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A comparative analysis of national HIV policies in six African countries with generalized epidemics

Kathryn Church,1 Francis Kiweewa,2 Aisha Dasgupta,3 Mary Mwangome,4 Edith Mpondaguta,5 Francesc Xavier Gómez-Olivé,6 Samuel Otí,7 Jim Todd,8 Alison Wringe,9 Eveline Geubbels,8 Amelia Crampin,8 Jessica Nakiyengi-Miiro,8 Chika Hayashi,10 Mutihoni Njage,11 Ryan G Wagner,12 Alex Riolexus Ario,13 Simon D Makombe,14 Owen Mugurungi15 & Basia Zaba16

Objective To compare national human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) policies influencing access to HIV testing and treatment services in six sub-Saharan African countries.

Methods We reviewed HIV policies as part of a multi-country study on adult mortality in sub-Saharan Africa. A policy extraction tool was developed and used to review national HIV policy documents and guidelines published in Kenya, Malawi, South Africa, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe between 2003 and 2013. Key informant interviews helped to fill gaps in findings. National policies were categorized according to whether they explicitly or implicitly adhered to 54 policy indicators, identified through literature and expert reviews. We also compared the national policies with World Health Organization (WHO) guidance.

Findings There was wide variation in policies between countries; each country was progressive in some areas and not in others. Malawi was particularly advanced in promoting rapid initiation of antiretroviral therapy. However, no country had a consistently enabling policy context expected to increase access to care and prevent attrition. Countries went beyond WHO guidance in certain areas and key informants reported that practice often surpassed policy.

Conclusion Evaluating the impact of policy differences on access to care and health outcomes among people living with HIV is challenging. Certain policies will exert more influence than others and official policies are not always implemented. Future research should assess the extent of policy implementation and link these findings with HIV outcomes.

Introduction

By the end of 2012, more than 7.5 million of the estimated 23.5 million people living with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) in Africa were receiving treatment, compared to only 50 000 people a decade before.1 The scale-up of treatment services in such a short period of time has been remarkable. Recent evidence suggests that HIV-attributable mortality has declined by more than 50% since antiretroviral therapy (ART) became available.2–4 Nonetheless, considerable concerns remain regarding high attrition rates throughout the continuum of care from HIV diagnosis, pre-ART care, timely initiation of ART and long-term retention in treatment.5 Various studies have observed substantial drop-out of people living with HIV across this care cascade. A recent pooled analysis of 37 studies in sub-Saharan Africa indicates that among those knowing their status, only 57% completed ART eligibility assessment, 66% of those eligible initiated ART and 65% of those initiating treatment were retained on ART.10

The network for analysing longitudinal population-based data on HIV in Africa (ALPHA) is investigating the extent of declines in HIV-related adult mortality attributable to treatment and the distribution of deaths at each stage of the diagnosis-to-treatment cascade.11–14 The network collects community-based data from 10 health and demographic surveillance sites in six countries with generalized epidemics – Kenya, Malawi, South Africa, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe. Table 1 identifies the ALPHA network sites and provides contextual information on the epidemic and treatment programme in each country.

To interpret site- and country-specific differences in mortality rates across the diagnosis-to-treatment cascade, we analysed national HIV policies. It is helpful for the agencies that define programme priorities and analyse differences in outcomes to understand the incentives and barriers to accessing – and remaining on – ART in different contexts. Our analysis focuses on the policy response to the HIV epidemic. We have not investigated the sociocultural barriers within communities that influence access to services in different sites.
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Table 1. Characteristics of the HIV epidemic in the six African countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Malawi</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>United Republic of Tanzania</th>
<th>Zimbabwe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic surveillance site(s)</td>
<td>Nairobi and Kisumu</td>
<td>Karonga</td>
<td>Agincourt and UmKhanyakude</td>
<td>Masaka and Rakai</td>
<td>Ifakara and Kisesa</td>
<td>Manicaland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult HIV prevalence in 2013</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult ART coverage in 2013 (%) (range)</td>
<td>42 (39–46)</td>
<td>51 (48–53)</td>
<td>42 (40–43)</td>
<td>40 (38–43)</td>
<td>41 (38–44)</td>
<td>51 (49–53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pmtct coverage in 2013 (%) (range)</td>
<td>63 (55–72)</td>
<td>79 (71–88)</td>
<td>90 (83–95)</td>
<td>75 (68–85)</td>
<td>73 (65–83)</td>
<td>78 (70–87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults knowing their HIV status (%)</td>
<td>36–56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36–55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant women knowing their HIV status (%)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>&gt; 95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>&gt; 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor funding as a proportion of total HIV/AIDS budget in 2013</td>
<td>75–100</td>
<td>75–100</td>
<td>0–24</td>
<td>75–100</td>
<td>50–74</td>
<td>75–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors per 100,000 people</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a Defined as the percentage of adults (15 years and older) living with HIV and receiving ART.

b Defined as the estimated percentage of pregnant women living with HIV who received antiretroviral medicines for PMTCT.

c Defined as testing at least once in the last 12 months and receiving results. Note that dates of studies vary.

Fig. 1. Conceptual framework of HIV policy and service factors influencing HIV-related adult mortality

Service access and coverage
- Costs of services
- Provider-initiated testing and counselling
- Services for high-risk groups
- Parental consent for youth
- Task-shifting for initiation
- Treatment options for opportunistic infections
- Outreach programmes

Quality-of-care
- Provider training
- Quality review/audit
- Confidentiality
- Record keeping
- Guideline availability
- Patient load
- Doctor/patient ratio
- Staff turnover
- Drug stockouts
- Limit on counselling sessions for HIV testers
- Stigmatization by health workers

Coordination of care and patient tracking
- Repeat testing
- Referral mechanisms
- Coordinated care
- Integration of services
- Pre ART monitoring
- Access to ART drugs (incl. refill intervals, collection options)
- Patient monitoring
- Patient tracing

Support to PLHIV
- Pre-test counselling
- Couple counselling
- Adherence support
- Nutritional support
- Peer support groups
- Home-based care

Medical management
- Initiation criteria/thresholds/timing (incl. in pregnancy, when infected with tuberculosis)
- Counselling requirements
- Laboratory tests
- Tuberculosis screening
- Prophylactic treatments
- ART regimen options
- Drug and equipment availability

Policy

Practice

Retained on ART

Treated with ART

Accessed care (pre-ART or ART eligibility assessment)

Diagnosed through HIV testing and counselling

ART: antiretroviral therapy; HIV: human immunodeficiency virus; PLHIV: people living with HIV.

Note: Factors in italics are only measurable and comparable through facility-based research and are not included in this review.
Methods

A conceptual framework was developed, identifying key HIV policy and programmatic factors that may influence HIV-related adult mortality (Fig. 1). These factors were derived from a review of the literature (including a recent systematic review on health sector interventions to ensure a continuum of care),18 an initial review of World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines and expert review of indicators by 28 HIV researchers and clinicians. Through the literature review and preliminary analysis of ALPHA network mortality data, we identified three attrition points to inform the structure of our policy review: (i) access to HIV testing and counselling; (ii) access to HIV care and treatment (including assessment of eligibility for treatment initiation and initiation itself); and (iii) retention on ART. Across these three attrition points (diagnosis, HIV care and retention), relevant factors fell into the following five areas: (i) service access and coverage; (ii) quality of care; (iii) coordination of care and patient tracking; (iv) medical management; and (v) support to people living with HIV.

A policy extraction tool was developed to facilitate the indicator review (available from the author). Documents were searched online through ministry of health and national HIV organization websites and/or retrieved in person from official offices and libraries, using the following inclusion criteria: (i) nationally relevant (not clinic- or district-specific); (ii) containing programmatic or clinical guidance on one of the three key adult HIV services: HIV testing and counselling, prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT) or HIV care and treatment; (iii) published between January 2003 and June 2013. Documents likely to fit these three criteria were considered, including policy statements, clinical guidelines, training manuals, strategies, indicator guides and parliamentary acts. Guideline documents produced by WHO relevant to criteria (i) and (ii) were also included.

The policy extraction tool was used to collect information on policy content, source, year and policy changes over time. Country teams completed gaps in data collection using unstructured informal interviews with key informants. Informants were either regional or national policy-makers, researchers or clinicians involved in policy development.

We summarized key policies judged most likely to affect access to HIV testing, access to HIV care and treatment and retention on ART. For each indicator, each country’s policy was categorized into one of the following: (i) has explicit policy; (ii) has implicit policy or policy has caveats or exceptions; (iii) is unclear whether policy exists or policy conflicts with other policies; or (iv) does not have policy. We also assessed whether the policy was consistent with WHO guidance or a country standard that went beyond such guidance.

Results

A total of 120 policy documents with guidance relevant to the indicators were identified and reviewed; references are available from the author.

Access to testing

Fig. 2 summarizes policies influencing access to HIV testing. Policies in the six countries were generally consistent and explicitly or partially adhered to the policy indicators, including provision of free testing services and provider-initiated testing and counselling. Malawi was the only country with no policy targeting testing among high-risk groups; while Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania did not define the high-risk groups. Only South Africa and Uganda had explicit policies enabling minors to access testing without parental consent.

Indicators related to quality of care were more variable. Anonymous HIV testing was guaranteed only in South Africa and Zimbabwe, whereas in Kenya, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania names could be recorded in registers to facilitate patient management. Various WHO documents emphasized confidentiality and protection from discrimination, but did not offer explicit guidance on maintaining anonymity. Only Kenya and the United Republic of Tanzania had policies limiting the number of testing sessions that counsellors can perform per day. While all countries stipulated the need for periodic refresher training for counsellors and quality control checks at sites, they varied in stated frequency, with the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe most explicit about how often retraining is required.

Policies influencing coordination of care and patient tracking were more ambiguous in the United Republic of Tanzania where there was no clear policy on repeat testing intervals for negatives or on repeat testing during pregnancy, labour or after delivery. Malawi was also ambiguous in this area, with repeat testing for negatives advised every 6–12 months for high-risk individuals and no explicit policy on repeat testing during pregnancy.

Regarding patient support, Malawi, South Africa and Uganda also stipulated that pretest HIV counselling be conducted either individually or in groups; others recommended at least one individual session. While all countries promoted couple counselling, this was not explicit in WHO guidance.

Access to care and treatment

Fig. 3 summarizes policies influencing access to care and treatment services, which varied more across countries. Free public sector access to PMTCT and ART was guaranteed everywhere, either explicitly in HIV policies or national health policies or implied in the national constitution, although WHO documents only implied free public sector access through promotion of universal access to HIV services. All countries promoted PMTCT availability within antenatal care and all allowed task-shifting of ART initiation to clinical officers, medical assistants or nurses (albeit with important variations in year of policy formulation, with Kenya, Malawi and the United Republic of Tanzania allowing task shifting as early as 2004/2005). Only Malawi and Uganda had explicit policies stating that all sites providing ART should also be able to initiate ART.

All countries had explicit policies on the need for CD4+ T-lymphocyte (CD4+ cells) testing at least every six months in the pre-ART phase and all recorded pre-ART visits in patient registers or forms. Only Kenya, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania had explicit policies on patient follow-up to ensure registration at treatment sites. All countries except Zimbabwe stipulated the need for PMTCT-ART referral, but only South Africa and the United Republic of Tanzania indicated when this referral should occur (six weeks after birth). Service integration between maternal and child health and ART was encouraged explicitly in Kenya, Malawi, Uganda and Zimbabwe.

Most countries adhered to WHO’s 2010 Option B regimen for PMTCT (provision of triple drug therapy to the mother during pregnancy until delivery.
or cessation of breastfeeding), except the United Republic of Tanzania which still adhered to WHO’s Option A regimen at the time of the review (single dose drug therapy with zidovudine [AZT] during pregnancy, triple therapy at onset of labour using nevirapine, AZT and lamivudine [3TC], followed by dual drug therapy for seven days postpartum with AZT and 3TC). Malawi was the only country to have explicitly adopted WHO’s Option B+ regimen (initiation of life-long triple ART therapy during pregnancy) for all women in 2011, which was earlier than WHO guidance. Roll-out of Option B+ in Kenya and Uganda was dependent on the capacity of the health facility to initiate triple therapy.

Most countries had explicit policies allowing all people co-infected with HIV and tuberculosis to initiate ART, but differed markedly in their year of uptake of this policy, ranging from 2004 in Malawi, to 2013 in South Africa. Country guidance varied on tuberculosis and HIV treatment initiation: Malawi and Uganda stated that co-infected patients must initiate ART on the same day or within two weeks of starting tuberculosis treatment (going beyond WHO guidance within eight weeks); while Kenya and the United Republic of Tanzania stated that treatment should preferably

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>WHO guidance</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Malawi</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>United Republic of Tanzania</th>
<th>Zimbabwe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service coverage and access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITC is standard for all clients including at ANC</td>
<td>2004*</td>
<td>2008*</td>
<td>2006*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2007*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing targeted at high-risk groups (e.g. sex workers, men who have sex with men, injecting drug users)</td>
<td>2004*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2007*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental consent not required for youth testing (&lt;18 years)</td>
<td>2007*</td>
<td>2008*</td>
<td>2008*</td>
<td>2009*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>2007*</td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of care</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous HIV testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum of 15 clients/day per counsellor</td>
<td>2001 onwards (all testing guidelines)</td>
<td>2006*</td>
<td>2006*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2001 onwards (all testing guidelines)</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic refresher training for counsellor required</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2009*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic quality control checks at testing sites required</td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2009*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination of care and patient tracking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives retested every 6–12 months</td>
<td>2007*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2009*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat testing in the 3rd trimester of pregnancy (if previously tested negative)</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2009*</td>
<td>2009*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing repeated during labour or after delivery if no prior test</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support to people living with HIV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual as well as group pre-test counselling recommended</td>
<td>2003*</td>
<td>2008*</td>
<td>2006*</td>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Has explicit policy | Has implicit policy, or policy has caveats or exceptions | Is unclear whether policy exists, or policy conflicts with other policies | Does not have policy

ANC: antenatal care; HIV: human immunodeficiency virus; PITC: provider-initiated testing and counselling for HIV; WHO: World Health Organization.

a Information from key informant interview.
### WHO guidance and policies in six African countries influencing access to HIV care and treatment, 2003 to mid-2013

#### Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service coverage and access</th>
<th>WHO guidance</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Malawi</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>United Republic of Tanzania</th>
<th>Zimbabwe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical officers, medical assistants and/or nurses initiate ART</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All sites providing ART also initiate ART</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Not in policy but practice</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coordination of care and patient tracking

| HIV-positive clients followed-up to ensure registration at treatment site | 2004 | 2010 | No clear follow-up | No clear follow-up | 2005 | 2010 |
| Clear guidance on when HIV-positive pregnant women referred to ART clinic | 2006 | 2012 | After delivery | 2012 | No specified time of referral | 2010 | 6 weeks after birth | 2011 | No specified time of referral | 2012 | Day 42 after birth |
| 6 monthly CD4 testing in pre-ART with CD4 count < 500 cells/µL | 2011 | Earlier if CD4 close to 500 cells/µL | 2011 | Every 3 months | 2010 | Every 6 months | 2003 | Every 6 months | 2005 | Every 6 months | 2010 | Every 6 months |
| Pre-ART visits recorded (registers or forms) | Left to country | 2011 | 2011 | * | 2009 | 2009 | 2010 |

#### Medical management

| WHO Option B ARV prophylaxis and ART regimen is the standard | 2010 | 2012 | 2011 (Extended to B+) | 2010 | 2011 |
| WHO Option B+ is the standard (all HIV-positive pregnant women initiate life-long ART) | 2012 | 2012 | Sites with capacity to initiate | 2011 | 2011 |
| All patients with tuberculosis eligible for ART initiation | 2009 | 2007 | 2004 | 2013 Previously only MDR/XDR tuberculosis | 2011 | 2012 | 2010 | Once stabilized on tuberculosis treatment |
| Confirmed tuberculosis/HIV should initiate ART on the same day or within 2 weeks of starting tuberculosis treatment | 2013 | As soon as possible within 8 weeks | 2011 | Within the initial 2–8 weeks | 2011 | 2013 | 2013 | 2012 | As soon as possible, within 2 weeks preferably |
| Initiate ART at WHO stage 3/4, or 1/2 with CD4 count < 350 cells/µL | 2009 | 2011 | 2011 | 2013 | 2011 | 2012 | 2010 |
| Initiate ART within 7 days of ART eligibility | 2005 | 2011 | 2011 | 2013 | 2013 | As soon as possible | 2010 |
| Laboratory tests not required to start ART (e.g. FBC, LFTS/RFTS) | Strongly recommended | 2005 | Tests are desirable | 2004 | 2013 | 2013 | At the earliest opportunity |
| Adherence counselling not compulsory before ART initiation | Strongly recommended | 2011 | Pregnant women allowed counselling later | 2013 |

---


* Information from key informant interview.
be initiated within two weeks. While all countries shared the standard ART initiation criteria, only Kenya and Malawi stipulated explicitly that ART should be initiated within seven days of being found eligible for treatment. Malawi and South Africa also had more liberal policies allowing ART initiation with minimum requirements for tests and counselling. Malawi has not required laboratory tests for initiation since the beginning of the treatment programme (2004). South Africa brought in this change in 2013 and stated that adherence counselling should not be compulsory before initiation.

Retention on ART

Fig. 4 summarizes policies influencing retention on ART. Stipulating that ART clinics include a doctor or clinical officer could be a barrier to access in resource-constrained contexts. This requirement is still applied in Kenya, Malawi, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe (even though task-shifting for initiation occurred). Quality indicators also varied, with staff retraining and quality control intervals varying or not made explicit; for example no quality control was required after initial accreditation in South Africa, versus quarterly checks in Malawi, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania.

There were also important differences in coordination of care and patient tracking. Since the beginning of the treatment programme, Malawi did not promote routine CD4 monitoring, unlike all other countries where yearly or six-monthly monitoring was standard. While most countries advised that stable patients receive a three-month supply of drugs, two months of supplies were stipulated in the United Republic of Tanzania and one month in South Africa. All countries promoted regular pill counts, but only South Africa and Zimbabwe had explicit policies on home visits following signs of poor adherence – others recommended home visits following missed appointments. Only Kenya explicitly recommended daily register reviews to identify missed appointments. Definitions of missed appointments and loss to follow-up varied. Zimbabwe was most reactive with a missed appointment defined as a one-week delay, followed by Malawi where a two-week absence triggered action. Most countries defined loss to follow-up or defaulting as no attendance within 90 days of the last visit, but the number of days was not defined in Malawi and was unclear in South Africa. Malawi, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania also allowed drug collection by designees (treatment partners/guardians).

Support to those on ART varied. All countries explicitly or implicitly recommended individual adherence counselling, but Malawi and Uganda did not stipulate referral to peer-support. Kenya and Uganda provided nutritional support to ART patients; Malawi stopped this in adults due to lack of evidence. Only South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe routinely referred all ART patients to home-based care programmes.

All sites recommended routine screening for tuberculosis, but Zimbabwe did not routinely provide isoniazid preventive therapy for tuberculosis prevention. All countries except Zimbabwe recommended at least four first-line ART regimen choices to patients, but not all complied with WHO’s 2010 recommended first line standard therapy (tenofovir, 3TC and nevirapine/efavirenz). Zimbabwe was the first to introduce WHO’s recommended regimen in 2010. All countries except Malawi had clear criteria for switching to efavirenz-based regimens for patients who develop tuberculosis.

Discussion

Here we demonstrate wide variation in national HIV policies influencing service access and attrition through the diagnosis-to-treatment cascade across six countries with generalized HIV epidemics. Given that African countries usually adopt guidance from WHO, such a degree of policy variation is surprising.

Several indicators were consistent across all countries, but for many indicators, countries were progressive in selected areas and no country stood out as having a consistently enabling policy context that would have a decisive impact on service access and attrition. In Malawi, for example, policies designed to facilitate access to care (such as no requirements for routine CD4 testing, early adoption of the Option B+ PMTCT regimen, rapid ART initiation for those eligible), contrasted with certain policy gaps (such as targeted testing for high-risk groups, repeat testing during labour/after delivery, referral to peer support or home-based care for patients on ART). South Africa is another case where policies aiming to enhance access in some areas contrasted with policy gaps in others. South Africa had policies on anonymous HIV testing, home visits following signs of poor adherence and few barriers to starting ART (no required laboratory tests, adherence counselling, or physician presence in ART clinics), but lacked policies on quality control for ART, provision of three-monthly ART supplies, guidance on missed appointments or loss to follow-up and compliance with WHO first-line regimen standards. In the United Republic of Tanzania, an enabling policy environment for retention of patients in care and treatment contrasted with the slow adoption of WHO Option B+ and ART regimens containing tenofovir (both subsequently adopted in September 2013), as well as weaknesses in repeat testing intervals.

There were also important differences in the timing of policy implementation in some indicators. Malawi adopted Option B+ in 2011 (before WHO guidance) and has not required laboratory tests for ART initiation since 2004 (versus South Africa, which made this change in 2013). Policies to trace missed appointments with home visits or phone contacts vary in dates of implementation from 2004–2005 in Malawi and the United Republic of Tanzania, to 2011 in Kenya. While countries often lagged behind WHO in national policy adoption, in some instances countries went beyond WHO standards; notable examples included policies related to pre-ART-CD4 monitoring intervals, rapid initiation of ART, task-shifting for ART initiation, drug resupply intervals, pill count recommendations, drug collection by designees, referral to peer support and home-based care. The fact that WHO had no explicit guidance on such topics may contribute to the differences in adoption of policies across countries.

Policies are likely to differ in their potential impact on service access and attrition. We are unable to judge, therefore, how policy differences are likely to influence mortality. There seems to be little correlation between policy profile and service coverage (Table 1). Our analysis did not attempt to weight policies – as this is likely to be highly subjective. One might expect that policies on patient coordination and tracking (e.g. pre-ART monitoring, timely initiation of ART
Fig. 4. **WHO guidance and policies in six African countries influencing retention on ART, 2003–mid-2013**  

### Service coverage and access

- **ART clinic staffing** does not have to include doctor or clinical officer: 2008

### Quality of care

- **Periodic refresher training for ART staff required**:
  - Kenya: 2010
  - Tanzania: 2010
  - United Republic of Tanzania: 2011

- **Quality of care**:
  - Training for ART staff required:
    - Kenya: 2010
    - South Africa: 2009
  - Every year:
    - Malawi: 2010
    - South Africa: 2009
    - Tanzania: 2009
  - Periodically:
    - Malawi: 2010
    - South Africa: 2010
    - Tanzania: 2010

### Coordination of care and patient tracking

- **Missed appointment defined when 1 week late**:
  - Tanzania: 2011
  - South Africa: 2010

- **Home visits following signs of poor adherence**:
  - Tanzania: 2010
  - South Africa: 2005

- **Daily review of missed appointment registers**:
  - Tanzania: 2010

- **Drugs can be collected by a designee**:
  - Malawi: 2004

- **Lost to follow up defined with no attendance for at least 90 days**:
  - Malawi: 2010

### Support to people living with HIV

- **Support to people living with HIV**:
  - Kenya: 2008
  - South Africa: 2009

### Medical management

- **Tuberculosis screening at every pre-ART and ART visit**:
  - Malawi: 2010
  - Tanzania: 2005

- **WHO first line ART as standard**:
  - Malawi: 2010
  - Tanzania: 2011

- **At least 4 first line regimen choices in national programme**:
  - Malawi: 2010
  - Tanzania: 2011

### Policies and countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>WHO guidance</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Malawi</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>United Republic of Tanzania</th>
<th>Zimbabwe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service coverage and access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART clinic staffing does not have to include doctor or clinical officer</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period quality control checks at ART clinics required</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of care and patient tracking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine 6 monthly CD4 count monitoring on ART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 monthly drug supplies once stable on ART</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pill counts at every visit</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home visits following signs of poor adherence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misplaced appointment defined when 1 week late</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home visit or telephone contact for missed visits</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily review of missed appointment registers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost to follow up defined with no attendance for at least 90 days</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs can be collected by a designee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV and tuberculosis services should be integrated within 1 facility</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to people living with HIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 adherence counselling conducted individually</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All patients on ART referred to peer support groups</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritional supplements for malnourished patients</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All patients on ART referred to home-based care</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT for all HIV patients without active tuberculosis</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuberculosis screening at every pre-ART and ART visit</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO first line ART as standard</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 4 first line regimen choices in national programme</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients on ART who develop tuberculosis switch to EFV-based regimen</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- 3TC: lamivudine; ART: antiretroviral therapy; AZT: zidovudine; CD4: cluster of differentiation 4; d4T: stavudine; EFV: efavirenz; HIV: human immunodeficiency virus; IPT: isoniazid preventative therapy; NVP: nevirapine; WHO: World Health Organization.
- Information from key informant interview.
and adherence monitoring) have greater impact than policies on quality of care
(e.g. staff training or quality audits). The relative emphasis on different policies
also varied; some indicators were only mentioned once in one document, while
others were core tenets of HIV service delivery and repeatedly mentioned.

We attempted to frame all policies as designed to increase service access
and reduce attrition, but the direction of effect was not always clear-cut. For
example, anonymous testing may pro-
mote access to diagnosis by reducing stigma, but may hamper linkage to care.
Group pretest counselling may facilitate
test access but have quality implications.
Requiring people co-infected with HIV
and tuberculosis to stabilize on tuber-
culosis treatment before initiating ART
may be beneficial only for patients with
very low CD4 counts.97 Allowing certain
sites to provide ART refills may also
be advantageous, allowing patients to ac-
cess drugs nearer home. Fast-tracking
patients into care (with rapid ART initia-
tion and no requirements for laboratory
tests or adherence counselling) may in-
crease immediate uptake of services, but
could undermine long-term adherence
if patients are inadequately prepared for
treatment. Not insisting on routine CD4
monitoring of ART patients in Malawi
forms an important aspect of the public
health approach to scaling up access,
but may have negative consequences for
timely identification of treatment failure.

Our review has some limitations.
First, establishing the precise date of policy
enactment was challenging. Publication
dates represent formal enactment, but key
informants reported instances in which
policies came into effect earlier. Certain
policies did not reappear in more recent
documents, casting doubt on their validity.
Furthermore, countries that recently pro-
duced HIV guidelines (South Africa: 2013
ART guidelines; Kenya: 2012 PMTCT
guidelines) may appear to have more
'advanced' policies than those currently
in the process of updating their guide-
lines, including Malawi and the United
Republic of Tanzania. Second, the extent
to which all relevant policy indicators
were captured is uncertain. Our systematic
approach to develop tools and indicators
attempted to minimize this, but there may
be other factors that were missed. We
did not investigate the broader national
policy environment (Fig. 1). Factors such
as national politics, laws and the criminal
justice system, programme financing
mechanisms and donor coordination have
been shown to have strong influences on
health seeking-behaviour and service
response.95-101 Country-specific policy
analyses will be needed to analyse these
national influences in detail.

Interpreting these findings with
regard to potential programme impact
is challenging. In part this stems from
the wide variation demonstrated in
our analysis, but perhaps more im-
portantly because policies are only the
first step in programme delivery. Their
effectiveness depends on service-level
implementation, as well community-
level factors.99,100 Further analysis will
examine how these different policies
are implemented in ALPHA’s network of
health and demographic surveillance
sites. This will allow us to assess whether
policy translates into practice and
whether practice exceeds stated policies,
as often claimed by our key informants.
International efforts to monitor policy
implementation – such as WHO’s esti-
mates on ART policy implementation14 –
are increasing and we hope that this
review and its tools can support other
efforts to track national policies.

Acknowledgements
We thank Masuma Mamdani, Sally
Mtenga and Astha Ramaiya from the
United Republic of Tanzania, Monserrat
Fernandez from South Africa and
Constance Nyamupaka and Simon
Gregson from Zimbabwe.

Funding: This research was funded by a
grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates
Foundation. Salaries of some individual
authors are sponsored by institutional
grants from: The Wellcome Trust, the
Medical Research Council (United
Kingdom) and the National Institutes of
Health (United States of America).

Competing interests: None declared.
Analyse comparative des politiques nationales de lutte contre le VIH dans six pays africains où l’épidémie est généralisée

Objectif Comparer les politiques nationales de lutte contre le virus de l’immunodéficience humaine (VIH) qui influencent les accès aux services de dépistage et de traitement du VIH dans six pays d’Afrique subsaharienne.


Résultats Nous avons observé de grandes différences entre les politiques de ces pays ; chaque pays était avancé dans certains domaines et pas dans d’autres. Le Malawi l’était particulièrement en matière de promotion du démarrage rapide du traitement antirétroviral. Cependant, aucun pays n’avait un contexte politique pouvant systématiquement permettre d’augmenter l’accès aux soins et d’éviter l’arrêt du traitement. Dans certains domaines, les pays allaient plus loin que les recommandations de l’OMS et les informateurs ont indiqué que la pratique dépassait souvent le cadre des politiques.

Conclusion Évaluer l’impact des différentes politiques sur l’accès aux soins et les résultats en termes de santé des personnes qui vivent avec le VIH n’est pas chose simple. Certaines politiques exercent une influence plus forte que d’autres et les politiques officielles ne sont pas toujours mises en œuvre. Des recherches ultérieures devraient évaluer le degré de mise en œuvre des politiques et mettre en lien leurs conclusions avec les résultats de la lutte contre le VIH.
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Resumen

Un análisis comparativo de las políticas nacionales sobre el VIH en seis países africanos con epidemias generalizadas

Objetivo
Comparar las políticas nacionales relativas al virus de la inmunodeficiencia humana (VIH) que influencian el acceso a las pruebas del VIH y a los tratamientos en seis países subsaharianos.

Métodos
Se revisaron las políticas relativas al VIH como parte de un estudio multinacional sobre la mortalidad de adultos en África Subsahariana. Se desarrolló una herramienta de extracción de políticas y se utilizó para revisar los documentos y guías de las políticas nacionales relativas al VIH publicadas en Kenia, Malawi, República Unida de Tanzania, Sudáfrica, Uganda y Zimbabue entre 2003 y 2013. Se hicieron entrevistas a informantes claves que ayudaron a llenar los vacíos en los resultados. Las políticas nacionales se clasificaron según si se adherían explícitamente a 54 indicadores de políticas, identificados mediante bibliografía y opiniones de expertos. Asimismo, se compararon las políticas nacionales con las directrices de la Organización Mundial de la Salud (OMS).

Resultados
Se descubrió que había una amplia variedad entre las políticas de los países. Cada país estaba más avanzado en algunas áreas que en otras. Malawi estaba especialmente avanzado en la promoción de empezar rápidamente la terapia antirretroviral. Sin embargo, ningún país tenía un contexto de introducción de políticas consistente que incrementara el acceso a la atención primaria y evitara la deserción. Algunos países iban más allá de las orientaciones de la OMS en algunas áreas e informantes clave informaron de que la práctica a menudo superaba la política.

Conclusión
Evaluar el impacto de las diferencias en las políticas relativas en el acceso a la atención primaria y los resultados en la salud entre aquellas personas con VIH es un reto. Algunas políticas ejercerán más influencia que otras y las políticas oficiales no siempre se aplican. Las investigaciones futuras deberán evaluar el grado de aplicación de las políticas y vincular estos resultados con los resultados del VIH.
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