

Research article

Differentiated models of care for postpartum women on antiretroviral therapy in Cape Town, South Africa: a cohort study

Landon Myer^{1,2§}, Victoria Iyun^{1,2}, Allison Zerbe³, Tamsin K. Phillips^{1,2}, Kirsty Brittain^{1,2}, Elton Mukonda¹, Joanna Allerton^{1,2}, Cathy D. Kalombo⁴, Andile Nofemela^{1,2†} and Elaine J. Abrams^{3,5}

[§]Corresponding author: Landon Myer, Division of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, School of Public Health & Family Medicine, University of Cape Town Faculty of Health Sciences, Anzio Road, Observatory 7925 Cape Town, South Africa. Tel: +27 21 406 6661. (Landon.Myer@uct.ac.za) [†]Deceased

Abstract

Background: The numbers of women initiating lifelong antiretroviral therapy (ART) during pregnancy and postpartum is increasing rapidly, presenting a burden on health systems and an urgent need for scalable models of care for this population. In a pilot project, we referred postpartum women who initiated ART during pregnancy to a community-based model of differentiated ART services. **Methods**: Eligible women (on ART for at least 3 months with viral load (VL)<1000 copies/mL) were offered a choice of two ART models of care: (i) referral to an existing system of community-based 'adherence clubs', operated by lay counsellors with medication collection every 2–4 months; or (ii) referral to local primary healthcare clinics (PHC) with services provided by clinicians and medication collection every 1–2 months (local standard of care for postpartum ART). For evaluation, women were followed through 6-months postpartum with VL testing separate from either ART service.

Results: Through September 2015, n = 129 women were enrolled (median age, 28 years; median time postpartum, 10 days). Overall, 65% (n = 84) chose adherence clubs and 35% (n = 45) chose PHCs; there were no demographic or clinical predictors of this choice. Location of service delivery was commonly cited as a reason for choice by women selecting either model of care; shorter waiting times, ability to receive ART from lay counsellors and less frequent appointments were motivations for choosing adherence clubs. Among women choosing adherence clubs, 15% never attended the service and another 11% attended the service but were not retained through six months postpartum. Overall, 86% of women (n = 111) remained in the evaluation through 6 months postpartum; in this group, there were no differences in VL<1000 copies/mL at six months postpartum between women choosing PHCs (88%) vs. adherence clubs (92%; p = 0.483), but women who were not retained in adherence clubs were more likely to have VL≥1000 copies/mL compared to those who remained (p = 0.002).

Discussion: Adherence clubs may be a valuable model for postpartum women initiating ART in pregnancy, with good shortterm outcomes observed during this critical period. To support optimal implementation, further research is needed into patient preferences for models of care, with consideration of integration of maternal and child health services, while ART adherence and retention require ongoing consideration in this population.

Keywords: postnatal care; HIV; antiretroviral therapy; adherence club; maternal and child health; South Africa

To access the supplementary material to this article please see Supplementary Files under Article Tools online.

Received 03 November 2016; Accepted 25 April 2017; Published 21 July 2017

Copyright: © 2017 Myer L et al; licensee International AIDS Society. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported (CC BY 3.0) License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Background

Approaches to the clinical management of HIV infection in pregnant and postpartum women in low- and middleincome countries (LMIC) have undergone a paradigm shift in recent years. From a focus on short-term antiretroviral prophylaxis for the majority of women to prevent motherto-child HIV transmission (PMTCT), global policies today emphasize universal, lifelong triple-drug antiretroviral therapy (ART) for all pregnant and breastfeeding women [1]. Implementation of this approach has led to rapid increases in the numbers of HIV-infected women receiving ART during pregnancy and the postpartum period [2], placing strain on health systems in many countries [3].

There are significant potential health benefits for maternal and child health (MCH) associated with universal ART initiation by pregnant and breastfeeding women [4]. However, there is mounting evidence that these benefits may be undermined by widespread challenges of non-adherence and/or disengagement from care [5,6]. Multiple studies have suggested that women who initiate ART in pregnancy may be less likely to be retained in care and adherent to treatment, particularly during the postpartum period, compared to other patient populations [7–9]. In turn, identifying approaches to provide effective ART care to women during the postpartum period is a major challenge facing ART programmes globally [10,11].

Outside of pregnancy and the postnatal period, there have been important advances in service delivery models to provide care to increasing numbers of patients on ART in LMIC. This has seen the rise of various models for differentiated ART care, which see stable patients referred to alternative service delivery models which commonly involve less frequent patient contact and are overseen by lay healthcare workers, sometimes taking place outside of established healthcare facilities [12-14]. The "adherence club" is one form of differentiated ART care that has been promulgated in South Africa [15], with evaluations of nonpregnant adults established on ART [16,17]. Differentiated ART care has generated tremendous interest from policymakers as it may be more acceptable to patients and may lead to clinical outcomes that are comparable to those observed under facility-based care, while almost certainly requiring fewer resources to administer [18,19].

While differentiated ART care has tremendous appeal, little is known about its optimal implementation in different health systems and patient populations. In particular, there has been little attention to differentiated ART care for postpartum women, despite their burgeoning numbers and significant concerns around non-adherence and/or disengagement from care in this group. To address this, we carried out a pilot project examining the enrolment of postpartum women into the adherence club system in Cape Town, South Africa.

Methods

This pilot project and evaluation of postpartum adherence clubs (ClinicalTrials.gov NCT02417675) is nested within the MCH-ART study (NCT01933477), a multicomponent implementation science study examining approaches to ART service delivery for pregnant and postpartum women [20]. The project took place around the Midwife-Obstetric Unit (MOU) of the Gugulethu Community Health Centre (CHC). This facility is located in a low-income, former African township, where the local antenatal HIV prevalence and antenatal care (ANC)/PMTCT coverage are both high [21]. The MOU is operated by nurse-midwives and sees more than 4000 women annually for primary care antenatal and/or obstetric services. Care is provided up to approximately 10 days postpartum, comprised principally of reviewing maternal clinical status as well as infant feeding and wellbeing.

HIV/ART services

Antenatal ART initiation and follow-up has been integrated into PMTCT services since 2012; from 2013 all HIV-infected

women have been eligible for lifelong ART regardless of disease stage or CD4 cell count. The vast majority of women starting ART in pregnancy are initiated onto teno-fovir 300 mg, emtracitabine 200 mg and efavirenz 600 mg, taken once daily as a fixed-dose combination. Clinical reviews take place at 1–2 monthly intervals throughout pregnancy, with viral load (VL) testing after 12 weeks on ART.

The local standard of care for ART services during the postpartum period in this setting is referral of mothers at <2 weeks after delivery (depending on the timing of their next scheduled visit to the MOU-ART service) to a network of primary healthcare clinics (PHCs) providing general ART services within the area; their HIV-exposed infants are referred separately to routine "well-baby" services that include routine anthropometry, vaccinations and HIV testing for infants (including HIV PCR at 6–10 weeks and antibody testing at 18 months).

Adherence clubs

The local model of differentiated ART care in this setting is a community-based adherence club system that has operated since 2012 as part of public sector standard of care [22]. The adherence clubs are facilitated by lay counsellors working in community venues located separately from health facilities. Locally, a network of approximately 105 clubs, each comprised 20-35 patients, meets 2-4 monthly (for an average of 5 visits per year per club) in an community venue located away from the PHC. At each visit, patients are weighed, complete a short symptom review and receive group educational talks on a range of HIV and health-related topics. Prepacked ART is dispensed at each visit and patients may send proxies (treatment buddies) to collect medications on their behalf. Within the club system, a clinical review takes place annually with nurse evaluation and VL testing.

To date, there are more than 3000 patients enrolled into the adherence club system serving the Gugulethu community. Outside of this pilot, these patients are non-pregnant adults who are identified as being eligible for clubs if they have been on ART for at least 6–12 months at a PHC, have a suppressed VL, have no adherence concerns and no comorbidities requiring ongoing clinical management. Individuals who are enrolled in the club system may be referred back to PHC if they miss a club appointment by more than 5 working days or stop taking ART, have an elevated VL (>400 copies/ml), or develop a comorbidity requiring clinical attention [23].

Evaluation design

Working in partnership with the Gugulethu CHC and provincial health services, we conducted an evaluation of a pilot project allowing women to be referred to adherence clubs immediately postpartum. The evaluation had two discrete components: (i) an initial choice of postpartum ART services and then (ii) a cohort study following all women (regardless of ART service choice) during the postpartum period with regular assessments conducted separately from routine care. In addition to local government approval, this evaluation was approved by the ethics committees of the University of Cape Town and Columbia University.

Eligibility was modelled on the criteria used by the parent MCH-ART study, and included age >18 years, ART initiation in the recent pregnancy, intention to live in Cape Town through 12 months postpartum, and breastfeeding at enrolment. In addition, this evaluation included eligibility for adherence club referral per local practice, most notably documented suppressed VL (based on testing after 12 weeks on ART) and no comorbidity requiring ongoing clinical review.

Enrolment and choice of postpartum service

Eligible women were identified at routine postpartum care visits taking place at the MOU and were referred to study counsellors for informed consent and an enrolment interview including socio-demographics and medical history. At the end of this interview, women received a standardized counselling script which explained that they could choose the site of their postpartum ART care - (i) referral to the existing system of community-based "adherence clubs"; or (ii) referral to a local PHC. The features of each service were explained briefly, including the location and frequency of visits and dispensing, as well as the care providers involved, and questions were answered. Neither service provided specific care for postpartum women or their children; for women choosing either service, routine infant follow-up including infant HIV testing took place at separate "wellbaby" services. Following their decision, a subset of consecutive women completed a short questionnaire on the reasons for their choice of service.

After making their choice, women were referred by the MOU to either the adherence club system or the local PHC. Following local standard of care, referral procedures included counselling on the referral process and the provision of a referral letter, as well as counselling on ART adherence and PMTCT, with provision of 1–2 months ART. Women were then accompanied by a counsellor to make their first appointment for either the next available AC meeting or at the PHC.

Follow-up

As part of the evaluation, all women were followed in a series of study measurement visits scheduled and conducted separately from either ART service. These visits included assessments of MCH service utilization, ART adherence, as well as VL testing conducted separately from VL monitoring in routine care, and batch tested by the South African National Health Laboratory Services using the Abbott RealTime HIV-1 platform (Abbott Laboratories, Chicago, Illinois, USA). At any study measurement visit where a participant was identified as being non-adherent and/or disengaged from care, counselling was provided on the importance of ART for MCH, with referral back to the selected service, as appropriate.

As part of the evaluation, engagement of women in the adherence clubs was assessed using paper-based registers maintained by lay counsellors at the adherence clubs. We used the definition of non-retention employed by the adherence clubs, based on being more than 5 working days late to a scheduled meeting, to determine when a patient would be removed from the adherence club system and referred back to the local PHC.

Analysis

Data were analysed using R (Gnu Project). Descriptive statistics included medians with interquartile ranges (IQR), means with standard deviations (SD) and proportions with 95% confidence intervals (CI). The factors associated with (i) initial choice of services and (ii) short-term outcomes in either service were examined with t-, rank sum or Fisher's exact tests, as appropriate. All statistical tests were twosided at alpha = 0.05. Mixed effects logistic regression was used to examine the associations between service delivery models and elevated VL after accounting for repeated measures and adjusting for covariation by socio-demographic and clinical characteristics.

Results

Between February and September 2015, we enrolled 129 postpartum women on ART into the evaluation. Women were enrolled at a median of 10 days post-delivery (IQR, 5–19) with a median of 23 weeks on ART (IQR 18–27). Figure 1 shows the disposition of participants in the evaluation, and Table 1 describes the demographic and clinical characteristics of the sample overall and by choice of ART service. The mean age of women was 28.4 years (SD, 5.2), 20% of women were primiparous, 63% of women were not married or cohabiting, and most women (59%) were newly diagnosed with HIV in the recently ended pregnancy.

Choice of postpartum services

When offered the choice of postpartum ART services, 65% of women chose to attend the adherence clubs and 35% of women chose to attend the local primary care ART service. There were no clear demographic or clinical predictors of this choice (Table 1). Although women choosing adherence clubs were slightly more likely to be employed and were slightly better educated, neither of these associations achieved statistical significance. Table 2 shows the reasons for the choice of postpartum ART service, among 58 women with data available. The defining features of the respective services - in terms of visit frequency, type of healthcare providers, and the availability of peer support - were frequently cited by individuals choosing either service. For example, 66% of women choosing adherence clubs cited the preference to receive care outside of the clinic, while 36% of women choosing PHCs stated that they did not wish to receive community-based care.

Among women choosing either service, geographic location was frequently noted as a reason for their choice – for 100% and 59% of women choosing clinics and clubs, respectively. However, a further 20% of women choosing clubs noted that a desirable feature was that these were located further from their home than the PHC. In addition,



Figure 1. Flow diagram of evaluation procedures.

* Study measurement visits conducted by evaluation staff separate from either routine ART service (PHC or AC).

substantial proportions of women in each group stated that their reason for choosing either service was the proximity to local "well-baby" clinical services for their infants.

Viral load during the postpartum period by choice of service

After enrolment and the initial choice of and referral to an ART service, 98%, 91% and 85% of women were followed at study measurement visits, separate from either ART service, held at 6, 12 and 24 weeks postpartum, respectively. There were no significant differences between women who did and did not complete the 6 month study measurement visit (Supplemental Table 1). The results of VL testing at these study measurement visits are shown in Table 3 and Figure 2(a), overall and by chosen referral service. The proportions of women with VL>50 and >1000 copies/mL both increased over time. For example by 6 months postpartum, VL>1000 copies/mL was observed in 8% versus 12% of women choosing clubs versus PHCs, respectively (p = 0.483). In multivariable models, the absence of an association between chosen ART service and elevated VL through 6 months postpartum persisted (Supplemental Table 2).

Retention in adherence clubs

Of the 84 women who chose to attend adherence clubs immediately postpartum, 15% (n = 13) were found on medical record review to have never attended any adherence club meeting, and an additional 11% (n = 9) were not retained in the club system following their initial meeting. The demographic and clinical characteristics of these 22 women – comprising 26% of all women who chose clubs – were largely similar to women who remained in the club system, although women who remained in the club system were more likely to be employed than women who did not (p = 0.039). Women who were not retained in the adherence club system were more likely to have elevated VL at 6 months postpartum (28%) compared to women who were retained (2%; p = 0.002; Figure 2(b)).

Discussion

This evaluation provides insights into the implementation of differentiated ART care for postpartum women who initiated therapy during pregnancy, a patient population who may be at particular risk of non-adherence and disengagement from care. The key findings are that patient preferences for models of care varied, but that short-term

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of postpartum women participating in pilot evaluation, overall and by selectedpostpartum ART service, in Cape Town, South Africa

Number of participants All wome Adherence clubs Primary care clink p-Value Number of participants 129 84 (65) 45 (35) Median (UQR) age in years 28 (24–31) 20 (24–31) 22 (24–31) 28 (24–31) 25 years 35 (27) 22 (26) 13 (29) 0.466 25-34 years 79 (61) 50 (60) 29 (64) 235 years 15 (12) 12 (14) 3 (7) Home language 2 (22) 0 (0) Educational attainment Less than secondary (any tertiary 69 (53) 42 (50) 13 (40) 0.278 Completed secondary/any tertiary 69 (53) 42 (50) 16 (30) 0.76 Endistionship status 3 (73) 0.176 Marine/cohabiting 48 (37) 32 (38) 16 (36) 0.776 Single 9 (13) 36 (32) 25 (30) 16 (36) 0.01 Perinary 10 (30) 66 (79) 37 (62)			Womer		
Number of participants12984 (65)45 (35)Median (URX) age in years28 (24–31)22 (24)38 (24–32)25-34 years79 (61)50 (60)29 (4)25-34 years79 (61)50 (60)29 (4)25-34 years79 (61)50 (60)29 (7)25-34 years15 (12)12 (4)3 (7)15 (12)12 (12)0 (0)20 (2)16 (13)127 (98)42 (50)28 (40)25 (24)20 (2)0 (0)20 (2)Chore and a scondary / artitizy69 (53)42 (50)28 (40)Completed scondary/arty tertiary69 (53)42 (50)33 (73)0.176Completed scondary/arty tertiary69 (53)32 (38)16 (36)0.776Median ship status78 (65)51 (61)33 (73)0.176Corrently emologed44 (34)32 (38)16 (36)0.776Net emologed48 (37)32 (38)16 (36)0.776Single26 (20)18 (21)87 (8)0.622Multiparous26 (20)18 (21)87 (8)0.622Multiparous26 (20)18 (21)76 (5)26 (2)16 (3)Preinty76 (59)48 (57)25 (30)16 (3)76 (5)Nergiancy Intention76 (59)48 (57)25 (3)16 (3)76 (5)Nergiancy Multiparous76 (59)48 (57)23 (1-27)20 (1-27)20 (1-27)Preinty Multiparous76 (59)48 (57)23 (50)27 (1-27)20 (1-27	Variable	All women	Adherence clubs	Primary care clinic	<i>p</i> -Value
Median (LQR) age in years28 (24–31)29 (24–31)28 (24–32)<25 years	Number of participants	129	84 (65)	45 (35)	
<25 years25 (27)22 (26)13 (29)0.46625-34 years79 (61)50 (60)29 (64)1Home language15 (12)12 (14)3 (7)1sixhoan22 (2)2 (2)0 (0)0.542Other2 (2)2 (2)0 (0)0.542Educational attainment2 (2)2 (2)0 (0)0.542Est shan secondary/any tertiary60 (47)42 (50)18 (40)0.176Completed secondary/any tertiary60 (47)42 (50)18 (40)0.176Currently employed44 (34)32 (38)12 (27)0.0776Net employed44 (34)32 (38)16 (36)0.776Single83 (63)52 (62)28 (18)0.622Mutrigo/cohabiting66 (20)18 (21)8 (18)0.622Mutrigorous103 (80)66 (7)37 (8)0.521Preinyarous26 (20)18 (21)8 (18)0.622Mutiparous103 (80)66 (7)37 (8)0.516Intended88 (58)59 (70)29 (50)64 (57)56 (50)Newly diagnosed HV+ in pregnancy10 (32)73 (7)0.561Newly diagnosed HV- in pregnancy27 (21)17 (20)10 (22)Previous 40 Ku Sto FMCT only27 (21)17 (20)10 (22)Previous 40 Ku Sto FMCT only23 (18-27)23 (19-27)24 (18-27)No previous 40 Ku Sto ART23 (18-27)23 (19-27)24 (18-27)Sto cells/uL10 (10)10 (10) <td>Median (IQR) age in years</td> <td>28 (24–31)</td> <td>29 (24–31)</td> <td>28 (24–32)</td> <td></td>	Median (IQR) age in years	28 (24–31)	29 (24–31)	28 (24–32)	
25-34 years79 (61)50 (60)29 (64)≥35 years15 (12)12 (14)3.7≥35 years15 (12)12 (14)3.7isNtosa127 (98)22 (2)0 (0)Educational attainment2 (2)2 (2)0.00Euss than secondary (any tertiary)69 (53)42 (50)25 (40)Completed secondary/any tertiary69 (53)42 (50)25 (40)Employment status84 (66)51 (61)33 (7)0.776Completed secondary/any tertiary84 (66)52 (38)12 (27)100Married/Yolabiting istatus84 (66)52 (38)16 (56)0.776Single81 (63)52 (62)29 (64).622Primjarous103 (80)66 (79)37 (82).622Primjarous103 (80)66 (79)37 (82).622Primjarous103 (80)66 (79)29 (64).501Intended48 (68)59 (70)29 (64).501Intended88 (68)59 (70)29 (64).502Newly diagnosed HV4 in pregnancy76 (59)48 (57)28 (62).576Diagnosed previously53 (41)36 (43)72 (71)72Newly diagnosed10 (8)0 (9)12 (71).772Previous def kris for PMTCT only27 (21)17 (20).772Previous def kris for PMTCT only23 (18-27)23 (18-27).572Diagnosed HV4 in presenter23 (18-27)23 (19-27).721Previous def kris prestructure	<25 years	35 (27)	22 (26)	13 (29)	0.466
235 years 15 (12) 12 (14) 3 (7) Home language issibhos 127 (98) 82 (98) 45 (100) 0.54z Other 2 (2) 2 (2) 0 (0) 0.54z Educational attainment Ess than secondary (any tertiary) 69 (53) 42 (50) 27 (60) 0.278 Completed secondary/any tertiary 69 (53) 42 (50) 27 (60) 0.278 Completed secondary/any tertiary 69 (63) 51 (61) 33 (73) 0.176 Currently employed 44 (37) 32 (38) 16 (36) 0.776 Single 81 (63) 26 (20) 18 (21) 84 (18) 0.622 Marted/cohabiting 26 (20) 18 (21) 87 (88) 0.613 1.021 Perganary intention 70 (30) 36 (31) 37 (32) 1.021	25–34 years	79 (61)	50 (60)	29 (64)	
Home Inguageisikhosa127 (98)82 (98)45 (100)0.42Gher2 (2)2 (2)0 (0)Educational attainmentLess than secondary/any tertiary69 (53)42 (50)28 (60)Employment status33 (73)0.176Currently employed44 (66)51 (61)33 (73)0.176Employment status32 (38)12 (27)Relationship status32 (38)16 (36)0.776Single48 (63)52 (62)29 (64)Primiparous103 (80)66 (79)37 (82)Primiparous103 (80)66 (79)37 (82)Nutiparous103 (80)66 (79)38 (62)0.576Intended41 (32)25 (30)15 (36)Intended76 (59)48 (57)28 (62)0.576Diagnosed Previously75 (41)36 (43)17 (38)Newly diagnosed HiV+ in pregnancy </td <td>≥35 years</td> <td>15 (12)</td> <td>12 (14)</td> <td>3 (7)</td> <td></td>	≥35 years	15 (12)	12 (14)	3 (7)	
isikhasa 12 (298) 82 (98) 45 (00) 0.542 Other 2 (2) 2 (2) 0 (0) Educational attainment Less than secondary Completed secondary/any tertiagy 66 (53) 42 (50) 18 (40) Employment tatus Not employed 06 (47) 42 (50) 18 (40) Employment tatus Not employed 44 (56) 51 (61) 33 (73) 0.176 Currently employed 44 (53) 32 (38) 12 (27) Evaluation 10 (51) 52 (52) 29 (64) Employment tatus Narried/Oxhabiting 52 (52) 29 (64) Parity Primiparous 26 (20) 18 (21) 88 (18) 0.522 Pregnancy intention Unitended 18 (68) 52 (62) 37 (82) Pregnancy intention Unitended 88 (68) 59 (70) 29 (64) 0.501 Intended 76 (59) 48 (57) 28 (62) 0.501 Intended 76 (59) 48 (57) 28 (62) 0.501 Intended 76 (59) 48 (57) 28 (62) 0.501 Previous defore pregnancy Newly diagnosed HIV+ in pregnancy Newly diagnosed HIV- in pregnancy Newly diagnosed 10 (07) 58 (59) 32 (1) (2) Previous us of ART 23 (19-27) 24 (18-27) 0.507 Previous us of ART 23 (19-27) 23 (19-27) 24 (18-27) 0.507 Previous defore pregnancy Newlea (10R) days postpartum 10 (5-19) 9 (5-21) 11 (6-15) 0.772 Median (10R) weeks on ART 23 (19-27) 24 (18-27) 0.507 Median (10R) weeks on ART 23 (19-27) 24 (18-27) 0.507 Median (10R) weeks on ART 32 (19-27) 24 (18-27) 0.507 Median (10R) weeks on ART 32 (19-27) 25 (19-27) 0.507 Median (10R) days postpartum 10 (5-19) 9 (5-21) 11 (6-15) 0.772 Median (10R) days postpartum 10 (5-19) 9 (5-21) 11 (6-15) 0.772 Median (10R) days postpartum 10 (5-19) 9 (5-21) 11 (6-15) 0.772 Median (10R) days postpartum 10 (5-19) 9 (5-21) 11 (6-15) 0.772 Median (10R) days postpartum 10 (5-19) 9 (5-21) 11 (6-15) 0.772 Median (10R) days postpartum 10 (5-19) 9 (5-21) 11 (6-15) 0.772 Median (10R) days postpartum 10 (5-19) 9 (5-21) 11 (6-15) 0.773 Median (10R) days pos	Home language				
Oher2 (2)2 (2)0 (0)Educational attaimentEducational attaimentLess than secondary/any tertiary60 (47)42 (50)18 (40)Employment status60 (47)42 (50)18 (40)Not employed44 (66)51 (61)33 (73)0.176Currently employed44 (34)32 (38)12 (27)10Relationship status752 (62)29 (64)10Married/cohabiting66 (37)32 (38)16 (36)0.622Primiparous66 (20)18 (21)8 (18)0.622Multiparous103 (80)66 (79)37 (82)10Preganary intention88 (68)59 (70)29 (64)50Unintended41 (32)25 (30)16 (36)50Newly diagnosed INV+ in pregnancy86859 (70)29 (64)50Newly diagnosed previously53 (41)36 (43)17 (38)50Newly diagnosed INV+ in pregnancy76 (59)48 (57)28 (62)0.576Newly diagnosed previously53 (41)36 (43)17 (38)70No previous RAV use90 (70)58 (69)32 (71)71Previous RAV use before pregnancy72 (21)17 (20)10 (22)Previous RAV use borney23 (18-27)23 (19-27)24 (18-27)0.501Previous RAV use borney10 (08)9 (10)4 (49)72Previous RAV dagnosed10 (8)74 (93)40 (93)71Previous RAV use borney23 (18-27)<	isiXhosa	127 (98)	82 (98)	45 (100)	0.542
Educational attainmentLess than secondary (any tertiary)69 (63)42 (50)12 (60)0.27 (60)0.27 (60)Completed secondary/any tertiary60 (67)42 (50)18 (40)Employment status84 (66)51 (61)33 (73)0.176Currently employed44 (34)32 (38)12 (27)Relationship status84 (637)32 (38)16 (36)0.76Single83 (63)52 (62)29 (64)0.62Parity70 (20)18 (21)8 (18)0.622Multiparous26 (20)18 (21)37 (82)0.61Pregnancy intention10 (20)66 (79)29 (64)0.501Intended88 (68)59 (70)29 (64)0.501Intended88 (68)59 (70)28 (62)0.576Diagnosed previously36 (31)36 (33)17 (38)37 (82)Nar Weld agenosed76 (59)48 (57)28 (62)0.576Diagnosed previously36 (31)36 (33)17 (38)37 (82)Nar Weld agenosed76 (59)58 (69)32 (71)72Previous Rel before pregnancy12 (9)9 (11)37 (32)0.201Previous Rel before pregnancy12 (9)9 (11)32 (73)24 (18-27)0.292 (14)Previous us of ANT12 (9)9 (11)17 (20)11 (6-15)0.772Previous us of ANT23 (18-27)23 (18-27)24 (18-27)0.292 (14)Previous us of ANT23 (18-27)23 (19-27)24 (18-27) <t< td=""><td>Other</td><td>2 (2)</td><td>2 (2)</td><td>0 (0)</td><td></td></t<>	Other	2 (2)	2 (2)	0 (0)	
Less than secondary69 (53)42 (50)27 (60)0.278Completed secondary/any tertiary60 (47)42 (50)18 (40)Completed secondary/any tertiary64 (34)32 (38)12 (27)Not employed48 (66)51 (61)33 (73)0.176Currently employed48 (37)32 (38)16 (36)0.776Baltatonship stuls84 (37)32 (38)16 (36)0.776Single81 (63)52 (62)29 (64)0.622Parity772 (30)67 (79)29 (64)0.501Pregnancy intention103 (80)66 (79)32 (16)0.576Unitended48 (68)59 (70)29 (64)0.501Intended48 (51)36 (43)17 (38)0.576Diagnosed previously53 (41)36 (43)17 (38)0.576Diagnosed previously dataposed76 (59)48 (57)28 (62)0.576Diagnosed previously ARV use before pregnary72 (21)17 (20)10 (22)Previous use of ARV sfor PMTCT only27 (21)17 (20)10 (22)Previous datagoais10 (8)0 (0)1 (2)0.491Previous diagnosed128 (92.2)84 (100)44 (8)Under (10R) weeks on ART23 (18-27)23 (19-27)24 (18-27)0.927Median (10R) weeks on ART23 (18-27)23 (19-27)24 (18-27)0.927Median (10R) weeks on ART23 (18-27)23 (19-27)24 (18-27)0.927Median (10R) weeks on ART23 (18-27) </td <td>Educational attainment</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Educational attainment				
Completed secondary/any tertiany 60 (47) 42 (50) 18 (40) Employment status Not employed 44 (34) 32 (38) 12 (27) Relationship status Married/cohabiting 48 (37) 52 (32) 29 (64) Parity 88 (67) 22 (38) 0.622 Multiparous 103 (80) 66 (79) 37 (82) 0.622 Pregnancy intention 36 (65) 48 (57) 29 (64) 0.501 Intended 103 (80) 66 (79) 37 (82) 0.622 Multiparous 103 (80) 66 (79) 29 (64) 0.501 Intended 41 (32) 25 (30) 16 (36) 0.622 Multiparous 103 (80) 66 (79) 37 (82) Pregnancy intention 41 (32) 26 (30) 16 (36) Diagnosed previously diagnosed HIV+ in pregnancy 8 (65) 32 (71) Previously diagnosed ARY for PMTCT only <td>Less than secondary</td> <td>69 (53)</td> <td>42 (50)</td> <td>27 (60)</td> <td>0.278</td>	Less than secondary	69 (53)	42 (50)	27 (60)	0.278
Employed84 (66)51 (61)33 (73)0.76Not employed84 (66)51 (61)33 (73)0.76Relationship status32 (38)12 (27)Married/cohabiting84 (37)32 (38)16 (36)0.776Single81 (63)52 (62)29 (64)0.76Parity81 (31)8 (18)0.622Multiparous26 (20)18 (21)8 (18)0.622Multiparous25 (30)16 (3)0.5011.613Intended41 (32)25 (30)16 (3)0.501Intended90 (70)58 (69)32 (71)1.021Previous de ARV use90 (70)58 (69)32 (71)1.021Previous use of ARV for PMTCT only27 (21)17 (20)10 (22)1.021Previous diagnosed10 (28)90 (70)58 (69)32 (71)1.021Previous diagnosed10 (29)94 (100)44 (98)1.0211.021Previous diagnosed10 (29)92 (11)3 (7)2.0271.0211.021Previous diagnosed10 (52)92 (12)<	Completed secondary/any tertiary	60 (47)	42 (50)	18 (40)	
Not employed84 (66)51 (61)33 (73)0.176Currently employed(43)32 (38)12 (27)Currently employed(43)32 (38)16 (36)0.776Relationship strus(31)32 (38)16 (36)0.776Single81 (63)52 (62)29 (64)0.622ParityF81 (21)8 (18)0.622Multiparous103 (80)66 (79)37 (82)0.622Multiparous103 (80)66 (79)37 (82)0.501Instended41 (32)25 (30)16 (36)0.501Intended41 (32)25 (30)16 (36)0.501Newly diagnosed HIV+ in pregnancy53 (41)36 (43)17 (38)0.501Newly diagnosed HIV- in pregnancy53 (41)36 (43)17 (38)0.501No previous ARV use90 (70)58 (69)32 (71)0.801Previous use of ART12 (9)9 (11)3 (7)0.801Previous use of ARV for PMTCT only27 (21)17 (20)10 (22)Previous Usignosed10 (8)0 (0)1 (2)0.349Not previously diagnosed10 (8)9 (11)3 (7)0.501Previously diagnosed10 (8)9 (52)111 (6-15)0.772CD4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124)34 (42)20 (47)0.572S50 cells/µL50 (6)3 (7)5 (6)3 (7)S50 cells/µL10 (8)71 (85)39 (87)0.628S00-000 copies/mL10 (8)71	Employment status				
Currently employed 44 (34) 32 (38) 12 (27) Relationship status Married/cohabiting 48 (37) 32 (38) 16 (36) 0.776 Single 81 (63) 52 (62) 29 (64) Parity 37 (82) 37 (82) Pregnancy intention 103 (80) 66 (79) 37 (82) Unintended 48 (68) 59 (70) 29 (64) 0.501 Intended 41 (32) 25 (30) 16 (36) 0.576 Diagnosed previously 33 (41) 36 (43) 17 (38) 0.576 Diagnosed previously for PMTCT only 72 (21) 17 (20) 10 (22) Previous use of ARV for PMTCT only 72 (21) 17 (20) 10 (22) Previous B diagnosed 10 (8) 0 (0) 1 (1) 0.371 0.801 Previous B diagnosed 12 (99.2) 84 (100) 44 (98) 0.927 0.927 Median (10R) weeks on ART 23 (18-27)<	Not employed	84 (66)	51 (61)	33 (73)	0.176
Relationship status Married/cohabiting 48 (37) 32 (38) 16 (3) 0.776 Single 81 (63) 52 (62) 29 (64) 9 Parity 81 (30) 66 (27) 38 (18) 0.622 Multiparous 103 (80) 66 (7) 37 (82) 9 Pregnancy intention 10 100 (80) 67 (97) 29 (64) 0.501 Intended 41 (32) 25 (30) 16 (36) 9 76 (59) 48 (67) 28 (62) 0.576 Diagnosed HIV+ in pregnancy 53 (41) 36 (43) 17 (38) 17 (38) 17 (38) Newly diagnosed HIV-ting regnancy 53 (41) 36 (43) 17 (38) 10 (82)	Currently employed	44 (34)	32 (38)	12 (27)	
Married/cohabiting48 (37)32 (38)16 (36)0.776Single81 (63)52 (62)29 (64)ParityPrimiparous66 (79)37 (82)Multiparous103 (80)66 (79)37 (82)Multiparous103 (80)66 (79)37 (82)Pregnancy intention41 (32)25 (30)16 (36)Intended41 (32)25 (30)16 (36)Diagnosed previously53 (41)36 (43)27 (30)Diagnosed previously53 (41)36 (43)27 (31)Any ARV use before pregnancy76 (59)48 (57)28 (62)Previous kRV use90 (70)58 (69)32 (71)Previous ef ARVs for PMTCT only27 (21)17 (20)0.021Previous ef ARVs for PMTCT only12 (9)9 (11)3 (7)0.801Previous use of ART12 (89.2)84 (100)44 (98)0.927Median (IQR) weeks on ART23 (18-27)23 (19-27)24 (18-27)0.927Median (IQR) weeks on ART23 (18-27)23 (19-27)24 (18-27)0.927S50 cells/µL70 (56)47 (58)23 (53)0.628HIV viral load at enrolment (n = 124)51 (11)0 (0)1.000S50 cells/µL16 (13)74 (93)40 (93)0.628Virou load at enrolment8 (7)5 (6)3 (7)>1000 copies/mL10 (85)71 (85)39 (87)1.000No missed doses10 (85)71 (85)39 (87)1.010No missed doses10 (85) </td <td>Relationship status</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Relationship status				
Single81 (63)52 (62)29 (64)ParityPrimiparous26 (20)18 (21)8 (18)0.62Multiparous103 (80)66 (79)37 (82)Pregnancy intention88 (68)59 (70)29 (64)0.501Intended81 (32)25 (30)16 (36)0.501Intended88 (68)59 (70)28 (62)0.576Diagnosed HIV+ in pregnancy76 (59)48 (57)28 (62)0.576Newly diagnosed HIV+ in pregnancy53 (41)36 (43)17 (38)No previous KPU use90 (70)58 (69)32 (71)10 (22)Previous use of ART12 (9)9 (11)3 (7)0.801Previous Use of ART12 (9)9 (11)3 (7)0.301Previous V diagnosed10 (8)0 (0)1 (2)0.349Not previous V diagnosed10 (8)0 (0)1 (2)0.349Net previously diagnosed10 (8)0 (0)1 (2)0.327Median (UQR) weeks on ART23 (18-27)23 (19-27)24 (18-27)0.927Median (UQR) days postpartum10 (5-19)9 (13)3 (7)0.628HIV viral load at enrolment (n = 124)54 (44)34 (42)20 (47)<50 coles/µL	Married/cohabiting	48 (37)	32 (38)	16 (36)	0.776
Pariny 26 (20) 18 (21) 8 (18) 0.622 Multiparous 26 (20) 18 (21) 8 (18) 0.622 Multiparous 103 (80) 66 (79) 37 (82) 0 Pregnancy intention 25 (30) 16 (36) 0.501 Intended 41 (32) 25 (30) 16 (36) 0.501 Newly diagnosed HIV+ in pregnancy 76 (59) 48 (57) 28 (62) 0.576 Diagnosed previously 53 (41) 36 (43) 17 (38) 76 Obignosed previously 53 (41) 36 (43) 17 (38) 76 Previous use of ARVs for PMTCT only 27 (21) 17 (20) 10 (22) 76 Previous use of ART 12 (9) 9 (11) 3 (7) 0.801 Previous use of ART 12 (9) 9 (11) 3 (7) 0.801 Previous use of ART 12 (9) 9 (11) 3 (7) 0.801 Median (QR) weeks on ART 23 (18-27) 23 (19-27) 24 (18-27) 0.927 Median (QR) weeks on ART 23 (18-27) 23 (19-27) 24 (18-27) 0.926 S250 celis/µL <td< td=""><td>Single</td><td>81 (63)</td><td>52 (62)</td><td>29 (64)</td><td></td></td<>	Single	81 (63)	52 (62)	29 (64)	
Primiparous 26 (20) 18 (21) 8 (18) 0.622 Multiparous 103 (80) 66 (79) 37 (82) Pregnancy intention 103 (80) 66 (79) 37 (82) Unintended 48 (68) 59 (70) 29 (64) 0.501 Intended 41 (32) 25 (30) 16 (36) 0.501 Newly diagnosed HIV+ in pregnancy 76 (59) 48 (57) 28 (62) 0.576 Diagnosed previously 53 (41) 36 (43) 17 (38) 304 AV use before pregnancy No previous ARV use before pregnancy 90 (70) 58 (69) 32 (71) 700 Previous use of ART 12 (9) 9 (11) 3 (7) 0.801 Previous Use of ART 12 (9) 9 (10) 3 (7) 0.801 Previous Use of ART 23 (18-27) 23 (19-27) 0.701 0.83 Not previously diagnosed 10 (8) 0 (0) 1 (2) 0.927 Median (IQR) weeks on ART 23 (18-27) 23 (18-27) 24 (18-27) 0.927 Median (IQR) days postpartum	Parity				
Multiparous 103 (80) 66 (79) 37 (82) Pregnancy intention	Primiparous	26 (20)	18 (21)	8 (18)	0.622
Pregnancy intention Value Value <td>Multiparous</td> <td>103 (80)</td> <td>66 (79)</td> <td>37 (82)</td> <td></td>	Multiparous	103 (80)	66 (79)	37 (82)	
Unintended 88 (68) 59 (70) 29 (64) 0.501 Intended 41 (32) 25 (30) 16 (36) Newly diagnosed HIV+ in pregnancy 76 (59) 48 (57) 28 (62) 0.576 Diagnosed previously 53 (41) 36 (43) 17 (38)	Pregnancy intention				
Intended 41 (32) 25 (30) 16 (36) Newly diagnosed HIV+ in pregnancy <	Unintended	88 (68)	59 (70)	29 (64)	0.501
Newly diagnosed HIV+ in pregnancy 76 (59) 48 (57) 28 (62) 0.576 Diagnosed previously 53 (41) 36 (43) 17 (38) Any ARV use before pregnancy 90 (70) 58 (69) 32 (71) No previous ARV use 90 (70) 58 (69) 32 (71) Previous use of ARVs for PMTCT only 27 (21) 17 (20) 10 (22) Previous use of ART 12 (9) 9 (11) 3 (7) 0.801 Previous TB diagnosis 11 (0.8) 0 (0) 1 (2) 0.349 Not previously diagnosed 128 (99.2) 84 (100) 44 (98) 44 (98) Median (IQR) weeks on ART 23 (18–27) 23 (19–27) 24 (18–27) 0.927 Median (IQR) days postpartum 10 (5–19) 9 (5–21) 11 (6–15) 0.772 CD4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124) 20 (47) >350 cells/µL 20 (47) >350 cells/µL 34 (42) 20 (47) >350 cells/µL 54 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) >350 cells/µL 0 (0) 0.000 >0000 copies/mL 114 (93) <	Intended	41 (32)	25 (30)	16 (36)	
Newly diagnosed 76 (59) 48 (57) 28 (62) 0.576 Diagnosed previously 53 (41) 36 (43) 17 (38) Any ARV use before pregnancy 90 (70) 58 (69) 32 (71) Previous ARV use 90 (70) 58 (69) 32 (71) Previous use of ARVs for PMTCT only 27 (21) 17 (20) 10 (22) Previous B diagnosis 1 (0.8) 0 (0) 1 (2) 0.349 Not previously diagnosed 1 (0.8) 0 (0) 1 (2) 0.349 Not previously diagnosed 1 (0.8) 0 (0) 1 (2) 0.349 Median (IQR) weeks on ART 23 (18–27) 23 (19–27) 24 (18–27) 0.927 Median (IQR) days postpartum 10 (5–19) 9 (5–21) 11 (6–15) 0.772 CD4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124) 350 cells/µL 34 (42) 20 (47) 350 S350 cells/µL 54 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) 350 36 (5) 36 (7) 350 VIV viral load at enrolment 114 (93) 74 (93) 40 (93) 37 (7)	Newly diagnosed HIV+ in pregnancy				
Diagnosed previously 53 (41) 36 (43) 17 (38) Any ARV use before pregnancy 90 (70) 58 (69) 32 (71) Previous ARV use 90 (70) 58 (69) 32 (71) Previous use of ART 12 (9) 9 (11) 3 (7) 0.801 Previous TB diagnosis 7 23 (19-27) 24 (18-27) 0.927 Median (IQR) weeks on ART 23 (18-27) 23 (19-27) 24 (18-27) 0.927 Median (IQR) weeks on ART 23 (18-27) 23 (19-27) 24 (18-27) 0.927 Median (IQR) weeks on ART 23 (18-27) 23 (19-27) 24 (18-27) 0.927 Median (IQR) weeks on ART 23 (18-27) 23 (19-27) 24 (18-27) 0.927 Median (IQR) days postpartum 10 (5-19) 9 (5-21) 11 (6-15) 0.772 CD4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124) 20 (47) 350 cells/µL 36 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) >350 cells/µL 54 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) 36 (3) 0.628 HIV viral load at enrolment 114 (93) <td>Newly diagnosed</td> <td>76 (59)</td> <td>48 (57)</td> <td>28 (62)</td> <td>0.576</td>	Newly diagnosed	76 (59)	48 (57)	28 (62)	0.576
Any ARV use before pregnancy No previous ARV use 90 (70) 58 (69) 32 (71) Previous use of ARVs for PMTCT only 27 (21) 17 (20) 10 (22) Previous use of ART 12 (9) 9 (11) 3 (7) 0.801 Previous TB diagnosis 0 (0) 1 (2) 0.349 Not previously diagnosed 1 (0.8) 0 (0) 44 (98) 0.927 Median (IQR) weeks on ART 23 (18–27) 23 (19–27) 24 (18–27) 0.927 Median (IQR) days postpartum 10 (5–19) 9 (5–21) 11 (6–15) 0.772 CO4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124) 23 (18–27) 23 (19–27) 24 (18–27) 0.927 >350 cells/µL 54 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) 5 0.628 HIV viral load at enrolment 114 (93) 74 (93) 40 (93) - 50-colpis/mL 1 (0.8) 1 (1) 0 (0) 1.000 1.000 Reported missed ART dose in 30 days prior to enrolment 1 (0.8) 1 (1) 0 (0) 1.000 Reported missed doses 10 (105) 71 (85)	Diagnosed previously	53 (41)	36 (43)	17 (38)	
No previous ARV use 90 (70) 58 (69) 32 (71) Previous use of ARVs for PMTCT only 27 (21) 17 (20) 10 (22) Previous use of ART 12 (9) 9 (11) 3 (7) 0.801 Previous TB diagnosis 1 (0.8) 0 (0) 1 (2) 0.349 Not previously diagnosed 12 (9.2) 84 (100) 44 (98) 0.927 Median (IQR) weeks on ART 23 (18–27) 23 (19–27) 24 (18–27) 0.927 Median (IQR) days postpartum 10 (5–19) 9 (5–21) 11 (6–15) 0.772 CD4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124) 23 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) >350 cells/µL 54 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) >3550 cells/µL 70 (56) 47 (58) 23 (53) 0.628 HIV viral load at enrolment 114 (93) 74 (93) 40 (93) 50–1000 copies/mL 8 (7) 5 (6) 3 (7) 1000 copies/mL 10 (85) 11 (85) 39 (87) 1000 1.0000 1.0000 1.0000 1.0000 1.0000 1.0000 1.0000	Any ARV use before pregnancy				
Previous use of ARVs for PMTCT only 27 (21) 17 (20) 10 (22) Previous use of ART 12 (9) 9 (11) 3 (7) 0.801 Previous TB diagnosis 1 (0.8) 0 (0) 1 (2) 0.349 Not previously diagnosed 1 (0.8) 0 (0) 44 (98) 0.00 44 (98) Median (IQR) weeks on ART 23 (18–27) 23 (19–27) 24 (18–27) 0.927 Median (IQR) days postpartum 10 (5–19) 9 (5–21) 11 (6–15) 0.772 CD4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124) 54 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) >350 cells/µL 70 (56) 47 (58) 23 (53) 0.628 HIV viral load at enrolment 50 -clls/µL 70 (56) 47 (58) 23 (53) 0.628 HIV viral load at enrolment 114 (93) 74 (93) 40 (93) 50-1000 copies/mL 8 (7) 5 (6) 3 (7) 1000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 <td>No previous ARV use</td> <td>90 (70)</td> <td>58 (69)</td> <td>32 (71)</td> <td></td>	No previous ARV use	90 (70)	58 (69)	32 (71)	
Previous use of ART 12 (9) 9 (11) 3 (7) 0.801 Previous TB diagnosis 1 (0.8) 0 (0) 1 (2) 0.349 Not previously diagnosed 128 (99.2) 84 (100) 44 (98) 0.927 Median (IQR) weeks on ART 23 (18–27) 23 (19–27) 24 (18–27) 0.927 Median (IQR) days postpartum 10 (5–19) 9 (5–21) 11 (6–15) 0.772 CD4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124) 54 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) >350 cells/µL 54 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) >350 cells/µL 70 (56) 47 (58) 23 (53) 0.628 HIV viral load at enrolment 114 (93) 74 (93) 40 (93) - >50-1000 copies/mL 8 (7) 5 (6) 3 (7) - >1000 copies/mL 10 (85) 71 (85) 39 (87) - 10 or more missed doses 19 (15) 13 (15) 6 (13) 0.743 Intimate partner violence (IPV) N 91 (50) 37 (82) 0.743 No IPV in preceding 12 month	Previous use of ARVs for PMTCT only	27 (21)	17 (20)	10 (22)	
Previous TB diagnosis Previously diagnosed 1 (0.8) 0 (0) 1 (2) 0.349 Not previously diagnosed 128 (99.2) 84 (100) 44 (98) Median (IQR) weeks on ART 23 (18–27) 23 (19–27) 24 (18–27) 0.927 Median (IQR) days postpartum 10 (5–19) 9 (5–21) 11 (6–15) 0.772 CD4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124) 54 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) >350 cells/µL 54 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) >350 cells/µL 70 (56) 47 (58) 23 (53) 0.628 HIV viral load at enrolment 70 (56) 47 (58) 23 (53) 0.628 S0 copies/mL 114 (93) 74 (93) 40 (93) 50–1000 copies/mL 8 (7) 5 (6) 3 (7) >1000 copies/mL 1 (0.8) 1 (1) 0 (0) 1.000 Reported missed ART dose in 30 days prior to enrolment 10 (85) 71 (85) 39 (87) 1 or more missed doses 19 (15) 13 (15) 6 (13) 0.743 Intimate partner violence (IPV) Vin preceding 12 months 113 (88) 76 (90) 37 (82) 0.175<	Previous use of ART	12 (9)	9 (11)	3 (7)	0.801
Previously diagnosed1 (0.8)0 (0)1 (2)0.349Not previously diagnosed128 (99.2)84 (100)44 (98)Median (IQR) weeks on ART23 (18–27)23 (19–27)24 (18–27)0.927Median (IQR) days postpartum10 (5–19)9 (5–21)11 (6–15)0.772CD4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124)54 (44)34 (42)20 (47) \leq 350 cells/µL54 (44)34 (42)20 (47) $>$ 350 cells/µL70 (56)47 (58)23 (53)0.628HIV viral load at enrolment114 (93)74 (93)40 (93) $<$ 50 copies/mL114 (93)74 (93)40 (93) $<$ 50 copies/mL8 (7)5 (6)3 (7) $<$ 1000 copies/mL8 (7)5 (6)3 (7) $<$ 1000 copies/mL10 (85)71 (85)39 (87) $<$ 1 or more missed doses19 (15)13 (15)6 (13)0.743Intimate partner violence (IPV)113 (88)76 (90)37 (82)0.175Any IPV in preceding 12 months16 (12)8 (10)8 (18)16	Previous TB diagnosis				
Not previously diagnosed128 (99.2)84 (100)44 (98)Median (IQR) weeks on ART23 (18–27)23 (19–27)24 (18–27)0.927Median (IQR) days postpartum10 (5–19)9 (5–21)11 (6–15)0.772CD4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124) 54 (44)34 (42)20 (47) \leq 350 cells/µL54 (44)34 (42)20 (47)>350 cells/µL70 (56)47 (58)23 (53)0.628HIV viral load at enrolment $=$ $=$ $=$ <50 copies/mL	Previously diagnosed	1 (0.8)	0 (0)	1 (2)	0.349
Median (IQR) weeks on ART23 (18–27)23 (19–27)24 (18–27)0.927Median (IQR) days postpartum10 (5–19)9 (5–21)11 (6–15)0.772CD4 cell count nearest enrolment ($n = 124$) \leq 350 cells/µL54 (44)34 (42)20 (47)>350 cells/µL70 (56)47 (58)23 (53)0.628HIV viral load at enrolment<50 copies/mL	Not previously diagnosed	128 (99.2)	84 (100)	44 (98)	
Median (IQR) days postpartum10 (5–19)9 (5–21)11 (6–15)0.772CD4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124) \leq 350 cells/µL54 (44)34 (42)20 (47) \geq 350 cells/µL70 (56)47 (58)23 (53)0.628HIV viral load at enrolment70 (56)47 (93)40 (93) <50 copies/mL114 (93)74 (93)40 (93) $50-1000$ copies/mL8 (7)5 (6)3 (7)>1000 copies/mL8 (7)5 (6)3 (7)>1000 copies/mL1 (0.8)1 (1)0 (0)1.000Reported missed ART dose in 30 days prior to enrolment110 (85)71 (85)39 (87)1 or more missed doses19 (15)13 (15)6 (13)0.743Intimate partner violence (IPV)113 (88)76 (90)37 (82)0.175Any IPV in preceding 12 months16 (12)8 (10)8 (18)76 (90)71 (85)	Median (IQR) weeks on ART	23 (18–27)	23 (19–27)	24 (18–27)	0.927
CD4 cell count nearest enrolment (n = 124) $\leq 350 \ cells/\muL$ $54 \ (44)$ $34 \ (42)$ $20 \ (47)$ $> 350 \ cells/\muL$ $70 \ (56)$ $47 \ (58)$ $23 \ (53)$ 0.628 HIV viral load at enrolment $114 \ (93)$ $74 \ (93)$ $40 \ (93)$ $< 50 \ copies/mL$ $114 \ (93)$ $74 \ (93)$ $40 \ (93)$ $50-1000 \ copies/mL$ $8 \ (7)$ $5 \ (6)$ $3 \ (7)$ $>1000 \ copies/mL$ $1 \ (0.8)$ $1 \ (1)$ $0 \ (0)$ 1.000 Reported missed ART dose in 30 days prior to enrolment $110 \ (85)$ $71 \ (85)$ $39 \ (87)$ 1 or more missed doses $110 \ (85)$ $71 \ (85)$ $39 \ (87)$ 1 or more missed doses $19 \ (15)$ $13 \ (15)$ $6 \ (13)$ 0.743 Intimate partner violence (IPV) V V V V V No IPV in preceding 12 months $113 \ (88)$ $76 \ (90)$ $37 \ (82)$ 0.175 Any IPV in preceding 12 months $16 \ (12)$ $8 \ (10)$ $8 \ (18)$	Median (IQR) days postpartum	10 (5–19)	9 (5–21)	11 (6–15)	0.772
≤350 cells/μL 54 (44) 34 (42) 20 (47) >350 cells/μL 70 (56) 47 (58) 23 (53) 0.628 HIV viral load at enrolment 114 (93) 74 (93) 40 (93) <50 copies/mL	CD4 cell count nearest enrolment ($n = 124$)				
>350 cells/µL 70 (56) 47 (58) 23 (53) 0.628 HIV viral load at enrolment <50 copies/mL 114 (93) 74 (93) 40 (93) 50–1000 copies/mL 8 (7) 5 (6) 3 (7) >1000 copies/mL 1 (0.8) 1 (1) 0 (0) 1.000 Reported missed ART dose in 30 days prior to enrolment No missed doses 110 (85) 71 (85) 39 (87) 1 or more missed doses 19 (15) 13 (15) 6 (13) 0.743 Intimate partner violence (IPV) No IPV in preceding 12 months 113 (88) 76 (90) 37 (82) 0.175 Any IPV in preceding 12 months 16 (12) 8 (10) 8 (18)	≤350 cells/µL	54 (44)	34 (42)	20 (47)	
HIV viral load at enrolment <50 copies/mL	>350 cells/µL	70 (56)	47 (58)	23 (53)	0.628
<50 copies/mL	HIV viral load at enrolment				
50–1000 copies/mL 8 (7) 5 (6) 3 (7) >1000 copies/mL 1 (0.8) 1 (1) 0 (0) 1.000 Reported missed ART dose in 30 days prior to enrolment 39 (87) 39 (87) No missed doses 110 (85) 71 (85) 39 (87) 1 or more missed doses 19 (15) 13 (15) 6 (13) 0.743 Intimate partner violence (IPV) 76 (90) 37 (82) 0.175 Any IPV in preceding 12 months 16 (12) 8 (10) 8 (18) 76	<50 copies/mL	114 (93)	74 (93)	40 (93)	
>1000 copies/mL 1 (0.8) 1 (1) 0 (0) 1.000 Reported missed ART dose in 30 days prior to enrolment 110 (85) 71 (85) 39 (87) No missed doses 110 (85) 71 (85) 39 (87) 1 or more missed doses 19 (15) 13 (15) 6 (13) 0.743 Intimate partner violence (IPV) Vin preceding 12 months 113 (88) 76 (90) 37 (82) 0.175 Any IPV in preceding 12 months 16 (12) 8 (10) 8 (18)	50–1000 copies/mL	8 (7)	5 (6)	3 (7)	
Reported missed ART dose in 30 days prior to enrolment 71 (85) 39 (87) No missed doses 110 (85) 71 (85) 39 (87) 1 or more missed doses 19 (15) 13 (15) 6 (13) 0.743 Intimate partner violence (IPV) 76 (90) 37 (82) 0.175 Any IPV in preceding 12 months 16 (12) 8 (10) 8 (18)	>1000 copies/mL	1 (0.8)	1 (1)	0 (0)	1.000
No missed doses 110 (85) 71 (85) 39 (87) 1 or more missed doses 19 (15) 13 (15) 6 (13) 0.743 Intimate partner violence (IPV) 113 (88) 76 (90) 37 (82) 0.175 Any IPV in preceding 12 months 16 (12) 8 (10) 8 (18)	Reported missed ART dose in 30 days prior to enrolment				
1 or more missed doses 19 (15) 13 (15) 6 (13) 0.743 Intimate partner violence (IPV) 113 (88) 76 (90) 37 (82) 0.175 Any IPV in preceding 12 months 16 (12) 8 (10) 8 (18)	No missed doses	110 (85)	71 (85)	39 (87)	
Intimate partner violence (IPV)113 (88)76 (90)37 (82)0.175No IPV in preceding 12 months16 (12)8 (10)8 (18)	1 or more missed doses	19 (15)	13 (15)	6 (13)	0.743
No IPV in preceding 12 months 113 (88) 76 (90) 37 (82) 0.175 Any IPV in preceding 12 months 16 (12) 8 (10) 8 (18)	Intimate partner violence (IPV)	. ,	. ,		
Any IPV in preceding 12 months 16 (12) 8 (10) 8 (18)	No IPV in preceding 12 months	113 (88)	76 (90)	37 (82)	0.175
	Any IPV in preceding 12 months	16 (12)	8 (10)	8 (18)	

All cells are N (%) unless specified otherwise.

Myer L et al. *Journal of the International AIDS Society* 2017, **20(Suppl 4)**:21636 http://www.jiasociety.org/index.php/jias/article/view/21636 | https://doi.org/10.7448/IAS.20.5.21636



Figure 2. Spaghetti plots of viral load measures conducted at study measurement visits in the cohort (total n = 129), from the time enrolment through approximately 6 months postpartum. Panel A shows log_{10} viral loads in women choosing primary care clinics versus adherence clubs. Panel B shows log_{10} viral loads in the cohort of women choosing adherence clubs, separating women who remained engaged in adherence clubs versus those who were not retained through 6 months after deli very. (a) Log10 viral loads in women choosing primary care clinics versus adherence clubs, by weeks from delivery; each line represents a participant. (b) Log10 viral loads among women choosing adherence clubs, separating women who remained engaged in adherence clubs (right-hand panel) versus those who were not retained through 6 months after delivery (left-hand panel); each line represents a participant.

Adherence clubs		Primary care clinics		
Reason for choice	n (%)	Reason for choice	n (%)	
Number of participants who gave reasons for service choice	44	Number of participants who gave reasons for service choice	14	
I live closer to the club	26 (59)	I live closer to the clinic	14 (100)	
The club location is further than the clinic, from where I live	9 (20)	The clinic is further than the clubs venue, from where I live	0 (0)	
I prefer to receive care outside of the health facility	29 (66)	I prefer not to receive care from the community	5 (36)	
I want to get peer support	23 (52)	I don't want peer support	6 (43)	
You have a few appointments in a year	32 (73)	I want regular check-ups	9 (64)	
Visits are short	41 (93)	I don't have enough information on clubs	4 (29)	
I'm happy to receive my ART care from a counsellor	35 (80)	I want to see a doctor/nurse frequently	11 (79)	
I don't need to see a doctor/nurse frequently	17 (39)	I don't want to receive care from a counsellor	3 (21)	
The club is closer to where my baby receives care	18 (41)	The clinic is closer to where my baby receives care	10 (71)	
A friend/family member goes to the club	2 (5)	A friend/family member goes to the clinic	4 (29)	

Table 2. Women's reasons for preferring adherence clubs or primary care clinics for postpartum ART services, in a subset of women completing questions on the reasons for their choice.

VL outcomes among women choosing adherence clubs appeared broadly comparable to those among women choosing primary healthcare clinics.

There are few documented experiences of patients choosing from different models of ART care, including differentiated models of care. Interestingly, there were no factors strongly associated with the choice of postpartum services but location-related preferences appeared prominent – with most women citing the location of either service as a reason for their choice. Given that participants in this evaluation had not experienced either the adherence

clubs or the ART services available at primary care clinics, it may be understandable that location emerges as an important basic consideration. While geography is a well-known determinant of health services uptake, acceptability and outcomes [24], it is possible that in other care contexts the most common reasons for preferring or avoiding differentiated models of care may vary.

We found similar VL outcomes over the first six months postpartum when comparing women attending adherence clubs to those choosing primary care clinics. Importantly VL was measured separately from routine ART care, allowing an

	Total	Adherence clubs	Primary care clinic	<i>p</i> -Value
HIV viral load at 6 weeks postpartum				
<50 copies/mL	119 (97)	80 (99)	39 (93)	
50–1000 copies/mL	3 (2)	0 (0)	3 (7)	
>1000 copies/mL	1 (0.8)	1 (1)	0 (0)	0.038
HIV viral load at 3 months postpartum				
<50 copies/mL	107 (94)	73 (94)	34 (94)	
50–1000 copies/mL	3 (3)	2 (3)	1 (3)	
>1000 copies/mL	4 (4)	3 (4)	1 (3)	1.000
HIV viral load at 6 months postpartum				
<50 copies/mL	97 (88)	68 (88)	29 (88)	
50–1000 copies/mL	3 (3)	3 (4)	0 (0)	
>1000 copies/mL	10 (9)	6 (8)	4 (12)	0.504

Table 3. Results of viral load testing conducted at study measurement visits, separate from chosen ART service, by postpartum ART service

All cells are N (%).

independent evaluation of ART effectiveness under either model. However, the comparison of VL outcomes must be framed in the context of patient self-selection into their preferred service, and as such, the outcomes observed may represent a "best case" scenario under both the adherence club system and primary healthcare clinics. And while the follow-up period here – through 6 months postpartum – captures the critical window of the immediate postnatal period, data on longer-term virologic outcomes are required.

In this evaluation, approximately one-quarter of women who chose the adherence club system for postpartum care were not retained in the adherence clubs through 6 months postpartum. This finding parallels the well-known challenges in providing care to this population, but also highlights a key consideration in transferring patients to differentiated ART care. Specifically, we found that 15% of women who chose the adherence club system and who received an appropriate referral never attended an adherence club. This proportion is surprisingly high - particularly given that women were allowed to choose their postpartum service - and loss to follow-up immediately after this initial transfer has not been documented previously in examinations of differentiated models of care. Instead, previous published evaluations typically begin with patients making their first visit to the differentiated service [16,17]. This evaluation suggests that such approaches are likely to overestimate retention of patients in care and should be avoided if possible. More generally, while challenges in linking ART-eligible patients to ART care are well known around treatment initiation, the challenges in transferring patients between ART services postpartum has received less attention [25,26] and we expect this issue to emerge as an important consideration with increasing numbers of patients referred to differentiated ART care.

Emerging questions for differentiated ART care

It is important to note that in this pilot project, women who initiated ART in pregnancy were referred immediately postpartum to an existing system of adherence clubs. These features raise at least two important issues that speak to broader concerns in the design and delivery of differentiated ART care.

How soon after ART initiation can patients be referred to differentiated models of care?

In enrolling women who initiated ART during pregnancy immediately postpartum, the median duration of ART use before referral to differentiated care was relatively short; to date, other models typically involve patients established on ART for substantially longer periods [16,17]. The question of how soon ART patients may be referred to a differentiated model of care is not well understood but will be a major question emerging in settings that are implementing universal ART eligibility and encountering sizable numbers of new ART patients. While this evaluation does not provide direct evidence on whether duration of ART may influence outcomes under differentiated care, it does suggest that early referral of patients on ART to such services may be feasible in this context. Pregnancy and the postpartum may be unique in this regards, however, since the end of pregnancy marks a period of change in many health service settings, with the end of intensive woman-focused antenatal care and the start of infant-focused MCH services. More broadly, we posit that at least some patients may be referred to differentiated ART care very rapidly after initiation while others would benefit from a more substantial foundation of experiencing traditional facility-based services for an extended period. Current approaches to identifying patients suitable for differentiated care, such as early VL suppression on routine monitoring, may only distinguish a fraction of such patients; understanding the characteristics of patients who fare well in differentiated care (and those who may not) is an important future research direction.

Should models of differentiated care be customized to special populations?

In this pilot project, the adherence club system to which women were referred was designed for the general population of adults on ART and did not include any adaptations to cater to specific maternal and/or child healthcare needs. This approach was based on consultation with the local health services who explicitly wished to avoid the potential programmatic and operational complexity associated with creating "special" clubs for postpartum women separate from the established public sector model of differentiated ART care. However sending postpartum women into the mix of general adult ART patients may not be ideal in all instances, and there are opportunities to provide MCH services within adherence clubs for postpartum women [27]. Such MCH-focused adherence clubs might include family planning for mothers on ART, infant feeding counselling, and HIV PCR testing as well as vaccinations and anthropometry for infants.

This possibility of special MCH-focused adherence clubs raises significant and broader questions related to the fundamental nature of differentiated ART care: if a differentiated model seeks to address the comprehensive set of primary healthcare needs facing different types of patients on ART, that model has the potential to become hypertrophied to the point of approximating a primary care health clinic. Such differentiated models of care may risk losing the focused efficiency which makes the approach appealing to many patients, providers and policymakers. This tension is not unique to postpartum women, and is likely to permeate the discussions around differentiated ART care for other special populations where the population in question has specific, significant healthcare requirements beyond basic ART provision. How this tension around the customization of differentiated models of ART care is best negotiated is highly context specific, based in part on local health systems as well as resource availability. Patient outcomes associated with greater versus lesser degrees of customization will be an important focus for research programmes in the future.

Strengths & limitations

These experiences are subject to a number of limitations. The study took place in one part of urban South Africa and findings should be generalized with caution, although the adherence club system evaluated here is well established within local public health services and did not benefit from donor or NGO support. While this is one of the first evaluations of postpartum women attending adherence clubs, the sample size is small and in turn our power to detect quantitative associations are limited. And while the evaluation is strengthened by the use of VL measures carried out independently from routine care, these outcomes were assessed over a relatively short time period, and there is a clear and urgent need for longer-term follow-up as well as inclusion of more diverse outcomes for both mothers and their infants.

Conclusions

In summary, findings from this pilot project suggest that the enrolment of postpartum women

Into adherence clubs may be a feasible model for women initiating ART in pregnancy, with short-term outcomes observed during this critical period that are comparable between adherence clubs and local primary care clinics. To support optimal implementation, further research is needed to understand the role of patient preferences for various models of care, as well as the issues involved in combining differentiated care alongside routine MCH services, while ART adherence and retention during the postpartum period require ongoing attention.

Authors' affiliations

¹Centre for Infectious Diseases Epidemiology & Research, School of Public Health & Family Medicine, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa; ²Division of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, School of Public Health & Family Medicine, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa; ³ICAP, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA; ⁴Provincial Government of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa; ⁵College of Physicians & Surgeons, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

Competing interests

None of the authors have any competing interests to declare.

Authors' contribution

LM conceived the study, assisted with development of data collection instruments, assisted with supervision of research activities and wrote the manuscript. VI supervised research activities and data collection and contributed to manuscript development. AZ developed data collection instruments, assisted with supervision of research activities and contributed to manuscript development. TP developed data collection instruments, supervised research activities, supervised data collection, contributed to data analysis, and contributed to manuscript development. KB led data analysis and contributed to manuscript development. EM contributed to data analysis and contributed to manuscript development. JO contributed to research activities, contributed to data analysis and contributed to manuscript development. CK contributed to research activities and contributed to manuscript development. AN contributed to research activities and contributed to manuscript development. EJA conceived the study, assisted with development of data collection instruments, assisted with supervision of research activities, contributed to manuscript development. All authors have read and approved the final version.

Funding

This research was supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) grant number R01HD074558.

References

[1] Ahmed S, Kim MH, Abrams EJ. Risks and benefits of lifelong antiretroviral treatment for pregnant and breastfeeding women: a review of the evidence for the option B+ approach. Curr Opin HIV AIDS. 2013;8(5):474–89.

[2] UNAIDS. Global AIDS update, 2016. Geneva: UNAIDS; 2016.

[3] Helova A, Akama E, Bukusi EA, Musoke P, Nalwa WZ, Odeny TA, et al. Health facility challenges to the provision of option B+ in western Kenya: a qualitative study. Health Policy Plan. 2016. [Epub ahead of print].

[4] Chi BH, Bolton-Moore C, Holmes CB. Prevention of mother-to-child HIV transmission within the continuum of maternal, newborn, and child health services. Curr Opin HIV AIDS. 2013;8(5):498–503.

[5] Haas AD, Msukwa MT, Egger M, Tenthani L, Tweya H, Jahn A, et al. Adherence to antiretroviral therapy during and after pregnancy: cohort study on women receiving care in Malawi's option B+ program. Clin Infect Dis. 2016;63(9):1227–35.

[6] Hoffmann CJ, Cohn S, Mashabela F, Hoffmann JD, McIlleron H, Denti P, et al. Treatment failure, drug resistance, and CD4 T-cell count decline among postpartum women on antiretroviral therapy in South Africa. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2016;71(1):31–7.

[7] Clouse K, Pettifor A, Shearer K, Maskew M, Bassett J, Larson B, et al. Loss to follow-up before and after delivery among women testing HIV positive

during pregnancy in Johannesburg, South Africa. Trop Med Int Health. 2013;18(4):451–60.

[8] Henegar CE, Westreich DJ, Maskew M, Miller WC, Brookhart MA, Van Rie A. Effect of pregnancy and the postpartum period on adherence to antiretroviral therapy among HIV-infected women established on treatment. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2015;68(4):477–80.

[9] Tenthani L, Haas AD, Tweya H, Jahn A, van Oosterhout JJ, Chimbwandira F, et al. Retention in care under universal antiretroviral therapy for HIVinfected pregnant and breastfeeding women ('Option B+') in Malawi. AIDS. 2014;28(4):589–98.

[10] Bhardwaj S, Carter B, Aarons GA, Chi BH. Implementation research for the prevention of mother-to-child HIV transmission in sub-Saharan Africa: existing evidence, current gaps, and new opportunities. Curr HIV/AIDS Rep. 2015;12(2):246–55.

[11] Geldsetzer P, Yapa HM, Vaikath M, Ogbuoji O, Fox MP, Essajee SM, et al. A systematic review of interventions to improve postpartum retention of women in PMTCT and ART care. J Int AIDS Soc. 2016;19(1):20679.

[12] Bemelmans M, Baert S, Goemaere E, Wilkinson L, Vandendyck M, van Cutsem G, et al. Community-supported models of care for people on HIV treatment in sub-Saharan Africa. Trop Med Int Health. 2014;19(8):968–77.

[13] Okoboi S, Ding E, Persuad S, Wangisi J, Birungi J, Shurgold S, et al. Community-based ART distribution system can effectively facilitate long-term program retention and low-rates of death and virologic failure in rural Uganda. AIDS Res Ther. 2015;12:37.

[14] Naslund JA, Dionne-Odom J, Junior Destiné C, Jogerst KM, Renold Sénécharles R, Jean Louis M, et al. Adapting and implementing a community program to improve retention in care among patients with HIV in Southern Haiti: "Group of 6". AIDS Res Treat. 2014;2014:137545.

[15] Wilkinson LS. ART adherence clubs: a long-term retention strategy for clinically stable patients receiving antiretroviral therapy. Southern Afr J HIV Med. 2013;14(2):48-50.

[16] Luque-Fernandez MA, Van Cutsem G, Goemaere E, Hilderbrand K, Schomaker M, Mantangana N, et al. Effectiveness of patient adherence groups as a model of care for stable patients on antiretroviral therapy in Khayelitsha, Cape Town, South Africa. PLoS One. 2013;8(2):e56088.

[17] Grimsrud A, Lesosky M, Kalombo C, Bekker LG, Myer L. Communitybased adherence clubs for the management of stable antiretroviral therapy patients in Cape Town, South Africa: a cohort study. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2016;71(1):e16–23. [18] Decroo T, Rasschaert F, Telfer B, Remartinez D, Laga M, Ford N. Community-based antiretroviral therapy programs can overcome barriers to retention of patients and decongest health services in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review. Int Health. 2013;5(3):169–79.

[19] Mdege ND, Chindove S, Ali S. The effectiveness and cost implications of task-shifting in the delivery of antiretroviral therapy to HIVinfected patients: a systematic review. Health Policy Plan. 2013;28 (3):223–36.

[20] Myer L, Phillips TK, Zerbe A, Ronan A, Hsiao NY, Mellins CA, et al. Optimizing Antiretroviral Therapy (ART) for Maternal and Child Health (MCH): rationale and design of the MCH-ART study. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2016;72(Suppl 2):S189–96.

[21] Myer L, Phillips T, Manuelli V, McIntyre J, Bekker LG, Abrams EJ. Evolution of antiretroviral therapy services for HIV-infected pregnant women in Cape Town, South Africa. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2015;69 (2):57–65.

[22] Wilkinson L, Harley B, Sharp J, Solomon S, Jacobs S, Cragg C, et al. Expansion of the adherence club model for stable antiretroviral therapy patients in the Cape Metro, South Africa 2011–2015. Trop Med Int Health. 2016;21(6):743–49.

[23] Grimsrud A, Sharp J, Kalombo C, Bekker LG, Myer L. Implementation of community-based adherence clubs for stable antiretroviral therapy patients in Cape Town, South Africa. J Int AIDS Soc. 2015;18:19984.

[24] Siedner MJ, Lankowski A, Tsai AC, Muzoora C, Martin JN, Hunt PW, et al. GPS-measured distance to clinic, but not self-reported transportation factors, are associated with missed HIV clinic visits in rural Uganda. AIDS. 2013;27(9):1503–08.

[25] Giuliano M, Liotta G, Andreotti M, Mancinelli S, Buonomo E, Scarcella P, et al. Retention, transfer out and loss to follow-up two years after delivery in a cohort of HIV+ pregnant women in Malawi. Int J STD AIDS. 2016;27(6):462–68.

[26] Phillips T, McNairy ML, Zerbe A, Myer L, Abrams EJ. Postpartum transfer of care among HIV-infected women initiating antiretroviral therapy during pregnancy. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2015;70 (3):102–09.

[27] Geelhoed D, Decroo T, Dezembro S, Matias H, Lessitala F, Muzila F, et al. Utilization of and barriers to HIV and MCH services among community ART group members and their families in Tete, Mozambique. AIDS Res Treat. 2013;2013:937456.