

HIV Prevalence, Estimated Incidence, and Risk Behaviors Among People Who Inject Drugs in Kenya

Ann E. Kurth, PhD, CNM, MPH,* Charles M. Cleland, PhD,* Don C. Des Jarlais, PhD,† Helgar Musyoki, MPH,‡ John A. Lizcano, MPH,* Nok Chhun, MS, MPH,* and Peter Cherutich, MBChB, MPH‡

Objective: HIV infection in sub-Saharan Africa increasingly occurs among people who inject drugs (PWID). Kenya is one of the first to implement a national needle and syringe program. Our study undertook a baseline assessment as part of evaluating needle and syringe program in a seek, test, treat, and retain approach.

Methods: Participants enrolled between May and December 2012 from 10 sites. Respondent-driven sampling was used to reach 1785 PWID for HIV-1 prevalence and viral load determination and survey data.

Results: Estimated HIV prevalence, adjusted for differential network size and recruitment relationships, was 14.5% in Nairobi (95% CI: 10.8 to 18.2) and 20.5% in the Coast region (95% CI: 17.3 to 23.6). Viral load (\log_{10} transformed) in Nairobi ranged from 1.71 to 6.12 (median: 4.41; interquartile range: 3.51–4.94) and in the Coast from 1.71 to 5.88 (median: 4.01; interquartile range: 3.44–4.72). Using \log_{10} viral load 2.6 as a threshold for HIV viral suppression, the percentage of HIV-infected participants with viral suppression was 4.2% in Nairobi and 4.6% in the Coast. Heroin was the most commonly injected drug in both regions, used by 93% of participants in the past month, typically injecting 2–3 times/day. Receptive needle/syringe sharing at last injection was more common in Nairobi (23%) than in the Coast (4%). Estimated incidence among

new injectors was 2.5/100 person-years in Nairobi and 1.6/100 person-years in the Coast.

Conclusions: The HIV epidemic is well established among PWID in both Nairobi and Coast regions. Public health scale implementation of combination HIV prevention has the potential to greatly limit the epidemic in this vulnerable and bridging population.

Key Words: HIV, injection drug use, sub-Saharan Africa, needle syringe program

(*J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2015;70:420–427)

INTRODUCTION

Little has been published on injection drug use in sub-Saharan Africa, where HIV continues to be a leading cause of death and disability.^{1,2} In Kenya, where the epidemic is largely driven by sexual transmission, parenteral transmission is increasingly becoming recognized^{3,4}; an estimated 18.7% of incident HIV infections on the Kenyan coast and 7.5% nationally are attributed to people who inject drugs (PWID).⁵ However, evidence-based prevention and care for PWID including needle syringe programs (NSP) and PWID-specific antiretroviral therapy (ART) support have been nearly non-existent in this region.⁶ Recent size estimation in Kenya revealed a growing PWID population, high background HIV prevalence,⁷ and high-risk behaviors.^{8,9}

PWID are highly vulnerable to HIV and can be a bridge for HIV transmission to general populations. Needle sharing^{10,11} and other high-risk behaviors (including “flashblood,” wherein users who cannot afford heroin inject the blood of a PWID who recently injected) are common.^{12,13} HIV prevalence among PWID in sub-Saharan Africa is estimated to range from 5.5% to 42.9%.¹⁴ In Kenya, PWID HIV prevalence is estimated at 18% versus 5.6% in the general population; 29.8% reported sex without a condom in the past month; 51.6% reported use of sterile injecting equipment the last time they injected.¹⁵ An analysis of a multicountry survey found that 12 of 14 (86%) female injectors in Nairobi engaged in sex work.¹⁶ In sub-Saharan Africa, the region with highest HIV prevalence globally, injectors can exacerbate HIV epidemics, given the rapid nature that is the hallmark of HIV epidemics among PWID.^{14,17}

Key interventions are highly effective in reducing risk of HIV acquisition [male circumcision, preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP)] and transmission (early initiation of ART), especially when used in a “combination prevention”

Received for publication February 9, 2015; accepted June 10, 2015.

From the *New York University College of Nursing, New York, NY; †Baron Edmond de Rothschild Chemical Dependency Institute, Mount Sinai Beth Israel, New York, NY; and ‡National AIDS & STI Control Programme (NASCOP), Nairobi, Kenya.

Supported by Grant R01DA032080 from the National Institute on Drug Abuse. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institute on Drug Abuse or the National Institutes of Health.

The authors have no funding or conflicts of interest to disclose.

Supplemental digital content is available for this article. Direct URL citations appear in the printed text and are provided in the HTML and PDF versions of this article on the journal's Web site (www.jaids.com).

A.E.K. had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. Study concept and design: A.E.K., P.E. Analysis and interpretation of data: A.E.K., C.M.C., D.C.D.J. Statistical analysis: C.M.C. Drafting of the manuscript: A.E.K., C.M.C., P.C., N.C., J.A.L. Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: A.E.K., C.M.C., D.C.D.J., H.M., J.A.L., N.C., P.C.

Correspondence to: Ann E. Kurth, PhD, CNM, MPH, New York University College of Nursing, 433 First Avenue, 6th Floor, New York, NY 10010 (e-mail: akurth@nyu.edu).

Copyright © 2015 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.

approach.¹⁸ Nine evidence-based interventions have been endorsed for prevention, treatment, and care of HIV in PWID,¹⁹ with NSP, opioid substitution therapy (OST), and ART for HIV positives recommended as an international minimum standard. PrEP use has been recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as a potential option to reduce HIV among high-risk PWID,²⁰ although PrEP has not yet been widely implemented in many countries.²¹ The World Health Organization (WHO) notes that NSPs are effective in reducing HIV transmission,²² especially in high-income countries.^{23–26} NSPs can be effective in reducing HIV in lower income country settings if implemented on a public health scale,^{23,27,28} and OST can also be effective for reducing illicit drug use and associated HIV risk behavior in middle/low-income settings if implemented according to WHO guidelines.^{29,30} Still, interventions in low/middle income countries do not have the benefit of high-income countries' more available resources, stronger health systems, and generally stable policy structures that influence HIV epidemic control, so that additional research on controlling HIV among PWID in transitional/low/middle income countries is clearly needed.

In 2013, Kenya implemented NSP at a countrywide level. This article is one of the first to describe baseline PWID risks before evaluating the potential effect of NSP in this key population. Our study leverages the Government of Kenya's decision to launch NSP for PWID. Using time series and stepped wedge cluster-randomized design elements, our "Testing and Linkage to Care for Injecting Drug Users" study will provide among the first data regarding implementation of a "seek, test, treat, and retain" approach to PWID in sub-Saharan Africa.³¹ Lessons learned will inform how Kenya and other countries in the region can best address the growing PWID contribution to the HIV epidemic. We present baseline data on HIV prevalence, estimated incidence, drug use and injecting behaviors, sexual risk behaviors, and viral load distribution among the PWID population in Kenya, Nairobi and the Coast region and consider the possible future HIV transmission in these areas.

METHODS

Study Sites

Study participants were recruited from 10 sites that were implementing partners for Kenya's NSP program working with PWID in Nairobi or Coast regions. Site sample sizes ranged from 86 to 231 (median: 204.5), with 663 PWID enrolled in Nairobi and 1122 enrolled in the Coast region between May 2012 and December 2012. Of the 10 study sites, 4 were in Nairobi and 6 in Coastal Mombasa. The 4 study sites in Nairobi, being more urban, are in close proximity, whereas most of the 6 study sites in Coastal Mombasa are spread apart from each other. In the beginning of the government's NSP rollout, there was some opposition from religious leaders in the Coast, especially from the Muslim community. However, with sensitization and engagement, the community began accepting the needed services for PWID. Most sites were close to the location where drug sales and injecting bases exist, which facilitates active PWID to

approach program sites for services, such as NSP and others. Although there is some variability across sites in Nairobi and the Coast, most sites offer the WHO-recommended 9 elements package of PWID services. Most of the study's partner sites have a growing infrastructure and supportiveness for prevention, treatment, and care of PWID. Only 2 of the partner sites do not offer direct services for PWID as they are hospitals; therefore, study participants from those 2 sites seek PWID services at other sites.

Sampling Design and Recruitment

Inclusion Criteria

Participants were at least 18 years old, lived in Nairobi or Coast regions, injected nonprescribed drugs at some point in their lifetime, and used nonprescribed drugs by any route of administration in the past year. Potential participants were not enrolled if they were under the influence of substances and thus unable to consent, reported being forced to participate, or if the interviewer was not confident that the potential participant was a PWID based on responses to questions about injection drug use particulars and visual observation of the skin.

Respondent-Driven Sampling

We used respondent-driven sampling (RDS) to overcome some of the limitations of other sampling methods for hard-to-reach populations. RDS's adaptation of chain referral methods allows for adequate population coverage and calculation of inclusion probabilities for each individual.^{32,33} With each inclusion probability known, the proportion of population members with a specific characteristic (eg, PWID with HIV) can be estimated in an asymptotically unbiased way.^{33,34} RDS starts with a number of "seed" participants, members of the target population who begin the sampling process by recruiting others from their social networks. Each recruit can recruit additional population members. Theoretically, the final sample will be independent of the initial seeds if a sufficient number of recruitment waves are undertaken³³ and sample composition becomes stable despite additional waves of recruitment, a state referred to as "equilibrium."³⁵ Attainment of equilibrium and independence of the final sample can be facilitated by limiting the number of recruits any one individual can bring in.³⁶ In our study sites, recruitment was initiated by 3–5 seeds who were trained to recruit PWID peers using coded recruitment coupons (mean and median of 3 coupons given). Overall ineligibility was 8% (162 of 1947 not eligible), most (69%) because the interviewer was not confident they were a PWID.

Data Collection

Biometric Data Collection

We used biometric (fingerprint) unique ID generation to prevent more than one enrollment of an individual PWID per study phase and to be able to track repeat visits over the course of the study beyond baseline. We used NCheck (Neurotechnology Inc., Vilnius, Lithuania) biometric

application and Dropbox (Dropbox Inc., San Francisco, CA) to synchronize ID databases in all the sites in real time.

Handheld-Assisted Personal Interview

Behavioral data were collected by staff-administered survey using encrypted Android tablets with Open Data Kit Collect software (ODK, University of Washington, Seattle, WA). The interview collected demographic information and assessed risks including HIV test history, parenteral and sexual risk behaviors, alcohol/drug use, exposure to services, prevention methods, treatment adherence, and mental health indices. Data from the 1947 enrolled participants were transferred to a secure encrypted server using GSM and 3 G networks (Safaricom, Kenya).

Experience and Training of Interviewers

Study staff were trained in human subject protection in addition to Kenyan program standards and training for TLC-IDU study procedures. All study staff had national certification for HIV testing and counseling and for phlebotomy. The National HIV Reference Laboratory in Nairobi conducted quality control proficiency testing of every staff member who conducted HIV testing on a quarterly basis. A booster training was provided to study staff halfway through the baseline period.

Laboratory Testing

HIV

After obtaining study consent and completing the survey, staff conducted HIV pretest counseling, confirmed participant's decision to test and receive results, and carried out HIV testing using a rapid serial assay algorithm following Government of Kenya guidelines. Screening specimens that tested negative using Alere Determine HIV-1/2 Ag/Ab rapid test (Alere Inc., Waltham, MA) were reported as negative. Those who tested positive were confirmed using a second assay, Uni-Gold HIV-1/2 (Trinity Biotech PLC, Wicklow, Ireland). If this second test was positive, the result was reported as positive. When 2 tests were discordant, specimens were sent to the National HIV Reference Laboratory for enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay, results of which were reported as the true results and appropriate posttest counseling and referrals was given. Quality control was maintained by collecting a dried blood spot (DBS) on every 20th HIV-negative and every fifth HIV-positive specimen collected, using Vironostika HIV-1/2 antigen/antibody and Murex HIV.1.2.O in parallel testing.

Viral Load Testing

To assess community viral load at baseline, we collected DBS specimens from all HIV-positive participants' fingertips onto Whatman 903 Specimen Collection paper, which was dried overnight then shipped in glycine in a zip-lock bag with desiccant and humidity indicator card to the National HIV Reference Laboratory where DBS specimens were stored at -20°C until analyzed. The National HIV Reference Laboratory used the COBAS AmpliPrep/COBAS TaqMan HIV-1 Qualitative Test, version 2.0 (CAP/CTM

v2.0) to obtain HIV-1 viral load results. Laboratory staff excised one 12-mm circular punch from the Whatman 903 Specimen Collection paper and placed it into a Sample input tube (S-tube). Afterward, 1100 μL of Specimen Pre-Extraction Reagent was added to the S-tube containing the circle of the collection paper and incubated in an Eppendorf Thermo mixer comfort at 56°C with continuous shaking at 1000 rpm for 10 minutes. Once specimens were ready, laboratory staff ran the specimens using the COBAS AmpliPrep instrument for automated specimen processing and the COBAS TaqMan analyzer for automated amplification and detection. AMPLILINK Software, 3.3 Series was needed to run the specimens and determine the results.

Data Analysis

Version 0.5 of the RDS R package³⁷ was used to calculate population estimates of HIV prevalence and other variables while taking into account social network sizes and patterns of recruitment. Version 3.03 of the R statistical computing environment³⁸ was used for all other analysis. Logistic regression was used to examine bivariate correlates of HIV infection in each study region. Logistic regression was also used to estimate the unique effects of predictors in multivariable models; starting with models containing all main effects, terms were removed from multivariable models using backward elimination of nonsignificant terms ($P > 0.05$).

Estimation of HIV incidence among new injectors followed methods used by Des Jarlais et al.³⁹ These methods have been used in other recent studies.^{40,41} Two opposing factors were considered when deciding which PWID to include in estimates of incidence. Including PWID with more years injecting increases sample size and allows for examination of a key assumption. Including PWID with fewer years injecting reduces the likelihood of differential loss of people with, versus without, HIV infection from the pool of potential recruits. To balance these opposing factors, we included PWID with 5 or fewer years injecting as "new injectors" contributing to estimation of incidence. These new injectors were defined as those whose age at the time of the survey was no more than 5 years greater than their reported age at first injection. About two-thirds of all participants were classified as new injectors ($n = 1185$; 66.4%). The incidence estimate assumes the following: (1) all new injectors were uninfected when they began injecting; (2) the number of incident cases among new injectors is equal to the number who tested positive for HIV at the time of the survey; (3) HIV infection among those who tested positive occurred midway between the start of injecting and the time of the survey; (4) the time at risk for new injectors testing negative was the total time from first injection to the survey; and (5) there was no differential loss of HIV positives versus HIV negatives in the PWID population in the short time periods between the first injection and time of interview. As the assumption that all subjects were uninfected when they began injecting is not likely to hold for the generalized epidemic in Kenya, we conducted additional analysis of incidence using logistic regression considering the probability of infection before injecting began and the increase in the probability of infection with each year

of injecting among new injectors. This approach allowed for estimating incidence due to injection while adjusting for HIV prevalence at the time injection began.

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics

Table 1 describes the age and gender of study participants by study region. Participants were typically young adult men, although most were women in 1 of the 10 study sites.

Diagrams for recruitment chains in each study site with HIV status differentiated (uninfected, previously diagnosed, and newly diagnosed) are presented in (see Figures S3–S12, Supplemental Digital Content, <http://links.lww.com/QAI/A720>). These figures show discordant recruitment relationships are frequently observed (positive recruiter and negative recruit or negative recruiter and positive recruit). Excluding 31 seed participants, approximately one-quarter of all recruitment relationships were HIV discordant (26.2%; 460 of 1754 recruits). In more than half of these HIV discordant recruitment relationships, the recruiter was infected and the recruit was uninfected (56.3%; 259 of 460).

Years Injecting

In the Nairobi region, years injecting ranged from 1 to 37, with a median of 2 years. One and 6 years of injecting marked the lower and upper quartiles of years injecting. Thus, 75% of Nairobi participants injected for 6 or fewer years. In the Coast region, years injecting ranged from 1 to 36, with

a median of 4 years. Two and 8 years marked the lower and upper quartiles of years injecting. Thus, 75% of Coast participants injected for 8 or fewer years.

HIV Prevalence

Estimated HIV prevalence, adjusted for differential network size and recruitment relationships was 14.5% in Nairobi (95% CI: 10.8 to 18.2) and 20.5% in the Coast region (95% CI: 17.3 to 23.6). Population homophily for positive HIV serostatus was 1.21 in Nairobi and 1.27 in the Coast region, which indicates 21%–27% more ties with concordant status than would be expected if ties form without regard to HIV infection. Convergence plots were used to determine whether equilibrium was reached in the HIV serostatus estimates in each site. In both regions, estimates of positive HIV serostatus changed little over the past 50 participants recruited.

Estimated HIV Incidence Among New Injectors

The 1185 new injectors across all study sites contributed a total of 2544.5 person-years at risk. A total of 145 of these new injectors had HIV infection at the time of the survey. Therefore, estimated incidence was approximately 5.7 per 100 person-years at risk (95% CI: 4.8 to 6.7). We also estimated incidence only for new male injectors. New male injectors contributed a total of 2253 person-years at risk, and 94 had HIV infection at the time of the survey. Therefore, estimated incidence was approximately 4.2 per 100 person-years at risk among male new injectors (95% CI: 3.4 to 5.1). The number of new female injectors and total time at risk among new female injectors were not sufficient for estimating incidence, but the difference between total and male incidence suggests incidence among female injectors may be higher.

General population HIV prevalence among young adults in Kenya was 5.6% in 2012,⁴² which makes the assumption that all participants were uninfected before they began injecting untenable. Using logistic regression, we estimated that prevalence among PWID was 7.0% in Nairobi and 9.2% in the Coast region before the start of injecting, higher prevalence than the general population before injecting began. As shown in Figure 1, among new injectors, prevalence increased to 19.5% in Nairobi and 17.4% in the Coast region after 5 years of injecting. Averaging over the first 5 years of injecting and subtracting estimated prevalence before injecting began, this suggests annual HIV incidence of 2.5% in Nairobi and 1.6% in the Coast region.

Viral Load

Results of viral load testing were available for 71 Nairobi participants and 216 Coast participants (71% of 404 participants with HIV). Figure 2 shows distributions of log₁₀ HIV viral load among participants with newly diagnosed and previously diagnosed HIV infection. Viral load (log₁₀ transformed) in Nairobi ranged from 1.71 to 6.12 (median: 4.41; interquartile range: 3.51–4.94). In the Coast region, log₁₀ viral load ranged from 1.71 to 5.88 (median: 4.01;

TABLE 1. Characteristics of People Who Inject Drugs in Kenya

	Coast (N = 1122)	Nairobi (N = 663)
Age (yrs)	31.71 (6.50)	30.40 (7.00)
Gender, male (%)	89.0 (86.5 to 91.4)	82.4 (75.1 to 89.7)
PWID social network size (n)	22.47 (33.39)	18.67 (47.05)
Age at first injection (yrs)	25.80 (6.33)	25.92 (7.01)
Years injecting	5.91 (5.67)	4.49 (4.89)
No. injections past month	68.15 (34.73)	69.33 (30.18)
Days injecting past month	25.89 (9.31)	28.04 (6.60)
Average injections/day	2.87 (3.67)	2.57 (1.50)
Receptive needle sharing at last injection (%)	4.2 (2.7 to 5.7)	23.4 (18.7 to 28.1)
Receptive sharing of cookers/cotton/water/bleach, last injection (%)	17.1 (14.1 to 20.1)	73.5 (68.8 to 78.2)
Age at sexual debut (yrs)	16.72 (3.47)	16.37 (3.44)
No condom with main partner at last sex (%)	23.7 (20.7 to 26.7)	18.3 (14.2 to 22.5)
No condom with casual partner at last sex (%)	6.2 (4.5 to 7.8)	5.0 (2.9 to 7.2)
HIV infection (%)	20.5 (17.3 to 23.6)	14.5 (10.8 to 18.2)
Previously diagnosed	14.5 (11.9 to 17.2)	8.2 (5.6 to 10.8)
Newly diagnosed	5.9 (4.1 to 7.8)	6.3 (3.8 to 8.8)

Values are given as mean (SD) or RDS weighted estimate of percentage (percentile bootstrap 95% confidence interval).




FIGURE 1. Predicted HIV prevalence in each region by years of injecting.

interquartile range: 3.44–4.72). A \log_{10} viral load of 2.6 (ie, 398 RNA copies per mL) can be used as a threshold for HIV viral suppression.⁴³ Using this threshold, the percentage of HIV-infected PWID participants with viral suppression was 4.2% in Nairobi and 4.6% in the Coast region.

Sexual Risk Behaviors

Among all participants, the prevalence of sex without a condom at last sex with a main partner was 18% in Nairobi and 24% in the Coast, and the prevalence of sex without a condom at last sex with a casual partner was 5% in Nairobi and 6% in the Coast. Among participants sexually active with a main partner (21% in Nairobi and 26% in Coast), the prevalence of sex without a condom at last sex with a main partner was 86% in Nairobi and 87% in the Coast. Among participants sexually active with a casual partner (10% in Nairobi and 14% in the Coast), the prevalence of sex without a condom at last sex with a casual partner was 54% in Nairobi and 43% in Coast. Average age at sexual debut was similar (16.4 years, SD: 3.4, Nairobi and 16.7, SD: 3.5 Coast).

Injection Drug Use and Injection Risk Practices

Heroin was the most commonly injected drug in both Nairobi and the Coast and was the most commonly used drug in the past month for 93% of participants. Participants typically injected 2–3 times per day nearly everyday in the past month. Receptive needle/syringe sharing at the last injection was more common in Nairobi (23%) than the Coast region (4%). At the times the surveys took place, there were no active needle and syringe programs in the areas where




FIGURE 2. Distributions of \log_{10} HIV viral load among participants with newly diagnosed and previously diagnosed HIV infection in Nairobi and coast region.

PWID were recruited. Participants were asked about the sources of their syringes. The most common sources identified were pharmacy (72%), the place where the PWID injects (12%), and dealers (8%).

Correlates of HIV Infection

Table 2 presents bivariate correlates of HIV infection. In Nairobi, male gender and age at first injection were associated with reduced odds of infection; PWID social network size, years injecting, injections per day, and receptive needle/syringe sharing were associated with increased odds of infection. In the Coast, male gender and age at first injection were associated with reduced odds of infection; age, years injecting, number of injections past month, days injecting in past month, injections per day, receptive needle/syringe sharing, receptive sharing of other injecting equipment, and older age at sexual debut were associated with increased odds of infection.

Table 3 presents results of multivariable logistic regression analysis to determine unique predictors of HIV infection. In Nairobi, male gender was associated with reduced odds of infection; years injecting and receptive needle/syringe sharing were associated with increased odds of infection. In the Coast, male gender was associated with reduced odds of infection; years injecting, number of injections past month, and receptive needle/syringe sharing were associated with increased odds of infection.

TABLE 2. Correlates of HIV Infection

	Coast (N = 1122)		Nairobi (N = 663)	
	Odds Ratio	95% CI	Odds Ratio	95% CI
Age	1.38	1.19 to 1.59	1.10	0.90 to 1.34
Gender, male	0.19	0.13 to 0.28	0.44	0.28 to 0.72
PWID social network size*	1.10	0.95 to 1.26	1.30	1.07 to 1.58
Age at first injection*	0.72	0.61 to 0.84	0.74	0.59 to 0.91
Years injecting*	1.89	1.65 to 2.18	1.55	1.30 to 1.85
Number of injections per month*	1.38	1.19 to 1.61	1.18	0.96 to 1.44
Days injecting per month*	1.26	1.07 to 1.51	0.98	0.81 to 1.21
Average injections/d*	1.22	1.05 to 1.59	1.35	1.09 to 1.74
Receptive needle sharing at last injection	3.74	2.07 to 6.73	1.96	1.24 to 3.05
Receptive sharing of cookers/cotton/water/bleach at last injection	1.52	1.10 to 2.10	0.79	0.52 to 1.21
Age at sexual debut*	1.16	1.01 to 1.34	1.03	0.84 to 1.26
No condom with main partner at last sex	0.76	0.53 to 1.09	0.98	0.56 to 1.63
No condom with casual partner at last sex	0.81	0.41 to 1.49	1.48	0.61 to 3.20

*These variables were rescaled to estimate the change in odds of infection associated with 1 SD change in the predictor.
CI, confidence interval.

TABLE 3. Predictors of HIV Infection in Multivariable Logistic Regression

	Coast (N = 1122)		Nairobi (N = 663)	
	Odds Ratio	95% CI	Odds Ratio	95% CI
Gender, male	0.15	0.10 to 0.22	0.38	0.24 to 0.63
Years injecting*	2.00	1.73 to 2.33	1.62	1.35 to 1.95
Number of injections per month*	1.26	1.07 to 1.48	—	—
Receptive needle sharing at last injection	3.33	1.74 to 6.37	2.05	1.28 to 3.26

*These variables were rescaled to estimate the change in odds of infection associated with 1 SD change in the predictor.
CI, confidence interval.

DISCUSSION

In this article, we set out to describe baseline PWID risks before evaluation of Kenya's NSP and to gather information regarding potential transmission risks in this high-need key population that can serve as a transmission bridge to general populations. We documented that HIV infection is well established among PWID in both Nairobi and the Coast region, with prevalence well above that of the general young adult population. HIV prevalence among PWID in these regions is well above "low" (<5%), although still just below "high" (>20%) designations.¹⁹ Our incidence estimates suggest that HIV is spreading in PWID populations—clearly not zero although also not the 10+/100 person-years associated with extremely rapid PWID transmission. Nonetheless, it remains above the levels noted in Kenya among some other key populations such as female sex workers (eg, in a Mombasa FSW cohort ~3/100 person-years).⁴⁴ Targets for HIV risk reduction among Kenyan PWID have been identified by Strathdee et al⁴⁵ and incorporated into the national NSP and the HIV Prevention Revolution Roadmap⁴⁶ in Kenya.

Injecting risk behaviors, for example, syringe sharing at last injection, was comparatively moderate, with a lower rate in the Coast. The effect of gender in multivariable logistic regression analysis suggests some HIV acquisition maybe due to sexual transmission before or after initiation of injecting, but effects of duration and frequency of injection as well as syringe sharing on the probability of HIV infection indicate parenteral transmission as well. The connections between HIV-positive and HIV-negative individuals noted in our RDS recruitment chains (see Figures S3–S12, Supplemental Digital Content, <http://links.lww.com/QAI/A720> 1–10, RDS recruitment chains) clearly demonstrate potential additional transmission, including through parenteral and sexual networks.

Limitations

Small sample sizes in some study sites decrease confidence in HIV prevalence estimates based on respondent-driven sampling. The assumption that PWID are uninfected at the start of injecting may be far from reality, as

there is a large heterosexual HIV epidemic in Kenya and many participants may have been infected by sexual transmission before the start of injecting. If many were HIV positive when they began injecting, there would probably be greater loss of HIV positives than HIV negatives in the injecting population, which would lead to underestimating HIV incidence. We did not observe any PWID who began injecting less than 1 year previously, which may be related to item wording and coding and could lead to underestimation of HIV incidence.

SUMMARY

In the absence of other specific data, we would predict continued moderate growth in HIV infection among PWID in Kenya. If high-quality combination prevention programs for PWID (including NSP, OST, and ART) are rapidly implemented on a public health scale as planned in Kenya, it should be possible to control the current epidemic. The ability to do so, however, may depend crucially on the service coverage levels of NSP, OST, ART, and potentially, PrEP, for PWID in Kenya. Combination prevention including evidence-based packages for PWID has been quite successful in reversing high HIV prevalence epidemics in a number of high-income country settings (eg, Amsterdam, Vancouver, San Francisco). Achieving comparable results in a resource-limited setting such as Kenya would be a major public health achievement.

It is unlikely, however, that HIV prevalence among PWID would approach zero. Residual injecting related transmission of HIV and sexual transmission of HIV among PWID and the entry of HIV seropositive persons into drug injecting are likely to keep HIV prevalence among PWID at least as high as prevalence among the young adult population. Most concerning, the proportion of HIV-infected PWID who were virally suppressed was less than 5% in both study areas, suggesting high levels of circulating virus in this community before NSP introduction. This represents a failure of the HIV treatment cascade goal of optimizing identification, treatment engagement, and successful adherence of HIV positives. Thus, acceptable and available combination prevention including a seek, test, treat, and retain approach for PWID will be necessary to control HIV and improve the health of this key population.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the following for their contributions and support: at NASCOP Dr. George Githuka, Eva Muluve, Mercy Nyakowa, Paul Macharia, Daniel Fedha; at the National HIV Reference Lab Joseph Ombayo, and the dedicated field staff; study Community Advisory Board members; at NYU David Resto; study consultants Scott Geibel, Steffanie Strathdee, Claris Ojwang, Elizabeth Ngugi, and Fred Owiti; and most of all the study participants. We are grateful to the NIH/NIDA for study funding (5R01DA032080, Kurth and Cherutich, principal investigators).

REFERENCES

1. Lozano R, Naghavi M, Foreman K, et al. Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age groups in 1990 and 2010:

- a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet*. 2012;380:2095–2128.
2. Ortblad KF, Lozano R, Murray CJ. The burden of HIV: insights from the GBD 2010. *AIDS*. 2013;27:2003–2017.
3. Gelmon L, Kenya P, Oguya F, et al. *Kenya HIV Prevention Response and Modes of Transmission Analysis*. Nairobi, Kenya: Kenya National AIDS Control Council; 2009.
4. Vermund SH. Global HIV epidemiology: a guide for strategies in prevention and care. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2014;11:93–98.
5. NASCOP. *MARPS Surveillance Report 2012: Most-at-risk Populations. Unveiling New Evidence for Accelerated Programming*. Nairobi, Kenya: Ministry of Health; 2012.
6. Asher AK, Hahn JA, Couture MC, et al. People who inject drugs, HIV risk, and HIV testing uptake in sub-Saharan Africa. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care*. 2013;24:e35–e44.
7. Petersen Z, Myers B, van Hout MC, et al. Availability of HIV prevention and treatment services for people who inject drugs: findings from 21 countries. *Harm Reduct J*. 2013;10:13.
8. Okal J, Geibel S, Muraguri N, et al. Estimates of the size of key populations at risk for HIV infection: men who have sex with men, female sex workers and injecting drug users in Nairobi, Kenya. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2013;89:366–371.
9. NASCOP. *National Data: Size Estimates by Typology*. 2013. Available at: <http://nascop.or.ke/marps/national-data.php>. Accessed August 4, 2013.
10. Beckerleg S, Telfer M, Hundt GL. The rise of injecting drug use in East Africa: a case study from Kenya. *Harm Reduct J*. 2005;2:12.
11. Beckerleg S, Telfer M, Sadiq A. A rapid assessment of heroin use in Mombasa, Kenya. *Subst Use Misuse*. 2006;41:1029–1044.
12. McCurdy SA, Ross MW, Williams ML, et al. Flashblood: blood sharing among female injecting drug users in Tanzania. *Addiction*. 2010;105:1062–1070.
13. McNeil D. Desperate addicts inject each other's blood. *The New York Times*. July 12, 2010.
14. Mathers BM, Degenhardt L, Phillips B, et al. Global epidemiology of injecting drug use and HIV among people who inject drugs: a systematic review. *Lancet*. 2008;372:1733–1745.
15. Kenya NACCo. *Kenya AIDS Response Progress Report: Progress towards Zero*. 2014. Available at: http://www.unaids.org/en/dataanalysis/knowyourresponse/countryprogressreports/2014countries/KEN_narrative_report_2014.pdf. Accessed August 6, 2014.
16. Cleland CM, Des Jarlais DC, Perlis TE, et al; Group WHOPIDICS. HIV risk behaviors among female IDUs in developing and transitional countries. *BMC Public Health*. 2007;7:271.
17. Jolley E, Rhodes T, Platt L, et al. HIV among people who inject drugs in Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia: a systematic review with implications for policy. *BMJ Open*. 2012;1–7.
18. Jones A, Cremin I, Abdullah F, et al. Transformation of HIV from pandemic to low-endemic levels: a public health approach to combination prevention. *Lancet*. 2014;384:272–279.
19. Mathers BM, Degenhardt L, Ali H, et al. HIV prevention, treatment, and care services for people who inject drugs: a systematic review of global, regional, and national coverage. *Lancet*. 2010;375:1014–1028.
20. Smith DK, Martin M, Lansky A, et al. Update to Interim Guidance for Preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP) for the prevention of HIV infection: PrEP for injecting drug users. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2013;62:463–465. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm6223a2.htm>. Accessed May 31, 2015.
21. Available at: <http://www.prepwatch.org/>. Accessed May 31, 2015.
22. Wodak A, Cooney A. *Effectiveness of Sterile Needle and Syringe Programming in Reducing HIV/AIDS Among Injecting Drug Users*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2004.
23. Des Jarlais DC, Felemyer JP, Modi SN, et al. High coverage needle/syringe programs for people who inject drugs in low and middle income countries: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*. 2013;13:53.
24. Dutta A, Wirtz AL, Baral S, et al. Key harm reduction interventions and their impact on the reduction of risky behavior and HIV incidence among people who inject drugs in low-income and middle-income countries. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS*. 2012;7:362–368.
25. Degenhardt L, Mathers B, Vickerman P, et al. Prevention of HIV infection for people who inject drugs: why individual, structural, and combination approaches are needed. *Lancet*. 2010;376:285–301.

26. Vlahov D, Junge B. The role of needle exchange programs in HIV prevention. *Public Health Rep.* 1998;113(suppl 1):75–80.
27. Abdul-Quader AS, Feelemyer J, Modi S, et al. Effectiveness of structural-level needle/syringe programs to reduce HCV and HIV infection among people who inject drugs: a systematic review. *AIDS Behav.* 2013;17:2878–2892.
28. Van Den Berg C, Smit C, Van Brussel G, et al. Full participation in harm reduction programmes is associated with decreased risk for human immunodeficiency virus and hepatitis C virus: evidence from the Amsterdam Cohort Studies among drug users. *Addiction.* 2007;102:1454–1462.
29. Feelemyer J, Des Jarlais D, Arasteh K, et al. Retention of participants in medication-assisted programs in low- and middle-income countries: an international systematic review. *Addiction.* 2014;109:20–32.
30. Feelemyer JP, Des Jarlais DC, Arasteh K, et al. Changes in quality of life (WHOQOL-BREF) and addiction severity index (ASI) among participants in opioid substitution treatment (OST) in low and middle income countries: an international systematic review. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2014;134:251–258.
31. Volkow ND, Baler RD, Normand JL. The unrealized potential of addiction science in curbing the HIV epidemic. *Curr HIV Res.* 2011;9:393–395.
32. Heckathorn DD. Respondent driven sampling: a new approach to the study of hidden populations. *Social Probl.* 1997;44:174–199.
33. Salganik MJ, Heckathorn DD. Sampling and estimation in hidden populations using respondent driven sampling. *Sociol Methodol.* 2004;34:193–239.
34. Heckathorn DD. Respondent driven sampling, II: deriving population estimates from chain-referral samples of hidden populations. *Social Probl.* 2002;49:11–34.
35. Abdul-Quader AS, Heckathorn DD, McKnight C, et al. Effectiveness of respondent-driven sampling for recruiting drug users in New York City: findings from a pilot study. *J Urban Health.* 2006;83:459–476.
36. Magnani R, Sabin K, Saidel T, et al. Review of sampling hard-to-reach and hidden populations for HIV surveillance. *AIDS.* 2005;19(suppl 2):S67–S72.
37. Handcock MS, Fellows IE, Gile KJ. *RDS: Respondent-Driven Sampling, Version 0.5*. Project home page. Available at: <http://hpmrg.org>; <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=RDS>. Accessed on December 1, 2014.
38. Team RC. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria. Available at: <http://www.R-project.org/>. Accessed on December 1, 2014.
39. Des Jarlais DC, Kling R, Hammett TM, et al. Reducing HIV infection among new injecting drug users in the China-Vietnam Cross Border Project. *AIDS.* 2007;21(suppl 8):S109–S114.
40. Uuskula A, Des Jarlais DC, Kals M, et al. Expanded syringe exchange programs and reduced HIV infection among new injection drug users in Tallinn, Estonia. *BMC Public Health.* 2011;11:517.
41. Jordan AE, Des Jarlais DC, Arasteh K, et al. Incidence and prevalence of hepatitis c virus infection among persons who inject drugs in New York City: 2006–2013. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2015;152:194–200.
42. Kimanga DO, Ogola S, Umuro M, et al. Prevalence and incidence of HIV infection, trends, and risk factors among persons aged 15–64 years in Kenya: results from a nationally representative study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2014;66(suppl 1):S13–S26.
43. McMahon JH, Elliott JH, Bertagnolio S, et al. Viral suppression after 12 months of antiretroviral therapy in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2013;91:377–385E.
44. McClelland RS, Richardson BA, Wanje GH, et al. Association between participant self-report and biological outcomes used to measure sexual risk behavior in human immunodeficiency virus-1-seropositive female sex workers in Mombasa, Kenya. *Sex Transm Dis.* 2011;38:429–433.
45. Strathdee SA, Hallett TB, Bobrova N, et al. HIV and risk environment for injecting drug users: the past, present, and future. *Lancet.* 2010;376:268–284.
46. MoH. *Kenya HIV Prevention Revolution Road Map: Count Down to 2030*. Available at: http://hivhealthclearinghouse.unesco.org/sites/default/files/resources/kenya_hiv_prevention_revolution_road_map.pdf. Accessed on January 5, 2015.