HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Sex Transm Dis. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 February 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Sex Transm Dis. 2023 February 01; 50(2): 92–97. doi:10.1097/OLQ.0000000000001729.

Point-of-care STI testing improves HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis initiation in pregnant women in antenatal care in Cape Town, South Africa, 2019–2021

Alex de Voux, PhD[1], **Rufaro Mvududu, MPH**[1], **Anna Happel, PhD**[2], **Heather B Jaspan, MD, PhD**[2,3,4], **Dorothy Chiwoniso Nyemba, MPH**[1], **Nyiko Mashele, PhD**[1], **Landon Myer, MBChB, PhD**[1], **Dvora Leah Joseph Davey, PhD**[1,5,6]

[1]Division of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, School of Public Health and Family Medicine, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

[2]Division of Immunology, Department of Pathology, Institute of Infectious Diseases and Molecular Medicine, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

[3]Seattle Children's Research Institute, Seattle, Washington, United States of America

[4]Department of Pediatrics and Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, United States of America

[5]Department of Epidemiology, Fielding School of Public Health, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, United States of America

[6]Division of Infectious Diseases, Geffen School of Medicine, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, United States of America

Abstract

Background—Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) programs present a platform for diagnostic STI testing in low- and middle-income countries, and availability of targeted STI testing has been hypothesized to influence PrEP use. We evaluated the association of STI testing modality and PrEP uptake among pregnant women in antenatal care.

Methods—We enrolled pregnant, HIV-uninfected women (≥16 years) at their first antenatal visit with follow-up through 12 months postpartum. Women were offered oral PrEP and tested for *Chlamydia trachomatis* (CT) and *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* (NG) using a point-of-care (Cepheid, August 2019–November 2020) or laboratory-based (Thermofisher, December 2020–October 2021) test. We compared the proportion of women initiating and continuing PrEP by STI test adjusting for confounders.

Results—We evaluated 1194 women (median age=26 years [IQR:22–31]) with a STI result (46% POC and 54% laboratory-based). The prevalence of any STI was the same in POC-tested (28%) and laboratory-tested (28%) women — 25% versus 23% for CT (p-value=0.35) and 7%

Corresponding Author: Alex de Voux, Division of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, School of Public Health, University of Cape Town, Observatory, 7925, South Africa, Telephone: (+27) (0)21 650 6173, alex.devoux@uct.ac.za.

We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

versus 9% for NG (p-value=0.11). Mean time from testing to result was 0 for POC and 26 days for laboratory testing and mean time from testing to treatment was 3 for POC and 38 days for laboratory testing. Receiving a POC STI test was associated with higher PrEP initiation compared to women receiving a laboratory-based test (90% versus 78%; adjusted odds ratio=2.1; 95% CI:1.5–2.9), controlling for age, gravidity, STI diagnosis, intimate partner violence, gestational age, employment, HIV risk perception, and cohabiting status.

Conclusion—POC STI testing, offering same-day results and treatment initiation, may increase PrEP initiation among pregnant women in antenatal care.

Short Summary

A study of HIV-uninfected pregnant women in South Africa found that women offered point-of-care STI testing had a higher odds of initiating HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis than women offered laboratory-based testing.

Keywords

pre-exposure prophylaxis; initiation; pregnant; point-of care; STI testing; South Africa

Introduction

In South Africa, pregnant and postpartum women (PPW) are at high risk of HIV and curable sexually transmitted infections (STIs) (1, 2). Bacterial STIs during pregnancy, specifically *Chlamydia trachomatis* (CT), and *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* (NG), and parasitic STIs such as *Trichomonas vaginalis* (TV), can lead to complications in both the mother and neonate. STIs can increase the risk of HIV acquisition and transmission (3), and maternal STIs can result in stillbirth (4), neonatal death, low birth weight (5–7), neonatal conjunctivitis or congenital deformities (8).

Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) is a safe and effective prevention strategy to reduce the risk of HIV acquisition among women during pregnancy and the postpartum period (9). The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends that PrEP programmes target individuals at high risk for HIV, including pregnant women (9). Many of the biological and behavioural factors that lead to an increased risk of HIV acquisition also place persons at an increased risk of an STI. STI/HIV acquisition risk factors include changes in the vaginal microbiota during the pregnancy and postpartum period, having multiple and/or anonymous sex partners and having condomless sex (10, 11). In South Africa, the standard approach to diagnosing and managing curable STIs is syndromic management, where the signs or symptoms of a group of diseases are treated (12). During pregnancy women are asked if they are experiencing any STI-related symptoms, such as vaginal discharge, and if so empirical treatment is provided to symptomatic women (12). Syndromic STI management is advantageous because it is low-cost, easy to implement, and facilitates treatment at the first visit for most pathogens associated with each syndrome (13). However, the efficacy of syndromic management is limited as the majority of STIs are asymptomatic and therefore remain untreated, which can lead to STI-related sequelae (14, 15). Additionally, during pregnancy vaginal discharge is common with limited specificity for STI diagnosis (16) and

has been shown to be a poor predictor of STIs among high-risk women in South Africa (17), which could lead to overtreatment.

Aetiological STI testing and treatment is an alternative to syndromic management with the potential to improve STI diagnosis and treatment among pregnant women (18). Even though aetiological STI testing has superior sensitivity to syndromic management in detecting and treating STIs, it can be difficult to implement in resource-constrained settings with limited access to laboratory diagnostics (19). In settings where laboratory diagnostics are available, STI test results may only be available after extended waiting periods (days–weeks), making immediate treatment based on laboratory results impossible (19, 20). Near-patient point-of-care (POC) STI tests are commercially available for CT, TV, and NG and have been shown to reduce STI missed treatment and overtreatment (14).

Given the synergistic relationship between HIV and STIs, PrEP programs can provide a platform for aetiological STI testing and treatment (21–23). The inclusion of routine STI screening in PrEP programs could lead to the rapid diagnosis and treatment of STIs, such as CT, NG, and TV. POC STI tests could render results available more readily, which may influence PrEP use (initiation and continuation). The return of same-day STI results could facilitate longer and more robust provider-patient discussion around STI (including HIV) risk. Given that these encounters (collection of specimen(s) for STI testing and the return of STI results) would likely happen with the same counsellor or provider, the continuity could allow for better engagement and additional opportunities for offering PrEP. POC STI screening among PrEP candidates could help identify individuals at risk of HIV acquisition and may prompt discussion about sexual health to better contextualize an individual's perception of their HIV/STI risk.

In this study, we hypothesised that POC STI testing had a positive association with PrEP initiation and continuation among PPW in a maternal PrEP cohort in Cape Town, South Africa. We also evaluated the impact of POC STI testing on time to receipt of STI results and treatment compared to laboratory-based STI testing.

Methods

Study population

The PrEP-PP (PrEP in Pregnant and Postpartum women) study was an open prospective cohort study that enrolled pregnant, adolescent girls and women not living with HIV at their first antenatal care (ANC) visit. Participants were recruited from a primary antenatal care clinic, the Gugulethu Midwife Obstetrics Unit (MOU), located in the urban township of Gugulethu in Cape Town, South Africa. In 2018, the HIV prevalence among women who utilized antenatal care services at the Gugulethu MOU was 27%. Participants were followed through 12 months after delivery. Women were eligible to participate if they were: (1) ≥ 16 years, (2) confirmed HIV-negative through a fourth-generation antigen/antibody combination HIV test (Abbott, Japan), (3) confirmed pregnant, (4) intended to stay in Cape Town, South Africa through the postpartum period and (5) did not have contraindications to PrEP.

Study procedures

At baseline, participants self-collected a lateral vaginal wall swab that was tested for CT, NG and TV using a point-of-care test from August 2019 until November 2020 (Cepheid Inc., Sunnyvale, CA, USA). STI treatment was provided according to the South African National Sexually Transmitted Infection Guidelines (12) on the same or following day if the participant did not wait for the results in the clinic. From November 2020, due to supply chain issues as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, Cepheid was unable to continue to support research studies with the provision of POC STI testing kits, and the self-collected vaginal swabs were sent to the Department of Pathology (University of Cape Town) for CT and NG testing using TaqMan™ Vaginal Microbiota assays as per manufacturer instructions (ThermoFisher Scientific, South Africa). The TaqMan™ Vaginal Microbiota Amplification Control was used as positive control. Upon receipt of the STI test results from the laboratory study staff contacted women diagnosed with an STI and asked them to return to the clinic for treatment. Since the laboratory tests did not screen for TV, we restricted our definition of being diagnosed with an STI to women who were diagnosed with NG or CT in order to compare the effects of POC versus laboratory-based STI testing on PrEP initiation and continuation.

Trained study interviewers conducted a socio-demographic and behavioural questionnaire at baseline and follow-up visits. The baseline interview took 30–45 minutes to complete. Study data were collected and managed using Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap), a secure web-based platform hosted at the University of Cape Town (5). Survey measures included information on: (1) basic demographics and obstetric history, (2) partner HIV status, (3) sexual behaviours, (4) HIV risk perception, (5) experience of intimate partner violence (IPV) and (6) relationship with partner.

All women, regardless of mode of STI testing, received HIV risk reduction counselling by trained study staff and were offered PrEP at baseline. The study interviewer asked the participant whether they were interested in starting PrEP, noting that any hesitancy or disinterest in PrEP initiation would not impact study participation. For women who were interested in initiating PrEP, the study nurse drew blood to measure baseline creatinine levels. Participants who got a POC STI test and stayed for their results received additional counselling on their STI result and were again given the option to start PrEP if they had declined PrEP prior to receiving their STI test results. Women who left prior to receipt of their STI results were called the following day to come in for treatment and were again given an option to start PrEP if they had declined. The study nurse provided the patient with a 30-day supply of oral tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine (TDF-FDC [Truvada©, Gilead, CA, USA]) at baseline and an invitation card to return in one month for a refill prescription if interested. PrEP uptake was assessed through participant self-report and pill count at the one month visit Women who returned after one month and agreed to continue PrEP were given a two-month prescription and an invitation to return after two months for a quarterly study visit. Women who did not initiate PrEP at baseline were invited to return in three months for a quarterly study follow-up visit with HIV testing and received additional counselling on PrEP with an offer of PrEP initiation. For the primary analysis, PrEP initiation was defined as accepting the PrEP prescription at baseline and

PrEP continuation was defined as receiving a PrEP prescription at both the baseline and the three-month follow-up visit. We also conducted a sensitivity analysis after redefining PrEP initiation as initiating PrEP at the baseline or the 3-month visit and compared the proportion of women who initiated PrEP to results obtained from the primary analysis.

To evaluate the effect of STI testing modality on PrEP initiation, we included all women who underwent STI testing (POC or laboratory-based testing) at the baseline visit. For the evaluation of PrEP continuation we included all women who were not censored due to pregnancy loss (miscarriage, stillbirths) or lost-to-follow-up prior to the three-month visit.

Ethics

The PrEP-PP study was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of Cape Town (#297/2018) and by the University of California, Los Angeles Institutional Review Board (IRB#18–001622). Written informed consent was provided by all participants in English or their local language, isiXhosa.

Results

Analytical sample

Between August 2019 and October 2021, the PrEP-PP study enrolled 1200 pregnant women and 99% (1194) underwent STI testing and were offered PrEP at baseline. Our analysis evaluating factors associated with PrEP initiation was restricted to 1009 (85% of 1194) women for whom we could confirm PrEP initiation. Of the 1009 women, 3.5% (35) were censored due to infant death, miscarriage, or pregnancy loss after their baseline visit, 18% (185) did not initiate PrEP at baseline, and 2.8% (34) were lost-to-follow-up and did not return for their 3-month visit, leaving 940 women (93% of 1009 PrEP baseline initiators) for the evaluation of PrEP continuation at the 3-month visit.

Demographics

The median age of all pregnant women was 26 years (interquartile range [IQR]: 22–31) and the median gestational age at baseline was 21 weeks (IQR: 15–31). Most women (66%) had at least one prior pregnancy. Almost half of the women (49%) had less than a grade 12 level of education, the majority were unemployed (64%) and most (63%) did not live with their partner. Employment status was the only significant demographic difference by STI testing group with a higher proportion of women employed among the POC (39%) compared to the laboratory STI testing group (32%; Table 1).

Almost all women (97%) reported being sexually active during pregnancy. Among women who reported being in a sexual relationship in the last 3 months (n=1160), 69% reported having sex without a condom during the last sexual act. Seventy-one percent of women reported that their partner had tested for HIV in the past 12 months — 2% reported having a partner living with HIV. Most women reported perceiving themselves to have no chance of HIV acquisition (54%), 34% reported a low chance and 11% reported a high chance of HIV acquisition. Twelve percent of women reported experiencing intimate partner violence in the past 12 months.

A similar proportion of women were tested for STIs with a POC (54%) or laboratory-based test (46%) following self-collection of a vaginal swab. The proportion of women testing positive for any STI (CT/NG) was the same among POC-tested (28%) and laboratory-tested (28%) women. Overall, 24% of women were diagnosed with CT — 25% of POC-tested women and 23% of laboratory-tested women (p-value=0.35). A smaller proportion of women overall was diagnosed with NG (8%) — 7% among POC-tested and 9% among laboratory-tested women (p-value=0.11).

STI treatment outcomes

Seventy-nine percent of POC-tested women were treated on the same day as their STI diagnosis, while this was not the case for any women undergoing laboratory-based STI testing. The mean time to STI treatment for POC-tested women was 3 (SD=12) days compared to 38 (SD=43) days for laboratory-tested women. A higher proportion of laboratory-tested women diagnosed with an STI never returned for treatment (28%) compared to POC-tested women diagnosed with an STI (4%) (p-value<0.001). Among laboratory-tested women who were diagnosed with an STI and treated, 19% (n=29) were treated after giving birth compared to 2% (n=4) among POC-tested women. The median gestational age was 21 (IQR=14–29) weeks for POC- and 22 (IQR=15–32) weeks for laboratory-tested women.

PrEP initiation

A higher proportion of POC-tested women (90%) initiated PrEP at baseline compared to laboratory-tested women (78%; p-value<0.001). While a small proportion of women initiated PrEP at a follow-up visit among POC-tested (6%) and laboratory-tested (3%) women, 11% of all women never initiated PrEP. Among women who never initiated PrEP, more than two-thirds (68%) were among laboratory-tested women. In a multivariable model evaluating the association of STI testing modality on PrEP initiation at baseline, POC-tested women were more likely to initiate PrEP compared to laboratory-tested women — adjusted odds ratio (aOR) = 2.07 (95% CI: 1.47–2.91), after adjusting for maternal age, gravidity, any STI diagnosis (CT or NG), experience of IPV in the last 12 months, gestational age, employment status, HIV risk perception at baseline, and cohabitation status. After redefining PrEP initiation as initiating PrEP at either the baseline or the 3-month visit, the overall proportion of women initiating PrEP increased to 89%. There was still a higher proportion of POC-tested women (93%; n=604) who initiated PrEP compared to laboratory-tested women (84%; n=463; p-value<0.001).

Among women who initiated PrEP at baseline and were invited to return one month later for a refill prescription (n=1009), 83% (n=841) returned and 98% were confirmed to have started PrEP through self-report and/or pill count. Among laboratory-tested women, 91% (n=389) returned at one month and 98% were confirmed to have started PrEP, while 78% of POC-tested women returned at one month and 98% were confirmed to have started PrEP.

PrEP continuation

A high proportion of women (79%) returned to their 3-month study visit, but this proportion was lower among laboratory-tested (75%) compared to POC-tested women

(82%; p-value=0.005). Despite a higher proportion of POC-tested women returning to their 3-month follow-up visit, a higher proportion of laboratory-tested (64%) compared to POC-tested (54%) women continued PrEP (aOR = 0.65; 95% CI: 0.49–0.85). Women with a gestational age of >20 weeks at baseline had a lower odds of PrEP continuation at three months compared to women with a gestational age ≤20 weeks (aOR=0.98; 95% CI: 0.96–0.99).

Discussion

In this study we demonstrated the feasibility and benefit of implementing POC STI testing during pregnancy in a maternal PrEP cohort in Cape Town, South Africa. In addition to decreasing time to receipt of STI results and treatment, our findings suggest that POC STI testing might lead to higher levels of PrEP initiation when compared to laboratory-based testing.

Prior studies have demonstrated the benefits of POC STI testing, particularly when compared to syndromic STI management which is the standard-of-care in South Africa. Aetiological STI testing has been shown to reduce postnatal STI prevalence compared to antenatal STI prevalence among pregnant women (18) and reduce genital inflammation among young women in South Africa (24). These findings suggest that aetiological POC STI testing may provide an effective intervention to reduce the high STI burden among pregnant women in South Africa. Aetiological STI testing has also been shown to have higher sensitivity and specificity in detecting genital infections when compared to syndromic management (17) and is able to detect STIs among asymptomatic women.

In our study, the proportion of POC-tested women who were treated for an STI was also higher compared to laboratory-tested women. Providing same day STI results and/or treatment are important in decreasing the risk of adverse birth outcomes due to delayed or no STI treatment among PPW. POC STI testing promises to circumvent both diagnosis and treatment delays associated with laboratory testing and provide an aetiological STI diagnosis that is absent from the standard syndromic STI approach. It is however important to note that even among POC-tested women, a minority (n=39, 21%) of women were not treated on the same day, despite all women having their STI results available on the same day. This suggests that any waiting period, even a relatively short one, can serve as a barrier to same-day STI treatment for some women and should be considered when implementing STI testing in the flow of the antenatal or general healthcare visit.

In this cohort, POC-tested women had higher odds of initiating PrEP compared to laboratory-tested women, after controlling for maternal age, gravidity, any STI diagnosis (CT or NG), experience of IPV in the last 12 months, gestational age, employment status, HIV risk perception at baseline, and cohabitation status. This an observation that may be related to the availability of same-day STI results and treatment for the majority (79%) of POC-tested women. POC-tested women received timely feedback on whether they had a curable STI and could consider this information when assessing their risk of HIV acquisition and potential benefit of initiating PrEP. POC-tested women also had a shorter interval between counselling pre-STI testing and counselling after receipt of their

STI results compared to laboratory-tested women. During both encounters the counsellor had an opportunity to offer PrEP to the participant in relatively short succession. The discussion with the counsellor regarding the STI test result, regardless of the outcome, could also facilitate a provider "nudge" to discuss sexual behaviours and risk of STI and HIV acquisition with the participant. Nudges are interventions that shape the way that options are presented (25), hopefully enabling individuals to make the best decision. Same-day STI results and treatment may have influenced women by facilitating discussion around sexual health, more accurately reflecting HIV risk and driving intention around behaviour change to reduce STI/HIV risk including PrEP initiation. Studies have shown a risk-reducing effect of a treatment consultation, such as an STI test, and/or positive test result on both behavioural and psychological characteristics related to sexual health (26).

Despite having an increased odds of initiating PrEP at their baseline visit, a smaller proportion of POC-tested women continued PrEP at 3 months compared to laboratory-tested women. The same factors promoting PrEP initiation may also serve as factors influencing PrEP discontinuation at 3 months. Behavioral economic theories have shown that individuals tend to make decisions based on information received more recently (27) and while this effect might have been beneficial to get women initiated on PrEP it may have biased women against fully considering the implications and demands of PrEP continuation. This finding supports several studies that show that barriers to PrEP initiation are different to barriers to PrEP continuation (28–30), and suggest that while POC STI testing might improve PrEP initiation in PPW, PrEP adherence and continuation counselling is critical to improve long-term outcomes in this population. This study did not include a biomarker for PrEP adherence and relied on self-report and pill count which is an imperfect measure of PrEP adherence.

The study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic and a 21-day nation-wide lockdown (26 March–16 April 2020) in South Africa, which in part necessitated the switch from POC to laboratory-based STI testing thereby providing investigators with an opportunity to compare the effect of STI testing modalities on PrEP uptake. However, given this context we are unable to fully adjust for any changes in participant behavior over this time that may have impacted their likelihood of PrEP initiation and/or continuation. COVID-19 and the consequent mitigation measures implemented adversely impacted health-seeking behaviors including access to antenatal care. During this time the study implemented home visits and conducted follow-up interviews telephonically to facilitate study participation and continuation. While we do not think that COVID-19 had a differential impact on the baseline visit by STI testing group (POC vs. laboratory-based), it may have differentially impacted lost-to-follow-up across the groups and subsequently PrEP continuation. Furthermore, women were not randomized to their STI testing modality, which were carried out over different time periods, so we cannot rule out the possibility of selection bias impacting the validity of our findings. Future work could evaluate the effect of STI testing modality on PrEP initiation and continuation in the context of a randomised controlled trial among PPW in South Africa.

In South Africa, PPW are at high risk of both HIV and STI acquisition. PrEP programmes have not only been successful at reducing HIV prevalence at the population level but also

offer a platform on which to integrate STI services such as testing and treatment. While it has previously been shown that POC STI testing allows for aetiological STI diagnosis and same-day treatment, reducing the risk of adverse birth and reproductive outcomes (14), our findings that women who underwent a POC STI test were more likely to initiate PrEP suggests a synergistic relationship between these two initiatives.

Acknowledgements:

We wish to thank all of the PrEP-PP study staff for collecting data and supporting the study. We also thank all of the pregnant women who participated for their important role in this study. We thank the Western Cape Department of Health for supporting this research. We also thank Gilead for the study drug (Truvada©) and Cepheid, Inc. for the GeneXpert STI test donations.

DJD received funding from Fogarty International Center (K01TW011187) and DJD and LM received funding from NIMH (R01MH116771).

References

1. Nyemba DC, Haddison EC, Wang C, et al. Prevalence of curable STIs and bacterial vaginosis during pregnancy in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Sex Transm Infect 2021.
2. Woldesenbet S, Kufa-Chakezha T, Lombard C, et al. Recent HIV infection among pregnant women in the 2017 antenatal sentinel cross-sectional survey, South Africa: Assay-based incidence measurement. PLoS One 2021; 16(4):e0249953.
3. Galvin SR, Cohen MS. The role of sexually transmitted diseases in HIV transmission. Nat Rev Microbiol 2004; 2(1):33–42. [PubMed: 15035007]
4. Warr AJ, Pintye J, Kinuthia J, et al. Sexually transmitted infections during pregnancy and subsequent risk of stillbirth and infant mortality in Kenya: a prospective study. Sex Transm Infect 2019; 95(1):60–66. [PubMed: 30228109]
5. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, et al. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform 2009; 42(2):377–381. [PubMed: 18929686]
6. Gomez GB, Kamb ML, Newman LM, et al. Untreated maternal syphilis and adverse outcomes of pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Bull World Health Organ 2013; 91(3):217–226. [PubMed: 23476094]
7. Silva MJ, Florencio GL, Gabiatti JR, et al. Perinatal morbidity and mortality associated with chlamydial infection: a meta-analysis study. Braz J Infect Dis 2011; 15(6):533–539. [PubMed: 22218511]
8. Cooper JM, Sanchez PJ. Congenital syphilis. Semin Perinatol 2018; 42(3):176–184. [PubMed: 29627075]
9. World Health Organization. WHO expands recommendation on oral pre-exposure prophylaxis of HIV infection (PrEP) Policy Brief. 2015.
10. McCree DH, Rompalo AM. Biological and Behavioral Risk Factors Associated with STDs/HIV in Women: Implications for Behavioral Interventions. In: Aral SO, Douglas JM, eds. Behavioral Interventions for Prevention and Control of Sexually Transmitted Diseases. Boston, MA: Springer US; 2007:310–324.
11. Ward H, Ronn M. Contribution of sexually transmitted infections to the sexual transmission of HIV. Curr Opin HIV AIDS 2010; 5(4):305–310. [PubMed: 20543605]
12. National Department of Health. Sexually Transmitted Infections Management Guidelines 2018. 2018.
13. World Health Organization. Sexually transmitted and other reproductive tract infections: a guide to essential practice. Geneva; 2005.
14. Wi TE, Ndowa FJ, Ferreyra C, et al. Diagnosing sexually transmitted infections in resource-constrained settings: challenges and ways forward. J Int AIDS Soc 2019; 22 Suppl 6:e25343.

15. Jasumback CL, Perry SH, Ness TE, et al. Point-of-Care Testing to Guide Treatment and Estimate Risk Factors for Sexually Transmitted Infections in Adolescents and Young People With Human Immunodeficiency Virus in Eswatini. Open Forum Infect Dis 2020; 7(3):ofaa052.
16. van Gemert C, Hellard M, Bradshaw CS, et al. Syndromic management of sexually transmissible infections in resource-poor settings: a systematic review with meta-analysis of the abnormal vaginal discharge flowchart for Neisseria gonorrhoea and Chlamydia trachomatis. Sex Health 2018; 15(1):1–12. [PubMed: 28838352]
17. Mlisana K, Naicker N, Werner L, et al. Symptomatic vaginal discharge is a poor predictor of sexually transmitted infections and genital tract inflammation in high-risk women in South Africa. J Infect Dis 2012; 206(1):6–14. [PubMed: 22517910]
18. Peters R, Klausner JD, de Vos L, et al. Aetiological testing compared with syndromic management for sexually transmitted infections in HIV-infected pregnant women in South Africa: a non-randomised prospective cohort study. BJOG 2021; 128(8):1335–1342. [PubMed: 33277768]
19. Mayaud P, Mabey D. Approaches to the control of sexually transmitted infections in developing countries: old problems and modern challenges. Sex Transm Infect 2004; 80(3):174–182. [PubMed: 15169997]
20. Unemo M, Bradshaw CS, Hocking JS, et al. Sexually transmitted infections: challenges ahead. Lancet Infect Dis 2017; 17(8):e235–e279. [PubMed: 28701272]
21. Hodges-Mameletzis I, Fonner VA, Dalal S, et al. Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis for HIV Prevention in Women: Current Status and Future Directions. Drugs 2019; 79(12):1263–1276. [PubMed: 31309457]
22. Wang L, Kourtis AP, Ellington S, et al. Safety of tenofovir during pregnancy for the mother and fetus: a systematic review. Clin Infect Dis 2013; 57(12):1773–1781. [PubMed: 24046310]
23. World Health Organization. WHO Technical brief: preventing HIV during pregnancy and breastfeeding in the context of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP). Geneva: WHO; 2017.
24. Garrett N, Mtshali A, Osman F, et al. Impact of point-of-care testing and treatment of sexually transmitted infections and bacterial vaginosis on genital tract inflammatory cytokines in a cohort of young South African women. Sex Transm Infect 2021; 97(8):555–565. [PubMed: 33608480]
25. Harrison JD, Patel MS. Designing Nudges for Success in Health Care. AMA J Ethics 2020; 22(9):E796–801. [PubMed: 33009777]
26. van Wees DA, Drissen M, den Daas C, et al. The impact of STI test results and face-to-face consultations on subsequent behavior and psychological characteristics. Prev Med 2020; 139:106200.
27. Linnemayr S, MacCarthy S, Wagner Z, et al. Using Behavioral Economics to Promote HIV Prevention for Key Populations. J AIDS Clin Res 2018; 9(11).
28. Serota DP, Rosenberg ES, Sullivan PS, et al. Pre-exposure Prophylaxis Uptake and Discontinuation Among Young Black Men Who Have Sex With Men in Atlanta, Georgia: A Prospective Cohort Study. Clin Infect Dis 2020; 71(3):574–582. [PubMed: 31499518]
29. Pillay D, Stankevitz K, Lanham M, et al. Factors influencing uptake, continuation, and discontinuation of oral PrEP among clients at sex worker and MSM facilities in South Africa. PLoS One 2020; 15(4):e0228620.
30. Beesham I, Joseph Davey DL, Beksinska M, et al. Daily Oral Pre-exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) Continuation Among Women from Durban, South Africa, Who Initiated PrEP as Standard of Care for HIV Prevention in a Clinical Trial. AIDS Behav 2022.

Sex Transm Dis. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 February 01.

Table 1.

Characteristics of pregnant women offered pre-exposure prophylaxis in antenatal care by sexually transmitted infection test in Cape Town, South Africa (N = 1194)

	Overall		Laboratory STI testing (12 Nov 2020 to 05 Oct 2021)			Point-of-care STI testing (23 Aug 2019 to 11 Nov 2020)			
	N	**column %**	**N**	**column %**	**row %**	**N**	**column %**	**row %**	***P***
Total	**1194**	**100**	**548**	**100**	**46**	**646**	**100**	**54**	
Maternal age (years)									
Median, IQR	26	(22–31)	27	(22–31)		26	(22–30)		
<24	399	(33)	183	33	46	216	33	54	0.99
Education < grade 12	580	(49)	267	49	46	313	48	54	0.93
Employed	428	(36)	174	32	41	254	39	59	**0.01**
Gravidity									
Primigravida	405	(34)	180	33	44	225	35	56	0.47
Multigravida	789	(66)	368	67	47	421	65	53	
Gestational age (weeks)									
Median (IQR)	21	(15–31)	22	(15–32)		21	(14–29)		
<20	504	(42)	219	40	43	285	44	57	0.15
Cohabiting with partner	441	(37)	211	39	48	230	36	52	0.30
Initiated PrEP at baseline	1009	(85)	427	78	42	582	90	58	**0.00**
Confirmed PrEP uptake following prescription†(n=1009)									
No	15	(1)	7	2	47	8	1	53	**0.00**
Yes	826	(82)	382	89	46	444	76	54	
Unconfirmed/ lost-to-follow-up	168	(17)	38	9	23	130	22	77	
Never initiated PrEP	131	(11)	89	16	68	42	7	32	
Initiated PrEP at a follow-up visit	54	(5)	32	6	59	22	3	41	
Any STI diagnosis (CT and/or NG)	334	(28)	152	28	46	182	28	54	0.87
CT and NG co-infection	48	(4)	24	(4)	(50)	24	(4)	(50)	0.56
CT diagnosis	285	24	124	23	43	161	25	56	0.35
NG diagnosis	97	8	52	9	54	45	7	46	0.11
TV diagnosis ††	75	(6)	N/A			75	(12)	(100)	

	Overall		Laboratory STI testing (12 Nov 2020 to 05 Oct 2021)			Point-of-care STI testing (23 Aug 2019 to 11 Nov 2020)			
	N	**column %**	**N**	**column %**	**row %**	**N**	**column %**	**row %**	***P***
Timing of STI treatment									
Treated on different day as diagnosis	140	42	109	72	73	31	17	27	**<0.001**
Treated on same day as diagnosis	143	43	0	0	0	143	79	100	
Not treated	51	15	43	28	79	8	4	21	
Median (IQR) days to STI test result	0	(0–24)	26	(18–33)		0	(0–0)		
Mean (SD) days to STI test result	12	(15)	26	(11)		0	(0–0)		
Median (IQR) days to STI treatment	0	(0–18)	23	(11–49)		0	(0–0)		
Mean (SD) days to STI treatment *	16	33	38	(43)		3	(12)		
Sexually active in pregnancy	1161	97	534	97	46	627	97	54	0.69
Used condom at last sex #	362	31	162	30	45	200	32	55	0.56
Experienced intimate partner violence in last 12 months	147	12	58	11	39	89	14	61	0.09
Partner HIV status in past 12 months									
Known living without HIV	823	69	370	68	45	453	70	55	0.18
Known living with HIV	20	2	13	2	65	7	1	35	
Don’t know/ No partner	351	29	165	30	47	186	29	53	
Perceived risk of HIV acquisition									
No chance	649	54	277	51	43	372	58	57	**0.01**
Low chance	411	34	195	36	47	216	33	53	
High chance	134	11	76	14	57	58	9	43	

†PrEP initiation was confirmed at one-month follow-up visit among those who initiated PrEP at baseline

††Only women who underwent point-of-care STI testing were tested for *Trichomonas vaginalis*,

*among women who were diagnosed with an STI and returned for treatment,

#among women in a sexual relationship in past 3 months, Bold p<0.05, STI = sexually transmitted infection, CT = *Chlamydia trachomatis,* NG = *Neisseria gonorrhoeae*, TV = *Trichomonas vaginalis*

Table 2.

Correlates of pre-exposure prophylaxis initiation at baseline among pregnant women in antenatal care (n=1194) in Cape Town, South Africa

	Univariable model			Multivariable model		
	Odds ratio	**95% CI**	***P***	**Odds ratio**	**95% CI**	***P***
STI testing method						
Laboratory test	Ref		-	Ref		-
Point-of-care test	2.07	(1.50–2.84)	**<0.01**	2.07	(1.47–2.91)	**<0.01**
Maternal age ≥24 years	1.34	(0.97–1.84)	0.07	1.15	(0.72–1.81)	0.56
Employed	1.07	(0.77–1.49)	0.67	1.11	(0.77–1.60)	0.58
Multigravida	1.52	(1.11–2.08)	**0.01**	1.68	(1.08–2.62)	**0.02**
Cohabiting with partner	0.97	(0.70–1.35)	0.87	0.81	(0.56–1.17)	0.26
Gestational age >20 weeks	1.00	(0.98–1.01)	0.52	1.00	(0.98–1.02)	0.95
STI diagnosis (CT and/or NG)	1.05	(0.75–1.48)	0.77	1.11	(0.76–1.61)	0.60
Perceived risk of HIV acquisition at baseline						
No chance	Ref		-	Ref		-
Low chance	0.81	(0.58–1.12)	0.20	0.78	(0.55–1.10)	0.16
High chance	1.19	(0.71–2.02)	0.50	0.98	(0.56–1.71)	0.94
Experienced intimate partner violence in last 12 months	1.63	(0.95–2.79)	0.07	1.65	(0.93–2.94)	0.09

STI = sexually transmitted infection, CT = *Chlamydia trachomatis,* NG = *Neisseria gonorrhoeae*

Table 3.

Correlates of pre-exposure prophylaxis continuation at 3 months among pregnant and postpartum women (n=940) in antenatal care in Cape Town, South Africa

	Univariable model			Multivariable model		
	Odds ratio	**95% CI**	***P***	**Odds ratio**	**95% CI**	***P***
STI testing method at baseline						
Laboratory test	Ref		-	Ref		-
Point-of-care test	0.64	(0.49–0.84)	**0.00**	0.65	(0.49–0.85)	**0.00**
Maternal age ≥24 years	1.06	(0.80–1.39)	0.70	0.93	(0.64–1.34)	0.70
Employed	0.73	(0.55–0.96)	**0.02**	0.63	(0.47–0.84)	**0.00**
Multigravida	1.26	(0.96–1.66)	0.10	1.19	(0.83–1.69)	0.34
Cohabiting with partner	0.94	(0.72–1.23)	0.67	0.79	(0.59–1.07)	0.13
Gestational age > 20 weeks	0.98	(0.96–0.99)	**0.00**	0.98	(0.96–0.99)	**0.00**
STI diagnosis (CT and/or NG)	0.93	(0.70–1.23)	0.60	0.90	(0.67–1.21)	0.49
Perceived risk of HIV acquisition at baseline						
No chance	Ref		-	Ref		-
Low chance	0.97	(0.73–1.29)	0.85	0.94	(0.70–1.26)	0.68
High chance	1.75	(1.13–2.71)	**0.01**	1.70	(1.08–2.68)	**0.02**
Experienced intimate partner violence in last 12 months	1.52	(1.02–2.28)	**0.04**	1.35	(0.89–2.05)	0.16

STI = sexually transmitted infection, CT = *Chlamydia trachomatis,* NG = *Neisseria gonorrhoeae*