

Pre-exposure Prophylaxis Use and Medication Adherence Among Men Who Have Sex With Men: A Systematic Review of the Literature

Steven Maxwell, MSc* • Mitzy Gafos, PhD • Maryam Shahmanesh, PhD

Abstract

The appropriate use of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) by men who have sex with men (MSM) can be highly effective at reducing HIV transmission. Our review examined prevalence estimates, sexual behaviors, and medication adherence among MSM PrEP users in high-income countries. Articles published between January 2008 and December 2018 were identified through Medline, Web of Science, CINAHL, and CENTRAL. The search identified 643 publications, of which 52 were included in the final synthesis. We found that PrEP initiation was not consistently associated with significant changes in sexual behavior, but some users may have risk compensated. A minority of MSM used PrEP, and they had high levels of adherence. PrEP-related stigma, side effects, and psychosocial factors lead to nonadherence. A daily routine, pill boxes, alarms/texts, and education can promote adherence. Further research is required to examine PrEP impact on sexual behavior and factors that influence adherence in high-risk MSM subpopulations.

Key words: medication adherence, men who have sex with men, preexposure prophylaxis, review

In 2016, there were more than 26,000 new HIV diagnoses in Western Europe; in the United States, there were more than 38,000 new HIV diagnoses (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2017; European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, 2017). Men who have sex with men (MSM) are a minority in the populations of the United States and Western Europe, but they are at higher risk of HIV transmission compared to the general population. In Western Europe, MSM accounted for 45% of new HIV diagnoses, and in the United States, MSM accounted for 67% of new HIV diagnoses (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2017; European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, 2017). The development of effective pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) is an important HIV prevention strategy for MSM.

In 2012, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration was the first to approve PrEP for high-risk groups (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014). In 2014, the United States published guidelines recommending that PrEP be provided to uninfected MSM who were not in

a mutually monogamous relationship and had either condomless anal intercourse (CAI) or been diagnosed with a sexually transmitted infection (STI) in the previous 6 months (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014). In 2015, France implemented PrEP through the national health care system, and in 2016, the European Medicines Agency provided authorization for PrEP use in European Union countries (Eurosurveillance, 2018). Since that time, a few European countries have implemented PrEP through their national health care systems (Eurosurveillance, 2018).

Since the introduction of PrEP, concern has been raised about risk compensation or changes in levels of high-risk sexual behavior because of PrEP (Blumenthal & Haubrick, 2014). The key public health concern following PrEP initiation has been related to a potential increase in STIs (Blumenthal & Haubrick, 2014). Proxy measures, such as changes in sexual behavior, are often used in research, but the public health focus must be on any increase in STIs.

Effectiveness and efficiency of PrEP in reducing HIV in MSM will depend on uptake and adherence for those at the highest risk. To date, there has been no comprehensive systematic review to synthesize what is known about the prevalence of PrEP use, sexual behaviors, and biopsychosocial factors associated with PrEP adherence in MSM. We examined biopsychosocial factors associated with PrEP that have influenced medication adherence by MSM in high-income countries. Our objectives were

Sponsorships or competing interests that may be relevant to content are disclosed at the end of this article.

Steven Maxwell, MSc, Postgraduate Certificate in Clinical Education, is an Academic Program Coordinator, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom. Mitzy Gafos, PhD, is an Associate Professor, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom. Maryam Shahmanesh, PhD, is an Associate Professor, University College London, London, United Kingdom.

**Corresponding author: Steven Maxwell, e-mail: steven.maxwell.16@ucl.ac.uk*

Copyright © 2019 Association of Nurses in AIDS Care

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/JNC.000000000000105>

- To define prevalence estimates for PrEP use in MSM;
- To identify factors associated with PrEP use, including sociodemographics and reasons/motivators for PrEP initiation;
- To describe high-risk sexual behaviors and STI rates in PrEP users;
- To identify levels of adherence in episodic and continuous dosing regimens; and
- To describe the biopsychosocial factors that influence PrEP medication adherence and nonadherence.

Methods

Search Strategy

Our systematic review was conducted and reported in accordance with the Preferred Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (Liberati et al., 2009). Four databases (Medline, CINAHL, Web of Science, CENTRAL) were used because they included medical, nursing, allied health professional, sociological, and clinical trial journals. Search terms were generated based on the population (MSM, homosexual men, gay men, gay males), intervention (PrEP), and outcomes of interest (adherence, nonadherence, concordance, compliance). All possible combinations of MeSH terms, MeSH headings, keywords, and phrases were used. The search was conducted in January 2018.

Eligibility Criteria

We included research that (a) examined actual use (as opposed to intended use) of PrEP; (b) had a sample of uninfected MSM; (c) were from high-income countries as defined by The World Bank (2019); (d) were primary research, fully published in peer-reviewed journals; (e) had cross-sectional, cohort, case-control, qualitative, or randomized controlled trial (RCT) designs; and (f) were published in English from January 2008 to December 2017.

Ethical Considerations

As per the institutional ethics guidelines, ethics approval was not required because this was a review of peer-reviewed published literature.

Study Selection and Data Extraction

One reviewer conducted the search using a predefined protocol developed with two senior researchers. Data retrieved through the search were extracted into Endnote x8 (Thomson Reuters, New York, NY). At the

abstract stage, an independent reviewer examined a random sample of abstracts (10% of excluded and 20% of included articles) to ensure robustness of inclusion and exclusion criteria. All differences were discussed and resolved. Data from the articles included in the final syntheses were extracted by one reviewer into a structured template.

Data Analysis

We synthesized evidence from studies that used a range of research methods and had wide variances in exposures/outcomes. A four-stage framework and techniques were used to increase transparency and trustworthiness of the narrative synthesis (Popay et al., 2006) and to compare and synthesize evidence in the review. The antecedent, behavior, and consequence (ABC) framework was used to (a) understand predictors that may have occurred before an event (antecedents), (b) describe the process involved in an event (behavior), and (c) determine what factors might be outcomes of the event (consequences; Meaden, Ayvazo, & Ostrosky, 2014). Table 1 contains a provisional ABC analysis of PrEP use drawn from the literature and research team discussions.

Quality Assessment

Three validated tools were chosen to appraise the quality of studies included in the review's final synthesis: (a) the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (2019) tool assessed cohort/cross-sectional studies, (b) the Effective Public Health Practice Project (2019) tool assessed RCTs/controlled clinical trials, and (c) the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (2019) qualitative checklist assessed qualitative studies. All three also assessed clarity and rigor of outcomes/measures, sample recruitment, data collection, analysis, ethical considerations, and findings.

Results

Study Selection

The number of studies identified, reviewed, selected, and reasons for exclusion are summarized in Figure 1. The initial number of articles captured from the search was 1,071; 52 articles were included in the final review.

Study Characteristics

Table 2 provides a summary of the aim, population, country, sample size, year of data collection, study

Table 1. ABC Analysis of PrEP Use and Medication Adherence

Antecedent	Behavior	Consequence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sociodemographic characteristics • Reasons/motivators for PrEP initiation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevalence • Sexual behavior • STI rates • PrEP adherence levels • Influences on PrEP adherence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STI diagnosis • Changes in sexual behavior (<i>risk compensation</i>)

Note. ABC = antecedent, behavior, and consequence; PrEP = preexposure prophylaxis; STI = sexually transmitted infection.

design, appropriate overall quality rating, and ABC findings of the 52 articles included in the review. Figure 2 provides a summary of our main findings, which is structured using the ABC framework. The majority of the studies were from the United States (44); other studies were from Canada/France (3), Switzerland (1), France (1), United Kingdom (1), Canada (1), and Australia (1). The majority of the studies were cross sectional (25) or cohort (12) in design; the remaining studies were qualitative (9) or RCTs (6).

Study Quality

The majority of the cross-sectional studies had a fair quality rating, which, on the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI) tool, means that a study could be susceptible to bias, but the findings were relevant; strengths and weaknesses were specific to each article (National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, 2019). Most reports did not provide sample size justification,

measured exposures only once, and were unclear if researchers were blinded to the status of the sample. The primary strengths in most studies were clear objectives, defined exposures and outcomes, and appropriate methods for data analysis.

Most of the cohort studies were rated as good in quality, which is the best NHLBI quality rating and means studies have a minimal level of bias and the findings are valid (National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, 2019). The key strengths of the cohort studies were analysis of different exposure levels, and exposures were measured more than once. Limitations in most of the cohort studies were the lack of sample size justification and not being clear if researchers were blinded to the sample status.

The Critical Appraisal Skills Programme qualitative tool does not provide an overall quality level of rating. However, the majority of qualitative studies provided a clear recruitment strategy, justified data collection methods, had ethics approval, described a rigorous analysis method, and provided findings in a clearly structured format. Most did not examine wider ethical issues raised in or from the study.

Most of the RCTs were rated as moderate in quality, which means studies have a robust and valid design, but a component in the study design had limitations (Effective Public Health Practice Project, 2019). The primary strengths of these studies were clear methods of randomization, no differences in study groups, sample blinded to the study outcome, and sample retention greater than 80%. Most were limited by not describing the reliability and validity of study assessment tools.

Prevalence of Preexposure Prophylaxis Use

Twenty studies from the United States (17), France (1), Australia (1), and Switzerland (1) examined prevalence estimates of PrEP use by MSM. Sample sizes ranged from 157 to 6,483, and all studies were cross sectional in design. The sample was heterogenous, as studies examined a variety of MSM populations using different




Figure 1. Study selection process. PRISMA flowchart from Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff, & Altman, 2009. Note. PrEP = preexposure prophylaxis; PRISMA = Preferred Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis.

Table 2. Summary of Findings

Author	Country	Aim	Sample	Data Collection	Design	Quality Rating	Key ABC Findings*
Arnold et al., 2017	USA	Explore social, structural, and behavioral factors that influence PrEP uptake	<i>N</i> = 30; YMSM via PrEP provision service	Not specified	Qualitative	Not applicable	A: Some said multiple or casual sex partners was a consideration for being on PrEP. B: Most said they did not encounter stigma but were apprehensive about potential social stigma. Two experienced side effects that led them to stopping PrEP.
Bauermeister et al., 2014	USA	Examine PrEP awareness and use among YMSM	<i>N</i> = 1,507; ages 18–24 years by social media	2013	Cross section	Fair	B: 2.7% had previously used PrEP.
Bien et al., 2017	USA	Assess demographics and behaviors of PrEP users	<i>N</i> = 108; via large health center	2011–2015	Cohort	Fair	B: MSM PrEP users: 38% previously diagnosed with an STI, 38% had a main partner living with HIV, 39% had multiple sex partners, and 43% had CAI.
Castro et al., 2017	France	Examine characteristics of PrEP use	<i>N</i> = 2,668; via community-based HIV support service	2014	Cross section	Fair	A: Being MSM and younger is associated with PrEP use. B: 4.6% had used PrEP, of this, 74% were MSM. In previous 12 months, injecting drugs and PEP use was associated with PrEP use.
Chan, Glynn, et al., 2016a	USA	Describe predictors of PrEP uptake of MSM attending STI services	<i>N</i> = 234; PrEP program via STI clinic	2013–2014	Cross section	Fair	A: Sex with a partner living with HIV was associated with PrEP uptake. B: 25 of 234 were prescribed PrEP. 20% of PrEP users had a current STI versus 17% of non-PrEP users. 32% PrEP users had >10 sex partners versus 25% for non-PrEP users.

(continued on next page)

Table 2. (continued)

Author	Country	Aim	Sample	Data Collection	Design	Quality Rating	Key ABC Findings*
Chan et al., 2016b	USA	Describe demographics and behaviors of PrEP users	N = 267; PrEP program via clinics	2014–2015	Cross section	Good	A: No factors associated with starting on PrEP. B: Retention in care did not vary by race, age, or medical cover. Adherence at 3 months was 92%, with 82% reporting optimal adherence in the previous week.
Chen, et al., 2016	USA	Examine trends in PrEP use and sexual practices	N = 301–1,211; multisite survey	2004–2014	Cross section	Good	B: PrEP use was 0% 2004, 2008, and 2011; 9.6% in 2014. 10% of PrEP users consistently used condoms versus 25% of non-PrEP users.
Collins et al., 2017	USA	Explore how PrEP affects the wider sexual health of MSM	N = 14; advertising via PrEP providers	2014	Qualitative	Not applicable	A: Most used PrEP as they had a history of inconsistent condom use B: Some users had reservation about informing peers and HCP due to potential stigma. C: Condom use did not change post PrEP, but there was increased receptive CAI.
Daughtridge et al., 2015	USA	Report characteristics and adherence of PrEP users: YMSM of color	N = 23; YMSM via PrEP clinic	2014	Cohort	Poor	B: Median adherence was 82% for those who used PrEP for a month, at Week 16: 79%; at Week 28: 88%. Four STIs diagnosed during the study. 74% reported inconsistent condom use.
Doblecki-Lewis et al., 2017	USA	Understand participants' experiences of being on a PrEP Demo project	N = 347; MSM/TGW via PrEP project	Not specified	Cross section	Fair	A: Older age and higher education/income associated with PrEP use. B: Common barrier for not continuing on PrEP was health care cost. 22% diagnosed with an STI after study completion.

(continued on next page)

Table 2. (continued)

Author	Country	Aim	Sample	Data Collection	Design	Quality Rating	Key ABC Findings*
Eaton et al., 2017	USA	Examine levels of PrEP use among Black men/transgender women	<i>N</i> = 1,274; Black gay pride events in five cities	2014	Cross section	Fair	A: 96% male; 77% identified as gay. B: 4.6% were currently taking PrEP. Those currently using PrEP were more likely to have a partner with unknown HIV status, more likely to experience discrimination and not afford health care in the past year than non-PrEP users.
Gilmore et al., 2013	USA	Understand contextual factors that influence PrEP adherence	<i>N</i> = 52; PrEP clinical trial participants	2009–2011	Qualitative	Not applicable	B: Some users missed pills due to illness, being away from home, a busy schedule, or mental health. Other medications and daily routine, pill boxes, and alarms could help facilitate adherence.
Goedel, Halkitis, Greene, Hickson, et al., 2016	USA	Examine HIV risk behaviors and PrEP awareness among MSM	<i>N</i> = 84; via one MSM dating app	2015	Cross section	Fair	A: Users were, on average, older. B: 12% had used PrEP and had more condomless sex partners than non-PrEP users. PrEP users had 7.5 receptive CAI partners versus 1.3 for non-users.
Goedel et al., 2016b	USA	Examine demographic and behavioral associations with PrEP	<i>N</i> = 152; via one MSM dating app	Not specified	Cross section	Fair	B: 9% had ever used PrEP. 86% of PrEP users engaged in receptive CAI and 64% insertive CAI with >1 partner in the previous 3 months compared to 32% receptive CAI and 40% insertive CAI for non-users.
Gupta et al., 2017	USA	Examine levels of PrEP use among MSM: focus on young Black/Latino	<i>N</i> = 270; via one MSM dating app	2013	Cross section	Fair	A: All PrEP users identified as male and median age was 30 years. B: 2% had ever used PrEP and 4 of 6 PrEP users used a condom at the last sexual encounter.

(continued on next page)

Table 2. (continued)

Author	Country	Aim	Sample	Data Collection	Design	Quality Rating	Key ABC Findings*
Hampel et al., 2017	Switzerland	Assess the need for a PrEP program for MSM	N = 1,893; via one MSM dating app	2017	Cross section	Fair	B: 4.3% currently using PrEP. 9% of PrEP users did not have an HIV test in the previous year. 78% took PrEP under medical supervision.
Hojilla et al., 2016	USA	Examine how PrEP users incorporated it into their HIV prevention measures	N = 26; participants of PrEP project	Not specified	Qualitative	Not applicable	C: HIV prevention strategies did not change on the initiation of PrEP, but some MSM took more risks due to feeling confident in PrEP effectiveness. In lower-risk scenarios, condoms were used less.
Holloway et al., 2017	USA	Examine level of PrEP uptake and adherence in YMSM	N = 761; via several geosocial networking apps	2015	Cross section	Fair	A: No difference in use by ethnicity. Main reasons for use: worry less about HIV (72%), > 1 sexual partner (66%), not always using condoms (53%), partners with unknown HIV status (50%), dislike condoms (32%). B: 9.7% ever used PrEP, 71.6% currently taking PrEP. STI diagnosis in past year associated with PrEP use.
Hood et al., 2016	USA	Assess trends of PrEP uptake among MSM	N = 2,168; via gay pride event	2009–2015	Cross section	Fair	B: <1% ever used PrEP from 2009 to 2011, 5% in 2012; 31% in 2015. In 2015, 23% of high-risk respondents were currently using PrEP, and low-risk respondents were stable at 1–3% from 2012 to 2015.

(continued on next page)

Table 2. (continued)

Author	Country	Aim	Sample	Data Collection	Design	Quality Rating	Key ABC Findings*
Hoots et al., 2016	USA	Report on willingness to take and use PrEP by MSM	<i>N</i> = 6,483, 20 city MSM venues	2014	Cross section	Fair	A: Men who had CAI with partner living with HIV were 5 times more likely to use PrEP than those who had sex with a condom or uninfected partner. B: 3.7% used PrEP in the previous year. PrEP use more common in those diagnosed with an STI in the previous year.
Hosek et al., 2013	USA	Examine/test methods to measure risk compensation and PrEP adherence in YMSM	<i>N</i> = 58; ages 18–22, participants in three arm pilot study	Not specified	RCT	Moderate	B: In the PrEP group, the median number of missed doses: 10 of 30. Rates of detectable drug levels in blood was 63% at Week 4 and 20% at Week 24. Poor concordance between self-report and blood testing. Reasons for missing doses was being busy, away from home, and forgot.
Hosek et al., 2017	USA	Examine patterns of PrEP use and adherence among YMSM	<i>N</i> = 200; PrEP project recruited via community/school and social media	Not specified	Cohort	Good	B: PrEP drug levels: Week 12 was 90% and Week 48 was 69%. Reasons for missing PrEP doses: forgot (28.5%), away from home (27%), or busy (27%); not wanting others to see them taking the pill (2.5%), or believed the pill was harmful (2%).
Klevens, 2017	USA	Measure frequency of PrEP use	<i>N</i> = 316; via multiple MSM venues	2014	Cross section	Fair	B: 119 men in sample answered the question about ever using PrEP, in which 6% had used PrEP in the past year.
Kuhns et al., 2017	USA	Assess level of PrEP uptake in YMSM	<i>N</i> = 394; via respondent social network	2014–2016	Cross section	Fair	A: Median age of user was 24 years; Black ethnicity negatively associated with use.

(continued on next page)

Table 2. (continued)

Author	Country	Aim	Sample	Data Collection	Design	Quality Rating	Key ABC Findings*
							B: 12% ever taken PrEP; 77% currently using PrEP. STI history, recent CAI, and partner living with HIV were associated with PrEP use.
Liu et al., 2008	USA	Assess PrEP/PEP knowledge in four specific HIV-negative MSM groups	N = 667; multiple MSM-related venues	2006	Cross section	Fair	B: 0–2% previously used PrEP. Some ambiguity distinguishing between PrEP and PEP.
Liu et al., 2013	USA	Examine the effect of PrEP pill taking on sexual practices.	N = 400; MSM participants in PrEP randomized clinical trial	2005–2007	RCT	Weak	B: In both groups, the mean number of sex partners at baseline was 7.25 and 5.27 at 12–24 months. C: Rates of CAI reported in the previous 3 months at study visits (baseline 57%; 52% at months 12–24) decreased over the course of the study.
Liu, et al., 2016	USA	Report on safety, adherence, sexual practices of a PrEP Demo project	N = 437; PrEP project via STI clinics	2014–2015	Cohort study	Good	B: Mean adherence was 82% by pill count. Drug levels in the protective range varied from 80–86% over 48 weeks of the study. C: The mean number of sex partners declined over the period of the study. STI incidence was stable across all periods of the study.
Malone et al., 2017	USA	Examine dynamics of PrEP use in male couples	N = 40; via medical services who provide PrEP	Not specified	Qualitative	Not applicable	A: PrEP was a practical tool, especially in open relationships, to reduce the risk of HIV from outside partners. B: 17 couples had past/current PrEP experience. 15 had open relationships; foundation of trust and emotional monogamy key in an open relationship. High level

(continued on next page)

Table 2. (continued)

Author	Country	Aim	Sample	Data Collection	Design	Quality Rating	Key ABC Findings*
							of awareness in HIV risk and using condoms with outside partners.
Marcus et al., 2016	USA	Assess adherence and discontinuation in PrEP initiators	N = 972; PrEP provision via integrated health service	2012 - 2015	Cohort	Good	B: Mean adherence was 92%; 13% had <80% adherence. Black participants were more likely to have <80% adherence compared to White. C: STI increased from baseline through the first year for urethral gonorrhea and rectal chlamydia but were stable for all other STIs.
Mayer et al., 2016	USA	Assess awareness and use of PrEP and PEP among MSM	Wave 1: N = 4,043, Wave 2: N = 2,737; MSM Internet site	2013–2014	Cross sectional	Fair	A: In Wave 1, history of STIs, PEP use was associated with PrEP use. In Wave 2, history of STIs and gay identity were not associated with PrEP use. B: In Wave 1, 1.5% used PrEP; in Wave 2, 2.3% used PrEP.
Mayer et al., 2017	USA	Examine if a Life Steps approach would improve PrEP adherence	N = 50; two arm RCT at large primary care service	2013–2014	RCT	Moderate	B: The intervention group had significantly higher PrEP drug levels at 6 months compared to the control group. No significant difference in achieving adherence of 80% or above between the groups.
McCormack et al., 2016	UK	Assess the efficacy, adherence to PrEP, and changes in sexual practices	N = 544; participants in RCT	2012–2014	RCT	Moderate	B: 8% missed doses due to adverse reactions. Most common side effects were nausea, headache, and arthralgia. C: No difference in sex partner numbers between study groups. Larger number in immediate group had more CAI

(continued on next page)

Table 2. (continued)

Author	Country	Aim	Sample	Data Collection	Design	Quality Rating	Key ABC Findings*
							with >10 partners. No difference in STI rates between study groups.
Mimiaga et al., 2014	USA	Explore partnership level influences that effect PrEP adherence in MSM club drug users	N = 40; MSM venues and HIV prevention services	2011–2,112	Qualitative	Not applicable	B: Some were wary of disclosing PrEP use to casual sex partners due to the brief nature of the encounter. Some would not disclose PrEP use due to associated stigma. Some said that the crystal meth high would deter them from taking PrEP before having sex with a casual sex partner. Most said that they would disclose PrEP use to a main partner.
Molina et al., 2015	France/Canada	Test safety and efficacy of episodic PrEP use in high risk MSM	N = 400; participants of a PrEP clinical trial	2012–2014	RCT	Moderate	B: Participants took an average of 15 pills per month. Rates of PrEP drug detection was 82–85%. 41% of PrEP group were diagnosed with an STI. C: Sexual behaviors did not change during the course of the study.
Molina et al., 2017	France/Canada	Understand the real-world use of PrEP episodic dosing	N = 361; participants from a PrEP clinical trial	2014–2016	Cohort	Good	B: 41 reported adverse reactions. Overall, PrEP were used for sexual encounters: not used (26%), suboptimal dose (24%), the correct dose (50%). C: Number of sex partners did not change in 2 months prior to follow-up visits but frequency of receptive CAI increased over 18 months.
Montgomery et al., 2016	USA	Evaluate PrEP drug levels in comparison to self-reported adherence	N = 50; via infectious disease service	2013–2014	Cohort	Good	B: 95% of sample were MSM. Mean self-reported adherence at follow-up was 6.2 tablets in the previous

(continued on next page)

Table 2. (continued)

Author	Country	Aim	Sample	Data Collection	Design	Quality Rating	Key ABC Findings*
							7 days and 26.8 tablets in previous 30 days. PrEP users in drug sampling group had a higher mean of self-reported adherence than those not in the drug sampling group.
Okafor et al., 2017	USA	Examine structural and behavioral correlates of PrEP use	N = 185; via substance use study	2015 - 2017	Cohort	Fair	A: Sex with a partner living with HIV compared to unknown or negative status associated with greater PrEP use. B: PrEP users more likely to have >6 anal sex partners in the previous 6 months than non-users.
Oldenburg et al., 2016	USA	Assess PrEP use among alcohol/stimulant-using MSM	N = 254; via MSM bars and clubs	2012	Cross section	Fair	B: 5% had previously used PrEP, all were stimulant users. Stimulant users reported their substance use more often would affect PrEP adherence.
Oldenburg et al., 2017	USA	Explore changes in sexual behavior following PrEP initiation	N = 61; MSM via PrEP program at an STI clinic	2013–2016	Cohort	Good	B: Mean number of anal sex partners at baseline was 4.9 and increased to 5.7 at 6 months; CAI partners at baseline 2.0 and increased to 3.3 at 6 months. C: Post PrEP initiation: No increase in anal sex partners but significant increase in CAI partners at 6 months compared to baseline.
Parker et al., 2015	USA	Explore PrEP users' real-life use of the medication.	N = 24; MSM, infectious disease services	Not specified	Qualitative	Not applicable	A: 75% engaged in CAI prior to starting on PrEP. B: Daily routine, pill boxes, alarms/texts promoted adherence. C: Majority of sample did not change number of sex partners or level of

(continued on next page)

Table 2. (continued)

Author	Country	Aim	Sample	Data Collection	Design	Quality Rating	Key ABC Findings*
							condom use after starting PrEP.
Parsons et al., 2017	USA	Proposes a motivational PrEP cascade on the cycle of change model	N = 995; MSM survey via social media	2015	Cross section	Fair	B: 1 in 10 using PrEP; 98% of users reported taking more than 4 doses per week.
Patrick et al., 2017	USA	Examine levels of PrEP awareness/use in MSM	N = 1,346; MSM venues in two cities	2011–2014	Cross section	Fair	B: In Washington, DC, PrEP use in 2011 was 0%, and in 2014, it was 7.5%. In Miami, PrEP use in 2011 was <1% and in 2014 was 1.5%.
Raifman et al., 2017	USA	Evaluate the impact of a PrEP education intervention on uptake	N = 316; MSM via STI clinic	2012–2015	Cohort	Good	B: 2.5% took PrEP before the intervention. Use increased from 1% to 3.5% in the control group and 3%–10% in the treatment group. Attending the clinic after the intervention was associated with a 5% increase in PrEP use.
Rucinski et al., 2013	USA	Examine knowledge of PrEP among MSM	N = 355; 18–40 years via six MSM media platforms	2011	Cross section	Fair	B: 1.5% had used PrEP in the previous 6 months.
Sagaon-Teyssier et al., 2016	France/Canada	Evaluate PrEP adherence and sexual behavior during a clinical trial	N = 400; MSM/TGW participants of PrEP RCT	2015	RCT	Moderate	B: PrEP was used optimally by 59% and 41% suboptimally at most recent anal sexual encounter. 70% reported the most recent receptive AI was without a condom. 43% of participants reported that their recent sexual encounter was protected only with PrEP.
Snowden et al., 2017	USA	Examine level of PrEP use in different MSM populations	N = 301; via multiple MSM venues	2014	Cross section	Fair	A: Eligible White men were 4 times more likely to use PrEP than non-White men. No eligible 18- to 24-year olds used PrEP; 30% were >55 years.

(continued on next page)

Table 2. (continued)

Author	Country	Aim	Sample	Data Collection	Design	Quality Rating	Key ABC Findings*
							B: 10% used PrEP in the previous year.
Storholm et al., 2017	USA	Examine PrEP adherence and condom use in substance-using YMSM	N = 30; ages 25–30, via integrated health care service	Not specified	Qualitative	Not applicable	B: Average number of missed doses over 3 months was 5.5. All crystal meth users said drug use impacted adherence. 30% of alcohol users said it impacted missing doses. 60% used memory techniques or devices to promote adherence. 87% recently engaged in CAI.
Strauss et al., 2017	USA	Examine PrEP use among racially diverse YMSM	N = 759; via HIV services/ organizations, social media	2013–2015	Cross section	Fair	A: Reasons for starting on PrEP: 38% sex with multiple partners, 33% had unprotected sex, 21% had sex with unknown HIV status partners. B: 9% used PrEP in the previous 3 months. C: 40% had not changed condom use and 35% were less likely to use condoms.
Tan et al., 2016	Canada	Examine routine mental health screening among MSM PrEP users	N = 32; MSM via infectious disease service	2014	Cohort	Poor	B: 16% previously used PrEP. Median number of sex partners in the last 6 months was 13.5. 37% had problematic alcohol use and 34% had problematic drug use. 41% had current mental health condition; 40% screened positive for depression.
Taylor et al., 2014	USA	Collect data on behavioral intervention to improve PrEP adherence	N = 39; participants from PrEP trial and MSM venues	2012	Qualitative	Not applicable	A: Participants said PrEP could free them from having to use condoms. B: PrEP users reported more sex partners and CAI in the previous 3 months than non-PrEP users. Alcohol use, mentally ill health,

(continued on next page)

Table 2. (continued)

Author	Country	Aim	Sample	Data Collection	Design	Quality Rating	Key ABC Findings*
							medication cost, and stigma of HIV medication could impact adherence.
Volk et al., 2015	USA	Examine characteristics of PrEP users and patterns of use	N = 801; attendees of medical center	2012–2015	Cohort	Good	A: PrEP initiators reported more sex partners than noninitiators. B: 99% of sample were MSM. After 1 year, 50% were diagnosed with an STI. C: After 6 months of PrEP, 74% did not change the number of sex partners, 15% decreased and 11% increased; 56% did not change level of condom use, 41% decreased and 3% increased.
Zablotska et al., 2013	Australia	Describe the use of ARVs before unprotected sex among MSM	N = 3,677; via multiple gay venues and STI clinics	2011	Cross section	Fair	A: No difference in PrEP use among varying ages. B: 2.5% had used ARVs before sex to prevent HIV infection, of whom, 66% took ARVs after sex.

Note. ABC = antecedent, behavior, and consequence; AI = anal intercourse; ARVs = antiretrovirals; CAI = condomless anal intercourse; HCP = health care providers; MSM = men who have sex with men; PEP = postexposure prophylaxis; PrEP = preexposure prophylaxis; RCT = randomized controlled trial; STI = sexually transmitted infection; TGW = transgender women; YMSM = young men who have sex with men.

* Definitions: A: predictors that may occur before PrEP use (antecedents); B: processes and factors involved in PrEP use (behavior); C: factors that may be outcomes of PrEP use (consequences).

recruitment techniques, with varied attempts to ensure representativeness. For example, some studies specifically recruited young MSM (YMSM) or minority racial/ethnic MSM, and the location of recruitment in some studies was primarily gay-centric venues. PrEP prevalence estimates ranged from 0% in a U.S. study conducted in 2004 to 12% in a U.S. study conducted in 2014 (Chen, Snowden, McFarland, & Raymond, 2016; Goedel, Halkitis, Greene, Hickson, & Duncan, 2016a).

Five U.S. studies collected data prior to 2012 and reported a PrEP prevalence estimate range of 0%–1.5% (Chen et al., 2016; Hood et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2008; Patrick et al., 2017; Rucinski et al., 2013). Fourteen U.S.

studies conducted during or after 2012 identified a prevalence range of 1.5–12%, although the majority of the higher estimates (9–12%) came from five studies that collected data in 2015 (Bauermeister, Meanley, Pingel, Soler, & Harper, 2014; Eaton et al., 2017; Goedel, Halkitis, Greene, & Duncan, 2016b; Goedel et al., 2016a; Gupta, Lounsbury, & Patel, 2017; Holloway et al., 2017; Hoots, Finlayson, Nerlander, & Paz-Bailey, 2016; Kleven et al., 2017; Kuhns, Hotton, Schneider, Garofalo, & Fujimoto, 2017; Mayer et al., 2016; Oldenburg et al., 2016; Snowden, Chen, McFarland, & Raymond, 2017; Strauss et al., 2017). The highest estimate of approximately 12% from two studies included

one small sample recruited via an MSM geosocial networking application and the other was a sample of YMSM (<30 years of age; Goedel et al., 2016a; Kuhns et al., 2017). With the exception of these studies, the 2015 estimated range of PrEP prevalence was approximately 9–10%. It appeared that MSM samples reported increasing use of PrEP following U.S. approval of PrEP in 2012 and guidelines for high-risk groups in 2014.

Studies from France, Australia, and Switzerland reported a prevalence estimate range of 2–5% (Castro et al., 2017; Hampel et al., 2017; Zablotska et al., 2013). Data collection dates in these studies ranged from 2011 to 2017, but the two more recent studies (2014–2017) from Western Europe reported a range of 4–5% (Castro et al., 2017; Hampel et al., 2017). The Australian study in 2011 found that 2.5% of the MSM sample were using PrEP (Zablotska et al., 2013). However, this study may not be generalizable to wider MSM populations because it recruited men from gay venues/events and sexual health clinics. Due to limited evidence, it was not possible to determine the precise prevalence of PrEP use among MSM outside of the United States.

Sociodemographics of Men Who Have Sex With Men Preexposure Prophylaxis Users

Twenty-seven studies reported or examined key socio-demographics of MSM who were using or had previously used PrEP. The majority were U.S. studies, which consisted of different designs: cross section to RCT. Sixteen studies did not recruit samples of a specific age and reported a median or mean age of PrEP users from 27 to 42 years (Arnold et al., 2017; Chan et al., 2016a; Collins, McMahan, & Stekler, 2017; Gilmore et al., 2013; Gupta et al., 2017; Hojilla et al., 2016; Marcus et al., 2016; Mayer et al., 2017; McCormack et al., 2016; Molina et al., 2015; Montgomery et al., 2016; Oldenburg et al., 2017; Parker et al., 2015; Storholm, Volk, Marcus, Silverberg, & Satre, 2017; Volk et al., 2015).

Three studies reported that no age was significantly associated with PrEP use (Hoots et al., 2016; Strauss et al., 2017; Zablotska et al., 2013), but two U.S. studies identified PrEP use as more common in older men (Doblecki-Lewis et al., 2017; Snowden et al., 2017). These two studies may be limited in generalizability to the PrEP-using population because they had relatively small samples. From the evidence, PrEP use peaked in the late 20s to early 40s but was used across all ages.

Nineteen studies provided a breakdown of race/ethnicity; 13 of these studies reported that most participants were White (Chan et al., 2016a; Chan et al., 2016b; Collins et al., 2017; Doblecki-Lewis et al., 2017;

Gilmore et al., 2013; Hojilla et al., 2016; Kuhns et al., 2017; Marcus et al., 2016; Mayer et al., 2017; McCormack et al., 2016; Montgomery et al., 2016; Oldenburg et al., 2017; Parker et al., 2015). Two U.S. studies reported that Whites were more likely to use PrEP compared to other races/ethnic groups (Hoots et al., 2016; Snowden et al., 2017). A study from the United States identified Black race as negatively associated with PrEP use (Kuhns et al., 2017), although this study only focused on YMSM. In contrast, an Australian study reported that minority racial/ethnic groups were more likely to use PrEP than Whites (Zablotska et al., 2013) and another U.S. study of YMSM reported that race/ethnicity was not associated with PrEP use (Strauss et al., 2017). In comparison, Strauss et al. (2017) had a sample size of 759, and Zablotska et al. (2013) had a sample size of 3,677. Overall, population representative evidence base was limited, and it was not possible to determine if there was an association between race/ethnicity and PrEP use.

Reasons and Motivators for Preexposure Prophylaxis Initiation

Twelve studies examined MSM reasons for starting PrEP. One study was an RCT and the primary reason for being involved in the study was to provide something meaningful back to the community (Gilmore et al., 2013). As this study was a trial, it may not help to understand key motivators for PrEP use. Three studies found that people started PrEP because they had or would be having multiple sex partners (Arnold et al., 2017; Holloway et al., 2017; Strauss et al., 2017), and four studies reported that a motivator for some MSM was that they had previously had or would have sex with partners whose HIV status was unknown or positive (Chan et al., 2016a; Holloway et al., 2017; Kuhns et al., 2017; Strauss et al., 2017). Two studies found that a history of having CAI or inconsistent condom use was associated with PrEP uptake (Collins et al., 2017; Kuhns et al., 2017); another study found that some men used PrEP because it allowed them to not use condoms (Taylor et al., 2014).

Five studies found that a central motivator for starting PrEP was to remove the anxiety of contracting HIV (Hojilla et al., 2016; Holloway et al., 2017; Hosek et al., 2013; Malone et al., 2017; Mimiaga, Closson, Kothary, & Mitty, 2014), but one U.S. study found no factors significantly associated with initiating PrEP (Chan et al., 2016b). The evidence suggests that planned high-risk sexual behaviors and removing anxiety related to contracting HIV motivated MSM to start PrEP.




Figure 2. ABC summary of findings. *Note.* ABC = antecedent, behavior, and consequence; CAI = condomless anal intercourse; MSM = men who have sex with men; PrEP = preexposure prophylaxis; YMSM = young MSM.

Sexual Behavior

Twenty-seven articles, the majority of which were from the United States, examined aspects of high-risk sexual behavior. Eight studies reported CAI rates for PrEP users (27–87%; Castro et al., 2017; Gilmore et al., 2013; Goedel et al., 2016b; Gupta et al., 2017; Holloway et al., 2017; Hosek et al., 2017; Parker et al., 2015; Storholm et al., 2017). The lowest rate (27%) was in a study where the majority of participants had a main partner (Castro et al., 2017); with the exception of this study, the CAI range was 40–87%.

Five studies, which examined changes in CAI behavior after participants had started PrEP, reported no increase in rates of CAI or changes in condom use (Hojilla et al., 2016; Hosek et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2013; Molina et al., 2015; Parker et al., 2015). However, three studies (two RCTs and one open label) reported increases in the frequency of CAI, and in two studies, CAI was specifically receptive (McCormack et al., 2016; Molina et al., 2017; Oldenburg et al., 2017). McCormack et al. (2016) found that the increase in receptive CAI occurred only in participants who reported more than 10 sexual partners. However, six studies that examined PrEP use over different time frames reported that PrEP initiation did not lead to an increased number of sex partners for the majority of participants (McCormack et al., 2016; Molina et al., 2015; Molina et al., 2017; Oldenburg et al., 2017; Parker et al., 2015; Volk et al., 2015). Two U.S. studies found that following PrEP initiation, 35–41% of the sample reported decreased use of condoms, whereas 3–27% reported increased use of condoms (Strauss et al., 2017; Volk et al., 2015).

Four studies reported that PrEP users were more likely to have more sex partners than non-PrEP users (Goedel et al. 2016b; Goedel et al. 2016a; Holloway et al., 2017; Okafor, Gorbach, Ragsdale, Quinn, & Shoptaw, 2017).

Four studies found that PrEP users were more likely to have sex with partners living with HIV than non-PrEP users (Holloway et al., 2017; Kuhns et al., 2017; Okafor et al., 2017; Taylor et al., 2014). One U.S. study reported that MSM who engaged in CAI with partners living with HIV were five times more likely to use PrEP than those who did not have CAI with men living with HIV (Hoots et al., 2016).

The evidence for risk compensation (increases in high-risk sexual behaviors) and the number of sexual partners after starting PrEP was mixed. The evidence did indicate that PrEP users may have had more CAI and sex partners than non-PrEP users, including men living with HIV. However, this was expected because CAI and partner numbers were criteria for being offered PrEP.

Sexually Transmitted Infections

Fourteen studies reviewed STIs in MSM who used PrEP. Nine studies reported an overall STI incidence estimate for PrEP users, which ranged from 20% to 66% (Bien, Patel, Blackstock, & Felsen, 2017; Chan et al., 2016b; Doblecki-Lewis et al., 2017; Hosek et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2016; Marcus et al., 2016; McCormack et al., 2016; Molina et al., 2015; Volk et al., 2015). The lowest rate (20%) was from a U.S. study with a relatively small number of PrEP users and 66% was from a study of YMSM. Only six studies examined specific STIs, and the majority identified the most common infections as chlamydia and gonorrhea (Daughtridge, Conyngham, Ramirez, & Koenig, 2015; Deutsch et al., 2015; Hosek et al., 2013; McCormack et al., 2016; Molina et al., 2015; Molina et al., 2017; Volk et al., 2015). The wide range of STI incidence reflected heterogeneity of study populations, but all found a high STI burden in MSM at high risk of HIV acquisition.

Hoots et al. (2016) found that MSM who had been diagnosed with an STI in the previous year were more likely to use PrEP than those who had not had an STI in the previous year, but this finding should be expected because an STI in the previous year was a clinical indicator for PrEP. Another U.S. study reported that STI diagnosis in the previous year was associated with PrEP use (Holloway et al., 2017). A U.S. cohort study reported that 1 year after PrEP initiation, diagnosis of urethral gonorrhea and rectal chlamydia increased, but all other STIs/sites remained stable (Marcus et al., 2016). Another U.S. cohort study reported that following PrEP initiation, overall STI incidence at 6 months was 30% and increased to 50% at 12 months (Volk et al., 2015). Cohort studies were limited by not having control groups to determine if STI increases were directly related to PrEP use. In contrast, two RCTs, which analyzed the efficacy of PrEP, reported that during study follow-up, PrEP and control groups showed no significant differences in STI rates (McCormack et al., 2016; Molina et al., 2015). The evidence suggests that MSM using PrEP had a high burden of other STIs, but there was limited evidence to suggest that PrEP use increased or reduced STI incidence.

Preexposure Prophylaxis Adherence

Eleven studies examined levels of PrEP adherence, using single- or combined-monitoring methods, ranging from self-report to blood tests. Ten studies examined continuous dosing regimens, in which adherence was defined as taking four or more pills per week. Four studies monitored PrEP levels via blood tests and reported that 24 weeks after starting PrEP, 20–84% of the sample had drug levels equivalent to four or more pills per week (Hosek et al., 2013, 2017; Liu et al., 2016; Mayer et al., 2017). Two of these studies reported that 48 weeks after starting PrEP, 34–80% of the sample had adequate drug levels (Hosek et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2016). The studies that reported lower adherence levels of 20–55% at Week 24, and 34% at Week 48, only examined PrEP use in YMSM (Hosek et al., 2017; Hosek et al., 2013). In contrast, the two studies that had nonspecific age samples reported an adherence level of more than 80% at Week 24 (Liu et al., 2016; Mayer et al., 2017).

Six studies used self-report to monitor PrEP use, in which three reported overall adherence of 80–90% (Chan et al., 2016b; Daughtridge et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2016). A study that examined potential and actual use of PrEP in the cycle of change found that 98% of the sample using PrEP reported taking more than four doses per week (Parsons et al., 2017). Two studies reported that at 6 months of PrEP use, participants reported taking

20–27 daily doses in the previous 30 days (Hosek et al., 2013; Montgomery et al., 2016). In contrast, Storholm et al. (2017) reported that after using PrEP for 3 months, their sample had taken 5.5 doses a week on average. Three studies used pill counting as a monitoring mechanism and reported an adherence level of 80–92% (Liu et al., 2016; Marcus et al., 2016; Mayer et al., 2017).

Two studies used two or more monitoring strategies and found that an adherence level of more than 80% was consistent between self-report and blood testing (Liu et al., 2016; Mayer et al., 2017). However, Hosek et al. (2013) found that participants reported high adherence levels, but blood monitoring indicated that a small minority had adequate drug levels to evidence effective adherence. Studies showing consistent adherence had generalized MSM samples; inconsistent reporting was found in studies of YMSM ages 18–22 years.

Only three articles examined episodic PrEP dosing. Recommended dosing in these studies was two pills 2–24 hours before sex, a third pill 24 hours after the first dose, and a fourth pill 24 hours later. Two studies reported that about half fully adhered and one-quarter partially adhered to the regimen (Molina et al., 2015; Molina et al., 2017). Molina et al. (2015) reported that 28% of their sample used 15 pills per month on average. In contrast, Molina et al. (2017) reported that 70% of their sample had detectable drug levels 6 months after starting PrEP. Sagaon-Teyssier et al. (2016) found that 59% of their sample fully adhered to the dosing schedule; 41% used a suboptimal dosing regimen. In contrast, Molina et al. (2017) reported that 9% of their sample did not use PrEP consistently at their last sexual encounters. The majority of episodic PrEP users adhered to the regimen, but the evidence was not as strong as for continuous regimens.

Fourteen studies examined biopsychosocial factors that could affect adherence; the majority of evidence came from continuous regimens. Six studies examined patient-related lifestyle factors. Two found that 27–47% of participants forgot to take pills because of busy schedules and 28–50% simply forgot to take some doses (Hosek et al., 2013, 2017). Three studies reported that 27–60% of participants did not take doses when away from home (Gilmore et al., 2013; Hosek et al., 2013, 2017). Three studies examined elements of substance use; two reported that alcohol use had a negative impact on PrEP adherence (Storholm et al., 2017; Taylor et al., 2014), and two reported that stimulant drugs were related to nonadherence (Oldenburg et al., 2016; Storholm et al., 2017).

A study from Canada examined mental health and substance use in men being processed for initial PrEP

consultation and reported problematic alcohol use (38%), problematic drug use (35%), and/or a mental health diagnosis (41%; Tan, Leon-Carlyle, Mills, Moses, & Carvalho, 2016). One study reported that symptoms of depression in participants contributed to missed doses of PrEP (Taylor et al., 2014). In contrast, five studies stated that a fundamental reason to use PrEP was to remove the fear of contracting HIV (Hojilla et al., 2016; Holloway et al., 2017; Hosek et al., 2013; Malone et al., 2017; Mimiaga et al., 2014). Overall, mixed factors were related to individual PrEP user adherence.

Five studies examined social and economic factors and reported that participants had a fear of being stigmatized by social supports if they knew the participant was on PrEP (Arnold et al., 2017; Collins et al., 2017; Hosek et al., 2017; Storholm et al., 2017; Taylor et al., 2014). One study reported fear of being judged as promiscuous by community peers (Collins et al., 2017). Storholm et al. (2017) stated that 10% of their sample had experienced stigma from other gay men because of using PrEP. In contrast, Hosek et al. (2017) reported that only 2.5% of their sample had missed doses because they did not want others to know they were taking PrEP.

Three U.S. studies reported that lack of affordable health care was a barrier for some men (Chan et al., 2016b; Doblecki-Lewis et al., 2017; Taylor et al., 2014). Three studies reported that some of participants had reservations about discussing PrEP use with health care providers for fear of stigma associated with risky sexual behavior and HIV medication (Collins et al., 2017; Eaton et al., 2017; Taylor et al., 2014). The evidence indicated that fear of stigma from peers, health care providers, and health care barriers impacted PrEP uptake, but evidence was limited related to its influence on PrEP adherence.

Five studies examined the impact of side effects on PrEP adherence. Three reported that up to 11% of their samples experienced side effects when taking PrEP (Liu et al., 2016; McCormack et al., 2016; Molina et al., 2017). McCormack et al. (2016) reported that 8% of their sample missed doses due to side effects, most commonly nausea and headache. A U.S. study of YMSM reported that 4.5% of the sample intentionally missed doses to avoid side effects (Hosek et al., 2017). In contrast, Arnold et al. (2017), in a small sample, found that a majority of participants had no side effects from PrEP, and only two missed doses because of potential side effects. Overall, the evidence suggests that adherence was affected by side effects in a minority of PrEP users but particularly in YMSM.

Six studies examined factors that facilitated optimal adherence to PrEP. Three reported an established daily

routine as one of the most effective facilitators for adherence (Gilmore et al., 2013; Parker et al., 2015; Taylor et al., 2014); two found that being on other medications facilitated daily doses of PrEP (Gilmore et al., 2013; Taylor et al., 2014). Six studies examined adherence prompts and props: three studies reported that the use of prompts (e.g., daily texts, alarms) improved adherence (Parker et al., 2015; Storholm et al., 2017; Taylor et al., 2014), and three found that some PrEP users found pill boxes useful (Gilmore et al., 2013; Parker et al., 2015; Storholm et al., 2017), but Gilmore et al. (2013) also reported that some participants did not find pill boxes helpful.

Sagaon-Teyssier et al. (2016) found that PrEP, in combination with other HIV prevention strategies, promoted adherence to dosing regimens, and Raifman et al. (2017) reported that a brief PrEP education intervention resulted in a 150% increase in PrEP use compared to PrEP awareness and previous PrEP use prior to education. Another facilitator was related by users who engaged in high-risk sexual behavior and viewed PrEP as a “necessity” to reduce HIV risk. The overall evidence did not indicate that one specific factor that promoted optimal adherence, but adherence prompts, structured adherence support, and education might be beneficial.

Discussion

To our knowledge, this was the first systematic review to analyze MSM PrEP use and medication adherence in high-income countries. Other literature reviews (Huang et al., 2018; Pinto, Berringer, Melendez, & Mmaje, 2018; Sidebottom, Ekstrom, & Stromdahl, 2018; Traeger et al., 2018; Young & McDaid, 2014) examined PrEP efficacy, sexual behavior, and medication adherence but did not provide in-depth behavioral analyses of PrEP use among MSM.

We used the ABC framework (Meade et al., 2014) to structure and synthesize evidence of behavioral processes in MSM PrEP use. The main strength of this approach was that it allowed a wide range of complex evidence to be synthesized into a three-stage process. Sexual behavior was congruent with the three ABC stages. Men who initiated PrEP used it as an additional HIV risk reduction strategy and engaged in varied high-risk sexual behaviors (antecedents). Following PrEP initiation, users were likely to continue high-risk sexual activity (behaviors) in comparison to nonusers. There was mixed evidence on whether PrEP initiation was substantially associated with risk compensation, but some MSM subgroups saw PrEP as an opportunity to reduce consistent condom use (consequences).

The evidence for changes in sexual behavior (risk compensation) following PrEP use is complex. As in a systematic review of PrEP efficacy (Huang et al., 2018), we did not find consistent increases in sex partners or CAI, and there was a lack of evidence to indicate an increase in STI diagnoses. However, another systematic review concluded that PrEP use was associated with increased sex without condoms and diagnoses of STIs, particularly a significant increase in rectal chlamydia (Traeger et al., 2018).

Two studies in our review suggested that there were increases in higher risk behaviors in a subgroup of PrEP users. Overall, this reflected limitations in assessing changes in sexual behavior in observational studies. First, PrEP users were likely to engage in high-risk sexual activity prior to PrEP initiation and to continue those behaviors. Second, before and after, observational studies cannot control for secular change and social desirability biases in reporting high-risk behaviors on or off PrEP. Further research is required to investigate if risk compensation and STI diagnosis are associated with PrEP uptake.

We found that a minority (<10%) of MSM were using PrEP, but this was with limitations in nonrepresentative samples with clear geographic heterogeneity in PrEP use and mixed quality. There was a lack of substantive data on the population level of MSM PrEP use in high-income countries, and studies examining prevalence estimates were limited by heterogenous sampling.

A systematic review of PrEP implementation in the United States found health care system barriers affecting uptake, including PrEP-related stigma and financial capability, which was nonequitable across races/ethnicities (Pinto et al., 2018). This study was congruent with findings in our review, but we found challenges when engaging young and racial/ethnic minority MSM in PrEP uptake and adherence. The barriers for YMSM are of concern if they have limited financial capability to pay for PrEP and if the health care system limits PrEP provision. There is a need to systematically monitor HIV incidence, PrEP uptake, and retention disaggregated by age and race/ethnicity in different geographic settings. This should be coupled with well-designed MSM studies to ensure equitable access to PrEP.

A systematic review found that MSM PrEP users of continuous and episodic dosing regimens had high levels of medication adherence (Sidebottom et al., 2018), which was consistent with our findings. However, a limited evidence base suggested that substance users and those with mental health diagnoses may have higher levels of nonadherence. Substance use by MSM is particularly important, as gay and bisexual men are three

times more likely to use illicit drugs than heterosexuals (Office for National Statistics, 2014). In particular, there are growing concerns about MSM who combine drugs with sex (Maxwell, Shahmanesh, & Gafos, 2019).

Chemsex is the intentional use of psychoactive drugs to facilitate or enhance sex. A systematic review reported that up to 13% of MSM engaged in chemsex, which often results in high rates of CAI, multiple sex partners, partners of unknown HIV status, and injecting drug use (Maxwell et al., 2019). In a study of intended PrEP use, chemsex participants reported that their drug use would negatively impact PrEP adherence and choice of dosing regimen would depend on the frequency of drug use (Closson, Mitty, Malone, Mayer, & Mimiaga, 2018). The use of PrEP by substance users may be a viable HIV risk reduction strategy, but further research is required to examine PrEP use in substance users and the impact on adherence. Overall, further investigations are needed to explore PrEP medication adherence in specific MSM populations.

To overcome barriers to adherence, it is important to examine what influences nonadherence. A systematic review of non-PrEP medication adherence in uninfected MSM reported that about 80% adhered to their medications, but barriers included forgetting, being away from home, and changes in daily routine (Liu et al., 2014); their findings were consistent with our study, which found high adherence levels, but that daily logistics contributed to nonadherence.

A specific influence for PrEP adherence was the user's perception of stigma from community peers and health care providers. A systematic review from the United States reported that potential health care provider stigma related to HIV, PrEP, and same-sex behavior could keep high-risk individuals from starting PrEP (Pinto et al., 2018). Our findings were similar to those of Liu et al. (2014), who found that an established daily routine and pill boxes could promote adherence. However, limited research has examined facilitators of PrEP adherence in high-risk MSM.

Strengths and Limitations

Our review was strengthened by a clear search protocol and well-established frameworks to structure and analyze the wide array of evidence. Use of the ABC framework provided a clear and simple model to understand behavioral processes of MSM PrEP use. Our review was limited by a lack of clear sampling frameworks and the heterogenous nature of samples across studies. In addition, we only included studies that were fully published in English.

Research Recommendations

To better understand PrEP use by MSM in high-income countries, research in the following areas is recommended: (a) examine prevalence estimates and patterns of PrEP use by age and race/ethnicity in different countries to ensure equitable access; (b) examine changes in sexual behavior and diagnosis of STIs after PrEP initiation; and (c) explore barriers and facilitators for PrEP uptake and adherence in high-risk MSM. As PrEP is an effective HIV risk reduction strategy and increasingly available in high-income countries, research in these areas would provide a foundation for evidence-based policy.

Conclusion

A minority of MSM in high-income countries used PrEP, but it appears to have increased in line with increasing availability. MSM who used PrEP were more often those who engaged in high-risk sexual behavior, but some users changed sexual behavior as a result of starting PrEP. MSM had high medication adherence levels, but specific high-risk groups had a lower uptake, were less adherent, and might have been at higher risk of HIV acquisition. As PrEP is increasingly available, it is important to understand what facilitates PrEP uptake and supports adherence for MSM at higher risk of acquiring HIV. Finally, there is a specific need for research to explore episodic use of PrEP.

Disclosures

The authors report no real or perceived vested interests related to this article that could be construed as a conflict of interest.

Key Considerations

- PrEP users engage in high-risk sexual behaviors, and PrEP initiation potentially means some users will risk compensate.
- MSM have high PrEP adherence levels, but younger men, substance users, and those with a mental health diagnosis have higher nonadherence levels.
- Barriers to PrEP uptake and adherence include stigma, side effects, cost, daily logistics, and forgetting.
- Facilitators that promote PrEP adherence include availability, daily routine, daily texts/alarms, pill boxes, and education.

References

- Arnold, T., Brinkley-Rubinstein, L., Chan, P. A., Perez-Brumer, A., Bologna, E. S., Beauchamps, L., ... Nunn, A. (2017). Social, structural, behavioral and clinical factors influencing retention in pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) care in Mississippi. *Plos One*, *12*(2), e0172354. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0172354
- Bauermeister, J. A., Meanley, S., Pingel, E., Soler, J. H., & Harper, G. W. (2014). PrEP Awareness and perceived barriers among single young men who have sex with men. *Current HIV Research*, *11*(7), 520-527. doi:10.2174/1570162X12666140129100411
- Bien, C., Patel, V., Blackstock, O., & Felsen, U. (2017). Reaching key populations: PrEP uptake in an urban health care system in the Bronx, New York. *AIDS and Behavior*, *21*(5), 1309-1314. doi:10.1007/s10461-016-1663-8
- Blumenthal, J., & Haubrick, R. (2014). Risk compensation in PrEP: An old debate emerges yet again. *The Virtual Mentor*, *16*(11), 909-915. doi:10.1001/virtualmentor.2014.16.11.stas1-1411
- Castro, D. R., Quatremere, G., Sagaon-Teyssier, L., Le Gall, J. M., Preau, M., Suzan-Monti, M., & Spire, B. (2017). Informal pre-exposure prophylaxis use in France: Results from the Flash PrEP survey (2014). *HIV Medicine*, *18*(4), 308-310. doi:10.1111/hiv.12419
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2017). *HIV Surveillance Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/library/reports/hiv-surveillance.html>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2014). *Pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention*. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/PrEP_fact_sheet_final.pdf
- Chan, P. A., Glynn, T. R., Oldenburg, C. E., Montgomery, M. C., Robinette, A. E., Almonte, A., ... Nunn, A. S. (2016a). Implementation of preexposure prophylaxis for human immunodeficiency virus prevention among men who have sex with men at a New England sexually transmitted diseases clinic. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*, *43*(11), 717-723. doi:10.1097/olq.0000000000000514
- Chan, P. A., Mena, L., Patel, R., Oldenburg, C. E., Beauchamps, L., Perez-Brumer, A. G., ... Nunn, A. (2016b). Retention in care outcomes for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis implementation programmes among men who have sex with men in three US cities. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*, *19*(1), 731-734. doi:10.7448/ias.19.1.20903
- Chen, Y.-H., Snowden, J., McFarland, W., & Raymond, H. (2016). Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) use, seroadaptation, and sexual behavior among men who have sex with men, San Francisco, 2004–2014. *AIDS and Behavior*, *20*(12), 2791-2797. doi:10.1007/s10461-016-1357-2
- Closson, E. F., Mitty, J. A., Malone, J., Mayer, K. H., & Mimiaga, M. J. (2018). Exploring strategies for PrEP adherence and dosing preferences in the context of sexualized recreational drug use among MSM: A qualitative study. *AIDS Care*, *30*(2), 191-198. doi:10.1080/09540121.2017.1360992
- Collins, S. P., McMahan, V. M., & Stekler, J. D. (2017). The impact of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) use on the sexual health of men who have sex with men: A qualitative study in Seattle, WA. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, *29*(1), 55-68. doi:10.1080/19317611.2016.1206051
- Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. (2019). *CASP checklists*. Retrieved from <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/>
- Daughtridge, G. W., Conyngham, S. C., Ramirez, N., & Koenig, H. C. (2015). I am men's health: Generating adherence to HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in young men of color who have sex with men. *Journal of the International Association of Providers of AIDS Care*, *14*(2), 103-107. doi:10.1177/2325957414555230
- Deutsch, M., Glidden, D., Sevelius, J., Keatley, J., McMahan, V., Guanira, J., ... Grant, R. (2015). HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis in transgender women: A subgroup analysis of the iPrEx trial. *Laboratory Hematology*, *2*(12), e512-e519. doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(15)00206-4
- Doblecki-Lewis, S., Liu, A., Feaster, D., Cohen, S. E., Cardenas, G., Bacon, O., ... Kolber, M. A. (2017). Healthcare access and PrEP

- continuation in San Francisco and Miami after the US PrEP Demo Project. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 74(5), 531-538. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000001236
- Eaton, L. A., Matthews, D. D., Driffin, D. D., Bukowski, L., Wilson, P. A., & Stall, R. D. (2017). A multi-US city assessment of awareness and uptake of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) for HIV prevention among Black men and transgender women who have sex with men. *Prevention Science*, 18(5), 505-516. doi:10.1007/s11121-017-0756-6
- Effective Public Health Practice Project. (2019). *Quality assessment tool*. Retrieved from <https://merst.ca/ephpp/>
- European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. (2017). *HIV/AIDS surveillance in Europe*. Retrieved from http://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/355570/20171127-Annual_HIV_Report.pdf?ua=1
- Eurosurveillance (2018). Special edition: HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP). Retrieved from https://www.eurosurveillance.org/upload/site-assets/imgs/Special_Issue_HIV_print.pdf
- Gilmore, H., Liu, A., Koester, K., Amico, K., McMahan, V., Goicochea, P., ... Grant, R. (2013). Participant experiences and facilitators and barriers to pill use among men who have sex with men in the iPrEx pre-exposure prophylaxis trial in San Francisco. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, 27(10), 560-566. doi:10.1089/apc.2013.0116
- Goedel, W. C., Halkitis, P. N., Greene, R. E., Hickson, D. A., & Duncan, D. T. (2016a). HIV risk behaviors, perceptions, and testing and preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP) awareness/use in Grindr-using men who have sex with men in Atlanta, Georgia. *The Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care*, 27(2), 133-142. doi:10.1016/j.jana.2015.11.005
- Goedel, W., Halkitis, P., Greene, R., & Duncan, D. (2016b). Correlates of awareness of and willingness to use pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men who use geosocial-networking smartphone applications in New York City. *AIDS and Behavior*, 20(7), 1435-1442. doi:10.1007/s10461-016-1353-6
- Gupta, S., Lounsbury, D. W., & Patel, V. V. (2017). Low awareness and use of preexposure prophylaxis in a diverse online sample of men who have sex with men in New York City. *The Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care*, 28(1), 27-330. doi:10.1016/j.jana.2016.10.001
- Hampel, B., Kusejko, K., Braun, D. L., Harrison-Quintana, J., Kouyos, R., & Fehr, J. (2017). Assessing the need for a pre-exposure prophylaxis programme using the social media app Grindr®. *HIV Medicine*, 18(10), 772-776. doi:10.1111/hiv.12521
- Hojilla, J. C., Koester, K. A., Cohen, S. E., Buchbinder, S., Ladzekpo, D., Matheson, T., & Liu, A. Y. (2016). Sexual behavior, risk compensation, and HIV prevention strategies among participants in the San Francisco PrEP Demonstration Project: A qualitative analysis of counseling notes. *AIDS and Behavior*, 20(7), 1461-1469. doi:10.1007/s10461-015-1055-5
- Holloway, I. W., Dougherty, R., Gildner, J., Beougher, S. C., Pulsipher, C., Montoya, J. A., ... Leibowitz, A. (2017). PrEP uptake, adherence, and discontinuation among California YMSM using geosocial networking applications. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 74(1), 15-20. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000001164
- Hood, J. E., Buskin, S. E., Dombrowski, J. C., Kern, D. A., Barash, E. A., Katzi, D. A., & Golden, M. R. (2016). Dramatic increase in preexposure prophylaxis use among MSM in Washington state. *AIDS*, 30(3), 515-519. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000000937
- Hoots, B. E., Finlayson, T., Nerlander, L., & Paz-Bailey, G. (2016). Willingness to take, use of, and indications for pre-exposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men-20 US cities, 2014. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 63(5), 672-677. doi:10.1093/cid/ciw367
- Hosek, S., Siberry, G., Bell, M., Lally, M., Kapogiannis, B., Green, K., ... Wilson, C. M. (2013). The acceptability and feasibility of an HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) trial with young men who have sex with men. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 62(4), 447-456. doi:10.1097/QAI.0b013e3182801081
- Hosek, S., Rudy, B., Landovitz, R., Kapogiannis, B., Siberry, G., Rutledge, B., ... Wilson, C. (2017). An HIV preexposure prophylaxis demonstration project and safety study for young MSM. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 74(1), 21-29. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000001179
- Huang, X. J., Hou, J. H., Song, A. X., Liu, X. C., Yang, X. D., Xu, J. J., ... Wu, H. (2018). Efficacy and safety of oral TDF-based pre-exposure prophylaxis for men who have sex with men: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, 9, 799. doi:10.3389/fphar.2018.00799
- Klevens, R. M., Martin, B. M., Doherty, R., Fukuda, H. D., Cranston, K., & DeMaria, A., Jr. (2017). Factors associated with pre-exposure prophylaxis in a highly insured population of urban men who have sex with men, 2014. *AIDS and Behavior*, 22(4), 1879-1882. doi:10.1007/s10461-017-1879-2
- Kuhns, L., Hottot, A., Schneider, J., Garofalo, R., & Fujimoto, K. (2017). Use of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in young men who have sex with men is associated with race, sexual risk behavior and peer network size. *AIDS and Behavior*, 21(5), 1376-1382. doi:10.1007/s10461-017-1739-0
- Liberati, A., Altman, G., Tetzlaff, J., Gotzsche, C., Ionnidis, P., & Moher, D. (2009). The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: Explanation and elaboration. *BMJ*, 339, b2700. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2700>
- Liu, A. Y., Cohen, S. E., Vittinghoff, E., Anderson, P. L., Doblecki-Lewis, S., Bacon, O., ... Kolber, M. A. (2016). Preexposure prophylaxis for HIV infection integrated with municipal- and community-based sexual health services. *Journal of the American Medical Association Internal Medicine*, 176(1), 75-84. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.4683
- Liu, A. Y., Hessol, N. A., Vittinghoff, E., Amico, K. R., Kroboth, E., Fuchs, J., ... Buchbinder, S. P. (2014). Medication adherence among men who have sex with men at risk for HIV infection in the United States: Implications for pre-exposure prophylaxis implementation. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, 28(12), 622-627. doi:10.1089/apc.2014.0195
- Liu, A. Y., Kittredge, P. V., Vittinghoff, E., Raymond, H. F., Ahrens, K., Matheson, T., ... Buchbinder, S. P. (2008). Limited knowledge and use of HIV post- and pre-exposure prophylaxis among gay and bisexual men. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 47(2), 241-247. doi:10.1097/QAI.0b013e31815e4041
- Liu, A. Y., Vittinghoff, E., Chillag, K., Mayer, K., Thompson, M., Grohskopf, L., ... Buchbinder, S. P. (2013). Sexual risk behavior among HIV-uninfected men who have sex with men participating in a tenofovir preexposure prophylaxis randomized trial in the United States. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 64(1), 87-94. doi:10.1097/QAI.014e31828f097a
- Malone, J., Syvertsen, J. L., Johnson, B. E., Mimiaga, M. J., Mayer, K. H., & Bazzi, A. R. (2017). Negotiating sexual safety in the era of biomedical HIV prevention: Relationship dynamics among male couples using pre-exposure prophylaxis. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 20(6), 658-672. doi:10.1080/13691058.2017.1368711
- Marcus, J. L., Hurley, L. B., Hare, C. B., Nguyen, D. P., Phengrasamy, T., Silverberg, M. J., ... Volk, J. E. (2016). Preexposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention in a large integrated health care system: Adherence, renal safety, and discontinuation. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 73(5), 540-546. doi:10.1097%2FQAI.0000000000001129
- Maxwell, S., Shahmanesh, M., & Gafos, M. (2019). Chemsex behaviours among men who have sex with men: A systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 63, 74-89. doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2018.11.014
- Mayer, K. H., Safren, S. A., Elsesser, S. A., Psaros, C., Tinsley, J. P., Marzinke, M., ... Mimiaga, M. J. (2017). Optimizing pre-exposure antiretroviral prophylaxis adherence in men who have sex with men: Results of a pilot randomized controlled trial of "Life-Steps for PrEP". *AIDS and Behavior*, 21(5), 1350-1360. doi:10.1007/s10461-016-1606-4
- Mayer, K., Oldenburg, C., Novak, D., Elsesser, S., Krakower, D., & Mimiaga, M. (2016). Early adopters: Correlates of HIV

- chemoprophylaxis use in recent online samples of US men who have sex with men. *AIDS and Behavior*, 20(7), 1489-1498. doi:10.1007/s10461-015-1237-1
- McCormack, S., Dunn, D., Desai, M., Dolling, D., Gafos, M., Gilson, R., ... Gill, O. (2016). Pre-exposure prophylaxis to prevent the acquisition of HIV-1 infection (PROUD): Effectiveness results from the pilot phase of a pragmatic open-label randomised trial. *Lancet*, 387(10013), 53-60. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00056-2
- Meaden, H., Ayvazo, S., & Ostrosky, M. (2014). The ABCs of challenging behavior: Understanding basic concepts. *Young Exceptional Children*, 19(1), 3-15. doi:10.1177/2F1096250614523969
- Mimiaga, M. J., Closson, E. F., Kothary, V., & Mitty, J. A. (2014). Sexual partnerships and considerations for HIV antiretroviral pre-exposure prophylaxis utilization among high-risk substance using men who have sex with men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 43(1), 99-106. doi:10.1007/s10508-013-0208-8
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G., The PRISMA Group. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Medicine*, 6(7), e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097
- Molina, J.-M., Charreau, I., Spire, B., Cotte, L., Chas, J., Capitant, C., ... Meyer, L. (2017). Efficacy, safety, and effect on sexual behaviour of on-demand pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV in men who have sex with men: An observational cohort study. *Lancet HIV*, 4, e402-e410. doi:10.1016/S2352-3018%2817%2930089-9
- Molina, J., Capitant, C., Spire, B., Pialoux, G., Cotte, L., Charreau, I., ... Delfraissy, J. (2015). On-demand preexposure prophylaxis in men at high risk for HIV-1 infection. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 373(23), 2237-2246. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1506273
- Montgomery, M. C., Oldenburg, C. E., Nunn, A. S., Mena, L., Anderson, P., Liegler, T., ... Chan, P. A. (2016). Adherence to pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention in a clinical setting. *PLoS One*, 11(6), e0157742. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0157742
- National Heart Lung and Blood Institute. (2019). *Quality assessment tool of observational cohort and cross-sectional studies*. Retrieved from <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools>
- Office for National Statistics. (2014). *Drug misuse: Findings from the 2013/14 Crime Survey for England and Wales*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/drug-misuse-findings-from-the-2013-to-2014-csew/drug-misuse-findings-from-the-2013-14-crime-survey-for-england-and-wales>
- Okafor, C. N., Gorbach, P. M., Ragsdale, A., Quinn, B., & Shoptaw, S. (2017). Correlates of preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP) use among men who have sex with men (MSM) in Los Angeles, California. *Journal of Urban Health*, 94(5), 710-715. doi:10.1007/s11524-017-0172-z
- Oldenburg, C. E., Mitty, J. A., Biello, K. B., Closson, E. F., Safren, S. A., Mayer, K. H., & Mimiaga, M. J. (2016). Differences in attitudes about HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis use among stimulant versus alcohol using men who have sex with men. *AIDS and Behavior*, 20(7), 1451-1460. doi:10.1007/s10461-015-1226-4
- Oldenburg, C. E., Nunn, A. S., Montgomery, M., Almonte, A., Mena, L., Patel, R. R., ... Chan, P. A. (2017). Behavioral changes following uptake of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men in a clinical setting. *AIDS and Behavior*, 22, 1075-1079. doi:10.1007/s10461-017-1701-1
- Parker, S., Chan, P. A., Oldenburg, C. E., Hoffmann, M., Poceta, J., Harvey, J., ... Nunn, A. (2015). Patient experiences of men who have sex with men using pre-exposure prophylaxis to prevent HIV infection. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, 29(12), 639-642. doi:10.1089/apc.2015.0186
- Parsons, J. T., Rendina, H. J., Lassiter, J. M., Whitfield, T. H. F., Starks, T. J., & Grov, C. (2017). Uptake of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in a national cohort of gay and bisexual men in the United States. *Journal Of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 74(3), 285-292. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000001251
- Patrick, R., Forrest, D., Cardenas, G., Opoku, J., Magnus, M., Phillips, G., II... Kuo, I. (2017). Awareness, willingness, and use of pre-exposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men in Washington, DC and Miami-Dade County, FL: National HIV Behavioral Surveillance, 2011 and 2014. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 75(Suppl 3), S375-S382. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000001414
- Pinto, R. M., Berringer, K. R., Melendez, R., & Mmeje, O. (2018). Improving PrEP implementation through multilevel interventions: A synthesis of the literature. *AIDS and Behavior*, 22(11), 3681-3691. doi:10.1007/s10461-018-2184-4
- Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Arai, A., Rodgers, M., & Britten, N. (2006). *Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews*. London, UK: Institute for Health Research.
- Raifman, J., Nunn, A., Oldenburg, C. E., Montgomery, M. C., Almonte, A., Agwu, A. L., ... Chan, P. A. (2017). An evaluation of a clinical pre-exposure prophylaxis education intervention among men who have sex with men. *Health Services Research*, 53(4), 2249-2267. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.12746
- Rucinski, K. B., Mensah, N. P., Sepkowitz, K. A., Cutler, B. H., Sweeney, M. M., & Myers, J. E. (2013). Knowledge and use of pre-exposure prophylaxis among an online sample of young men who have sex with men in New York City. *AIDS and Behavior*, 17(6), 2180-2184. doi:10.1007/s10461-013-0443-y
- Sagaon-Teyssier, L., Suzan-Monti, M., Demoulin, B., Capitant, C., Lorente, N., Preau, M., ... Spire, B. (2016). Uptake of PrEP and condom and sexual risk behavior among MSM during the ANRS IPERGAY trial. *AIDS Care*, 28, 48-55. doi:10.1080/09540121.2016.1146653
- Sidebottom, D., Ekstrom, A. M., & Stromdahl, S. (2018). A systematic review of adherence to oral pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV: How can we improve uptake and adherence? *BMC Infectious Diseases*, 18(581), 2-14. doi:10.1186/s12879-018-3463-4
- Snowden, J. M., Chen, Y.-H., McFarland, W., & Raymond, H. F. (2017). Prevalence and characteristics of users of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) among men who have sex with men, San Francisco, 2014 in a cross-sectional survey: Implications for disparities. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, 93(1), 52-55. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2015-052382
- Storholm, E. D., Volk, J. E., Marcus, J. L., Silverberg, M. J., & Satre, D. D. (2017). Risk perception, sexual behaviors, and PrEP adherence among substance-using men who have sex with men: A qualitative study. *Prevention Science*, 18(6), 737-747. doi:10.1007/s11121-017-0799-8
- Strauss, B. B., Greene, G. J., Phillips, G., II, Bhatia, R., Madkins, K., Parsons, J. T., & Mustanski, B. (2017). Exploring patterns of awareness and use of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis among young men who have sex with men. *AIDS and Behavior*, 21(5), 1288-1298. doi:10.1007/s10461-016-1480-0
- Tan, D. H. S., Leon-Carlyle, M., Mills, R., Moses, E., & Carvalhal, A. (2016). Self-administered screening for syndemic mental health problems should be routinely implemented among MSM PrEP users. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health*, 20(1), 13-20. doi:10.1080/19359705.2015.1105765
- Taylor, S. W., Mayer, K. H., Elsesser, S. M., Mimiaga, M. J., O'Cleirigh, C., & Safren, S. A. (2014). Optimizing content for pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) counseling for men who have sex with men: Perspectives of PrEP users and high-risk PrEP naive men. *AIDS and Behavior*, 18(5), 871-879. doi:10.1007/s10461-013-0617-7
- The World Bank. (2019). *World Bank and lending groups: Country classifications*. Retrieved from <https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/topics/19280-country-classification>
- Traeger, M. W., Schroeder, S. E., Wright, E. J., Hellard, M. E., Cornelisse, V. J., Doyle, J. S., & Stooze, M. A. (2018). Effects of pre-exposure prophylaxis for the prevention of human immunodeficiency virus infection on sexual risk behavior in men who have sex with men: A systematic review and meta-analysis.

- Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 67(5), 676-686. doi:10.1093/cid/ciy182
- Volk, J. E., Marcus, J. L., Phengrasamy, T., Blechinger, D., Nguyen, D. P., Follansbee, S., & Hare, C. B. (2015). No new HIV infections with increasing use of HIV preexposure prophylaxis in a clinical practice setting. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 61(10), 1601-1603. doi:10.1093/cid/civ778
- Young, I., & McDaid, L. (2014). How acceptable are antiretrovirals for the prevention of sexually transmitted HIV?: A review of research on the

- acceptability of oral pre-exposure prophylaxis and treatment as prevention. *AIDS and Behavior*, 18(2), 195-216. doi:10.1007/s10461-013-0560-7
- Zablotska, I. B., Prestage, G., de Wit, J., Grulich, A. E., Mao, L. M., & Holt, M. (2013). The informal use of antiretrovirals for preexposure prophylaxis of HIV infection among gay men in Australia. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 62(3), 334-338. doi:10.1097/QAI.0b013e31827e854a

For 13 additional continuing education articles related to HIV or AIDS care, go to NursingCenter.com/CE.

Instructions:

- Read the article on page E38.
- The test for this CE activity can be **taken online** at www.NursingCenter.com/CE/JANAC. Find the test under the article title. Tests can no longer be mailed or faxed.
- You will need to create a username and password and login to your personal CE Planner account before taking online tests. (It's free!) Your planner will keep track of all your Lippincott Professional Development online CE activities for you.
- There is only one correct answer for each question. A passing score for this test is 13 correct answers. If you pass, you can print your certificate of earned contact hours and access the answer key. If you fail, you have the option of taking the test again at no additional cost.

- For questions, contact Lippincott Professional Development: 1-800-787-8985.

Registration Deadline: June 4, 2021

Disclosure Statement: The authors and planners have disclosed that they have no financial relationships related to this article.

Provider Accreditation:

Lippincott Professional Development will award 1.5 contact hours for this continuing nursing education activity.

LPD is accredited as a provider of continuing nursing education by the American Nurses Credentialing Center's Commission on Accreditation.

This activity is also provider approved by the California Board of Registered Nursing, Provider Number CEP 11749 for 1.5 contact hours. LPD is also an approved provider of continuing nursing education by the District of Columbia, Georgia, and Florida, CE Broker #50-1223.

Your certificate is valid in all states.

Payment:

- The registration fee for this test is \$9.95 for members and \$17.95 for nonmembers.

DOI: 10.1097/JNC.000000000000108