

## Determinants of PrEP uptake, intention and awareness in the Netherlands: A socio-spatial analysis

Authors: Haoyi Wang<sup>1</sup>, Oladipupo Shobowale<sup>1</sup>, Chantal den Daas<sup>2</sup>, Eline Op de Coul<sup>3</sup>, Bouko Bakker<sup>4</sup>, Aryanti Radyowijati<sup>5</sup>, Koenraad Vermey<sup>6</sup>, Arjan van Bijnen<sup>6</sup>, Wim Zuilhof<sup>6</sup>, Kai J. Jonas<sup>1\*</sup>

### Affiliation:

1 Department of Work and Social Psychology, Maastricht University, Maastricht, the Netherlands

2 Health Psychology, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, United Kingdom

3 Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, the Netherlands

4 Rutgers, Utrecht, the Netherlands

5 ResultsinHealth, Leiderdorp, the Netherlands

6 Soa Aids Netherlands, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

### ORCID ID:

HW: [0000-0002-1844-7156](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1844-7156)

OS: [0000-0002-3371-4515](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3371-4515)

EoC: [0000-0002-8263-9187](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8263-9187)

CdD: [0000-0003-0955-3691](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0955-3691)

KJJ: [0000-0001-6607-1993](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6607-1993)

Correspondence to: Kai J Jonas

Department of Work and Social Psychology, Maastricht University, Maastricht, 6200ER, the Netherlands

Phone: +31 43 38 84068

Email: [kai.jonas@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:kai.jonas@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

## Declarations

Funding: No funding was received for conducting this study.

Conflicts of interest: The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Ethics approval: Ethical approval was obtained from the Observational Research Ethics Committee at the LSHTM (review reference 14421/RR/8805).

Consent to participate: Not applicable

Consent for publication: Not applicable

Availability of data and material: Data are available upon request.

Code availability: Not applicable

### Authors' contribution

All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were performed by [Kai J Jonas], and [Haoyi Wang]. The first draft of the manuscript was written by [Haoyi Wang] and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Abstract

PrEP uptake in the Netherlands is growing but remains at suboptimal levels. Hence, the analysis of hurdles is paramount. Given the initial focus of PrEP provision among men-who-have-sex-with-men (MSM) via a demonstration project that was launched in June 2015, AmPrEP in Amsterdam, and pharmacies in the main urban areas (so called “Randstad”, entailing Amsterdam, Utrecht, Leiden, The Hague and Rotterdam), investigating regional differences is necessary. This study seeks to unravel regional differences jointly with psychosocial determinants of PrEP uptake. This cross-sectional study included 3,232 HIV-negative Dutch MSM recruited via the EMIS survey in late 2017. Prevalence and standardized prevalence ratio (SPR) of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake were measured on a regional level (Randstad vs. the rest of the country). Multilevel logistic modelling was conducted to identify the association of PrEP uptake with PrEP awareness and intention, sociodemographic, psycho-social determinants, and random effects from regional differences. MSM from the Randstad used more PrEP (SPR=1.4 vs. 0.7) compared to the rest of the country, but there were minor differences for awareness and intention. The regional distinction was estimated to explain 4.6% of the PrEP use variance. We observed a greater influence from PrEP intention (OR=4.5, 95%CI 2.0-10.1), while there was limited influence from the awareness of PrEP (OR=0.4, 95%CI 0.04-4.4). Lower education (OR=0.4, 95%CI 0.2-0.9) was negatively associated with PrEP uptake, however, no significant difference was found between middle and high education (OR=1.2, 95%CI 0.7-2.0). We showed that regional differences – MSM in non-urban regions – and other psycho-social determinants account for lower PrEP uptake. Based on these findings, more fine-tuned PrEP access with a focus on non-urban regions can be implemented, and tailored campaigns increasing intention/use can be conducted among target populations.

Key words: MSM, PrEP use/uptake, socio-spatial analysis, HIV prevention

## Introduction

While new HIV infections are declining overall in the Netherlands, HIV transmission remains a major health threat among men having sex with men (MSM) (1). As a biomedical intervention and part of comprehensive prevention measures, pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) is highly effective in preventing HIV-negative MSM from acquiring HIV (2-6), and is estimated to be cost-effective in the Netherlands over a 30-year time frame (7). In response, PrEP has been formally introduced in Europe in 2016, and was subsequently included in the Dutch national delivery plan in September 2019 through the sexual health clinics of the Public Health Services (GGD) (1, 8-10). It is estimated that around 10,000 MSM meet the eligibility criteria for PrEP in the Netherlands (4). Yet, PrEP uptake remains suboptimal in many countries (11), which underlines the need for better tailored PrEP provision. To further promote PrEP uptake, an improved quality of the epidemiologic surveillance of current PrEP uptake and intention among MSM could better inform the national and local PrEP programming, including allocation and delivery. This paper seeks to provide such evidence by means of suggesting a socio-spatial analysis investigating regional differences in conjunction with individual-level determinants of PrEP uptake among MSM, in the sample context of the Netherlands.

### Estimating PrEP awareness, intention and PrEP uptake

To tailor PrEP interventions adequately, data on PrEP awareness, intention, and uptake is necessary to determine subpopulations or regions of interest. In most countries, there is no centralized, comprehensive data available that allows to determine actual PrEP use, one exception being countries which make pharmacy data publicly available, for example France (12). Hence, PrEP use data is often based on self-report only, or actual use data is split up across a number of registries and stored at different data aggregation levels which makes it

impossible to determine sub-populations or regions that require special attention to close the PrEP uptake gap.

To stay within the Dutch example, delivering PrEP remains challenging (13), especially when PrEP care is offered by decentralized healthcare providers (the 25 GGDs in the Netherlands), by GPs and by private clinics across the country. The 8,500 slots for PrEP users to be supplied by the GGDs are considered to be more or less taken, but there is little information available about PrEP users accessing PrEP via their GPs or private clinics (14). Thus, PrEP self-reported uptake data has to be complemented by awareness and intention data, too.

To date, PrEP intention among MSM data has been mostly gathered among MSM residing in Amsterdam (8, 15-17). Cross-sectional data from these Amsterdam-based studies revealed that PrEP intention among MSM increased from 13% (high intention to use) during the initial assessment in 2013 (15) to a higher proportion of definite intention of almost 40% in 2016 (8). To corroborate these findings, a significant increasing trend of informal PrEP uptake among Dutch MSM residing in Amsterdam from 2015 to 2017 was also observed (18, 19). While these temporal trends can provide a good picture of PrEP use among MSM in Amsterdam over time, they are also a glaring reminder of the missing data and information from other cities and regions in the Netherlands.

Hence, geo-spatial data on differences in PrEP awareness, intention and uptake across the Netherlands has the potential to complement the epidemiologic trend of PrEP uptake by providing a more comprehensive perspective. The spatial distribution of current PrEP awareness, intention and uptake can be useful to evaluate the national programme and help to tailor local PrEP delivery in order to prioritise where PrEP implementation should be further strengthened (13, 20). In the Netherlands, the characterisation of the residence of an individual is usually divided into the main urban area (so called “Randstad”, entailing Amsterdam,

Utrecht, Leiden, The Hague and Rotterdam, more details in the Methods section) and the rest of country (ROC) (8, 16, 21). However, a geo-spatial distribution of the Randstad-ROC level of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake among MSM have yet to be analysed in the Netherlands, mainly due to the limited availability of PrEP prior to its structural introduction (1). However, available PrEP uptake data from national surveys, which aim to access and improve health among MSM, such as European MSM Internet Survey 2017 (EMIS-2017) can be employed to fill current data and knowledge gaps. Therefore, we sought to investigate how PrEP awareness, intention and uptake among MSM are distributed under this geo-spatial framework in the Netherlands.

Furthermore, it is important to jointly understand psycho-social facilitators and hurdles of PrEP uptake together with spatial trends to unravel co-variation. So far, in the Global North, studies have mostly examined the individual-level determinants of PrEP uptake such as HIV transmission risk, prior STI diagnoses, sexualized substance use (chemsex) and sociodemographic factors, such as age, race/ethnicity, education, employment status and income (8, 20, 22-24). However, to our knowledge, no attention has been given to investigating these determinants jointly with the spatial distribution of PrEP uptake among MSM, even though both spatial and socio-ecological determinants may influence PrEP uptake trends. We thus sought to explore whether these individual determinants of PrEP uptake and the spatial variation of PrEP uptake can provide a deeper understanding of PrEP uptake when combined.

To gain insights on the spatial trend of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake in the Netherlands, we aimed to conduct a socio-spatial analysis using data collected by EMIS-2017. Specifically, we sought to investigate regional differences in conjunction with individual-level determinants of PrEP uptake under a socio-spatial framework.

## Methodology

### Study population and study design

This study has a cross-sectional design. All men in this study were originally recruited between 19<sup>th</sup> October 2017 and 30<sup>th</sup> January 2018 via the European MSM Internet Survey (EMIS-2017, [www.emis2017.eu](http://www.emis2017.eu)). EMIS-2017 was an anonymous, self-administered, and cross-sectional online survey conducted across Europe to inform interventions for MSM who are highly affected by infections with HIV and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs) (25). Ethical approval for this survey was obtained from the Observational Research Ethics Committee at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (review reference 14421/RR/8805). We used data from Netherlands-based respondents from EMIS-2017 (participation eligibility and further details about EMIS-2017 survey can be found in the published EMIS-2017's design and methods report (25)). In our analysis, we only included data from respondents indicated they were living in the Netherlands and were living without HIV at the time of data collection.

### Study settings and measures

All measures were self-reported. All men were assigned to geo-regions in the Netherlands, in this study the Randstad and the ROC, based on the area of residence as identified by the postal code provided within the survey. The Randstad entails the agglomeration of cities in the West of the Netherlands, in particular Amsterdam, Utrecht, Leiden, The Hague and Rotterdam. As the economic and political centre of the Netherlands, the Randstad accounts for approximately 50% of the national population and the majority of the newly-diagnosed HIV infections (1). The remainder of postcode regions were coded together, and referred to as Rest of the Country (ROC).

## Outcomes and Covariates

In the descriptive analysis, the outcome variables were PrEP awareness, PrEP intention, and PrEP uptake. We dichotomised these variables into “yes”/”no”. To take potential influence from sociodemographic determinants into account, age in 10-year-bands (eight groups in total, see Appendix Table S3), education level (categorised as low, median and high), employment status ((self-)employed, unemployed, student and retired) and income status (low, median and high) were used as covariates to build the standardisation matrix (for more details see Section Descriptive analysis).

In the multilevel modelling analysis, PrEP uptake (yes/no) was the only outcome variable. Covariates were PrEP awareness (yes/no), PrEP intention (yes/no), age in years, education level, employment status, income status, sexual orientation (homosexual/bisexual and straight or other), outness (non-disclosed, low-partially disclosed, high-partially disclosed and fully), recency of having anal sex with another man, safe-sex efficacy (decisions to have safe sex and decisions to reject sex), PrEP knowledge, HIV knowledge, depression/anxiety level (PHQ-4) (26), alcohol dependency (CAGE-4) (27), unprotected anal sex (UAI) with non-steady partner (yes/no), UAI with steady-partner (yes/no), UAI with non-steady partner living with HIV (yes/no), STI status (yes/no), transactional sex recency ( never, ever but more than 12 months ago, and ever and recent), injecting drug use (IDU, yes/no), and chemsex recency. See Appendix S1 table for more details.

## Data analysis

### Descriptive analysis

We first estimated and compared the crude prevalence and standardised prevalence ratio (SPR) of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake between the Randstad and ROC. We used the Wilson score interval method to estimate the 95% confidence intervals (95%CI). The SPR of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake in this study were standardised by the sociodemographic

variables' matrix (participant's 10-year age group (eight groups), employment status (four groups), income status (three groups), and education level (three groups), Appendix Table S3) in a total of 288 ( $=8*4*3*3$ ) strata with an indirect standardisation approach:

$$SPR_i = Y_i/E_i$$

$$E_i = r^{(s)}n^{(i)},$$

Where  $r^{(s)}$  is the overall prevalence in all regions, and  $n^{(i)}$  presents the study sample size of region  $i$ . This allows us to compare the risk-levels in different regions that if region  $i$  has higher ( $SPR >1$ ), equal ( $SPR=1$ ) or lower ( $SPR <1$ ) risk than the overall prevalence in the total study population.

To account for the Dutch PrEP eligibility criteria, we conducted a sensitivity analysis which only included men who met the Dutch PrEP eligibility criteria: 1) men who were not always using condoms during anal intercourse with both steady/non-steady partners; 2) men who have a relationship with a partner living with HIV; 3) men who had been diagnosed any type of STIs (syphilis, chlamydia or gonorrhoea) or had ever had transactional sex or ever reported injection drug use.

### Multi-level analysis

Under the assumption that there would be an influence of region of residence (Randstad and ROC) on PrEP uptake, a generalised logistic mixed modelling analysis was conducted to investigate both the variation between regions and the sociodemographic, behavioural, and psycho-social determinants of this variation (28). Accordingly, we considered two levels – the Dutch HIV-negative MSM included in this study at level 1 nested within the two geo-regions at level 2, for a generalized logistic mixed model. In the multi-level analysis, we included those men who did not meet the eligibility criteria in the multi-level analysis, as the eligibility criteria were reflected by the included covariates.

In the multi-level models, we first fitted a null two-level model with only random intercept to ascertain the variance between geo-regions. Next, we added all explanatory variables included in this study to the two-level model with only random intercept to identify determinants. A backward selection approach was applied to select explanatory variables. The Akaike information criterion (AIC) was used to assess the goodness of fit of models. Associations were represented by odds ratios (OR) with 95% CIs. We used marginal  $R^2$  to assess the variance of the fixed effects. Additionally, conditional  $R^2$  was applied to estimate the variance taking both the fixed and the random effects into account. Interclass-correlation (ICC) was calculated for the final model to estimate the influence from the geo-regions. All analyses were conducted with R software (version R 4.0.4 GUI 1.70).

## Results

### Study population characteristics

EMIS recruited 3,851 MSM in the Netherlands. We excluded 619 individuals living with HIV (PLHIV, 16.1%) and included 3,232 men who were HIV negative in our study (for the sensitivity analysis accounting for the Dutch PrEP eligibility criteria, 2,424 men were included). Among these men, 35.6% (1,150 of 3,232) were living in the Randstad region in the Netherlands, and 64.4% (2,082 of 3,232) were residents from the ROC. The median age of these respondents was 43 (range 16-87). Overall, 63.2% (2,044 of 3,232) of the respondents had at least an HBO degree (equivalent to college education), while only 12.9% (418 of 3,232) of these men did not complete high school. In terms of financial situation, 67.6% (2,184 of 3,232) of the respondents regarded themselves as having a comfortable/very comfortable life based on their income, compared to only 8.3% (269 of 3,232) who were struggling to make due with their income. The majority (74.4%) was employed, ten percent of the participants were students and six percent being retired. Information on other participant characteristics by

geo-regions can be found in Table 1. Detailed age-stratified distributions of the education level, income status and employment status can be found in Appendix Table S3.

**Table 1. Participant characteristics by geo-regions**

Variables	Randstad		ROC		Overall	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age*	43	16 - 80	43	16 - 87	43	16 - 87
Education level						
High	820	71.3	1224	58.8	2044	63.2
Median	220	19.1	550	26.4	770	23.8
Low	110	9.6	308	14.8	418	12.9
Employment status						
Employed	908	79.2	1495	72.0	2403	74.6
Retired	62	5.4	133	6.4	195	6.1
Student	94	8.2	225	10.8	319	9.9
Unemployed	83	7.2	222	10.7	305	9.5
Income status						
High	814	70.8	1370	65.8	2184	67.6
Median	238	20.7	541	26.0	269	8.3
Low	98	8.5	171	8.3	779	24.1
Sexual identity						
Gay	1021	88.8	1685	80.9	2706	83.7
Bisexual	83	7.2	300	14.4	383	11.9
Straight or other	46	4.0	97	4.7	143	4.4
Outness						
All or almost all	862	75.0	1362	65.4	2224	68.8
More than half	136	11.8	214	10.3	350	10.8
Few or less than half	145	12.6	485	23.3	630	19.5
None	7	0.6	21	1.0	28	0.9
Gay intercourse recency						
Within 12 months	958	83.3	1674	80.4	2632	81.4
Never or more than 12 months	192	16.7	408	19.6	600	18.6
Decision to have safe sex <sup>#</sup>	5	NA	4	NA	4	NA
Decision to reject sex <sup>#</sup>	4	NA	5	NA	4	NA
PrEP knowledge <sup>#</sup>	2	NA	0	NA	0	NA
HIV knowledge <sup>#</sup>	3	NA	3	NA	3	NA
PHQ-4 (Depression/anxiety level) <sup>#</sup>	1	NA	1	NA	1	NA
CAGE-4 (Alcohol dependency) <sup>#</sup>	1	NA	1	NA	1	NA
Unprotected anal sex with non-steady partner						
Yes	379	33.0	633	30.4	1012	31.3
No	771	67.0	1449	69.6	2220	68.7

Unprotected anal sex with steady partner							
Yes	143	12.4	272	13.1	415	12.8	
No	1007	87.6	1810	86.9	2817	87.2	
Unprotected anal sex with non-steady partner living with HIV							
Yes	129	28.2	164	19.8	293	22.8	
No	329	71.8	665	80.2	994	77.2	
STI status							
Ever	692	60.2	1046	50.2	1738	53.8	
Never	458	39.8	1036	49.8	1494	46.2	
Transactional sex recency							
Ever, within 12 months	126	11.0	225	10.8	351	10.9	
Ever, more than 12 months	1012	88.0	1805	86.7	2817	87.1	
Never	12	1.0	52	2.5	64	2.0	
Injection drug using							
Ever	59	5.1	110	5.3	169	5.2	
Never	1091	94.9	1972	94.7	3063	94.8	
Chemsex recency <sup>#</sup>	8	NA	8	NA	8	NA	

Notes: Self-efficacy\_1 = The sex I have is always as safe as I want it to be. Self-efficacy\_2 = I find it easy to say "no" to sex I don't want. \*: value presented in median and range. #: values presented in mode. ROC=rest of the country. NA=not applicable.

## Prevalence and standardised prevalence ratio of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake

To estimate the crude prevalence and SPR of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake among the respondents, Table 2 describes the distributions in the Randstad and the ROC in the Netherlands. Almost eight percent of the MSM in the Randstad region used PrEP (7.9%, 95%CI 6.5-9.6), which was more than twice as high as in the rest of the Netherlands (3.1%, 95%CI 2.4-3.9). After standardising by 10-year age bands, education level, income status and employment status, the SPR of MSM in the Randstad was estimated to be much higher than the ROC (SPR 1.4 vs. 0.7).

More than 90% of the MSM living in the Randstad were aware of PrEP (90.1%, 95%CI 89.0%-92.4%) compared to 78% in the ROC (78.1%, 95%CI 76.2%-79.8%). However, after standardising, the SPR of PrEP awareness among MSM living in the Randstad was similar to the ROC (SPR 1.1 vs. 0.9). Similar proportions of MSM intended to use PrEP in both regions (Randstad: 46.3%, 95%CI 43.4%-49.2%, SPR=1.02; ROC: 45.4%, 95%CI 43.3%-47.6%, SPR=0.94).

In the sensitivity analysis, after excluding men who did not meet the Dutch PrEP eligibility criteria, we observed a same overall trend but slightly higher prevalence and SPR of PrEP awareness, intention, and uptake in the Randstad (see Appendix S2 table for full details).

**Table 2. Estimated prevalence and standardised prevalence ratio, Randstad vs. the rest of the country (ROC), 2017**

Region	PrEP uptake		PrEP awareness		PrEP intention	
	Prevalence (%; 95%CI)	SPR*	Prevalence (%; 95%CI)	SPR*	Prevalence (%; 95%CI)	SPR*
<b>Randstad</b>	7.91 (6.49 - 9.62)	1.41	90.84 (89.02 - 92.38)	1.11	46.26 (43.4 - 49.15)	1.02
<b>ROC</b>	3.07 (2.41 - 3.91)	0.71	78.08 (76.23 - 79.83)	0.94	45.44 (43.31 - 47.58)	0.94

Note: Data are crude prevalence (95% confidence interval). Data are not age/education level/income status/employment status- standardised.

\* Data are age/education level/income status/employment status- standardised. ROC=rest of the country.

## Multi-level analysis

### Between region variances

To investigate the impact of place of residence, we conducted multi-level analyses. Table 3 shows the full model and the final model fitted with generalised logistic mixed modelling. The ICC of level 2 random effect from the final model, compared to the full model, decreased to 0.046 ( $\tau_{00} = 0.15$ ,  $\sigma^2 = 3.29$ ) from 0.054, which indicates that 4.6% of the residual variation in the PrEP uptake among HIV-negative MSM in the Netherlands can be attributed to the unobserved regional characteristics between the Randstad and the ROC. This depicts a small but non-ignorable variance between Randstad region and the rest of the country. A detailed performance check of the final model can be found in Appendix figure S4.

### Random intercept model

To investigate the determinants of PrEP uptake, Table 3 presents the association between explanatory variables and PrEP uptake. The AIC decreased from 569.4 to 568.6 from the full model to the final model. Both marginal  $R^2$  and conditional  $R^2$  decreased from the full model to the final model. In the final model, greater influence from PrEP intention (OR=4.5, 95% CI 2.0-10.1) was estimated compared to the limited influence from the awareness of PrEP (OR=0.4, 95% CI 0.04-4.4).

Among behavioural factors, having unprotected anal sex (UAI) with non-steady partners (OR=2.3, 95% CI 1.1-4.8), having UAI with HIV positive partners (OR=1.89, 95% CI 1.2 to 3.0), having ever been diagnosed with an STI (OR=2.1, 95% CI 1.1 to 3.9), and injecting drugs (OR=2.4, 95% CI 1.2-4.5) were estimated to have positive associations with PrEP uptake. Compared to those who bought/sold sex within the last 12 months, men who had transactional sex more than 12 months ago showed a lower OR of 0.47 (95% CI 0.25-0.90), while no significant difference was detected between men who had recent transactional sex and those who never have transactional sex (OR=0, 95% CI 0-Inf).

Psycho-social factors including decision to have safe sex (OR=1.3, 95%CI 1.0-1.6), and having sufficient PrEP knowledge (OR=7.0, 95%CI 4.1-12.0) were found to be significantly associated with higher odds of PrEP uptake. However, decision to reject sex (OR=0.76, 95%CI 0.56-1.03), HIV knowledge (OR=1.11, 95%CI 0.60-2.04), PHQ-4 (depression/anxiety level, OR=1.09, 95%CI 0.79-1.51) and CAGE-4 (alcohol dependency, OR=1.33, 95%CI 0.67-2.63) were not significantly associated with PrEP uptake.

It is worth mentioning that, among sociodemographic factors, only low education (OR=0.4, 95%CI 0.2-0.9) was found to be negatively associated with PrEP use. No significant difference was found between median and high education (OR=1.2, 95%CI 0.7-2.0). Age, employment status and perceived financial status were found to be not relevant to explain the PrEP uptake in our sample (Full model, Table 3).

**Table 3 Generalised logistic mixed models: variation between regions and the determinants of PrEP uptake, a comparison between the full model and the final model**

Predictors	Full model PrEP uptake (AIC = 569.4)			Final model PrEP uptake (AIC = 568.6)		
	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value
(Intercept)	0	0.00 – Inf	0.982	0	0.00 – 0.00	<0.001
PrEP awareness [Yes]	0.35	0.03 – 3.95	0.396	0.4	0.04 – 4.06	0.437
PrEP intention [Yes]	4.61	1.97 – 10.82	<0.001	4.46	1.95 – 10.20	<0.001
Age in years	1	0.98 – 1.03	0.727			
Sexuality [Bisexual]	0.81	0.23 – 2.84	0.739			
Sexuality [Straight or others]	0.5	0.05 – 5.52	0.574			
Outness [Few or less than half]	0.52	0.22 – 1.21	0.127			
Outness [More than half]	1.44	0.70 – 2.94	0.318			
Outness [None]	0	0.00 – Inf	0.993			
Recent Intercourse sex	1288782.08	0.00 – Inf	0.989			
Decision to have safe sex	1.31	1.02 – 1.69	0.038	1.29	1.03 – 1.61	0.028
Decision to reject sex	0.76	0.56 – 1.03	0.073			
PrEP knowledge	7.66	4.38 – 13.37	<0.001	7.34	4.28 – 12.56	<0.001
HIV knowledge	1.11	0.60 – 2.04	0.746			
PHQ-4 (Depression/ Anxiety status)	1.09	0.79 – 1.51	0.587			
CAGE-4 (Alcohol dependency)	1.33	0.67 – 2.63	0.412			
Unprotected anal sex with non-steady partner	1.79	0.85 – 3.80	0.128	2.3	1.11 – 4.77	0.024
Unprotected anal sex with steady partner	1.28	0.76 – 2.16	0.346			
Unprotected anal sex with non-steady partner living with HIV	2.16	1.32 – 3.54	0.002	1.97	1.26 – 3.10	0.003
STI status	1.97	1.02 – 3.80	0.042	2.14	1.15 – 3.98	0.016
Transactional sex [Ever but longer than 12 months]	0.47	0.25 – 0.90	0.022	0.52	0.29 – 0.96	0.036
Transactional sex [Never]	0	0.00 – Inf	0.999	0	0.00 – Inf	0.993
Injection drug using	2.11	1.03 – 4.33	0.042	2.28	1.20 – 4.34	0.012
Chemsex recency	0.98	0.89 – 1.08	0.724			
Education level [Low]	0.4	0.16 – 0.99	0.046	0.4	0.17 – 0.92	0.03
Education level [Median]	1.32	0.79 – 2.19	0.29	1.24	0.76 – 2.03	0.392
Income status [Low]	0.75	0.29 – 1.95	0.557			
Income status [Median]	0.8	0.45 – 1.40	0.429			
Employment status [Retired]	2.06	0.61 – 6.88	0.242			
Employment status [Student]	0.73	0.25 – 2.14	0.56			

Employment status			
[Unemployed]	1.39	0.58 – 3.32	0.459
Random Effects			
$\sigma^2$	3.29		3.29
$\tau_{00}$	0.18 <sub>randstad</sub>		0.15 <sub>randstad</sub>
ICC	0.054		0.046
Marginal R <sup>2</sup> / Conditional R <sup>2</sup>	0.820 / 0.829		0.706 / 0.719

Note: AIC = Akaike information criterion. OR = odds ratio. 95% CI = 95% confident intervals.

## Discussion

Using data collected from MSM in the EMIS-2017 survey, we explored and analysed the spatial distribution of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake in the Netherlands, based on a socio-spatial structure of the main urban area (Randstad) vs. the rest of the country (ROC). Our analysis revealed heterogeneity in the spatial distribution of PrEP uptake in the Netherlands.

In our estimations of prevalence and SPR of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake, we observed a high prevalence of the awareness and intention of PrEP but a much lower uptake of PrEP among MSM (around 8% in the Randstad and 3% in the ROC) in the Netherlands prior to the structural, healthcare-provider-based availability of PrEP (Table 2). Our results confirm that there was a gap to bridge to reach the cost-effectiveness requirements of 10% as set Nichols et al. (7), even though our estimation in the sensitivity analysis indicated a PrEP uptake of more than 10% among those men who met the Dutch PrEP eligibility criteria in the Randstad (10.1%, see Appendix S2 table).

Additionally, we found that despite the proportion of the awareness and intention of PrEP were similar between the Randstad region and the ROC in the Netherlands, the prevalence of PrEP uptake between the Randstad region and the ROC differed by almost two times. In the Randstad vs ROC-level analysis, our generalised logistic models confirmed the observation that a small but non-ignorable proportion of variance of PrEP uptake among MSM in the Netherlands can be explained by whether the residence place is in the Randstad area or not. One possible reason may be the unequal geographic coverage of PrEP provision due to a lack of access sites (13, 29) in the ROC compared to the Randstad region. To explain this finding, it is noteworthy to mention that besides individual access via a GP (at much higher costs) PrEP was only available via the Amsterdam PrEP (AMPrEP) demonstration project or some activist groups (30) prior to its structural introduction via STI clinics (1, 31). Another possible reason to explain this difference may be the variance in believes/attitudes about PrEP

among STI/HIV professionals (32) in the Randstad region and the ROC (21). Also, some psycho-social and sociodemographic determinants may also explain our findings. Determinants such as low education level, insufficient PrEP knowledge, and injection drug use were higher in the ROC compared to the Randstad (Table 1). These may suggest psycho-social/sociodemographic barriers for PrEP access in the ROC compared to the Randstad. We thus call for public health efforts and further interventions to be allocated to the ROC which focus on these barriers of PrEP access to better tailor localised HIV prevention.

We further explored the determinants of PrEP uptake in the Netherlands in the socio-spatial structure context. We found that compared to being aware of PrEP, the intention may facilitate the PrEP uptake in the Netherlands, which may be explained by the Health belief model (33). In addition, similar to the determinants of PrEP interest in the Netherlands reported by van Dijk et al., we observed PrEP knowledge and UAI as determinants (8). However, instead of engaging in chemsex (8), the ever-injecting drug use is significantly associated with PrEP uptake. In addition, both Coyer et al. and van Dijk et al. reported that PrEP users did not differ from non-PrEP users in terms of socio-demographic characteristics (16, 18). Our results confirmed their findings except for participants with low education, who had a lower chance of PrEP uptake compared to MSM who has a high education in our data. One possible reason may be the unequal economic environment, which shapes the distribution of resources and barriers within a society (34), between the Randstad and the ROC.

### Strengths and Limitations

One major strength of this study was the socio-spatial analysis of PrEP uptake which combines both Randstad and the ROC into the inferential process for the first time. It not only offers national and local PrEP implementation teams with a spatial distribution, but also examines the determinants of PrEP uptake while considering spatial heterogeneity. Our methodology can thus be employed in the future of PrEP surveillance when comparing determinants between

different geo-regions. We thus further expect our results will retain their relevance in the future and provide evidence for the future investigations of PrEP uptake in any context, also outside of the Netherlands. In addition, our sensitivity analysis on the with/without non-eligible men can be considered evidence for the role of the PrEP eligibility criteria, even though the differences between the analyses were minor in this sample context. Future studies thus should not ignore the influence of the PrEP eligibility when investigating the epidemiology of PrEP uptake.

There are a few of limitations in our study. One major limitation may be that our data is not devoid of biases, for example due to limited sampling contexts, above and beyond the self-report nature of the survey, this has been discussed in the previous EMIS methods paper (25). Another limitation may be the lack of data for our discussion of the acceptability of PrEP prescription among STI/HIV specialists. Given the fact that STI/HIV specialists from the Randstad region have a higher acceptability of PrEP (21) before the nationwide structural PrEP introduction, we hypothesized a possible association between the regional level of PrEP support among STI/HIV specialists and the PrEP uptake among MSM in the Netherlands. However, we cannot conclude this association, again, due to lack of data. Therefore, future studies should collect information on PrEP beliefs and attitudes from the STI/HIV specialists and integrate this information in modelling analyses. In addition, we only investigated the determinants of PrEP uptake through our generalised logistic mixed modelling analysis. The lack of modelling analysis of the determinants of PrEP awareness and PrEP intention may be another limitation. Our findings, especially the lower prevalence of PrEP intention than PrEP awareness for both the Randstad region and the ROC, suggested more studies are needed to explore strategies to increase the intention of PrEP from being aware of PrEP among MSM. More efforts are thus needed from the healthcare professionals to bridge the needs and intention from the PrEP promotion and delivery in the Netherlands. One major methodological limitation

in this study could be the lack of a concise spatial structure of geoinformation of the Randstad-ROC structure in the Netherlands. A more robust methodology, such as small area estimation analysis, thus cannot be conducted (35). The available level of geoinformation made a prior distribution assignment or honing in on other areal information impossible. Consequently, our spatial heterogeneity estimation for the Randstad vs. the ROC may thus be less robust. However, with the strength from the generalised logistic modelling, given the fact that we still succeeded to pick up the spatial variances, the message of unequal spatial distribution of PrEP uptake in the Netherlands remains valid. Hence, future studies should zoom in on a lower geographical level, such as GGD regional level, to investigate a more concise spatial distribution through a more comprehensive model such as Bayesian spatial modelling analysis. Another major methodological limitation may be the lack of data on the temporal dimension of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake. This may limit the scope of this study that we cannot conclude how the PrEP uptake change from a spatio-temporal perspective. We acknowledge that our data were collected prior to the structural introduction of PrEP in the Netherlands, but this factor is less relevant for the general applicability of the approach that we introduced here. Naturally, a replication with more recent data remains desirable. The spatial distribution of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake among MSM may thus change due to the effort of the PrEP promotion in the Netherlands through the GGDs (36). Therefore, future studies should take the temporal variance, especially data prior-/post-to the structural introduction, together with the spatial distribution of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake into account to offer a more dynamic epidemiologic picture.

## Conclusion

With the estimated differences between the Randstad region and the rest of the country in the Netherlands on PrEP uptake, together with the psycho-social determinants of PrEP uptake, results from this study can inform the current national PrEP program in the Netherlands to

evaluate the PrEP implementation and allocation, and to identify regions and populations that require attention to close the PrEP uptake gap in the Netherlands. Resources and attention should be allocated more towards the rest of the country compared to the Randstad to bridge the geographic gaps of PrEP awareness, intention and uptake among MSM.

## Reference

1. van Sighem A.I. WF, Boyd A., Smit C., Matser A., Reiss P. Monitoring Report 2020. Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Infection in the Netherlands. Amsterdam: Stichting HIV Monitoring, 2020. 2020 [Available from: <https://www.hiv-monitoring.nl/en/resources/monitoring-reports>.
2. McCormack S, Dunn DT, Desai M, Dolling DI, Gafos M, Gilson R, 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.
3. Grant RM, Lama JR, Anderson PL, McMahan V, Liu AY, Vargas L, et al. Preexposure Chemoprophylaxis for HIV Prevention in Men Who Have Sex with Men. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2010;363(27):2587-99.
4. Hoornenborg E, Krakower DS, Prins M, Mayer KH. Pre-exposure prophylaxis for MSM and transgender persons in early adopting countries. *AIDS (London, England)*. 2017;31(16):2179-91.
5. Hoornenborg E, Coyer L, Achterbergh RCA, Matser A, Schim van der Loeff MF, Boyd A, et al. Sexual behaviour and incidence of HIV and sexually transmitted infections among men who have sex with men using daily and event-driven pre-exposure prophylaxis in AMPREP: 2 year results from a demonstration study. *The lancet HIV*. 2019;6(7):e447-e55.
6. Grant RM, Anderson PL, McMahan V, Liu A, Amico KR, Mehrotra M, et al. Uptake of pre-exposure prophylaxis, sexual practices, and HIV incidence in men and transgender women who have sex with men: a cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2014;14(9):820-9.
7. Nichols BE, Boucher CAB, van der Valk M, Rijnders BJA, van de Vijver DAMC. Cost-effectiveness analysis of pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV-1 prevention in the Netherlands: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2016;16(12):1423-9.
8. van Dijk M, Duken SB, Delabre RM, Stranz R, Schlegel V, Rojas Castro D, et al. PrEP Interest Among Men Who Have Sex with Men in the Netherlands: Covariates and Differences Across Samples. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2020;49(6):2155-64.
9. GGD-Amsterdam. STI, HIV and sense - PrEP 2019 [Available from: <https://www.ggd.amsterdam.nl/english/sti-hiv-sense/prep/#:~:text=Dutch%20National%20programme%202019,are%20at%20risk%20for%20HIV>.
10. Jongen VW, Hoornenborg E, van den Elshout MAM, Boyd A, Zimmermann HML, Coyer L, et al. Adherence to event-driven HIV PrEP among men who have sex with men in Amsterdam, the Netherlands: analysis based on online diary data, 3-monthly questionnaires and intracellular TFV-DP. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. 2021;24(5):e25708.
11. ECDC. Pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention in Europe and Central Asia 2019 [Available from: [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/HIV-pre-exposure-prophylaxis-evidence-2019\\_0.pdf](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/HIV-pre-exposure-prophylaxis-evidence-2019_0.pdf).
12. EPI-PHARE. La spécialité Truvada® est une association à dose fixe de deux inhibiteurs de la transcriptase inverse du VIH, l'emtricitabine (analogue nucléosidique) et le ténofovir disoproxil fumarate (analogue nucléotidique) initialement indiquée chez l'adulte dans le traitement de l'infection par le VIH-1 en association avec d'autres antirétroviraux 2020 [Available from: <https://www.epi-phare.fr/rapports-detudes-et-publications/suivi-de-utilisation-de-truvada-ou-generiques-pour-une-prophylaxie-pre%20%80%90exposition-prep-au-vih/#:~:text=Depuis%202017%2C%20le%20suivi%20de,se%20poursuit%20et%20s'intensifie>.

13. Venter WDF. Pre-exposure Prophylaxis: The Delivery Challenge. *Frontiers in public health*. 2018;6:188-.
14. RIVM. PrEP 2021 [Available from: <https://www.rivm.nl/Soa-seksueel-overdraagbare-aandoening/prep>].
15. Bil JP, Davidovich U, van der Veldt WM, Prins M, de Vries HJC, Sonder GJB, et al. What do Dutch MSM think of preexposure prophylaxis to prevent HIV-infection? A cross-sectional study. *AIDS*. 2015;29(8).
16. van Dijk M, de Wit JBF, Guadamuz TE, Martinez JE, Jonas KJ. Slow Uptake of PrEP: Behavioral Predictors and the Influence of Price on PrEP Uptake Among MSM with a High Interest in PrEP. *AIDS Behav*. 2021;25(8):2382-90.
17. van Dijk M dWJ, Guadamuz T, Martinez JE, Jonas K. Quality of sex life and perceived sexual pleasure of PrEP users in the Netherlands 2020. 2020.
18. Coyer L, van Bilsen W, Bil J, Davidovich U, Hoornenborg E, Prins M, et al. Pre-exposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men in the Amsterdam Cohort Studies: Use, eligibility, and intention to use. *PLOS ONE*. 2018;13(10):e0205663.
19. Basten M, den Daas C, Heijne JCM, Boyd A, Davidovich U, Rozhnova G, et al. The Rhythm of Risk: Sexual Behaviour, PrEP Use and HIV Risk Perception Between 1999 and 2018 Among Men Who Have Sex with Men in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. *AIDS Behav*. 2020.
20. Brantley ML, Rebeiro PF, Pettit AC, Sanders A, Cooper L, McGoy S, et al. Temporal Trends and Sociodemographic Correlates of PrEP Uptake in Tennessee, 2017. *AIDS Behav*. 2019;23(Suppl 3):304-12.
21. Bil JP, Hoornenborg E, Prins M, Hogewoning A, Dias Goncalves Lima F, de Vries HJC, et al. The Acceptability of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis: Beliefs of Health-Care Professionals Working in Sexually Transmitted Infections Clinics and HIV Treatment Centers. *Front Public Health*. 2018;6:5.
22. Willie TC, Kershaw TS, Blackstock O, Galvao RW, Safon CB, Tekeste M, et al. Racial and ethnic differences in women's HIV risk and attitudes towards pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in the context of the substance use, violence, and depression syndemic. *AIDS Care*. 2021;33(2):219-28.
23. Holloway IW, Dougherty R, Gildner J, Beougher SC, Pulsipher C, Montoya JA, et al. Brief Report: PrEP Uptake, Adherence, and Discontinuation Among California YMSM Using Geosocial Networking Applications. *Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes (1999)*. 2017;74(1):15-20.
24. Bourne A, Alba B, Garner A, Spiteri G, Pharris A, Noori T. Use of, and likelihood of using, HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men in Europe and Central Asia: Findings from a 2017 large geosocial networking application survey. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*. 2019;95:sextrans-2018.
25. Weatherburn P, Hickson F, Reid DS, Marcus U, Schmidt AJ. European Men-Who-Have-Sex-With-Men Internet Survey (EMIS-2017): Design and Methods. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. 2020;17(4):543-57.
26. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB, Löwe B. An ultra-brief screening scale for anxiety and depression: the PHQ-4. *Psychosomatics*. 2009;50(6):613-21.
27. Shields AL, Caruso JC. A Reliability Induction and Reliability Generalization Study of the Cage Questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 2004;64(2):254-70.
28. Weinmayr G, Dreyhaupt J, Jaensch A, Forastiere F, Strachan DP. Multilevel regression modelling to investigate variation in disease prevalence across locations. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2016;46(1):336-47.

29. Sullivan PS, Siegler AJ. Getting pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) to the people: opportunities, challenges and emerging models of PrEP implementation. *Sexual Health*. 2018;15(6):522-7.
30. PrEPnu. Ik slik, slik jij? 2022 [Available from: <https://www.prepnu.nl/>].
31. Hoornenborg E, Achterbergh R, Loeff M, Davidovich U, van der Helm J, Hogewoning A, et al. Men who have sex with men more often chose daily than event-driven use of pre-exposure prophylaxis: Baseline analysis of a demonstration study in Amsterdam. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. 2018;21:e25105.
32. Pinto RM, Berringer KR, Melendez R, Mmeje O. Improving PrEP Implementation Through Multilevel Interventions: A Synthesis of the Literature. *AIDS Behav*. 2018;22(11):3681-91.
33. Champion VL, Skinner CS. The health belief model. *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice*. 2008;4:45-65.
34. Bauermeister JA, Eaton L, Andrzejewski J, Loveluck J, VanHemert W, Pingel ES. Where You Live Matters: Structural Correlates of HIV Risk Behavior Among Young Men Who Have Sex with Men in Metro Detroit. *AIDS Behav*. 2015;19(12):2358-69.
35. Wang H, den Daas C, Op de Coul E, Jonas KJ. MSM with HIV: Improving prevalence and risk estimates by a Bayesian small area estimation modelling approach for public health service areas in the Netherlands. 2022.
36. GGD-Amsterdam. National PrEP programme 2021 [Available from: <https://www.ggd.amsterdam.nl/english/sti-hiv-sense/prep/national-prep-program/>].