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Family Planning and HIV Interventions among Women in Low-income Settings

Abstract

This dissertation examines the effectiveness of interventions related to family planning and the uptake of HIV-related preventive services among women in low-income settings. Women in low-income settings and living with HIV face many barriers to care, including limited access to services for family planning and HIV-related preventive care. At the same time, national, regional, and global efforts are looking for interventions to help control rapid population growth, create an HIV-free generation, and provide adequate preventive care for those living with HIV. This dissertation cuts across these issues and can help to inform debate and policies to address these issues.

This dissertation comprises three discrete papers. Paper 1 (chapter 1) examines the effectiveness of a national scale-up of community-based distribution of family planning services on contraceptive use in Malawi’s rural areas during the period 2005-2016. The national-scale up of the intervention followed the success of a pilot of a similar intervention implemented in the period 1999-2004. As in the pilot, the scaled-up program distributed condoms and oral contraceptives and provided family planning education. Further, because education and income are important determinants of individual contraceptive use, the paper also examines whether the effectiveness of the national scale CBDs varies over these dimensions. The paper uses the Malawi Demographic and Health Surveys. The study finds that the intervention increased contraceptive use by 6.8 percentage points and the effects were greater among uneducated and low-income women.

Paper 2 (chapter 2) conducts a cost-effectiveness analysis of a trial of cash incentives aimed at increasing the uptake of services for the prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT) of
HIV. The trial was conducted in the Democratic of the Congo (DRC) as part of an effort to find ways of increasing uptake of PMTCT services in sub-Saharan Africa where uptake of these services remains low. The study is conducted from the societal perspective, relies on multiple sources within and outside of the DRC for cost data, and reports economic costs in 2016 International Dollars (I$). At a threshold of 3*GDP per capita for the DRC (I$2409), the study finds that the intervention is cost-effective.

Paper 3 (chapter 3) examines the guideline concordance of the time to follow-up anal cancer screening in women living with HIV at high risk for anal cancer. In the US, the incidence of anal cancer in women living with HIV has increased significantly in the past 2-3 decades. However, early detection of anal cancer, through regular screening, can lead to effective secondary prevention of the disease. While guidelines for anal cancer screening exist, very little is known about the guideline concordance of the time to follow-up anal cancer screening in women at high risk of acquiring anal cancer. Hence this study. The study uses Medicaid Analytic eXtract files which compile claims of individuals enrolled in Medicaid—a public health insurance program largely for eligible low-income adults and the largest single payer for HIV/AIDS in the US. The study finds that time to follow-up screening is not guideline-concordant for most women living with HIV, particularly those with one of the two risk factors for anal cancer: a history of abnormal cervical test results or a history of genital warts.
Chapter 1: The effects of community-based distribution of family planning services on contraceptive use in Malawi

Abstract

**Background:** To address rapid population growth, Malawi implemented and scaled-up a pilot project of community-based distribution (CBD) of family planning services. However, the effects of the scaled-up (national) CBDs on contraceptive use remain unclear. To address this knowledge gap, we evaluated the effectiveness of the national CBDs of family planning on contraceptive use. We also investigated whether education and income, two important determinants of individual-level contraceptive use behaviors, moderate these effects.

**Methods:** We used the 2000/2004 and 2010/2016 Malawi Demographic and Health Surveys (N=57,978) and difference-in-differences analyses to estimate the effects of the 2005 national scale-up of CBDs on modern contraceptive use. We used rural and urban communities as the intervention and comparison groups since the national CBDs were implemented only in rural communities. Contraceptive use is defined as current use of any modern contraceptive method—e.g., pills—and was modeled using multilevel logistic regression.

**Results:** Prior to the national CBD scale-up (2000/2004), the probability of using contraceptives was 21.5% in rural communities and 26.3% in urban communities. In the post-scale-up period (2010/2016), the probability of using contraceptives increased in both rural and urban communities but was greater in rural communities (44.9% vs. 42.9%). The effect attributable to CBDs was 6.8 percentage points (95% CI=3.3, 9.7). The effects of the CBD scale-up were greater among uneducated and low-income women.

**Conclusions:** These findings suggest that national CBDs increase overall contraceptive use, particularly in rural communities. Poor and uneducated women benefit more from family planning interventions that reduce communication and financial barriers. Further research on the effects of national CBDs on fertility, as well as the value and affordability of the national CBDs, is needed.
1. Introduction

Since gaining independence from the British in 1964, Malawi has experienced rapid population growth [1], [2], which has strained the country’s resources in important sectors of education and health and has undermined the country’s efforts to reduce poverty [3]. Malawi’s population grew by about 500%, from 3.7 million in 1964 to over 17 million in 2015 [1], [2]. To find ways to slow the population growth, the Malawi government with financial support from the World Bank rolled out a pilot of the Learning and Innovation Population and Family Planning (Pop/FP) Project [4]–[6]. The pilot’s objective was to test the feasibility of implementing a comprehensive community approach aimed at increasing the demand for and improving access to family planning services among hard-to-reach populations [6], [7]. The project trained community-based distribution1 (CBD) agents to carry modern contraceptive methods (pills and condoms) and conduct family planning education in local languages of their designated communities of service [5], [6]. Some CBD agents of family planning referred clients to health facilities for services the agents could not provide [4].

The pilot project was implemented from 1999 to 2003 in 3 districts, one in each region. The districts were Chiradzulu in the South, Dowa in the Center and Chitipa in the North [5], [6], figure 1. The districts were selected based on the presence of a committed District Health Management Team (DHMT), low contraceptive prevalence rate (CPR), high population density, and low literacy rates [7]. Each pilot district had one control selected based on proximity and comparable socio-demographic characteristics (e.g., education) [5], [7]. The controls were

---
1 The idea of a community approach to delivering family planning services was not entirely new in Malawi. It was first introduced in the late 1980s [4]. In 1991, the Christian Health Association of Malawian—an umbrella body of faith organizations providing healthcare services in Malawi—started a similar initiative [4]. The difference, however, is that prior efforts were not well coordinated, did not have a large presence in the communities, and had little or no involvement of public sector institutions [4].
Mulanje for Chiradzulu, Ntchisi for Dowa and Karonga for Chitipa [5], [7]. An end-of-pilot evaluation in 2003 suggested that the pilot was effective in increasing contraceptive use [5], [6]. Given the pilot project’s effectiveness, it was scaled-up to the national level in late 2004. However, no study has evaluated the effect of the national CBD scale-up. Therefore, the current study investigates the effect of the full national scale-up of the CBDs of family planning (henceforth, CBDs) on contraceptive use during the period 2005-2016. Furthermore, because education and income are important determinants of individual contraceptive use behavior [8]–[11] and the intervention was designed to reduce or eliminate information and financial barriers to accessing contraceptives [5], [6], we also examine whether the effect of the CBDs varies by the education or income of the target population. The first hypothesis is that CBDs increased the number of women using modern contraceptives. The second hypothesis is that the effects of CBDs on contraceptive use are moderated (influenced) by both the education and income of the women receiving the services and these effects greater among highly educated and high-income women. The scale of the CBDs was done simultaneously across the country [personal communication, Malawi’s Ministry of Health, January 2016].

Understanding the effect of the full scale-up of Malawi CBDs is important for several reasons. First, many projects implemented in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) show promise of success when implemented as pilots [12]–[16], [17, p. 360], [18], [19], but when scaled to the national level, the evidence on the performance of such projects is lacking. This makes it difficult for policymakers to respond to emerging challenges and set new goals for the countries to achieve. Moreover, the few studies that have evaluated large-scale or scaled-up CBDs in Africa were not rigorous enough to provide reliable evidence that can be extrapolated to Malawi for evidence-based decision making. The studies either lacked control groups [20], [21] or did
not use pre- and post-intervention study designs [22]. This study addresses the methodological shortcomings of the previous studies by implementing a difference-in-differences technique to mimic an experimental study design to identify the effect of the CBDs on contraceptive use.

The second reason for evaluating the effects of the national CBDs in Malawi is that the selection criteria of the pilot districts (e.g., the presence of a committed DHMT and low district CPR) predisposed the pilot of the CBDs to demonstrate a level of effectiveness higher than would have been the case had the districts been randomly selected [6], [7]. Therefore, as these criteria suggest that the pilot districts were systematically different from the non-pilot districts and that the effect of CBDs in the pilot project might have been overstated, it is important to investigate the effect of the CBDs in the non-pilot districts after the scale-up.

Third and importantly, the national scale-up was implemented as a variant of the pilot project as not all conditions in the pilot project were maintained in the national scale-up which raises questions about the effectiveness of the scaled-up CBDs. A comparison of the pilot and national CBDs is provided in table 1. Notably, a monthly $6 cash payment to each CBD agent during the pilot was discontinued. Moreover, during the pilot the CBDs were primarily supervised by project employees who were given adequate resources, including motorcycles; in the national scale-up, primary CBD supervisors are government employees (Health Surveillance Assistants [HSA]—a cadre of community health workers) who use push bicycles to conduct the supervision [6]. Without the cash incentives and questions about supervision adequacy in the national scale-up, it is unclear whether the CBDs continued to be as effective as they were in the pilot.

In sum, an investigation into the effects of Malawi CBDs is needed as evidence on the effectiveness of the CBDs at the national level is lacking, but this evidence is important to Malawi. The evidence can be used by the Malawi government in the reorganization of the
country's priorities as the country works to achieve its target of eliminating poverty, providing quality education, and ensuring healthy lives for Malawians [3].

The rest of the study is organized as follows. Section 2 presents a background to the community-based distribution of family planning. Sections 3 and 4 present the theoretical/conceptual framework and methods. Results are presented in section 5. A discussion of the study's findings, strengths and limitations, and implications for policy is presented in section 6. Section 7 concludes.

2. **Background to community-based distribution of family planning services**

Community-based distribution (CBD) refers to strategies that rely on community structures, including community leaders and trained non-professional members of the community, to provide health services in the communities [23], [24]. CBDs of family planning promote the use of simple and safe non-clinical family planning methods such as oral contraceptives and condoms [24]. CBDs were introduced to reduce the unmet need for family planning in many parts of the world, particularly in rural areas of LMIC where the healthcare workforce is limited, stock-outs of modern contraceptives are frequent, and travel distances to health facilities are long [25]–[29]. CBDs were started in Latin America in the 1960s, then in Asia in the 1970s and more recently after 1980 in Africa [24], [30].

The promotion of CBDs in LMICs is based on theory and evidence which suggest that the CBDs have many advantages over services received in clinical settings. First, by bringing services to the communities, CBDs are more convenient for many people to access family planning services [23], [24], [27]. Second, family planning services received from CBDs cost less because many CBD agents work as volunteers or accept a small payment for their services and do not require extensive training [27], [31]. Third, it is easier for people in the communities to accept family
planning messages from the CBD agents since in many cases, the CBD agents are respectable and trusted members of their communities, especially when they are selected by the communities themselves [24]. Moreover, because CBD agents usually have many commonalities (e.g., language and cultural beliefs) with the rest of the community, it is easier for them to overcome social customs and traditions hindering the uptake of contraceptives [24], [27], [29], [32], [33].

Fourth, there is repeated messaging: because the CBD agents often reside in communities in which they provide the family planning services, there are more opportune occasions (e.g., social gatherings) where they can talk about family planning [4], [27]. The CBD agents may also informally talk about family planning which can be more appealing than the demand-based and static clinical set-up [27].

2.1. The effectiveness of community-based distribution of family planning

Despite CBDs being considered an important innovation in the delivery of family planning services, evidence of their effectiveness is mixed and mainly comes from pilot projects. Data show that CBDs have increased contraceptive use in many parts of Africa [14]–[16], [21], [34], [35], and that the positive effects of the CBDs persist when the portfolio of methods carried by CBDs is expanded beyond the non-clinical methods to include depot medroxyprogesterone acetate (DMPA)—an injectable contraception [12], [17], [36]. Furthermore, CBDs are still effective even when the CBDs integrate family planning services with other services [36], or when social institutions are the medium for channeling family planning information [24], or in makeshift settings in times of crisis [37]. However, evidence suggests that CBDs have not increased contraceptive use in some parts of Africa [20], [38], [39].

The effectiveness of CBDs depends on many factors. CBDs are more effective in communities with low CPR [24], [29], in more rural and isolated communities [14], [27], and in earlier periods
of CBD implementation [14]. Characteristics of the CBD agents also affect the effectiveness of the CBDs, although this evidence is mixed. Reports show that CBD agents are less effective if the agents are not well educated [39], [40]. However, other evidence shows that the agents’ age, education, and marital status have no association with CBDs’ productivity [41], although the sex of the CBD agent is important in influencing the choice of the contraceptive method [29].

Despite the evidence that contextual factors and characteristics of the CBD agents influence the effectiveness of CBDs, it is unclear whether the education and income of the target population also affect the effectiveness of CBDs. It is important to understand the role of education and income of the people receiving services from the CBDs because education and income are important determinants of individual contraceptive use behavior [8]–[11], and the CBD agents disseminate family planning information in ways that are easier to understand and overcome financial barriers associated with accessing contraceptives [13], [24]. Therefore, apart from investigating the effects of Malawi CBDs on contraceptive use, we also investigate whether the education and income of the target population affect the effectiveness of the CBDs.

3. Theoretical and conceptual framework

To understand the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use, we draw upon the economic framework for fertility analysis and the human capital model of demand for health. The economic framework for fertility analysis expands on consumer choice approaches [42] by incorporating supply factors and the cost of regulating fertility to understand household fertility behavior [43]. The theory notes that a household’s need to regulate fertility arises when its biological supply of children exceeds its demand for the children [43]. However, there are costs to fertility regulation. The costs could be objective (e.g., transportation and contraceptive costs) or subjective (e.g., coping with using contraceptives against one’s beliefs) [44]. While having many children may
provide utility to some households [45] or alleviate the subjective feeling of poverty in some societies of LMICs [46], the relatively high costs of obtaining modern contraceptives prevent many households in LMICs from regulating their fertility [47]–[49]; this is where CBDs become relevant and important in Malawi. By bringing contraceptives to the communities, the CBDs bring down the objective costs of fertility regulation to almost zero. CBD clients are not required to pay for services received from the CBDs because public health services in Malawi are free at the point of delivery [50].

We also draw upon the human capital model of demand for health by Grossman which identifies two pathways through which education impacts health behaviors like contraceptive use. First, through productive efficiency: educated people are better decision makers and thus have higher marginal products in the health production process [51]. Second, through allocative efficiency: educated people tend to have more knowledge about health which helps them to change their set of choices as well as behaviors to produce more health [51], [52]. The information shared by CBDs adds to the knowledge educated people already had, making it easier for them to dispense with traditional customs and beliefs that may impede contraceptive use [8]. In sum, although both educated and uneducated people might have improved access to contraceptives through CBDs, educated people are likely to process family planning information better, discuss and follow recommendations for contraceptive use [8], [53], [54].

Based on the two economic theories, we developed a conceptual framework of the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use while incorporating contextual or community factors which may also influence contraceptive use as documented in the literature [8], [9], [55]–[58], figure 2. The conceptual framework is specific to rural communities as CBDs work in rural communities only. The framework shows that contraceptive use is influenced by CBDs, the intervention, as well as
individual-level characteristics (maternal and paternal) of the target population and community-level factors. As the study has hypothesized that the direct effect of CBDs on contraceptive use is moderated by education and income, education and income were extracted from the other individual-level characteristics so that their moderating effects on the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use could be depicted as hypothesized. Further, the framework shows that individual-level characteristics of the target population affect contraceptive use directly or indirectly via community characteristics.

4. Materials and methods

4.1. Overview

The study used data from four waves (2000, 2004, 2010, and 2016) of the Malawi Demographic and Health Surveys (MDHS) and the difference-in-differences (DD) method to estimate the effect of the CBDs on contraceptive use in a weighted sample of 52,768 women aged 15–49 years. As CBDs were implemented only in rural communities, the rural communities were designated as the intervention group and urban communities as controls; primary sampling units were used as a proxy for communities. As CBDs were introduced in 2005, data collected before 2005 (MDHS2000 and MDHS2004) represented the pre-intervention period while MDHS2010 and MDHS2015 represented the post-intervention period. Contraceptive use was defined as current use of any modern contraceptive method—for example, pills. Contraceptive use was modeled as a binary variable (“no method” and “modern method”) in a multi-level logistic regression with women nested in communities and communities nested in districts.

4.2. Data sources

Four waves of the Malawi Demographic and Health Surveys (MDHS2000, MDHS2004, MDHS2010 and MDHS2016) were used in this study. The surveys were conducted by the
National Statistical Office (NSO) in partnership with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the country’s other development partners [57], [59]–[61]. In years 2000, 2004, 2010, and 2016, the surveys covered 14,213, 15,091, 27,000 and 26,361 households, respectively [57], [59]–[61]. From the selected households, eligible women aged 15-49 years and men aged 15-54 years in a sub-sample of about one-third of the households were interviewed. The surveys provided comprehensive up-to-date information on education, wealth, and contraceptive use, among other indicators [57], [59]–[61]. The surveys use two-stage stratified cluster sampling to produce representative samples of urban and rural populations at the district, regional and national levels. Urban areas are defined as any of the country's major cities or areas encompassing district administrative headquarters or any official town planning areas; all the other areas are rural [62].

4.3. Hierarchical structure of the data

Since the surveys use multi-stage sampling designs to generate nationally representative samples, data from the surveys have a hierarchical or clustered structure [63]–[65]. Elements sampled in the first-stage, districts, constitute the highest level while those sampled in the final-stage, women, are the lowest units [63]. Thus, women are nested in communities and the communities in districts. The nesting means that women from the same community or district are similar and do not act as independent observations in their use of contraceptives. The similarity might be due to unobserved factors, like having similar cultural and traditional beliefs, which can facilitate or hinder contraceptive use [66], [67]. Therefore, statistical modeling of these data should account for this dependence to avoid producing biased estimates [63], [68]. As discussed below, contraceptive use was modeled using a multilevel model to account for the hierarchical structure of the data.
4.4. Sample

The final sample comprised 57,524 women, representing about 79% of women in the four MDHS files. Figure 3. The data for this study came from the “women recode” files. Figure 3 shows how the sample was derived and the number of women from each wave of the MDHS. Infecund women, defined as women wanting to have another child but not being able to get pregnant, were excluded. Pregnant women were also excluded because the dependent variable was constructed from a question which focused on current contraceptive use. All women, regardless of marital status, were included in the study as they can all demand contraceptives. However, the association between CBDs and contraceptive use was also examined in a subsample of married women to make the findings more comparable to those from the pilot of the CBDs which reported contraceptive use among married women only [5].

4.5. Variable definition

4.5.1. Dependent Variable

The dependent variable is current use of modern contraceptive methods, and it is binary (1=using a modern method and 0= not using a modern method). The women were asked this question:

Are you currently [at the time of the interview] doing something or using any method to delay or avoid getting pregnant [70]?

Women answering “YES” to this question were further asked to mention the methods they were using. The contraceptive methods were classified as either modern or traditional. Modern methods include injections, pills, intrauterine device, diaphragm, condoms, sterilization, implants, foam or jelly, and lactational amenorrhea; traditional methods include abstinence and withdrawal [69]. Abortion was not considered as contraception because contraception was
defined as any effort to reduce the risk of conception. The three categories of contraceptive use ("no method", "traditional method", and "modern method") were collapsed into two categories "no method" and "modern method" as <2% of the women used "traditional methods". A test for combining categories of the dependent variable proposed by Long and Freese [71] showed that "traditional methods" and "no method" could be collapsed into one category as the two categories were indistinguishable.

4.5.2. Explanatory variables

Consistent with the conceptual framework in figure 2, explanatory variables were classified into two broad groups: individual-level variables and community-level variables. Among the individual-level variables, the woman’s partner’s education and occupation were included as these may also affect contraceptive use regardless of the woman’s characteristics [72], [73]. Community variables were also included because these may exert influence on women’s behaviors related to contraceptive use [74], [75]. For example, community literacy was included because women without any education may get assistance or encouragement to use contraceptives from other women with education in the same community. All explanatory variables, including definitions and how they were constructed, are presented in Appendix A1.

4.6. Identification strategy: difference-in-differences

We used the difference-in-differences (DD) method to identify the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use. The method rests on the parallel paths assumption, which states that the intervention and comparison groups would have followed the same time trends were there no intervention [76]–[78]. An effective policy intervention, therefore, causes the intervention group to deviate from its time trend [76], [78], [79]. The assumption, however, requires that the policy change should be exogenous or that any of the groups should not systematically select to adopt
the policy change. The study identified rural and urban communities as the intervention and comparison groups, respectively, although the government did not explicitly say that it was introducing CBDs in rural communities. However, by the scope of their work and as corroborated by a family planning expert [personal communication, Directorate of Reproductive Health and Family Planning in Malawi, January 2017], CBDs operate in rural communities only. CBDs target populations residing in hard-to-reach communities and urban communities are not hard-to-reach; many urban communities have wealthier households, better roads, and a higher supply of both health facilities and healthcare workforce, all of which permit easy access to healthcare services [80], [81] and diminish the need for CBDs in the urban communities.

Furthermore, the period before 2005 was identified as the pre-CBD period while the period after 2005 was the post-CBD period, figure 4. The introduction of CBDs occurred from December 2004 to February 2005 while interviews for MDHS2004 started in October 2004 and were completed in February 2005 [59]. Although there was an overlap of two months (December and January) between the introduction of CBDs and the data collection process, the overlap was not expected to affect the identification strategy. This is because data collection for the MDHS2004 had just started when CBDs were being introduced, and it was likely that CBD effects had a time lag. Therefore, the assumption was that the data collected in December 2004 and January 2005 did not capture CBD effects on contraceptive use. So, MDHS2000 and MDHS2004 were designated as the baseline surveys and MDHS2010 and MDHS2016 as the post-intervention surveys. However, in sensitivity analysis (Appendix A2), the effect of the overlap was checked by redefining the pre-CBD period to the year 2000 and removing the year 2004 from the analyses.
Finally, the three districts (Chitipa, Ntchisi, and Chiradzulu) in which the pilot of the CBDs was conducted (1999 to 2003) were excluded from the analysis. A change in the trend of contraceptive use after 2004 in rural communities of these districts was not expected because CBDs operated almost continuously from 1999 through 2016. In sensitivity analysis (Appendix A2), the validity of the identification strategy was tested by examining contraceptive use in areas where CBDs were expected not to have significant effects, namely, in the three pilot districts and in urban communities.

4.7. Statistical analysis

Data were analyzed using univariable and multivariable statistical approaches. In univariable analyses, categorical variables were described using proportions and continuous variables using averages. In multivariable analyses, contraceptive use was modeled using multilevel logistic regressions to account for the hierarchical structure of the data, as done previously [74], [75], [82]. Multilevel modeling (MLM) was also warranted because CBDs were introduced at a higher level—the community. Since MDHS' do not have a defined geographic area for communities, primary sampling units (PSU) were used as a proxy for communities. On average, each PSU comprised 30 households [57], [59]–[61]. The appropriateness of MLM was tested using the likelihood ratio (LR) test in a comparison of the single-level to the MLM. The degree of clustering in contraceptive use among women at the community and district levels was assessed using the intra-class correlation (ICC)—a measure of the relative similarity among observations from a sampling process and is estimated by analysis of variance and variance components [83], [84].

All analyses were conducted incorporating weights to correct for the unequal probabilities of selection to permit nationally representative estimates of the population. The weights provided in
the MDHS public use files were scaled using a weight-scaling method which makes the cluster size equal to the effective sample size to make the weights more appropriate for adjusting estimations at higher levels of the model [63], [85]. The weight scaling method assumes that level-1 weights are non-informative and uncorrelated with covariates multiplying the random effect thereby yielding unbiased estimates [63].

All results are presented as log-odds and marginal effects. We did not use odds ratios because they are difficult to interpret when logistic regression includes interaction terms [86], [87]. Therefore, we relied on the marginal effects to understand the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use and whether the effect depended on education or income. Statistical significance of the results was determined using p-values and confidence intervals. All analyses were performed in Stata 14.2 [88, p. 14].

4.7.1. Model specifications

4.7.1.1. Effect of CBDs on contraceptive use

To examine the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use, the study’s primary objective, we first estimated a single-level logistic regression and then a multilevel logistic regression in the country's 25 districts in which the pilot of CBDs was not conducted. The multilevel logistic regression was a 3-level random intercept model and was estimated using Stata's "melogit" command [89]. Stata’s melogit performs optimization using the “original metric of variance components” and was preferred to other candidate commands like the meqrlogit because model convergence time is much shorter using the melogit command than the meqr command [89], [90]. The single-level logistic regression for any woman is specified as follows:
\[
\log \left( \frac{\pi_i}{1-\pi_i} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1(Rural) + \beta_2(CBDA) + \beta_3(Rural \times CBDA) + \lambda X_i + \alpha P_j + \\
\gamma_k + \Gamma + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)
\]

Extending the single-level logistic regression in equation 1, the 3-level random intercept model for the \( i \)th woman, in the \( j \)th community and \( k \)th district is specified as follows:

\[
\log \left( \frac{\pi_{ijk}}{1-\pi_{ijk}} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1(Rural_{jk}) + \beta_2(CBDA) + \beta_3(Rural_{jk} \times CBDA) + \lambda X_{ijk} + \\
\alpha P_{jk} + \Gamma + U_k + U_{jk} + \varepsilon_{ijk} \quad (2)
\]

Where:

\( \pi_{ijk} \) is the proportion of women using contraceptives and \( (1-\pi_{ijk}) \) is the proportion of women not using any contraceptives.

\( Rural=1 \) if the community is in a rural area; \( Rural=0 \) for communities in urban areas.

\( CBD=1 \) if year is 2010 or 2016; \( CBD=0 \) if year = 2000 or 2004.

\( X_{jk} \) is a vector of individual-level variables e.g., age (see table A1) and \( \lambda \) is a vector of parameters corresponding to the individual-level characteristics.

\( P_{jk} \) is a vector of community-level variables e.g., community child mortality (see table A1) and \( \alpha \) is a vector of parameters corresponding to the community-level variables.

\( \Gamma \) captures fixed effects for the years 2000, 2004, 2010 and 2016.

\( U_k, U_{jk}, \) and \( \varepsilon_{ijk} \) are adjusted district random effects, community random effects, and individual-level residuals, respectively, and they are all assumed to be independent and normally distributed with zero means [76]. The district and community effects represent the unobserved district and community characteristics which influence contraceptive use.
It these unobserved factors which cause correlation in contraceptive use among women from the same community or district [75, 76].

Thus, for a binary outcome variable $Y_{ijk}$, in equation 2, $\pi_{ijk} = Pr(Y_{ijk}=1)$ is the probability that the $i^{th}$ woman in the $j^{th}$ community in the $k^{th}$ district uses contraceptives and $\log (\pi_{ijk}/[1-\pi_{ijk}])$ is the natural log of using contraceptives versus not using contraceptives.

We assessed the fitness of the model in equation 2 by comparing observed vs. predicted values of contraceptive use and deviance residuals.

4.7.1.2. Assessing moderation

To assess whether education or income moderate (influence) the relationship between CBDs and contraceptive use, we extended the model in equation 2 as follows:

**Education as a moderator**

$$
\log \left( \frac{\pi_{ijk}}{1-\pi_{ijk}} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1(Rural_{jk}) + \beta_2(CBDA) + \beta_3(Education_{ijk}) + \beta_4(Rural_{jk} * CBDA) + \beta_5(Rural * Education_{ijk}) + \beta_6(CBDA * Education_{ijk}) + \beta_7(Rural * CBDA * Education_{ijk}) + \lambda X_{ijk} + \alpha P_{jk} + \Gamma + U_k + U_{jk} + \varepsilon_{ijk} \quad (3)
$$

**Income as a moderator**

$$
\log \left( \frac{\pi_{ijk}}{1-\pi_{ijk}} \right) = \delta_0 + \delta_1(Rural_{jk}) + \delta_2(CBDA) + \delta_3(Income_{ijk}) + \delta_4(Rural_{jk} * CBDA) + \delta_5(Rural * Income_{ijk}) + \delta_6(CBDA * Income_{ijk}) + \delta_7(Rural * CBDA * Income_{ijk}) + \lambda X_{ijk} + \alpha P_{jk} + \Gamma + U_k + U_{jk} + \varepsilon_{ijk} \quad (4)
$$

We defined the parameters, variables, and variances in equations 3 and 4 as in equation 2 above.
5. Results

5.1. Trends in contraceptive use

We examined trends in contraceptive use among rural and urban women before and after implementation of CBDs, figure 5. Over the two periods, the proportion of women using contraceptives increased in both rural communities (where CBDs were implemented nationally) and urban communities. However, the increase was greater among rural women by about 8 percentage points.

5.2. Sample characteristics

We examined the characteristics of a weighted sample of 52,978 (unweighted sample=57,524) women aged 15-49 years, table 2. About 80% of the women were from rural communities. While the percent of women with primary or secondary education increased in both communities, in each period rural women were more likely not to have any education. The percent of low-income women declined in rural communities and stayed the same in urban communities, although in both periods rural women were still less likely to have higher incomes than urban women. In either period, both rural and urban women were more likely to be married but rural women were higher in the percent that was married. The percent of women exposed to family planning information declined in both rural and urban communities, but rural women were less likely to be exposed. Both rural and urban women were most likely not to want to have any more children in both periods, and the percent of women that wanted to delay fertility increased in both communities. Finally, rural communities were more likely to report problems of access to healthcare, higher community child mortality, be poor, illiterate, and want to have more children; these indicators, however, improved after introduction of CBDs.
5.3. Average community and district contraceptive use

We assessed contraceptive use among women from 2,567 communities in 25 districts and found that the odds of using contraceptives in an “average” community and district—given by the overall intercept when district and community effects are equal to zero—was about 0.55 (95% confidence interval (C.I.) =0.51, 0.60) corresponding to a probability of 0.36 (95% C.I.=0.34, 0.38). We also found between-district and between-community variations of 0.04 (95% C.I. = 0.02, 0.09) and 0.28 (95% C.I. = 0.23, 0.35), respectively. These estimates were obtained from an empty multilevel model, and we present caterpillar plots with 95% confidence intervals of average community and district contraceptive use in figures 6 and 7.

In figure 6 and 7, the line at zero represents average log-odds of using contraceptives. We found that in many communities the 95% confidence intervals of contraceptive use overlapped with the zero line, with about 15% of the communities significantly deviating from the overall average. Furthermore, nearly 40% of the districts had contraceptive use that differed significantly from the district average and one district—Mangochi—had below average outlying contraceptive use.

In sum, we found significant heterogeneity in contraceptive use at the community and district levels, providing preliminary evidence supporting using an MLM so that each district and community could have its own intercept.

5.4. Appropriateness of multilevel models

When the single level and multilevel logistic regressions of contraceptive use were compared, we found that the multilevel logistic regression was more appropriate [LR Chi (2) =1852, p<0.0001]. Next, a comparison of two- and three-level logistic regressions showed that the three-level model should be preferred [LR Chi (1) =121, p<0.0001]. The evidence confirmed that women do not act as independent observations in contraceptive use; they are clustered at the
community and district levels. The clustering was about 4 times stronger among women in the same community than among women from different communities of the same district.

5.5. Effect of CBDs on contraceptive use

We present the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use estimated from the MLM in table 3. For comparison, we also include estimates from the single-level model. In all, the results from the two models are consistent with each other, although estimates from the MLM are slightly higher in many cases. Furthermore, the multilevel model had consistently larger standard errors and wider confidence intervals than the single-level model. This suggests that were we to use the single-level model, the probability of type 1 error (rejecting a true null hypothesis) would have been slightly higher than the nominal level as the statistical significance of our results would have been overstated [91], [92]. Our findings suggest that the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use was not homogenous in rural and urban communities as the coefficient of the interaction of CBDs and rural is statistically significant. The results also show that community factors explain the use of modern contraceptive methods in Malawi. The effect of the CBDs on contraceptive use is presented as marginal effects in table 4.

We found that CBDs increased contraceptive use by 6.8 percentage points among all women, table 5. The probabilities were predicted using the fixed part of the random coefficient model which is equivalent to setting the community and district random effects to zero. Thus, the average probabilities are for women in the median community [76]. Before CBDs were introduced, the probability of using contraceptives was 21.5% in rural communities and 26.3% in urban communities. After CBDs were introduced, however, the probability of using contraceptives in rural communities increased substantially and was higher than in urban communities (44.9% vs. 42.9%). Subtracting the urban-rural difference before CBDs from the
urban-rural difference after CBDs shows that CBDs increased contraceptive use by about 6.8 [95% C.I.=3.3, 9.7] percentage points, all other factors held constant. In a sub-sample of married women, CBDs increased the probability of using contraceptives by about 8.2 [95% C.I.=4.1,12.3] percentage points.

5.6. Assessing whether education and income are moderators of CBD effects

When we examined whether the association between contraceptive use and CBDs depended on education and income, we found that the association depended on both these factors, table 5. The effect of the CBDs varied by education and was significantly higher among women without any education followed by those with primary education in comparison with women with at least a secondary education. Similarly, the effect of CBDs was also moderated by income and was significantly greater among women with low and medium incomes compared to women with high income.

Figures 8 and 9 present the predicted probabilities of contraceptive use at various levels of education and income before and after the CBDs were introduced. The CBDs increased the probability of using contraceptives in each group of women and the percentage point changes were as follows: women without education (+22.8); women with primary education (+17.23); women with at least a secondary education (+9.69); low-income women (+19.85); medium-income women (+17.00); and high-income women (+10.05). Thus, women without any education benefitted the most from the CBDs with a 13-point net increase in the probability of contraceptive use over and above women with at least a secondary education. Compared to urban women, the change in contraceptive use was greater among rural women at every level of education. In terms of income, differences in contraceptive use were not statistically different between women in rural and urban communities.
5.7. Sensitivity analysis of the identification strategy

Because the data used for this study were not collected for evaluating the effect of CBDs, we performed three robustness checks to validate the identification strategy. To identify the effect of CBDs, we made three assumptions. First, we assumed that after the national rollout, the effect of CBDs was only in the 25 districts in which the pilot of the CBDs was not implemented. So, we tested this assumption by examining the effect of CBDs in the three districts in which the pilot of the CBDs was implemented, expecting the CBDs not to have significant effects in these districts. As expected, the coefficient of the interaction between CBDs and rural was not significant at 5% (log-odds=0.738, 95% C.I. = -0.418,1.894). A more detailed analysis of these results is presented in appendix A2.

Second, we assumed that the introduction of CBDs was exogenous and only in rural communities. Therefore, we expected CBDs not to have significant effects on contraceptive use in urban communities. We tested this assumption by examining the effect of CBDs in urban communities and whether education and/or income moderate the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use in urban communities. We found that CBDs and its interaction with education or income did not have a statistically significant effect on contraceptive use in urban communities at 5%, Appendix A2. However, these variables had significant effects in rural communities as reported earlier. This result reinforces the findings from the first sensitivity analysis and we conclude that our strategy identifies the effect of CBDs. A more detailed analysis of these results is presented in Appendix A2.

Third, we assumed that MDHS data collected in the years 2000 and 2004 served as the baseline for contraceptive use in the 25 districts in which the pilot of CBDs was not implemented. In these districts, CBDs were introduced after 2004, so MDHS2000 and MDHS2004 should not
capture CBD effects. We tested this assumption by examining the effect of changing the baseline years. We found that CBDs increased contraceptive use by 7.58 and 5.25 percentage points when the baseline years are 2000 and 2004, respectively, compared with 6.8 percentage points when both (2000+2004) are used as the baseline, Appendix A2. Thus using 2004 as the base year underestimated the effect of CBDs which suggests that the overlap between MDHS2004 and the introduction CBDs might be attenuating the effect of CBDs. In all, the sensitivity analyses showed that our identification strategy is valid, and in any case, we are underestimating the effect of the CBDs.

5.8. Model fitness
We tested model goodness-of-fit tests using two approaches both of which suggested that the model is a good fit for the data. First, we compared observed vs. predicted values of contraceptive use to understand how well the theoretical (binomial) distribution of the data fits the empirical distribution. We classified all women with a <0.5 probability of using contraceptives as not using contraceptives, while those with a ≥0.5 probability as using contraceptives. Second, we examined deviance residuals and identified outlying values. A residual was outlying if it lied outside two standard deviations of a mean residual value of zero. We found that our model correctly predicted about 75% of women as either using or not using contraceptives. However, the model had higher accuracy of predictions among nonusers of contraceptives compared to users (>80% vs. >60%), possibly because there were more nonusers of contraceptives than there were users. Deviance residuals in figure 9 also confirm that the model correctly predicted the status of contraceptive use for many women although less than 2% of predictions were outlying.
6. Discussion

Our primary objective was to estimate the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use in Malawi during the period 2005-2016. As hypothesized, we found that CBDs increased the probability of using modern contraceptives by 6.8 percentage points among rural women. Our finding is consistent with Kalanda’s who reported that the pilot of CBDs in Malawi increased the probability of contraceptive use by 7 percentage points [5]. Because Kalanda reported contraceptive use among married women only and we report contraceptive use for all groups of women regardless of marital status, we also conducted a secondary analysis of the effect of CBDs in a sub-sample of married women only to make our findings more comparable. In the secondary analysis, we found that CBDs increased the probability of married women using contraceptives by about 8.2 percentage points, higher than reported in the pilot.

There are two possible explanations for the bigger effect of CBDs among married women in the national scale-up than in the pilot. First, the pilot was only for three years which may not have been adequate to see the full effects of the CBDs; to influence people to have positive attitudes towards contraceptives and for them to begin to use contraceptives consistently requires more time [93], [94]. Second, the scaled-up program has been evolving to include more contraceptive methods than there were in the pilot and increasing the number of contraceptive methods carried by CBDs is associated with increased contraceptive use [95]. USAID reported that from 2010 the Malawi Ministry of Health began to allow Health Surveillance Assistants—primary supervisors of CBDs—to administer DMPA [96]. Although few Health Surveillance Assistants administer the DMPA [96], it is probable that without this development fewer women would have reported using modern methods. This explanation is consistent with reports from pilot studies that including DMPA within the existing CBD programs increases contraceptive use, attracts new
users, and equally satisfies women as DMPA obtained in health clinic [12], [17, p. 360], [18], [36], [96], [97].

Our findings are also consistent with reports from previous studies examining the effect of community interventions in other parts of Africa. For example, contraceptive use increased in Mali following the introduction of village-level family planning promoters [15], in Ghana where health workers with basic training in curative health services were deployed with community volunteers to provide family planning services [14], in the Gambia where family planning was promoted through traditional social and religious institutions [24], and in South Sudan where a CBD program was implemented among displaced people [37].

Other studies have reported different results, however. In Ethiopia, Tawye et al. reported that community-based interventions, increased contraceptive use in some regions but not in others [20], perhaps because the study did not have a control group to serve as a counterfactual and/or may not have properly identified effects of the community intervention [20]. In Kenya, the African Medical and Research Foundation (AMREF) documented that traditional birth attendants and male herbalists working as CBDs did not increase contraceptive use [39], although AMREF attributed the null findings to the illiteracy of the CBDs. In the DRC, Bertrand et al. reported that CPR was relatively unchanged despite the introduction of CBDs [38]. Although the study was a pretest-posttest design, Bertrand et al. did not have a control group to fully and properly identify the effect of the intervention, unlike the current study which used a pre- and post-test design with a control group.

The current study also adds to the literature in its assessment of whether the effect of CBDs is moderated by education and income. As hypothesized, we found that the effect of CBDs is moderated by both education and income; we also found that the effect of CBDs varied more
strongly with education than with income. A surprising finding, however, was the finding that the effect of CBDs was strongest among women with no education and declined as the education level increased. There are two potential explanations for this finding. First, because CBDs provide family planning information in the simplest form possible, they may be seen to work to meet the needs of uneducated women. Second, CBDs carry a very limited number of contraceptives—in many cases pills and condoms only—which may be less appealing to highly educated women. As a result, highly educated women may be reluctant to seek services from CBDs. Since highly educated women are also more likely to have higher incomes, it means they can afford to pay for alternative methods of contraception or seek contraceptives elsewhere which is consistent with the finding that the effect of CBDs was strongest among low-income women. Low-income women are more likely to be receptive to commodities offered by CBDs because they have limited contraceptive choices and contraceptive sources.

6.1. Strengths and limitations

Findings from this study must be understood in the context of the following strengths and limitations. The key strength of our study is the use of nationally representative data to examine the effects of the CBDs on contraceptive use. Also, the incorporation of within- and between-community variation and unobserved community random effects makes our findings generalizable beyond the women from communities in the sample [98]. Additionally, by pooling independent cross-sections in different time periods, we can make inferences about changes in contraceptive use at the population level. Furthermore, our study produces more valid estimates of the effect of CBDs because the data were not reported by the CBDs themselves; data obtained directly from CBDs can be suspect or incomplete which can introduce bias [16], [95]. Moreover,
we performed a series of sensitivity analyses which validated our identification strategy and suggested that our findings are robust.

The study also has many limitations. First, because the MDHS’ do not have defined geographic areas called communities, we used PSUs as a proxy for communities which might not be precise. Despite this limitation, it is still reasonable to think that women from the same PSU are more likely to have shared interests and attitudes and therefore constitute a community [9], [74], [75]. Second, while communities were dichotomized as rural or urban, communities occur on the urban-rural continuum. It is possible for some communities to have been misclassified and because the data come with PSU already classified as rural or urban, we were unable to perform a sensitivity analysis of our findings to changes in the urban-rural taxonomy.

Third, many variables used in the study, including contraceptive use, education, and income, are based on women’s self-reports which may not accurately measure what we say they are measuring [99]–[101]. Our findings are thus biased to the extent of differential bias in self-reporting between rural and urban women and/or before and after CBD implementation and if the bias exists, its direction is unclear. Notwithstanding this limitation, we still used the self-reported measures because they are readily available and reflect the respondents’ own view. Moreover, current contraceptive use has been validated before and women’s self-reports were found to be more valid than men’s [102]. A fourth limitation is that the data were not collected for purposes of evaluating the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use. Among women reporting contraceptive use, we do not know how many got the methods from CBDs or from other sources e.g., health centers. That said, the current analysis suggests that with a proper identification strategy it is possible to leverage national data (e.g., MDHS) collected for other purposes to answer programmatic questions.
Finally, due to data limitations, we were unable to check if CBD effects spilled over from the pilot districts to the neighboring districts during the CBD pilot project. Any spillovers are more likely to have occurred through the diffusion of family planning information than through contraceptive methods crossing district boundaries because the CBD agents had defined villages in which they worked; in Malawi, village boundaries do not transcend district boundaries. If spillover effects occurred, however, it means our estimates are biased towards the null as contraceptive use in the districts sharing borders with the pilot districts was higher than should have been at the time of the national scale-up of the CBDs.

6.2. Policy implications

From this research, several policy implications are evident. First, CBDs should be continued and strengthened if the country is to sustain the gains made in contraceptive use. Among other things, the government, the country’s development partners, and stakeholders should ensure that supply of contraceptives to the communities is uninterrupted, CBDs receive refresher training regularly, supervision of the CBDs is active and frequent, provision of CBD agents’ working kits (e.g., bicycles and gumboots) to facilitate follow-up of clientele. The availability of these facilities will help ensure that women relying on CBDs continue to get quality services and prevent intermittent use of contraceptives among the rural women.

Second, this work suggests that there may be a need to increase the portfolio of contraceptive methods carried by the CBDs. As noted, methods carried out by CBDs are not meeting the needs of women with more education and high income. With proper accountability and support, we suggest that all CBDs and their supervisors should be carrying DMPA and natural methods (e.g., cycle beads) in addition to the condoms and pills. Third, given the success of CBDs in rural communities, our results suggest that urban communities can benefit from the introduction of
CBDs or an equivalent of the CBDs in the urban communities. For example, health posts manned by Health Surveillance Assistants could be introduced in urban communities which have limited access to health centers or have high population densities. As the government of Malawi continues with efforts to increase contraceptive use, it is important that both urban and rural communities are targeted and that the efforts should not create or perpetuate rural/urban disparities in contraceptive use as noted in this study.

6.3. Future research

While we have reported that CBDs in Malawi increased contraceptive use, we make two recommendations for future research. First, the value of the CBDs should be established. Doing this would require analyzing both the costs and effects of the CBDs after the national scale-up; we have only examined their effectiveness. Examining costs and hence the value of the CBDs is important because prior evidence suggests that CBDs can add as much as 30% per capita to the primary healthcare budgets [103]. Second, this study has only reported the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use—a proximate determinant of fertility. The goal of introducing CBDs was to reduce fertility or at least increase birthing intervals in Malawi. Therefore, future studies should focus on evaluating the effects of CBDs on these outcomes.

7. Conclusion

Following the success of a pilot of CBDs from 1999 to 2003, the Malawi government scaled the CBDs to all rural communities of Malawi in 2005. We have found that CBDs increased contraceptive use during the period 2005 to 2016, and the intervention can help the country to achieve its long-term agenda of reducing population growth. Before the implementation of the CBDs, contraceptive use in rural communities was lower than in urban communities. After the implementation of the CBDs, however, contraceptive use increased significantly in the rural
communities to the extent that urban communities are now lagging. The effect of CBDs was strongest among uneducated and poor women suggesting that delivering messages and interventions using the communities’ local languages and structures is important if any intervention is to reach the target population, particularly rural communities. While the CBDs should be continued and strengthened, it is important to establish whether the CBDs have also reduced fertility or are cost-effective.
Table 1. Comparison of the pilot and national CBDs in Malawi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Pilot</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of recognition</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbrellas, boots, raincoats, backpacks, and push bicycles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US$6 per month</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms and badges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated resources for supervision*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle (program-specific)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Push bicycles</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Health Management Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, education, and communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health talks, dramas, leaflets, flyers, and posters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-shirts, radio jiggles, cassette players, and, comic books</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family planning commodities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pills</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condoms</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the pilot, project employees supervised CBDs. In national CBDs, Health Surveillance Assistants (community health workers) employed by the government conduct the supervision.
### Table 2: Descriptive statistics (Weighted sample size: n=52,978)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Rural (n=42,707)</th>
<th>Urban (n=10,272)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-CBD (n=14,320)</td>
<td>Post-CBD (n=28,386)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal-level factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current contraceptive use*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (wealth)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divorced</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertility desire***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wants child in &lt; 1 year</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wants child in &gt;1 year but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;3 years</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wants child after 3 years</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no more children</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to family planning information*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not exposed</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some exposure</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Before CBD</td>
<td>After CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no autonomy</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi or complete autonomy</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic or Anglican</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christians</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-level factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare access problems**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community literacy***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not literate</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community income***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community religion**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic or Anglican</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christians</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community child mortality (mean)</td>
<td>209.167</td>
<td>136.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

All variables are categorical, except community child mortality, and proportions are presented in the table. For the categorical variables, we tested whether the proportion of women under each variable was the same in the periods before and after CBDs were introduced across both rural and urban communities. For the continuous variable, community child mortality, we tested whether the means were different in the two CBD periods across rural and urban communities. The tests were performed using the Wald test.
Table 3: Effect of CBDAs on contraceptive use in Malawi (2005-2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable: Contraceptive use</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main explanatory variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBDAs</td>
<td>0.919***</td>
<td>[0.767,1.071]</td>
<td>0.954***</td>
<td>[0.706,1.202]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>-0.411***</td>
<td>[-0.540,-0.281]</td>
<td>-0.314***</td>
<td>[-0.481,-0.147]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref: Urban, before CBDAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural, after CBDAs</td>
<td>0.421***</td>
<td>[0.272,0.571]</td>
<td>0.424***</td>
<td>[0.236,0.612]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-level factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (ref: 15-19 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29yr</td>
<td>0.568***</td>
<td>[0.470,0.666]</td>
<td>0.588***</td>
<td>[0.486,0.689]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39yr</td>
<td>0.555***</td>
<td>[0.446,0.663]</td>
<td>0.582***</td>
<td>[0.455,0.710]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49yr</td>
<td>0.357***</td>
<td>[0.234,0.479]</td>
<td>0.393***</td>
<td>[0.242,0.544]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation (ref: unemployed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed/agriculture</td>
<td>0.093**</td>
<td>[0.036,0.149]</td>
<td>0.087*</td>
<td>[0.018,0.155]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/formal</td>
<td>0.240***</td>
<td>[0.159,0.320]</td>
<td>0.251***</td>
<td>[0.190,0.312]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (ref: never married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0.929***</td>
<td>[0.736,1.123]</td>
<td>0.978***</td>
<td>[0.757,1.200]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to family planning information (ref: no exposure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some exposure</td>
<td>0.210***</td>
<td>[0.156,0.264]</td>
<td>0.216***</td>
<td>[0.163,0.269]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertility desire (ref: wants child &lt;1y)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1y but &lt;3y</td>
<td>1.777***</td>
<td>[1.615,1.940]</td>
<td>1.854***</td>
<td>[1.726,1.981]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child after 3y</td>
<td>2.080***</td>
<td>[1.926,2.233]</td>
<td>2.170***</td>
<td>[2.023,2.317]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more children</td>
<td>2.381***</td>
<td>[2.228,2.534]</td>
<td>2.454***</td>
<td>[2.319,2.590]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (ref: no autonomy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least some autonomy</td>
<td>0.113***</td>
<td>[0.053,0.173]</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
<td>[0.025,0.198]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner education (ref: no education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0.127***</td>
<td>[0.051,0.202]</td>
<td>0.120**</td>
<td>[0.040,0.201]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0.189***</td>
<td>[0.099,0.280]</td>
<td>0.166***</td>
<td>[0.068,0.265]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>0.244*</td>
<td>[0.055,0.432]</td>
<td>0.234*</td>
<td>[0.010,0.458]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (ref: Catholic/Anglican)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christians</td>
<td>-0.107***</td>
<td>[-0.171,-0.044]</td>
<td>-0.093***</td>
<td>[-0.147,-0.039]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>-0.312***</td>
<td>[-0.428,-0.196]</td>
<td>-0.279***</td>
<td>[-0.411,-0.147]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-level factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access problem (ref: no problem)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some problem</td>
<td>-0.061*</td>
<td>[-0.119,-0.002]</td>
<td>-0.082*</td>
<td>[-0.138,-0.026]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy (ref: illiterate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>[-0.009,0.120]</td>
<td>0.102**</td>
<td>[0.037,0.166]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (ref: low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium income</td>
<td>0.104***</td>
<td>[0.044,0.165]</td>
<td>0.126***</td>
<td>[0.069,0.182]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (ref: Catholic/Anglican)</td>
<td>0.135**</td>
<td>[0.054,0.217]</td>
<td>0.219***</td>
<td>[0.124,0.315]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christians</td>
<td>0.0601</td>
<td>[-0.022,0.142]</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>[-0.015,0.153]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>-0.299***</td>
<td>[-0.429,-0.169]</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>[-0.382,0.012]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community child mortality</td>
<td>-0.0001</td>
<td>[-0.0005,0.0003]</td>
<td>-0.0006*</td>
<td>[-0.001,-0.0001]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year fixed effects (ref: 2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>[-0.110,0.079]</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>[-0.081,0.109]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-0.776***</td>
<td>[-0.846,-0.707]</td>
<td>-0.775***</td>
<td>[-0.875,-0.675]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.004***</td>
<td>[0.003,0.006]</td>
<td>0.003***</td>
<td>[0.002,0.004]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>57312</td>
<td>56619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>57587</td>
<td>56833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of districts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>52978</td>
<td>52978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

† Effect of CBDAs was estimated in the 25 districts in which the CDBA pilot was not implemented.

The table summarizes and compares the effect of CBDs (community-based distribution) on contraceptive use modeled using a single-level logistic regression and a multilevel (3-level random intercept) logistic regression. While both models show that the CBDs increased contraceptive use, estimates from the multilevel model are generally larger and have wider confidence intervals. In both models, contraceptive use was significantly associated with both individual- and community-level explanatory variables, but the association was stronger with individual-level variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>First difference (D) [95% C.I.]</th>
<th>Second difference (DD) [95% C.I.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>0.215 [0.199, 0.231]</td>
<td>0.263 [0.237, 0.288]</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before CBDs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After CBDs</td>
<td>0.450 [0.430, 0.469]</td>
<td>0.429 [0.400, 0.459]</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First difference (D)</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.1668</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.068 [0.031, 0.098]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Assessment of education and income (wealth) as moderators of CBD effects on contraceptive use in rural areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1A (Education)</th>
<th>Model 1B (Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient 95% C.I.</td>
<td>Coefficient 95% C.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref: Before CBDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBDs</td>
<td>1.500*** [1.310,1.691]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref: No education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0.128** [0.0338,0.223]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0.113 [-0.0262,0.251]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref: No education, before CBDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary, after CBDs</td>
<td>-0.172* [-0.310,-0.0348]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary, after CBDs</td>
<td>-0.505*** [-0.657,-0.353]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref: Low income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium income</td>
<td>0.226*** [0.116,0.336]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income</td>
<td>0.388*** [0.241,0.536]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref: Low income, before CBDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium income, after CBDs</td>
<td>-0.229*** [-0.323,-0.135]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income, after CBDs</td>
<td>-0.575*** [-0.731,-0.419]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>42865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of districts</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table summarizes results of examining whether education and income influence the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use. For ease of interpretability and understanding, models for education and income were run separately. In both models, the coefficient of the interaction terms (CBD*education and CBD*income) is statistically significant at 5% which suggests that both education and income individually influence the association between CBDs and contraceptive use.
Figure 1: District participation in a community-based distribution (CBD) pilot of family planning services in Malawi, 1999-2003

This figure is a map of Malawi showing intervention and control districts in a pilot project testing whether a comprehensive community approach to family planning could increase contraceptive use in Malawi, 1999-2003.

Source of shapefiles: Global Administrative Areas (http://www.gadm.org)
*CBD stands for community-based distribution of family planning service.
†Refers to women's characteristics except when the word partner is used.

**Figure 2. A conceptual framework for understanding the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use in rural areas of Malawi**

The figure shows a conceptual framework of the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use in Malawi's rural areas. It also shows that the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use is moderated by both education and income. The figure also shows that individual-level characteristics may affect contraceptive use directly or indirectly via community characteristics.
Figure 3: A flowchart for deriving a sample for examining the effect of community-based distribution (CBDs) on contraceptive use in Malawi

The flowchart shows the exclusions applied to derive a sample of women to examine the effect of community-based distribution agents (CBDs) of family planning on contraceptive use in Malawi. The data were drawn from four waves (2000, 2004, 2010 and 2016) of the Malawi Demographic and Health Surveys (MDHS). The data came from women recode files of the MDHS and contained responses from all women (ages 15-49 years) interviewed in the surveys.
Figure 4. Timeline for implementation of community-based distribution (CBD) of family planning services and data collection in the Malawi Demographic and Health Surveys (MDHS)

This figure shows the timeline for the scale-up of national CBDs and MDHS data collection. The blue color (■) shows the timeline for pilot or national CBD implementation, orange color (■) shows the pre-CBD period while green color (■) shows the timeline for the MDHS. Thus, the study identified MDHS 2000/2004 as the pre-CBD period while MDHS 2010/2016 as the post-CBD period. Data collection for MDHS 2004 was from October 2004 to January 2005. CBD scale-up was from December 2004 to February 2005, overlapping in December 2004 and January 2005.
Figure 5: Urban-rural trends in contraceptive use before and after national CBDs in Malawi
Figure 6: Average community contraceptive use
This figure shows contraceptive use in each community relative to the average contraceptive use in all the communities. The line at zero represents the average log-odds of using contraceptives. We found that in many communities the 95% confidence intervals of contraceptive use overlapped with the zero line, although a significant number deviated from the overall average.
Figure 7: Average district contraceptive use
This figure shows contraceptive use in each district relative to the average contraceptive use in all the districts. The line at zero represents the average log-odds of using contraceptives in all the districts. We found that four districts had below average contraceptive use while 6 had above average contraceptive use.
Figure 8: Predicted probability of contraceptive use by women’s education.
This figure shows that contraceptive use increased among both rural and urban women, but the increases were greater among rural women with rural uneducated women benefiting the most from the scale-up of the CBDs.
Figure 8: Predicted probability of contraceptive use by women’s income.
This figure shows that contraceptive use increased among both rural and urban women, but the increases were greater among women with low incomes. The figure also shows that the increases in contraceptive use were similar for both rural and urban women at every level of income.
Figure 9: A goodness-of-fit test using deviance residuals
This figure shows that very few observations have outlying (above the red line) predictions, suggesting that the model is a good fit for the data.
Appendices

Appendix A1: Variable definition and construction

Table A1: Definition and construction of variables for examining the effect of community-based distribution agents on contraceptive use in Malawi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Explanation/ justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current contraceptive use</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>Dependent variable: 1=using a modern method, 0=not using a modern method.</td>
<td>Women were asked if they were using any contraceptives at the time of the interview. We classified women using traditional methods (&lt;2% of the total) as not using any contraceptive method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based distribution (CBD) of family planning services</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>CBD=1 if year is 2010 or 2016 (post-CBD period) and CBD=0 if year is 2000 or 2004 (pre-CBD period).</td>
<td>This is the key explanatory variable and it is the variable whose effect on contraceptive use we are assessing. Our hypothesis is that CBDs increased contraceptive use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/urban status</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>Rural=1, urban=0.</td>
<td>This is the second key explanatory variable. CBDs were introduced in rural communities only, so we designated the rural communities as the intervention and urban communities as the comparison group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-level variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal education</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>2=secondary or higher, 1=primary, 0=no education.</td>
<td>Highly educated women are more likely to use contraceptives. We grouped women with higher than secondary education with those with secondary education; &lt;2% of the women had an education higher than secondary level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>2=secondary or higher, 1=primary, 0=no education.</td>
<td>Women with highly educated partners are more likely to use contraceptives. We grouped partners with higher than secondary education with those with secondary education; fewer than 2% of the women's partners had an education higher than secondary level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income*</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>3=high, 2=medium and 3=low.</td>
<td>High-income women are more likely to use contraceptives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>4=&quot;40-49yr&quot;, 3=&quot;30-39yr&quot;, 2=&quot;20-29yr&quot;, 1=&quot;15-19yr&quot;.</td>
<td>Contraceptive use among women increases with age but begins to decline after age 39. This age classification is consistent with other studies on contraceptive use in Africa [8], [104], [105].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation (woman or her partner)</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>2=professional employment, 1=self-employed or agriculture, 0=Unemployed.</td>
<td>This variable is highly correlated with education and income. Women in the professional sector or with partners in the professional are most likely to face a higher opportunity cost of raising children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>3=widowed, 2=divorced, 1=married, 0=never married.</td>
<td>Married women are most likely to use contraceptives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to family planning methods†</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>1=Little or no exposure 0=moderate or substantial exposure.</td>
<td>Exposure to reproductive health messages via media in the month preceding the surveys. Women exposed to family planning information are more likely to use contraceptives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy†</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>0=Little or no autonomy, 1=semi or complete autonomy.</td>
<td>Autonomy is the woman's ability to consciously make decisions about her health and life without fear of reprisals. Autonomous women are more likely to use contraceptives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>1=Catholic or Anglican, 2=other Christians, 3=Muslims, 4=no religion.</td>
<td>The religion to which a woman belongs. Some religions encourage contraceptive use while others do not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fertility desire</strong></td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>4=wants no more children, 3=wants child after 3 years, 2=wants a child in &gt;1 year but &lt;3 years, 1=wants child in &lt;1 year. Women desiring to have children in less than one year are less likely to use contraceptives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-level and residency variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community literacy</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>2=literate, 1=partly literate, 0=not literate. Constructed from the maternal education variable by assigning the education category with the highest number of women to the whole community. We created this variable because women without any education may still get assistance from others with an education in the same community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community income</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>3=high, 2=medium, 1=low. We averaged wealth scores were averaged at the community level and created percentiles for each of the survey years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community religion</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>1=Catholic or Anglican, 2=other Christians, 3=Muslims. Assigned to the whole community based on which religion had the largest membership in that community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community access problems to care</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>1=some problem, 0=no problem. Women were asked to report if they had any problems accessing health care services in the 12 months preceding the study. Women with problems of access to care are less likely to use contraceptives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to health facility$</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community child mortality$</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>District dummy variables. These are the country's 28 administrative districts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$The Malawi Demographic and Health Surveys (MDHS) do not collect data on income; we used wealth as a proxy for the income. MDHS provides wealth scores reflecting ownership of durable goods and housing characteristics. We created the wealth categories separately for each year to reflect income distributions in the years of the surveys.

†Exposure to family planning variable was created from the following media: radio, TV, and newspaper. Exposure to each medium was given a score of 1 and then summed. In 2016, exposure to family planning messages via phone messages was added but for consistency with previous surveys, it was not included. Those with a zero score were regarded as not exposed.

‡The variable was constructed based on the extent to which the woman had a final say on the following: 1) Making large household purchases; 2) Making household purchases for daily needs; 3) Visiting family or relatives; 4) The woman's own health care; and 5) Meals prepared each day. For each of the five domains, there were 5 options on who made the decision: the woman alone; together with her partner; together with someone else; partner alone; someone else or decision was not made. The responses were scored on a scale of 1-5 (to be consistent with the response options) and then summed to get the total score for each woman. From the total scores, 2 groups were created with a cut-off point at the 50th percentile.

§Straight line distance (kilometers) from the community to the nearest health facility, calculated in ArcGIS 10.3.1. To calculate the distance, the MDHS files were joined to the Malawi 2012 Service Provision Assessment file (SPA)—also a public use file. The MDHS files provided coordinates for the communities while coordinates for health facilities came from the Malawi 2012 SPA. Since the Service Provision Assessment data only provided geographic coordinates for health facilities, we do not expect the temporal difference between the two surveys to influence the distances between the communities and health facilities.

¶Calculated at the community level and each household in the community is assumed to face this child mortality rate regardless of whether the household itself experienced child mortality. Community child mortality is used instead of household child mortality because the latter would be endogenous in a model of contraceptive use.
Appendix A2: Robustness of the identification strategy

Because the data used for this study were not collected for evaluating the effect of CBDs, we performed three robustness checks to validate our identification strategy. To identify the effect of CBDs, we made three assumptions. First, we assumed that after the national rollout, the effect of CBDs was only in the 25 districts in which the pilot of the CBDs was not implemented. So, we tested this assumption by examining the effect of CBDs in the three districts in which the pilot of the CBDs was implemented, expecting the CBDs not to have significant effects in these districts. Second, we assumed that the introduction of CBDs was exogenous and only in rural communities. We, therefore, expected CBDs not to have significant effects on contraceptive use in urban communities. We tested this assumption by examining the effect of CBDs in urban communities and whether education and/or income were moderators of the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use in the urban communities. Third, we assumed that MDHS data collected in the years 2000 and 2004 served as the baseline for contraceptive use in the 25 districts in which the pilot of CBDs was not implemented. In these districts, CBDs were introduced after 2004, so MDHS2000 and MDHS2004 should not capture CBD effects. We tested this assumption by examining the effect of changing the baseline years. In all, the sensitivity analysis showed that our identification strategy is valid, see detailed results below.

CBD effects in CBD-pilot districts

In the first sensitivity analysis, we applied the model in equation 2 to the three districts (Chitipa, Ntchisi, and Chiradzulu) in which the CBDs were piloted. In these districts, the nationwide adoption of CBDs was a continuation of the pilot. For emphasis, the model is repeated below:
\[ \log \left( \frac{\pi_{ijk}}{1-\pi_{ijk}} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (\text{Rural}_{jk}) + \beta_2 (\text{CBDAs}) + \beta_3 (\text{Rural}_{jk} \times \text{CBDAs}) + \lambda X_{ijk} + \alpha P_{jk} + \Gamma + U_k + U_{jk} + \varepsilon_{ijk} \]  

(5)

For valid identification, \( \beta_3 \) was expected to be not statistically significant at 5\% in equation 5.

Results of this analysis are presented in table A2. In the three pilot districts, the effect of CBDs was not statistically significant at 5\%. This suggests that our strategy properly identified the effects of CBDs on contraceptive use. However, some caution is warranted: the non-significant result of the interaction term could also be a result of the sample size being smaller in the pilot districts rather than the scale-up of the CBDs not having a statistically significant effect in the pilot districts. The estimate for the pilot districts was estimated with less precision, given the wider confidence interval, than the one for the non-pilot districts.

Table A2: Effect of CBDs on contraceptive use in CBD pilot and CBD non-pilot districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contraceptive use</th>
<th>Non-pilot districts</th>
<th>Pilot districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main explanatory variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBDAs</td>
<td>0.954***</td>
<td>[0.706,1.202]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>-0.314***</td>
<td>[-0.481,-0.147]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref: Urban, before CBDAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.424***</td>
<td>[0.236,0.612]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-level factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (ref: 15-19 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29yr</td>
<td>0.588***</td>
<td>[0.486,0.689]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39yr</td>
<td>0.582***</td>
<td>[0.455,0.710]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49yr</td>
<td>0.393***</td>
<td>[0.242,0.544]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation (ref: unemployed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed/agriculture</td>
<td>0.087*</td>
<td>[0.018,0.155]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/formal</td>
<td>0.251***</td>
<td>[0.190,0.312]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (ref: never married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1.389***</td>
<td>[1.192,1.587]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0.978***</td>
<td>[0.757,1.200]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to FP information (ref: no exposure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some exposure</td>
<td>0.216***</td>
<td>[0.163,0.269]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertility desire (ref: wants child &lt;1 yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1yr but &lt;3yr</td>
<td>1.854***</td>
<td>[1.726,1.981]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child after 3 yrs</td>
<td>2.170***</td>
<td>[2.023,2.317]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more children</td>
<td>2.454***</td>
<td>[2.319,2.590]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (ref: No autonomy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least some autonomy</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
<td>[0.025,0.198]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner education (ref: no education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0.120**</td>
<td>[0.040,0.201]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0.166***</td>
<td>[0.068,0.265]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>0.234*</td>
<td>[0.010,0.458]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (ref: Catholic/Anglican)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christians</td>
<td>-0.0934***</td>
<td>[-0.147,-0.039]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>-0.279***</td>
<td>[-0.411,-0.147]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-level factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access problem (ref: no problem)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some problem</td>
<td>-0.082*</td>
<td>[-0.138,-0.026]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy (ref: illiterate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>0.102**</td>
<td>[0.037,0.166]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (ref: low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium income</td>
<td>0.126***</td>
<td>[0.069,0.182]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income</td>
<td>0.219***</td>
<td>[0.124,0.315]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (ref: Catholic/Anglican)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA and Other Christians</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>[-0.015,0.153]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>[-0.382,0.012]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community child mortality</td>
<td>-0.0006*</td>
<td>[-0.001,-0.0001]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year fixed effects (ref: 2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>[-0.081,0.109]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-0.775***</td>
<td>[-0.875,-0.675]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.003***</td>
<td>[0.002,0.004]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of districts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>52978</td>
<td>4546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001. † The results in non-pilot districts are the same as the multilevel results already presented in table 3, but they are duplicated here to facilitate comparison.

**Education and income as moderators of CBD effects in urban communities**

In the second sensitivity analysis, we examined the effect of CBDs in urban communities and whether this effect is moderated by education or income. This analysis was performed using the model in equation 2 but only in urban communities of the 25 non-pilot districts. Because CBDs were implemented in rural communities only, the effect of CBDs and the interaction of CBDs...
and education, as well as that of CBDs and income in urban communities should not be statistically significant at 5%. In Panel 1 of table A3, we present the log odds of using contraceptives in urban communities while in Panel 2 we reproduce the log odds for rural communities (already presented in table 6). We found that CBDs and its interaction with education or income did not have a statistically significant effect on contraceptive use in urban communities; confidence intervals of these variables overlapped with a log-odds of 0 and the p-values were greater than 0.05. As reported earlier, however, these variables had significant effects in rural communities. This result reinforces our earlier findings from the first sensitivity analysis and we conclude that our strategy identifies the effect of CBDs.
Table A3: Sensitivity analysis of the moderating effects of education and income on the association between CBDs and contraceptive use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Panel 1: Urban</th>
<th>Panel 2: Rural</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M2A (Education)</td>
<td>M2B (Income)</td>
<td>M1A (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[95% C.I.]</td>
<td>[95% C.I.]</td>
<td>[95% C.I.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref: Before CBDs

CBDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref: No education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref: No education, before CBDs

Primary, after CBDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Secondary, after CBDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref: Low income

Medium income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref: Low income, before CBDs

Medium income, after CBDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| High income, after CBDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations

|                  | 10113 | 10089 | 42865 | 42865 |

The table summarizes sensitivity analysis results of examining whether education and income influence (moderate) the effect of CBDs on contraceptive use in urban areas. For ease of interpretability and understanding, models for education and income were run separately. In the urban panel, the coefficient of the interaction terms (CBD*education and CBD*income) is not statistically significant at 5% which suggests that both education and income do not individually influence the association between CBDs and contraceptive use.
Varying the definition of the pre-CBD period: 2000 or 2004

We earlier explained and showed in figure 4 that there was an overlap of about 2 months between the introduction of CBDs and data collection in MDHS2004. Although we expected CBDs not to have affected contraceptive use by the time the data were being collected, we still checked the effect of the overlap by defining the baseline as the year 2004 or 2000. If MDHS2004 captured the effects of the CBDs, our estimate would be biased towards the null. We first examined whether contraceptive use was different between years 2000 and 2004. We found that the log-odds of using contraceptives were lower in 2004 than in 2000, but the difference was immaterial. Thus either year (2000 or 2004) could be used to define the pre-CBD period.

We present results of defining the baselines as the year 2000 or 2004 in the table A4, while results in Panel A combine years 2000 and 2004 (like those presented earlier in table 3). We found that, for many coefficients, the direction and strength of association with contraceptive use were the same across the three models. We also found that CBDs increased contraceptive use by 7.58 and 5.25 percentage points when the baseline years are 2000 and 2004, respectively, compared with 6.8 percentage points when both are used as the baseline. Thus using 2004 as the base year underestimated the effect of CBDs which suggests that the overlap between MDHS2004 and the introduction CBDs might be attenuating the effect of CBDs. While this evidence points to using 2000 as the baseline, we preferred to use a model that combined 2000 and 2004 as the baseline. This is because estimates from the model in Panel A are measured with the most precision and this model allowed us to account for year fixed effects; the other models cannot do this because of collinearity problems among year, CBDs, and the intercept.
Table A4: Effect of CBDs on contraceptive use in response to changing the baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dep var contraceptive use</th>
<th>A (main results) †</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline: 2000+2004</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coefficient</strong></td>
<td><strong>95% C.I.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coefficient</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main explanatory variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>0.954***</td>
<td>[0.706,1.202]</td>
<td>0.870***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>-0.314***</td>
<td>[-0.481,-0.147]</td>
<td>-0.403***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref:</td>
<td>Urban, before CBDAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural, after CBDAs</td>
<td>0.424***</td>
<td>[0.236,0.612]</td>
<td>0.483***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-level factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (ref: 15-19 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29yr</td>
<td>0.588***</td>
<td>[0.486,0.689]</td>
<td>0.622***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39yr</td>
<td>0.582***</td>
<td>[0.455,0.710]</td>
<td>0.585***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49yr</td>
<td>0.393***</td>
<td>[0.242,0.544]</td>
<td>0.329***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation (ref: unemployed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed/agriculture</td>
<td>0.087*</td>
<td>[0.018,0.155]</td>
<td>0.098**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/formal</td>
<td>0.251***</td>
<td>[0.190,0.312]</td>
<td>0.261***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (ref: never married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0.978***</td>
<td>[0.757,1.200]</td>
<td>1.045***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to FP information (ref: no exposure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some exposure</td>
<td>0.216***</td>
<td>[0.163,0.269]</td>
<td>0.203***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertility desire (ref: wants child &lt;1y)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (ref: No autonomy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or total autonomy</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
<td>[0.025,0.198]</td>
<td>0.134**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner education (ref: no education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0.120**</td>
<td>[0.040,0.201]</td>
<td>0.116**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0.166***</td>
<td>[0.068,0.265]</td>
<td>0.118*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>0.234*</td>
<td>[0.010,0.458]</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (ref: Catholic/Anglican)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christians</td>
<td>-0.093***</td>
<td>[-0.147,-0.039]</td>
<td>-0.0784*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>-0.279***</td>
<td>[-0.411,-0.147]</td>
<td>-0.265***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-level factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access problem (ref: no problem)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some problem</td>
<td>-0.082*</td>
<td>[-0.138,-0.026]</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy (ref: illiterate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>0.102**</td>
<td>[0.037,0.166]</td>
<td>0.128**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Confidence Interval [lower bound, upper bound]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium income</strong></td>
<td>0.126***</td>
<td>[0.069,0.182]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.120***</td>
<td>[0.052,0.187]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.137***</td>
<td>[0.082,0.192]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High income</strong></td>
<td>0.219***</td>
<td>[0.124,0.315]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.189***</td>
<td>[0.090,0.289]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.232***</td>
<td>[0.126,0.338]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion (ref: Catholic/Anglican)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA and Other Christians</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>[-0.015,0.153]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>[-0.053,0.165]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>[-0.098,0.148]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>[-0.382,0.012]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.219</td>
<td>[-0.443,0.005]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.305*</td>
<td>[-0.546,-0.064]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community child mortality</td>
<td>-0.001*</td>
<td>[-0.001,-0.000]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.001**</td>
<td>[-0.001,-0.000]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>[-0.001,0.000]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year fixed effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>[-0.081,0.109]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-0.775***</td>
<td>[-0.875,-0.675]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.762***</td>
<td>[-0.867,-0.658]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.766***</td>
<td>[-0.872,-0.659]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.003***</td>
<td>[0.002,0.004]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations | 52978 | 44503 | 43162

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001. †These results are the same as the multilevel results already presented in table 3, but they are duplicated here to facilitate comparison.
Stata do file

///ANALYSIS

use analysis_cbda.dta, clear
set more off
log using contra_use, text replace

*setting the font for graphs to times roman new

graph set window fontface "Times New Roman"

*trends in contraceptive use

*graph bar (mean) none (mean) modern, over(year) percentages blabel(bar, size(small) format(%9.2g)) by(, title(Urban-rural trends in contraceptive use in Malawi)) by(rural, total)

graph bar (mean) none (mean) modern, over(cbda, label(labsize(3.0))) stack ///

by(urban, note(" ")) graphregion( color(white)) plotregion(fcolor(white) lcolor(white)) ///

subtitle(, fcolor(white) lcolor(white)) ///

bar(1, lpattern(solid) color(bluishgray)) bar(2, lpattern(dot) color(eltblue)) bar(3, lpattern(solid)) blabel(bar, size(3.0) position(center) format(%9.2g)) ///

by(, title("Figure 3: Urban-rural trends in contraceptive use before and after national CBDs in Malawi", size(3.0) color(black))) ///
ytitle("Proportion", size(3)) scheme(s2color) ///
legend(label(1 "Not using modern contraceptives ") label(2 "Using modern contraceptives") order(2 "Using modern contraceptives" 1 "Not using modern contraceptives" ))

graph save Graph "U:\Home\Health Behavior and Policy\masianosp\Dissertation\Paper_1\Analyis\Graphs\urban-ruraltrends_1.gph", replace

**Conducting a test of the IIA assumption

mlogit contra_use cbda##rural , base(0)
estimates store m_1
mlogit contra_use urban##education if (contra_use != 1), base(0) /*excludes traditional methods*/
estimates store m_2
hausman  m_1 m_2, alleqs constant /*alleqs means to test using all
equations*/

*the test statistic from the above is negative so the more appropriate test
is suest
suest m_1 m_2

test [m_1_modern=m_2_modern], common const /*we fail to reject the null, the
IIA assumption is met*/

*test for combining categories
mlogit contra_use comm_fertpref comm_wealth comm_literacy

*random effects model
set more off
use analysis_cbda, clear

*combining nonusers and traditional users
gen contra_use_orig= contra_use
recode contra_use 2=0

*setting weights

svyset community, weight(comm_wt) || _n, weight(sampweight)

/*checking the effect of weights*/
tab region
tab region  [iweight=sampweight]
tab region  [iweight=comm_wt]

*empty or null model with 3 levels
melogit contra_use if notpilot==1 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, 
pw(comm_wt) or covariance(unstructured)
estimates store null_3levels
estat icc
gen _prob=exp(_b[_cons])/(1+ exp(_b[_cons])))
di _prob
drop _prob

*empty or null model with 2 levels
melogit contra_use if notpilot==1 [pw=sampweight] ||community:, pw(comm_wt)
or covariance(unstructured)
estimates store null_2levels

*single level logit
logit contra_use if notpilot==1 [pw=sampweight], or
estimates store null_singlelevel

*comparing the two-level to the single-level
lrtest null_3levels null_singlelevel, force

*comparing the three level to the single level
lrtest null_3levels null_singlelevel, force

*comparing the 2-level and 3-level models
lrtest null_3levels null_2levels, force /*shows that the 3-level model shouldbe preferred*/

**drawing caterpillar plots from the variance components model
melogit contra_use if notpilot==1 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or covariance(unstructured)
estimates replay null_3levels, or

*reffects and reses calculate the shrunken residuals/best linear unbiased
prediction of random intercepts and standard errors
predict u0dist u0comm, reffects reses(u0sedist u0secomm)

*district caterpillars
egen pickonedist=tag(district)
sort u0dist

gen u0rankdist=sum(pickonedist)

*to draw the caterpillar graph with 95% confidence band of intercept residuals

serrbar u0dist u0sedist u0rankdist if pickonedist==1, scale(1.96) mvopts(
msymbol(square) mlabel(district) mlabcolor(black) ///
mlabsize(*0.95) mlabposition(6) mlabgap(huge) mcolor(red)
mlabangle(vertical)) ytitle(District random effects) xtitle(District rank)
yline(0) ///
title("Figure 4b: Average district contraceptive use", size(medium large))

graph save Graph "J:\Home\Health Behavior and
Policy\masianosp\Dissertation\Paper_1\Analysis\Graphs\District_residuals.gph", replace

*counting the number of districts outside average district contraceptive use

count if ((u0dist + 1.96*u0sedist)<0 | (u0dist - 1.96*u0sedist)>0) & pickonedist==1

*community caterpillars
egen pickonecomm=tag(community)
sort u0comm
gen u0rankcomm=sum(pickonecomm)

*to draw the caterpillar graph with 95% confidence band of intercept residuals

serrbar u0comm u0secomm u0rankcomm if pickonecomm==1, scale(1.96) mvopts(
msymbol(smx) mcolor(red)) ///
ytitle(Community random effects) xtitle(Community rank) yline(0) ///
title("Figure 4a: Average community contraceptive use", size(medium large))

graph save Graph "J:\Home\Health Behavior and
Policy\masianosp\Dissertation\Paper_1\Analysis\Graphs\comm_residuals.gph", replace

*counting the number of communities outside average average contraceptive use

count if ((u0comm + 1.96*u0secomm)<0 | (u0comm - 1.96*u0secomm)>0) & pickonecomm==1 /*93*/
//effect of CBDS
*full model standard logistic regression

global controls "i.age_cat i.occup i.marstatus i.exp_fp_inf
i.fertility_desire i.autonomy i.ptnr_education i.religion i.access_prob
i.comm_literacy i.comm_wealth i.comm_religion comm_childmort i.year"

logit contra_use cbda##rural $controls if notpilot==1 [pw=sampweight], or
estimates store full_std

*full model with random effects

melogit contra_use cbda##rural $controls if notpilot==1 [pw=sampweight]
||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or covariance(unstructured)
estimates store full_re

//cluster specific margins or probabilities
margins, at(cbda=(0 1) rural=(0 1)) predict(mu fixed) noestimcheck post
margins r.cbda##r.rural, predict(mu fixed) contrast noestimcheck post

*average margins in a sub-sample of married women only

global controls "i.age_cat i.occup i.exp_fp_inf i.fertility_desire i.autonomy
i.ptnr_education i.religion i.access_prob i.comm_literacy i.comm_wealth
i.comm_religion comm_childmort i.year"

melogit contra_use cbda##rural $controls if notpilot==1 & marstatus==1
[pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or
covariance(unstructured)
estimates store full_marriedonly

//cluster specific margins or probabilities
margins, at(cbda=(0 1) rural=(0 1)) predict(mu fixed) noestimcheck post
margins r.cbda##r.rural, predict(mu fixed) contrast noestimcheck post

//average margins, including random effects
drop u0dist u0comm u0sedist u0secomm pickonedist u0rankdist pickonecomm
u0rankcomm
estimates restore full
*refeffects calculate the shrunken residuals/best linear unbiased prediction of random intercepts
predict prmeandist prmeancomm, remeans reses(prsedist prsecomm)

*table 4, CBDA effects in single and multi-level models

esttab full_std full_re using CBDA_effect.rtf, nogaps wide eform b se aic bic replace nonum label
refcat(cbda "Main explanatory variables" 1.cbda#1.rural "Ref: Urban, before CBDAs"
2.age_cat "Age (ref: 15-19 years)" 2.occup "Occupation (ref: unemployed)" 1.marstatus "Marital status (ref: never married)"
1.exp_fp_inf "Exposure to FP inf (ref: no exposure)"
2.fertility_desire "Fertility desire (ref: wants child <1 yr)"
1.autonomy "Autonomy (ref: No autonomy)"
1.ptnr_education "Partner education (ref: no education)"
2.religion "Religion (ref: Catholic/Anglican)"
1.access_prob "Access problem (ref: no problem)"
1.comm_literacy "Literacy (ref: illiterate)"
2.comm_wealth "Income (ref: low)"
2.comm_religion "Religion (ref: Catholic/Anglican)"
2004.year "Year fixed effects (ref: 2000)"
0.education "Individual-level factors"
0.access_prob "Community-level factors" , nolabel
mtitle("Single-level Logistic Regression" "Multi-level Logistic Regression")
title("Table 4: Effect of CBDAs on contraceptive use")
collabels("Odds Ratio" "Standard errors" "95% Confidence Interval" "Odds Ratio" "95% Confidence Interval")
coeflabels(eq1 "cbda "CBDAs" 1.cbda "CBDAs" 1.rural "Rural"
1.cbda#1.rural " Rural, after CBDAs"
comm_childmort "Community child mortality")
drop (0.rural 0.cbda 0.cbda#0.rural 1.cbda#0.rural 0.cbda#1.rural 2000.year)
2015.year 1.age_cat 1.occup 0.marstatus 0.exp_fp_inf 0.autonomy
.fertility_desire 1.religion 0.ptnr_education 1.comm_wealth
1.comm_religion 0.comm_literacy) obslast

//The effect of education

*Mediation
*unadjusted
melogit contra_use cbda i.education if notpilot==1 [pw=sampweight]
||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or covariance(unstructured)
estimates store unadj_edu
coeffplot, xline(0)

*adjusted but without education
melogit contra_use cbda rural i.wealth $controls if notpilot==1
[pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or
covariance(unstructured)
estimates store cbda_adj_noedu

*adjusted with education
melogit contra_use cbda i.education rural i.wealth $controls if notpilot==1
[pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or
covariance(unstructured)
estimates store cbda_adj_edu
coeffplot, xline(0) keep(*education)

esttab cbda_only unadj_edu cbda_adj_noedu cbda_adj_edu using
edu_mediation.rtf, eform b ci noeqlines eqlabels(none) keep(cbda
*.education) //

coefflabels (eq1 ""cbda "CBDA" ) //
drop(0.education) //
refcat(1.education "Ref: No education") //
title("Table 6: Assessment of education as a mediator of CBDA
effects on contraceptive use") //
mtitle("Model 1A" "Model 1B" "Model 2A" "Model 2B") label replace
nonum
// the effect of wealth

* unadjusted

melogit contra_use cbda i.wealth if notpilot==1 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or covariance(unstructured)
estimates store unadj_wealth

* adjusted but without wealth

melogit contra_use cbda rural i.education $controls if notpilot==1
[pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or covariance(unstructured)
estimates store cbda_adj_nowealth

* adjusted with wealth

melogit contra_use cbda i.education rural i.wealth $controls if notpilot==1
[pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or covariance(unstructured)
estimates store cbda_adj_wealth

esttab cbda_only unadj_wealth cbda_adj_nowealth cbda_adj_wealth using wealth_mediation.rtf, eform b ci noeqlines eqlabels(none) ///
   keep(cbda *.wealth) nogaps ///
   coeflabels (eq1 "cbda "CBDA") ///
   drop(1.wealth) ///
   refcat(2.wealth "Income (Ref: Low income)") ///
   title( "Table 6B: Assessment of income (wealth) as a mediator of
CBDA effects on contraceptive use") ///
   mtitle("Model 1A" "Model 1B" "Model 2A" "Model 2B") label replace nonum

*Moderation

global controls "i.age_cat i.occup i.exp_fp_inf i.fertility_desire i.autonomy i.ptnr_education i.religion i.access_prob i.comm_literacy i.comm_wealthealth i.comm_religion comm_childmort i.year"
recode education 3=2

melogit contra_use cbda##ib0.education $controls if notpilot==1 & rural==1 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) covariance(unstructured)
estimates store moderation_education_r

melogit contra_use cbda##ib1.wealth $controls if notpilot==1 & rural==1 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) covariance(unstructured)
estimates store moderation_wealth_r

coefplot (moderation_education_r, label("Education") keep(*:1.cbda 1.cbda#0.education 1.cbda#1.education )) (moderation_wealth_r, label("Income") keep(*:1.cbda#1.wealth 1.cbda#2.wealth)), bylabel(Rural) ///
||, eform cismooth levels(95 90) msymbol(S) xline(1) xscale(r(1 2)) xlabel(1(0.5)4) ylab(, labsize(3)) ///
xtitle("Odds ratios", size(2.5)) ytitle("CBDA effect by education/income", size(3.5)) grid(none) ///
title("Figure 6: Education and income as moderators of CBDA effects", span size(4) color(black))

graph save Graph "U:\Dissertation\Paper_1\Analysis\Graphs\moderation_main2.gph", replace

*making a table of the moderating effects of education and wealth
esttab moderation_education_r moderation_wealth_r using edu_wealth_moderation1.rtf, b ci wide noeqlines eqlabels(none) ///
title( "Table 6: Assessment of education and income (wealth) as moderators of CBDA effects on contraceptive use in rural areas") ///
keep(*1.cbda *.wealt **ed .education) nogaps ///
refcat(1.cbda "Ref: Before CBDAs" 0.education "Ref: No education" 1.cbda#1.education "Ref: No education, before CBDAs" 1.wealth ///
"Ref: Low income" 1.cbda#1.wealth "Ref:Low income, before CBDAs") ///
coeflabels (eq1 " cbda "CBDAs" 1.cbda "CBDAs" 1.cbda#1.education "Primary, after CBDAs" 1.cbda#2.education "Secondary, after CBDAs" ///
1.cbda#2.wealth "Medium income, after CBDAs" 1.cbda#3.wealth "High income, after CBDAs") ///
mtitle("Model 1A" "Model 1B") label replace nonum aic bic

*this makes bar graphs
*coefplot moderation_education moderation_wealth, eform keep(1.cbda#*)
vertical recast(bar) barwidth(0.25) fcolor(*.5) ciopts(recast(rcap)) citop
citype(logit) xtitle(Repair Record 1978) ytitle(Proportion)

**another moderation graph, strength of the association between education and
wealth

melogit contra_use cbda##education##wealth $controls if notpilot==1 &
rural==1 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or
covariance(unstructured)
estimates store moderation_2

gen education1=education
recode education1 3=2
label copy education education1
label values education1 education1

*predicting probabilities
predict predprob, fixedonly

*getting average probabilities by education and income
table education1 wealth cbda, c(mean predprob)

*setting the font
graph set window fontface "Times New Roman"

graph bar (mean) predprob if rural==1, over(education1) over(wealth,
label(labsize(small))) over(cbda) asyvars ///
   ytitle(Predicted probability) ///
   bltitle("") ///
   legend(rows(1) ///
subtitle(Education level)) ///
bargap(0) ///
bar(1, lpattern(solid) color(dkorange)) bar(2, lpattern(solid)
color(brown)) bar(3, lpattern(solid) color(green) fintensity(70) ) ///
title("Figure 8: Predicted probability of contraceptive use by income
and education among rural women", size(3) color(black))

graph save Graph "U:\Home\Health Behavior and
Policy\masianosp\Dissertation\Paper_1\Analysis\Graphs\moderationbyeducation2.g
ph", replace

//*Model diagnostics

use analysis_cbda, clear

global controls "age agesq i.occup i.marstatus i.exp_fp_inf
i.fertility_desire i.autonomy i.ptnr_education i.religion i.access_prob
i.comm_literacy i.comm_wealth i.comm_religion comm_childmort i.year"

melogit contra_use cbda##rural i.education i.wealth $controls if
notpilot==1 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or
covariance(unstructured)
estimates store for_residuals

*goodness of fit test using predicted probabilities

predict probability, fixedonly

gen predicted_contra=0
replace predicted_contra=1 if probability>0.5

tab contra_use predicted_contra if notpilot==1, row
count if contra_use==1 & predicted_contra==1 & notpilot==1 | contra_use==0 &
predicted_contra==0 & notpilot==1
drop probability predicted_contra

*goodness of fit test using residuals

gen n = _n

predict residuals, deviance

label var n "Observation number"

twoway (scatter residuals n if contra_use) (scatter residuals n if
!contra_use) if notpilot==1, ///
yline(-2 2) legend(off) text(3.8 10000 "Using contraceptives") text(0.2 10000 "Not using contraceptives") ///

title("Figure 8: Goodness-of-fit test using deviance residuals", size(4) color(black)) ///

ytitle("Deviance residuals")

graph save Graph "J:\Home\Health Behavior and Policy\masianosp\Dissertation\Paper_1\Analysis\Graphs\deviance_residuals.gph", replace

/***sensitivity analysis

global controls "i.age_cat i.occup i.marstatus i.exp_fp_inf i.fertility_desire i.autonomy i.ptnr_education i.religion i.access_prob i.comm_literacy i.comm_wealth i.comm_religion i.mort i.year"

melogit contra_use cbda##rural $controls if notpilot==1 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or covariance(unstructured)
estimates store sensitivity_pilot

melogit contra_use cbda##rural $controls if notpilot==0 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or covariance(unstructured)
estimates store sensitivity_notpilot

*joint test of the interaction term and the main effects
test _b[1.cbda]=_b[1.rural]=_b[1.cbda#1.rural]
esttab sensitivity_pilot sensitivity_notpilot using Sensitivity_1.rtf, nogaps wide b ci replace nonum label

   refcat(cbda "Main explanatory variables" 1.cbda#1.rural "Ref: Urban, before CBDAs" ///
2.age_cat "Age (ref: 15-19 years)" 2.occup "Occupation (ref: unemployed)" 1.marstatus "Marital status (ref: never married)" ///
1.exp_fp_inf "Exposure to FP inf (ref: no exposure)"
2.fertility_desire "Fertility desire (ref: wants child <1 yr)"
1.autonomy "Autonomy (ref: No autonomy)"
1.ptnr_education "Partner education (ref: no education)"
2.religion "Religion (ref: Catholic/Anglican)"
1.access_prob "Access problem (ref: no problem)"
1.comm_literacy "Literacy (ref: illiterate)"
2.comm_wealth "Income (ref: low)"
2.comm_religion "Religion (ref: Catholic/Anglican)" 2004.year "Year fixed effects (ref: 2000)" ///
0.access_prob "Community-level factors", nolabel) ///
mtitle("Pilot districts" "Non-pilot districts") ///
title("Table 4: Effect of CBDAs on contraceptive use") ///
collabels("Odds Ratio" "95% Confidence Interval" "Odds Ratio"
"95% Confidence Interval") ///
coeflabels (eq1 "cbda "CBDAs" 1.cbda "CBDAs" 1.rural "Rural"
1.cbda#1.rural " Rural, after CBDAs" ///
comm_childmort "Community child mortality") ///
drop (0.rural 0.cbda 0.cbda#0.rural 1.cbda#0.rural
0.cbda#1.rural 2000.year ///
2015.year 1.age_cat 1.occup 0.marstatus 0.exp_fp_inf 0.autonomy ///
1.fertility_desire 1.religion 0.ptnr_education 1.comm_wealth
1.comm_religion 0.comm_literacy) obslast

**Moderation: effects of education and wealth
melogit contra_use cbda##ib3.education##ib3.wealth $controls if notpilot==1 & rural==1 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or
covariance(unstructured)
estimates store moderation_education_u

melogit contra_use cbda##ib3.wealth $controls i.education if notpilot==1 & rural==0 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or
covariance(unstructured)
estimates store moderation_wealth_u

coefplot (moderation_education_u, label("Education") keep(*: 1.cbda
1.cbda#0.education 1.cbda#1.education) ) (moderation_wealth_u,
label("Income") keep(*: 1.cbda#1.wealth 1.cbda#2.wealth) ), bylabel(Panel A: urban) ///
|| (moderation_education_r, label("Education") keep(*:1.cbda
1.cbda#0.education 1.cbda#1.education) ) (moderation_wealth_r,
label("Income") keep(*: 1.cbda#1.wealth 1.cbda#2.wealth) ), bylabel(Panel B: rural) ///
||, eform xline(1) cissmooth levels(99.999) byopts(xrescale)
msymbol(S) label ylab(, labsize(3)) ///
**Examining the effect of using 2000, 2004 as baselines**

use analysis_cbda.dta, clear

global controls "i.age_cat i.occup i.marstatus i.exp_fp_inf i.fertility_desire i.autonomy i.ptnr_education i.religion i.access_prob i.comm_literacy i.comm_wealth i.comm_religion comm_childmort i.year"

quietly melogit contra_use  cbda##rural $controls  if notpilot==1 & year!=2004 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or covariance(unstructured)
estimates store _2000

quietly melogit contra_use  cbda##rural $controls  if notpilot==1 & year!=2000 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or covariance(unstructured)
estimates store _2004

quietly melogit contra_use  cbda##rural $controls  if notpilot==1 [pw=sampweight] ||district: ||community:, pw(comm_wt) or covariance(unstructured)
estimates store full

esttab _2000 _2004 full using year_sensitivity.rtf , nogaps eform b ci wide replace nonum label ///
   refcat(cbda "Main explanatory variables" 1.cbda#1.rural "Ref: Urban, before CBDAs" /)
   2.age_cat "Age (ref: 15-19 years)" 2.occup "Occupation (ref: unemployed)" 1.marstatus "Marital status (ref: never married)" /
   1.exp_fp_inf "Exposure to FP information (ref: no exposure)"
   2.fertility_desire "Fertility desire (ref: no more child)" /
1. autonomy "Autonomy (ref: No autonomy)" 1. ptnr_education
"Partner education (ref: no education)" ///

2. religion "Religion (ref: Catholic/Anglican)" 1. access_prob
"Access problem (ref: no problem)" ///

1. comm_literacy "Literacy (ref: illiterate)" ///

2. comm_religion "Religion (ref: Catholic/Anglican)" 2004. year
"Year fixed effects" 0. education "Individual-level factors" ///

0. access_prob "Community-level factors", nolabel) ///


title("Table S2: Effect of CBDAs on contraceptive use in
response to changing baseline") ///

coeflabels (eq1 "cbda "CBDA" 1. cbda "CBDA" 1. rural "Rural"
1. cbda#1. rural " Rural, after CBDAs" ///

comm_childmort "Community child mortality") ///

drop (0. rural 0. cbda 0. cbda#0. rural 1. cbda#0. rural
0. cbda#1. rural 2000. year ///

2015. year 1. age_cat 1. occup 0. marstatus 0. exp_fp_inf 0. autonomy
///

1. fertility_desire 1. religion 0. ptnr_education 1. comm_wealth
1. comm_religion 0. comm_literacy) obslast
estwrite * using results, replace
estread results
log close
Chapter 2: Conditional cash transfers to increase the uptake of services for the prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV: a trial-based cost-effectiveness analysis

Abstract

Background: Innovative strategies have been implemented to address the prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT) of HIV in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). A recent randomized controlled trial found that conditional cash transfers (CCTs) to pregnant women with HIV increases the uptake of PMTCT services. The current study evaluates the cost-effectiveness of the CCTs.

Methods: A cost-effectiveness analysis, from the societal perspective, was conducted for a randomized controlled trial of CCTs in 89 clinics in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), 2013-2015. The trial had two arms. The intervention group (n=216) received the standard of care plus US$5 at the first visit and increased by US$1 at every scheduled visit. The control group (n=217) only received the standard of care. Health outcomes were measured using PMTCT uptake and PMTCT retention. We expressed incremental effectiveness using the number needed to treat (NNT). We evaluated economic costs by trial arm and relied on the trial, negotiated drug price lists, and the literature for cost estimates. We reported the costs in 2016 International Dollars (I$). The threshold for cost-effectiveness was based on 3x GDP per capita for the DRC in 2016 (I$2409). We used both deterministic sensitivity analyses and cost-effectiveness acceptability curves to examine the uncertainty associated with the ICERs.

Results: The CCTs increased PMTCT uptake and retention, but at a higher cost. The NNT was 7.0 (95% C.I.=6.7-7.6) for PMTCT uptake and 12.1 (95% C.I.=11.6-12.8) for PMTCT retention. The mean costs/participant in the intervention and control groups were I$516 and I$431, representing an incremental cost of I$85 (95% C.I.=59-111). The ICER was I$595 (95% C.I. =567-624) for PMTCT uptake and I$1026 (95% C.I.=960-1101) for PMTCT retention. In uncertainty analyses, the CCTs were still cost-effective even in the worst case.

Conclusion: CCTs are a cost-effective way to increasing uptake of PMTCT services in the DRC and similar settings. However, additional research is needed to understand the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the CCTs in larger populations and over a longer analytic time horizon before further scale-up of CCTs.
1. Introduction

Despite global progress in reducing the number of new HIV infections, mother-to-child transmission (MTCT) of HIV remains a challenge. The United Nations Joint Program on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) estimated that over 440 children (ages 0-14 years) were infected with HIV every day in 2016, mostly through vertical transmission [106]. Most of these infections (88%) occurred in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) where nearly 70% (26 million) of all people with HIV lived in 2016 and uptake of services for the prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV (PMTCT) is low (<70 percent overall and as low as 32 percent in countries like Nigeria) [106], [107]. Evidence suggests that PMTCT services, which include the provision of highly efficacious preventive antiretroviral drugs to both the mother and the infant, can reduce the risk of MTCT to <5%. However, in the absence of PMTCT services, the risk of MTCT is about 40% [108]–[110].

The low uptake of PMTCT services despite the advantages and wide availability of the services in SSA poses challenges to global ambitions of eliminating the AIDS epidemic by 2030 [111]. This raises a need to find innovative and cost-effective approaches to help overcome barriers preventing the uptake of and demand for these services. One such approach is the use of conditional cash transfers (CCTs), an approach previously used to modify individual and household behaviors in health and other sectors like education [112]–[114]. To test whether CCTs can be used to increase the uptake of PMTCT services, a randomized controlled trial (RCT) of the CCTs was implemented in the Democratic of the Congo (DRC) [115]. The expectation was that the CCTs would help to overcome demand-side barriers, particularly transport costs—one of the major factors preventing the uptake of PMTCT services in SSA [116]–[119].
Results from the DRC trial suggested that CCTs can increase the number of women taking up PMTCT services [115], but it is unclear whether the CCTs are cost-effective. Therefore, the goal of the present study is to conduct a trial-based cost-effectiveness analysis of the CCTs to establish whether the CCTs represent a good value for the money. We emphasize that the main contribution of this study is in the cost and cost-effectiveness analysis and not in establishing the effectiveness of the intervention.

2. Overview of the trial

In 2013-2015, an RCT was launched in the DRC to test the effectiveness of paying pregnant women with HIV cash to help overcome demand-side barriers to healthcare [115]. These barriers include lack of transport money and the opportunity of time spent seeking PMTCT services [117], [118]. The trial, funded by the National Institutes of Health, was conducted in Kinshasa in 89 facilities already offering PMTCT services as part of maternal and child health clinics. All women newly diagnosed with HIV, <32 weeks of gestation, and registered for ANC at any of the 89 facilities were considered for participation.

The trial enrolled 433 women, with 216 randomized to the intervention group and 217 to the control group. The intervention group received standard PMTCT care plus the cash incentives while the control group only received the standard PMTCT care. At the initial visit, each participant in the intervention group received US$5 which increased by US$1 at the next visit but was reset to $5 if the participant missed a scheduled visit or refused a proposed service [115]. Option B+ was the standard of care at the time of the trial [115]. Under this protocol, pregnant women with HIV—irrespective of gestation age or HIV disease stage—are initiated on antiretroviral drugs and continue to take the drugs for life [120], [121]. Table 1 lists the protocol’s recommendations.
2.1. Trial outcomes

The trial had two primary health outcomes: uptake of PMTCT services and retention in PMTCT care. Uptake was defined as timely attendance (within 5 days) of all scheduled clinic visits from randomization through 6 weeks’ postpartum and acceptance of all proposed services listed in table 1. Retention was defined as being in HIV care at 6 weeks’ postpartum regardless of the reason for missing any prior scheduled visits [115].

3. Methods

3.1. Overview

We conducted a trial-based cost-effectiveness of CCTs aimed at increasing uptake of PMTCT services and retention in PMTCT care in the DRC. We conducted the study from both the societal and healthcare perspectives and largely followed recommendations by the World Health Organization (WHO) for cost-effectiveness analysis in resource-limited settings [122]–[124]. Data on resource utilization came from the trial but cost data came from multiple sources. We report economic costs in constant 2016 international dollars (I$). Costs in local currency were first adjusted for inflation using DRC’s gross domestic product (GDP) deflator and then converted to 2016 I$. In line with the trial, we measured the effectiveness of the CCTs using two health outcomes: uptake of PMTCT services and retention in PMTCT care. We expressed incremental effectiveness in terms of the number needed to treat (NNT)—the number of participants needed to receive the cash incentives for one more participant to take up the services or be retained in care. We did not discount the costs or effects to net present value as participant follow-up was <1 year. The threshold for cost-effectiveness was based on 3x GDP per capita for the DRC in 2016 (I$2409). We used both deterministic sensitivity analyses and cost-effectiveness acceptability curves to examine the uncertainty in the ICERs. This study was
approved as exempt by the Internal Review Board of Virginia Commonwealth University (IRB#: HM20009283).

3.2. Study perspective

We conducted the study from a societal perspective as recommended by the WHO [122]. The perspective included formal healthcare sector costs (e.g., drugs) and informal healthcare sector costs (e.g., patient transport costs) [122]. We summarize the costs included in this study in Table 2.

3.3. Identifying cost sources

As the trial was not designed for an economic evaluation and therefore, did not collect detailed cost data, we relied on multiple sources for the cost data. The sources included peer-reviewed studies and the grey literature from within and outside of the DRC. We searched Google, Google Scholar, PubMed, and Medline using the terms in Appendix B1. We also manually searched reference lists of identified studies for studies not captured by our search terms.

We restricted the search to cost sources contextually relevant to the DRC. We defined contextual relevance in three ways: the time of the study, geography, and income—measured using GDP per capita as classified by the World Bank. In terms of time, the search was restricted to studies conducted from the year 2005 onward as antiretroviral drugs and PMTCT strategies were widely introduced after 2004 [125], [126]. In terms of geography, the search was restricted to studies in SSA. In terms of income, the search was restricted to countries with low GDP per capita, similar to the DRC [127]. For prices of antiretroviral drugs, we relied on price lists of international negotiated prices publicly available through the Clinton Health Access Initiative (CHAI) [128]. Appendix B2 lists the candidate cost sources.
3.4. Identifying unit costs in base case analysis

From the list of candidate cost sources in appendix B2, we selected estimates from high-quality studies to represent base case unit costs, table 3. We defined high-quality studies as peer-reviewed studies and project reports which clearly articulated data sources, how costs were assigned, followed recommended guidelines for estimating costs in cost and cost-effectiveness analyses, and presented costs in disaggregated form—for example, cost per visit. If multiple high-quality sources were available, we selected estimates from studies closest to 2016 as they are likely to be more applicable to the current context.

3.5. Valuation of goods and services, inflation adjustment, and discounting

We valued the cost of the CCTs in international dollars (I$)—a hypothetical currency with the same purchasing power as the US$ has in the United States [122], [123]. The I$ reflects the correct value of goods because it distinguishes between tradable and non-tradable goods; without this distinction, non-tradable goods would be undervalued countries with higher purchasing power such as the DRC [122], [124]. Tradable goods (e.g., medications) are those goods that can be imported or exported and converted their estimates using nominal (official) exchange rates. On the other hand, non-tradable goods are produced locally and cannot be imported or exported (e.g., labor) [122], [124] and converted their estimates using purchasing power parity (PPP) exchange rates. All exchange rates came from a World Bank database [129].

As the trial was conducted for >1 year and cost estimates were extrapolated from multiple time periods [122], we adjusted the costs for inflation and reported the costs in constant 2016 I$—the year with the most recent conversion factors at the time of this study. To adjust for inflation, we used the implicit gross domestic product (GDP) deflator accessible through the World Bank database [130]. Unlike other candidate inflation-adjustment tools like the consumer price index,
the GDP deflator covers price changes in a broader range of economic activity, including the
health sector [36]. We first applied inflation adjustment and then converted the inflation-adjusted
estimates to I$. We did not discount costs or effects as participant follow-up was <1 year [131].

3.6. Cost assignment

We assigned costs to participants based on the number of visits or services utilized and used both
micro-costing and gross-costing to estimate the costs. For example, we assigned the cost of
transport and drugs based on micro-costing and the cost of utilities and staff wages using gross-
costing. Micro-costing entails conducting a detailed identification and measurement of all
activity inputs to value costs [132], [133]. Micro-costing can yield more precise estimates [132],
but it was not possible to use this method to value all costs. Thus, we also used gross-costing—
use of mean costs aggregated at a higher level from other studies to determine the value of an
activity [132]. Gross-costing is simple, tractable and quick to use [132], although it may produce
biased estimates because of overgeneralization [132], [134].

3.6.1. Medications and laboratory costs

To assign the cost of medications, we multiplied the number of days a participant was on the
medications by the unit cost of the medications. We calculated the number of days on the
medications by taking the difference between the date a participant was started on the medication
and the date the participant was last followed-up. Participants lost to follow-up at six weeks were
assumed to have taken the medications for 3 weeks (half-way between the first visit date and the
would-have-been visit at six weeks). We also estimated the cost of infant NVP suspension but
only for six weeks after delivery because thereafter participants were not followed-up. Unit
prices of medications, which came from CHAI and represent drug acquisition costs only, were
increased by 15% to cover shipping costs [135].
Among laboratory tests, we estimated the cost of CD4 cell counting and DNA PCR testing of infant dried blood sample (DBS). We also estimated the cost of transporting the DBS to a central laboratory in Kinshasa where the testing was done. We did not cost HIV testing and counseling as these services were provided to all pregnant mothers attending ANC clinics, regardless of study participation and therefore, would not contribute to incremental costs. We did not cost viral load tests because these tests were not performed or recorded systematically during the trial.

3.6.2. Delivery and post-delivery counseling

We estimated the cost of health facility deliveries as an episode. Separately, we also estimated the cost of post-delivery counseling on family planning and safe infant feeding practices. We assumed two post-delivery counseling sessions—one session soon after delivery but before the participant was discharged from the clinic and the other at six weeks’ postpartum. We calculated the cost of the two counseling sessions separately because some participants who delivered in health facilities did not return at six weeks’ postpartum.

3.6.3. Labor and overhead costs

We assigned labor costs to each visit, except the visit for hospital delivery which we assumed was included in the overall cost of the deliveries. We separately estimated labor costs for clinical and support staff. We used a nurse salary to approximate the labor cost of clinical staff. We assumed that a nurse saw 20 patients in a day [136] and worked for 22 days in a month. Therefore, we divided a nurse monthly salary by 440 (20*22) to find the labor cost of each visit. Using a similar approach, we derived the labor cost of support staff for each visit.

At each visit, we also calculated the cost of overheads—resources shared by other programs—which included utilities and equipment. Many of the studies from which we abstracted overhead
costs assigned costs to participants per month [137]–[139], so we assumed that the monthly cost was for one visit. We summed the costs per visit then multiplied by the number of visits to find the total cost of all visits per participant.

3.6.4. Patient and peer/family support costs

We also included costs incurred by participants and their supporters (peers or family) in the form of transport costs and the opportunity cost of time spent seeking PMTCT services [133]. Evidence suggests that women with HIV receiving PMTCT services are accompanied by their peers/family to the health facilities and they value their time and effort [140]. The trial recorded self-reported one-way transport costs which we doubled to get the transport cost per visit. We assigned the peer/family member the same transport cost as the participant. We also assumed that one clinic visit took one working day of the participant’s time and that a participant’s support lost an equal amount of time. Further, assumed the participant and their support lost 2 days for delivering in health clinics. We used a minimum day’s wage for the DRC of 1680 FC in 2016 as the opportunity cost of time [141].

3.7. Missing data

In preliminary analyses, we found that about 40% of the participants had missing transport costs which we replaced using multiple imputations to introduce variation in the imputed values and derive asymptotically consistent estimates [142]. We assessed the pattern of data missingness and found that the missingness was not systematic—a key assumption is multiple imputations [143]. We performed the multiple imputations using predictive mean matching which does not make any assumptions about the distribution of the data [144], [145]. We included the dependent variable and all explanatory variables from equation 1 (below) in the imputation, as recommended [146].
3.8. Analysis

All analyses were by intention-to-treat. That is, all participants were kept in the groups to which they were randomized, regardless of deviations from the trial’s protocol [147]. For example, one participant assigned to the control group and randomly selected to receive the cash incentives was still analyzed as part of the control group. We analyzed effects and costs using univariable and multivariable approaches and then estimated the incremental effectiveness and incremental costs. We then multiplied the incremental effectiveness and incremental costs to derive ICERs.

3.8.1. A general statistical model for analyzing effectiveness and costs

To model the effectiveness and costs of the CCTs, we used marginal models estimated via generalized estimating equations (GEE) and adjusted for potential clustering at the clinic level. Ignoring the potential clustering could have led to a narrower 95% confidence interval [148] and thus increasing the probability of type 1 error [91]. We also adjusted for baseline participant characteristics as randomization might still fail to equalize trial arms due to sampling error [77]. GEEs produce population-averaged coefficients which are desirable because they can inform policymakers, on average, the effectiveness or cost of the CCTs were all pregnant HIV-positive women to receive the intervention. Other candidate models like the generalized linear mixed models produce cluster-specific coefficients and not population-averaged coefficients [66], [149]. Another advantage of GEE is that the coefficients from these models are robust to misspecification of the variance structure making them appropriate for studies interested in estimating coefficients and not the variance itself; GEEs treat the variance as a nuisance thereby making correct variance specification less important [66], [149], [150]. While GEEs may produce biased estimates when the number of clusters is small (<10) and study arms are not balanced [148], [151], we have confidence in the estimates as the trial had a high number of
clusters (89 clinics) and the arms were balanced (216 vs. 217). We implemented the models using “xtgee” in Stata 14.2 [152].

The following was the generalized linear model:

\[ F^{-1}(\text{Outcome}_{ij}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Intervention}_{ij} + \mathbf{X}_{ij} \mathbf{A} \quad (1) \]

where:

\( \text{Outcome}_{ij} \) was either PMTCT uptake or PMTC retention or cost for the \( i^{th} \) participant at the \( j^{th} \) clinic;

\( \text{Intervention} = 1 \) if the participant received CCTs and 0 otherwise; \( \beta_1 \) was the coefficient of interest.

\( \mathbf{X}_{ij} \) is a vector of participant characteristics and \( \mathbf{A} \) a corresponding vector of coefficients.

We specified an exchangeable within-group correlation structure for both effectiveness and costs, but the links and distributions were different. An exchangeable structure means that the correlation between any pair of participants receiving PMTCT services at the same clinic was equal but non-zero [66], [149].

### 3.8.2. Effectiveness

To model the effectiveness of the CCTs, we specified a Poisson distribution and a logarithmic link in equation 1. We specified a Poisson distribution because a log-binomial model could not converge within the GEE environment in Stata 14.2. While the Poisson and log-binomial regressions produce identical estimates, standard errors from the Poisson are larger [153], [154] which increases the probability of failing to reject the null (type 2 error) [91]. To make the
standard errors smaller and comparable to those from a log-binomial model, we estimated the Poisson model with robust error variances [154].

To duplicate published results from the trial [115], we reported the effectiveness using relative risks. Thus, for PMTCT uptake in equation 1, participants who received the CCTs had \( \beta_1 \) times the risk of taking up PMTCT services compared with participants who did not receive the CCTs. Similarly, for PMTCT retention, participants who received the CCTs had \( \beta_1 \) times the risk of being retained in PMTCT care compared with participants who did not receive the CCTs.

### 3.8.3. Incremental effectiveness

Next, we estimated the incremental effectiveness of the CCTs expressed using NNT, like several other studies in the HIV literature[155], [156]. NNT is an epidemiological measure that quantifies the number of participants needed to receive a treatment to avoid a poor outcome [157], for example, not taking up PMTCT services. NNT is a natural number and therefore easier to interpret clinically than other candidate measures of incremental effectiveness like risk differences [157]. Thus, a higher NNT means that the treatment is less effective in avoiding the unwanted outcome. We were unable to use traditional measures of incremental effectiveness like the disability-adjusted life years (DALY) averted because participant follow-up time was too short, and the study was not powered to detect the effect of the CCTs on survival.

Calculation of NNT, like for relative risks, was based directly on the underlying risk of PMTCT uptake or PMTCT retention in each trial arm. We emphasize that we could not directly estimate the NNT using the relative risks from the Poisson regression. Therefore, after estimating the Poisson regression in equation 1, we derived the NNT in the following steps:

1. Predicted the absolute risk for each participant.
2. Calculated the mean absolute risk in each arm.
3. Calculated the mean absolute risk difference between the intervention and control arms.
4. Calculated the NNT, which is the reciprocal of the mean absolute risk difference [158].

We interpreted the NNT as the number of participants needed to receive the cash incentives for one more participant to take up PMTCT services, compared to standard of care. We made a similar interpretation for PMTCT retention.

3.8.4. Economic costs
To determine total costs in each trial arm, we multiplied resources used by each participant by the unit cost of that resource and then added. We described costs using both the median and mean but in multivariable regressions modeled mean costs only. While reporting of median costs is recommended as cost data are almost always positively skewed [131], we also report mean costs because budgeting and policy decisions are made based on expectation [159]. We tested differences in means and medians using t-tests and rank sum tests. The t-test, which assumes a normal distribution, is still robust when the sample size is greater than 150 or when the number of participants in the intervention and control groups is similar [160], as in this study.

3.8.5. Incremental costs
To estimate incremental costs, we also used equation 1 with cost as the outcome. We specified an exchangeable within-group correlation structure, a gamma distribution, and an identity link. These specifications were based on results of testing several correlation structures and cost distributions using the quasi-likelihood under the independence model criterion (QIC) [161]. By specifying an identity link, β1 was in the original cost values and represented the difference in costs between the intervention and the control arms—or the incremental cost of the CCTs.
3.8.6. Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio

To derive ICERs, we multiplied incremental costs and incremental effectiveness (incremental costs*NNT)\(^2\). Because the ICER is a ratio and therefore does not have standard errors to use in calculating the 95% confidence intervals, we used Fieller’s theorem to generate the confidence intervals [131], Appendix B4. Unlike other parametric methods which assume a normal distribution of the ratio, Fieller’s method considers the skewed distribution of the ICER [131], [162].

3.8.7. Are the CCTs cost-effective?

To determine whether the CCTs are cost-effective, we compared the ICER of the CCTs to cost-effectiveness thresholds based on 3x the GDP per capita for the DRC in 2016 (I$2409) [163]. Thus, I$2409 represented the maximum willingness-to-pay for an additional participant to take up PMTCT services or be retained in care. However, because of concerns that a threshold of 3x GDP per capita may be too high [164]–[166], we also considered a lower threshold (1.5x the GDP per capita for the DRC in 2016 or I$1205).

3.8.8. Uncertainty analysis

We also assessed uncertainty in the cost variables and the estimated ICER[122], [133], [167]. Sources of the uncertainty included: abstraction of cost data in different unit costs outside of the trial, use of gross costing, and imputation of transport costs [143], [167], [168]. We used deterministic sensitivity analyses to examine uncertainty in cost variables and cost-effectiveness acceptability curves to examine uncertainty in ICERs.

\(^2\) In the traditional approach, ICER=\(\frac{\Delta C}{\Delta E}\), where \(\Delta C\) is the incremental cost and \(\Delta E\) is the incremental effectiveness. Estimating effectiveness using absolute risk means that the \(\Delta E\) is the risk difference (RD). Thus, ICER=\(\frac{\Delta C}{\Delta D} = \frac{\Delta C}{1/RD}\). But \(1/RD=NNT\). Therefore, ICER=\(\Delta C\times NNT\).
3.8.8.1. One-way sensitivity analysis

In one-way sensitivity analyses, we identified the main cost drivers by varying the cost of key components one at a time across a plausible range of values, holding other cost components at their base values [133], [169]. A component was key if it had high unit costs or high utilization relative to the other components, and therefore, more likely to substantially affect costs if varied [170]. We selected values for lower and upper bound unit costs from the sources of the base case unit costs [170]. We used the limits of the 95% confidence intervals of the base case unit costs as the upper and lower bounds in the sensitivity analyses. If the base unit cost did not have a 95% confidence interval, we decreased and increased base case estimate by 50% to derive the lower and upper bound estimates, as done previously [169], [171], [172]. In each one-way sensitivity analysis, we calculated new ICERs and report the results using tornado diagrams [173], [174]. Table 3 presents the key components and the unit costs in the sensitivity analysis.


Since multiple variables may be uncertain, we examined the effect of simultaneously varying key cost variables in multi-way sensitivity analysis [169]. We created best- and worst-case scenarios. We combined the most optimistic unit costs (lower bound unit costs) in table 3 to create the best case and the most pessimistic unit costs (upper bound unit costs) to create the worst case. In each scenario, we calculated new ICERs and the associated 95% confidence intervals.

3.8.8.3. Cost-effectiveness acceptability curve

To examine the uncertainty associated with the ICERs in the base case, we used cost-effectiveness acceptability curves. These give the probability that an intervention is cost-effective compared with the alternative, for varying levels of willingness-to-pay [175]. To derive the cost-effectiveness acceptability curves, we implemented the following steps:
1. Using simple random sampling with replacement, we drew a sample of 216 observations from the trial data, similar to the size of the intervention arm [162], [176], [177].

2. From the resampled data, we calculated the mean cost and effectiveness [162], [176], [177].

3. We repeated steps 1 and 2 to obtain the mean cost and effectiveness in the control arm.

4. Next, we combined the resampled datasets and calculated a new ICER.

5. We repeated steps 1-4 for 4000 times although 1500 times is recommended [178]. This is because the bootstrapped costs and effects were normally distributed after 4000 samples. We bootstrapped costs and effects together because of their interdependence.

6. From the 4000 ICERs, we estimated differences in costs and differences in effects. From the differences in costs and effects in step 6, we derived the cost-effectiveness acceptability curves. We also plotted the joint distribution of the differences in costs and effects on a cost-effectiveness plane. To construct the CEAC, we modified an existing Stata program by changing the program’s default confidence limits and maximum values [179].

4. Results

4.1. Effectiveness of CCTs

We found that CCTs significantly increased the uptake of PMTCT services and retention in PMTCT care. About 68% (146/216) of women in the intervention group took up PMTCT services compared with 53% (116/217) in the control group. About 81% (174/216) of women in the intervention group were retained in PMTCT care compared with 72% (157/217) in the control group. Compared to participants who did not receive the cash incentives, participants who received the cash incentives were 28% and 12% more likely to take up PMTCT services and
being retained in PMTCT care, respectively, table 4. Further, women with a secondary education and those who walked to clinics were significantly more likely to take up PMTCT services.

4.1.1. The incremental effectiveness of CCTs (number-needed-to-treat)
We present incremental effectiveness (NNT) of the CCTs and the values at each step of deriving the NNT in table 5. We emphasize that NNT cannot be derived directly from relative risks and therefore, results in table 4 could not have been used to derive the NNT. The NNT for PMTCT uptake was 7.0 (95% C.I.=6.7-7.6)—that is 7 participants needed to receive the cash incentives for one more participant to take up the PMTCT services. For PMTCT retention, the NNT was 12.1 (95% C.I.=11.6-12.8).

4.2. The economic cost of the CCTs
We summarize economic costs in table 6. The mean total cost ± SD per participant in the intervention group was I$516 (116), compared with I$431 (132) in the control group (p-value <0.001). The median cost was also higher in the intervention group (I$540, IQR (485-590) vs. I$ 468, IQR (392-512)) (p-value <0.001). As a share of mean total costs, the cost of delivering in a health facility was the highest in both arms, although lower in the intervention group (52% vs. 58%). In the intervention arm, the cost of the CCTs ranked second tied with the cost of medications (10%). Overall, participants in the intervention group made 35 visits (934 vs. 899), with a mean cost per visit of I$119 (vs. I$104 in the control group).

4.2.1. The incremental cost of the CCTs
Table 7 presents the incremental costs of the CCTs. The CCTs had an incremental cost of I$85 (95% C.I.=59-111). The Incremental costs did not differ significantly by participant
characteristics although the costs were higher among those who were married, without any education, and walked to the clinics.

4.3. Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios of CCTs

In the following subsections, we present incremental cost-effectiveness ratios in the base case and in uncertainty analyses.

4.3.1. Base case analysis

Table 8 presents the incremental cost-effectiveness ratios of the CCTs in the base-case analysis. The incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of the CCTs with respect to PMTCT uptake was I$595 (95% C.I. = 567-624) and I$1026 (95% C.I. = 960-1101) with respect to PMTCT retention. Thus, the CCTs were very cost-effective in increasing PMTCT uptake (ICER < 1x DRC GDP per capita or I$803) and cost-effective in increasing PMTCT retention (ICER > I$803 but < 3x DRC GDP per capita or I$2409).

I$595 (95% C.I. = 567-624) for PMTCT uptake and I$1026 (95% C.I. = 960-1101)

4.3.2. One-way sensitivity analysis

Figure 1, a tornado diagram, presents the results of the one-way sensitivity analysis and the associated ICERs. The vertical line in the diagram corresponds to the ICER in the base case. The variables are ranked so that the most influential variable is at the top. The x-axis measures the change in ICER from the base case while the labels of the bars are the lower and upper bound unit costs used in the sensitivity analysis. The CCTs followed by delivery in health facilities were the main drivers of the incremental cost-effectiveness ratios. For example, paying each participant I$20 (or US$11) at every visit while holding other variables constant increases the
ICER from I$1026 per additional HIV+ mother retained in PMTCT care in the base case to I$1,570, but still cost-effective.

4.3.3. Multi-way sensitivity analysis

Table 9 presents results of multi-way sensitivity analysis. In the best-case, the ICERs were <1x GDP per capita and therefore very cost-effective. In the worst case, the CCTs were still cost-effective as the 95% confidence intervals of the ICERs were < I$2409 (PMTCT uptake: ICER=I$1175, 95% C.I. (1118-1235); PMTCT retention: ICER=I$2027, 95% C.I. (1893-2178).

4.3.4. Cost-effectiveness acceptability curves and willingness to pay for CCTs

We present the joint distribution of differences in costs and effects for PMTCT uptake in figure 2 and for PMTCT retention in figure 3. In both figures, all the data points (incremental cost-effectiveness ratios) are in the northeast quadrant of the cost-effectiveness plane—thus the CCTs increased both effectiveness and costs in all the resampled datasets. Furthermore, the clustering of ICERs in the same part of the quadrant shows that the values of the ICERs from the resampled datasets were close and did not greatly vary from the ICER estimate from the original trial data.

Based on the joint distribution of incremental costs and effects, we capture the uncertainty surrounding the incremental cost-effectiveness of CCTs at different willingness-to-pay thresholds in figure 4. This acceptability curve shows the level of uncertainty surrounding the ICER estimate and the probability that the CCTs were cost-effective, compared to the control group, for a given level of willingness-to-pay. Points B and F correspond to the ICER point estimates reported in table 7 and all points on the solid black line in figures 2 and 3. These

---

3 The ICER point estimates in figures 2, 3, and 4 are slightly different from the ICERs in the main results (table 8). This is because in resampling the original trial data 4000 times, each resampled dataset had its own ICER.
points have 0.5 probabilities of being cost-effective. The steep slope and the rapid rise of the curves (A to C and E to G) suggest small deviations from the original ICER estimate, and therefore, a high degree of certainty associated with the ICERs.

In addition to showing a high degree of certainty surrounding the ICERs, figure 4 also shows that the CCTs were cost-effective at many of the thresholds of willingness-to-pay proposed in this study. For example, if the willingness-to-pay is I$2409 (3x GDP per capita in 2016), the probability that the CCTs were cost-effective is almost 1. At a threshold of I$1205 (1.5x GDP per capita in 2016), the probability that the CCTs were cost-effective is almost 1. At a threshold of I$803 (1x GDP per capita in 2016), the probability that the CCTs were cost-effective in increasing PMTCT uptake is almost 1 (point D), but for PMTCT retention the probability is almost zero. At any threshold < I$570, the CCTs have no chance of being cost-effective.

5. Discussion

Uptake of PMTCT services in SSA remains low despite scale-up of Option B+ in the region [106], posing challenges to global ambitions of eliminating MTCT of HIV. Coupled with inadequate domestic funding and lack of growth in international financing towards the HIV/AIDS response [181], [182], it is imperative to find innovative and cost-effective strategies that can increase the uptake of the PMTCT services. We examined the cost-effectiveness of a trial of one such strategy—small but increasing cash incentives aimed to increase PMTCT uptake and PMTCT retention in the DRC. The findings suggest that the cash incentives were cost-effective from the societal perspective. To our knowledge, this is the first study to evaluate
the cost-effectiveness of cash incentives aimed to increase the uptake of PMTCT services and retention in PMTCT care.

From the societal perspective, the estimated incremental cost of the cash incentives was I$85, with corresponding ICERs of I$585 for PMTCT uptake and I$1081 for PMTCT retention. For a willingness-to-pay threshold of 3x DRC GDP per capita in 2016 (I$2409), these estimates suggest that the cash incentives were very cost-effective in increasing PMTCT uptake but cost-effective in increasing PMTCT retention. In a sensitivity analysis, the cash incentives were the main cost drivers and the intervention was still cost-effective even in the worst case.

The study’s finding that the cash incentives were cost-effective is consistent with reports from previous studies which examined the cost-effectiveness of other strategies aimed at increasing uptake of PMTCT services although some of the studies predate the Option B+ era. We emphasize that literature on interventions aimed at increasing uptake of PMTCT services is limited. Instead, the literature is replete with cost-effectiveness studies comparing different treatment protocols (for example, no intervention vs Option A vs. Option B vs. Option B+) or different HIV testing and counseling strategies [183]–[185]. For example, universal HIV testing of all pregnant mothers during ANC clinics was cost-effective in multiple countries [186], as were HIV rescreening late in pregnancy in South Africa [187] and couple counseling in Kenya [188]. Evidence from studies of non-conventional models for the delivery of PMTCT services suggests that these models are also cost-effective, although comparability is still limited because of health outcomes used. The Futures Institute reported that low and high levels of integration of PMTCT services with maternal, neonatal, and child health within antenatal care clinics in Malawi, Uganda, and Mozambique were cost-effective [189]. The study reported health outcomes using number of HIV infant infections averted over a period of 100 years [189].
Similarly, the JSI Research and Training Institute, which used data from Kenya and reported health outcomes using number of infant infections averted and QALYs gained, reported that Civil Society Organizations delivered PMTCT services more cost-effectively than did public health facilities [190]. Peer mentors like Mother2mothers—initially implemented in South Africa and later scaled to other parts of SSA [191], [192]—increased uptake of PMTCT services, improved health outcomes, and represent a good value for the money according to another report by the JSI Research and Training Institute [193]. However, comparability of findings is limited because the study had a longer analytic time horizon and was a cost-benefit analysis—that is, it expressed incremental effectiveness in monetary terms [193].

This study contributes to a broader, although limited, literature on the cost-effectiveness of cash incentives to improve individual/household behaviors and well-being. The findings from this limited literature are mixed overall but suggest that the cash incentives are cost-effective in resource-limited settings [194]–[196] or when the analytic time horizon is longer—for example over a lifetime [197]. The lack of evidence that cash incentives are cost-effective is largely for two reasons. First, the lack of comprehensive data about costs and effects. Second, not considering the effects of the cash incentives more broadly [198], [199]. This is particularly true for effects because the impact of the cash incentives is likely to go beyond the specific sector of interest [198]–[201]. For example, in Malawi, cash incentives averted one HIV infection among school going girls aged 13-22 years at a cost more than 15 times Malawi’s GDP per capita [202], and therefore less cost-effective. However, the cash the incentives also increased retention of the girls in school [202]. Thus, although less cost-effective when considered more narrowly (via the lens of HIV financing only), the cash incentives could be cost-effective and make economic sense when co-financing models (for example, including resources from education) are
considered [203]. Given that this study did not include all the possible benefits of the cash incentives, for example, increases in uptake of family planning services and improvements in overall health-seeking behaviors, it is likely that the current study underestimates the cost-effectiveness of the CCTs. Further, the evidence suggests that cash incentives are less-cost effective in high-income countries perhaps because the size of the incentives relative to household income is not large enough to be effective [204], [205], [206, p.]. On the other hand, cash incentives do appear to be cost-effective in developing countries where the cash incentives increased school enrollment and attendance and improved secondary school outcomes [194], [195]. Cash incentives were also cost-effective in increasing household food security and child development [196] and preventing undernutrition in emergency situations [171]. Therefore, although the evidence is mixed, this study adds to the building evidence that cash incentives are cost-effective and can be used to promote good social behaviors, particularly in resource-limited settings like in many countries in SSA.

5.1. Limitations

This study has limitations. First, because the trial did not collect detailed data for each cost component, there may be bias in the cost estimates. We relied on external sources, made a series of assumptions, and imputed missing data to estimate the costs. However, recognizing that this may have introduced bias [207], we conducted sensitivity analyses and the findings suggest that the cash incentives were still cost-effective even in the worst of circumstances.

Second, we were unable to use traditional health outcome measures for incremental effectiveness analysis like the number of DALYs [163] or HIV-infections averted. This is because participant follow-up, which was up to six weeks post-partum, was not long enough to have definitive results about the HIV status of infants in each trial arm. This limits the comparability of the
study’s findings with other cost-effectiveness analysis studies. Despite the limitation, these findings serve as a foundation for future cost-effectiveness studies that can incorporate final, versus intermediate, health outcomes. Moreover, the success of PMTCT services in achieving the desired goals begins with the uptake of the PMTCT services [108]–[110] and the findings from this study suggest that the cash incentives increase PMTCT uptake and do so cost-effectively.

Third, the thresholds based on GDP per capita have been criticized in the literature for not reflecting the opportunity cost of local resources used in the interventions [164]–[166], as recommended [208]. This suggests that most interventions deemed effective using these thresholds, may not be cost effective if the thresholds reflected the opportunity cost of the local resources used in the interventions. Furthermore, we emphasize that these thresholds based on GDP per capita were developed for cost-effectiveness analyses using final health outcome like DALYs averted or QALYs gained [163], and not intermediate outcomes like NNT. Noting these limitations, we considered a more conservative threshold (1.5x DRC GDP per capita) in uncertainty analysis and found that the cash incentives were still cost-effective. Moreover, results from studies using thresholds based on GDP per capita continue to help inform policy. For example, Option B+, an intervention already adopted and expanded by the DRC and many countries in SSA was found to be cost-effective based on these thresholds [209]–[211].

5.2. Implications for future research

While these findings suggest that the cash incentives are cost-effective, additional research is needed before any recommendations to scale-up the intervention can be made. First, we need to understand the cost-effectiveness of the cash incentives using final health outcomes like DALYs averted or life-years saved, as might be done in mathematical modeling studies. Such studies can
also examine whether the cash incentives are still cost-effective in larger populations and with different HIV profiles. Second, there is a need to understand whether the cash incentives can be combined with other cost-effective strategies also aimed at increasing the uptake of PMTCT services. This is important because the cash incentives, even if scaled widely, cannot overcome all barriers preventing the uptake of PMTCT services. Overcoming barriers to uptake of PMTCT services like stigmatization of people living with HIV and lack of partner support [118], [212] would require other interventions, particularly those that are community-based. Several of these interventions have shown effectiveness in increasing uptake of PMTCT services in Tanzania [213], South Africa [214], [215], Nigeria [216], Malawi [217], Zimbabwe [218], and Uganda [219]. Therefore, if these interventions are also cost-effective, future research should focus on whether some of these interventions can be combined with the cash incentives.

6. Conclusion

Low uptake of PMTCT services is a challenge in SSA, with implications on global efforts of realizing an HIV-free generation. Based on WHO’s thresholds for cost-effectiveness, conditional cash transfers are cost-effective in increasing uptake of PMTCT services and retention in PMTCT care in the DRC and similar settings. Additional research is needed to understand the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the cash incentives using final health outcomes and in larger populations before further scale-up of the intervention. Given that the cash incentives can overcome financial, vs. social barriers like stigmatization, considerations to combine the cash incentives with other cost-effective community-based strategies should also be made.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Definition of standard PMTCT care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIV counseling and testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV posttest counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD4 cell count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotrimoxazole prophylaxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZT if CD4 cell count $\geq 350$ cells/mm³ or triple ARV therapy if $&lt;350$ cells/mm³*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery in a health facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-partum care, including counseling on infant feeding options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevirapine suspension for the infant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotrimoxazole prophylaxis for infants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA PCR and Serologic testing for infants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants with CD4 cell counts $<350$ cells/mm³ were referred to an HIV clinic where they received AZT. Source: Yotebieng et. al, 2016.
### Table 2: Included costs, societal perspective*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Type of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal healthcare sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health outcomes <em>(effects)</em>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uptake of PMTCT services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In PMTCT care six weeks' postpartum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Medical costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratory tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation of infant dried blood samples‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health facility deliveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-delivery counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor (wages for clinical and support staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overhead costs (utilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital costs (equipment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal healthcare sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patient time costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer/family support time costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patient transportation costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer/family support transportation costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table is based on recommendations by the second US Panel on Cost-effectiveness in Health and Medicine [220] and not the World Health Organization. † The study had two primary outcomes: uptake of PMTCT services and retention in PMTCT care. Uptake of PMTCT services was defined as timely attendance (within 5 days) of all scheduled clinic visits from randomization through 6 weeks’ postpartum and accepting all proposed services listed in box 1. ‡ Infant dried blood samples from all clinics participating in the study were transported to a central laboratory in Kinshasa for DNA PCR testing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost component</th>
<th>Unit of measurement</th>
<th>Base case*</th>
<th>Lower bound†</th>
<th>Upper bound†</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Incentives</td>
<td>Per visit</td>
<td>9-20‡</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Trial data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZT (mother)</td>
<td>Per dose (30 days)</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>[128]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART (mother)</td>
<td>Per dose (30 days)</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>[128]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotrimoxazole (mother)</td>
<td>Per dose (30 days)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>[221]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevirapine (infant)</td>
<td>Per dose (6 weeks)</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>[128]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotrimoxazole (infant)</td>
<td>Per dose (6 weeks)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>[222]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD4 count</td>
<td>Per test</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>22.95</td>
<td>[138]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA PCR (infant)</td>
<td>Per test</td>
<td>45.28</td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td>67.92</td>
<td>[138]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation of DBS§</td>
<td>Per sample</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>[223]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facility deliveries †</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Per delivery</td>
<td>281.31</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>843.92</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-delivery counselling</td>
<td>Per session</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[184]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages for clinical staff</td>
<td>Per visit</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[225]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages for support staff</td>
<td>Per visit</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[226]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital and overhead costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Per visit</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[227]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Per visit</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[138]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient and peer/family support costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Per day</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>[141]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (varies by patient)</td>
<td>Per visit</td>
<td>0.19-5.75</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>Trial data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base-case values were used to derive total mean costs in each trial arm for the main analysis. †Lower and upper bounds were created from 95% confidence intervals of the base case unit costs. If a base unit cost did not have a 95% confidence interval, the base unit cost was decreased by 50% to derive the lower bound and increased by 50% to derive the upper bound unit cost. The lower and upper bounds were individually used in one-way deterministic sensitivity analysis and in combination to create best- and worst-case scenarios in multi-way sensitivity analysis. ‡This range in USD is 5-11. §DBS (dry blood sample) was transported from the study clinics to a central laboratory in Kinshasa. ††Health facility deliveries: as the trial did not collect data on facility type, delivery method, and employment status, we made the following assumptions. For the base case unit cost, we assumed that all study participants delivered in secondary health centers, the baby was delivered normally and that all participants were unemployed. For the lower bound unit cost, we assumed that all study participants delivered in primary health centers, delivery was normal and that they were all unemployed. For the upper bound unit cost, we assumed that all study participants delivered in primary health centers, delivery was through cesarean section and that all study participants were employed.
Table 4: Effectiveness of conditional cash transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PMTCT Uptake†</th>
<th></th>
<th>PMTCT Retention‡</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative risk</td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
<td>Relative risk</td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1.276**</td>
<td>[1.09,1.50]</td>
<td>1.12*</td>
<td>[1.01-1.23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>[0.99,1.02]</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>[0.99,1.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (ref: not married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>[0.83,1.15]</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>[0.89,1.13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (ref: no education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>[0.73,1.15]</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>[0.90,1.21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or higher</td>
<td>1.396**</td>
<td>[1.14,1.71]</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>[0.94,1.29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (ref: first quintile (poorest))§</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quintile</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>[0.74,1.19]</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>[0.83,1.15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quintile</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>[0.86,1.331]</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>[0.87,1.19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quintile</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>[0.69,1.20]</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>[0.84,1.16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth quintile (richest)</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>[0.85,1.40]</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>[0.84,1.17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport mode (ref: other means)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>1.209*</td>
<td>[1.04,1.40]</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>[0.99, 1.20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.423***</td>
<td>[0.27,0.66]</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>[0.61,1.04]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: 433

Abbreviations: PMTCT, prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV.
* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001. † PMTCT uptake was defined as meeting the following conditions: attended all scheduled clinic visits from enrollment date through 6 weeks' postpartum, gave birth in a study clinic, accepted all proposed services including providing blood samples for CD4 cell count and dried blood spot sample for early infant diagnosis of HIV at six weeks' postpartum. ‡ PMTCT retention was defined as being in HIV care at 6 weeks’ postpartum regardless of the reason for missing any prior scheduled visits [115]. § Wealth quintiles were created from twelve variables using principal components analysis (PCA). The following variables were included in the PCA: maternal education, average number of household members per room, number of beds in the household, water source for the household (private or communal) and cooking fuel type (electrical stove, or firewood/charcoal). Ownership status of the following durable assets was also used in the PCA: radio, television, mobile telephone, refrigerator, and car [115].
Table 5: Number-needed-to-treat (NNT), and steps for deriving the NNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>PMTCT uptake</th>
<th>PMTCT retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicted mean absolute risk in the treatment group</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted mean absolute risk in the control group</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculated absolute risk reduction*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number-needed-to-treat (NNT) †</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.01 (6.69-7.57)</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.11 (11.55-12.81)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values in the table may not be exact due to rounding. *We subtracted the predicted mean absolute risks between the intervention and control groups to derive the absolute risk reduction. †We took the reciprocal of the absolute risk reduction to derive the NNT. ‡These numbers represent the 95% confidence intervals and were generated using Fieller’s method.
Table 6. Mean cost per participant, by trial arm (2016 I$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Intervention Mean</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
<th>Control Mean</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
<th>p-value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Incentives</td>
<td>51.10</td>
<td>[48.56-53.64]</td>
<td>0.31†</td>
<td>[0.00-0.93]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZT (mother)</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>[16.19-20.34]</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>[15.33-19.47]</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotrimoxazole (mother)</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>[4.79-5.29]</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>[4.58-5.13]</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevirapine (infant)</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>[9.6-10.65]</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>[8.82-10.05]</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotrimoxazole (infant)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>[3.78-4.04]</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>[3.51-3.86]</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD4</td>
<td>35.99</td>
<td>[33.98-38]</td>
<td>31.66</td>
<td>[29.65-33.67]</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA PCR (infant)</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>[27.75-33.46]</td>
<td>24.21</td>
<td>[21.17-27.24]</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation of dry blood sample</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>[1.43-1.72]</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>[1.09-1.4]</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facility deliveries</td>
<td>265.68</td>
<td>[257-274.36]</td>
<td>250.19</td>
<td>[238.33-262.05]</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-delivery counselling</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>[0.43-0.46]</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>[0.4-0.44]</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages for clinical staff</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>[10.63-11.8]</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>[10.18-11.41]</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages for support staff</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>[4.71-5.23]</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>[4.52-5.06]</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital and overhead costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>[5.44-6.04]</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>[5.21-5.84]</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>[2.88-3.2]</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>[2.76-3.1]</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient and peer/family support costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient and family support’s time</td>
<td>35.96</td>
<td>[34.74-37.18]</td>
<td>34.02</td>
<td>[32.73-35.31]</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (varies by patient)</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>[17.22-20.43]</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>[16.28-19.73]</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>515.94</td>
<td>[500.37-531.51]</td>
<td>431.43</td>
<td>[413.75-449.11]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The p-values were from tests of medians based on the Wilcoxon rank sum tests. †The mean cost of cash incentives in the control group is not zero because one randomly selected participant in the control group received an incentive of IS 82 (or US$ 45). We truncated the confidence interval for the cash incentives in the control group at zero; the actual confidence interval was [-0.31-0.93].
Table 7. Adjusted costs of conditional cash transfers, I$2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>84.77***</td>
<td>[58.72,110.82]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>[-3.64,0.28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (ref: not married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>[-9.12,54.64]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (ref: no education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>[-29.94,26.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or higher</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>[-56.11,55.84]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (ref: first quintile (poorest))†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quintile</td>
<td>-8.90</td>
<td>[-45.27,27.47]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quintile</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>[-33.14,29.89]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quintile</td>
<td>-28.90</td>
<td>[-70.35,12.47]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth quintile (richest)</td>
<td>-28.80</td>
<td>[-70.33,12.70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport mode (ref: other means)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>[-13.45,39.48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>469.00***</td>
<td>[408.31,529.71]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001. †Wealth quintiles were created from twelve variables using principal components analysis (PCA). The following variables were included in the PCA: maternal education, average number of household members per room, number of beds in the household, water source for the household (private or communal) and cooking fuel type (electrical stove, or firewood/charcoal). Ownership status of the following durable assets was also used in the PCA: radio, television, mobile telephone, refrigerator, and car.
Table 8. Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios of conditional cash transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PMTCT Uptake</th>
<th></th>
<th>PMTCT Retention</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental cost (I$)</td>
<td>84.77</td>
<td>[58.72-110.82]</td>
<td>84.77</td>
<td>[58.72-110.82]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICER*†</td>
<td><strong>594.54</strong></td>
<td>[567.04-624.26]</td>
<td><strong>1026.23</strong></td>
<td>[959.99-1101.26]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: PMTCT, prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV; NNT, number-needed-to-treat; ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio.

*Confidence intervals generated using Fieller's theorem. †At a cost-effectiveness threshold 3x DRC GDP per capita in 2016 (I$2409), the conditional cash transfers were cost-effective.
Table 9. Multi-way sensitivity analysis of the cost-effectiveness of CCTs: best and worst cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PMTCT Uptake</th>
<th></th>
<th>PMTCT Retention</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICER</td>
<td>95% C.I.*</td>
<td>ICER</td>
<td>95% C.I.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base case</td>
<td>594.54</td>
<td>[567.04-624.26]</td>
<td>1026.23</td>
<td>[959.99-1101.26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best case†</td>
<td>219.78</td>
<td>[210.01-230.37]</td>
<td>379.36</td>
<td>[355.36-406.62]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst case‡</td>
<td>1174.51</td>
<td>[1118.11-1235.32]</td>
<td>2027.34</td>
<td>[1893.95-2178.09]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: PMTCT, prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV; ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio.

*The 95% confidence intervals generated using Fieller's theorem. †The best case was created by combining lower-bound unit costs of the key cost components. ‡Worst-case scenario created by combining upper-bound unit costs of the key components. At a cost-effectiveness threshold 3x DRC GDP per capita in 2016 (I$2409), the conditional cash transfers were still cost-effective.
Panel 1: PMTCT uptake

Base ICER=I$595

Cash Incentives I$9 – I$20
Health facility deliveries I$28 – I$844
Laboratory tests I$23 – I$68
Medication I$4 – I$13
Patient and caregiver costs I$2 – I$4

Panel 2: PMTCT retention

Base ICER=I$1026

Cash Incentives I$9 – I$20
Health facility deliveries I$28 – I$844
Laboratory tests I$23 – I$68
Medication I$4 – I$13
Patient and caregiver costs I$2 – I$4

This figure shows how ICERs respond to changes in unit costs of one variable while holding costs of other variables at their baseline values. The thick vertical lines in the graphs correspond to the ICERs derived using unit costs in the base case. The labels at the end of each bar are the lower and upper bound unit costs used in the sensitivity analysis. The length of the bar on either side of the vertical line represents the new ICER associated with each of the unit costs, and its value can be read from the x-axis. Cash incentives followed by health facility deliveries were the most influential variables in determining the ICER.
Figure 2: Differences in costs and effects, PMTCT uptake
This figure shows a joint distribution of differences in costs and effects associated with uptake of PMTCT services. A total 4000 replications of the original trial data were performed, and each dot in the graph represents one incremental cost-effectiveness ratio.
Figure 3: Differences in costs and effects, PMTCT retention
This figure shows a joint distribution of differences in costs and effects associated with retention in PMTCT care. A total 4000 replications of the original trial data were performed, and each dot in the graph represents one incremental cost-effectiveness ratio.
Figure 4: Society’s willingness-to-pay for uptake of PMTCT services and retention in PMTCT care
This figure shows the uncertainty surrounding the mean incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICER) of the cash incentives with respect to PMTCT uptake and PMTCT retention. The steep slopes of the curves suggest a high degree of certainty surrounding the mean ICERs.
Appendices

Appendix B1: Overview of search terms for cost estimates

"prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV" OR "prevention of mother-to-child transmission" OR "PMTCT of HIV" OR "PMTCT" OR "vertical transmission of HIV" OR "Maternal and infant interventions in HIV" OR "prevention of vertical transmission of HIV" OR "mother-to-child transmission of HIV" OR "vertical transmission of HIV" OR "HIV"

AND

"cost" OR "cost analysis" OR "cost-effectiveness" OR "cost-utility" or "economic evaluation" or "cost-benefit analysis"

The study used these terms to search for cost estimates in Google, Google Scholar, Medline, and PubMed
## Appendix B2: Candidate cost sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Cost source</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Currency and year</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Original Unit</th>
<th>Common Derived Unit</th>
<th>Common Derived Unit</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recurrent costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical staff*</td>
<td>IntraHealth International</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 USD</td>
<td>145.00</td>
<td>per nurse per m</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>[228]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Becker-Dreps</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2005 USD</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>per hour</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>[225]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adebeyi &amp; Waldron</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>[137]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCoy et al.</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>2006 USD</td>
<td>204.50</td>
<td>per nurse per m</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>[229]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arise Project</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>2012 USD</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>per patient per m</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>[230]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott et al.</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>per nurse visit</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>[221]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maheswaran et al.</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>2014 USD</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>[139]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tagar et al.</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
<td>365.00</td>
<td>per nurse per m</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>[231]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tagar et al.</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
<td>117.00</td>
<td>per nurse per m</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>[231]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tagar et al.</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
<td>386.00</td>
<td>per nurse per m</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>[231]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tagar et al.</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
<td>806.00</td>
<td>per nurse per m</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>[231]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jain et al.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2012 USD</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>per nurse per m</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>[138]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff†</td>
<td>Binagwaho et al.</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>2009 USD</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>per 18 m</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>[184]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bratt et al.</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2008 USD</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Per visit</td>
<td>Per visit</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>[226]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab tests‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD4 count</td>
<td>Toure et al.</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>2009 USD</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>[232]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bikilla et al.</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2005 USD</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>per person year</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>[233]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jain et al.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2012 USD</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>[138]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutta et al.</td>
<td>LIC</td>
<td>2014 USD</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>per person-year</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>[234]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ishikawa et al.</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2013 USD</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>[235]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott et al.</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>[221]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA PCR</td>
<td>Jain et al.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2012 USD</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>[138]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B2: Candidate cost sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Cost source</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Currency and year</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Original Unit</th>
<th>Common Derived Unit</th>
<th>Estimate common unit</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ishikawa et al.</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2013 USD</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>[235]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasawe et al.</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>2010 USD</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>[209]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khamadi et al.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2007 USD</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>per test</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>[223]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medications‡</th>
<th>HIV drugs (mothers) §</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‡</td>
<td>§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zidovudine</td>
<td>CHAI reference prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 tablets per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perriens et al.</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per patient per y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zidovir</td>
<td>CHAI reference prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 tablets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perriens et al.</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per patient per y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zidolam-N</td>
<td>CHAI reference prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AZT/3TC/NVP)</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 tablets per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutta et al.</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per patient y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perriens et al.</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per patient per y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zidolam (AZT/3TC)</td>
<td>CHAI reference prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 tablets per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott et al.</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per patient m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perriens et al.</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per patient per y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efavirenz (EFV)</td>
<td>CHAI reference prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 tablets per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutta et al.</td>
<td>LIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per patient y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott et al.</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per patient m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perriens et al.</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>183.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per patient per y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotrimoxazole (mothers)</td>
<td>Fasawe et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott et al.</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per patient m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B2: Candidate cost sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Cost source</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Currency and year</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Original Unit</th>
<th>Common Derived Unit</th>
<th>Estimate common unit</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIV drugs (infants)</td>
<td>CHAI reference prices</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>2016 USD</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>per infant m</td>
<td>6 w</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>[128]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maclean et al.</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2003 USD</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>per m</td>
<td>6 w</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>[237]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuznik et al.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>per 6 w</td>
<td>6 w</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>[185]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ciaranello et al.</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>2008 USD</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>per m</td>
<td>6 w</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>[238]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotrimoxazole (infants)</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>2006 USD</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>per d</td>
<td>6 w</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>[222]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Binagwaho et al.</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>2009 USD</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>per y</td>
<td>6 w</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>[184]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chitah</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2015 USD</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>per dose</td>
<td>6 w</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>[239]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facility deliveries†</td>
<td>Kongo Emmanuel†</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>15000.00</td>
<td>per delivery (normal, PHC, unemployed)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>15000.00</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kongo Emmanuel</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>25000.00</td>
<td>per delivery (dystocia, PHC, unemployed)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>25000.00</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kongo Emmanuel</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>300000.00</td>
<td>per delivery (cesarean, PHC, unemployed)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>300000.00</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kongo Emmanuel</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>50000.00</td>
<td>per delivery (normal, PHC, employed)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>50000.00</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kongo Emmanuel</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>100000.00</td>
<td>per delivery (dystocia, PHC, employed)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>100000.00</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kongo Emmanuel</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>450000.00</td>
<td>per delivery (cesarean, PHC, employed)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>450000.00</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B2: Candidate cost sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Cost source</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Currency and year</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Original Unit</th>
<th>Common Derived Unit</th>
<th>Estimate common unit</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kongo Emmanuel</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>150000.00</td>
<td>per delivery (normal, SHC, unemployed)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>150000.00</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kongo Emmanuel</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>40000.00</td>
<td>per delivery (dystocia, SHC, unemployed)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>40000.00</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kongo Emmanuel</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>870000.00</td>
<td>per delivery (cesarean, SHC, unemployed)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>870000.00</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kongo Emmanuel</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>200000.00</td>
<td>per delivery (normal, SHC, employed)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>200000.00</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kongo Emmanuel</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>100000.00</td>
<td>per delivery (dystocia, SHC, employed)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>100000.00</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kongo Emmanuel</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>950000.00</td>
<td>per delivery (cesarean, SHC, employed)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>950000.00</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2005 USD</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>[240]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2005 USD</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>[240]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2005 USD</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>[240]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2005 USD</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>[240]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2005 USD</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>[240]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2005 USD</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>[240]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gibbons et al.</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2008 USD</td>
<td>131.40</td>
<td>per delivery (cesarean)</td>
<td>per delivery</td>
<td>131.40</td>
<td>[241]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling after delivery</td>
<td>Binagwaho et al.</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>2009 USD</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>per session</td>
<td>per session</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>[184]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B2: Candidate cost sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Cost source</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Currency and year</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Original Unit</th>
<th>Common Derived Unit</th>
<th>Estimate common unit</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation of DBS</td>
<td>Khamadi et al.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2007 USD</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>per sample</td>
<td>per sample</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>[223]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Adebeyi &amp; Waldron</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>[137]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menzies et al.</td>
<td>5 PEPFAR countries</td>
<td>2009 USD</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>per y, minimum</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>[227]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menzies et al.</td>
<td>5 PEPFAR countries</td>
<td>2009 USD</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>per y, mean</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>[227]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jain et al.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2012 USD</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>per m</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>[138]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galarraga et al.</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2009 USD</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>per y</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>[242]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maheswaran et al</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>2014 USD</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>[139]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity cost of time #</td>
<td>US Department of</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2016 FC</td>
<td>1680.00</td>
<td>per day</td>
<td>per day</td>
<td>1680.00</td>
<td>[141]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital costs**</td>
<td>Adebeyi &amp; Waldron</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2011 USD</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>[137]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menzies et al.</td>
<td>5 PEPFAR countries</td>
<td>2009 USD</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>per y, minimum</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>[227]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menzies et al.</td>
<td>5 PEPFAR countries</td>
<td>2009 USD</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>per y, mean</td>
<td>per visit</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>[227]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: DRC (Democratic Republic of the Congo); LMIC (Low-and-middle income countries); PCR (polymerase chain reaction); USD (United States Dollar); FC (Congolese Francs); WHO (World Health Organization); CHAI (Clinton Health Access Initiative); PEPFAR (Presidential Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief); PHC (primary health center); SHC (secondary health center). * We assumed that a patient was seen by one clinical staff (assumed to be a nurse) at each antenatal care (ANC) visit. We further assumed that a nurse takes care of 20 patients in a day and divided the monthly wage of a nurse by 22 because we also assumed that, in many countries, normal work hours exclude weekends. The study by Becker-Dreps [225] provided an hourly cost estimate, so we assumed that each visit or interaction between the nurse and the patient lasted for 30 minutes and divided the hourly estimate by 2. † We assumed that one support staff was adequate at each ANC visit. ‡ Goods and services classified as tradable—goods that can be imported or exported[122], [124]; the rest were classified as non-tradable. § To estimate monthly costs for drugs, we divided annual costs by 12 or multiplied daily costs by 30. We assumed 15% for shipping and handling of the drugs [135] which we added to the estimates published by CHAI or Medicines Sans Frontier (MSF). We did not add the shipping and handling costs to estimates from peer-reviewed literature because these were assumed to have been included in the studies. ‖Estimates in local currency for health facility deliveries were not available, except for one study by Emmanuel Kongo [224] which did not indicate when the estimates were collected. So, we assumed that the estimates were collected in 2015—one year before the study was
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Cost source</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Currency and year</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Original Unit</th>
<th>Common Derived Unit</th>
<th>Estimate common unit</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

published. ‡ The 5 PEPFAR countries were Uganda, Nigeria, Botswana, Ethiopia, and Vietnam. # We assumed that both the patient and their support spent one day traveling and receiving (waiting plus actual interaction with a nurse) health care services at the clinic and quantified the cost of this time in terms of lost wages or earnings. Because there was no data on earnings, we assumed that the patient and her support each lost the equivalent of the statutory minimum wage (1680 Congolese Francs) for the DRC [141], [243], in 2016.
Appendix B3: Analytic decisions and recommendations for conducting cost-effectiveness analyses
In this appendix, we outline a series of analytic decisions for estimating economic costs in the current study which were largely informed by CEA recommendations by WHO under the Cost Effectiveness and Strategic Planning[122], [124]. For completeness, we also present recommendations from two other organizations: The World Bank under the Disease Control Priorities Project (DCPP) [244], [245] and The US Panel on Cost-effectiveness in Health and Medicine[220], [246].

Appendix B3: Recommendations for cost analysis and analytic decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic decision</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Debate/commentary</th>
<th>Decision implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Perspective       | This is the viewpoint for conducting a CEA. Examples include: societal, payer (including donor, employer, insurer, and/or government), healthcare, clinical provider, or patient. | *WHO*: The study can be conducted from multiple perspectives, but the societal perspective should be primary. The societal perspective means that all costs associated with an intervention must be valued, regardless of who is paying for the intervention or service [122]. The rationale for this approach is that health and consumption of healthcare services contribute to social welfare [122].

*World Bank/DCPP*: The primary perspectives are the donor or partner and beneficiary (e.g., patient) perspective, although other perspectives like an implementer’s may also be specified [245]. The rationale is that the donor | While many experts do not disagree with using the societal perspective as the primary perspective in CEA, they disagree on the extent of the societal perspective [247]. This is because including every aspect of the society affected by a health intervention may be burdensome to the analyst (thereby violating the “rule of reason”), particularly for interventions which extend survival or improve the quality of life. Additionally, while some experts do not agree with including future health-unrelated consumption or productivity benefits or losses, the position and guidance from other panels have been evolving on this matter. For example, the first US Panel (1996) on CEA recommended excluding |
|                    |         |                 |                  | We used a societal perspective which was limited to the inclusion of transport costs and the opportunity cost of time for both the patient and her support. Productivity costs were not included because the RCT of the CCTs was not powered to estimate effects of the CCTs on avert new HIV infections or |
### Appendix B3: Recommendations for cost analysis and analytic decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic decision</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Debate/commentary</th>
<th>Decision implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost components</strong></td>
<td>This decision is about which cost components to include in the analysis. The question is: should the analysis include direct (health-related) costs only or direct and indirect (health-unrelated) costs?</td>
<td><strong>WHO</strong>: Include both direct and indirect costs. The rationale is that costs like caregiving, travel time, and waiting time need to be valued as they can determine whether an intervention is effective or whether people will seek healthcare services. Additionally, health and healthcare also affect families’ consumption of other goods and services, either immediately or in the future.[122], [124].</td>
<td>Many low-income countries, like the DRC, do not have properly functioning health systems or adequate healthcare infrastructure which pose barriers to accessing healthcare services[250], [251]. The trial of the CCTs was borne as an effort to help overcome barriers (e.g., transport costs) to accessing PMTCT services.</td>
<td>We included both direct and indirect costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytic decision</strong></td>
<td><strong>Concept</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debate/commentary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decision implemented</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the beneficiary of an intervention or program face different costs and an intervention which is cost-effective from the beneficiary’s perspective may not be cost-effective from the donor’s perspective [245].</td>
<td>US Panel: CEA studies must be conducted from two perspectives: healthcare and societal perspectives [220].</td>
<td>Productivity losses associated with an illness because such costs will have been captured in measures of quality life [246]. However, the second US Panel (2016) says that productivity gains or losses should be included whenever it is possible because there is no evidence suggesting that the quality of life measures reflect the productivity costs [220].</td>
<td>Quality of life through increased survival.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic decision</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Debate/commentary</th>
<th>Decision implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>World Bank/DCPP: Include direct costs only. The World Bank assumes that a properly functioning health system, defined as a health system that does not impose additional costs on consumers, is in place[244]. Furthermore, because some of the indirect costs can be higher than the cost of an intervention, some interventions may erroneously be deemed to be not cost-effective[244], [248].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US Panel: Include both direct and indirect costs. The rationale is the same as with WHO[249].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price level</td>
<td>This refers to whether resources consumed by the intervention should be valued at international or local prices.</td>
<td>WHO: Two recommendations are made by the WHO. First, to value the cost of an intervention using local prices when detailed cost data about the intervention have been collected. Furthermore, to use local prices when the intervention is more local that international comparisons are not necessary or meaningful [122], [124]. Second, to value the costs of the intervention at</td>
<td>The decision about price levels is often confused with the decision of currency choice[124], although in many cases the international prices are the US$ or the I$ (international dollar). Methods for deriving I$ are described below in a discussion of tradable and non-tradable and currency choice.</td>
<td>We used international price levels (in I$) because the results of the CEA might also be relevant to other countries, particularly those in Sub-Saharan Africa, where</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic decision</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Debate/commentary</th>
<th>Decision implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinguishing between tradable vs. nontraded goods.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tradable goods</strong>—for example, medications—are those goods that can be imported or exported while non-tradable goods (for example, labor) are those that are produced locally and cannot be imported or exported [122], [124].</td>
<td><strong>WHO</strong>: Tradable goods should be distinguished from non-tradable goods. The rationale is that these goods must be costed differently to reflect the correct value of the good, otherwise non-tradable goods will be undervalued if they are treated like tradable goods in countries with higher purchasing power [122], [124].</td>
<td>The difference between the WHO and World Bank/DCPP recommendations is in the valuation of non-tradable goods. According to the World Bank, if the cost of a non-tradable good is in local currency, then it must be converted to US$ using the nominal (official) exchange rate of that country’s local currency to the US$. s that if the cost estimate of a non-tradable good (e.g., buildings) is being extrapolated from another setting with the estimate already in US$, then no further conversion is required. On the other hand,</td>
<td>We distinguished between tradable and non-tradable goods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**World Bank/DCPP**: Like WHO, the recommendation is to value the costs of an intervention at international prices. The rationale is also to facilitate comparison of results from multiple studies across countries [244].
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic decision</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Debate/commentary</th>
<th>Decision implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytic decision</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Debate/commentary</td>
<td>Decision implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>goods. The rationale is that tradable (imported) goods are already in US$ while the cost of non-tradable goods must be converted to US$ using exchange rates[244].</td>
<td>the WHO recommendation is that all non-tradable goods should be converted using purchasing power parity (PPP)—the number of units of a local currency required to buy the same quantities of goods and services as one US$ would do in the United States[122]. The unit cost of goods and services valued this way is the international dollar (I$) and 1I$=1US$. WHO also recommends that non-tradable goods quoted in US$ should be converted using the ratio of the PPP conversion factor to the official exchange rate of that country to the USD in the year of the cost estimate. Thus, using the PPP exchange rates eliminates price differences when converting or transferring costs across countries[123], [124]. The World Bank argues against using the PPP because the I$ is hypothetical and is not informative of how much an intervention costs which is important for budgeting purposes[244].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency choice</td>
<td>This refers to the choice of currency for reporting costs. This is particularly important</td>
<td>WHO: 1) When the analyst has decided to use international price levels and to distinguish between tradable and non-tradable goods, the recommendation is</td>
<td>While both the US$ and I$ may facilitate international comparisons of results from different studies, the World Bank notes that the I$ is hypothetical and is not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US Panel: Not discussed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic decision</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Debate/commentary</th>
<th>Decision implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as this study draws estimates from multiple sources with the cost estimates in different currencies. Furthermore, the choice of currency is informed by two analytic decisions presented above: price levels and distinguishing between tradable and non-tradable goods.</td>
<td>to use I$ which is derived when the PPP exchange rate is used (see discussion on tradable vs. non-tradable goods). The rationale is that using the PPP exchange rates eliminates price differences when converting or transferring costs across countries [122], [124].</td>
<td>informative of how much an intervention costs and is not relevant to decision makers interested in budgeting or expanding interventions[244]. But the argument by WHO is that, in many cases, the I$ accurately reflects what people can purchase given a certain amount of resources and the US$ fails to convey this information.</td>
<td>the cost of an intervention but it does not tell you its value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Bank/DCPP: To use the US$. The rationale is that the US$ is informative of how much an intervention actually costs[244].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year for reporting costs.</td>
<td>This refers to the year for reporting results of the CEA</td>
<td>This varies from study to study and depends on the analyst’s assessment of what the aims of the CEA are, so there are no clear guidelines on which year to use.</td>
<td>For the current study, there are three options: 1) 2013: Start date of the RCT of the CCTs in the DRC; 2) 2015: End date of the RCT in the DRC; and 3) 2016: Year for which the most current data for inflation adjustment and currency conversion are available.</td>
<td>We used 2016 as the base year because it is the year for which the most recent conversion data were available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic decision</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Debate/commentary</th>
<th>Decision implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Inflation adjustment | Adjusting for inflation removes the effect of price changes and is necessary when the original cost data are reported in different years. Inflation adjustment will allow us to obtain estimates in a constant currency. Thus, the data from years prior to the chosen year will be inflated while data from later years will be deflated. | **WHO:** Inflation adjustment to be done using the GDP (gross domestic product) deflator—an index number comparing real GDP to nominal GDP. The GDP deflator is recommended because it covers price changes in a broad range (almost everything) of economic activity, including health sector costs [122], [124], [252].  

**World Bank/DCPP:** Not discussed  

**US Panel:** Inflation adjustment to be done using the medical price index[249]. The rationale is that, unlike the general consumer price index (CPI), the medical price index more accurately reflects changes in prices in the healthcare sector as it is specific to that sector. | The main problem with the GDP deflator is that in many low-income countries, like the DRC, it fails to account for heterogeneity among sectors and can lead to wrong conclusions[253]. Although the medical CPI is recommended, it is not available for the DRC. We adjusted for inflation using the GDP deflator as it is the only recommended inflation-adjustment method which is readily available. |

| Order for inflation adjustment and | When transferring costs across time and space, the order in which inflation | **WHO:** Adjust for inflation before applying exchange rates. The rationale is that inflation in countries like the DRC also depends on exchange rates, | The issue of whether inflation adjustment is done before currency conversion is almost a settled issue. | We first adjusted for inflation before |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic decision</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Debate/commentary</th>
<th>Decision implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exchange rate application</td>
<td>adjustment and exchange rates are applied can affect the eventual cost estimates and whether an intervention is cost-effective.</td>
<td>and because of weaker currencies, the inflation rate is much higher than in developed countries. This means that adjusting for inflation after currency conversion will more likely overvalue non-tradable goods[123].</td>
<td></td>
<td>applying exchange rate conversion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Fox-Rushby, who has published some of the CEA guidelines by the World Bank, also recommend adjusting for inflation before applying exchange rates[254].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B4: Fieller’s theorem for estimating confidence intervals for incremental cost-effectiveness ratios.

Note: This appendix draws heavily from Glick, 2014.

Fieller’s method is a parametric method for estimating confidence intervals for ratios like the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER). Compared to other parametric methods such as the normal distribution interval, Fieller’s method has one advantage: the method takes into account the skewness of the ratio as it does not require the distribution of the ICER to be normal or symmetrical [131], [159], [162]. Briefly, the parametric Fieller’s method proceeds as follows: let the bivariate normal distribution of the difference in mean costs and effects be represented by the expression $RQ - C$ with a mean of zero [131]. In this expression, $R = C/Q$ and $Q$ is the difference in the mean effect and $C$ is the difference in the mean cost [131]. Glick (2015) notes that when this expression is standardized using its standard error and setting it equal to a critical $t$-value, the result is a quadratic equation in $R$. If we take the square root of the quadratic equation in $R$, which also includes the Pearson correlation coefficient ($\rho$) between $C$ and $Q$, we obtain the lower and upper confidence limits of the ICER [131]. The confidence intervals are as follows:

**Lower Limit**

$$
\frac{[CQ - (t_\alpha)^2 \rho se_c se_q] - \{[CQ - (t_\alpha)^2 \rho se_c se_q] - [Q^2 - (t_\alpha)^2 se^2_q](C^2 - (t_\alpha)^2 se^2_c)\}^{0.5}}{Q^2 - (t_\alpha)^2 se^2_q}
$$

**Upper Limit**

$$
\frac{[CQ - (t_\alpha)^2 \rho se_c se_q] + \{[CQ - (t_\alpha)^2 \rho se_c se_q] - [Q^2 - (t_\alpha)^2 se^2_q](C^2 - (t_\alpha)^2 se^2_c)\}^{0.5}}{Q^2 - (t_\alpha)^2 se^2_q}
$$

In these equations:
- $C$ and $Q$ are the differences in mean costs and mean effects in the two groups.
- $t_\alpha$ is the critical value from a student’s t-distribution; $t_\alpha = 1.96$ for 95% C.I.
\( \rho \) is the Pearson correlation coefficient between C and Q.

\( se_c \) and \( se_q \) are the standard errors for C and Q, respectively.

Interpretation of the confidence limits:

- A statistically significant difference in effects between the two groups exists only when the denominator is positive and the interval is lower to upper limit [131].
- Negative denominators mean there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups. In that case, the upper limit is smaller than the lower limit [131].
- If there is no statistically significant difference in both effects and costs part of the numerator for which we are taking the square root (the term in brackets) will likely be negative, making the lower and upper limits undefined as negative numbers do not have square roots [131].
Stata do file
/*capture log close
set more off
log using cea.log, text replace
insheet using cea_new.csv, comma clear

*listing all the variables
ds

format %12s observations
ds

*generating treatment
gen treatment=. replace treatment=0 if group=="Soins habituels"
replace treatment=1 if group=="Intervention - Cash"
label define treatment 0 "Control" 1 "Treatment", replace
label values treatment treatment
tab treatment
tab treatment group

*working with the variables
codebook marital_status
encode marital_status, gen(marstatus)

*transport cost has some values missing
order transportcost transportcostart
tab transportcost transportcostart , m

replace transportcost=transportcostart if transportcost==.

*multiple imputation of missing transport costs
misstable patterns transportcost, bypatterns
mi set mlong
mi register imputed transportcost /*registers transportcost as the variable to be imputed*/
mi misstable summarize treatment ses transportcost

mi impute pmm transportcost treatment uptakepmtct incaresixweek i.ses yearofeducation ///
earlyancvisit traveltime i.transportmode i.marstatus age gestationalage,
add(20) knn(5) rseed(2232)

mi estimate: regress transportcost treatment uptakepmtct incaresixweek i.ses ///
yearofeducation earlyancvisit traveltime i.transportmode i.marstatus age gestationalage

*checking how the imputation worked
mi estimate, vartable dftable /*as expected only travel time and SES significinantly predicted transport cost*/
*keeping a single dataset of imputed transport cost data
keep if _mi_m > 0
collapse (mean) transportcost , by( pidc)
save cea_imputed, replace
export excel using "cea_imputed", firstrow(variables) replace
log close*/

***ANALYSIS BEGIN HERE
capture log close
set more off
log using cea_analysis, replace

insheet using cea_DRC_PPP_final.txt, tab clear

*formatting column widths
format %12s obs

*listing all the variables
ds

*ordering variables
order pidc group amountpaid ltfubydelivey incaresixweek ltfuat6wk uptakepmtct
///
cost_pp cost_sp datepremierevisit visitnumber artstartdate aztstartdate
cotrim_final ///
deliverydate gestationalage

*generating treatment
gen treatment=.
replace treatment=0 if group=="Control"
replace treatment=1 if group=="Intervention"
label define treatment 0 "Control (No CCTs)" 1 "Intervention (CCTs)" 2 "Control (No CCTs)"
replace
label values treatment treatment

tab treatment
tab treatment group
drop if treatment==.

*correcting the variable incare at 6 wks postpartum. It seems 1s should be 0s and 0s 1s

tab treatment incaresixweek
recode incaresixweek 0=2
recode incaresixweek 1=0
recode incaresixweek 2=1
label define incaresixweek 0 "Not in care" 1 "In care", replace
label values incaresixweek incaresixweek

*Uptake of PMTCT services

tab treatment uptakepmtct
label define uptakepmtct 0 "No uptake" 1 "Uptake", replace
label values uptakepmtct uptakepmtct

tab uptakepmtct treatment

*Early ANC visit
tab earlyancvisit treatment
label define earlyancvisit 0 "Late ANC" 1 "Early ANC", replace
label values earlyancvisit earlyancvisit
tab earlyancvisit treatment

*marital status and cohabitation
codebook marital_status
encode marital_status, gen(marstatus)
codebook marstatus
tab marstatus treatment
replace marstatus=0 if marstatus!=1
replace marstatus=1 if cohabitation=="yes" /*assumes that cohabiting is marriage*/
label define marstatus 1 "Married" 0 "Not married", replace
label values marstatus marstatus
tab marstatus treatment

*first pregnancy
tab primiparus
rename primiparus firstpregnancy
label define firstpregnancy 0 "Not first pregnancy" 1 "First pregnancy", replace
label values firstpregnancy firstpregnancy

*HIV disclosure
codebook disclosure
encode disclosure, gen(disclosure1)
drop disclosure
rename disclosure1 disclosure
recode disclosure 1=0 2=1
label define disclosure 0 "No" 1 "Yes", replace
label values disclosure disclosure
tab disclosure

*Transport mode
tab transportmode treatment
recode transportmode 2=0 3=0
label define transportmode 0 "Other means" 1 "Walk", replace
label values transportmode transportmode
tab transportmode treatment

*education
tab educlevel
rename educlevel education
label define education 0 "No education" 1 "Primary" 2 "Secondary or higher", replace
label values education education
tab education treatment

*SES
rename ses wealth
codebook wealth
label define wealth 4 "Fifth (richest)" 3 "Fourth" 2 "Third" 1 "Second" 0 "First (poorest)", replace
label values wealth wealth
tab wealth treatment
*labelling variables
label var pidc "Patient ID"
label var treatment "Intervention"
label var amountpaid "Incentive paid"
label var age "Age"
label var incaresixweek "PMTCT Retention"
label var cost_pp "Cost (Payer perspective)"
label var cost_sp "Cost (Society perspective)"
label var datepremierevisit "Enrollment date"
label var disclosure "HIV disclosure"
label var incaresixweek "PMTCT Retention"
label var gestationalage "Gestational age"
label var uptakepmtct "PMTCT Uptake"
label var traveltime "Travel time"
label var earlyancvisit "Early ANC visit"
label var yearofeducation "Education (years)"
label var wealth "Wealth quintile"
label var incentive "Incentive paid"
label var transportmode "Travel mode"

*SUMMARIZING DATA
*TABLE OF DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

*checking the distribution of costs
sum cost_pp
recode treatment 0=2

hist cost_sp, by(treatment, note("")) freq subtitle(, size(medium)) ///
by(, title("Figure 1: Cost distribution in the intervention and Control
groups, societal perspective", size(medium large) col(black))) ///
  xtitle(Cost (2016 I$)) ///
  legend(rows(1)) ///
  graphregion(fcolor(white)) ///
  ylab(, nogrid)
*graphregion(color(white))
graph save "cost_distribution_sp", replace

hist cost_pp, by(treatment, note("")) freq subtitle(, size(medium)) ///
by(, title("Figure 1: Cost distribution in the intervention and Control
groups, payer perspective", size(medium large) col(black))) ///
  xtitle(Cost (2016 I$)) ///
  legend(rows(1)) ///
  graphregion(fcolor(white)) ///
  ylab(, nogrid) graphregion(color(white))
graph save "cost_distribution_pp", replace

*graph combine cost_distribution_sp.gph cost_distribution_pp.gph
recode treatment 2=0

count if cost_sp<200 & treatment==1
count if cost_sp>=450 & treatment==1
count if cost_sp>600 & treatment==1
count if cost_sp<200 & treatment==0
count if cost_sp>=450 & treatment==0
count if cost_sp>600 & treatment==0

gen g_than_450=0
replace g_than_450=1 if cost_sp>=450

*dpplot costparticipant, dist(gamma) param(´e(alpha)´, ´e(beta)´)

*sample characteristics

tabstat cost_pp cost_sp, by(treatment) stats(mean sd median p25 p75)
tabstat cost_pp cost_sp age gestationalage yearofeducation traveltime, by(treatment) stats(mean sd median p25 p75)
ttest cost_pp, by(treatment)
ttest cost_sp, by(treatment)
ranksum cost_pp, by(treatment)
ranksum cost_sp, by(treatment)

*summary of number of visits

sum visitnumber, d

tab treatment, sum(visitnumber)
hist visitnumber, by(group)
ttest visitnumber, by(treatment) level(90)
tabstat visitnumber, by(treatment) stats(mean median sum)

*cost per visit

bysort treatment: egen cost_per_visit=mean(cost_sp/visitnumber)

*TABLE SUMMARIZING COSTS

*checking the distribution of continuous variables

mvtest normal cost_pp cost_sp age traveltime yearofeducation incentive gestationalage , bivariate univariate stats(all)

*performing the Mann-Whitney test

foreach var of varlist incentive cost* {
    ranksum `var', by(treatment)
}

foreach var of varlist yearofeducation age traveltime gestationalage {
    ranksum `var', by(treatment)
}

foreach var of varlist uptakepmtct incaresixweek education wealth marstatus earlyancvisit firstpregnancy disclosure transportmode {
    tab `var' treatment, col chi2
}

*effectiveness

*unadjusted risk ratios

cs incare treatment, exact
cs uptake treatment, exact

order pid cost_* incare uptake treatment treatment incentive traveltime
education marstatus firstpregnancy earlyancvisit disclosure wealth transportmode
*exporting the dataset to SAS for comparing analyses in Stata and those performed in SAS
save cea_analysed_forsas, replace
saveold cea_analysed_forsasv12, version(12) replace
fdasave cea_analysed_forsas, rename replace
outsheet using cea_analysedforsas.txt, comma replace

*putting controls in a global macro
global controls "treatment earlyancvisit disclosure age i.marstatus
i.education i.wealth firstpregnancy transportmode"

eexploratory OLS multivariate model
mvreg cost_sp cost_pp = $controls

**GEE MODELS
xtset clinic

*EFFECTIVENESS
xtgee incaresixweek $controls, family(poisson) link(log) corr(exch) robust
eform
*xtgee incaresixweek $controls, family(bin) link(log) corr(exch)
estimates store incare
estimates replay, eform

/*xtgee uptake $controls, family(poisson) link(log) corr(exch) vce(robust)
eform
estimates store uptake*/
xtgee uptake $controls, family(poisson) link(log) corr(exch) robust
estimates store uptake
estimates replay, eform

**Getting the number needed to treat (this will be used in the CEA)
*incare
global controls "treatment age i.marstatus yearofeducation"
binreg incaresixweek $controls, rd vce(robust)
gen rd_incare= b[treatment]
gen sd_rd_incare=0.0404129
gen NNT_incare=1/ b[treatment]
list NNT_incare in 1/1
*predicting risk of being in care
predict risk_incare, xb
tab treatment, sum(risk_incare)

*uptake
binreg uptake $controls, rd vce(robust)
gen rd_uptake= b[treatment]
gen sd_rd_uptake=0.0462205
gen NNT_uptake=1/ b[treatment]
list NNT_uptake in 1/1
*predicting risk of taking up PMTCT services
predict risk_uptake, xb
tab treatment, sum(risk_uptake)
**COSTS**
*identifying the family using the modified park test

global controls "treatment age i.marstatus i.education i.wealth transportmode"

glm cost_pp $controls, family(gamma) link(identity) vce(robust)
predict resid, dev
predict yhat, xb
gen resid_sq=resid^2
glm resid_sq yhat, family(gamma) link(identity) vce(robust)
test yhat=0
test yhat=2 /*shows that the gamma should be used. See this link for this test:
http://www.uphs.upenn.edu/dgimhsr/documents/isp15.glmworkshop.glick.2.pdf*/
drop resid* yhat

**Payer perspective**
xtgee cost_pp $controls, family(gamma) link(identity) corr(exch) vce(robust)
estimates store cost_pp
*incremental cost
gen Inc_cost_pp=_b[treatment]
gen sd_cost_pp=11.52162 /*standard errors*/
gen sample_size=217 /*sample size*/

*predicted costs
predict pred_cost_pp, xb

**Society perspective**
xtgee cost_sp $controls, family(gamma) link(identity) corr(exch) vce(robust)
estimates store cost_sp
*incremental cost
gen Inc_cost_sp=_b[treatment]
gen sd_cost_sp=13.29177 /*standard errors*/
*predicted costs
predict pred_cost_sp, xb

/*table of costs*/
esttab cost_pp cost_sp using costs.csv , plain nogaps b(a2) ci(a4) wide
replace label obslast star ///
refcat (treatment "Ref: Control group" 1.wealth "Ref: First quintile(poorest)"
1.education "Ref: No education" 1.marstatus "Ref: Not married"
transportmode "Ref: Other means") ///
collabels("2016 I$" "2016 I$") ///
drop (0.wealth 0.marstatus 0.education) brackets ///
addnote("95% Confidence intervals in brackets; * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, ***
p<0.001") ///
title("Table 5: Adjusted costs and effectiveness of conditional cash transfers")

*table of effectiveness
esttab uptake incare using effectiveness.csv, plain eform nogaps b(a3) ci
replace label wide obslast star ///
refcat (treatment "Ref: Control group" 1.wealth "Ref: First quintile(poorest)"
1.education "Ref: No education" 1.marstatus "Ref: Not married"
transportmode "Ref: Other means") ///
collabels("Relative risk" "Relative risk") ///
drop (0.wealth 0.marstatus 0.education) brackets ///
addnote("95% Confidence intervals in brackets; * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, ***
p<0.001") ///
title( "Table 5: Adjusted effectiveness of conditional cash transfers")

**generating incremental cost effectiveness ratios
*payer perspective
gen ICER_pp_incare=Inc_cost_pp*NNT_incare

*society perspective
gen ICER_sp_inccare=Inc_cost_sp*NNT_incare

*uptake
*payer perspective
gen ICER_pp_uptake=Inc_cost_pp*NNT_uptake

*society perspective
gen ICER_sp_uptake=Inc_cost_sp*NNT_uptake

list NNT_incare NNT_uptake ICER_pp_incare ICER_sp_inccare ICER_pp_uptake ICER_sp_uptake in 1/1

**calculating confidence intervals using the Fieller's theorem
*payer perspective
list Inc_cost_pp sd_cost_pp sample_size rd_uptake sd_rd_uptake sample_size in 1/1
list Inc_cost_pp sd_cost_pp sample_size rd_incare sd_rd_incare sample_size in 1/1

*society perspective
list Inc_cost_sp sd_cost_sp sample_size rd_uptake sd_rd_uptake sample_size in 1/1
list Inc_cost_sp sd_cost_sp sample_size rd_incare sd_rd_incare sample_size in 1/1

***BOOTSTRAPPING 95% FOR THE ICER
*recall that the following are the steps involved

*1. Generate a sample of nc cost and effect pairs from the experimental group
data with replacement. The cost and effect pairs need to be resampled
together as they are inter-dependent.
*2. Generate a sample of nc cost and effect pairs from the control group data
with replacement
*3. Calculate the ICER for this bootstrap resample.
*4. Repeat this procedure 1000 times, to get 1000 bootstrap estimates of the
ICER. These estimates then define the empirical sampling distribution of the
ICER.

*1&2. Bootstrapping to create treatment and control groups of sizes similar to
the trial
bootstrap pred_cost_pp pred_cost_sp risk_incare risk_uptake if treatment==0, reps(217) cluster(clinic) saving(control, replace) seed(1980):
summarize
bootstrap pred_cost_pp pred_cost_sp risk_incare risk_uptake if treatment==1, reps(216) cluster(clinic) saving(treat, replace) seed(1980):
summarize
save cea_analysed, replace

*combining the resampled datasets of treatment and control groups
use control, clear
gen treatment=0
save control, replace

use treat, clear
append using control
replace treatment=1 if treatment==.
rename _bs_1 cost_pp
rename _bs_2 cost_sp
rename _bs_3 risk_incare
rename _bs_4 risk_uptake

*3. Calculating the ICER and 95% C.I. from the bootstrap resample
program icer, rclass
  version 14.2
  ****costs
  ***payer perspective
  summarize cost_pp if treatment==0, meanonly
  local a = r(mean)
  summarize cost_pp if treatment==1, meanonly
  local b = r(mean)
  return scalar Incost_pp=`b'-`a'
  **incare
  summarize risk_incare if treatment==0, meanonly
  local c=r(mean)
  summarize risk_incare if treatment==1, meanonly
  local d=r(mean)
  *NNT
  return scalar diff_incare= `d'-`c'
  return scalar NNT_incare=1/(`d'-`c')
  *ICER
  return scalar ICER_incarePP =(`b'-`a')/(`d'-`c')
  **uptake
  summarize risk_uptake if treatment==0, meanonly
  local e=r(mean)
  summarize risk_uptake if treatment==1, meanonly
  local f=r(mean)
  *NNT
  return scalar diff_uptake=`f'-`e'
  return scalar NNT_uptake=1/(`f'-`e')
  *ICER
  return scalar ICER_uptakePP =(`b'-`a')/(`f'-`e')
  *society perspective
  summarize cost_sp if treatment==0, meanonly
  local g=r(mean)
  summarize cost_sp if treatment==1, meanonly
  local h=r(mean)
  return scalar Incost_sp=`h'-`g'
  *in care
  return scalar ICER_incareSP=(`h'-`g')/(`d'-`c')
  *uptake
  return scalar ICER_uptakeSP=(`h'-`g')/(`f'-`e')
end
*4. Bootstrapping the ICERs.

```stata
bootstrap r(Inccost_pp) r(Inccost_sp) r(diff_uptake) r(NNT_uptake)
r(diff_incare) r(NNT_incare) r(ICER_incarePP) r(ICER_uptakePP)
r(ICER_incareSP) r(ICER_uptakeSP), saving(trial, replace) bca reps(1000)
seed(1980) strata(treatment) nodots: icer summarize
program drop icer
save CEA_with_CI, replace
```

**GENERATING CEA ACCEPTABILITY CURVES**

*bootstrapping differences in mean costs and mean effects. Note that above what was bootstrapped was the ICER itself.

capture program drop bscer
program define bscer
    sum `1' if `5'==1, meanonly
    scalar meancostpp=r(mean)
    sum `1' if `5'==0, meanonly
    scalar diffcostPP=meancostpp-r(mean)
    sum `2' if `5'==1, meanonly
    scalar meancostsp=r(mean)
    sum `2' if `5'==0, meanonly
    scalar diffcostSP=meancostsp-r(mean)
    sum `3' if `5'==1, meanonly
    scalar meanriskincare=r(mean)
    sum `3' if `5'==0, meanonly
    scalar diffriskincare=meanriskincare-r(mean)
    sum `4' if `5'==1, meanonly
    scalar meanriskuptake=r(mean)
    sum `4' if `5'==0, meanonly
    scalar diffriskuptake=meanriskuptake-r(mean)
    scalar ICER_incarePP= diffcostPP/diffriskincare
    scalar ICER_uptakePP=diffcostPP/diffriskuptake
    scalar ICER_incareSP= diffcostSP/diffriskincare
    scalar ICER_uptakeSP=diffcostSP/diffriskuptake
end
scalar exper=0

clear
use CEA_analysed
bootstrap "bscer pred_cost_pp pred_cost_sp risk_incare risk_uptake treatment clinic " "diffcostPP diffcostSP diffriskincare diffriskuptake ICER_incarePP ICER_incareSP ICER_uptakePP ICER_uptakeSP", reps(4000) saving(Cost&Effects) replace strata(treatment) cluster(clinic)

clear
quietly do bsceaprogs
use Cost&Effects
sum
corr
quietly do bscieaggraphs
*uptake
bscicer _bs_2 _bs_4 .95
bscicergaph
bsaccept _bs_2 _bs_4 .95
bsaccgraph
*incare
bscicer _bs_2 _bs_3 .95
bscicergaph
bsaccept _bs_2 _bs_3 .95
bsaccgraph

*CEA curve
clear
import excel "Willingess-to-pay_final.xlsx", sheet("Sheet1") firstrow
case(lower) clear
keep wtpacceptp retention uptake
scatter retention uptake wtpacceptp, connect(dot dot) msize(tiny tiny) ///
   xtitle("Willingness-to-pay (WTP)", size(3.0)) ///
   ytitle("% acceptable", size(3.0) height(7)) ///
   graphregion(color(white)) ///
   xline(402 803 1205) ///
   yline(0.1 0.5 0.8) ///
   legend(order(2 "Uptake" 1 "Retention")) ///
   title("Figure 2: Willingness-to-pay for uptake of PMTCT services and retention in PMTCT care", size(3.5) col(black))
graph save WTP_final, replace

log close
log2html cea_analysis, replace
*sensitivity analysis
Chapter 3: Guideline concordance of time to follow-up of anal cancer screening in women living with HIV at high-risk for acquiring anal cancer

Abstract

**Background:** In the past 2-3 decades, the incidence of anal cancer has increased significantly among women with HIV. This calls for a better understanding of receipt of anal screening in this population, particularly among those at increased risk of acquiring anal cancer. While some evidence suggests that these women receive initial anal cancer screening, it is unclear whether they also receive follow-up screening consistent with the guidelines for anal cancer screening in this population. This study examines the guideline concordance of the time to follow-up for anal cancer screening in women with HIV with histories of abnormal cervical tests or genital warts.

**Methods:** Data for this analysis came from administrative claims of Medicaid beneficiaries ages 19–64 years who qualified for Medicaid based on income and disability and who were continuously enrolled for ≥ 24 months. We created a 4-year retrospective cohort (2009-2012) of high-risk women using ICD-9 codes for abnormal cervical tests or genital warts. We estimated the follow-up time as the time from the date of the first anal cancer screen (after a high-risk diagnosis) to the date of the second screen. Follow-up time was guideline-concordant if the follow-up screening was performed in ≤ 6 months for those with abnormal results on the first screen and ≤ 12 months for those with normal results on the first screen. We used the Kaplan-Meier to estimate the follow-up time and modeled the guideline concordance of the follow-up time using logistic regressions. In sensitivity analysis, we restricted the sample to those continuously enrolled for 4 years, expanded the number of ICD-9 codes used to define a sample of high-risk women with HIV, and examined follow-up time of anal cancer screening at thresholds higher than those stipulated in the guidelines.

**Results:** A total of 3,779 high-risk women were eligible for follow-up screening and contributed 4,458 person-years. The median time to follow-up screening was 16.1 months (95% C.I.=15.2,17.6) and was shortest among women with histories of both risk factors (median=9.3, 95% C.I.=7.6,11.0 months). The time to follow-up screening was guideline-concordant for 47.3% (95% C.I.=42.0,53%) of high-risk women with abnormal results on the first screen and for 40.0% (95% C.I.=38.0,41.4%) for those with normal results. The time to follow-up screening was not guideline concordant for women with one risk factor. The odds that time to follow-up screening was guideline concordant were more than twice among women with two risk factors compared with those with a single risk factor for anal cancer (OR=2.06, 95% C.I.=1.73,2.46). These findings persisted in sensitivity analyses.

**Conclusions:** Time to follow-up anal cancer screening is not guideline-concordant overall and for nearly two-thirds of women with a single risk factor. Training providers in high-resolution anoscopy, gathering more evidence about the benefits of anal cancer screening to clarify the guidelines for anal cancer screening, and creating a billable procedural code for anal cancer screening could help to increase the rates of follow-up anal cancer screening in high-risk women.
1. **Introduction**

Among all non-AIDS-defining cancers, anal cancer has recorded the largest increase in incidence over the past 2-3 decades [256]. These increases have been observed in all groups of people living with HIV (PLWH), including women [257]–[259]. In that period, the incidence of anal cancer among women with HIV increased by 40% and is still increasing [257]–[260]. The high and rising incidence of anal cancer in women with HIV suggests that screening for anal cancer is critical in this population. This is particularly true in this era of combination antiretroviral therapy when PLWH have life expectancies similar to the general population but who are at a higher risk for many diseases, including anal cancer [261]–[263]. For example, data show that the incidence of anal cancer is 30 per 100,000 person-years in women with HIV, which is 15 times greater than in women without HIV [264].

Anal cancer screening leads to early detection of abnormal anal cells otherwise known as anal intraepithelial neoplasia (AIN), making effective secondary prevention possible [267], [268]. The evidence suggests that rates of abnormal anal test results range from 12 to 42% [269]–[275] and that AIN can develop quickly in women with HIV [273] even if the women have normal anal cells at baseline [270]. Further evidence suggests that untreated low-grade AIN can progress to high-grade AIN within 2 years in many PLWH [267] and that untreated high-grade AIN can progress to anal cancer in less than one year [268]. However, among those screened and treated for AIN, the rates of progression are much lower [267], [268]. Additional evidence also suggests

---

4 A cancer is AIDS-defining if its onset marks progression from HIV to AIDS [255]
5 AIN is used to describe biopsy-confirmed results of anal cancer screening. Less severe lesions are classified as AIN1 while more severe ones are classified as AIN2 or AIN3 [265], [266]. On the hand, cytology results are reported as squamous intraepithelial lesions (SIL) and are classified as low-grade or high-grade SIL [265], [266]. These classifications are based off the terminology used in cervical cancer screening [265], [266].
that early detection of cancerous anal cells has survival benefits. The 5-year survival rates for localized, regional, and metastatic anal cancers are 0.78, 0.56, and 0.18, respectively [276].

While guidelines exist for anal cancer screening [277], little is known about the timing of screening for this cancer in women with HIV. This is particularly true for time to follow-up of anal cancer screening among women living with HIV at increased risk of acquiring anal cancer.

Regular anal cancer screening is recommended for these at-risk women including those with histories of abnormal cervical tests or genital warts [277]–[279], two groups whom we collectively define as high-risk. Previous studies of anal cancer screening frequency in PLWH mainly focused on men who have sex with other men (MSM) [280]–[286], with women rarely included in those studies. While the few studies that included women provide some evidence of initial anal cancer screening in high-risk women with HIV [269]–[275], it is unclear whether high-risk women also receive follow-up screening and whether the timing of the follow-up screening is concordant with the guidelines. Studies that examined follow-up anal cancer screening in women with HIV had small sample sizes, were limited in geographic scope [270], [273], [275], [282], [283], or did not stratify findings by anal cancer risk factors [287], [288].

Guidelines for anal cancer screening by the HIV Medical Association recommend screening at baseline in all PLWH but thereafter, the screening depends on the outcome of the initial test and the risk of the individual [277]. When abnormal anal cells are detected at the initial test, follow-up screening is recommended in 6 months. When the initial test is normal, a follow-up test is recommended in 12 months but only in PLWH at high-risk for acquiring anal cancer, figure 1. This includes women with histories of abnormal cervical tests or genital warts, two groups of women at the center of this study.
Given these guidelines and the limitations of previous studies, the goal of the current study is to examine the guideline concordance of the time to follow-up of anal cancer screening in high-risk women, and whether this varies by the risk factors for anal cancer. We overcome limitations of previous studies by creating a large retrospective cohort of high-risk women from Medicaid administrative claims data in the US South.

1.1. Conceptual framework

We adapted Andersen’s behavioral model of healthcare utilization to develop a conceptual framework for understanding the frequency of follow-up anal cancer screening in high-risk women [289], figure 2. The framework consists of three domains: individual and population characteristics, use of health services, and outcomes. It posits that health service utilization is a result of the interplay of three individual/population characteristics—predisposing factors, enabling resources, and need [289]. We emphasize that the focus of the current study is on the utilization of follow-up anal cancer screening services and not the benefits of the screening.

From left to right, the first part of the framework consists of predisposing factors—factors which exist before a person’s need for healthcare arises. Although these factors do not define a person’s health service utilization, they suggest the propensity that a person will need health services. The predisposing factors—for example, age—are exogenous and only affect healthcare utilization through enabling resources [289]–[291]. Next, enabling resources are necessary—although insufficient—for health services utilization to occur [289], [290]. These resources, for example, income, can facilitate follow-up anal cancer screening if available or impede it if unavailable.

Finally, individuals must have a need for healthcare if services are to be utilized. The need can be perceived (subjective) or evaluated (objective) [289]–[291]. While women with HIV have a need for anal cancer screening overall [292]–[296], the need is greater among those with one risk
factor for acquiring anal cancer and much greater among those with multiple risk factors [277]–[279]. Therefore, we expect the timing of follow-up anal cancer screening to be shorter in high-risk women with both risk factors for anal cancer but guideline-concordant in all high-risk women, regardless of the type or number of risk factors.

2. Methods

2.1. Overview

We examined the guideline concordance of the time to follow-up anal cancer screening in a retrospective cohort of high-risk women with HIV continuously enrolled in Medicaid for ≥ 24 months. Data for this analysis came from the Medicaid Analytic eXtract (MAX) files, which included administrative claims of beneficiaries ages 19–64 years and who qualified for Medicaid based on income and disability in the US South\(^6\) (2009-2012). We used the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9) codes to identify women with HIV, genital warts, abnormal cervical tests, and abnormal anal cells. To identify high-risk women screened for anal cancer, we used Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) codes for anal cytology and high-resolution anoscopy. We estimated the time to follow-up screening as the time from the date of the first anal cancer screen after a high-risk diagnosis (henceforth, the first screen) to the date of the second (follow-up) screen. In each group, we estimated the percentage with guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening. To determine whether the time to follow-up was guideline-concordant for the whole group and to be consistent with the literature, we compared the median follow-up time in that group to the follow-up time in the guidelines. We compared the odds that time to follow-up screening was guideline-concordant across the groups.

\(^6\) The US South encompasses 16 states (Delaware, Florida, Maryland, North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas) plus the District of Columbia.
using logistic regressions. In sensitivity analysis, we redefined the sample of high-risk women and examined follow-up time at thresholds higher than recommended in the guidelines.

### 2.2. Data sources

MAX files, available through the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), were the primary data source. These data contain person-level information on Medicaid eligibility, utilization of healthcare services, and payments [297]. We used three MAX files: the MAX Personal Summary (PS) file to obtain enrollees’ demographic information; MAX Other Therapy (OT) file to identify PLWH, high-risk women, those screened for anal cancer and outcomes of the screening; and the MAX Prescription Drug (RX) file to verify, using antiretroviral prescriptions, enrollees with HIV. Claims for services provided to PLWH are submitted to states by healthcare providers and in turn, each state’s health department sends the claims to CMS every quarter [297]. MAX data is a reliable source for services received by PLWH [298], [299], and CMS regularly validates these data [300].

We supplemented the MAX data with data from the Area Health Resources File (AHRF) and AIDSVu for additional county-level information. In the MAX data, person-level socio-demographic information is limited to age, sex, and race/ethnicity. The AHRF, maintained by the Health Resource Service Administration, has county-level data on income, education, and availability of healthcare workforce [301]. We controlled for county-level education, income, and the healthcare workforce because these variables are positively associated utilization of health services [289], [302], [303]. AIDSVu, constructed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and maintained by Emory University, consists of county-level HIV surveillance data in the US [304]. We controlled for county-level HIV prevalence because PLWH in counties with a high HIV burden are more likely to access HIV providers and receive appropriate HIV care.
[305]. The study was approved by the institutional review board of Virginia Commonwealth University and used the data in accordance with a data use agreement with the CMS (IRB#: HM20008091, DUA#: RSCH-2017-51616)

2.3. Sample selection and eligibility criteria

We identified high-risk women from a sample of people verified to be living with HIV. Briefly, the sample of PLWH was derived as follows: Enrollees with HIV/AIDS were identified using ICD-9 codes 042 (AIDS diagnosis) and V08 (HIV diagnosis) [306]. In this sub-sample of enrollees living with HIV, we excluded enrollees for whom we could not verify and confirm an HIV-positive diagnosis. These included enrollees who only received HIV counseling, had HIV-associated ICD-9 codes that occurred < twice during the analytic time horizon or had first and last HIV-associated claims < 30 days, only received Truvada—a pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV. From this sample, we retained non-elderly women with HIV using the sex variable (el_sex_cd) and restricted ages of 19-65 years⁷. We also excluded women enrolled in both Medicare and Medicaid. Next, we identified high-risk women using ICD-9 codes for abnormal cervical tests and genital warts [307], [308], Appendix C2. We also excluded those diagnosed as high-risk before the date of the first HIV-associated ICD-9 code or on their last verified date of service. Finally, we excluded women enrolled for < 24 months to permit enough time to observe ≥ 2 anal cancer screens after a high-risk diagnosis.

2.4. Identifying high-risk women screened for anal cancer

We identified high-risk women who received anal cancer screening using CPT codes for anal cytology and high-resolution anoscopy, Appendix C3. We used these codes because there were

⁷ Although the data requested from the CMS was for Medicaid beneficiaries aged 19-64 years, we applied this exclusion because transitions from Medicaid to Medicare may not be instantaneous and some beneficiaries may receive services under Medicaid and Medicare during the transition period.
no CPT codes for anal cancer screening during the current study’s analytic time horizon, 2009-2012 [309], [310]. At that time, the practice was for providers to bill payers for services and components that constituted anal cancer screening—for example, direct smear (CPT code 88104) or anoscopy (CPT code 46600). Although CPT code 88112 (anal cytology, liquid-based preparation) is the most commonly used for anal cytology [311], we included the other codes because specimens for anal cancer screening can be obtained in multiple ways and each of these codes reflects the method used [312].

2.5. Statistical analysis

We estimated time to follow-up anal cancer screening as the time from the date of the first screen (after a high-risk diagnosis) to the date of the second screen. We used Kaplan-Meier to estimate the time to follow-up screening overall and by risk group to make our findings comparable to the literature. The Kaplan-Meier estimator produces unbiased estimates even if the data are censored or have gaps [313], [314]. Data are censored if the observation of time-to-event is incomplete while gaps mean that a participant disappears from the study and then reappears at a later date [315]. These issues were important because of some enrollees moving in and out of the Medicaid program (churning) or not receiving any follow-up screening at the end of the analytic time horizon. To report the time to any follow screening, we used the median because the follow-up time was right-skewed ($\chi^2 = 1777(2)$, p-value $<0.001$). We tested the statistical significance of the differences in the time-to-follow-up screening between the groups using the log rank test.

2.5.1. Guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening (unadjusted)

In each of the groups of high-risk women, we report the percent of women receiving follow-up screening at the times stipulated in the guidelines for anal cancer screening. We report these percentages at 6 and 12 months if on the first screen the results were, respectively, abnormal and
normal. However, for comparability with previous studies, we also report the median time—the time at which 50% of the group received follow-up screening. We tested whether the median time to follow-up screening was guideline-concordant by comparing it to the follow-up time recommended in the guidelines. Therefore, a group of high-risk women (for example, women with both risk factors) was considered to have had guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening if the median time was ≤ 6 months for those with abnormal results on the first screen and ≤ 12 months for those with normal results on the first screen. To ascertain whether the result on the first screen was normal or abnormal, we used the ICD-9 codes in Appendix C4.

2.5.2. Guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening (adjusted)

We modeled the likelihood that time to follow-up screening was guideline-concordant using logistic regressions, adjusting for other factors that can potentially influence the time to follow-up of anal cancer screening. We reported the results as odds ratios and probabilities. The odds ratios compared the guideline concordance of time to follow-up screening between groups while the probabilities determined if the time to follow-up in each group was guideline-concordant. Time to follow-up screening was guideline-concordant if the average predicted probability for a given group was ≥ 0.5. We created a binary variable “concordance” based on the follow-up time recommended in the guidelines. Concordance was equal to one if the time to follow-up screening was guideline-concordant and zero otherwise. We specified the following model:

\[
\log \left( \frac{\pi_i}{1-\pi_i} \right) = \beta_0 + \lambda X_i + \alpha P_j + \Gamma + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)
\]

Where;

\(\pi_i\) is the proportion with guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening; \((1-\pi_i)\) is the proportion with time to follow-up screening not guideline-concordant.
\( X_i \) is a vector of individual-level variables, for example, age (Appendix C1); \( \lambda \) is a vector of parameters corresponding to the individual-level characteristics.

\( P_j \) is a vector of county-level variables, for example, the prevalence of HIV (Appendix C1); \( \alpha \) is a vector of parameters corresponding to the county-level variables.

\( \Gamma \) captures state fixed-effects for the 16 Southern states plus the District of Columbia.

\( \varepsilon_i \) is residuals—assumed to be independent and normally distributed with zero means.

Tests of model fitness using the Hosmer-Lemeshow test which compares observed vs. expected frequencies and deviance residuals which can identify outlying observations [316, p. 3] suggested the model was a good fit of the data: Hosmer-Lemeshow, \( \chi^2 (8) = 6.29 \) (p>0.05) and <5% (129/3,779) of observations were outlying (±2 standard deviations of the residuals’ mean—zero). Test of multicollinearity suggested this was not a problem (mean VIF=6.10) [316], [317].

### 2.6. Sensitivity analysis

We conducted three sensitivity analyses. First, we restricted the sample of high-risk women to only those continuously enrolled in Medicaid for the entire study period (2009-2012). Redefining the sample this way helped to understand whether Medicaid enrollment length and churning influenced the frequency of anal cancer screening. In the second sensitivity analysis, we redefined the sample of high-risk women by including additional ICD-9 codes that might also be used to indicate a diagnosis of abnormal cervical test or genital warts. We conducted this sensitivity analysis to account for differences in practices in deciding which diagnoses might qualify an individual for anal cancer screening. For example, women with a diagnosis of “other abnormal Pap smear of cervix and cervical HPV (ICD-9 code 795.09)” may be considered as high-risk by some practitioners but not by others. All the supplementary codes used in the
sensitivity analysis are presented in Appendix C2. In the third sensitivity analysis, we modeled the time to follow-up screening at thresholds higher than stipulated in the guidelines to account for logistical delays in seeking care. We assumed a 2-month delay. Thus, in equation 1, we examined the likelihood of follow-up screening at ≤ 14 months among women with normal results and ≤ 8 months among those with abnormal results on the first screen.

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive statistics

Overall, we identified 6,086 high-risk women continuously enrolled in Medicaid for ≥ 24 months. Sixty-two percent (3,779/6,086) were screened for anal cancer after a high-risk diagnosis. Therefore, we examined time to follow-up screening in 3,779 high-risk women who accounted for a total of 4,458 person-years, table 1. Approximately three-quarters qualified for Medicaid via the disability path, with nearly two-thirds continuously enrolled in Medicaid for 4 years. The mean (±SD) age (years) was 41.5±10.4. The sample largely comprised women with histories of abnormal cervical tests (74%) followed by those with histories of both risk factors (18%). Most were non-Hispanic black (68%) followed by other races/ethnicities (for example, Pacific Islanders, Hawaiians, and Asians) (15%), non-Hispanic whites (12%), and Hispanics (5%). The incidence of anal cancer screening was 0.39 (95% C.I.=0.26,0.37) per person-year overall but much higher among high-risk women with both risk factors (0.62 (95% C.I.=0.57,0.68) per person-year). The time to follow-up screening was guideline-concordant for 46% of those with abnormal results and 37% among those with normal results. Women with both risk factors were highest in the proportion with guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening, regardless of the result on the first screen.
3.2. Time to any follow-up anal cancer screening (unadjusted)

The overall median time to any follow-up screening was 16.1 months (95% C.I.=15.2,17.6) but differed by risk group ($\chi^2(2) =115.8$, p-value<0.001). The follow-up time was shortest among women with histories of both risk factors, with a median time almost half that of the next most screened group (women with histories of abnormal cervical tests only) (median=9.3, 95% C.I.=7.6,11.0 months vs. median=18.6, 95% C.I.=17.6,19.9 months). Among women with histories of genital warts only, the median follow-up time was two years (median=24.4, 95% C.I.=16.3,39.0 months). When examined collectively, the median time to follow-up screening for women with any single risk history was 18.9 (95% C.I.=17.8,20.3) months, figure 3. By 24 months, >75% of women with both risk histories had received follow-up screening compared with <60% among women with only one risk factor.

3.3. Guideline concordance of the time to follow-up screening (unadjusted)

Receipt of guideline-concordant follow-up anal cancer screening—defined as receiving follow-up screening within 6 months and 12 months for those with normal and abnormal results after the first screen, respectively—also differed by risk group. The time to follow-up screening was guideline-concordant for 47.3% (95% C.I.=42.0,53%) of high-risk women with abnormal results on the first screen and for 40.0% (95% C.I.=38.0,41.4%) for those with normal results. When stratified by risk group, the time to follow-up screening was guideline-concordant for more than half of high-risk women with both risk factors, figure 4 (points A and C). The percent of women with guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening was lowest for women with a single risk factor and normal results on the first screen (36.8%, 95% C.I.=35.0,38.7%), figure 4 (point D).
3.4. The odds of any follow-up anal cancer screening (adjusted)

In adjusted analyses, the odds of receiving any follow-up anal cancer screening differed by the number of risk factors, table 2 (panel 1). The odds were significantly higher in women with both risk factors than in women with one factor (OR=2.57, 95% C.I.=2.12,3.12). At the same time, high-risk women with an abnormal anal test on the first screen had significantly higher odds of receiving any follow-up screening compared with those who had normal results (OR=3.22, 95% C.I.=2.39,4.34). We also found that the odds of receiving any follow-up screening were significantly higher among those who qualified for Medicaid via the disability path and increased with increasing years of enrollment and age. Compared to non-Hispanic whites, Hispanics had significantly higher odds of receiving any follow-up anal cancer screening. Non-Hispanic blacks had similar odds of receiving any follow-up screening as non-Hispanic whites.

3.5. The odds and probability of guideline-concordant follow-up screening (adjusted)

The odds that the time to follow-up of anal cancer was guideline-concordant differed by risk group, table 2 (panel 2). Compared with women with a single risk factor, women with both risk factors had double the odds of having guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening (OR=2.06, 95%=1.73,2.46). The odds were also higher among women with abnormal results on the first screen compared with women with normal results (abnormal vs. normal, OR=1.27, C.I.=1.00,1.63).

These results are also presented as predicted probabilities in table 3 (base case analysis). From first to last, the average probabilities that the timing of the follow-up screening was guideline-concordant were as follows: both risk factors and abnormal result, 56.7% (95% C.I.=50.7,62.8%); both risk factors and normal result, 50.9 (95% C.I.=47.0-54.8%); one risk
factor and abnormal result, 39.3% (95% C.I.=33.7,44.9%); one risk factor and normal result, 33.8% (95% C.I.=32.2,35.6%).

We also found that the odds that time to follow-up screening was guideline-concordant differed on some individual- and county-level variables. The odds were significantly higher for older enrollees and those who qualified for Medicaid via the disability path. However, the odds did not significantly differ by years of continuous enrollment or race/ethnicity. In terms of county-level variables, the odds were higher for those living in counties with higher HIV prevalence but lower for those living in counties with more specialists. Finally, the odds were lower for high-risk women in states with higher proportions of Medicaid managed care enrollment although the difference was not significant.

3.6. Sensitivity analysis

When we restricted the sample of high-risk women to only those continuously enrolled in Medicaid for the entire study period (2009-2012), the percent of women with guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening increased but only marginally (within five percentage points), table 3 (continuously enrolled for 4 years). For example, among women with both risk factors and abnormal results the percent with guideline-concordant follow-up time to screening increased from 57% (95% C.I.=51%,63%) in the main analysis to 62% (95% C.I.=56%,68%) in the sensitivity analysis.

Table 4 presents the results of the second sensitivity analysis in which we increased the number of ICD-9 codes used to create a sample of high-risk women, thereby relaxing the approach for constructing our sample. The pattern suggests that the percent with guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening decreased but was still higher in high-risk women with both risk factors. The decreases ranged from zero to three percentage points. Overall, the percent with guideline-
concordant time to follow-up decreased by two percentage points among high-risk women with normal results on the first screen after a high-risk diagnosis but did not decrease among those with abnormal results. Similar patterns were observed when the time to follow-up was analyzed by risk group.

In the third sensitivity analysis, which examined follow-up screening at the guideline-recommended times plus 2 months, the probability of follow-up anal cancer screening increased but marginally. The increases were by three to five points in each group, table 5. As in the main analysis, the probability of receiving follow-up screening at the higher thresholds was highest among women with both risk factors and abnormal results on the first screen, followed by those with both risk factors and normal results. In these two groups, the probabilities were >0.5. In high-risk women with one risk factor, the probabilities were <0.5, regardless of the result on the first screen.

4. Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine and report, by anal cancer risk factors and screening result, the guideline concordance of the time to follow-up of anal cancer screening in women with HIV at high-risk for acquiring anal cancer. These women include those with histories of abnormal cervical tests or genital warts. We found that the time to any follow-up of anal cancer screening was longer overall, although shorter among high-risk women with histories of both risk factors. The time to follow-up screening was not guideline-concordant for most high-risk women although it was for most high-risk women with both risk factors. These findings persisted in sensitivity analyses. Among women at high risk of acquiring anal cancer, the odds of guideline-concordant screening are lower in those who are younger and qualified for Medicaid through the disability pathway.
Overall, we found that the time to follow-up of anal cancer screening was much longer among high-risk women with one risk factor, and it was not guideline-concordant for nearly two-thirds of them. However, the time to follow-up was guideline-concordant for high-risk women with both risk factors, regardless of the result on the first screen after a high-risk diagnosis. The lack of guideline concordance of the time to follow-up overall and among high-risk women with one risk factor is not surprising and might be for several reasons. One possible explanation is that the guidelines for anal cancer screening are not very clear on what to do next after the initial screening, particularly when a positive test is obtained [277], [318]. As a result, opinions and practice patterns of experts tend to influence institutions’ anal cancer screening processes. For example, for people treated for severe lesions (AIN2/3), the University of San Francisco’s screening protocol recommends follow-up screening every six months with high-resolution anoscopy (HRA)—the same as for those with untreated AIN1 [319], [320]. On the other hand, John’s Hopkins does not have formal recommendations on follow-up time for those treated for AIN2/AIN3 but does recommend that follow-up screening with HRA be performed every six months in those with AIN1 [318]. Another area of uncertainty and debate is when the result of a pap smear is determined to be ASC-US—atypical squamous cell of undetermined significance or ASC-H—atypical squamous cell, cannot rule out high-grade lesion. For ASC-US, the University of San Francisco recommends follow-up screening with HRA screening and if lesions not found, an annual Pap test is recommended [319]. On the other hand, Johns Hopkins does not make any recommendations on ASC-US. However, if the result is ASC-H, it recommends HRA and if there is no lesion or AIN1, repeat HRA should be performed every 3 months [318]. The University of San Francisco has no formal recommendations for ASC-H. The position of the HIV Medical Association is unclear on these grey areas. This lack of clarity in the guidelines
suggests that the time to follow-up will vary by providers and some providers may not recommend follow-up screening to their clients even if the results on the initial screen are positive.

Given the lack of clarity in the guidelines, another possible explanation is that the guidelines may not have been sufficiently popularized and therefore, some providers may not be fully aware of the guidelines for anal cancer screening. This lack of awareness about the guidelines would most likely affect rates of anal cancer screening among women with histories of abnormal cervical tests or genital warts. This is because these risk factors for anal cancer are not the most well-known or most extensively studied. Receptive anal intercourse is [321] and hence the large literature on anal cancer screening in MSM with HIV [267], [280]–[283]. Thus, it is probable that providers not aware of the guidelines may prioritize anal cancer screening in MSM and overlook high-risk women, particularly those with a single risk factor.

Another potential explanation for the low rates of follow-up screening is that while HRA is considered the gold standard for anal cancer screening and strongly recommended for follow-up screening [318], [320], [322], several challenges limiting its use remain. These challenges include a shortage of colposcopies, shortage of well-trained personnel, and a long learning curve for the technique [278], [323], [324]. For example, data show that it takes examining about 200 cases for a provider to competently detect all high-grade lesions using HRA [324]. These technological limitations suggest that high-risk women, particularly those with abnormal results on the first screen after a high-risk diagnosis, may not receive the follow-up screening even if they want to.

An additional potential explanation is that physicians, particularly specialists, may not have enough time to provide the follow-up screening services. In multivariable regressions, we found
that high-risk women in counties with more specialists are significantly less likely to have guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening. At the same time, the likelihood of receiving guideline-concordant follow-up screening is higher, although not significant, in counties with more primary care physicians. This suggests that high-risk women relying on specialists, vs. primary care physicians, may face delays in receiving the follow-up anal cancer screening. These delays could be due to the involvement of multiple specialties vs. a single specialty in providing this care [325], [326]. Finally, it is possible that those with one risk factor may downplay the risk of anal cancer given that they have one and not multiple risk factors. Therefore, they may procrastinate in seeking follow-up screening, thinking the problem is not serious enough and may naturally disappear.

The pattern of the time to follow-up screening among those with abnormal and normal results (on the first screen) is consistent with reports from previous studies, although we emphasize that the overall median follow-up time in this study is not always consistent with those studies. Similar to the current study, previous studies reported higher follow-up screening frequencies among women with abnormal results compared to those with normal results [273], [275], [287]. The study’s overall median follow-up time (18 months) compares favorably with findings from a study in California which reported a follow-up time of 17 months in women with HIV [287]. In New York, women with HIV and normal results on the previous screen received follow-up anal cancer screening in 12 months [275], which is guideline-concordant but inconsistent with this study’s findings. Studies of women with HIV in Boston, Connecticut, and Massachusetts, reported a follow-up time of 6 months if the previous screen was normal [270], [273]. We emphasize that comparisons with these studies are limited because the studies did not restrict
their samples to women at high risk for anal cancer, had smaller sample sizes (<100 in many cases) or were limited in geographic scope.

Finally, the finding that time to follow-up screening was guideline-concordant for <50% of the high-risk women is consistent with other studies on the guideline concordance of care among PLWH. Among women with HIV, <50% receive guideline-concordant depression care [328] and <40% receive guideline-concordant cervical cancer screening [329]. Among PLWH, <40% receive guideline-concordant opioid therapy [330], <30% receive timely medical care for HIV symptoms [331], and <50% receive regular HIV care [332]. Therefore, this study contributes to a broader literature suggesting that there is room for improvement in the delivery of HIV-related care.

4.1. Limitations

This study has limitations. First, we were unable to examine the guideline concordance of the time to follow-up screening in women with HIV and histories of receptive anal intercourse due to data limitations. These women are also at high risk of acquiring anal cancer and are recommended for regular follow-up screening [277]. Although ICD-9 codes for high-risk sexual behaviors were available, we could not identify specific diagnoses of receptive anal intercourse in the MAX data. Despite this limitation, it is likely that we captured some of these women among those with histories of genital warts. This is because individuals with high-risk sexual behaviors like receptive anal intercourse are more likely to acquire sexually transmitted infections, including genital warts [333].

Second, we were unable to know if any women received follow-up anal cancer screening not paid for by Medicaid and therefore, not captured in the MAX data. This problem was likely to occur because of churning. Data show that individuals who churn tend to have health service
utilization patterns different from those continuously enrolled in Medicaid [334], [335]. Thus, the estimates are biased to the extent that the frequency of follow-up screening among those who churned systematically differed by risk group. To mitigate this problem, we limited the study’s sample to high-risk women continuously enrolled in Medicaid for ≥ 24 months. Moreover, the study’s findings were robust in sensitivity analysis when we restricted the sample to only those continuously enrolled for the entire study period (48 months).

Third, we did not have access to individual-level socio-economic data like education and income—two factors that influence the utilization of preventive care and health outcomes among PLWH [302], [303]. To address this limitation, we supplemented the MAX data with the AHRF and controlled for county-level education and income.

Finally, the findings may not be generalizable to all women with HIV at high-risk of acquiring anal cancer. This is particularly true as we used a cohort of Medicaid enrollees in the US South and not a nationally representative sample. Thus, the time to follow-up screening reported here may not be observed in the country’s other regions or among those privately insured or rely on Ryan White HIV clinics. Despite these limitations, it is likely the study adequately captured the frequency of follow-up anal screening in high-risk women with HIV given the large sample for the study and likely reflects regional trends in the receipt of follow-up screening in this population.

4.2. Implications for practice and policy

Time to follow-up anal cancer screening is not guideline-concordant for most high-risk women with histories of abnormal cervical tests or genital warts, although it is for most high-risk women with both risk factors. This problem can be addressed in several ways, including enhancing partnerships between primary care physicians and specialists and training more providers in
using HRA—a specialized test for anal cancer screening and recommended for follow-up screening particularly among those with abnormal cytologic results. Use of HRA in follow-up screening is critical because, unlike cytology, HRA can distinguish between low-grade and high-grade lesions and therefore, allows for the appropriate treatment and follow-up recommendations [318], [320], [322].

Second, it is critical to clarify the guidelines for anal cancer screening. This can be achieved by gathering more compelling evidence on the benefits of anal cancer screening, particularly in individuals at high-risk for acquiring anal cancer. While experts agree that anal cancer screening in high-risk individuals can prevent anal cancer or at least detect it early, the guidelines for anal cancer screening have not been adopted universally [336], [337]. This is mainly because of the lack of compelling evidence about the benefits of anal cancer screening [336], [337]. To address this gap, a randomized controlled trial evaluating the benefits of treating high-grade lesions in PLWH is currently in progress in the USA [338]. Thus, the evidence from that trial and perhaps additional observational studies can help to clarify the guidelines, lead to their universal adoption and popularization, and eliminate any confusions about the timing of follow-up screening.

Furthermore, re-examining the payment policy for anal cancer screening services can be useful since there is no CPT code for anal cancer screening [309], [310], [312]. Thus, clinicians cannot bill payers for anal cancer screening as a single service. The status quo is that clinicians bill payers the bits and pieces that comprise anal cancer evaluation and management (for example, anoscopy) [339], [340]. Payers argue that they cannot pay for anal cancer screening because its benefits have not been evaluated in any randomized controlled trial and the screening is not universally recommended [278], [336], [340]. It is noteworthy that payers reimburse clinicians for cervical cancer screening despite cervical and anal cancers having many similarities and both
lacking evidence of screening benefits from randomized controlled trials [336], [339]. The lack of a single CPT code for anal cancer screening creates difficulties in reimbursement for the services [309], [312] and therefore, a disincentive to the continued provision of anal cancer screening services. Thus, it is probable that creating a billable CPT code for anal cancer screening could eliminate the difficulties in reimbursements and increase rates of anal cancer screening overall.

Finally, high-risk women should be made aware of the benefits of anal cancer screening, regardless of the number of risk factors for anal cancer. Data show that 63% of people at risk for anal cancer do not know that anal cancer screening is recommended [341], a sizable proportion refuses the screening [341]–[343], and not all clinicians discuss this with their patients [344]. Therefore, discussions between providers and their clients at a high-risk for acquiring anal cancer about the benefits of anal screening can increase the uptake of anal cancer screening services.

4.3. Future research

While this study contributes to a broader literature suggesting that most PLWH do not receive guideline-concordant care, much remains to be done. Future research should focus on whether the timing of follow-up anal cancer screening varies by health service delivery model (managed care) or payment model (fee-for-service). This is important as many states have moved from Medicaid fee-for-service to Medicaid managed care [345]. However, it is unclear how such changes affect the receipt of anal cancer screening specifically and HIV-related preventive care in general. Future research should also examine racial/ethnic disparities in the timing of follow-up anal cancer screening overall and in each group of high-risk women. Evidence suggests that racial/ethnic minorities are less likely to receive HIV-related preventive care [346]–[348], be treated for anal cancer [349], and more likely to present with advanced disease stage [350],
[351], compared with non-Hispanic whites. Among MSM with HIV, non-Hispanic blacks are less likely to be screened for anal cancer [286], [343], [352]. It is unclear whether these disparities extend to follow-up anal cancer screening of high-risk women. We were unable to investigate this question because of inadequate sample sizes for high-risk non-Hispanic whites and Hispanics.

5. Conclusion

In the past 2-3 decades, the incidence of anal cancer among PLWH has increased significantly. We examined the guideline concordance of the timing of follow-up anal cancer screening in two groups of women at high-risk for acquiring anal cancer: women with HIV and histories of either abnormal cervical tests or genital warts. The timing of the follow-up screening is not guideline-concordant overall and among high-risk women with a history of one risk factor. However, it is guideline-concordant among those with histories of both risk factors. These findings suggest that high-risk women with one risk factor are in danger of being overlooked as also being at risk for anal cancer. As a result, they may present for screening with advanced disease, making secondary prevention difficult, and thereby limiting the chance of survival. In all, these findings provide support for efforts, including training providers in how to effectively use HRA and generating more evidence to help push for the universal adoption of the guidelines for anal cancer screening, to increase rates of follow-up anal cancer screening in those at high-risk of acquiring anal cancer.
Table 1: Summary statistics for high-risk women living with HIV followed-up for anal cancer screening, by risk group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All high-risk women (n=3,779)</th>
<th>Genital warts only (n=292)</th>
<th>Abnormal cervical only (n=2,809)</th>
<th>Abnormal cervical and genital warts (n=678)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First screen after a high-risk diagnosis***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>3453</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time at risk (person-years)†</td>
<td>4458</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received follow-up screening***</td>
<td>2086</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of follow-up screening (per person-year)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to follow-up screening guideline-concordant‡</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal anal test at first screening***</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal anal test at first screening***</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic white</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic black</td>
<td>2570</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid qualification***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>2785</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment length***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously enrolled for 2 years</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously enrolled for 3 years</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously enrolled for 4 years</td>
<td>2406</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean and standard deviation) ***, years</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p-value<0.05; **p-value<0.01; ***p-value<0.001. †Percentages are by row, otherwise, percentages are by column. § Receipt of follow-up anal cancer screening within 6 months for those with an abnormal anal test at the first test and within 12 months for those with normal results at the first test. $First column=mean and second column= standard deviation. For these variables tests of statistical significance were performed using the F-test; otherwise, Chi-square were tests used.
### Table 2: Odds of guideline-concordant time to follow-up anal cancer screening in high-risk women with HIV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Panel 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Panel 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any follow-up anal cancer screening</td>
<td>Guideline-concordant follow-up anal cancer screening†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-level factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of risk factors (ref: one risk factor)‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both factors</td>
<td>2.57***</td>
<td>[2.12,3.12]</td>
<td>2.06***</td>
<td>[1.73,2.46]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result at first anal cancer screen (ref: normal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal</td>
<td>3.22***</td>
<td>[2.39,4.34]</td>
<td>1.27†</td>
<td>[1.00,1.63]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification for Medicaid (ref: income)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1.23**</td>
<td>[1.03,1.47]</td>
<td>1.28***</td>
<td>[1.06,1.53]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of continuous enrollment (ref: 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>1.29**</td>
<td>[1.03,1.62]</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>[0.88,1.39]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1.37***</td>
<td>[1.16,1.64]</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>[0.81,1.16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (ref: 19-34 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>1.39***</td>
<td>[1.16,1.67]</td>
<td>1.40***</td>
<td>[1.16,1.68]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>1.30***</td>
<td>[1.07,1.58]</td>
<td>1.24**</td>
<td>[1.02,1.51]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>1.58***</td>
<td>[1.22,2.04]</td>
<td>1.66***</td>
<td>[1.28,2.14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity (ref: non-Hispanic whites)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Black</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>[0.86,1.34]</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>[0.71,1.11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.63**</td>
<td>[1.11,2.41]</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>[0.79,1.66]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>[0.87,1.70]</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>[0.59,1.16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County/state level controls§</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosed HIV cases per 100,000 adults (ref: 0-54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-138</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>[0.61,5.55]</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>[0.81,9.76]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139-2426</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>[0.44,3.69]</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>[0.59,6.65]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary care physicians per 10,000 population (ref: 0-3.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8-6.3</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>[0.90,2.03]</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>[0.81,1.85]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4-47.6</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>[0.78,1.91]</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>[0.75,1.85]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists per 10,000 population (ref: 0-0.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.93-3.4</td>
<td>0.43***</td>
<td>[0.24,0.76]</td>
<td>0.41***</td>
<td>[0.24,0.72]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5-147.8</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>[0.24,0.83]</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>[0.27,0.91]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent living the federal poverty level (ref:0.9%-13.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6%-18.9%</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>[0.60,1.17]</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>[0.81,1.59]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%-63.2%</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>[0.56,1.20]</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>[0.64,1.37]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with less than high school education (ref: 1%-11.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5%-18%</td>
<td>0.80†</td>
<td>[0.63,1.03]</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>[0.67,1.09]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1%-55</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>[0.66,1.27]</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>[0.78,1.51]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with Medicaid managed care enrollment (ref: &lt;=60%)¶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%-80%</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>[0.29,3.54]</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>[0.08,1.27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>[0.34,3.58]</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>[0.10,1.41]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>3779</td>
<td></td>
<td>3779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. †Receipt of follow-up anal cancer screening in 6 months for those with an abnormal anal test at the first test and within 12 months for those with normal results at the first test. ‡The risk factors are histories of abnormal cervical tests or genital warts. §The county and state control variables are tertiles. ¶State-level variable.
Table 3: The percent of women living with HIV with guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening at varying restrictions of years of continuous enrollment in Medicaid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factors*</th>
<th>Base case analysis† (n=3,779)</th>
<th>Sensitivity analysis‡ (n=2,406)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuously enrolled for at least 2 years</td>
<td>Only those continuously enrolled for 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal (≤12 months)</td>
<td>Abnormal (≤6 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate (%)</td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Risk factors: a history of abnormal cervical tests or a history of genital warts. †The base case (main) analysis uses a sample of women living with HIV continuously enrolled in Medicaid for at least two years. ‡ This is a sensitivity analysis in which the guideline concordance of the follow-up time to anal cancer screening was examined only in women living with HIV continuously enrolled in Medicaid for 4 years (2009-2012)-the study's analytic time horizon.
Table 4: The percent of women living with HIV with guideline-concordant time to follow-up screening, using varying numbers of ICD-9 codes to define high-risk women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factors*</th>
<th>Base case analysis† (n=3,779)</th>
<th>Sensitivity analysis (n=4,960)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent receiving follow-up screening†</td>
<td>Percent receiving guideline-concordant‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal (≤12 months)</td>
<td>Abnormal (≤6 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Estimate (%)</td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviation: ICD-9, International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision. *Risk factors: a history of abnormal cervical tests or a history of genital warts. †Estimates in the base case analysis were derived from a sample of high-risk women created using a more conservative definition (fewer ICD-9 codes) of high-risk. ‡In the sensitivity analysis, a sample of high-risk women was created using additional codes that may or may not conclusively suggest that an individual is high-risk. ‡Receipt of follow-up anal cancer screening within 6 months for those with an abnormal anal test at the first test and within 12 months for those with normal results at the first test.
Table 5: Average predicted probability of receiving follow-up anal cancer screening in women with HIV at different cut-off points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factors*</th>
<th>Normal (≤12 months)</th>
<th>Abnormal (≤6 months)</th>
<th>Normal (≤14 months)</th>
<th>Abnormal (≤8 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>95% C.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>[0.35-0.39]</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>[0.42-0.52]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One risk factor</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>[0.32-0.36]</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>[0.34-0.45]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both risk factors</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>[0.47-0.55]</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>[0.51-0.63]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Risk factors: a history of abnormal cervical tests or history of genital warts. †The base case analysis represents the time to follow-up recommended in the guidelines for follow-up anal cancer screening. ‡The sensitivity analysis represents a relaxed threshold to account for logistical delays that may happen is seeking follow-up anal cancer screening services.
Thick boxes highlight the groups of people living with HIV and anal cancer screening frequencies of interest in this study.

*Both men and women with genital warts are recommended for regular screening, but the focus is on women with genital warts.

Figure 1: Recommendations for anal cancer screening in people living with HIV at high risk for anal cancer

This figure summarizes recommendations for anal cancer screening in people with HIV at high-risk of acquiring anal cancer. Guidelines for anal cancer screening recommend regular screening in those with histories of high-risk sexual behaviors, abnormal cervical tests, or genital warts. Follow-up screening is recommended every 12 months if the initial result is normal or every 6 months if the result is abnormal.
Adapted from Andersen, *J. Health Soc. Behav.*, 1995

The thick box highlights that the present study is interested in the frequency of anal cancer screening (utilization of health services) in high-risk people living with HIV. *Variable is only available at the county- and not individual-level. †The guidelines for anal cancer screening recommend screening of all people diagnosed with HIV at baseline and then those with histories of abnormal cervical Pap or genital warts should be screened annually if the anal cancer screening results are normal or bi-annually if the results are abnormal.

**Figure 2: A framework for understanding the frequency of follow-up anal cancer screening in high-risk women living with HIV**

This figure shows the interplay of individual/population factors and how they affect the utilization of anal cancer screening services. It also shows that while people living with HIV people have a need for anal cancer screening, risk factors like having a history of genital warts increase this need.
Figure 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of the frequency of follow-up anal cancer screening, by risk group
This figure shows that the frequency of follow-up anal cancer screening was higher in women with HIV and histories of both abnormal cervical tests and genital warts.
The risk factors are 1) history of abnormal cervical tests ; 2) history of genital warts.

**Figure 4: Percent receiving guideline-concordant follow-up anal cancer screening, by risk group and the result of the first screen**

This figure shows that the percent of women receiving guideline-concordant follow-up screening was highest among those with both risk factors, regardless of the result of the first anal cancer screen after a high-risk diagnosis (points A and C). The percent was lowest among those with a single risk factor and a normal result on the first test (point D).
## Appendices

### Appendix C1: Variable definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Time from first anal cancer screen after a high-risk diagnosis to the next screen.</td>
<td>Dependent variable.</td>
<td>MAX files</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordance</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>Receipt of guideline-concordant follow-up screening: concordance=1 if guideline-concordant, concordance=0</td>
<td>Dependent variable</td>
<td>MAX files</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk group</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>1=history of abnormal cervical tests, 2=history of genital warts, 3=history of abnormal cervical tests and genital warts</td>
<td>Key explanatory variable. Anal cancer screening likely higher among women with both risk factors.</td>
<td>MAX files</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification for Medicaid</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>1= via income, 2= via disability.</td>
<td>Anal cancer screening likely higher among those qualified via the disability path.</td>
<td>MAX files</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous enrollment (years)</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Years continuously enrolled in Medicaid: 1=2 years, 2=3 years, 3=4 years.</td>
<td>Anal cancer screening likely higher among those enrolled in Medicaid for longer periods.</td>
<td>MAX files</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>1=19-34 years, 2=35-44 years, 3=45-54 years, 4=55-64 years.</td>
<td>Older participants more likely to be screened for anal cancer.</td>
<td>MAX files</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td>1=non-Hispanic white, 2=non-Hispanic black, 3=Hispanic, 4=Others</td>
<td>Use of healthcare services differs by race [286], [343], [352].</td>
<td>MAX files</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County-level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV prevalence</td>
<td>Ordinal (tertiles)</td>
<td>HIV cases per 100,000 adult population.</td>
<td>People in high-burden HIV counties are more likely to receive HIV appropriate care as HIV providers are more likely to locate there [305].</td>
<td>AIDSVu*</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary care physician population (PCP) ratio</td>
<td>Ordinal (tertiles)</td>
<td>The ratio of primary care physicians per 10,000 population</td>
<td>Anal cancer screening services are more likely to be available in areas with a higher supply of PCPs.</td>
<td>AHRF</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist population ratio</td>
<td>Ordinal (tertiles)</td>
<td>The ratio of specialists per 10,000 population</td>
<td>Anal cancer screening more likely to be available in areas with a higher supply of specialists.</td>
<td>AHRF</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Ordinal (tertiles)</td>
<td>The percent of people in poverty.</td>
<td>Income is an enabler of health services use [289].</td>
<td>AHRF†</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Ordinal (tertiles)</td>
<td>The proportion of residents with at least a high school education.</td>
<td>Education predisposes an individual to use healthcare services [289].</td>
<td>AHRF</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State-level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid managed care enrollment.</td>
<td>Ordinal (tertiles)</td>
<td>The percent of Medicaid beneficiaries enrolled in managed care.</td>
<td>Beneficiaries in managed care are more likely to receive preventive care [353], like anal cancer screening.</td>
<td>KFF 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: MAX, Medicaid Analytic eXtract file; AHRF, AHRF Area Health Resources File; KFF, Kaiser Family Foundation. *AIDSVu, maintained by Emory University, consists of county-level surveillance data on diagnosed HIV cases in the US [304]. †AHRF is maintained by the Health Resource Service Administration [301].
Appendix C2: Identifying high-risk women from a sample of women living with HIV

To identify high-risk women among those with HIV, we used diagnosis codes for abnormal cervical tests or genital warts [307], [308]. We searched Google for commonly used ICD-9 codes for abnormal cervical tests or genital warts which we validated using the literature and expert opinions. For abnormal cervical tests, codes traditionally used for abnormal cervical Pap smears or cervical intraepithelial neoplasia were the main codes [354]–[357], table C2. However, other codes such as 795.01 (Papanicolaou smear of cervix with atypical squamous cells of undetermined significance) were also included to account for coding errors or misdiagnoses. The supplementary codes in table C2 were used in sensitivity analysis only. For genital warts, while ICD-9 code 078.11 is specific to genital warts, two codes are also commonly used: 078.10 for unspecified viral warts and 078.19 for other specified viral warts [358]. The supplementary codes were used in sensitivity analyses only. We did not restrict the ICD-9 code to a specific position.
Table C2: Codes for identifying women with HIV at high-risk for acquiring anal cancer

**Identifying women living with HIV***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICD-9 Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>AIDS diagnosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V08</td>
<td>HIV diagnosis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abnormal cervical Pap test/cervical intraepithelial neoplasia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICD-9 Code (Main)†</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>795.02</td>
<td>Papanicolaou smear of cervix with atypical squamous cells cannot exclude high grade squamous intraepithelial lesion (ASC-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795.03</td>
<td>Papanicolaou smear of cervix with low grade squamous intraepithelial lesion (LGSIL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795.04</td>
<td>Papanicolaou smear of cervix with high grade squamous intraepithelial lesion (HGSIL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795.05</td>
<td>Cervical high-risk human papillomavirus (HPV) DNA test positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795.06</td>
<td>Papanicolaou smear of cervix with cytologic evidence of malignancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622.10</td>
<td>Dysplasia of cervix, unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622.11</td>
<td>Mild dysplasia of the cervix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622.12</td>
<td>Moderate dysplasia of the cervix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.1</td>
<td>Carcinoma in situ of cervix uteri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.32</td>
<td>Carcinoma in situ vulva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13.22</td>
<td>History of cervical dysplasia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICD-9 Code (Supplementary)‡</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>622.1</td>
<td>Dysplasia of cervix, uteri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Dysplasia of vagina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>HPV infection, unspecified site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795.00</td>
<td>Abnormal glandular Papanicolaou smear of cervix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795.01</td>
<td>Papanicolaou smear of cervix with atypical squamous cells of undetermined significance (ASC-US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795.07</td>
<td>Satisfactory cervical smear but lacking transformation zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795.08</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory cervical cytology smear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795.09</td>
<td>Other abnormal Pap smear of cervix and cervical HPV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**History of genital warts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICD-9 Code (Main)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>078.11</td>
<td>Condyloma acuminatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>078.10</td>
<td>Viral warts, unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>078.19</td>
<td>Other specified viral warts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICD-9 Code (Supplementary)‡</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>078.12</td>
<td>Plantar warts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: ICD-9, International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision. *ICD-9 codes V01.79 (exposure to HIV virus) and 795.71 (nonspecific serologic evidence of HIV) were not included in identifying women with HIV because these codes do not confirm HIV disease. †These are the main codes for this diagnosis but added supplementary codes to account for coding errors. ‡ The supplementary codes were used in sensitivity analysis only.
Figure C2: Algorithm for identifying high-risk HIV-infected women from Medicaid Analytic eXtract (MAX) files
This figure shows the process of deriving a sample of women at high-risk for acquiring anal cancer from a sample of women enrolled in Medicaid and validated to be living with HIV. The analytic sample comprised 6,086 of whom 5,977 had a history of abnormal cervical tests, 889 had a history of genital warts, and 1,051 had histories of both abnormal cervical tests and genital warts.
Appendix C3: Identifying high-risk women screened for anal cancer

To identify high-risk women screened for anal cancer, we used CPT codes that suggest that an anal cancer screen was performed, table C3. Unlike similar services such as cervical cancer screening, there is no single CPT code for anal cancer screening [309], [310], [312]. For example, CPT code 88104 “fluid requiring simple smear preparation” suggests that anal cancer screening was performed using a Pap smear. We searched Google, Google Scholar, and PubMed for commonly used CPT codes that suggest anal cancer screening was performed. Examples of terms used include “CPT code” used in combination with “anal cytology” or “anal cancer screen” or “high-resolution anoscopy”.

Table C3: CPT codes for anal cancer screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anal cytology</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPT* code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87207</td>
<td>Stain for inclusion bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88104</td>
<td>Fluid requiring simple smear prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88108</td>
<td>Fluid requiring concentration tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88112</td>
<td>Fluid requiring thin layer prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88160</td>
<td>Smear prepared by the client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88161</td>
<td>Smear requiring prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88162</td>
<td>Multiple smears (5 or more) requiring extended study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88172</td>
<td>Determination of adequacy of specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88173</td>
<td>FNA (fine needle aspiration) interp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88305</td>
<td>Fluid requiring cell block prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anoscopy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPT code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46600</td>
<td>Anoscopy, with or without collecting a specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46601</td>
<td>Anoscopy; diagnostic, with high-resolution magnification (HRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46606</td>
<td>Anoscopy with multiple biopsy specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46607</td>
<td>Diagnostic anoscopy and biopsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCPCS code†</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2078</td>
<td>Anoscopy, high resolution (with magnification and chemical agent enhancement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6027</td>
<td>High-resolution anoscopy with specimen collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6028</td>
<td>High-resolution anoscopy with biopsy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CPT codes are used to report medical, surgical and diagnostic procedures rendered by physicians and other healthcare professionals. †HCPCS codes are in two levels. Level 1 comprises CPT codes while level 2 is for supplies, medications, and services provided to patients outside the physician's office and not included in the CPT code.
Appendix C4: Ascertaining whether a result of an anal cancer screen was abnormal

To ascertain whether the outcome of the anal cancer screen was abnormal, we used ICD-9 codes suggesting that an abnormal result was found during the screening. If an enrollee received the screening but none of the codes we found were recorded, we assumed that abnormal or suspicious anal cells were not found. We searched Google, Google Scholar, and PubMed for the ICD-9 codes. For the search, we used the terms “ICD-9 or in combination with “anal squamous intraepithelial lesion” or “dysplasia of anus” or “anal intraepithelial neoplasia”, among other terms.

Table C4: ICD-9 codes for identifying women with abnormal results after anal cancer screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICD-9 Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>796.70</td>
<td>Abnormal glandular Papanicolaou smear of anus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796.71</td>
<td>Papanicolaou smear of anus with atypical squamous cells of undetermined significance (ASC-US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796.72</td>
<td>Papanicolaou smear of anus with atypical squamous cells cannot exclude high grade squamous intraepithelial lesion (ASC-H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796.73</td>
<td>Papanicolaou smear of anus with low grade squamous intraepithelial lesion (LGSIL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796.74</td>
<td>Papanicolaou smear of anus with high grade squamous intraepithelial lesion (HGSIL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796.75</td>
<td>Anal high-risk human papillomavirus (HPV) DNA test positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796.76</td>
<td>Papanicolaou smear of anus with cytologic evidence of malignancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796.77</td>
<td>Satisfactory anal smear but lacking transformation zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796.78</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory anal cytology smear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796.79</td>
<td>Other abnormal Papanicolaou smear of the anus and anal HPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569.44</td>
<td>Dysplasia of anus (mild, moderate, AINI and II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230.5</td>
<td>Carcinoma in situ of the anal canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230.6</td>
<td>Carcinoma in situ of anus, unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211.4</td>
<td>Benign neoplasms of rectum and anal canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569.49</td>
<td>Other specified disorders of rectum and anus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stata do file
///Analysis of initial anal cancer screening

cd /mnt/isilon/data/hpr/yang/HIV/STEVEN/DATA/CLAIM/Working_folder/Stata/

log using summaries, replace

set more off

use hiv+_hirsk_patient_analysis, clear

*examining the characteristics of those enrolled for two years and those who were not
tab continuously_2yr riskgroup, chi exp row
tab continuously_2yr race, chi exp row
tab continuously_2yr scrnd_for_AC, chi exp row
tab race scrnd_for_AC if continuously_2yr==0, chi exp row
tab race scrnd_secondtime if continuously_2yr==0, chi exp row

*keeping only those enrolled for at least two years
tab continuously_2yr, m
keep if continuously_2yr==1

*checking the association between routine care and anal cancer screening
tab routinecare
tab routinecare scrnd_for_AC, chi
tab routinecare scrnd_for_AC, col
tab routinecare scrnd_for_AC, col row

*setting the font
graph set window fontface "Times New Roman"
***********
*Initial anal cancer screening

**understanding the data

tsetting the data
stset time_exit1, origin(time_entry1) failure(scrnd_for_AC ==1) id(msis_id)
scale(30)

tab _d, m
*tab _d scrnd_for_AC, m
gsort-_d
order scrnd_for_AC srvc_bgn_dt srvc_end_dt time* date_first_hirsk _d
srvc_date_first srvc_date_last

*describing the data
stdescribe

forval i=1/3 {
stdescribe if riskgroup==`i'
}

forval i=1/4 {
stdescribe if race==`i'
}

*summarizing the data
stsum, by(riskgroup)
stsum, by(race)
stsum, by(riskgroup race)
* checking if any of the variables are timevarying
stvary

* using the log-rank and unadjusted cox model to check variables for inclusion
///
* usually if p value > .2, the variable should not be included
* log rank test is for categorical variables, while Cox is for continuous one
* log rank
foreach var of varlist riskgroup race eligibility {
sts test `var'
}
* Cox
stcox age
stcox enrollment

*** summary statistics
summarize enrollment age

* one way ANOVA
oneway age riskgroup, tab
oneway enrollment riskgroup, tab

* kruskall Wallis test, by risk group
tabstat enrollment age, by(riskgroup) stats(p50 iqr)
kwallis enrollment, by(riskgroup)
kwallis age, by(riskgroup)

foreach var of varlist scrnd_for_AC scrnd_secondtime abnanal race eligibility continuously_3 continuously_4 {
tab `var' riskgroup, chi
*ranksum tests
median age, by (riskgroup)
**
**table 2 of descriptives (by race)
*kruskall Wallis test, by race
tabstat enrollment age, by(race) stats(p50 iqr)
kwallis enrollment, by(race)
kwallis age, by(race)

oneway age race, tab
oneway enrollment race, tab

foreach var of varlist scrnd_for_AC scrnd_secondtime abnanal riskgroup eligibility continuously_3 continuously_4 {
tab `var' race, chi
}
**the bivariate analyses
*the bivariate analyses will be only among those continuously enrolled for at least 24 months

*table 3: bivariate analyses
foreach var of varlist riskgroup race continuously_3 continuously_4 {
stsum, by(`var')
stci, by(`var')
stci, rmean by(`var')
sts test `var'
}

drawing Kaplan-Meier graphs: interest is in failure (success) and not survival
sts graph, gwood failure risktable(, color(black) size(2.5) order(1 "All women")) title("Risk table", size(3.0))) ///
yline(0.5, lwidth(0.002) lcolor(black) lpattern(-)) ylab(), labsize(2.5)
xline(13.6, lwidth(0.002) lcolor(black) lpattern(-)) ///
xtitle("Analysis time (months)" , size(3.0)) ytitle("% screened for anal cancer", size(3.0) height(7)) xlabel(), labsize(3.0)) ///
graphregion(fcolor(white)) ///
legend(rows(1) label(1 "(95% C.I.)") label(2 "Screening function") size(2.5) order(2 "Screening function" 1 "95% C.I.") ///
title("Figure 1: Kaplan-Meier (KM) estimates of initial anal cancer screening rates", size(3) color(black)) ///
graphregion(color(white))

glm scrnd_for_AC i.riskgroup, fam(bin) link(log) eform /*shows that separate success curves are warranted*/

stcox i.riskgroup

sts graph, failure by(riskgroup) risktable(, color(black) size(2.5) order(1 "Warts only" 2 "Abn. cerv only" 3 "Both") title("Risk table", size(3.0))) ///
yline(0.5, lwidth(0.002) lcolor(black) lpattern(-)) ylab(), labsize(2.5)
xline(4.2 14.8 43.9, lwidth(0.002) lcolor(black) lpattern(-)) ///
legend(rows(1) subtitle("Risk group", size(3.0)) label(1 "Warts only") label(2 "Abn. cerv only") label(3 "Both") size(2.5)) ///
xtitle("Analysis time (months)" , size(3.0)) ytitle("% screened for anal cancer", size(3.0) height(7)) xlabel(), labsize(3.0)) ///
graphregion(fcolor(white)) ///
xlabel(0 (12) 48) ///
plot1opts(lpattern(longdash_dot) lcolor(blue)) ///
plot2opts(lpattern(dash) lcolor(maroon)) ///
plot3opts(lpattern(dash_dot) lcolor(green)) ///
caption("Abnormal cervical: HR=1.48, 95% C.I.=1.30-1.69; Both: HR=2.28, 95% C.I.=1.97-2.63", size(3.0)) ///
Figure 1: KM estimates of initial anal cancer screening rates after a high-risk diagnosis, by risk group

*estimating baseline hazards (read about this on page 142 and 143 of intro to survival analysis using stata)

stcox i.riskgroup i.race i.eligibility log_enrol age number_pcp specialists proportion_college med_hh_inc countycases

*stcurve, hazard at(riskgroup=1) at(riskgroup=2) at(riskgroup=3) kernel(gaussian) width(4) noboundary

stcurve, cumhaz at(riskgroup=1) at(riskgroup=2) at(riskgroup=3) ///
legend(rows(1) subtitle("Risk group", size(3.0)) label(1 "Warts only")
label(2 "Abn. cerv only") label(3 "Both") size(2.5)) ///
xtitle("Analysis time (months)", size(3.0)) ytitle("Cumulative risk (hazard) of anal cancer screening", size(2.5) height(7)) xlabel(0 (12) 48) ///
cpattern(longdash dash longdash_dot) clcolor(blue maroon green) ///
xlabel(0 (12) 48) ///
caption("Abnormal cervical: HR=1.51, 95% C.I.=1.32-1.72; Both: HR=2.48, 95%
C.I.=2.15-2.87", size(2.8)) ///
title("Figure 2: Adjusted risk of initial anal cancer screening (CPH) after a high-risk diagnosis, by risk group", size(3.5) color(black)) ///
graphregion(color(white))

*by race

glm scrdn_for_AC i.race, fam(bin) link(log) eform /*shows that separate success curves are not warranted*/

stcox i.race

stcox i.riskgroup i.race i.eligibility log_enrol age number_pcp specialists proportion_college med_hh_inc countycases

*unadjusted (KM)
sts graph, failure by(race) risktable(, color(black) size(2.5) order(1 "Whites" 2 "Blacks" 3 "Hispanics" 4 "Others") title("Risk table", size(3.0))) ///
yline(0.5, lwidth(0.002) lcolor(black) lpattern(-)) ylab(, labsize(2.5))
xline(6.3 8.2 8.5, lwidth(0.002) lcolor(black) lpattern(-)) ///
legend(rows(1) subtitle("Race/ethnicity", size(3.0)) label(1 "Whites")
label(2 "Blacks") label(3 "Hispanics") label(4 "Others")size(2.5)) ///
xtitle("Analysis time (months)", size(3.0)) ytitle("% screened for anal
cancer", size(3.0) height(7)) xlabel(,labsize(3.0)) ///
xlabel(0 (12) 48) ///

graphregion(fcolor(white)) ///
caption("Blacks: HR=0.95, 95% C.I.=0.87-1.04; Hispanics: HR=0.89, 95%
C.I.=0.76-1.04 Others: HR=0.45, 95% C.I.=0.41-0.51", size(2.2)) ///
title("Figure 2: KM estimates of initial anal cancer screening rates, by
race", size(3) color(black)) ///
plot1opts(lpattern(longdash_dot) lcolor(blue)) ///
plot2opts(lpattern(dash) lcolor(maroon)) ///
plot3opts(lpattern(dash_dot) lcolor(green)) ///
plot4opts(lpattern(longdash) lcolor(black)) ///

*adjusted (CPH)

stcurve, cumhaz at(race=1) at(race=2) at(race=3) at(race=4) ///
legend(rows(1) subtitle("Race/ethnicity", size(3.0)) label(1 "Whites")
label(2 "Blacks") label(3 "Hispanics") label(4 "Others")size(2.5)) ///
xtitle("Analysis time (months)", size(3.0)) ytitle("Cumulative risk (hazard)
of anal cancer screening", size(2.5) height(7)) xlabel(,labsize(3.0)) ///
xlabel(0 (12) 48) ///

clpattern(longdash_dot dash dash_dot longdash) clcolor(blue maroon green
black) ///
caption("Blacks: HR=0.97, 95% C.I.=0.88-1.06; Hispanics: HR=0.84, 95%
C.I.=0.72-0.99; Others: HR=0.65, 95% C.I.=0.57-0.73", size(2.2)) ///
title("Figure 7: CPH adjusted risk of anal cancer screening, by
race/ethnicity", size(3.5) color(black)) ///

graphregion(color(white))

graph save byrace_kaplan, replace
stci, rmean by(riskgroup)
stci, emean by(riskgroup)
stci, p(20) by(riskgroup)
stci, by(riskgroup)
stci, by(riskgroup abnanal)
stci, emean by(riskgroup) /*gives the extended mean*/

stci, emean graph
stci, emean tmax(100) graph

*estimating the hazard function using the adjusted Cox PH model
stcox i.riskgroup i.race i.eligibility enrollment age

*finding the correct functional form
predict mg, mgale
lowess mg age /*no major concerns here*/
lowess mg enrollment /*no major concerns here*/
drop mg

******overall hazards
stcox i.riskgroup i.race i.eligibility log_enrol age number_pcp specialists proportion_college med hh_inc countycases
estimates store overall

esttab overall using overall.rtf, nogaps wide eform b se aic bic replace nonum label

**hazards at different time periods
*estimating hazard rates at different time intervals
log using summaries1, replace

stptime, by(riskgroup) at (1 6 12 24 48)
stptime, by(race) at (1 6 12 24 48)
stssplit time,
at(1 6 12 24)

stcox i.riskgroup i.race eligibility age log_enrol number_pcp specialists med hh inc proportion college countycases

bysort time: stcox i.riskgroup i.race eligibility age log_enrol number_pcp specialists med hh inc proportion college countycases

drop time

log2html summaries1, replace

*estimating the cumulative baseline hazard
stcox i.riskgroup i.race i.eligibility log_enrol age
predict H0, basechazard

line H0 _t, c(J) sort
label variable H0 "Warts only"
label variable _t "Analysis time (months)"

*getting the baseline hazard for each risk group

gen H2=H0*(exp(_b[2.riskgroup]))
label variable H2 "Abnormal cervical only"

gen H3=H0*(exp(_b[3.riskgroup]))
label variable H3 "Both warts and abnormal cervical"

line H0 H2 H3 _t, c(J J J) sort //
legend(rows(1) size(2.0)) //
xtitle(, size(3.0)) ytitle("Cumulative risk (hazard) of anal cancer screening", size(2.5) height(7)) xlabel(, labsize(3.0)) //
title("Figure 5: Adjusted risk of anal cancer screening", size(3.5) color(black))

drop H0 H2 H3
*stcurve, cif at(riskgroup=1) at(riskgroup=2) at(riskgroup=3)

/*survivor functions (these might not be needed)
predict S0, basesurv
line S0 _t, c(J) sort

gen S2=S0*exp(_b[2.riskgroup])
gen S3=S0*exp(_b[3.riskgroup])
line H0 H2 H3 S0 S2 S3 _t, c(J J J J J J) sort
*/

*testing the PH assumption

*Global test for all and each variable after Cox regression
stphtest, rank detail

*graphs for each variable
stphtest, plot(age) ///
title("Age", position(12) ring(0) size(3.5) color(black)) ///
xtitle("Analysis time (months)", height(4) size(2.8) ) ///
xlabel(0 (12) 48) ///
ytitle(, height(7) size(2.8)) ///
graphregion(color(white)) ///
note("")
graph save age_ph.gph, replace

stphtest, plot(log_enrol) ///
title("Enrollment", position(12) ring(0) size(3.5) color(black)) ///
xtitle("Analysis time (months)", height(4) size(2.8)) ///
xlabel(0 (12) 48) ///
*****
*testing overall fitness of the model
*Cox-snell residuals
*note that without the mgale option the results would be different
set more off

*before transforming enrollment
stcox i.riskgroup i.race i.eligibility enrol age, mgale(mg)
predict cs, csnell
stset cs, failure(scrnd_for_AC ==1)
sts generate H = na
line H cs cs, sort xlab(0 1 to 4) ylab(0 1 to 4) ///
title("Figure 7a: Overall model fitness using Cox-snell residuals" ///
"Before variable transformation", linegap(2) size(3.5) color(black)) ///
graphregion(color(white))
graph save gof_ph.gph, replace
drop mg cs H

*after transforming enrollment

stcox i.riskgroup i.race i.eligibility log_enrol age, mgale(mg)
predict cs, csnell
stset cs, failure(scrnd_for_AC ==1)
sts generate H = na
line H cs cs, sort xlab(0 1 to 4) ylab(0 1 to 4) ///
title("Figure 7b: Overall model fitness using Cox-snell residuals" ///
"After variable transformation (final model)", linegap(2) size(3.5) color(black)) ///
graphregion(color(white))

graph save gof1_ph.gph, replace

stcox i.riskgroup i.race ib5.eligibility age enrollment, mgale(mg)

stcox i.riskgroup i.race ib5.eligibility age log_enrol, mgale(mg)
predict cs, csnell

stset cs, failure(scrnd_for_AC ==1)
sts generate H = na

line H cs cs, sort xlab(0 1 to 4) ylab(0 1 to 4) ///
title("Figure 7: Overall model fitness using Cox-snell residuals", size(3.5) color(black))
drop mg cs H

******LOGISTIC REGRESSIONS: EXAMINING GUIDELINE CONCORDANCE OF FOLLOW-UP SCREENING****

cd /mnt/isilon/data/hpr/yang/HIV/STEVEN/DATA/CLAIM/Working_folder/Stata/

use for_logistic_regressions, clear

*tsetting the data

stset time_exit2, scale(30) origin(time_entry2) failure(scrnd_secondtime==1) id(msis_id)
order _t _st
tab _st
keep if _st==1

*testing the normality/skewness of time

mvtest normal _t, univariate

****MAIN ANALYSIS****
**creating some variables
*any follow-up screening

```
tab scrnd_secondtime

gen any_fup_screen=scrnd_secondtime
label define any_fup_screen 0 "Not screened" 1 "Screened", replace
label values any_fup_screen any_fup_screen

```
tab any_fup_screen scrnd_secondtime

`*concordance`

```
gen concordant=.
replace concordant=1 if abnanal==0 & _t<=12 & scrnd_secondtime==1 | abnanal==1 & _t<=6 & scrnd_secondtime==1
replace concordant=0 if concordant==.
label define concordant 1 "Concordant" 0 "Not concordant", replace
label values concordant concordant

```
order abnanal _t concordant
tab concordant abnanal, col chi exp
tab concordant riskgroup, col chi exp
tab concordant race, col chi exp

```
*Categorical age variable
```

```
gen age_cat=.
replace age_cat=1 if age<=34
replace age_cat=2 if age>34 & age<=44
replace age_cat=3 if age>44 & age<=54
replace age_cat=4 if age>54
label define age_cat 1 "19-34 years" 2 "35-44 years" 3 "45-54 years" 4 "55-64 years", replace
label values age_cat age_cat
tab age_cat
```
tab age_cat

```
```
```
*enrollment_variable, categorical

gen continuous_enrollment=continuously_1yr + continuously_2yr + continuously_3yr + continuously_4yr

label define continuous_enrollment 2 "2 years" 3 "3 years" 4 "4 years", replace
label values continuous_enrollment continuous_enrollment

tab continuous_enrollment

*summary statistics

tab abnanal riskfactor, chi

tab scrnd_secondtime riskfactor, chi

tab concordant riskfactor

tab concordant riskfactor if abnanal==1, chi


tab concordant riskfactor if abnanal==0, chi

tab race riskfactor, chi


tab eligibility riskfactor, chi


tab continuous_enrollment riskfactor, chi

stsum, by(riskfactor)
stptime, by(riskfactor)

*working with MCO enrollment variable

gen mco=.

replace mco=1 if mco_enrollment <=0.6

replace mco=2 if mco_enrollment >0.6 & mco_enrollment<=0.8

replace mco=3 if mco_enrollment >0.8 & mco_enrollment<=1

label define mco 1 "<=60%" 2 "61%-80%" 3 ">80%", replace

label values mco mco

tab mco

*creating numeric state variable

encode state, gen(state_num)
*Any follow up screening

*without state fixed-effects

logit any_fup_screen  i.riskgroup i.abnanal i.eligibility i.continuous_enrollment i.age_cat i.race i.HIVrate_tert i.pcp_tert i.spec_tert i.poverty i.less_than_HS i.mco , noconst or
estimates store anyfup_no_fe

*with state-fixed effects

logit any_fup_screen  i.riskgroup i.abnanal i.eligibility i.continuous_enrollment i.age_cat i.race i.HIVrate_tert i.pcp_tert i.spec_tert i.poverty i.less_than_HS i.mco  i.state_num , noconst or
estimates store anyfup_with_fe

**guideline concordance

*without state fixed-effects

logit concordant  i.riskgroup i.abnanal i.eligibility i.continuous_enrollment i.age_cat i.race i.HIVrate_tert i.pcp_tert i.spec_tert i.poverty i.less_than_HS i.mco  , or nocons
estimates store concordant_no_fe

*with state-fixed effects

logit concordant  i.riskgroup i.abnanal i.eligibility i.continuous_enrollment i.age_cat i.race i.HIVrate_tert i.pcp_tert i.spec_tert i.poverty i.less_than_HS i.mco  i.state_num , or nocons
estimates store concordant_with_fe

margins abnanal
margins, at(riskgroup=(1 2) abnanal=(0 1)) post
margins abnanal

esttab concordant_with_fe anyfup_with_fe using logits.rtf, nogaps wide eform b(2) ci(2) label replace  nonum star(* 0.10 ** 0.05 *** 0.01) ///
collabels("Odds Ratio" "95% Confidence Interval" "Odds Ratio" "95% Confidence Interval") ///
mtitle("Guideline-concordant follow-up anal cancer screening" 
"Any follow-up anal cancer screening") ///

title("Table 1: Predictors of guideline-concordant follow-up anal 
cancer screening in high-risk women living with HIV") ///

refcat(2.riskgroup "Risk factors (ref: one risk factor)"
1.abnanal "Result at first test (ref: normal)" ///

2.race "Race/ethnicity (ref: non-Hispanic whites)" 2.eligibility
"Qualification for Medicaid (ref: income)" ///

3.continuous_enrollment "Continuous enrollment (ref: 2 years)"
2.pcp_tert "Physician 10,000 population (ref: 0-3.7)" ///

2.spec_tert "Specialists per 10,000 population (ref:0-0.92)"
2.less_than_HS "Less than high school (ref: 1%-11.4%)" ///

2.poverty "Percent poor (ref:0.9%-13.5%)") 2.HIVrate_tert "HIV 
prevalence per 100,000 adults (ref: 0-54)" ///

2.mco "Medicaid managed care enrollment (ref: <=60%)") 2.age_cat
"Age (ref:19-34 years)", nolabel) ///

drop (1.riskgroup 0.abnanal 1.race 1.eligibility
2.continuous_enrollment 1.pcp_tert 1.spec_tert 1.less_than_HS ///

1.poverty 1.HIVrate_tert 1.mco 1.age_cat *state_num)

*checking for multicollinearity

collin riskgroup abnanal race eligibility continuous_enrollment age
number_pcp specialists proportion_college med_hh_inc countycases state_n

**goodness of fit measures

logit concordant i.riskgroup i.abnanal i.race i.eligibility
i.continuous_enrollment age number_pcp specialists proportion_college
med_hh_inc countycases, or

*Hosmer lemeshow

estat gof, group(10)
1fit, group(20)

*predicted probabilities

predict probability , pr
gen conc_pred=0
replace conc_pred=1 if probability>=0.5

**plotting residuals**
gen n=_n
predict residuals, deviance
sum residual
gen county_n=countynamex if residuals>2 & residuals<10
gen county_m=countynamex if residuals<-2
label var n "Observation number"
twoway (scatter residuals n if concordant==1 , mlabel(county_n) mlabsize(2))
(scatter residuals n if !concordant, mlabel(county_m) mlabsize(2)), ///
yline(-2 2) legend(off) text(1.9 1000 "Concordant") text(0 1000 "Not concordant") ///
title("Fig 1: Goodness-of-fit test using deviance residuals", size(4)) ///
ytitle("Deviance residuals")
count if county_n!="" | county_m!=""
drop probability conc_pred residuals county_n county_m

tab conc_pred concordant, chi
roctab concordant conc_pred, detail table

\\\///SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
//sensitivity analysis 2
*continuously enrolled for 4 years

sts list if continuously_4yr==1, failure by(abnanal) at (6 12)

sts list if continuously_4yr==1, failure by( riskgroup abnanal) at (6 12)
logit concordant  i.riskgroup i.abnanal i.eligibility i.age_cat i.race i.HIVrate_tert i.pcp_tert i.spec_tert i.poverty i.less_than_HS i.mco i.state_num, or nocons
estimates store two_years_main
logit concordant  i.riskgroup i.abnanal i.eligibility i.age_cat i.race i.HIVrate_tert i.pcp_tert i.spec_tert i.poverty i.less_than_HS i.mco i.state_num if continuously_4yr==1, or nocons
estimates store four_years
esttab two_years_main four_years, nogaps wide eform b(2) ci(2) label replace nonum star(* 0.10 ** 0.05 *** 0.01) ///
    collabels("Odds Ratio" "95% Confidence Interval" "Odds Ratio" "95% Confidence Interval") ///
    mtitle("Guideline-concordant follow-up anal cancer screening" "Any follow-up anal cancer screening") ///
    title( "Table 1: Predictors of guideline-concordant follow-up anal cancer screening in high-risk women living with HIV") ///
    refcat(2.riskgroup "Risk factors (ref: one risk factor)"
        1.abnanal "Result at first test (ref: normal)"
        2.race "Race/ethnicity (ref: non-Hispanic whites)"
        2.eligibility "Qualification for Medicaid (ref: income)"
        2.pcp_tert "Physician 10,000 population (ref: 0-3.7)"
        2.spec_tert "Specialists per 10,000 population (ref:0-0.92)"
        2.less_than_HS "Less than high school (ref: 1%-11.4)"
        2.poverty "Percent poor (ref:0.9%-13.5)"
        2.HIVrate_tert "HIV prevalence per 100,000 adults (ref: 0-54)"
        2.mco "Medicaid managed care enrollment (ref: <=60)"
        2.age_cat "Age (ref:19-34 years)"
    , nolabel) ///
    drop (1.riskgroup 0.abnanal 1.race 1.eligibility 1.pcp_tert
        1.spec_tert 1.less_than_HS)
    tab *concordance
    drop concordant
    gen concordant=. 199
replace concordant=1 if abnanal==0 & _t<=14 & scrnd_secondtime==1 | abnanal==1 & _t<=8 & scrnd_secondtime==1
replace concordant=0 if concordant==.
label define concordant 1 "Concordant" 0 "Not concordant", replace
labe values concordant concordant
order abnanal _t concordant
tab concordant abnanal, col chi exp
tab concordant riskgroup, col chi exp

*without state fixed-effects
logit concordant  i.riskgroup i.abnanal i.eligibility i.continuous_enrollment
i.age_cat i.race i.HIVrate tert i.pcp tert i.spec tert i.poverty
i.less_than_HS i.mco , or
estimates store concordant_no_fe

*with state-fixed effects
logit concordant  i.riskgroup i.abnanal i.eligibility i.continuous_enrollment
i.age_cat i.race i.HIVrate tert i.pcp tert i.spec tert i.poverty
i.less_than_HS i.mco  i.state_num , or
estimates store concordant_with_fe
margins abnanal
margins, at(riskgroup=(1 2) abnanal=(0 1)) post
esttab concordant_with_fe, wide eform ci
log close
Chapter 5: Conclusion

This dissertation examined the effectiveness of interventions aimed at increasing uptake of family planning services and HIV-related preventive care among women in low-income settings. The studies show that uptake of these services is low overall but find that interventions at the clinic or community levels are effective in increasing the uptake of these services. However, the studies also emphasize several areas for future research. For example, paper 1 which reports that contraceptive use increased among rural women following the national scale-up of CBDs in rural Malawi, the paper suggests that future research should focus on examining the cost-effectiveness of the national CBDs given that resources in these settings are very limited. The trial-based cost-effectiveness of conditional cash transfers in the DRC suggests that future research should focus on examining the cost-effectiveness of the cash incentives in larger populations and over a longer analytic horizon before further scale-up of the intervention in sub-Saharan Africa. Similarly, gathering more evidence about the benefits of anal cancer screening in people living with HIV at high risk for anal cancer in the USA can help solidify the guidelines for anal cancer screening and improve the rates overall follow-up anal cancer screening.
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