# SHORT REPORT



# Social and structural drivers of HIV vulnerability among a respondent-driven sample of feminine and non-feminine presenting transgender women who have sex with men in Zimbabwe

Lauren E. Parmley<sup>1,§</sup>, Sophia S. Miller<sup>1</sup>, Innocent Chingombe<sup>2</sup>, Munyaradzi Mapingure<sup>2</sup>, Owen Mugurungi<sup>3</sup>, John H. Rogers<sup>4</sup>, Godfrey Musuka<sup>2</sup>, Chesterfield Samba<sup>5</sup>, Avi J. Hakim<sup>6</sup>, and Tiffany G. Harris<sup>1,7</sup>

\*Corresponding author: Lauren E. Parmley, ICAP at Columbia University, New York, NY, USA. Tel: +27 76 480 3906. (lparmley@usaid.gov)

### Abstract

**Introduction:** We sought to characterize social and structural drivers of HIV vulnerability for transgender women (TGW) in Zimbabwe, where TGW are not legally recognized, and explore differences in vulnerability by feminine presentation.

**Methods:** A secondary analysis was conducted with a sub-sample of participants recruited from a 2019 respondent-driven sampling survey that comprised men who have sex with men, TGW and genderqueer individuals assigned male sex at birth, from two cities in Zimbabwe. Survey questionnaires captured information related to socio-demographics, sexual and substance use behaviours, and social and structural barriers to HIV services. Secondary analyses were restricted to participants who identified as female, transfemale or transwomen (236/1538) and were unweighted. Descriptive statistics were used to calculate sample estimates and chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were used to assess differences in vulnerability by feminine presentation.

**Results:** Among 236 TGW, almost half (45.3%) presented as feminine in the 6 months preceding the survey and 8.5% had ever used hormones to affirm their gender identities. Median age among TGW was 23 years (interquartile range: 20–26). Feminine presenting TGW in our sample had higher prevalence of arrest (15.9% vs. 3.9%), rejection by family/friends (38.3% vs. 14.0%), employment termination (11.2% vs. 3.9%), employment refusal (14.0% vs. 3.9%), denial of healthcare (16.8% vs. 2.3%), physical, sexual or verbal harassment or abuse (59.8% vs. 34.1%), alcohol dependence (32.7% vs. 12.4%), recent transactional sex with a male or TGW partner (30.8% vs. 13.3%) and recent non-injection drug use (38.3% vs. 20.2%) than non-feminine presenting TGW (all *p*-value <0.05).

**Conclusions:** Findings suggest that TGW, particularly feminine presenting TGW, experience social and structural inequities which may contribute to HIV vulnerability. Interventions aimed at addressing inequities, including trans competency training for providers and gender-affirming, psychosocial and legal support services for TGW, might mitigate risk.

Keywords: transgender people; key and vulnerable populations; human rights; Zimbabwe; structural drivers; Africa

### Received 18 June 2023; Accepted 23 February 2024

Copyright © 2024 The Authors. Journal of the International AIDS Society published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of International AIDS Society. This article has been contributed to by U.S. Government employees and their work is in the public domain in the USA.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

# **1** | INTRODUCTION

Transgender people, including transgender women (TGW), are disproportionately affected by HIV [1–3] and face distinct challenges accessing HIV prevention and treatment services. In 2021, the relative risk of acquiring HIV was 14 times higher among TGW than adult women in the general population globally [4]. In the same year, 2% of all new HIV acquisitions were estimated to occur among TGW [4].

While available estimates on the burden of HIV among TGW reveal health inequities across contexts, estimates on

HIV-related vulnerabilities and the continuum of HIV services for TGW continue to be hampered by limited availability and quality of data, undermining efforts of a datadriven response. For the 2017–2021 period, only 11 countries reporting on global AIDS monitoring indicators related to a country's HIV response for key populations (KP) had available data on recent avoidance of healthcare seeking by transgender people, seven had available data on recent physical and/or sexual violence and four had available data on recent experiences of stigma and discrimination [4]. HIV vulnerabilities, such as stigma, discrimination and gender-based violence, are perpetuated by the criminalization of KP, including transgender, gender-diverse people and men who have sex with men (MSM) [5]. Among the UNAIDS surveyed countries in 2022, at least 20 had legal and policy environments that formally criminalized and/or prosecuted transgender people (45 countries lacked data) and 70 that criminalized same-sex sexual relations [4]. Pathways by which the legal and policy environment influence HIV outcomes have been explored for some KP [6–10], and may include both enacted and perceived stigma.

In Zimbabwe, legal protections for KP, including MSM and transgender persons, are non-existent. Trans or nonbinary/genderqueer persons are not legally recognized and there is no provision for transgender people to update their gender on identification documents or official records [11]. Same-sex sexual relationships are criminalized in Zimbabwe. and without legal recognition, TGW who have sex with men risk detention [11]. Access to gender-affirming care, including hormone therapy and gender affirmation surgery, is absent, and there are documented reports of transgender people accessing hormone therapy through the black-market or by travelling to South Africa [12, 13]. Hormone therapy in the absence of a medical provider poses health risks, and international travel to access routine health services has cost implications, further compounding vulnerabilities for TGW who access gender-affirming care through what may be their only means.

We sought to document the social and structural drivers of HIV vulnerability for TGW in Zimbabwe and explore differences by feminine presentation as part of a secondary data analysis. We hypothesized that feminine presenting TGW may experience greater vulnerabilities than non-feminine presenting TGW considering the social and legal context in Zimbabwe. Findings from this analysis contribute towards the evidence base on TGW in sub-Saharan Africa, an underrepresented group in HIV research, and could inform a more transinclusive HIV response in the country.

# 2 | METHODS

# 2.1 | Study design

Survey methods and primary outcomes have been published elsewhere [14, 15]. Briefly, individuals in Harare and Bulawayo, Zimbabwe were recruited to participate in a crosssectional biobehavioural survey using respondent-driven sampling (RDS), a peer-chain referral approach designed to recruit populations for whom no sampling frame exists [16], from March to July 2019. Individuals were eligible to participate if they were male sex assigned at birth (irrespective of gender identity), had anal/oral sex with a man in the past 12 months,  $\geq$ 18 years, resided in the city for  $\geq$ 1 month and spoke English/Shona/Ndebele. Nineteen purposively selected seeds (Harare: 11; Bulawayo: 8), four of which identified as TGW, were provided three coupons and encouraged to recruit their peers; those recruited also received three coupons and the process continued until the target sample size was reached (Harare: 718; Bulawayo: 820).

### 2.2 | Procedures

Survey procedures were aligned to those outlined in the World Health Organization Biobehavioral Survey Guidelines [17]. Individuals were screened for eligibility and if eligible and interested, provided written informed consent. A tablet-based questionnaire was administered to participants. Interview domains included demographic characteristics, sexual orientation and gender identity, HIV risk behaviours, social and structural vulnerabilities, including experiences of stigma and discrimination, and health-seeking behaviours. Consenting participants were tested for HIV, syphilis, and hepatitis B and were referred for care if the results were positive. All participants were reimbursed a maximum of US\$25 to cover transport costs and time.

### 2.3 | Ethics

Ethical approvals were received from the Columbia University Institutional Review Board and the Medical Research Council of Zimbabwe. The protocol was also reviewed per 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.

## 2.4 | Measures

Gender identity was assessed using a two-step question. Participants were first asked their current gender followed by their sex assigned at birth. Gender response options were male, female, transmale/transman, transfemale/transwoman, genderqueer (a non-binary term used in Zimbabwe) and other which, if selected, was followed by a free-text response. The analytic sample was restricted to participants who identified their current gender as female, transfemale or transwoman, hereafter referred to as TGW. All participants who identified as TGW received an additional series of questions related to their gender identity and experiences. For example, participants were asked "In the past 6 months, have you ever lived as a woman? By living as a woman, I mean dressing and presenting yourself as a woman." Those who answered "yes" were categorized to be feminine presenting. Validated measures in the questionnaire included the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) and the Patient Health Questionnaire-2 (PHQ-2) [18, 19]. Alcohol dependence was assessed using an AUDIT score ≥15 [18] and major depressive disorder was assessed using a PHQ-2 score  $\geq$ 3 [19]. Transactional sex was defined as having received money, goods or services for sex with one or more male or TGW partners in the past 6 months.

### 2.5 | Data analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to calculate sample prevalence estimates and chi-square and Fisher's exact tests (when expected cell counts <5) were used to assess differences in

# Table 1. Demographic and gender-related characteristics among a sample of feminine and non-feminine presenting TGW in Harare and Bulawayo, Zimbabwe (N = 236), 2019

			Non-feminine presenting TGW		Feminine presenting		χ <sup>2</sup> or Fisher's
	Total	(N = 236)	(N	= 129)	TGW	(N = 107)	exact tests
Characteristic	col%	n/N	row%	n/N	row%	n/N	<i>p</i> -value
Age, median (IQR)	23 (20–26)		22 (20–24)		23 (20–28)		
City							<0.0001
Bulawayo	16.1	(38/236)	13.2	(5/129)	86.8	(33/107)	
Harare	83.9	(198/236)	62.6	(124/129)	37.4	(74/107)	
Marital status							1.0
Single, never married	91.5	(216/236)	54.6	(118/129)	45.4	(98/107)	
Married or cohabitating	1.7	(4/236)	50.0	(2/129)	50.0	(2/107)	
Separated/divorced or widowed	6.8	(16/236)	56.3	(9/129)	43.8	(7/107)	
Highest education attended							0.9664
None or Primary	3.4	(8/236)	50.0	(4/129)	50.0	(4/107)	
Secondary	74.2	(175/236)	54.3	(95/129)	45.7	(80/107)	
Tertiary or Vocational	22.5	(53/236)	56.6	(30/129)	43.4	(23/107)	
Nationality							0.0918
Zimbabwean	98.7	(233/236)	55.4	(129/129)	44.6	(104/107)	
Other African	1.27	(3/236)	0	(0/129)	100.0	(3/107)	
Sexual orientation							0.0066
Gay/homosexual	86.4	(204/236)	52.0	(106/129)	48.0	(98/107)	
Bisexual	12.7	(30/236)	76.7	(23/129)	23.3	(7/107)	
Straight/heterosexual	0	(0/236)	0	(0/129)	0	(0/107)	
Other	0.9	(2/236)	0	(0/129)	100.0	(2/107)	
Disclosed gender identity to <sup>a</sup>							
Transgender friends	72.5	(171/236)	46.8	(80/129)	53.2	(91/1.7)	<0.0001
Gay/Lesbian friends who are not	95.8	(226/236)	54.4	(123/129)	45.6	(103/107)	1.0
Heterosexual friends who are not	39.0	(92/236)	39.1	(36/129)	60.9	(56/107)	0.0001
transgender	07.0	(727200)	07.1	(00/12/)	00.7	(30/10/)	0.0001
Family	35.6	(84/236)	357	(30/129)	64 3	(54/107)	<0.0001
Spouse	34	(8/236)	25.0	(2/129)	75.0	(6/107)	0.1456
Healthcare provider	18.2	(43/236)	25.6	(11/129)	74.4	(32/107)	<0.0001
Ever used hormones to affirm gender identity	10.2	(10,200)	20.0	(++) + ( / )	/ 1. 1	(02,107)	0.0011
No	915	(216/236)	579	(125/129)	421	(91/107)	0.0011
Yes	85	(20/263)	20.0	(4/129)	80.0	(16/107)	

Abbreviations: IQR, interquartile range; TGW, transgender women.

<sup>a</sup>Responses not mutually exclusive.

prevalence among TGW by feminine presentation. All analysis was conducted in SAS 9.4 (Cary, NC). Data were treated as a convenience sample and analysis did not account for sampling design as the original RDS sample did not reach convergence on key variables aligned with primary study objectives, including HIV.

# 3 | RESULTS

# 3.1 Sample characteristics and participant demographics

Among the original sample, 77.6% (1194/1538) identified as male, 8.8% (135/1538) identified as female, 6.6% (101/1538) identified as transfemale/transwoman and 7.0% (108/1538) identified as genderqueer/non-binary. Among TGW in the analytic sample (N = 236), most were single (91.5%) and identified as gay/homosexual (86.4%) (Table 1). Median age among TGW was 23 years (interquartile range [IQR]: 20-

Table 2. Associations of feminine presentation and social and structural drivers of HIV among a sample of TGW in Harare and Bulawayo, Zimbabwe, 2019

	_		Non-feminine presenting TGW	Feminine presenting TGW	χ2 or Fisher's
	$\frac{\text{Total } (N = 236)}{N}$		(N = 129)	(N = 107)	exact test <i>p</i> -value
	70	n/in	70	70	
Arrest because you have sex with men	9.3	(22/236)	3.9	15.9	0.0016
Rejection by family/friends because you have sex with men	25.0	(59/236)	14.0	38.3	<0.0001
Unemployment	38.6	(91/236)	41.9	34.6	0.2526
Employment termination because you have sex with men	7.2	(17/236)	3.9	11.2	0.0299
Employment refusal because you have sex with men	8.5	(20/236)	3.9	14.0	0.0053
Blackmail because you have sex with men	17.8	(42/236)	12.4	24.3	0.0174
Avoidance of seeking healthcare because you were worried someone may learn you have sex with men	22.9	(54/236)	18.6	28.0	0.0859
Unfair treatment by healthcare provider or denial of healthcare because you have sex with men	8.9	(21/236)	2.3	16.8	<0.0001
Physical, sexual, or verbal harassment or abuse because you have sex with men	45.8	(108/236)	34.1	59.8	<0.0001
Alcohol dependence <sup>a</sup>	21.6	(51/236)	12.4	32.7	0.0002
Non-injection drug use in the past 6 months	28.4	(67/236)	20.2	38.3	0.0021
Transactional sex with a male or TGW	21.3	(50/235)	13.3	30.8	0.0011
partner in the past 6 months <sup>b</sup>					
Major depressive disorder <sup>c</sup>	16.1	(38/236)	15.5	16.8	0.7838

Note: Boldface font denotes statistical significance at p-value <0.05.

Abbreviations: AUDIT, Alcohol Use Identification Test; PHQ, Patient Health Questionnaire; TGW, transgender women.

<sup>c</sup>PHQ-2 score ≥3.

26). TGW most reported disclosing their gender identity to friends who were gay/lesbian (Table 1). Almost half (45.3%) of TGW dressed/presented as feminine in the 6 months preceding the survey and 8.5% had ever used hormones to affirm their gender identities. Feminine presentation was more common among TGW in Bulawayo compared to Harare (86.8% vs. 37.4%; *p*-value <0.0001) (Table 1).

# 3.2 | Social and structural drivers of HIV vulnerability

Nearly half (45.8%) of TGW reported experiencing physical, sexual or verbal abuse because they have sex with men (Table 2). Of those, 71.3% had experienced abuse within 6 months preceding the survey. Abuse was perpetrated by friends (58.3%), strangers (50.9%), family members (21.3%), sex partners (12.0%), uniformed services personnel (9.3%), authority figures (8.3%) and healthcare workers (7.4%). Approximately 1 in 10 TGW had ever been arrested because they have sex with men (9.3%), 1 in 5 had alcohol dependence (21.6%) and 1 in 3 were unemployed (38.6%).

Feminine presenting TGW had higher prevalence of arrest (15.9% vs. 3.9%), rejection by family/friends (38.3% vs. 14.0%), employment termination (11.2% vs. 3.9%), employment refusal (14.0% vs. 3.9%), blackmail (24.3% vs. 12.4%), unfair treatment by healthcare provider or denial of healthcare (16.8% vs. 2.3%) and physical, sexual or verbal harassment or abuse (59.8% vs. 34.1%) because they have sex with men, alcohol dependence (32.7% vs. 12.4%), recent transactional sex with a male or TGW partner (30.8% vs. 13.3%) and recent non-injection drug use (38.3% vs. 20.2%) than nonfeminine presenting TGW (all p-value <0.05) (Table 2). There was no difference in the levels of major depressive disorder (16.8% vs. 15.5%), unemployment (34.6% vs. 41.9%) or avoidance of seeking healthcare out of worry someone may learn they have sex with men (28.0% vs. 18.6%) between feminine and non-feminine presenting TGW (all *p*-value  $\geq$ 0.05).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>AUDIT score of  $\geq$ 15.

bn = 1 missing.

### 4 | DISCUSSION

Advancing HIV and health services for TGW populations in sub-Saharan Africa necessitates improved data on and understanding of TGW. Taken together, findings support our hypothesis that feminine presenting TGW may experience greater vulnerabilities than non-feminine presenting TGW and contribute to the limited body of evidence on HIV-related research among this group.

Consistent with findings in the region [20], data suggest that TGW are highly vulnerable to social and structural vulnerabilities that contribute to health inequities. In a multicountry analysis of TGW in sub-Saharan Africa, TGW reported high levels of stigma and violence [20]; nearly 8% reported prior arrest, 30% reported rejection by friends as a result of sexual orientation or practice, 27% reported fear of seeking healthcare services due to sexual orientation or practice and 2% reported denial of healthcare services [20]. While our sample overall had comparable levels to those reported in this aggregate analysis, feminine presenting TGW in our study had higher levels of social and structural vulnerabilities compared to non-feminine presenting TGW, demonstrating the importance of more nuanced approaches to understand risk vulnerabilities among TGW and suggesting that the presentation of TGW's gender may influence vulnerability profiles in non-protective legal contexts. Interventions aimed at addressing social and structural factors that contribute to HIV and other health-related vulnerabilities may mitigate these challenges and are important enablers to reaching the UNAIDS 10-10-10 targets to remove social and legal impediments to access and utilize HIV services [21].

In many contexts, gender-affirming services, including transcompetent providers and availability of hormone therapy, can support access to HIV prevention, care, and treatment services [22] and improved outcomes [23-25]. Equally, unmet need for gender affirmation may inhibit HIV-related outcomes for TGW [26]. As earlier noted, hormone therapy was not available through the public health sector in Zimbabwe at the time of the survey and, therefore, may have been accessed through illegal and potentially unsafe means or accessed outside of Zimbabwe for participants using hormone therapy. Feminine presentation by participants may also, therefore, be an important indication of minimum interest in or demand for hormone therapy if it were made available in this context. However, additional data to better understand access to, use of and demand for hormone therapy among TGW in Zimbabwe are warranted to enable trans-inclusive services. Moreover, the reported high prevalence of unfair treatment or denial of healthcare by providers in our sample underscores an urgent need for gender-affirming services and provider sensitization on trans people in Zimbabwe, including the provision of psychosocial and legal support for TGW who, as demonstrated in our sample, experience high levels of stigma and discrimination and substance use.

These data represent a convenience sample and do not necessarily represent TGW in Harare and Bulawayo. While the small sample size limited our ability to run a multivariable model adjusting for potential confounders, such as city, distribution of vulnerabilities by feminine presentation was consistent when we restricted analyses to TGW in Harare alone (unpublished) with the exception of alcohol dependence. blackmail and employment refusal, suggesting the relationship between feminine presentation and increased experiences of most social and structural vulnerabilities may be similar in both cities. There are limitations of the feminine presentation measure used in this study, including that participants may have different definitions for living as a woman and that feminine presentation may change over time. One limitation of the primary study is that TGW were not explicitly recruited in the survey's formative assessment, and it was only after the formative assessment was conducted that stakeholder feedback highlighted the need for TGW's inclusion in the study [27]. As a result, conflation of sexual orientation and gender identity terms, and understanding of gender identity in this context was not explored in-depth. In our analysis, most TGW reported their sexual orientation as gay/homosexual which may appear to be surprising or incongruent with western understanding of gender identity. Further exploration on terminology and understanding of gender identity in Zimbabwe may elucidate these findings. Despite limitations, this is one of few HIV surveys which describe gender minorities in sub-Saharan Africa. Findings warrant further study into the relationship between feminine presentation and HIV vulnerabilities for TGW in other contexts.

### 5 | CONCLUSIONS

Findings suggest that TGW, particularly feminine presenting TGW, experience social and structural inequities, including stigma, discrimination, depression and substance abuse, which may contribute to HIV vulnerability in this context. Social and structural interventions, including trans competency training for providers and implementation of gender-affirming, psychosocial and legal support services for TGW, to support an enabling, human rights-affirming environment may alleviate these inequities.

### AUTHORS' AFFILIATIONS

<sup>1</sup>ICAP at Columbia University, New York, New York, USA; <sup>2</sup>ICAP at Columbia University, Harare, Zimbabwe; <sup>3</sup>Zimbabwe Ministry of Health and Child Care, Harare, Zimbabwe; <sup>4</sup>Division of Global HIV & TB, U.S. Centers for Disease Control, Harare, Zimbabwe; <sup>5</sup>Gay and Lesbians of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe; <sup>6</sup>Division of Global HIV & TB, U.S. Centers for Disease Control, Atlanta, Georgia, USA; <sup>7</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, New York, New York, USA

### COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

### AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

LEP, SSM, IC, MM, OM, JHR, GM, CS, AJH and TGH contributed to designing the survey, developing the data collection instruments and implementing survey procedures. LEP wrote the initial manuscript draft and led the analysis. SSM contributed to the drafting of the manuscript and verified the underlying data. All authors critically reviewed the manuscript, approved the final manuscript and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to participants for their time and contribution to the survey and acknowledge the hard work of survey staff to implement this survey. We thank the Ministry of Health and Child Care, GALZ, TranSmart, Population Services International, Pangaea Zimbabwe Aids Trust, Centre for Sexual Health and HIV/AIDS Research Zimbabwe, Hands of Hope and Sexual Rights Centre for their support.

### FUNDING

This project was supported by the U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief through the CDC under the terms of cooperative agreement #U2GGH001939.

#### DISCLAIMER

Lauren Parmley was not at USAID when the research for the current paper was conducted. The findings and conclusions in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the funding agencies.

### DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

#### REFERENCES

1. Poteat T, Scheim A, Xavier J, Reisner S, Baral S. Global epidemiology of HIV infection and related syndemics affecting transgender people. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2016;72(Suppl 3):S210–19.

2. Baral SD, Poteat T, Strömdahl S, Wirtz AL, Guadamuz TE, Beyrer C. Worldwide burden of HIV in transgender women: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Infect Dis. 2013;13(3):214–22.

3. Stutterheim SE, van Dijk M, Wang H, Jonas KJ. The worldwide burden of HIV in transgender individuals: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS One. 2021;16(12):e0260063.

4. UNAIDS. In Danger: UNAIDS Global AIDS update 2022. Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS; 2022.

5. UNAIDS. HIV and transgender and other gender-diverse people: human rights fact sheet series. UNAIDS; 2021.

 Lyons CE, Schwartz SR, Murray SM, Shannon K, Diouf D, Mothopeng T, et al. The role of sex work laws and stigmas in increasing HIV risks among sex workers. Nat Commun. 2020;11(1):773.

7. Shannon K, Strathdee SA, Goldenberg SM, Duff P, Mwangi P, Rusakova M, et al. Global epidemiology of HIV among female sex workers: influence of structural determinants. Lancet. 2015;385(9962):55–71.

8. Reeves A, Steele S, Stuckler D, McKee M, Amato-Gauci A, Semenza JC. National sex work policy and HIV prevalence among sex workers: an ecological regression analysis of 27 European countries. Lancet HIV. 2017;4(3):e134–40.

9. Schwartz SR, Nowak RG, Orazulike I, Keshinro B, Ake J, Kennedy S, et al. The immediate effect of the Same-Sex Marriage Prohibition Act on stigma, discrimination, and engagement on HIV prevention and treatment services in men who have sex with men in Nigeria: analysis of prospective data from the TRUST cohort. Lancet HIV. 2015;2(7):e299–e306.

10. Lyons CE, Twahirwa Rwema JO, Makofane K, Diouf D, Mfochive Njindam I, Ba I, et al. Associations between punitive policies and legal barriers to consensual same-sex sexual acts and HIV among gay men and other men who have sex with men in sub-Saharan Africa: a multicountry, respondent-driven sampling survey. Lancet HIV. 2023;10(3):e186–94.

11. Country Policy and Information Note-Zimbabwe: sexual orientation and gender identity and expression. United Kingdom Home Office; 2019.

12. Laws and policies affecting transgender persons in Southern Africa. Southern Africa Litigation Centre; 2017.

13. Ndhlovu L. Trans people struggle for acceptance in Zimbabwe. 2018. Accessed on May 2023. Available from: https://news.trust.org/item/ 20181023124431-y0t0w

14. HIV and STI biobehavioral survey among men who have sex with men, transgender women, and genderqueer individuals in Zimbabwe–Final Report. New York: ICAP at Columbia University; 2020.

15. Harris TG, Wu Y, Parmley LE, Musuka G, Mapingure MP, Chingombe I, et al. HIV care cascade and associated factors among men who have sex with men, transgender women, and genderqueer individuals in Zimbabwe: findings from a biobehavioural survey using respondent-driven sampling. Lancet HIV. 2022;9(3):e182–e201.

16. Heckathorn D. Respondent-driven sampling: a new approach to the study of hidden populations. Soc Probl. 1997;44(2):174–99.

17. WHO, CDC, UNAIDS, FHI360. Biobehavioral survey guidelines for populations at risk for HIV. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2017.

18. Babor TF, Higgins-Biddle JC, Saunders JB, Monteiro MG. The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2001.

19. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The Patient Health Questionnaire-2: validity of a two-item depression screener. Med Care. 2003;41(11): 1284-92.

20. Poteat T, Ackerman B, Diouf D, Ceesay N, Mothopeng T, Odette K-Z, et al. HIV prevalence and behavioral and psychosocial factors among transgender women and cisgender men who have sex with men in 8 African countries: a cross-sectional analysis. PLoS Med. 2017;14(11):e1002422.

21. UNAIDS. 2025 AIDS TARGETS: UNAIDS. Accessed on May 2023. Available from: https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/2025-AIDS-Targets\_en.pdf

22. Sevelius JM, Keatley J, Calma N, Arnold E. 'I am not a man': trans-specific barriers and facilitators to PrEP acceptability among transgender women. Glob Public Health. 2016;11(7–8):1060–75.

23. Summers NA, Huynh TT, Dunn RC, Cross SL, Fuchs CJ. Effects of genderaffirming hormone therapy on progression along the HIV care continuum in transgender women. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2021;8(9):ofab404.

24. Bothma R, O'Connor C, Nkusi J, Shiba V, Segale J, Matsebula L, et al. Differentiated HIV services for transgender people in four South African districts: population characteristics and HIV care cascade. J Int AIDS Soc. 2022;25(Suppl 5):e25987.

25. Chyten-Brennan J, Patel VV, Anastos K, Hanna DB. Brief Report: role of gender-affirming hormonal care in HIV care continuum outcomes when comparing transgender women with cisgender sexual minority men. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2022;91(3):255–60.

26. Rosen JG, Malik M, Cooney EE, Wirtz AL, Yamanis T, Lujan M, et al. Antiretroviral treatment interruptions among Black and Latina transgender women living with HIV: characterizing co-occurring, multilevel factors using the gender affirmation framework. AIDS Behav. 2019;23(9):2588–99.

27. Parmley LE, Miller SS, Harris TG, Mugurungi O, Rogers JH, Hakim A, et al. Characterizing acceptable and appropriate implementation strategies of a biobehavioral survey among men who have sex with men and others assigned male who have sex with men in Zimbabwe. PLOS Glob Public Health. 2022;2(10): e0001097.