Determinants of loss to follow-up among preexposure prophylaxis users at a portuguese tertiary hospital



Authors: Magalhães S.¹; Lino S.¹; Pinto R.¹; Carlos M.¹; Cristóvão G.¹; Gonçalves A.C.¹; Caria J.¹; Almeida V.¹; Cruz C.¹; Leal Santos M.¹; Bento D.¹; Betkova S.¹; Garrote R.¹; Ramirez F.¹; Póvoas D.¹; Seixas D.¹; Cardoso O.¹; Manata M.J.¹; Maltez F.¹

¹Infectious Diseases Department, Hospital de Curry Cabral, Unidade Local de Saúde de São José, Lisboa, Portugal

Background

Pre-exposure prophylaxis approved in Portugal since June 2017, is a safe and effective tool to prevent HIV infection in high risk individuals [1]. Although PrEP prescription and distribution were approved outside hospital settings in December 2023, this has not yet become a reality in Portugal. This presents several barriers to its utilisation. Understanding the factors associated with loss to follow-up in PrEP users stands as fundamental to guide the development of strategies to enhance retention in PrEP care.

Materials and Methods

In this retrospective observational study, we reviewed the electronic medical records of all referenced individuals who started PrEP between **April 2018** and **May 2024** at an Infectious Diseases Department in a Portuguese tertiary hospital. Loss to follow-up was defined as not having had an office or virtual visit within 6 months prior to data collection.

Results



Loss to follow-up

Overall cumulative LTFU rate: 22.8%

Factors associated with higher risk of LTFU:

- Individuals of non-Portuguese origin
- Cisgender women
- Sex workers
- Individuals without a STI

Table 1: LTFU rates among different cohorts attending PrEPappointment (N = 1912)

	LTFU rate	
Country of birth	Portugal 14.7%	Non-Portugal 25.8%
Gender	Cisgender men 22.2%	Cisgender women 41.3%
Sex workers	No 21.5%	Yes 34.0%
STI diagnosis	Yes 16.6%	<mark>No</mark> 30.1%

Among those were lost to follow-up (N=436)

50 (11.5%) had appointments for STI screening/diagnosis

6 (1.4%) were awaiting a new PrEP appointment

5 (1.1%) acquired HIV infection

3 (0.7%) required **post-exposure prophylaxis**

Among those who maintained follow-up (N=1287)

> 9 (0.7%) acquired HIV infection

Conclusions

Our study is in line with the published evidence [2, 3, 4], indicating that PrEP retention is suboptimal, especially in migrants, sex workers and cisgender women, reinforcing the importance of adopting targeted strategies and community-based PREP care.

ABBREVIATIONS

PrEP: pre-exposure prophylaxis; LTFU: loss to follow-up; MSM: men who have sex with men; NGO: non-governmental organization; HA: hospital appointments; GPA: general practitioner appointments; STI: sexually transmitted infection

REFERENCES [1] McCormack S, Dunn DT, Desai M, et al. Pre-exposure prophylaxis to prevent the acquisition of HIV-1 infection (PROUD): effectiveness results from the pilot phase of a pragmatic open-label randomised trial. Lancet. 2016;387(10013):53-60. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00056-2 | [2] Mayer KH, Agwu A, Malebranche D. Barriers to the Wider Use of Pre-exposure Prophylaxis in the United States: A Narrative Review. Adv Ther. 2020;37(5):1778-1811. doi:10.1007/s12325-020-01295-0 | [3] Herns S, Panwala R, Pfeil A, et al. Predictors of PrEP retention in at risk patients seen at a HIV primary care clinic in San Diego. Int J STD AIDS. 2023;34(11):785-790. doi:10.1177/09564624231179276 | [4] Chan PA, Patel RR, Mena L, et al. Long-term retention in pre-exposure prophylaxis care among men who have sex with men and transgender women in the United States. J Int AIDS Soc. 2019;22(8):e25385. doi:10.1002/jia2.25385