). We used descriptive statistics to  
21 summarize patient characteristics; chi-squared tests were used to assess differences in categorical  
22 variables, with Kruskal-Wallis tests used to assess differences in medians.

23

1 For time-to-event analyses, follow-up time was calculated in days from ART initiation to the last  
2 clinic contact (among those who were known to have died or transferred or were lost to clinic),  
3 or was censored at 365 days after ART initiation if none of those outcomes occurred. For all  
4 patients, one day of follow-up time was added to avoid the occurrence of zero follow-up time  
5 among patients who did not return to the clinic after the date of enrolling in care.

6  
7 We used bivariate and multivariable Poisson regression models to estimate crude and adjusted  
8 relative risks of SDA and viral suppression. We used bivariate and multivariable Cox  
9 proportional hazards regression models with sandwich variance estimators to estimate hazards of  
10 LTFU within 12 months of enrollment. Because over half of the sample was missing VL data,  
11 we also used Poisson regression models to examine unadjusted and adjusted associations  
12 between predictor variables and VL missingness. Multivariable models adjusted for sex, age  
13 group, BMI, disease stage, facility location, health facility level, HIV spending per prevalent  
14 case in 2017; we did not include pregnancy status in models because of concern that pregnancy  
15 was substantially underreported. All models accounted for site-level clustering using generalized  
16 estimating equations (GEE).

### 17 18 *Sensitivity analyses*

19 We conducted several sensitivity analyses to test the robustness of our findings on the  
20 association of SDA with LTFU and viral suppression. First, to assess heterogeneity among those  
21 initiating ART after the day of enrollment, we used a four-level variable for the timing of ART  
22 initiation: same-day, 1-7, 8-30 and >30 days. Second, to better understand the impact of missing  
23 clinical data (disease stage, BMI) at enrollment, we restricted models to patients with complete



1 data for these variables. Third, a substantial number of patients had no follow-up data after the  
2 enrollment visit (i.e. single contact with the site), with no way to determine whether this was  
3 secondary to true LTFU, data error (e.g. undocumented transfer), or sites that operate on a hub-  
4 and-spoke model, transferring patients to peripheral clinics after ART initiation [25]. Therefore,  
5 we calculated the proportion of patients with a single contact at each site and excluded sites  
6 where >10% of patients never returned after the enrollment visit. Fourth, to address potential  
7 selection bias created by excluding patients who never initiated ART, we examined LTFU using  
8 models that included this group. For this sensitivity analysis, we categorized non-initiators  
9 together with those initiating ART  $\geq 1$  day after enrollment, with follow-up time starting at  
10 enrollment rather than ART initiation for patients never initiating treatment. Finally, given  
11 updated WHO guidelines defining viral suppression as  $< 50$  copies/mL [13], we repeated  
12 analyses for this outcome using this lower threshold  
13

## 14 **RESULTS**

15 In total 29,017 patients were included (**Supplemental Figure 1**); among them, 17,610 (60.7%)  
16 were female and median age was 35 years (interquartile range 28-43) (**Table 1**). Most patients  
17 (90%) were from IeDEA cohorts in East Africa (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda) and Central Africa  
18 (Burundi, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo, Rwanda); the  
19 remainder were from West Africa (Cote d'Ivoire, Senegal) and South Africa. At enrollment,  
20 21,458 (74.0%) were missing CD4 count and 11,742 (40.5%) were missing WHO stage. Among  
21 18,836 (64.9%) with available data on either CD4 count or WHO stage, 6,195 (32.9%) were  
22 classified as having advanced disease at enrollment. The majority received care from district

1 hospitals (7,983, 27.5%) or regional, provincial or university hospitals (12,355, 42.6%), located  
2 in urban or mostly urban areas (21,586, 74.4%).

#### 4 ***Time to ART initiation***

5 Among all ART patients, median time to ART initiation was 0 days (95% CI 0,0). Overall,  
6 18,584 (64.0%) initiated ART on the same day, 3,432 (11.8%) between 1-7 days, 4,409 (15.2%)  
7 between 8 and 30 days, and 2,592 (8.9%) >30 days after enrollment. SDA was less likely among  
8 those with advanced versus early-stage disease (adjusted risk ratio [aRR] 0.83, 95% CI 0.72-  
9 0.95) (**Table 2**). SDA was more likely at rural/mostly rural sites (vs. urban/mostly urban: aRR  
10 1.40, 95% CI 1.11-1.75).

#### 12 ***Loss to follow-up***

13 During the 12 months after enrollment, 1,941 patients (6.7%) had documented transfers and  
14 1,111 (3.8%) died. A total of 7,293 (25.1%) were LTFU, with a median time to LTFU of 29  
15 days (95% CI 28, 31). Among SDA initiators, 27.7% were lost to clinic (including 11.5% who  
16 never returned after the enrollment visit) compared with 20.6% of those initiating  $\geq 1$  day after  
17 enrollment. In the adjusted model, hazard of LTFU within 12 months was 34% lower among  
18 those initiating ART  $\geq 1$  day of enrollment, compared with SDA initiators (aRR 0.66, 95% CI  
19 0.57-0.76) (**Table 3, Supplemental Figure 2**). Hazard of LTFU was higher among men versus  
20 women, younger (15-19, 20-24 and 25-34 years) versus older (>34 years) patients, patients at  
21 district hospitals versus health centers, and in countries in the 1st (vs 2nd and 3<sup>rd</sup>) tertile of per-  
22 capita HIV spending.

23

1 In a sensitivity analysis using a four-level variable for time to ART initiation, compared with  
2 SDA initiators, hazard of LTFU decreased monotonically with increased time to initiation, from  
3 0.77 (95% CI: 0.65-0.92) among those initiating ART at 1 to 7 days after enrollment to 0.59  
4 (95% CI: 0.49-0.70) among those initiating ART >30 days after enrollment (**Supplemental**  
5 **Table 2, Supplemental Figure 2**). We observed results similar to our main analysis in  
6 additional sensitivity analyses examining LTFU (**Supplemental Table 1**).

### 8 *Viral suppression*

9 Among 28,894 patients with  $\geq 8$  months (244 days) of potential follow-up time after ART  
10 initiation or any VL testing between 4-8 months after ART initiation, 11,898 (41.2%) had a VL  
11 measured between 4-8 months after ART initiation. VL was more likely to be missing among  
12 SDA initiators, men, younger patients, and those with advanced disease at enrollment  
13 (**Supplemental Table 3**). Among those with VL data, 10,487 (88.1%) were virally suppressed.  
14 Among patients with a measured VL, no difference in rate of suppression was observed among  
15 SDA initiators versus those initiating  $\geq 1$  day after enrollment (aRR 1.00, 95% CI 0.98-1.02)  
16 (**Table 4**). Suppression was less likely among patients with BMI  $< 18.5$  (vs  $\geq 18.5$ ) kg/m<sup>2</sup> and  
17 those with advanced disease at enrollment compared with patients without advanced disease.  
18 Results from sensitivity analyses were similar (**Supplemental Tables 2 and 4**).

## 20 **DISCUSSION**

21 In this analysis of routine clinical data from diverse HIV service delivery settings in 11 African  
22 countries, most patients initiated ART quickly after enrollment, with nearly two-thirds initiating  
23 on the same day. A substantially higher proportion of these patients were lost to follow-up

1 compared with those who initiated ART later—results that were similar in sensitivity analyses.  
2 Notably, LTFU was not associated with advanced disease at care enrollment (including in  
3 analyses stratified by time to ART initiation, not shown), suggesting that this factor is not a  
4 primary driver of care engagement. Our results are consistent with findings from observational  
5 studies in eSwatini, Ethiopia, and South Africa [10–12,17] reporting that SDA initiators were  
6 more likely to be lost to follow-up. While SDA may reduce logistical and structural challenges to  
7 delivering care, prior research under Treat-All has identified patient-level barriers to rapid ART  
8 initiation, including feeling overwhelmed by the diagnosis, fear of lifelong medication, and  
9 feeling insufficiently engaged in care [26–28]. In this context, our findings support recent WHO  
10 recommendations for providing tailored counseling and support to patients who accept an offer  
11 of SDA [13].

12  
13 It is possible that the higher LTFU among SDA initiators reflects undocumented transfers or  
14 deaths immediately after initiation, as has been documented in prior tracing studies in SSA [29–  
15 31]. However, in sensitivity analyses excluding sites where high proportions of patients had only  
16 one contact with the health center, the association between SDA and LTFU was not  
17 substantively attenuated. Furthermore, it is unlikely that many SDA initiators died prior to  
18 follow-up, given that this group was less likely to have advanced HIV at enrollment than patients  
19 who initiated ART later. Our findings suggest a need for supplementary investigations such as  
20 tracing studies and sampling-based approaches that augment routinely collected data to better  
21 ascertain outcomes and to understand reasons for disengaging from care.

22

1 We observed high rates of viral suppression among patients with available VL, with no  
2 differences by timing of ART initiation—results consistent with the very limited literature  
3 published to date [8,17]. These results provide some reassurance that the timing of ART  
4 initiation (same-day versus later) likely does not negatively impact subsequent viral suppression  
5 among those with a VL test. Our findings suggest that later initiation of ART is a reasonable  
6 approach when patient or provider concerns arise, consistent with guidance from WHO [13].  
7 Notably, only 41% of patients had available VL data between 4 to 8 months after ART initiation,  
8 despite longstanding WHO guidance recommending monitoring at 6 months [13, 32], suggesting  
9 that gaps remain in reaching VL monitoring goals. Furthermore, observed differences in VL  
10 availability by time to ART, age and disease stage, suggest that patterns of viral suppression may  
11 differ among the entire cohort compared with those with available VL, and that patients less  
12 likely to be engaged in care (e.g. SDA initiators) are potentially less likely to be virally  
13 suppressed.

14  
15 Several additional findings from this analysis are worth noting. The rapid time to LTFU (median  
16 29 days) highlights the need for adequate support systems immediately after enrollment, a  
17 particularly vulnerable time for newly-diagnosed PLHIV. Younger patients were as likely as  
18 patients >24 years to initiate ART on the day of enrollment, but more likely to be lost to clinic.  
19 HIV incidence is higher among adolescents and young adults than every other age group in SSA  
20 [33]; they remain at high risk of poor outcomes, including potential for onward transmission of  
21 HIV given relatively higher rates of sexual activity [34, 35]. Our findings suggest that particular  
22 care should be taken to ensure support systems are in place prior to offering SDA to younger

1 PLHIV. We also observed that patients with more advanced HIV were less likely to initiate ART  
2 immediately and less likely to be virally suppressed but did not experience higher rates of LTFU.

3  
4 A key strength of this observational study is the use of data from a large number of patients  
5 enrolled in HIV care across a diverse group of 63 sites in 11 African countries. Results from this  
6 large, diverse sample are reflective of real-world implementation of WHO's recommendations  
7 for ART initiation [4]. This study also has several limitations. Despite the size and diversity of  
8 the sample, certain groups (e.g., pregnant women and patients at sites with limited data on pre-  
9 ART care) were likely underrepresented in the study, and our findings may not be fully  
10 generalizable to these subgroups. Because of incomplete data on the date of HIV diagnoses, we  
11 were not able to directly measure the impact of ART initiation on the day of diagnosis and could  
12 only assess the timing of ART initiation relative to care enrollment. Additional studies are  
13 needed to understand trajectories of linkage to care and very early care engagement in the Treat-  
14 All era, including prevalence and predictors of early transfers. We were not able to ascertain  
15 definitively what proportion of those LTFU were truly lost from care. We were also unable to  
16 measure other important factors that may influence decision-making on when to initiate ART  
17 (e.g., type of ART counseling received, presence of medical conditions that may impact ART  
18 timing, or patient or clinician assessments of readiness for ART. Finally, the substantial amount  
19 of missing VL data may have introduced bias into the analysis of viral suppression.

20  
21 In sum, we observed high levels of same-day ART initiation among patients across diverse HIV  
22 care programs in various countries in SSA, suggesting that WHO's recommendations for rapid  
23 ART initiation for patients newly enrolling in HIV care have been widely adopted and scaled up.

1 Nonetheless, patients initiating ART on the day of enrollment were more likely to be LTFU than  
2 those initiating later. Our findings suggest that careful consideration of patient and programmatic  
3 factors is necessary to optimize timing of ART as programs increasingly move towards rapid  
4 initiation of treatment for all PLHIV.

5

6

7

## 8 **NOTES**

9

### 10 **Funding**

11 The International Epidemiology Databases to Evaluate AIDS (IeDEA) is supported by the U.S.  
12 National Institutes of Health's National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, the *Eunice*  
13 *Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the National  
14 Cancer Institute, the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Institute on Drug Abuse,  
15 the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and  
16 Alcoholism, the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, the Fogarty  
17 International Center, and the National Library of Medicine: *AsiaPacific*, U01AI069907;  
18 *CCASAnet*, U01AI069923; *Central Africa*, U01AI096299; *East Africa*, U01AI069911; *NA-*  
19 *ACCORD*, U01AI069918; *Southern Africa*, U01AI069924; *WestAfrica*, U01AI069919.  
20 Informatics resources are supported by the Harmonist project, R24AI24872. JR is supported by  
21 the U.S. National Institute of Mental Health (K23 MH114752). AH was supported by a grant  
22 from the Swiss National Science Foundation under award number 193381. KA, DN, EB and  
23 CTY reports support from U.S. National Institutes of Health. GF reports support from  
24 International Epidemiologic Databases to Evaluate AIDS-Southern Africa, using funding

1 provided by the US National Institutes of Health (Funding provided to Kheth'Impilo AIDS Free  
2 Living (Nonprofit)). BC reports support from NIH-NIAID (5 UO1 AI 069911-16: Name of  
3 PD/PI: Kare Wools-Kaloustian, Yiannoutsos Constantin, Aggrey Semwendero Semeere). This  
4 work is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official  
5 views of any of the institutions mentioned above.

6 **Acknowledgments.** The authors acknowledge the patients and staff at all facilities who  
7 contributed data to this study, as well as the site investigators and data managers across the  
8 IeDEA collaboration (see Supplementary File 2).

9 **Potential conflicts of interest:** DN received research support from Pfizer, Inc., payment or  
10 honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events  
11 from Various academic lectures at Universities (paid to author), and consulting fees from  
12 Epidemic Intelligence, LLC and Medscape. JR reports payment or honoraria for lectures,  
13 presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events for Grand Rounds  
14 speaker in 2019 (paid to author). EB reports support from U.S. National Institutes of Health. GF  
15 reports support from International Epidemiologic Databases to Evaluate AIDS-Southern Africa,  
16 using funding provided by the US National Institutes of Health (Funding provided to  
17 Kheth'Impilo AIDS Free Living (Nonprofit)). BC reports support from NIH (D43 TW 009771:  
18 Name of PD/PI: Castelnuovo/Kambugu/Manabe) and EDCTP (TWA 2017GSF-1936:  
19 Castelnuovo). CTY and KA reports grants or contracts and support for attending meetings and/or  
20 travel from NIH (paid to institution). MY reports grants or contracts from NIH: U01AI096299,  
21 R01HD087993, R01HD105526, and U54CA254568. No other authors report potential conflicts  
22 of interest.

23  
24



## 1 REFERENCES

- 2
- 3 1. Insight Start Study Group, Lundgren JD, Babiker AG, Gordin F, Emery S, Grund B, et al.  
4 Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy in Early Asymptomatic HIV Infection. *N Engl J Med.*  
5 2015;373(9):795–807.
- 6 2. Temprano Anrs Study Group, Danel C, Moh R, Gabillard D, Badje A, Le Carrou J, et al. A  
7 Trial of Early Antiretrovirals and Isoniazid Preventive Therapy in Africa. *N Engl J Med.*  
8 2015;373(9):808–22.
- 9 3. Cohen MS, Chen YQ, McCauley M, Gamble T, Hosseinipour MC, Kumarasamy N, et al.  
10 Prevention of HIV-1 infection with early antiretroviral therapy. *N Engl J Med.* 2011 Aug  
11 11;365(6):493–505.
- 12 4. World Health Organization, Department of HIV/AIDS. Guideline on when to start  
13 antiretroviral therapy and on pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV. 2015 Sep.
- 14 5. Ford N, Vitoria M, Doherty M. Providing antiretroviral therapy to all who are HIV positive:  
15 the clinical, public health and programmatic benefits of Treat All. *J Int AIDS Soc* [Internet].  
16 2018 Feb;21(2). Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29436776>
- 17 6. Koenig SP, Dorvil N, Devieux JG, Hedt-Gauthier BL, Riviere C, Faustin M, et al. Same-  
18 day HIV testing with initiation of antiretroviral therapy versus standard care for persons  
19 living with HIV: A randomized unblinded trial. *PLoS Med.* 2017 Jul;14(7):e1002357.
- 20 7. Amanyire G, Semitala FC, Namusobya J, Katuramu R, Kampiire L, Wallenta J, et al.  
21 Effects of a multicomponent intervention to streamline initiation of antiretroviral therapy in

- 1 Africa: a stepped-wedge cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2016 Nov;3(11):e539–48.
- 2 8. Rosen S, Maskew M, Fox MP, Nyoni C, Mongwenyana C, Maletse G, et al. Initiating  
3 Antiretroviral Therapy for HIV at a Patient’s First Clinic Visit: The RapIT Randomized  
4 Controlled Trial. *PLoS Med*. 2016 May;13(5):e1002015.
- 5 9. Mody A, Sikazwe I, Namwase AS, et al. Effects of implementing universal and rapid HIV  
6 treatment on initiation of antiretroviral therapy and retention in care in Zambia: a natural  
7 experiment using regression discontinuity. *Lancet HIV* 2021; 8: e755–65.
- 8 10. Lilian RR, Rees K, McIntyre JA, Struthers HE, Peters RPH. Same-day antiretroviral  
9 therapy initiation for HIV-infected adults in South Africa: Analysis of routine data. *PLoS*  
10 *One*. 2020 Jan 14;15(1):e0227572.
- 11 11. Joseph Davey D, Kehoe K, Serrao C, Prins M, Mkhize N, Hlophe K, et al. Same-day  
12 antiretroviral therapy is associated with increased loss to follow-up in South African public  
13 health facilities: a prospective cohort study of patients diagnosed with HIV. *J Int AIDS Soc*.  
14 2020 Jun;23(6):e25529.
- 15 12. Kerschberger B, Boulle A, Kuwengwa R, Ciglenecki I, Schomaker M. The Impact of Same-  
16 Day Antiretroviral Therapy Initiation Under the World Health Organization Treat-All  
17 Policy [Internet]. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2021. Available from:  
18 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwab032>
- 19 13. Updated recommendations on HIV prevention, infant diagnosis, antiretroviral initiation and  
20 monitoring. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.

- 1 14. UNAIDS Data 2021. Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS; 2021.  
2 Available from:  
3 [https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media\\_asset/JC3032\\_AIDS\\_Data\\_book\\_2021\\_En](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/JC3032_AIDS_Data_book_2021_En.pdf)  
4 [.pdf](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/JC3032_AIDS_Data_book_2021_En.pdf). Accessed 22 August 2022.
- 5 15. Lebelonyane R, Bachanas P, Block L, Ussery F, Abrams W, Roland M, et al. Rapid  
6 antiretroviral therapy initiation in the Botswana Combination Prevention Project: a quasi-  
7 experimental before and after study. *Lancet HIV*. 2020 Aug;7(8):e545–53.
- 8 16. Mshweshwe-Pakela N, Hansoti B, Mabuto T, Kerrigan D, Kubeka G, Hahn E, et al.  
9 Feasibility of implementing same-day antiretroviral therapy initiation during routine care in  
10 Ekurhuleni District, South Africa: Retention and viral load suppression. *South Afr J HIV*  
11 *Med*. 2020;21(1):1–6.
- 12 17. Ahmed I, Demissie M, Worku A, Gugsu S, Berhane Y. Effectiveness of same-day  
13 antiretroviral therapy initiation in retention outcomes among people living with human  
14 immunodeficiency virus in Ethiopia: empirical evidence. *BMC Public Health*. 2020 Nov  
15 26;20(1):1802.
- 16 18. Labhardt ND, Ringera I, Lejone TI, Klimkait T, Muhairwe J, Amstutz A, et al. Effect of  
17 Offering Same-Day ART vs Usual Health Facility Referral During Home-Based HIV  
18 Testing on Linkage to Care and Viral Suppression Among Adults With HIV in Lesotho:  
19 The CASCADE Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2018 Mar 20;319(11):1103–12.
- 20 19. Egger M, Ekouevi DK, Williams C, Lyamuya RE, Mukumbi H, Braitstein P, et al. Cohort  
21 Profile: the international epidemiological databases to evaluate AIDS (IeDEA) in sub-

- 1 Saharan Africa. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2012 Oct;41(5):1256–64.
- 2 20. IeDEA International epidemiology Databases to Evaluate AIDS [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jul  
3 14]. Available from: <https://www.iedea.org/>. Accessed 24 May 2022.
- 4 21. Duda SN, Musick BS, Davies M-A, Sohn AH, Ledergerber B, Wools-Kaloustian K, et al.  
5 The IeDEA Data Exchange Standard: a common data model for global HIV cohort  
6 collaboration. *medRxiv* [Internet]. 2020; Available from:  
7 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.22.20159921v1.abstract>
- 8 22. Chi BH, Yiannoutsos CT, Westfall AO, *et al*. Universal definition of loss to follow-up in  
9 HIV treatment programs: a statistical analysis of 111 facilities in Africa, Asia, and Latin  
10 America. *PLoS Med* 2011; **8**: e1001111
- 11 23. Lok JJ, Bosch RJ, Benson CA, Collier AC, Robbins GK, Shafer RW, et al. Long-term  
12 increase in CD4+ T-cell counts during combination antiretroviral therapy for HIV-1  
13 infection. *AIDS*. 2010 Jul 31;24(12):1867–76.
- 14 24. Global HIV/AIDS Spending 2000-2017 [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jul 15]. Available from:  
15 <http://ghdx.healthdata.org/record/global-hivaids-spending-2000-2017>
- 16 25. Agaba PA, Genberg BL, Sagay AS, Agbaji OO, Meloni ST, Dadem NY, et al. Retention in  
17 Differentiated Care: Multiple Measures Analysis for a Decentralized HIV Care and  
18 Treatment Program in North Central Nigeria. *J AIDS Clin Res* [Internet]. 2018 Feb 13;9(2).  
19 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4172/2155-6113.1000756>
- 20 26. Ross J, Ingabire C, Umwiza F, Gasana J, Munyaneza A, Murenzi G, et al. How early is too

- 1 early? Challenges in ART initiation and engaging in HIV care under Treat-All in Rwanda-A  
2 qualitative study. *PLoS One*. 2021 May 13;16(5):e0251645.
- 3 27. Horter S, Bernays S, Thabede Z, Dlamini V, Kerschberger B, Pasipamire M, et al. “I don’t  
4 want them to know”: how stigma creates dilemmas for engagement with Treat-all HIV care  
5 for people living with HIV in Eswatini. *Afr J AIDS Res*. 2019 Mar;18(1):27–37.
- 6 28. Onoya D, Sineke T, Mokhele I, Bor J, Fox MP, Miot J. Understanding the Reasons for  
7 Deferring ART Among Patients Diagnosed Under the Same-Day-ART Policy in  
8 Johannesburg, South Africa. *AIDS Behav*. 2021 Sep;25(9):2779–92.
- 9 29. Edwards JK, Lesko CR, Hecce ME, Murenzi G, Twizere C, Lelo P, et al. Gone But Not  
10 Lost: Implications for Estimating HIV Care Outcomes When LTFU Is Not Loss to Care.  
11 *Epidemiology*. 2020 Jul;31(4):570–7.
- 12 30. Etoori D, Wringe A, Kabudula CW, Renju J, Rice B, Gomez-Olive FX, et al. Misreporting  
13 of Patient Outcomes in the South African National HIV Treatment Database: Consequences  
14 for Programme Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation. *Front Public Health*. 2020 Apr  
15 7;8:100.
- 16 31. Chammartin F, Zürcher K, Keiser O, Weigel R, Chu K, Kiragga AN, et al. Outcomes of  
17 Patients Lost to Follow-up in African Antiretroviral Therapy Programs: Individual Patient  
18 Data Meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2018 Nov 13;67(11):1643–52.
- 19 32. World Health Organization. Consolidated Guidelines on the Use of Antiretroviral Drugs for  
20 Treating and Preventing HIV Infection: Recommendations for a Public Health Approach.  
21 Geneva, 2013.
- 22

- 1 33. Karim SSA, Baxter C. HIV incidence trends in Africa: young women at highest risk. *Lancet*  
2 HIV. 2021 Jul;8(7):e389–90.
- 3 34. Enane LA, Vreeman RC, Foster C. Retention and adherence: global challenges for the long-  
4 term care of adolescents and young adults living with HIV. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS*. 2018  
5 May;13(3):212–9.
- 6 35. Melesse DY, Mutua MK, Choudhury A, et al Adolescent sexual and reproductive health in  
7 sub-Saharan Africa: who is left behind? *BMJ Global Health* 2020;5:e002231.

8  
9

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

**TABLE 1. Baseline characteristics and clinical outcomes among ART-naïve patients who enrolled in care and initiated ART at an IeDEA site in sub-Saharan Africa after Treat-All implementation.**

Variables	Total	N 29017	Median time to ART initiation in days (IQR)	Time to ART initiation		P value
				Same day n (%)	Not same day n (%)	
<b>CHARACTERISTICS</b>			0 (0-7)	18584 (64.0)	10433 (36)	
<i>Patient-level</i>						
<b>Sex</b>						<0.0001
Female	17610 (60.7)		0 (0-7)	11492 (61.8)	6118 (58.6)	
Male	11407 (39.3)		0 (0-8)	7092 (38.2)	4315 (41.4)	
<b>Age</b>						
Median age in years (IQR)	35 (28, 43)		-	35 (28, 43)	36 (29, 44)	<0.0001
15-19	723 (2.5)		0 (0-12)	451 (2.4)	272 (2.6)	<0.0001
20-24	3331 (11.5)		0 (0-6)	2253 (12.1)	1078 (10.3)	
25-34	9442 (32.5)		0 (0-7)	6178 (33.2)	3264 (31.3)	
>34	15521 (53.5)		0 (0-7)	9702 (52.2)	5819 (55.8)	
<b>Pregnant at enrollment (among females)</b>						<0.0001
Not pregnant	7823 (44.4)		0 (0-2)	5653 (49.2)	2170 (35.5)	
Pregnant	942 (5.4)		0 (0-15)	619 (5.4)	323 (5.3)	
Unknown status	8845 (50.2)		0 (0-9)	5220 (45.4)	3625 (59.3)	
<b>BMI at enrollment (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>						<0.0001
<18.5	4769 (16.4)		0 (0-7)	3076 (16.6)	1693 (16.2)	
≥18.5	18804 (64.8)		0 (0-5)	12633 (68.0)	6171 (59.1)	
Missing	5444 (18.8)		0 (0-21)	2875 (15.5)	2569 (24.6)	
<b>WHO Stage at enrollment</b>						<0.0001
I	8581 (29.6)		0 (0-4)	5713 (30.7)	2868 (27.5)	
II	4513 (15.6)		0 (0-1)	3307 (17.8)	1206 (11.6)	
III	3144 (10.8)		0 (0-8)	1838 (9.9)	1306 (12.5)	
IV	1037 (3.6)		2 (0-14)	471 (2.5)	566 (5.4)	
Missing	11742 (40.5)		0 (0-13)	7255 (39.0)	4487 (43)	
<b>CD4 count at enrollment (cells/mm<sup>3</sup>)</b>						<0.0001
<200	2491 (8.6)		0 (0-9)	1289 (6.9)	1202 (11.5)	
200-349	1632 (5.6)		0 (0-7)	906 (4.9)	726 (7.0)	
350-499	1372 (4.7)		0 (0-7)	796 (4.3)	576 (5.5)	
≥500	2064 (7.1)		0 (0-7)	1225 (6.6)	839 (8.0)	
Missing	21458 (74.0)		0 (0-7)	14368 (77.3)	7090 (68)	
<b>AIDS diagnosis at enrollment</b>						<0.0001
No AIDS diagnosis	13249 (45.7)		0 (0-3)	9058 (48.7)	4191 (40.2)	
AIDS diagnosis	4695 (16.2)		0 (0-14)	2543 (13.7)	2152 (20.6)	
Missing/unknown	11073 (38.2)		0 (0-12)	6983 (37.6)	4090 (39.2)	
<b>Disease stage at enrollment*</b>						<0.0001
Non-advanced disease	12641 (43.6)		0 (0-4)	8668 (46.6)	3973 (38.1)	
Advanced disease	6195 (21.4)		0 (0-12)	3330 (17.9)	2865 (27.5)	
Missing/unknown	10181 (35.1)		0 (0-11)	6586 (35.4)	3595 (34.5)	
<i>Clinic- and country-level</i>						
<b>Urban/rural</b>						<0.0001
Urban/Mostly urban	21586 (74.4)		0 (0-10)	12643 (68.0)	8943 (85.7)	
Rural/Mostly rural	7431 (25.6)		0 (0-0)	5941 (32.0)	1490 (14.3)	
<b>Level of facility</b>						<0.0001
Health center	8679 (29.9)		0 (0-6)	5467 (29.4)	3212 (30.8)	
District hospital	7983 (27.5)		0 (0-1)	5932 (31.9)	2051 (19.7)	
Regional, provincial or university hospital	12355 (42.6)		0 (0-9)	7185 (38.7)	5170 (49.6)	
<b>HIV spending per prevalent case in 2017</b>						<0.0001
1st tertile (\$218 - \$284)	3550 (12.2)		0 (0-3)	2146 (11.5)	1404 (13.5)	

Variables	N	Median time to ART initiation in days (IQR)	Time to ART initiation		P value
			Same day n (%)	Not same day n (%)	
2nd tertile (\$285 - \$362)	6875 (23.7)	0 (0-14)	3603 (19.4)	3272 (31.4)	
3rd tertile (\$363 - \$611)	18592 (64.1)	0 (0-5)	12835 (69.1)	5757 (55.2)	

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT



Variables	N	Median time to ART initiation in days (IQR)	Time to ART initiation		P value
			Same day n (%)	Not same day n (%)	
<b>OUTCOMES AFTER ART INITIATION</b>					
<b>Transfer within 12 months of</b>					0.0003
Did not transfer	27076 (93.3)	0 (0-7)	17414 (93.7)	9662 (92.6)	
Transferred out	1941 (6.7)	0 (0-8)	1170 (6.3)	771 (7.4)	
<b>Death within 12 months</b>					0.505
Did not die	27906 (96.2)	0 (0-7)	17862 (96.1)	10044 (96.3)	
Died	1111 (3.8)	0 (0-8)	722 (3.9)	389 (3.7)	
<b>Lost to follow-up within 12 months</b>					<0.0001
Not lost	21724 (74.9)	0 (0-8)	13437 (72.3)	8287 (79.4)	
Lost	7293 (25.1)	0 (0-2)	5147 (27.7)	2146 (20.6)	
<b>Viral suppression at 6 months</b>					<0.0001
Not suppressed ( $\geq 1000$ copies)	1802 (6.2)	0 (0-8)	1094 (5.9)	708 (6.8)	
Suppressed ( $< 1000$ copies)	12575 (43.3)	0 (0-8)	7768 (41.8)	4807 (46.1)	
No measured VL	14640 (50.5)	0 (0-7)	9722 (52.3)	4918 (47.1)	

ART: antiretroviral therapy; IQR: interquartile range; BMI: body mass index

\*Advanced disease at care entry: WHO stage 3 or 4 or CD4 at enrollment  $< 200$ , or AIDS diagnosis at enrollment

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

1 **TABLE 2. Factors associated with same-day ART initiation among all included patients.**  
 2

<b>Variables</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>RR (95% CI)*</b>	<b>aRR (95% CI)*^</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>29017</b>	<b>18584 (64.0)</b>		
<i>Patient-level</i>				
<b>Sex</b>				
M	11407	7092 (62.2)	0.95 (0.91-1.00)	0.97 (0.92-1.02)
F (ref)	17610	11492 (65.3)	1	1
<b>Age</b>				
15-19 (ref)	723	451 (62.4)	<b>1.00 (0.91 - 1.09)</b>	<b>1.00 (0.90 - 1.10)</b>
20-24	3331	2253 (67.6)	<b>1.08 (1.00 - 1.17)</b>	<b>1.05 (0.98 - 1.13)</b>
25-34	9442	6178 (65.4)	<b>1.05 (0.99 - 1.11)</b>	<b>1.03 (0.98 - 1.08)</b>
>34	15521	9702 (62.5)	1	1
<b>BMI at enrollment</b>				
<18.5 (ref)	4769	3076 (64.5)	1	1
≥18.5	18804	12633 (67.2)	1.04 (0.97-1.12)	1.05 (1.02-1.09)
Unknown/missing	5444	2875 (52.8)	0.82 (0.73-0.91)	0.88 (0.79-0.99)
<b>Disease at enrollment</b>				
Non-advanced disease (ref)	12641	8668 (68.6)	1	1
Advanced disease	6195	3330 (53.8)	<b>0.78 (0.68-0.90)</b>	<b>0.83 (0.72-0.95)</b>
Unknown/missing	10181	6586 (64.7)	0.94 (0.75-1.18)	0.95 (0.79-1.13)
<i>Clinic- and country-level</i>				
<b>Urban/rural</b>				
Urban/mostly urban (ref)	21586	12643 (58.6)	1	1
Rural/Mostly rural	7431	5941 (79.9)	<b>1.37 (1.14-1.64)</b>	<b>1.40 (1.11-1.75)</b>
<b>Level of facility</b>				
Health center (ref)	8679	5467 (63.0)	1	1
District hospital	7983	5932 (74.3)	1.18 (0.96-1.45)	1.12 (0.92-1.36)
Regional, provincial or university hospital	12355	7185 (58.2)	0.92 (0.66-1.29)	1.09 (0.82-1.45)
<b>HIV spending per prevalent case in 2017</b>				
1st tertile (\$218 - \$284) (ref)	3550	2146 (60.5)	1	1
2nd tertile (\$285 - \$362)	6875	3603 (52.4)	0.87 (0.50-1.51)	0.76 (0.46-1.28)
3rd tertile (\$363 - \$611)	18592	12835 (69.0)	1.14 (0.94-1.38)	1.03 (0.77-1.37)

3 ART: antiretroviral therapy; IQR: interquartile range; BMI: body mass index; RR: rate ratio; CI: confidence interval

4 \* Rate ratios estimated via Poisson regression, accounting for clustering within health center. Models include patients with missing  
 5 data related to BMI and HIV disease stage at time of enrollment in HIV care.

6 ^ Adjusted for sex, age group, BMI at enrollment, disease stage at enrollment, urban vs. rural facility location, health facility level,  
 7 HIV spending per prevalent case in 2017.

8

1 **TABLE 3. Factors associated with loss to follow-up (LTFU) within 12 months after ART initiation.**  
 2

Variables	N	LTFU within 12 months n (%)	Median time to LTFU Days (IQR)	HR (95% CI)*	aHR (95% CI)*^
<b>Total</b>	<b>29017</b>	7293 (25.1)	29 (1-153)		
<i>Patient-level</i>					
<b>Same-day ART initiation</b>					
Initiated ≥1 day after enrollment	10433	2146 (20.6)	56 (1-183)	<b>0.71 (0.59-0.84)</b>	<b>0.66 (0.57-0.76)</b>
Initiated on same day as enrollment (ref)	18584	5147 (27.7)	19 (1-136)	1	1
<b>Sex</b>					
M	11407	2830 (24.8)	29 (1-148)	0.98 (0.91-1.07)	<b>1.09 (1.03-1.15)</b>
F (ref)	17610	4463 (25.3)	30 (1-155)	1	1
<b>Age</b>					
15-19	723	244 (33.7)	16 (1-122)	<b>1.67 (1.37-2.04)</b>	<b>1.80 (1.49-2.17)</b>
20-24	3331	1098 (33.0)	43 (1-161)	<b>1.58 (1.40-1.79)</b>	<b>1.73 (1.58-1.89)</b>
25-34	9442	2546 (27.0)	30 (1-155)	<b>1.26 (1.16-1.36)</b>	<b>1.32 (1.23-1.42)</b>
>34 (ref)	15521	3405 (21.9)	26 (1-151)	1	1
<b>BMI at enrollment</b>					
<18.5 (ref)	4769	1092 (22.9)	40 (1-149)	1	1
≥18.5	18804	4326 (23.0)	34 (1-165)	0.97 (0.87-1.09)	0.93 (0.84-1.03)
Unknown/missing	5444	1875 (34.4)	9 (1-125)	<b>1.61 (1.21-2.14)</b>	<b>1.68 (1.31-2.17)</b>
<b>Disease at enrollment</b>					
Non-advanced disease (ref)	12641	3027 (23.9)	33 (1-159)	1	1
Advanced disease	6195	1529 (24.7)	22 (1-139)	1.06 (0.90-1.26)	1.10 (0.94-1.27)
Unknown/missing	10181	2737 (26.9)	29 (1-149)	1.16 (0.90-1.50)	1.09 (0.90-1.31)
<i>Clinic- and country-level</i>					
<b>Urban/rural</b>					
Urban/mostly urban (ref)	21586	5612 (26.0)	24 (1-147.5)	1	1
Rural/Mostly rural	7431	1681 (22.6)	44 (1-165)	0.86 (0.63-1.16)	0.86 (0.67-1.12)
<b>Level of facility</b>					
Health center (ref)	8679	1925 (22.2)	73 (1-186)	1	1
District hospital	7983	2258 (28.3)	37 (1-144)	<b>1.32 (0.93-1.88)</b>	<b>1.45 (1.11-1.91)</b>
Regional, provincial or university hospital	12355	3110 (25.2)	3 (1-120)	1.17 (0.78-1.77)	1.01 (0.59-1.72)
<b>HIV spending per prevalent case in 2017</b>					
1st tertile (\$218 - \$284) (ref)	3550	1312 (37.0)	1 (1-57)	1	1
2nd tertile (\$285 - \$362)	6875	1468 (21.4)	58 (1-166)	<b>0.55 (0.35-0.85)</b>	<b>0.53 (0.38-0.73)</b>
3rd tertile (\$363 - \$611)	18592	4513 (24.3)	40 (1-162)	<b>0.62 (0.51-0.75)</b>	<b>0.50 (0.30-0.84)</b>

3 ART: antiretroviral therapy; IQR: interquartile range; BMI: body mass index; HR: hazard ratio; CI: confidence interval

4 \* Hazard ratios estimated via Cox proportional hazards regression, accounting for clustering within site/center. Models include patients unknown BMI and HIV disease stage at time of enrollment in HIV care.

5 ^ Adjusted for sex, age group, BMI at enrollment, disease stage at enrollment, urban vs. rural facility location, health facility level, HIV spending per prevalent case in 2017.

6  
7  
8

**TABLE 4. Viral load monitoring among patients initiating ART, and factors associated with viral suppression among patients with a viral load measured between 4 to 8 months after ART initiation.<sup>#</sup>**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Viral load measured n (%)</b>	<b>Viral load suppressed (among those measured) n (%)</b>	<b>RR (95% CI)*</b>	<b>aRR (95% CI)*^</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>28894</b>	11898 (41.2)	10487 (88.1)		
<i>Patient-level</i>					
<b>Same-day ART initiation</b>					
Initiated ≥1 day after enrollment	10310	4322 (41.9)	3809 (88.1)	1.00 (0.97-1.03)	1.00 (0.98-1.02)
Initiated on same day as enrollment	18584	7576 (40.8)	6678 (88.1)	1	1
<b>Sex</b>					
M	11363	4563 (40.2)	3993 (87.5)	0.99 (0.97-1.01)	0.99 (0.98-1.01)
F (ref)	17531	7335 (41.8)	6494 (88.5)	1	1
<b>Age</b>					
15-19 (ref)	718	227 (31.6)	194 (85.5)	0.98 (0.94 - 1.02)	0.96 (0.92 - 1.01)
20-24	3321	1199 (36.1)	1079 (90.0)	<b>1.03 (1.01 - 1.05)</b>	1.01 (0.99 - 1.03)
25-34	9401	3792 (40.3)	3377 (89.1)	1.02 (1.00 - 1.04)	1.01 (0.99 - 1.03)
>34	15454	6680 (43.2)	5837 (87.4)	1	1
<b>BMI at enrollment</b>					
<18.5 (ref)	4761	2000 (42.0)	1679 (84)	1	1
≥18.5	18773	8484 (45.2)	7570 (89.2)	<b>1.06 (1.04-1.08)</b>	<b>1.05 (1.03-1.07)</b>
Unknown/missing	5360	1414 (26.4)	1238 (87.6)	1.04 (1.00-1.08)	1.03 (0.99-1.07)
<b>Disease at enrollment</b>					
Non-advanced disease (ref)	12613	5503 (43.6)	5023 (91.3)	1	1
Advanced disease	6179	2225 (36)	1941 (87.2)	<b>0.96 (0.94-0.98)</b>	<b>0.96 (0.94-0.97)</b>
Unknown/missing	10102	4170 (41.3)	3523 (84.5)	<b>0.93 (0.90-0.95)</b>	<b>0.94 (0.91-0.96)</b>
<i>Clinic- and country-level</i>					
<b>Urban/rural</b>					
Urban/mostly urban (ref)	21479	8532 (39.7)	7482 (87.7)	1	1
Rural/Mostly rural	7415	3366 (45.4)	3005 (89.3)	1.02 (0.97-1.07)	1.02 (1.00-1.04)
<b>Level of facility</b>					
Health center (ref)	8632	3673 (42.6)	3258 (88.7)	1	1
District hospital	7958	3678 (46.2)	3115 (84.7)	0.95 (0.92-0.99)	0.97 (0.94-1.00)
Regional, provincial or university hospital	12304	4547 (37.0)	4114 (90.5)	1.02 (0.98-1.06)	1.00 (0.96-1.05)
<b>HIV spending per prevalent case in 2017</b>					
1st tertile (\$218 - \$284) (ref)	3536	827 (23.4)	756 (91.4)	1	1
2nd tertile (\$285 - \$362)	6817	2881 (42.3)	2635 (91.5)	1.00 (0.95-1.05)	1.00 (0.96-1.03)
3rd tertile (\$363 - \$611)	18541	8190 (44.2)	7096 (86.6)	0.95 (0.92-0.97)	0.96 (0.92-1.01)

ART: antiretroviral therapy; BMI: body mass index; RR: rate ratio; CI: confidence interval

<sup>#</sup> Analyses restricted to patients with at least 244 days' potential follow-up time between ART initiation and database close or <244 days potential follow-up time and a viral load test between 120 and 244 days after ART initiation)

\*Rate ratios estimated via Poisson regression, accounting for clustering within site/center.

<sup>^</sup> Adjusted for sex, age group, BMI at enrollment, disease stage at enrollment, urban vs. rural facility location, health facility level, HIV spending per prevalent case in 2017.