

# PRS Project Efficacy Criteria for Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) Evidence-Based Interventions (EBIs)

## Intervention Description

- Clear description of key aspects of the intervention

## Quality of Study Design\*

- 2 or more study arms
- Prospective study design
- Appropriate and concurrent comparison arm (provided it is similar to intervention arm with respect to population, setting, and time frame, and identical with respect to follow-up interval, recall period, and outcome measures; or reports adjusted analysis)
- Random allocation or the use of methods that allocate participants to study arms and do not cause substantial concern. These methods allow for selection bias unrelated to the intervention or HIV risk. Assignment may be based on pre-established groups or selection into something other than the intervention, provided neither is directly related to HIV risk
  - For a study that arranged units of assignment (e.g., individual, couple, personal network) into larger groups for delivery of the intervention, analysis should be adjusted for the potential cluster effect or intraclass correlation (ICC) among participants receiving the intervention together, unless there are only two larger groups, or studies report that the ICC was small enough (estimated to be  $<0.10$ ) that adjustment was unnecessary.

## Quality of Study Implementation and Data Analysis

- Follow-up assessment
  - $\geq 3$ -months post initiation of intervention for each study arm for patient-level study
  - at least one post intervention follow-up assessment (no specific follow-up or recall period) for healthcare provider-level or system-level study
- At least a 60% retention rate at a single follow-up assessment in each study arm for screening for PrEP eligibility and referring to PrEP services, PrEP initiation/uptake, PrEP use, PrEP medication adherence or persistence, PrEP drug levels, or HIV incidence
- Comparison between an intervention arm(s) and an appropriate comparison arm(s)
- Analysis of participants in study arms as originally allocated (i.e., participants may not be re-assigned for analytic purposes)
- Data from contaminated participants may be excluded if these numbers are small
- Analysis of participants regardless of the level of intervention exposure
  - Note: Participants exposed to  $< 50\%$  of the entire intended intervention may be excluded.
- If participants are excluded due to contamination or low exposure, retention rate must acknowledge the exclusion of these participants at each assessment
- Use of appropriate cluster-level analyses if assigned to study arms by cluster or group
- Analysis must be based on follow-up levels or on pre-post changes in measures between study arms
  - Note: If pre-post changes are used in analysis, measures must be identical, including identical recall period.
- Analysis is based on a p-value of  $< 0.05$  and a 2-sided test

- With nonrandomized assignment, either no statistical differences in baseline levels of the outcome exist or baseline differences are statistically controlled for in the analysis
- Baseline sample  $\geq 40$  participants per study arm
  - Note: Studies that meet all evidence-based criteria with the exception of sample size (i.e.,  $n \geq 40$  per arm), and have at least 25 participants per study arm at baseline will be evaluated with evidence-informed criteria (see [PrEP Evidence-Informed criteria](#)).

## Strength of Evidence

### Demonstrated Significant Positive Intervention Effects

- Statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) positive intervention effect for  $\geq 1$  relevant outcome measure in the intervention arm relative to the comparison arm.
  - A positive intervention effect is defined as an improvement in relevant PrEP-related behavioral or biologic outcomes in an intervention arm relative to a comparison arm.
  - Relevant PrEP-related behavioral or biological outcomes are defined as and include:

#### PrEP Patient-Level

- Screening for PrEP eligibility and referring to PrEP services: assessed HIV risk behavior to identify a participant as an eligible PrEP candidate and referred them to PrEP services (e.g., scheduled the first PrEP service appointment)
- Linkage to PrEP care: a participant completed healthcare visit that includes being prescribed PrEP
- PrEP initiation/uptake: initiation of PrEP among PrEP-naïve participants or those who were not PrEP users as defined by study authors via self-report or medical or pharmacy records (e.g., filled a prescription for PrEP, started PrEP);
- PrEP use: on PrEP (including lifetime, current use) based on self-report or medical or pharmacy records;
- PrEP medication adherence or persistence: taking PrEP on a regularly agreed to schedule (e.g., daily dose, on demand) measured by electronic data monitoring (e.g., Medication Event Monitoring System [MEMS] caps), pill count, pharmacy refill, self-reported adherence, or medical record;
- PrEP drug levels: based on assays that assess PrEP drug or drug metabolite levels in plasma, urine, hair, or dried blood spots;
- Retention in PrEP care: completed PrEP medical visit(s) over a period of time (e.g., attended one visit every 3 months for at least 6 months) that is self-reported or documented in medical records;
- HIV incidence: HIV infections that are self-reported or documented in medical records

#### PrEP Healthcare Provider- or System-Level

- PrEP prescribing behavior: self-reported by provider or documented in medical or pharmacy records
- PrEP utilization among health care systems and communities: number of people on PrEP assessed at the healthcare system or community level

### No Demonstrated Significant Negative Intervention Effects

- No negative and statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) intervention effects for any PrEP-relevant outcome in the intervention arm relative to the comparison arm.
  - A negative intervention effect is defined as the intervention arm showing:

- Greater reduction in, or lower level of, PrEP initiation/uptake, PrEP use, PrEP medication adherence or persistence or PrEP drug levels;
- Lower level of screening for PrEP and referring to PrEP services, linkage to PrEP care, retention in PrEP care;
- Greater increase in HIV incidence;
- Lower proportion of PrEP prescribing behavior; and
- Lower proportion of people on PrEP assessed at the healthcare system or community level

### Additional Limitations to Evaluate

- No evidence that additional limitations resulted in considerable bias that reduces the confidence of the findings
  - Examples of limitations:
    - Too many post-hoc analyses
    - Inconsistent evidence between effects
    - Inappropriate subset analyses
    - Not accounting for various reasons why participants were not included in the PrEP outcome
    - Not adjusting for cluster effects for studies that allocated individuals to a group-level intervention
    - Not accounting for factors that may influence findings (e.g., historical events)
    - Other notable biases threatening internal or external validity

### Additional Study Strengths

Evidence-Informed intervention studies that exhibit additional strengths will have those strengths noted on all summary documentation. These strengths include:

- Study design-related strengths:
  - Follow-up assessment occurring  $\geq 12$  months for any PrEP-related outcomes
  - Outcomes occurring within or exceeding optimal follow-up assessment time points
    - Screening for PrEP eligibility and referring to PrEP care or linkage to PrEP care  $\leq 1$  month
    - PrEP initiation/uptake  $\leq 3$  months
    - PrEP use, medical adherence or persistence, drug levels, or no HIV incidence  $\geq 12$  months
    - Retention in PrEP care: one visit every 3 months for at least 6 months as recommended by the CDC PrEP guideline
  - Targeting persons who meet indications for PrEP according to CDC guidelines
    - Men who have sex with men who:
      - have HIV-positive sex partner;
      - are diagnosed with a recent bacterial sexually transmitted infection (STI);
      - have a high number of sex partners;
      - have a history of inconsistent or no condom use; or
      - engage in commercial sex work
    - Heterosexual women and men who:
      - have HIV-positive sex partner;
      - are diagnosed with a recent bacterial STI;
      - have a high number of sex partners;
      - have a history of inconsistent or no condom use;
      - engage in commercial sex work; or
      - live in a high-prevalence area or network
    - Injection drug users who:
      - have HIV-positive injecting partner; or

- share injection equipment
- Targeting populations that experience HIV disparities (e.g., black men who have sex with men)
- Recruiting adequate sample size
  - PrEP studies with baseline sample sizes  $\geq 150$
- Implementation-related strengths:
  - Delivering intervention as planned
    - Measures fidelity of intervention
- Outcome-related strengths:
  - Lack of disparities in study outcomes (e.g., same intervention effects are observed throughout all racial/ethnic, gender, or/and age groups)

\*Additional study designs (e.g., before/after study design) will be evaluated with evidence-informed criteria for PrEP.

**All criteria must be satisfied for an intervention to be considered a PrEP Evidence-Based Intervention (EBI).**

