Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

IJID Regions



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijregi

Factors associated with adherence to HIV testing guidelines among HIV-negative female sex workers in Kampala, Uganda



Lydia Atuhaire^{a,b,*}, Constance S. Shumba^{c,d}, Lovemore Mapahla^a, Innocent Maposa^e, Peter S. Nyasulu^{a,f}

^a Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Stellenbosch University, Cape Town, South Africa

^b Makerere University/UVRI Infection and Immunity Research Training Programme, Entebbe, Uganda

^c School of Nursing and Midwifery, Aga Khan University, Nairobi, Kenya

^d Department of Population Health, Aga Khan University, Nairobi, Kenya

e Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

^f School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Adherence HIV testing guidelines Female sex workers Kampala

ABSTRACT

Background: Frequent human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) testing is recommended among female sex workers. This study examined the extent to which HIV-negative female sex workers (FSWs) in Kampala adhere to the HIV testing guidelines, and identified associated factors.

Methods: This cross-sectional study used a simple random sampling method to select 12 sex work hotspots. Two hundred participants were allocated proportionally in each hotspot. Frequencies were used to describe categorical characteristics of FSWs, and a multivariable logistic regression model was used to determine the factors associated with adherence to the HIV testing guidelines.

Results: Eighty-eight percent of the 200 study participants reported their HIV testing status; of these, 56% had tested three or more times in the 12 months preceding the survey. Attaining a secondary education was associated with adherence to the HIV testing guidelines [odds ratio (OR) 1.86, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.01–3.44; P=0.047]. Sexually transmitted infection testing in the preceding 3 months (OR 2.13, 95% CI 0.95–4.74; P=0.065) and accessing HIV testing at a drop-in centre (OR 5.90, 95% CI 0.71–49.1; P=0.101) were associated with higher odds of adherence to the HIV testing guidelines.

Conclusion: Adherence to the HIV testing guidelines was suboptimal, indicating the need to scale up interventions to improve access to HIV testing, including rigorous behaviour change communication.

Introduction

Globally, female sex workers (FSWs) are recognized as a population that is at increased risk of acquiring human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection. As such, emphasis is placed on this key population as a critical target for early and frequent testing to optimize rapid access to HIV prevention and treatment services following diagnosis. Frequent HIV testing every 3–6 months among FSWs is recommended to curb transmission and improve care (World Health Organization 2016; Macdonald et al., 2017). This approach was adopted in 2016 by the Ministry of Health in Uganda to improve care among FSWs (Ministry of Health Uganda 2019).

Various approaches, such as integration of HIV testing services with other health services (Narasimhan et al., 2019), and community-

based testing within sex work hotspots and at drop-in centres (DICs) (Mulongo et al., 2015; Pande et al., 2019; Ma et al., 2020), have been implemented and shown to improve access to routine HIV testing among FSWs (Bassett et al., 2015).

A study conducted in Benin (Batona et al., 2015) reported HIV testing uptake of 40% among FSWs in the first 3 months, and only 21% had tested in the period between 3 to 6 months. A cross-sectional survey among FSWs in Mombasa, Kenya found that 45% were testing for HIV every 3 months (Bengtson et al., 2014). A few studies conducted in Mombasa, Kenya which found high levels of testing among FSWs – 89.2% (Setlhare and Manyeagae, 2017) and 88% (Bengtson et al., 2014) – measured longer intervals between testing (i.e. 12 months) and ever tested.

Previous studies undertaken in Kampala showed that only 53% of FSWs had ever tested for HIV, and of these, 16% had tested in the pre-

* Corresponding author at: Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Department of Global Health Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Stellenbosch University, Francie van Zijl Drive, TYGERBERG 7505, South Africa.

E-mail address: 22455280@sun.ac.za (L. Atuhaire).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijregi.2022.05.008

Received 19 April 2022; Received in revised form 25 May 2022; Accepted 25 May 2022

2772-7076/© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of International Society for Infectious Diseases. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)



ceding 12 months (Hladik et al., 2017). Results of screening practices among FSWs in Uganda showed that 67% had tested for HIV two or more times in the 12 months preceding the survey (Muhindo et al., 2019).

HIV testing among FSWs is propagated by several factors which have previously been reported to influence routine HIV testing. These include behavioural factors such as high alcohol intake, drug use, and high mobility of FSWs in search of new customers (Bengtson et al., 2014; Deering et al., 2015; Setlhare and Manyeagae, 2017). Further, there are structural factors such as stigma and discrimination, violence and violation of rights (Damacena et al., 2011; Martins et al., 2018), and health system factors such as unfriendly testing centres due to testing hours conflicting with FSWs' work schedules. These factors make FSWs reluctant to seek routine HIV testing services (Decker et al., 2013; Nyblade et al., 2017; Tokar et al., 2018). However, programmes such as the enhanced peer outreach approach, which was developed with an understanding of FSWs' contextual issues, have registered great success in improving access to routine HIV testing services and early diagnosis of HIV infection (Lillie et al., 2019; Olawore et al., 2020).

Although studies in sub-Saharan Africa, particularly Uganda (Hladik et al., 2017; Muhindo et al., 2019), have studied uptake of HIV testing, the majority have focused on examining the history of ever testing, and how recent the tests were (Deering et al., 2015; Setlhare and Manyeagae, 2017; Shokoohi et al., 2017; Martins et al., 2018; Tokar et al., 2018). These studies did not assess the extent that FSWs adhered to the HIV testing guidelines (World Health Organization 2016). As such, the present study examined the extent to which FSWs adhered to the HIV testing guidelines, and assessed factors associated with adherence to the HIV testing guidelines.

Methods

Study design

This cross-sectional study was conducted using structured questionnaires. Simple random sampling was used to select sex work hotspots, and voluntary response sampling, a particular type of convenience sampling, was used to select the participants. Adherence to the HIV testing guidelines for FSWs was assessed by determining the number of times that FSWs had tested for HIV in the 12 months preceding the study.

Study setting

This study was conducted at sex work hotspots in the five administrative divisions of Kampala. These sex work hotspots were defined as geographical locations where sex work trade is concentrated, such as streets, lodges and bars. Kampala is the capital and largest city in Uganda, and is divided into five administrative division: Nakawa, Makindye, Kampala Central, Rubaga and Kawempe. Kampala was selected because it is a highly active and economically vibrant business centre, and attracts potential customers for FSWs due to financial accessibility. The city has many truck drivers that transport commercial goods across Kampala from neighbouring countries of Rwanda, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Tanzania, Kenya, Burundi, Rwanda and South Sudan.

Study population

The study population consisted of FSWs aged ≥ 18 years who operated in the sex work hotspots within any of the five administrative divisions of Kampala at the time of the study. FSWs who were HIV negative, based on self-report, were recruited into this study. FSWs were defined as individuals who had offered sex in exchange for money or other financial or material benefits in the 12 months preceding the survey. Young FSWs (aged <18 years) were excluded from the study for ethical reasons and due to safety-related concerns. In Uganda, the age of consent is 18 years, and while the young FSWs had a window to consent as emancipated minors, the authors could not guarantee their safety, or rule out risks associated with unintended breach of confidentiality as some of them still lived with their parents.

Variable measurements

The main outcome measure was adherence to the HIV testing guidelines for FSWs. Adherence was defined as having tested for HIV three times or more within the last 12 months. The exposure variables were demographic and sociobehavioural characteristics, including age, education level, marital status, housing status, and if the FSW had another job other than sex work. The sociobehavioural exposure variables are indicated in Table 2.

Sample size and sampling procedure

Sampling was performed at three stages: (i) administrative division level; (ii) hotspot level; and (iii) FSW level. Kampala is divided into five administrative divisions. All five divisions were included in the first stage sampling. At hotspot level, a list of sex work hotspots with an estimated population of FSWs was obtained from the Infectious Diseases Institute. This institute works with FSW network organizations in Kampala, and has accurate data regarding FSW hotspots in the city. In total, there were 327 mapped hotspots, with an estimated total number of 11,558 FSWs operating in these hotspots. From the list of sites, 30 hotspots were selected at random for the study. A sample of 30 observations is the acceptable minimum requirement for statistical significance (Landreneau and Creek, 2009). However, of the 30 hotspots, there were only 12 gate keepers, so only 12 hotspots were accessible and willing to participate in the orientation meeting in preparation for recruitment and data collection. Consequently, 12 hotspots were considered for the study, and these yielded a total 6761 FSWs. There is minimal variation in how sex work hotspots operate, as FSWs in those hotspots are mobile and have diverse geographical origins. As their characteristics do not necessarily depend on the hotspots they operate in, the 12 included hotspots can be considered to be representative.

For sampling of FSWs, the minimum required sample size was computed using the precision calculation formula, assuming an adherence rate of 50%, a Z-score of 1.96 for a 95% confidence interval (CI), a total population of 6761, and a 5% margin of error. Due to resource constraints, the authors were willing to accept a 7% margin of error in the adherence estimate, as this was within an acceptable margin of error (5–10%) (Habib et al.,2014). When these values were used in Equation [1] (Daniel and Cross, 1999), a sample size of 191 FSWs was obtained. This was rounded to 200 to allow for non-responses.

$$N = ZP(1-P)/d^2 \tag{1}$$

where, n is the sample size, z is the z-score associated with a level of confidence, p is the sample proportion, expressed as a decimal, d2 is the margin of error, expressed as a decimal

Proportional allocation procedures were followed to determine the actual number of FSWs for each hotspot, and this involved apportioning the sample size of 200 FSWs to 12 hotspots such that the sample size allocated to each hotspot was proportional to the total number of FSWs at that site.

Participant recruitment

The FSW network organizations were approached in order to introduce the study, and to ask them to help in identification of FSW peer leaders from the selected sex work hotspots. An introductory session was conducted with FSW peer leaders to orient them on the study objectives and all issues related to ethical conduct of the survey. The importance of confidentiality, safety, privacy and the voluntary nature of study participation were emphasized. After orientation, the peer leaders approached various FSWs and introduced them to the study. Those who expressed willingness to participate were allowed to identify a mutually agreed private and safe place for a detailed interview. Based on proportional allocation, the recruitment process was conducted on a first come, first served basis until enough FSWs were recruited for each hotspot to reach a final sample of 200 FSWs.

Data collection procedures

Validation of tools and data quality assurance

A structured questionnaire and consent documents were developed based on the empirical literature, and prior experience of the research team in HIV programming. From a comprehensive review of the literature, potential factors that influence adherence to the HIV testing guidelines were categorized into different domains: sociobehavioural practices, health-seeking behaviour, HIV testing, availability and access to HIV prevention services, risk perception, stigma and discrimination, and depressive tendencies. After the key domains were identified, relevant questions relating to each domain were developed by considering the Ugandan and FSW contexts. Accordingly, 98 questions assessing all the domains on adherence to the HIV testing guidelines were initially developed. Two members of the team with expert knowledge in HIV prevention performed content validation of the tool to select the most relevant questions, and the total number of questions was reduced to 60. The team also assessed clarity of the instrument. Discussion of each question with two people with a non-medical background was also undertaken to further ensure clarity and face validity of the instrument.

The tools were translated into Luganda, a common local language in Kampala, and backtranslated into English. The questionnaire was piloted in a non-study sex work hotspot in Wakiso district neighbouring Kampala. In total, 12 FSWs were enrolled in the pilot testing process. The pilot testing of the questionnaire helped to determine and correct the limitations of the survey in terms of the format of the questions, clarity, appropriate wording, and the estimated time for questionnaire completion.

Data collection

Data were collected using a hard copy structured questionnaire administered by interviewers in one-on-one interviews. A research team with experience in quantitative data collection among FSWs was recruited and trained to refresh their knowledge in quantitative data collection practices and research ethics. Emphasis was placed on confidentiality and safety, and focused on the sensitivity of collecting data from FSWs, a highly marginalized subpopulation. FSWs who provided verbal informed consent were interviewed in a private place agreed mutually with the researcher, and no identifying information was collected. Data collection was undertaken between November and December 2020.

Data management

Data quality checks were conducted daily during field monitoring by crosschecking discrepancies and completeness of data on all variables. Real-time form review and correction of missing or wrongly captured data was undertaken while still in the field when it was still possible to access participants. Data were entered into Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap), an online data management tool for surveys which helps to identify discrepancies and errors in the collected data rapidly (Van Bulck et al., 2022). Electronic copies of data were stored on a password protected computer, and backed up on a secure external hard drive. Data were exported into Stata Version 15.0 (Stata Corp., College Station, TX, USA), where further checking for errors, outliers and completeness was conducted.

Statistical analysis

Frequencies and corresponding percentages were used to describe categorical variables. Only complete cases were used in analysis of the Table 1

Sociodemographic characteristics of the study participants.

| LocationKampala Central6030.0Nakawa2211.0Kawempe6231.0Rubaga3718.5Makindye199.5Age group (years)12518-245829.025-308542.531-495829.025-308542.531-49281418-241005025-456934.5Missing31.5Education19.025-456934.5Secondary9748.5Secondary31.5Primary9748.5Secondary1.89.0Primary9748.5Secondary1.89.0Separated/divorced/widowed13869.0Harried/cohabiting189.0Separated/divorced/widowed13869.0Has children17185.5Missing17185.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing10.5Housed by relatives/friends189.0Housed by relatives/friends189.0No shelter489.0 | Sociodemographic characteristics | Frequency <i>n</i> =200 | Percentage |
|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| Kampala Central6030.0Nakawa2211.0Nakawa2231.0Kawempe6231.0Rubaga3718.5Makindye195Age group (years)1218-245829.025-308542.531-495728Age at initiation of sex work (years)110-17281418-241005025-456934.5Missing31.5Education189.0Primary9748.5Secondary8241.0Post-secondary31.5Married/cohabiting189.0Separated/divorced/widowed13869.0Haschildren122.0None189.0Separated/divorced/widowed13869.0Haschildren155.5Missing155.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing10.5Housed by relatives/friends189.0No shelter17889.0 | Location | | |
| Nakawa2211.0Kawempe6231.0Rubaga3718.5Makindye199.5Age group (years)1829.025-308542.531-495728.5Age at initiation of sex work (years)10-172818-241005025-456934.5Missing31.5Education9091Primary9748.5Secondary8241.0Post-secondary31.5Married/cohabiting189.0Steparated/divorced/widowed13869.0Has-thildren12844Yes17185.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing10.5Housed by relatives/friends189.0Yes7185.5Missing10.5Housed by relatives/friends189.0No shelter17889.0 | Kampala Central | 60 | 30.0 |
| Kawempe6231.0Rubaga3718.5Makindye1995Age group (years)118-245829.025-308542.531-495728.5Age at initiation of sex work (years)110-17281418-241005025-456934.5Missing31.5Education19.0Primary9748.5Secondary8241.0Post-secondary31.5Marital status1.5Sigle/never married4422.0Married/cohabiting189.0Separated/divorced/widowed13869.0Has children185.5No2814Yes17185.5Missing10.5Housed by celatives/friends189.0Ves7135.5Missing10.5Housed by relatives/friends189.0No shelter189.0 | Nakawa | 22 | 11.0 |
| Rubaga3718.5Makindye199.5Age group (years)9.518-245829.025-308542.531-495728.5Age at initiation of sex work (years)105010-17281418-241005025-456934.5Missing31.5Education90Primary9748.5Secondary8241.0Post-secondary8241.0Post-secondary8241.0Sequer married4422.0Married/cohabiting189.0Separated/divorced/widowed13869.0Has children17185.5Missing10.5Another job other than sex work12864Yes7135.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing12864Yes7335.5< | Kawempe | 62 | 31.0 |
| Makindye 19 9.5 Age group (years) 18–24 58 29.0 25-30 85 42.5 31-49 57 28.5 Age at initiation of sex work (years) 10–17 28 14 18–24 100 50 25-45 69 34.5 Missing 3 5 Education None 18 9.0 Primary 97 48.5 Secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 82 9.0 Segarated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Married/cohabiting 18 9.0 Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children 14 Yes 171 85.5 Missing 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Miss | Rubaga | 37 | 18.5 |
| Age group (years)18-245829.025-308542.531-495728.5Age at initiation of sex work (years)72810-17281418-241005025-456934.5Missing31.5Education748.5Secondary9748.5Secondary8241.0Post-secondary8241.0Post-secondary189.0Married/cohabiting189.0Separated/divorced/widowed13869.0Has children7185.5Missing10.5Another job other than sex work12864Yes7135.51Missing10.52Housed by relatives/friends189.0Housed by relatives/friends189.0No shelter189.0 | Makindye | 19 | 9.5 |
| 18-245829.025-308542.531-495728Age at initiation of sex work (years)1010-17281418-241005025-456934.5Missing31.5Education189.0Primary9748.5Secondary8241.0Post-secondary31.5Married/cohabiting189.0Separated/divorced/widowed13869.0Has children12864Yes17185.5Missing10.5Another job other than sex work12864Yes7135.5Missing10.5Housed by relatives/friends189.0Housed by relatives/friends189.0No shelter17889.0 | Age group (years) | | |
| 25-308542.531-495728.5Age at initiation of sex work (years)28.1410-17281418-241005025-456934.5Missing31.5Education90Primary9748.5Secondary8241.0Post-secondary31.5Married/cohabiting189.0Separated/divorced/widowed13869.0Has children12814Yes17185.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing10.5Housel pool than sex work12864Yes7135.5Missing10.5Housed by relatives/friends189.0No shelter17889.0 | 18–24 | 58 | 29.0 |
| 31-495728.5Age at initiation of sex work (years)10-17281418-241005025-456934.5Missing31.5Education90Primary9748.5Secondary8241.0Post-secondary33Single/never married4422.0Marriat status90Separated/divorced/widowed13869.0Has children185.5Missing185.5Missing185.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing12864Yes7135.5Missing attus, n=12417189.0Housed by relatives/friends189.0No shelter42.0 | 25-30 | 85 | 42.5 |
| Age at initiation of sex work (years) 10 14 10–17 28 14 18–24 100 50 25-45 69 34.5 Missing 3 1.5 Education 100 80 None 18 9.0 Primary 97 48.5 Secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 82 9.0 Marital status 5 5 Single/never married 44 22.0 Married/cohabiting 18 9.0 Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children 10 5 Missing 10 0.5 Another job other than sex work 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 10 0.5 Housed by r | 31–49 | 57 | 28.5 |
| 10-17281418-241005025-456934.5Missing31.5Education90Primary9748.5Secondary8241.0Post-secondary8241.0Post-secondary8241.0Post-secondary1.5Martied/cohabitingMarried/cohabiting189.0Separated/divorced/widowed13869.0Has children17185.5Missing10.5Another job other than sex work12864Yes7135.5Missing10.5Housing status, n=12417189.0Own/rented house17889.0No shelter42.0 | Age at initiation of sex work (years) | | |
| 18-24 100 50 25-45 69 34.5 Missing 3 1.5 Education 1 9.0 Primary 97 48.5 Secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 3 1.5 Married/cohabiting 44 22.0 Married/cohabiting 18 9.0 Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children 171 85.5 Missing 171 85.5 Missing 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 Nos chelter 178 89.0 | 10–17 | 28 | 14 |
| 25-45 69 34.5 Missing 3 1.5 Education 90 Primary 97 48.5 Secondary 97 48.5 Secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 3 1.5 Marrial status 9.0 1.5 Single/never married 44 2.0 Married/cohabiting 18 9.0 Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children 171 85.5 Missing 1 0.5 Missing 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housing status, n=124 1 1 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 | 18–24 | 100 | 50 |
| Missing 3 1.5 Education None 18 9.0 Primary 97 48.5 Secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 3 1.5 Marrial status 1.5 Single/never married 44 22.0 Married/cohabiting 18 9.0 Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children 14 Yes 171 85.5 Missing 1 2.0 No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housing status, n=124 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | 25–45 | 69 | 34.5 |
| Education None 18 9.0 Primary 97 48.5 Secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 3 1.5 Marital status 3 1.5 Single/never married 44 22.0 Married/cohabiting 18 9.0 Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children 1 85.5 Missing 1 0.5 Another job other than sex work 1 85.5 No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housing status, m=124 1 1 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | Missing | 3 | 1.5 |
| None 18 9.0 Primary 97 48.5 Secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 82 1.5 Marital status 5 5 Single/never married 44 22.0 Married/cohabiting 18 9.0 Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children 7 85.5 Missing 171 85.5 Missing 1 0.5 Another job other than sex work 71 35.5 No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housing status, n=124 7 7 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | Education | | |
| Primary 97 48.5 Secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 3 1.5 Martiel status 5 5 Single/never married 44 22.0 Married/cohabiting 18 9.0 Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children 7 85.5 Missing 1 0.5 Another job other than sex work 71 85.5 No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housing status, n=124 7 9.0 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | None | 18 | 9.0 |
| Secondary 82 41.0 Post-secondary 3 1.5 Married, status 1.5 Single/never married 44 22.0 Married/cohabiting 18 9.0 Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children 1 50 No 28 14 Yes 171 85.5 Missing 1 0.5 Another job other than sex work 1 50 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 0.5 50 Housing status, n=124 1 50 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | Primary | 97 | 48.5 |
| Post-secondary 3 1.5 Marrial status | Secondary | 82 | 41.0 |
| Marital status Value Single/never married 44 22.0 Married/cohabiting 18 9.0 Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children 138 69.0 Has children 1 85.5 No 28 14 Yes 171 85.5 Missing 1 0.5 Another job other than sex work V V Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housing status, n=124 V V Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | Post-secondary | 3 | 1.5 |
| Single/never married 44 22.0 Married/cohabiting 18 9.0 Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children 138 69.0 Has children 138 69.0 No 28 14 Yes 171 85.5 Missing 1 0.5 Another job other than sex work No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housing status, n=124 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | Marital status | | |
| Married/cohabiting 18 9.0 Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children 138 69.0 Has children 2 14 No 28 14 Yes 171 85.5 Missing 1 0.5 Another job other than sex work No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 0.5 Housing status, n=124 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | Single/never married | 44 | 22.0 |
| Separated/divorced/widowed 138 69.0 Has children No 28 14 Yes 171 85.5 Missing 1 0.5 Another job other than sex work No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 0.5 Mosing status, n=124 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | Married/cohabiting | 18 | 9.0 |
| Has children Ves 28 14 Yes 171 85.5 Missing 1 0.5 Another job other than sex work 1 85.5 No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housing status, n=124 1 9.0 Won/rented house 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | Separated/divorced/widowed | 138 | 69.0 |
| No 28 14 Yes 171 85.5 Missing 1 0.5 Another job other than sex work No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housing status, n=124 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | Has children | | |
| Yes 171 85.5 Missing 1 0.5 Another job other than sex work No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housing status, n=124 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | No | 28 | 14 |
| Missing 1 0.5 Another job other than sex work No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.0 Housing status, n=124 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | Yes | 171 | 85.5 |
| Another job other than sex work Ves 64 No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0 Housing status, n=124 Ves 9.0 Own/rented house 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | Missing | 1 | 0.5 |
| No 128 64 Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housing status, n=124 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | Another job other than sex work | | |
| Yes 71 35.5 Missing 1 0.5 Housing status, n=124 Own/rented house 178 89.0 Housed by relatives/friends 18 9.0 No shelter 4 2.0 | No | 128 | 64 |
| Missing10.5Housing status, n=12489.0Own/rented house17889.0Housed by relatives/friends189.0No shelter42.0 | Yes | 71 | 35.5 |
| Housing status, n=124Own/rented house17889.0Housed by relatives/friends189.0No shelter42.0 | Missing | 1 | 0.5 |
| Own/rented house17889.0Housed by relatives/friends189.0No shelter42.0 | Housing status, n=124 | | |
| Housed by relatives/friends189.0No shelter42.0 | Own/rented house | 178 | 89.0 |
| No shelter 4 2.0 | Housed by relatives/friends | 18 | 9.0 |
| | No shelter | 4 | 2.0 |

dataset. Univariate logistic regression models were used for each independent variable and the binary study outcome (i.e. adherence of HIV-negative FSWs to the HIV testing guidelines). All variables from univariate models which had a *P*-value of ≤ 0.2 were included in the multivariate model. The multivariate logistic regression model started with the variable with the strongest relationship with adherence of FSWs to the HIV testing guidelines. Other independent variables were added to this model one after another using a forward stepwise method. The added variable was subsequently dropped if it weakened the relationship between the first variable and the outcome. The stepwise logistic regression model was used to select a reduced number of independent variables automatically to build the best performing logistic regression model. Odds ratio (OR) was used to assess the relationship with adherence to the HIV testing guidelines after adjusting for other covariates. Adjusting for other covariates was meant to take care of possible confounding of the relationship of an independent variable and the study outcome by another independent variable. Factors with $P \le 0.05$ were considered significant.

Results

Sociodemographic characteristics of the study participants

Eighty-five (43%) participants aged 25–30 years represented the largest age group in this study, and 100 (51%) participants had started sex work between 18 and 24 years of age. The main source of income for this study sample was sex work (64%, n=128). The majority of participants were living in rented homes (89%, n=178) and had children (86%, n=171). Forty-nine percent (n=97) of participants had attained a primary education and 41% (n=82) had attained a secondary education (Table 1).

Table 2

Characteristics of female sex workers (FSWs) by adherence to human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) testing guidelines.

| Variable | Non-adherence n (%) | Adherence n (%) | P-value |
|---|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Age group (years) (n=179) | | | |
| 18–24 | 22 (27.9) | 33 (33.0) | 0.398 |
| 25–30 | 38 (48.1) | 38 (38.0) | |
| 31–49 | 19 (24.1) | 29 (29.0) | |
| Education (n=179) | | | |
| None | 30 (37.9) | 32 (32) | 0.03 ^a |
| Primary | 20 (25.3) | 15 (15) | |
| ≥Secondary | 29 (36.7) | 53 (53) | |
| Marital status (n=179) | | | |
| Single/never married | 15 (19.0) | 26 (26.0) | 0.512 |
| Married/cohabiting | 9 (11.4) | 9 (9.0) | |
| Separated/divorced/widowed | 55 (69.6) | 65 (65.0) | |
| Another job other than sex work (<i>n</i> =178) | | | |
| No | 50 (63.3) | 63 (63.6) | 0.962 |
| Yes | 29 (36.7) | 36 (36.4) | |
| Housing status (n=124) | | | |
| Own/rented house | 67 (84.8) | 91 (91.0) | 0.296 |
| Housed by relatives/friends | 11 (13.9) | 7 (7.0) | |
| No shelter | 1 (1.3) | 2 (2.0) | |
| Condom use by FSW $(n=179)$ | | | |
| Consistent | 10 (12.7) | 11 (11.0) | 0.732 |
| Inconsistent | 69 (87.3) | 89 (89.0) | |
| Drug use (ever used) $(n=176)$ | | | |
| No | 58 (74.4) | 64 (65.3) | 0.196 |
| Yes | 20 (25.6) | 34 (34.7) | |
| Regular medical check-ups $(n=179)$ | | | |
| No | 59 (74.7) | 64 (64) | 0.126 |
| Yes | 20 (25.3) | 36 (33) | |
| Knowledge on testing guidelines $(n=178)$ | | | |
| No | 24 (30.8) | 40 (40) | 0.203 |
| Yes | 54 (69.2) | 60 (33) | |
| Most recent HIV test $(n=179)$ | o · (o · · _) | () | |
| No | 57 (72.1) | 73 (73) | 0.899 |
| Yes | 22 (27.8) | 27 (27) | 0.055 |
| Social support for HIV test $(n=178)$ | 22 (2/10) | 2, (2,) | |
| Yes | 36 (45.6) | 48 (48 5) | 0 699 |
| No | 43 (54 4) | 51 (51 5) | 0.055 |
| Receipt of minimum health package in preceding 3 months ($n=179$) | | () | |
| No | 79 (100) | 82 (82.0) | 0.001* |
| Yes | 0 (33) | 18 (18 0) | 0.001 |
| HIV testing awareness campaign $(n=179)$ | 0 (00) | 10 (10.0) | |
| No | 12 (15 2) | 10 (10 0) | 0 294 |
| Yes | 67 (84 8) | 90 (90 0) | 0.251 |
| Concerns about stigma and discrimination $(n=178)$ | 07 (01.0) | 50 (50.0) | |
| High | 31 (39 7) | 36 (36 0) | 0.567 |
| Moderate | 20 (25.6) | 33 (33 0) | 0.007 |
| Low | 27 (34.6) | 31 (31.0) | |
| FSW risk perception about risk of HIV $(n=176)$ | 27 (07.0) | 01 (01.0) | |
| No risk | 11 (14 5) | 14 (14 0) | 0 747 |
| low risk | 33 (43 4) | 49 (49 0) | 0.7 77 |
| >High risk | 32 (42 1) | 37 (37 0) | |
| <u>∠111511 110K</u> | 32 (72.1) | 57 (57.0) | |

^a P<0.05 was considered to indicate significance.

Adherence to the HIV testing guidelines and associated characteristics

As shown in Table 2, 90% (n=179) of the HIV-negative participants reported that they had tested for HIV infection in the preceding 12 months, and 56% (n=100) had tested at least three times in the preceding 12 months. Adherence to the HIV testing guidelines was higher among the HIV-negative FSWs who had attained a secondary education compared with the FSWs who had attained a primary education or had no education at all (53%, n=53). All of the 18 FSWs in the study who had received the complete FSW minimum health package in the preceding 3 months adhered to the HIV testing guidelines (100%, n=18).

Factors that facilitated adherence to the HIV testing guidelines

The prime motivating factor for HIV testing was the desire of FSWs to know their HIV status and seek treatment early should they be found HIV positive (41%, n=111). Easier accessibility to testing services since

the testing services had been brought nearer to their communities was also a motivator (11%, n=32). Thirteen percent (n=37) of participants indicated that their perception of being at elevated risk of HIV infection due to a condom bursting during sexual intercourse prompted them to seek HIV testing (Figure 1).

Factors associated with non-adherence to the HIV testing guidelines

Approximately 22% (n=40) of FSWs reported challenges and individual attitudes to routine HIV testing, including low risk perception of HIV infection and fear of knowing their HIV status (43%, n=17), lack of transport to visit a health facility for regular HIV testing (28%, n=11), and fear of being stigmatized by the health workers (13%, n=5). Although 64% (n=114) of the participants were aware of the HIV testing guidelines, only 60% (n=60) of those who knew about the guidelines were adherent, indicated that they were using condoms consistently and did not see the reason for routine testing (48%, n=26), and that the opening hours of the testing centres conflicted with the FSWs' work

L. Atuhaire, C.S. Shumba, L. Mapahla et al.



Figure 1. Factors that facilitated adherence to human immunodeficiency virus testing guidelines. EMTCT, elimination of mother-to-child transmission.



Figure 2. Factors that facilitated non-adherence to human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) testing guidelines.

schedules (22%, n=12). Other participants were reluctant to test for unknown reasons (18%, n=10) (Figure 2).

Univariate analysis of factors associated with adherence to the HIV testing guidelines among HIV-negative FSWs

On univariate analysis (Table 3), participants who had attained a secondary education were more likely to adhere to the HIV testing guidelines than those who had attained a primary education or no education at all (OR 1.94, 95% CI 1.06–3.55; P=0.031). Those participants who had tested for sexually transmitted infections (STIs) in the preceding 3 months (OR 2.13, 95% CI 0.95–4.74; P=0.065), as well as those who had accessed HIV testing at a DIC (OR 5.90, 95% CI 0.71–49.1; P=0.101), had higher odds of adhering to the HIV testing guidelines, although this was not significant.

Multivariate analysis of factors associated with adherence to the HIV testing guidelines among FSWs

On multivariate logistic regression analysis (Table 4), attaining a secondary education remained significantly associated with adherence to the HIV testing guidelines, after adjusting for use of DICs and routine medical check-ups (OR 1.86, 95% CI 1.01–3.44; P=0.047).

Table 3

Univariate analysis of factors associated with adherence to human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) testing guidelines.

| Factors | Univariate analysis OR (95% CI) | P-value |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| Age (years) | | |
| 18–24 | 1 | |
| 25–30 | 0.67 (0.33-1.35) | 0.258 |
| 31–49 | 1.02 (0.46-2.24) | 0.966 |
| Education | | |
| Primary | 1 | |
| ≥Secondary | 1.94 (1.06–3.55) | 0.031 ^a |
| Marital status | | |
| Single/never married | 1 | |
| Married/cohabiting | 0.58 (0.19–1.77) | 0.336 |
| Separated/divorced/widowed | 0.68 (0.33-1.41) | 0.304 |
| Another job other than sex work | | |
| No | | |
| Yes | 0.99 (0.53–1.82) | 0.962 |
| Condom use | | |
| No | | |
| Yes | 1.17 (0.47-2.92) | 0.732 |
| Drug use | | |
| No | | |
| Yes | 1.54 (0.80-2.97) | 0.197 |
| Alcohol use | | |
| No | | |
| Yes | 1.26 (0.61-2.60) | 0.535 |
| STI screening in last 3 months | | |
| No | | |
| Yes | 2.13 (0.95-4.74) | 0.065 |
| Routine medical check-ups | | |
| No | | |
| Yes | 0.86 (0.74–1.02) | 0.076 |
| Knowledge of testing guidelines | | |
| No | | |
| Yes | 1.00 (0.88–1.14) | 0.989 |
| Housing status | | |
| Own/rented house | 1 | |
| Housed by relatives/friends | 0.40 (0.14-1.13) | 0.084 |
| No shelter | 1.27 (0.11–14.5) | 0.847 |
| HIV testing awareness | | |
| No | | |
| Yes | 1.61 (0.66-3.95) | 0.297 |
| Risk perception of HIV risk | | |
| No risk | 1 | |
| low risk | 1.17 (0.47-2.88) | 0.738 |
| ≥High risk | 0.91 (0.36-2.28) | 0.838 |
| Social support | | |
| No | | |
| Yes | 0.89 (0.50-1.61) | 0.699 |
| Use of drop-in centres | | |
| No | | |
| Yes | 5.90 (0.71-49.1) | 0.101 |

STI, sexually transmitted infection; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval. ^a P<0.05 was considered to indicate significance.

Table 4

Multivariate analysis of factors associated with adherence of female sex workers to human immunodeficiency virus testing guidelines.

| Factors | Multivariate analysis OR (95% CI) | P-value |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Age (years) | | |
| 18–24 | 1 | |
| 25–30 | 0.58 (0.22-1.53) | 0.270 |
| 31–49 | 1.12 (0.40-3.20) | 0.832 |
| Education | | |
| Primary | 1 | |
| ≥Secondary | 2.18 (1.01-4.71) | 0.047 ^a |
| Routine medical check-ups | | |
| No | | |
| Yes | 0.88 (0.73-1.05) | 0.167 |
| Housing status | | |
| Own/rented house | 1 | |
| Housed by relatives/friends | 0.37 (0.12-1.13) | 0.081 |
| No shelter | 0.83 (0.06-11.1) | 0.886 |

OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval.

^a P<0.05 was considered to indicate significance.

Discussion

This study investigated the extent to which negative FSWs adhere to the HIV testing guidelines, and discussed associated factors. Fifty-seven percent of FSWs had tested three or more times in the preceding 12 months, which is a low percentage relative to the WHO (World Health Organization 2016) and Ugandan guidelines (Ministry of Health Uganda 2019). Previously, few studies have assessed the frequency of testing, and have focused instead on the outcome of recent testing (Tokar et al., 2018). With the introduction of self-testing, studies have reported a potential benefit of increasing the frequency of HIV testing among FSWs (Shava et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020). As such, the present study highlights a need for programmes and studies to actively track complementary HIV testing outcomes, including accessibility to HIV testing services, willingness to test, and frequency of HIV testing among FSWs.

Education was found to be significantly associated with adherence to the HIV testing guidelines. Other studies have reported similar findings, although in different populations and with different study outcomes. For example, a study on HIV testing among adolescents in Uganda found that individuals with a secondary or higher education were more likely to have ever tested for HIV compared with those who had no education at all (Purba et al., 2018). Similarly, analysis of a demographic and health survey in Zambia found that higher educational attainment was a strong predictor of uptake of HIV testing among women of childbearing age (Muyunda et al., 2018). This implies that less educated FSWs may not fully understand the HIV testing guidelines, and may not realize the benefits of adherence to recommended testing frequencies. Therefore, health promotion models for HIV testing tailored for HIV-negative FSWs with no formal education or primary education alone may help to increase adherence to the HIV testing guidelines. It is also critical to reevaluate the dissemination, reach and impact of the current messaging on testing guidelines for FSWs.

Findings from this study show that FSWs who were staying with friends or relatives, compared with those who were renting houses on their own, were likely to undertake a greater number of HIV tests in a year. Although non-significant, this finding supports previous reports of other studies about relationships between social support and increased uptake of HIV testing. A systematic review on uptake of HIV testing and counselling among FSWs found that FSWs who were married, those who had peers to remind them to test, and those who were encouraged to test by their employers had higher uptake of HIV testing (Tokar et al., 2018). Other studies (Qiao et al., 2015; Mizinduko et al., 2021) have also shown that FSWs who have social support are likely to seek a range of health services, such as condom use and other reproductive health services. This underscores the need for strengthened programmatic and sustained peer-to-peer support among FSWs, an intervention that has been proven to support increased access to HIV services among FSWs (Nnko et al., 2019; Atuhaire et al., 2021). As such, predictable programme financing for sex work broader than HIV prevention programmes is a strong pillar for sustained support for HIV testing programmes for FSWs.

This study also found that FSWs who had routine health check-ups at health facilities and those who had been tested for STIs in the preceding 3 months showed improved adherence to the HIV testing guidelines. This confirms the finding from previous studies that health-seeking behaviour influences decisions to take HIV tests regularly (Nangendo et al., 2020; Musekiwa et al., 2021). WHO recommends that FSWs should screen for STIs every 3 months (World Health Organization 2016). According to service delivery guidelines for key populations in Uganda, FSWs who visit health facilities for various health needs should also be offered STI screening and provider-initiated HIV testing (Ministry of Health Uganda 2019). If this guidance was followed strictly by health workers, the results would be reflected in increased numbers of FSWs testing for HIV every 3 months. However, due to stigma and discrimination by health workers - a barrier that was reported in this study and in previous studies (Nakanwagi et al., 2016; Wanyenze et al., 2017) - FSWs may not freely self-identify to be practising sex work, and this may imply that there are missed opportunities for testing FSWs routinely whenever they visit health facilities for other healthcare needs.

In this study, an association was found between use of DICs to test for HIV and adherence to the HIV testing guidelines, but the relationship was not significant. Due to health disparities and barriers to access HIV services, WHO recommends setting up safe spaces where nonjudgmental services can be provided, allowing meaningful engagement of FSWs to determine their health priorities (World Health Organization 2016). Previous studies have reported the impact of DICs to increase access to HIV services, including HIV testing, in Uganda (Pande et al., 2019), Mozambique (Lafort et al., 2010) and Malawi (Vu et al., 2021). However, DICs have not been taken to scale, and are therefore inaccessible to FSWs who may have wished to access HIV testing through DICs. The Uganda Ministry of Health is making steps to increase the number of DICs, and has developed guidelines to establish and operate DICs (Ministry of Health Uganda 2020). Setting up DICs in additional districts of Uganda and building their competence to provide appropriate services for FSWs will go a long way to improve the availability of FSW-friendly testing services, and thus improve adherence to the HIV testing guidelines among FSWs.

FSWs in Uganda face various barriers that affect routine HIV testing (Wanyenze et al., 2017; Pande et al., 2019). Health system and individual challenges were reported, including stigma and discrimination from health workers, transportation costs, and the inflexibility of clinic opening hours that do not favour FSW work schedules. These findings are consistent with reports from other studies in Uganda and other countries in the region (Wanyenze et al., 2017; Lafort et al., 2018; Atuhaire et al., 2021). Other barriers reported in this study were individual perceptions related to hesitancy to take routine HIV tests because some FSWs perceived themselves to be at minimal risk due to consistent use of condoms. These findings underscore the need for consistent health education targeting FSWs, as well as periodic evaluation of health promotion models to ensure that concerns and the knowledge gaps of beneficiaries are addressed.

This study had some limitations. Eligibility for inclusion required that a participant be HIV negative, and this was self-reported. Therefore, the possibility of false information regarding seropositivity status cannot be excluded, thus introducing measurement bias. However, this is thought to be a minimal limitation as the authors did not inform the gate keepers about this eligibility criterion, and developed a pseudo short questionnaire that the research team would transition to whenever a participant disclosed their HIV-positive status. Further, due to the cross-sectional nature of the study design, it was not possible to draw causal relationships, but only to determine associations. Lastly, convenience sampling was used in this study, and this could have introduced selection bias. The findings from this study therefore need to be interpreted with caution.

Conclusion

This study has provided critical data on the extent to which FSWs adhere to the HIV testing guidelines. Despite the importance of routine testing in facilitating timely diagnosis and early treatment among FSWs, this study found suboptimal adherence to the HIV testing guidelines. This study showed that attaining a secondary education was significantly associated with routine HIV testing. Other factors associated with improved adherence to the HIV testing guidelines were use of DICs and having social support. However, adherence to the HIV testing guidelines was affected by stigma and discrimination from health workers, transportation costs to access testing, and other health systems barriers. Given these findings, strategies that can improve adherence to the HIV testing guidelines among FSWs are those that increase the reach to HIV testing services, and impact the behaviour change communication messaging. It is recommended that testing programmes should be expanded to reach all FSWs. It is also critical to use real-time programme data continuously in order to assess the current HIV testing strategies and

ascertain their effectiveness in promoting adherence to the HIV testing guidelines. In addition, equipping health workers and FSW peer leaders with skills to deliver messaging in a manner that can be understood by FSWs with a lower level of education will go a long way to improve adherence to the HIV testing guidelines by FSWs.

Declaration of Competing Interest

None declared.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Ms. Doreen Bakeiha and Ms. Florence Namimbi, the HIV Prevention Advisors at the Infectious Disease Institute, who were the link to the network organizations and provided lists of all mapped hotspots in Kampala. In addition, the authors wish to thank the study participants, the network organizations, and the FSWs' peers who helped reach the participants for data collection. Finally, the authors wish to thank Dr. Jacques Tamuzi for his contribution in fine tuning the references.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sector.

Ethical approval

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards of Uganda Virus Research Institute (Ref. no. GC/12719/08/723), the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences of Stellenbosch University (Ref. no S19/05/088), and Uganda National Council of Science and Technology (Ref. no. HS-2665).

Consent to participate

Participants provided verbal informed consent as opposed to written consent, in line with guidance from the Uganda National Council of Science and Technology (Ref. no. HS-2665) on conducting research among key populations.

Data availability

Data are available upon reasonable request.

References

- Atuhaire L, Adetokunboh O, Shumba C, Nyasulu PS. Effect of community-based interventions targeting female sex workers along the HIV care cascade in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Syst Rev 2021;10:137.
- Bassett IV, Regan S, Mbonambi H, Blossom J, Bogan S, Bearnot B, et al. Finding HIV in hard-to-reach populations: mobile HIV testing and geospatial mapping in Umlazi township, Durban, South Africa. AIDS Behav 2015;19:1888–95.
- Batona G, Gagnon MP, Simonyan DA, Guedou FA, Alary M. Understanding the intention to undergo regular HIV testing among female sex workers in Benin: a key issue for entry into HIV care. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 2015;68(Suppl. 2):S206–12.
- Bengtson AM, L'Engle K, Mwarogo P, King'ola N. Levels of alcohol use and history of HIV testing among female sex workers in Mombasa, Kenya. AIDS Care 2014;26:1619–24.
- Damacena GN, Szwarcwald CL, de Souza Júnior PR, Dourado I. Risk factors associated with HIV prevalence among female sex workers in 10 Brazilian cities. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 2011;57(Suppl. 3):S144–52.
- Decker MR, Wirtz AL, Pretorius C, Sherman SG, Sweat MD, Baral SD, et al. Estimating the impact of reducing violence against female sex workers on HIV epidemics in Kenya and Ukraine: a policy modeling exercise. Am J Reprod Immunol 2013;69(Suppl. 1):122–32.
- Deering KN, Montaner JS, Chettiar J, Jia J, Ogilvie G, Buchner C, et al. Successes, and gaps in uptake of regular, voluntary HIV testing for hidden street- and off-street sex workers in Vancouver. Canada. AIDS Care 2015;27:499–506.
- Habib A, Johargy A, Mahmood K, Humma H. Design, and determination of the sample size in medical research. IOSR J Dent Med Sci 2014;13:21–31.
- Hladik W, Baughman AL, Serwadda D, Tappero JW, Kwezi R, Nakato ND, et al. Burden and characteristics of HIV infection among female sex workers in Kampala, Uganda – a respondent-driven sampling survey. BMC Public Health 2017;17:565.

- Lafort Y, Geelhoed D, Cumba L, Lázaro CD, Delva W, Luchters S, et al. Reproductive health services for populations at high risk of HIV: performance of a night clinic in Tete province. Mozambique. BMC Health Serv Res 2010;10:144.
- Lafort Y, Greener L, Lessitala F, Chabeda S, Greener R, Beksinska M, et al. Effect of a 'diagonal' intervention on uptake of HIV and reproductive health services by female sex workers in three sub-Saharan African cities. Trop Med Int Health 2018;23:774–84.
- Landreneau KJ, Creek W. Sampling strategies. 2009. Available at: http://www.natcol.org (accessed 10 May 2022).
- Lillie TA, Persaud NE, DiCarlo MC, Gashobotse D, Kamali DR, Cheron M, et al. Reaching the unreached: performance of an enhanced peer outreach approach to identify new HIV cases among female sex workers and men who have sex with men in HIV programs in West and Central Africa. PLoS One 2019;14.
- Ma H, Wang L, Gichangi P, Mochache V, Manguro G, Musyoki HK, et al. Transitions Study Team. Venue-based HIV testing at sex work hotspots to reach adolescent girls and young women living with HIV: a cross-sectional study in Mombasa, Kenya. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 2020;84:470–9.
- Macdonald V, Verster A, Baggaley R. A call for differentiated approaches to delivering HIV services to key populations. J Int AIDS Soc 2017;20(Suppl. 4):21658.
- Martins TA, Kerr L, Macena RHM, Mota RS, Dourado I, Brito AM, et al. Incentives, and barriers to HIV testing among female sex workers in Ceará. Rev Saude Publ 2018;52:64.
- Ministry of Health Uganda. Guidelines for establishing and operating drop-in centres for key populations in Uganda. Ministry of Health Uganda; 2020. Available at: https://cquin.icap.columbia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/SOP-Drop-In-Centre-DIC-Final-June-2020.pdf (accessed 14 April 2022). Uganda
- Ministry of Health Uganda. Toolkit for differentiated HIV and other services delivery models for key populations in Uganda. Ministry of Health Uganda; 2019.
- Mizinduko M, Moen K, Pinkowski Tersbøl B, Likindikoki SL, Alexander Ishungisa M, Leyna GH, et al. HIV testing and associated factors among female sex workers in Tanzania: approaching the first 90% target? AIDS Care 2021. doi:10.1080/09540121.2021.2014779.
- Muhindo R, Castelnuovo B, Mujugira A, Parkes-Ratanshi R, Sewankambo NK, Kiguli J, et al. Psychosocial correlates of regular syphilis and HIV screening practices among female sex workers in Uganda: a cross-sectional survey. AIDS Res Ther 2019;16:28.
- Mulongo S, Kapila G, Hatton T, Canagasabey D, Arney J, Kazadi T, et al. Applying innovative approaches for reaching men who have sex with men and female sex workers in the Democratic Republic of Congo. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 2015;68(Suppl. 2):S248-51.
- Musekiwa A, Bamogo A, Shisana O, Robsky K, Zuma K, Zungu NP, et al. Prevalence of selfreported HIV testing and associated factors among adolescent girls and young women in South Africa: results from a 2017 nationally representative population-based HIV survey. Publ Health Pract 2021;2.
- Muyunda B, Musonda P, Mee P, Todd J, Michelo C. Educational attainment as a predictor of HIV testing uptake among women of child-bearing age: analysis of 2014 Demographic and Health Survey in Zambia. Front Public Health 2018;6: 192.
- Nakanwagi S, Matovu JK, Kintu BN, Kaharuza F, Wanyenze RK. Facilitators and barriers to linkage to HIV care among female sex workers receiving HIV testing services at a community-based organization in periurban Uganda: a qualitative study. J Sex Transm Dis 2016;2016.
- Nangendo J, Katahoire AR, Armstrong-Hough M, Kabami J, Obeng-Amoako GO, Muwema M, et al. Prevalence, associated factors, and perspectives of HIV testing among men in Uganda. PLoS One 2020;15.
- Narasimhan M, Yeh PT, Haberlen S, Warren CE, Kennedy CE. Integration of HIV testing services into family planning services: a systematic review. Reprod Health 2019;16(Suppl. 1):61.
- Nnko S, Kuringe E, Nyato D, Drake M, Casalini C, Shao A, et al. Determinants of access to HIV testing and counselling services among female sex workers in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review. BMC Public Health 2019;19:15.
- Nyblade L, Reddy A, Mbote D, Kraemer J, Stockton M, Kemunto C, et al. The relationship between health worker stigma and uptake of HIV counseling and testing and utilization of non-HIV health services: the experience of male and female sex workers in Kenya. AIDS Care 2017;29:1364–72.
- Olawore O, Astatke H, Lillie T, Persaud N, Lyons C, Kamali D, et al. Peer recruitment strategies for female sex workers not engaged in HIV prevention and treatment services in Côte d'Ivoire: Program Data Analysis. JMIR Public Health Surveill 2020;6:e18000.
- Pande G, Bulage L, Kabwama S, Nsubuga F, Kyambadde P, Mugerwa S, et al. Preference, and uptake of different community-based HIV testing service delivery models among female sex workers along Malaba-Kampala highway, Uganda, 2017. BMC Health Serv Res 2019;19:799.
- Purba FD, Hunfeld JAM, Fitriana TS, Iskandarsyah A, Sadarjoen SS, Busschbach JJV, et al. Living in uncertainty due to floods and pollution: the health status and quality of life of people living on an unhealthy riverbank. BMC Publ Health 2018;18:782.
- Qiao S, Li X, Zhang C, Zhou Y, Shen Z, Tang Z. Social support, and condom use among female sex workers in China. Health Care Women Int 2015;36:834–50.
- Setlhare K, Manyeagae GD. Factors associated with HIV testing among female sex workers in Botswana. J AIDS HIV Res 2017;9:42–51.
- Shava E, Manyake K, Mdluli C, Maribe K, Monnapula N, Nkomo B, et al. Acceptability of oral HIV self-testing among female sex workers in Gaborone, Botswana. PLoS One 2020;15.
- Shokoohi M, Noori A, Karamouzian M, Sharifi H, Khajehkazemi R, Fahimfar N, et al. Remaining gap in HIV testing uptake among female sex workers in Iran. AIDS Behav 2017;21:2401–11.
- Tokar A, Broerse JEW, Blanchard J, Roura M. HIV testing and counseling among female sex workers: a systematic literature review. AIDS Behav 2018;22:2435–57.

- Van Bulck L, Wampers M, Moons P. Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap): tackling data collection, management, storage, and privacy challenges. Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs 2022;21:85–91.
- Vu L, Zieman B, Muula A, Samuel V, Tenthani L, Chilongozi D, et al. Assessment of community-based ART service model linking female sex workers to HIV care and treatment in Blantyre and Mangochi, Malawi. 2021. Available at: https://knowledgecommons.popcouncil.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1550&context=departments_sbsr-hiv (accessed 14 April 2022).
- Wang C, Wang YJ, Tucker JD, Xiong MZ, Fu HY, Smith MK, et al. Correlates of HIV self-testing among female sex workers in China: implications for expanding HIV screening. Infect Dis Poverty 2020;9:147.
- Wanyenze RK, Musinguzi G, Kiguli J, Nuwaha F, Mujisha G, Musinguzi J, et al. "When they know that you are a sex worker, you will be the last person to be treated": perceptions and experiences of female sex workers in accessing HIV services in Uganda. BMC Int Health Hum Rights 2017;17:11.
- World Health Organization. Consolidated guidelines on the use of antiretroviral drugs for treating and preventing HIV infection: recommendations for a public health approach -2nd ed. Geneva: WHO; 2016 Available at: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/ handle/10665/208825/9789241549684_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (accessed 14 April 2022).