



**Promotion of couples' voluntary HIV counseling and testing in Lusaka, Zambia by influence network leaders and agents: a cohort study**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2012-001171
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Mar-2012
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Wall, Kristin; Emory University, Epidemiology  Kilembe, William; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Nizam, Azhar; Emory University, Biostatistics and Bioinformatics; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Vwalika, Cheswa; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Kautzman, Michelle; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Chomba, Elwyn; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Tichacek, Amanda; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Sardar, Gurkiran; University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Medicine  Casanova, Deborah; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Henderson, Faith; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Mulenga, Joseph; Zambia National Blood Transfusion Services, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Kleinbaum, David; Emory University, Epidemiology; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Allen, Susan; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health</p>
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Global health, Infectious diseases
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, International health services < HEALTH SERVICES

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

	ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, HIV & AIDS < INFECTIOUS DISEASES

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

For peer review only

Research Report

**Promotion of couples' voluntary HIV counseling and testing in Lusaka, Zambia by  
influence network leaders and agents: a cohort study**

Kristin M Wall, William Kilembe, Azhar Nizam, Cheswa Vwalika, Michelle Kautzman, Elwyn  
Chomba, Amanda Tichacek, Gurkiran Sardar, Deborah Casanova, Faith Henderson, Joseph  
Mulenga, David Kleinbaum, Susan Allen

All authors: Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Dept of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine,  
School of Medicine and Hubert Dept of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory  
University, Atlanta, GA, USA

William Kilembe MD MSc, Cheswa Vwalika MD MPH, Michele Kautzman MD MPH, Elwyn  
Chomba MD, Gurkiran Sardar MD MPH, Deborah Casanova MPH, Faith Henderson MPH,  
Joseph Mulenga MD MBA; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, Lusaka, Zambia

Additional affiliations:

Kristin M Wall, MS PhD (cand), and David Kleinbaum, PhD, Department of Epidemiology,  
Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Azhar Nizam, MS, Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Rollins School of Public  
Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

1  
2  
3 Elwyn Chomba, MD, University Teaching Hospital and University of Zambia School of  
4  
5  
6 Medicine, Lusaka, Zambia

7  
8 Joseph Mulenga MD MBA, Zambia National Blood Transfusion Services, Lusaka, Zambia

9  
10 Gurkiran Sardar, MD, MPH, University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Medicine, Chicago, IL,  
11  
12 USA

13  
14 Susan Allen MD MPH and Amanda Tichacek MPH, Department of Pathology and Laboratory  
15  
16 Medicine, School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 **Running Head:** Couples' voluntary HIV counseling and testing promotions  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 **Corresponding Author:**

28  
29 Kristin M Wall

30  
31 Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, Emory University

32  
33 1518 Clifton Road NE, 3rd Floor

34  
35 Atlanta, GA 30322

36  
37 Phone: (512) 785-4779

38  
39 E-mail: kmwall@emory.edu  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 **Keywords:** community workers, couples' voluntary counseling and testing, HIV, Zambia  
47  
48  
49

50 **Word Count:**

51  
52 Text: 2960 words

53  
54 Abstract: 299 words  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** Hypothesizing that predictors of CVCT promotions can be identified to increase CVCT uptake, this study identified predictors of successful CVCT promotion in Lusaka, Zambia.

**Design:** Cohort study

**Setting:** Lusaka, Zambia

**Participants:** 68 influential network leaders [INLs] identified 320 agents [INAs] who delivered 29119 CVCT invitations to heterosexual couples

**Intervention:** The CVCT promotional model used INLs who identified INAs who in turn conducted community-based promotion and distribution of CVCT invitations from July 2004-December 2005.

**Primary outcome measure:** The primary outcome of interest was couple testing (yes/no) after receipt of a CVCT invitation. INA, couple, and invitation characteristics predictive of couples' testing were evaluated accounting for two-level clustering.

**Results:** INAs delivered 29119 invitations resulting in 1727 couples testing (6% success rate). In multivariate analyses, INA characteristics significantly predictive of CVCT uptake included promoting in community-based (adjusted odds ratio [aOR]=1.3; 95% confidence interval [CI]=1.0-1.8) or health (aOR=1.5; 95%CI=1.2-2.0) networks versus private networks, being employed in the sales/service industry (aOR=1.5; 95%CI=1.0-2.1) versus unskilled manual labor, owning a home (aOR=0.7; 95%CI=0.6-0.9) versus not, and testing for HIV with a partner (aOR=1.4; 95%CI=1.1-1.7) or alone (aOR=1.3; 95%CI=1.0-1.6) versus never testing. Cohabiting couples were more likely to test (aOR=1.4; 95%CI=1.2-1.6) than non-cohabiting couples. Context characteristics predictive of CVCT uptake included inviting couples (aOR=1.2;

1  
2  
3 95%CI=1.0-1.4) versus individuals, the woman (aOR=1.6; 95%CI=1.2-2.2) or couple (aOR=1.4;  
4  
5 95%CI=1.0-1.8) initiating contact versus the INA, the couple being socially acquainted with the  
6  
7  
8 INA (aOR=1.6; 95%CI=1.4-1.9) versus having just met, home invitation delivery (aOR=1.3;  
9  
10 95%CI=1.1-1.5) versus elsewhere, and easy invitation delivery (aOR=1.8; 95%CI=1.4-2.2)  
11  
12 versus difficult as reported by the INA.

13  
14  
15 **Conclusions:** This study demonstrated the ability of influential people to promote CVCT and  
16  
17 identified agent, couple, and context-level predictors of CVCT uptake in Lusaka, Zambia. We  
18  
19 encourage the development of CVCT promotions in other sub-Saharan African countries to  
20  
21 support sustained CVCT dissemination.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ARTICLE SUMMARY

### Article Focus

- Given preliminary findings from Zambia and Rwanda suggesting successful community-based promotion, we hypothesize that predictors of CVCT promotions can be identified to increase CVCT uptake in Lusaka, Zambia.
- This study evaluated the ability of community-based activities to promote CVCT and identified predictors of CVCT uptake in Lusaka, Zambia.

### Key Messages

- Here, we demonstrated not only the feasibility of CVCT promotions using influential network agent and leaders (INAs and INLs) to promote CVCT, but also identified practical INA, couple, and invitation-level predictors of CVCT uptake.
- The predictors of CVCT uptake included: recruiting INAs who have tested with partners, focusing invitations on INA acquaintances, issuing invitations to couples and in a discreet location, and utilizing INAs from non-governmental and health networks.

### Strengths and Limitations

- These predictors can be used to enhance CVCT promotions in Zambia and may be extended as a framework to other locales, with adaptation based on location-specific predictors of CVCT promotions
- Country-specific differences in CVCT promotions indicate that more research into country-specific predictors of CVCT may be necessary for successful CVCT promotions in other locales.

## BACKGROUND

In 2009, 68% of the global HIV-positive population resided in sub-Saharan Africa, equating to roughly 22.5 million cases. Zambia has one of the largest HIV burdens, with roughly 980 000 prevalent and 76 000 incident cases in 2009,[1] and HIV prevalence is roughly twice as high in urban (20%) versus rural (<10%) Zambia.[2]

Heterosexual transmission is the primary cause of incident HIV infections in sub-Saharan Africa where discordant couples (an HIV+ and HIV- partner) in long-term relationships represent the largest group at-risk for HIV.[1, 3] In urban Zambia, roughly 60% of new

1  
2  
3 infections occurred between married/cohabiting heterosexual couples [3], and 17% of pregnant  
4  
5 couples in Lusaka were discordant.[4]  
6  
7

8 Knowledge of HIV serostatus is critical for transmission prevention. According to the  
9  
10 2007 Zambia Demographic and Health Survey, although most adults know where to receive an  
11  
12 HIV test, only 35% of women and 20% of men have ever tested and received results.[2]  
13  
14 Voluntary HIV counseling and testing [VCT] is an evidence-based strategy to increase serostatus  
15  
16 awareness, decrease high-risk behavior, and decrease transmission.[5] Couples' VCT [CVCT],  
17  
18 in which both partners are tested and mutually disclose results, addresses issues with disclosure,  
19  
20 allows for risk-reduction planning based on partner serostatus, and decreases high-risk  
21  
22 behavior.[6-8] However, though CVCT effectively targets the highest at-risk group in sub-  
23  
24 Saharan Africa, it has not been widely disseminated due to lack of demand and subsequent lack  
25  
26 of funding. Lack of demand primarily results from insufficient knowledge about the possibility  
27  
28 of couple serodiscordance and CVCT services.[8-11]  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The Zambia-Emory HIV Research Project [ZEHRP], based in Lusaka, provides CVCT  
35  
36 services. ZEHRP and other groups have shown clinic and community-based CVCT promotions  
37  
38 can increase CVCT awareness and demand.[4, 11-14] Social networks and community leaders  
39  
40 are critical in changing perceptions towards HIV/AIDS and other health issues in sub-Saharan  
41  
42 Africa;[15-18] at ZEHRP, CVCT promotional efforts are directed by influential network leaders  
43  
44 [INLs] and agents [INAs], based in the Social Networks and Social Support Theory.[19] This  
45  
46 study assessed the ability of INLs and INAs to promote CVCT and identified predictors of  
47  
48 CVCT uptake in Lusaka.  
49  
50  
51

## 52 53 54 55 **METHODS** 56 57 58 59 60



### **INL and INA recruitment and training**

ZEHRP CVCT promotions maximize program impact by utilizing two existing social networks levels -- INLs and INAs. INL and INA recruitment and training methods are described elsewhere.[13, 20] Briefly, INLs were identified from CVCT consensus meetings and national/citywide umbrella referrals from four social networks (faith-based/religious, health, private, and community-based/non-governmental organizations [CBO/NGO]). INLs identified INA candidates from their respective networks, and final selection was made after interviewing with experienced ZEHRP counselors. Enrolled INAs received four-day training in HIV/AIDS health advocacy/outreach, social networking, CVCT promotions, and observation of successful door-to-door ZEHRP promotional strategies. INLs and INAs completed demographic questionnaires and were offered CVCT or VCT.

### **CVCT promotions**

CVCT promotional activities took place from July 2004-December 2005 in two randomly selected neighborhoods as described elsewhere.[21] Briefly, of eight neighborhoods assessed as potential sites, three were selected based on similar population size, infrastructure, and with consideration of geographic distance to minimize spillover effects. Two of these were randomly assigned to CVCT promotions while the third had no promotions. Given the catchment areas of these two neighborhoods (99 280 and 85 022 individuals), it was assumed that couples would rarely receive multiple invitations. INAs distributed invitations to couples or individuals within their neighborhoods which detailed CVCT facility directions and procedures. Couples could be cohabiting or non-cohabiting. Invitations included a unique ID, INA identifier, and a receipt portion that the INA retained and submitted bi-weekly. The receipt portion contained the invitation ID and space to record the date, time, place of invitation, relationship of the INA and

1  
2  
3 recipient, recipient description (man, woman, or couple), recipients' age(s), residence, marital  
4 status, and INA's perception of the difficulty of invitation delivery.  
5  
6

7  
8 Before March 18, 2005, INAs received \$0.21/invitation issued and an additional  
9 \$4.20/couple attending CVCT. Beginning March 19, 2005, payment/invitation was reduced to  
10 \$0.11 and payment/couple attending CVCT was increased to \$5.25 to deter fraudulent invitation  
11 delivery. In addition to fixed CVCT sites, which could serve 30 couples/day, a mobile HIV  
12 testing unit, which could serve an additional 30 couples/day, was available for nine months in  
13 one neighborhood and then nine months in the other. Mobile testing sites were selected based on  
14 facility (churches, schools, and community centers) availability. For perspective, Purchasing  
15 Power Parity in Zambia, an adjusted measure of per-capita-income number, is \$1500/year,[22]  
16 and the proportion of Zambians living on less than \$1/day is 63.6%.[23]  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 **CVCT procedures**

30  
31 CVCT procedures are described elsewhere.[13] Briefly, couples participate in group counseling,  
32 joint pre-test counseling, and, for those testing, confidential informed consent procedures,  
33 phlebotomy, two rapid HIV tests,[24] and joint post-test counseling and test result delivery.  
34  
35 CVCT services were free and transportation to testing sites was reimbursed. Invitation receipts  
36 were collected from INA-invited couples and the invitation ID was linked to the couple ID  
37 number. The study was approved by the Emory University IRB and the University of Zambia  
38 Research Ethics committee. Informed consent was obtained from all study participants.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

### 48 **Statistical analysis**

49  
50 Counts (percentages) for categorical variables and means (standard deviations) for continuous  
51 variables were calculated for INL, INA, couple, and invitation-level characteristics. Number of  
52 invitations distributed was tabulated by INA characteristic as were success rates (the number  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 couples tested/number invitations distributed). Analyses were stratified by couple cohabitation  
4  
5 status to identify differences in CVCT uptake and predictors of success. INAs not achieving  
6  
7  $\geq 1.5\%$  success were excluded from analyses to prevent inclusion of INAs systematically  
8  
9 returning fraudulent receipts.  
10  
11

12  
13 Crude odds ratios [ORs], 95% CIs, and p-values evaluated associations between INA-  
14  
15 level characteristics predictive of successful invitations. Generalized estimating equation [GEE]  
16  
17 methods evaluated the association between couple and invitation-level characteristics predictive  
18  
19 of successful invitations. Since couple and invitation-level data are clustered at two-levels,  
20  
21 within individual INAs and INLs, GEE methods accounted for non-independence of  
22  
23 observations.  
24  
25

26  
27 INA, couple, and invitation-level variables significant (Bonferroni corrected p-  
28  
29 value=0.002) in univariate analyses were entered into a multivariate logistic regression model,  
30  
31 and variables were examined for multi-collinearity. GEE methods accounted for clustering of  
32  
33 couple and invitation-level characteristics within individual INAs and INLs. Data analysis was  
34  
35 conducted with SASv9.2 (North Carolina, USA).  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 **RESULTS**

### 42 **INL characteristics**

43  
44 Sixty-eight INLs were recruited from CBO/NGO, faith-based, health, and private sector  
45  
46 networks. Average INL age was 45 (inter-quartile range [IQR]=36-52), and 68% were men.  
47  
48 Average years living in Lusaka was 25 (IQR=15-34), and 72% were married. Almost all INLs  
49  
50 understood Nyanja and/or Bemba or English, roughly half owned their home, and most had  
51  
52 previously tested for HIV (Table 1).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### INA characteristics associated with couples' testing (Tables 1-2)

INLs recruited 320 INAs (excluding 70 INAs with <1.5% success), and overall, INAs distributed 29 119 invitations with 1727 couples tested for an average of 91 invites/INA and 5 couples tested/INA. INAs affiliated with CBO/NGOs distributed more than average invitations/INA and were more likely to successfully invite cohabiting couples relative to private network INAs. Health network INAs also distributed a high number of average invitations/INA and were more successful among all couples relative to private network INAs (Tables 1-2).

Most INAs were women, and performance with respect to invitations delivered, success rates, and average number of couples tested was similar by gender (Table 1). Average INA age was 37 (IQR=29-44), and older INAs were significantly more successful among cohabiting, but less successful among non-cohabiting, couples relative to younger INAs (Table 2). The average number of years living in Lusaka was 21 (IQR=11-30) (data not shown), and years living in Lusaka significantly predicted successful invitation among cohabiting couples (Table 2).

Married INAs were significantly more successful among cohabiting couples relative to divorced, widowed, or single INAs (Table 2). Divorced INAs had very low success rates among non-cohabiting couples (Table 1). Among INAs with a partner, years of current relationship had a similar effect as age, with longer unions associated with significantly decreased success among non-cohabiting couples.

Seventy-four percent of INAs were sales/service industry employees, and these INAs were significantly more successful among cohabiting and non-cohabiting couples relative to unskilled manual laborers. Professional and agricultural sector employees were also more successful among non-cohabiting couples (Table 2). Eighty percent of INAs could read English

1  
2  
3 (Table 1), and this was associated with successful invitations among non-cohabiting couples  
4  
5 only.  
6  
7

8 Over half of INAs rented their home. The 38% who owned a home were less successful  
9  
10 than those who rented or lived in housing provided by others; with stratification this remained  
11  
12 significant only among cohabiting couples (Table 2). Two percent of INAs had housing provided  
13  
14 by an employer and were substantially more successful among cohabiting couples (Table 1).  
15  
16

17 Only 57% of INAs reported having tested for HIV with a partner (22%) or alone (35%)  
18  
19 (Table 1). INAs testing for HIV with a partner were more successful among all couples, and  
20  
21 testing alone was associated with higher success among non-cohabiting couples relative to never  
22  
23 testing (Table 2).  
24  
25

26 Seventy INAs did not achieve 1.5% success and were excluded from analyses. These  
27  
28 INAs distributed 125 invitations/INA and were similar to INAs in the analysis by gender ( $\chi^2$  test  
29  
30 of association=0.8, p=0.4), age (t-statistic=-1.9, p=0.06), and network ( $\chi^2=3.7$ , p=0.3).  
31  
32  
33

34 Of 29 119 invitations, 9707 (33.3%) were delivered prior to March 19, 2005 (prior to the  
35  
36 incentive structure change) and 19 412 (66.7%) were delivered on/after that date. Of the 1727  
37  
38 couples who tested, 939 were invited prior to March 19, 2005 and 788 were invited on/after that  
39  
40 date, an invitation success rate of 9.7% prior to and 4.1% after the incentive change (p<0.0001).  
41  
42 Prior to the incentive change, the number of invites distributed/INA increased steadily from 112  
43  
44 to 247, and the number of couples tested/INA increased from 3 to 7. After the incentive change,  
45  
46 invites/INA dropped to 42, but the number of couples tested/INA increased from 5 to 7. It  
47  
48 should be noted that fewer INAs were trained by the end of March as INA enrollment became  
49  
50 more selective and more productivity was expected per INA.  
51  
52  
53  
54

### 55 **Couple and invitation characteristics associated with couples' testing (Table 3)** 56 57 58 59 60

1  
2  
3 The mean age of men was 33 and of women was 27 years. Couples' testing were slightly older  
4 than those not testing ( $p < 0.001$ ). Most couples were cohabiting, and these were significantly  
5 more likely to test versus non-cohabiting couples. The mean duration of relationship was 6  
6 years, and tested couples had been together on average one year longer than non-tested couples.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 INAs initiated contact 93% of the time, though in the rare instances when the couple or  
14 the woman initiated contact with the INA, the couple was more likely to test. Inviting a couple  
15 together also resulted in increased testing. Couples who were family members or social  
16 acquaintances of the INA were more likely to test versus those previously unacquainted. Ease of  
17 invitation delivery (operationalized as not being time-consuming, requiring long explanations,  
18 challenging because of invitee resistance or scheduling conflicts) was also associated with  
19 couples' testing. Interestingly, though public endorsements were predictive of testing during a  
20 pilot study [13], they were not associated with increased uptake of testing in this larger study.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32 Similarly, the presence of mobile units was not associated with increased testing.  
33

#### 34 **Multivariate model of couples' testing predictors (Table 4)**

35  
36 Age of the man and woman were collinear and woman's age was excluded from the multivariate  
37 model. Couple cohabitation status was an effect measure modifier, and multivariate analyses  
38 were stratified by cohabitation status. All adjusted ORs [aORs] presented below were  
39 statistically significant in multivariate analyses accounting for two-level clustering.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Health sector INAs were most successful (aOR=1.5) followed by CBO/NGO INAs  
47 (aOR=1.3) relative to private sector INAs. Married INAs were more successful versus others  
48 among cohabiting couples (aOR=1.3). Sales/service industry employees (aOR=1.5) versus  
49 unskilled manual laborers were more successful overall. Among non-cohabiting couples, INAs  
50 who could read English were more successful (aOR=2.0) whereas among cohabiting couples,  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 INAs owning homes were less successful (aOR=0.7). INAs who had tested for HIV with a  
4  
5 partner were more successful among all couples (aOR=1.4), while those who had tested for HIV  
6  
7 alone were more successful among non-cohabiting couples (aOR=2.1), versus INAs who had  
8  
9 never tested. Cohabiting couples were more likely to test (aOR=1.4) versus non-cohabiting  
10  
11 couples.  
12  
13

14  
15 Invitation-level predictors of testing among cohabiting couples included inviting the  
16  
17 couple versus the woman alone (aOR=1.3); also couple (aOR=1.4) versus INA initiated contact  
18  
19 was predictive. Being socially acquainted with the INA (aOR=1.6) versus having just met was  
20  
21 predictive among all couples, while home CVCT invitation delivery (aOR=1.4) versus  
22  
23 elsewhere, and easy invitation delivery (aOR=1.9) versus difficult were predictive among  
24  
25 cohabiting couples.  
26  
27

## 28 29 **DISCUSSION**

30  
31 In an African capital city where very few couples have jointly tested for HIV, a promotional  
32  
33 program using INLs and INAs prompted approximately 100 couples/month to seek CVCT. INA  
34  
35 network, occupation, marital status, and testing history, as well as couple cohabitation status and  
36  
37 the INA-invitee relationship, influenced invitation success. Invitations delivered to the couple,  
38  
39 in the home, and invitations initiated by the woman partner were also significant CVCT uptake  
40  
41 predictors.  
42  
43

44  
45 CBO/NGO and health network INAs were more successful than faith-based or private  
46  
47 sector INAs. CBO/NGO networks included parent teacher, legal aid, skills training, and health  
48  
49 information organizations. Health networks included clinical officers, nurses, home healthcare  
50  
51 visitors, community health workers, neighborhood health committee members, and traditional  
52  
53 birth attendants. Previous studies have similarly demonstrated the ability of influential people to  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 effectively disseminate information and change attitudes and behaviors towards HIV in sub-  
4 Saharan Africa.[16-18] Unlike health and CBO/NGO INAs, private sector INAs may have been  
5 preoccupied with income generation and/or did not have similar opportunities to integrate CVCT  
6 promotions into their daily routine. The poor performance of faith-based INAs was surprising  
7 given Zambia is strongly religious; however, though religious leaders have opportunities to  
8 promote from the pulpit, the stigma associated with sexually transmitted infections [STIs] may  
9 inhibit open discussion of CVCT.[17, 25]

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 Cohabiting couples were more likely than non-cohabiting couples to test, and married  
21 INAs delivered more successful invitations than unmarried INAs. Fear of stigma among married  
22 couples is common,[9, 26, 27] and perhaps married INAs were able to more successfully  
23 overcome this barrier. INAs who previously tested for HIV with a partner were also more  
24 successful than those who had not tested, likely due to their firsthand knowledge of CVCT  
25 procedures and ability to speak personally to perceived CVCT barriers.

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 INAs socially acquainted with the invitee were more successful versus those previously  
35 unacquainted with the invitee. The strength of INA-invitee relationship may facilitate open  
36 discussion of CVCT and engender confidence. INAs inviting the couple together versus either  
37 partner alone, thereby removing pressure for one partner to propose testing to the other, were  
38 also more successful. Previous studies support the effectiveness of couple-level targeted  
39 prevention strategies.[13, 28-31]

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 Though most invitations were initiated by INAs, when the woman partner initiated  
49 contact with the INA, CVCT uptake increased. This finding likely reflects pre-existing  
50 motivation to discuss or participate in CVCT.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3           Invitations delivered in the home versus community were more effective. Previous  
4  
5 studies indicate that home and workplace HIV counseling and testing promotions are more  
6  
7 successful in Zambia, Uganda, and Malawi relative to community locations.[32-35] These  
8  
9 findings are likely due to increased discretion and comfort associated with home settings.  
10  
11

12           Results from a similar study using both INLs and INAs in Kigali, Rwanda highlight  
13  
14 country-specific similarities and differences. Similar to Zambia, Rwandan health INAs were  
15  
16 more successful relative to private network INAs. Married Rwandan INAs were more successful  
17  
18 than single INAs, and cohabiting couples were more likely to test than non-cohabiting couples in  
19  
20 univariate analyses. We similarly found that invitations delivered to couples socially acquainted  
21  
22 with the INA, woman partner initiated contact, and invitations delivered in the home were more  
23  
24 successful in multivariate analyses in Rwanda. In contrast to this study, Rwandan faith-based  
25  
26 INAs were more successful in univariate analyses relative to private network INAs, and the  
27  
28 overall INA success rate in Rwanda was higher (18%). Mobile units were also associated with  
29  
30 increased testing in Rwanda.[20]  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36           Kigali and Lusaka, though both capital cities, differ in several important ways: Kigali has  
37  
38 a monolingual population of 800 000 with easy and inexpensive transportation. In contrast,  
39  
40 Lusaka's 1.7 million inhabitants represent all 73 Zambian languages/dialects, the city is large,  
41  
42 and transportation is expensive. Another study in the Bemba-speaking Copperbelt region of  
43  
44 Zambia combined INA promotions with mass media strategies in two cities of 600 000 each and  
45  
46 obtained success rates between those found in Lusaka and Kigali.[14] These linguistic and  
47  
48 infrastructural differences highlight the importance of testing and adapting network-based  
49  
50 promotional models to different environments.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Results from a pilot study of promotions in Lusaka with 33 INAs (no INLs) showed that,  
4 while invitation-level predictors were similar to those found in this larger study, the small sample  
5 size did not allow simultaneous detection of INA, couple, and invitation-level characteristics in  
6 hierarchical analysis.[13] Similarly, the Copperbelt study described previously did not examine  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Results from a pilot study of promotions in Lusaka with 33 INAs (no INLs) showed that, while invitation-level predictors were similar to those found in this larger study, the small sample size did not allow simultaneous detection of INA, couple, and invitation-level characteristics in hierarchical analysis.[13] Similarly, the Copperbelt study described previously did not examine INA, couple, or invitation-level predictors of success.[14]

Overall, this study demonstrated the feasibility of CVCT promotions in Lusaka, and we believe success rates could be considerably increased by utilizing the modifiable predictors of CVCT uptake identified: recruiting INAs who have tested with partners, focusing invitations on INA acquaintances, issuing invitations to couples and in a discreet location, and utilizing INAs from CBO/NGO and health networks. It should be noted that most of the statistically significant aORs are close to the null suggesting cautious interpretation of these associations. More research is especially needed to encourage faith-based leaders in Zambia to more effectively promote CVCT.

## CONCLUSION

CVCT is an evidence-based testing strategy shown to reduce transmission of HIV and other STIs and to help prevent unintended pregnancies in sub-Saharan Africa. However, CVCT has yet to be widely implemented in this region.[4, 6, 7, 36-40] Here, we demonstrated not only the feasibility of CVCT promotions using INAs and INLs, but also identified practical INA, couple, and invitation-level CVCT uptake predictors. These predictors can be used to enhance CVCT promotions in Zambia and may be extended as a framework to other locales, with adaptation based on location-specific predictors of CVCT promotions.

### Contributorship statement

Kristin M Wall – made substantial contributions to the analysis and interpretation of data, drafting the article and revising it critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

William Kilembe - made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

Azhar Nizam – made substantial contributions to the analysis and interpretation of data, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

Cheswa Vwalika – made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

Michelle Kautzman – made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

Elwyn Chomba - made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

Amanda Tichacek - made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

1  
2  
3 Gurkiran Sardar - made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the  
4 article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be  
5 published  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Deborah Casanova - made substantial contributions to data acquisition, revising the article  
11 critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be  
12 published  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 Faith Henderson - made substantial contributions to data acquisition, revising the article critically  
18 for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published  
19  
20  
21

22 Joseph Mulenga - made substantial contributions to data acquisition, revising the article critically  
23 for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published  
24  
25  
26

27 David Kleinbaum - made substantial contributions to the analysis and interpretation of data,  
28 revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the  
29 version to be published  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Susan Allen - made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the article  
35 critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be  
36 published  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Acknowledgements**

44 We would like to acknowledge and thank the study participants, staff, interns, and Project  
45 Management Group members of the Zambia-Emory HIV Research Project in Lusaka, Zambia.  
46  
47  
48

49 We would also like to thank Drs Joseph Telfair, David L Roth, Leslie Clark, and Alan Haworth  
50 for participating in the development of this intervention.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Competing interests

The authors have no competing interests, including relevant financial interests, activities, relationships, and affiliations.

### Data sharing statement

There is no additional data available.

### Funding

This work was supported by funding from the National Institute of Mental Health [R01 66767]; the AIDS International Training and Research Program Fogarty International Center [D43 TW001042]; the Emory Center for AIDS Research [P30 AI050409]; National Institutes of Health [R01s AI40951, AI51231, HD40125]; and the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative.

**REFERENCES**

1. Global Report: UNAIDS report on the global AIDS epidemic 2010. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) 2010.  
[http://www.unaids.org/documents/20101123\\_GlobalReport\\_em.pdf](http://www.unaids.org/documents/20101123_GlobalReport_em.pdf) (accessed 19 Dec 2010).
2. Zambia Demographic and Health Survey 2007. Central Statistical Office (CSO), Ministry of Health (MOH), Tropical Diseases Research Centre (TDRC), University of Zambia, and Macro International Inc. 2009. Calverton, Maryland, USA: CSO and Macro International Inc.
3. Dunkle KL, Stephenson R, Karita E, et al. New heterosexually transmitted HIV infections in married or cohabiting couples in urban Zambia and Rwanda: an analysis of survey and clinical data. *Lancet* 2008;**371**(9631):2183-91.
4. Conkling M, Shutes EL, Karita E, et al. Couples' voluntary counselling and testing and nevirapine use in antenatal clinics in two African capitals: a prospective cohort study. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2010;**3**(1):10.
5. UNAIDS Technical Update: Voluntary counselling and testing (VCT). Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) 2000. <http://www.who.org> (accessed 4 Dec 2010).
6. Allen S, Tice J, Van de Perre P, et al. Effect of serotesting with counselling on condom use and seroconversion among HIV discordant couples in Africa. *BMJ* 1992;**304**(6842):1605-9.

- 1  
2  
3 7. The Voluntary HIV-1 Counseling and Testing Efficacy Study Group. Efficacy of  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
7. The Voluntary HIV-1 Counseling and Testing Efficacy Study Group. Efficacy of  
voluntary HIV-1 counselling and testing in individuals and couples in Kenya, Tanzania,  
and Trinidad: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 2000;**356**:103-112.
8. Painter TM. Voluntary counseling and testing for couples: a high-leverage intervention  
for HIV/AIDS prevention in sub-Saharan Africa. *Soc Sci Med* 2001;**53**(11):1397-411.
9. Roth DL, Stewart KE, Clay OJ, et al. Sexual practices of HIV discordant and concordant  
couples in Rwanda: effects of a testing and counselling programme for men. *Int J STD  
AIDS* 2001;**12**(3):181-8.
10. Bakari JP, McKenna S, Myrick A, et al. Rapid voluntary testing and counseling for HIV.  
Acceptability and feasibility in Zambian antenatal care clinics. *Ann NY Acad Sci*  
2000;**918**:64-76.
11. McKenna SL, Muyinda GK, Roth D, et al. Rapid HIV testing and counseling for  
voluntary testing centers in Africa. *AIDS* 1997;**11**(Suppl 1):S103-10.
12. Chomba E, Allen S, Kanweka W, et al. Evolution of couples' voluntary counseling and  
testing for HIV in Lusaka, Zambia. *JAIDS* 2008;**47**(1):108-15.
13. Allen S, Karita E, Chomba E, et al. Promotion of couples' voluntary counselling and  
testing for HIV through influential networks in two African capital cities. *BMC Public  
Health* 2007;**7**:349.
14. Lambdin BH, Kanweka W, Inambao M, et al. Local residents trained as 'influence agents'  
most effective in persuading African couples on HIV counseling and testing. *Health Aff  
(Millwood)* 2011;**30**(8):1488-97.

- 1  
2  
3 15. Baiden F, Akanlu G, Hodgson A, et al. Using lay counsellors to promote community-  
4 based voluntary counselling and HIV testing in rural northern Ghana: a baseline survey  
5 on community acceptance and stigma. *J Biosoc Sci* 2007;**39**(5):721-33.  
6  
7
- 8  
9  
10 16. Helleringer S, Kohler HP. Social networks, perceptions of risk, and changing attitudes  
11 towards HIV/AIDS: new evidence from a longitudinal study using fixed-effects analysis.  
12 *Popul Stud (Camb)* 2005;**59**(3):265-82.  
13  
14
- 15  
16  
17 17. Trinitapoli J. Religious Responses to AIDS in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Examination of  
18 Religious Congregations in Rural Malawi. *Review of Religious Research* 2006;**47**:253-  
19 270.  
20  
21
- 22  
23  
24 18. Kohler HP, Behrman JR, Watkins SC. Social networks and HIV/AIDS risk perceptions.  
25 *Demography* 2007;**44**(1):1-33.  
26  
27
- 28  
29  
30 19. Heaney CA, Israel BA. Social Networks and Social Support. In: Glanz K, Rimer BK,  
31 Lewis FM, eds. *Health Behavior and Health Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass  
32 2002.  
33  
34
- 35  
36  
37 20. Wall KM, Karita E, Nizam A et al. Influence network effectiveness in promoting couples'  
38 HIV voluntary counseling and testing in Kigali, Rwanda. *AIDS* 2012;**26**(2):217-227.  
39  
40
- 41  
42  
43 21. Kelley A, Karita E, Sullivan P, et al. Knowledge and perceptions of couples' voluntary  
44 counseling and testing in urban Rwanda and Zambia: a cross-sectional household survey.  
45 *PLoS One* 2011;**6**(5):e19573.  
46  
47
- 48  
49  
50 22. Zambia GDP - per capita (PPP). IndexMundi 2011.  
51 [http://www.indexmundi.com/zambia/gdp\\_per\\_capita\\_\(ppp\).html](http://www.indexmundi.com/zambia/gdp_per_capita_(ppp).html) (accessed 29 Feb 2012).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
23. *Zambian Economy Statistics. NationMaster 2003-2012.*  
[http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/eco\\_pop\\_und\\_1\\_a\\_day-economy-population-under-1-day](http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/eco_pop_und_1_a_day-economy-population-under-1-day) (accessed 29 Feb 2012).
  24. Boeras DI, Luisi N, Karita E, et al. Indeterminate and discrepant rapid HIV test results in couples' HIV testing and counselling centres in Africa. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2011;**14**:18.
  25. Ucheaga DN, Hartwig KA. Religious leaders' response to AIDS in Nigeria. *Glob Public Health* 2010;**5**(6):611-25.
  26. Kilewo C, Massawe A, Lyamuya E, et al. HIV counseling and testing of pregnant women in sub-Saharan Africa: experiences from a study on prevention of mother-to-child HIV-1 transmission in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *JAIDS* 2001;**28**(5):458-62.
  27. Keogh P, Allen S, Almedal C, et al. The social impact of HIV infection on women in Kigali, Rwanda: a prospective study. *Soc Sci Med* 1994;**38**(8):1047-53.
  28. Kakimoto K, Kanal K, Mukoyama Y, et al. Influence of the involvement of partners in the mother class with voluntary confidential counseling and testing acceptance for prevention of mother to child transmission of HIV programme (PMTCT programme) in Cambodia. *AIDS Care* 2007;**19**:381-384.
  29. Desgrees du Lou A, Brou H, Djohan G, et al. Beneficial Effects of Offering Prenatal HIV Counselling and Testing on Developing a HIV Preventive Attitude Among Couples, Abidjan 2002-2005. *AIDS Behav* 2009;**13**(2):348-55.
  30. El-Bassel N, Witte SS, Gilbert L, et al. The efficacy of a relationship-based HIV/STD prevention program for heterosexual couples. *Am J Public Health* 2003;**93**(6):963-9.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
31. Were WA, Mermin JH, Wamai N, et al. Undiagnosed HIV infection and couple HIV discordance among household members of HIV-infected people receiving antiretroviral therapy in Uganda. *JAIDS* 2006;**43**(1):91-5.
  32. Angotti N, Gaydos L, Kimchi E, et al. The Fear Factor in HIV Testing: Local Reactions to Door-to-Door Rapid Blood Testing for HIV in Rural Malawi. American Sociological Association Annual Conference. New York, NY: 2007.
  33. Fylkesnes K, Siziya S. A randomized trial on acceptability of voluntary HIV counselling and testing. *Trop Med Int Health* 2004;**9**(5):566-572.
  34. Corbett E, Dauya E, Matambo R, et al. Uptake of workplace HIV counselling and testing: a clusterrandomised trial in Zimbabwe. *PLoS Med* 2006;**3**:e238.
  35. Wolff B, Nyanzi B, Katongole G, et al. Evaluation of a home-based voluntary counselling and testing intervention in rural Uganda. *Health Policy Plan* 2005;**20**:109-116.
  36. Allen S, Meinzen-Derr J, Kautzman M, et al. Sexual behavior of HIV discordant couples after HIV counseling and testing. *AIDS* 2003;**17**(5):733-40.
  37. King R, Allen S, Serufilira A, et al. Voluntary confidential HIV testing for couples in Kigali, Rwanda. *AIDS* 1993;**7**(10):1393-4.
  38. Carpenter LM, Kamali A, Ruberantwari A, et al. Rates of HIV-1 transmission within marriage in rural Uganda in relation to the HIV sero-status of the partners. *AIDS* 1999;**13**(9):1083-9.
  39. Fideli US, Allen SA, Musonda R, et al. Virologic and immunologic determinants of heterosexual transmission of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 in Africa. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses* 2001;**17**(10):901-10.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 40. Allen S, Serufulira A, Gruber V, et al. Pregnancy and contraception use among urban  
5  
6 Rwandan women after HIV testing and counseling. Am J Public Health 1993;**83**(5):705-  
7  
8 10.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

**Table 1** INL and INA characteristics by invitations distributed, success rate, and couple cohabitation status

	INL (N=68)		INA (N=320)		Invitations Distributed	Couples Tested	Average invites/INA	Average couples tested/INA	Success Rate (%)	% invitations given to cohabiting couples	% couples tested who are cohabiting	Success Rate (%)	
	N	%	N	%								Cohab Couples	Non- Cohab Couples
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>		<b>320</b>		<b>29119</b>	<b>1727</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>Network</b>													
Private	16	24%	73	23%	5592	302	77	4	5%	79%	82%	6%	3%
Religious	19	28%	62	19%	5530	282	89	5	5%	85%	95%	6%	4%
Health	12	18%	95	30%	9529	617	100	6	6%	80%	86%	7%	5%
CBO/NGO	21	31%	90	28%	8468	526	94	6	6%	82%	87%	7%	4%
<b>Gender</b>													
Man	46	68%	131	41%	11620	700	89	5	6%	81%	85%	6%	5%
Woman	22	32%	189	59%	17499	1027	93	5	6%	82%	88%	6%	4%
<b>Relationship status</b>													
Married	49	72%	208	65%	18814	1178	90	6	6%	82%	88%	7%	4%
Divorced	5	7%	21	7%	2033	86	97	4	4%	82%	94%	5%	1%
Single	7	10%	38	12%	2902	131	76	3	5%	74%	83%	5%	3%
Widow	7	10%	45	14%	4212	303	94	7	7%	83%	84%	7%	7%
Missing	0	0%	8	3%	1158	29	145	4	3%	78%	79%	3%	2%
<b>Occupation</b>													
Professional/technical/ managerial	28	41%	68	21%	5605	330	82	5	6%	80%	81%	6%	5%
Sales/service	22	32%	163	51%	11462	793	70	5	7%	81%	88%	7%	5%
Agricultural	1	1%	6	2%	739	43	123	7	6%	75%	77%	6%	5%
Unskilled manual labor	12	18%	42	13%	5352	278	127	7	5%	84%	90%	6%	3%
Do not work for money	2	3%	33	10%	4912	253	149	8	5%	82%	90%	6%	3%
Missing	3	4%	8	3%	1049	30	131	4	3%	82%	100%	3%	0%
<b>Read English</b>													
Yes	64	94%	265	83%	23744	1439	90	5	6%	81%	86%	6%	4%

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

No	4	6%	55	17%	5375	288	98	5	5%	82%	92%	6%	2%
<b>Housing</b>													
Provided by employer (free)	5	7%	6	2%	372	38	62	6	10%	83%	95%	12%	3%
Rental home	22	32%	166	52%	16341	985	98	6	6%	81%	86%	6%	4%
Free housing by other means	10	15%	26	8%	1611	113	62	4	7%	80%	89%	8%	4%
Own home	30	44%	120	38%	10583	585	88	5	6%	82%	87%	6%	4%
Missing	1	1%	2	1%	212	6	106	3	3%	62%	100%	5%	0%
<b>Ever tested for HIV</b>													
Yes with partner	41	60%	71	22%	6274	303	88	4	5%	82%	93%	5%	2%
Yes alone	14	21%	113	35%	10424	608	92	5	6%	81%	87%	6%	4%
No	13	19%	135	42%	12207	802	90	6	7%	81%	85%	7%	5%
Missing	0	0%	1	0%	214	14	214	14	7%	86%	86%	7%	7%

**Table 2** Bivariate association between INA characteristics and couples' testing by couples' cohabitation status

INA characteristics	All Couples				Cohabiting Couples				Non-cohabiting Couples			
	Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value	Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value	Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value
<b>Network</b>												
Private	Ref				Ref				Ref			
CBO/NGO	1.23	1.06	1.43	0.01	1.21	1.03	1.42	0.02	1.35	0.88	2.06	0.17
Health	1.29	1.12	1.49	0.001	1.25	1.07	1.46	0.01	1.56	1.04	2.35	0.03
Religious	1.06	0.90	1.26	0.48	1.07	0.90	1.27	0.47	1.02	0.63	1.66	0.94
<b>Gender</b>												
Male	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Female	0.97	0.88	1.07	0.58	1.01	0.91	1.12	0.84	0.79	0.60	1.03	0.09
<b>Age (per year increase)</b>	1.01	1.00	1.01	0.07	1.01	1.00	1.01	0.002	0.98	0.96	0.99	0.001
<b>Years living in Lusaka (per year increase)</b>	1.01	1.00	1.01	<0.001	1.01	1.01	1.01	<0.001	1.00	0.99	1.01	0.80
<b>Relationship status</b>												
Other (divorced, widowed, single)	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Married	1.19	1.07	1.32	0.001	1.22	1.09	1.36	0.001	0.96	0.73	1.26	0.75
<b>Years of relationship (per year increase)*</b>	1.00	0.99	1.01	0.97	1.01	1.00	1.01	0.09	0.95	0.93	0.97	<0.001
<b>Occupation</b>												
Unskilled manual labor	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Professional	1.14	0.97	1.35	0.11	1.02	0.86	1.22	0.82	2.25	1.42	3.57	0.001
Sales/service	1.36	1.18	1.56	<0.001	1.31	1.13	1.52	<0.001	1.73	1.12	2.67	0.01
Agricultural	1.13	0.81	1.57	0.48	0.95	0.66	1.38	0.79	2.24	1.01	4.97	0.05
Do not work for money	0.99	0.83	1.18	0.92	0.99	0.82	1.18	0.87	1.09	0.63	1.88	0.76
<b>Read English</b>												
No	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Yes	1.14	1.00	1.30	0.05	1.06	0.92	1.21	0.44	2.12	1.35	3.33	0.001
<b>Housing</b>												
Other housing (rental, free)	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Own home	0.89	0.80	0.98	0.02	0.89	0.79	0.99	0.03	0.88	0.66	1.16	0.36

Ever tested for HIV

No	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Yes with partner	1.39	1.21	1.59	<0.001	1.26	1.09	1.45	0.002	2.97	1.85	4.78	<0.001
Yes alone	1.22	1.06	1.41	0.01	1.13	0.97	1.31	0.11	2.42	1.48	3.95	<0.001

\*Among those with a partner

Table 3 Bivariate association between couple and invitation characteristics and couples' testing accounting for clustering within INAs and INLs

	All couples		Couples not tested		Couples tested		Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value
	N	%	N	%	N	%				
<b>Couple Characteristics</b>										
Age of man (mean, SD)	33.25	9.03	33.16	8.99	34.61	9.43	1.01	1.01	1.02	<0.001
Age of woman (mean, SD)	27.12	7.75	27.03	7.72	28.60	8.15	1.02	1.02	1.03	<0.001
<b>Relationship of couple</b>										
Not cohabiting	5275	18%	5058	19%	217	13%	Ref			
Cohabiting	23664	82%	22161	81%	1503	87%	1.58	1.38	1.81	<0.001
Years of relationship (mean, SD)	6.27	6.42	6.22	6.35	7.18	7.38	1.02	1.01	1.03	<0.001
Number of children (mean, SD)	2.04	2.16	2.04	2.16	2.06	2.12	1.01	0.99	1.03	0.29
<b>Invitation Characteristics</b>										
<b>Invitee (1st contact)</b>										
Woman	8934	31%	8426	31%	508	30%	Ref			
Couple	8567	30%	7972	29%	595	35%	1.24	1.08	1.43	0.002
Man	11467	40%	10851	40%	616	36%	0.91	0.81	1.03	0.13
<b>Who initiated contact?</b>										
INA	26620	93%	25103	93%	1517	89%	Ref			
Couple	527	2%	475	2%	52	3%	1.71	1.34	2.18	<0.001
Man	877	3%	811	3%	66	4%	1.18	0.88	1.58	0.26
Woman	690	2%	624	2%	66	4%	1.59	1.20	2.10	0.001
<b>Relationship to INA</b>										
Just met/unknown	19688	68%	18749	69%	939	55%	Ref			
Co-worker	287	1%	269	1%	18	1%	1.35	0.89	2.06	0.16
Family	1697	6%	1525	6%	172	10%	2.08	1.75	2.49	<0.001
Social acquaintance (neighbor, friend, church member)	7186	25%	6601	24%	585	34%	1.64	1.43	1.87	<0.001



<b>Place of invitation</b>										
Community	9828	34%	9339	35%	489	29%	Ref			
Couple home	15460	54%	14532	54%	928	55%	1.41	1.23	1.61	<0.001
INA home	1636	6%	1461	5%	175	10%	2.25	1.87	2.71	<0.001
Couple or INA work	1812	6%	1702	6%	110	6%	1.21	0.97	1.51	0.09
<b>Public endorsement</b>										
No	18148	63%	17080	63%	1068	62%	Ref			
Yes	10715	37%	10066	37%	649	38%	1.04	0.92	1.17	0.53
<b>Delivering invitation</b>										
Difficult/somewhat difficult	3030	10%	2912	65%	118	0.4%	Ref			
Easy	25860	89%	1599	35%	24261	99.5%	1.60	1.33	1.93	<0.001
<b>Mobile unit present at time of invitation</b>										
No	14268	49%	13713	50%	909	53%	Ref			
Yes	14622	51%	13679	50%	818	47%	1.12	0.89	1.39	0.33
<b>Neighborhood of invitation</b>										
Neighborhood 1	13705	47%	12911	47%	794	46%	Ref			
Neighborhood 2	15414	53%	14481	53%	933	54%	0.97	0.79	1.18	0.74
Community: church/mosque, clinic, market, street/public place, social gathering										

Table 4 Multivariate model of INA level, couple level, and invitation level characteristics associated with couples' testing

	All Couples				Cohabiting Couples				Non-cohabiting Couples			
	Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value	Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value	Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value
<b>INA characteristics</b>												
<b>Network</b>												
Private	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Religious	1.01	0.71	1.43	0.95	1.01	0.73	1.40	0.94	1.16	0.49	2.77	0.74
Health	1.53	1.15	2.04	0.004	1.48	1.11	1.97	0.01	1.80	0.96	3.35	0.07
CBO/NGO	1.34	1.01	1.77	0.04	1.31	0.98	1.76	0.07	1.53	0.84	2.79	0.16
<b>Years living in Lusaka</b>	1.01	1.00	1.02	0.14	1.01	1.00	1.02	0.07	1.01	0.99	1.04	0.24
<b>Age (per 1 year increase)</b>	1.00	0.99	1.02	0.79	1.00	0.99	1.02	0.53	0.99	0.97	1.01	0.35
<b>Marital status</b>												
Other (divorced, widowed, single)	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Married	1.23	0.99	1.53	0.06	1.28	1.02	1.60	0.03	1.06	0.70	1.62	0.77
<b>Occupation</b>												
Unskilled manual labor	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Professional	1.19	0.77	1.84	0.45	1.06	0.69	1.64	0.79	1.98	0.92	4.27	0.08
Sales/service	1.45	1.01	2.10	0.05	1.37	0.94	1.99	0.11	1.67	0.88	3.19	0.12
Agricultural	1.14	0.65	2.01	0.64	0.97	0.55	1.72	0.93	1.68	0.60	4.67	0.32
Do not work for money	0.95	0.62	1.45	0.81	0.95	0.62	1.45	0.80	0.69	0.26	1.82	0.45
<b>Reads English</b>												
No	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Yes	1.18	0.90	1.55	0.22	1.15	0.87	1.51	0.32	1.98	1.05	3.72	0.03
<b>Housing</b>												
Other housing (rental, free)	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Own home	0.74	0.59	0.92	0.01	0.73	0.58	0.91	0.01	0.93	0.62	1.38	0.71
<b>Ever tested for HIV</b>												
No	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Yes with partner	1.36	1.07	1.72	0.01	1.29	1.01	1.66	0.04	2.13	1.27	3.57	0.004
Yes alone	1.28	1.00	1.64	0.05	1.21	0.94	1.56	0.15	1.92	1.10	3.35	0.02

**Couple Characteristics**

<b>Age of man (per 1 year increase)</b>	1.00	1.00	1.01	0.30	1.01	1.00	1.02	0.10	1.03	1.00	1.05	0.02
<b>Years of relationship (per 1 year increase)</b>	1.01	0.99	1.02	0.35	1.02	1.01	1.03	<0.001	0.45	0.37	0.55	<0.001
<b>Relationship of couple</b>										n/a		n/a
Not cohabiting	Ref											
Cohabiting	1.39	1.19	1.63	<0.001								
<b>Invitation Characteristics</b>												
<b>Invitee (1st contact)</b>												
Individual (Woman/Man)	Ref				Ref					Ref		
Couple	1.20	1.04	1.39	0.01	1.27	1.09	1.49	0.003	0.82	0.52	1.28	0.38
<b>Who initiated contact?</b>												
INA	Ref				Ref					Ref		
Couple	1.35	1.03	1.78	0.03	1.43	1.05	1.94	0.02	0.94	0.27	3.20	0.92
Man	1.22	0.89	1.67	0.22	1.26	0.90	1.75	0.18	1.00	0.47	2.12	1.00
Woman	1.60	1.17	2.19	0.003	1.53	1.10	2.12	0.01	1.54	0.73	3.27	0.26
<b>Relationship to INA</b>												
Just met/unknown	Ref				Ref					Ref		
Co-worker	1.48	0.89	2.43	0.13	1.47	0.84	2.55	0.18	1.11	0.27	4.56	0.89
Social acquaintance (neighbor, friend, church member, family)	1.62	1.41	1.87	<0.001	1.60	1.37	1.87	<0.001	1.60	1.15	2.24	0.01
<b>Place of invitation</b>												
Other (Community or couple/INA work)	Ref				Ref					Ref		
Couple or INA home	1.30	1.14	1.48	<0.001	1.39	1.21	1.61	<0.001	0.93	0.68	1.27	0.65
<b>Delivering invitation</b>												
Difficult/somewhat difficult	Ref				Ref					Ref		
Easy	1.75	1.41	2.17	<0.001	1.87	1.47	2.37	<0.001	1.15	0.67	1.99	0.61

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found
<b>Introduction</b>		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses
<b>Methods</b>		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up (b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
<b>Results</b>		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period

Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses
<b>Discussion</b>		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results
<b>Other information</b>		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at <http://www.strobe-statement.org>.



**Promotion of couples' voluntary HIV counseling and testing in Lusaka, Zambia by influence network leaders and agents**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2012-001171.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	30-Jun-2012
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Wall, Kristin; Emory University, Epidemiology  Kilembe, William; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Nizam, Azhar; Emory University, Biostatistics and Bioinformatics; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Vwalika, Cheswa; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Kautzman, Michelle; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Chomba, Elwyn; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Tichacek, Amanda; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Sardar, Gurkiran; University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Medicine  Casanova, Deborah; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Henderson, Faith; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Mulenga, Joseph; Zambia National Blood Transfusion Services, ; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Kleinbaum, David; Emory University, Epidemiology; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health  Allen, Susan; Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Emory University, Pathology &amp; Laboratory Medicine, Global Health</p>
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Global health, Infectious diseases
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, International health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, HIV & AIDS < INFECTIOUS DISEASES

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

For peer review only

Research Report

**Promotion of couples' voluntary HIV counseling and testing in Lusaka, Zambia by  
influence network leaders and agents**

Kristin M Wall, William Kilembe, Azhar Nizam, Cheswa Vwalika, Michelle Kautzman, Elwyn  
Chomba, Amanda Tichacek, Gurkiran Sardar, Deborah Casanova, Faith Henderson, Joseph  
Mulenga, David Kleinbaum, Susan Allen

All authors: Rwanda Zambia HIV Research Group, Dept of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine,  
School of Medicine and Hubert Dept of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory  
University, Atlanta, GA, USA

William Kilembe MD MSc, Cheswa Vwalika MD MPH, Michele Kautzman MD MPH, Elwyn  
Chomba MD, Gurkiran Sardar MD MPH, Deborah Casanova MPH, Faith Henderson MPH,  
Joseph Mulenga MD MBA; Zambia Emory HIV Research Project, Lusaka, Zambia

Additional affiliations:

Kristin M Wall, MS PhD (cand), and David Kleinbaum, PhD, Department of Epidemiology,  
Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Azhar Nizam, MS, Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Rollins School of Public  
Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA



1  
2  
3 Elwyn Chomba, MD, University Teaching Hospital and University of Zambia School of  
4  
5  
6 Medicine, Lusaka, Zambia

7  
8 Joseph Mulenga MD MBA, Zambia National Blood Transfusion Services, Lusaka, Zambia

9  
10 Gurkiran Sardar, MD, MPH, University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Medicine, Chicago, IL,  
11  
12 USA

13  
14 Susan Allen MD MPH and Amanda Tichacek MPH, Department of Pathology and Laboratory  
15  
16 Medicine, School of Medicine, and Department of Global Health, School of Public Health,  
17  
18 Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA  
19  
20

21  
22  
23  
24  
25 **Running Head:** Couples' voluntary HIV counseling and testing promotions  
26  
27

28  
29 **Corresponding Author:**

30  
31 Kristin M Wall

32  
33 Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, Emory University

34  
35 1518 Clifton Road NE, 3rd Floor

36  
37 Atlanta, GA 30322

38  
39 Phone: (512) 785-4779

40  
41 E-mail: kmwall@emory.edu  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 **Keywords:** community workers, couples' voluntary counseling and testing, HIV, Zambia  
50  
51

52  
53 **Word Count:**

54  
55 Text: 3106 words  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Abstract: 300 words  
4

5 **ABSTRACT**  
6

7  
8 **Objectives:** Hypothesizing that couples' voluntary counseling and testing (CVCT) promotions  
9  
10 can increase CVCT uptake, this study identified predictors of successful CVCT promotion in  
11  
12 Lusaka, Zambia.  
13

14  
15 **Design:** Cohort study  
16

17  
18 **Setting:** Lusaka, Zambia  
19

20  
21 **Participants:** 68 influential network leaders [INLs] identified 320 agents [INAs] who delivered  
22  
23 29,119 CVCT invitations to heterosexual couples  
24

25  
26 **Intervention:** The CVCT promotional model used INLs who identified INAs who in turn  
27  
28 conducted community-based promotion and distribution of CVCT invitations in two  
29  
30 neighborhoods over 18 months, with a mobile unit in one neighborhood crossing over to the  
31  
32 other mid-way through.  
33

34  
35 **Primary outcome:** The primary outcome of interest was couple testing (yes/no) after receipt of a  
36  
37 CVCT invitation. INA, couple, and invitation characteristics predictive of couples' testing were  
38  
39 evaluated accounting for two-level clustering.  
40

41  
42 **Results:** INAs delivered invitations resulting in 1727 couples testing (6% success rate). In  
43  
44 multivariate analyses, INA characteristics significantly predictive of CVCT uptake included  
45  
46 promoting in community-based (adjusted odds ratio [aOR]=1.3; 95%CI=1.0-1.8) or health  
47  
48 (aOR=1.5; 95%CI=1.2-2.0) networks versus private networks; being employed in the  
49  
50 sales/service industry (aOR=1.5; 95%CI=1.0-2.1) versus unskilled manual labor; owning a home  
51  
52 (aOR=0.7; 95%CI=0.6-0.9) versus not; and having tested for HIV with a partner (aOR=1.4;  
53  
54 95%CI=1.1-1.7) or alone (aOR=1.3; 95%CI=1.0-1.6) versus never having tested. Cohabiting  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 couples were more likely to test (aOR=1.4; 95%CI=1.2-1.6) than non-cohabiting couples.

4  
5 Context characteristics predictive of CVCT uptake included inviting couples (aOR=1.2;  
6  
7  
8 95%CI=1.0-1.4) versus individuals; the woman (aOR=1.6; 95%CI=1.2-2.2) or couple (aOR=1.4;  
9  
10 95%CI=1.0-1.8) initiating contact versus the INA; the couple being socially acquainted with the  
11  
12 INA (aOR=1.6; 95%CI=1.4-1.9) versus having just met; home invitation delivery (aOR=1.3;  
13  
14 95%CI=1.1-1.5) versus elsewhere; and easy invitation delivery (aOR=1.8; 95%CI=1.4-2.2)  
15  
16  
17 versus difficult as reported by the INA.

18  
19 **Conclusions:** This study demonstrated the ability of influential people to promote CVCT and  
20  
21 identified agent, couple, and context-level factors associated with CVCT uptake in Lusaka,  
22  
23 Zambia. We encourage the development of CVCT promotions in other sub-Saharan African  
24  
25 countries to support sustained CVCT dissemination.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ARTICLE SUMMARY

### Article Focus

- Given preliminary findings from Zambia and Rwanda suggesting community-based promotion of CVCT is effective, we hypothesize that predictors of successful promotions can be identified to increase CVCT uptake in Lusaka, Zambia.
- This study evaluated the ability of community-based activities to promote CVCT and identified predictors of CVCT uptake in Lusaka, Zambia.

### Key Messages

- Here, we demonstrated not only the feasibility of CVCT promotions using influential network agent and leaders (INAs and INLs) to promote CVCT, but also identified INA, couple, and invitation-level predictors of CVCT uptake.
- The predictors of CVCT uptake included: recruiting INAs who have tested with partners, focusing invitations on INA acquaintances, issuing invitations to couples and in a discreet location, and utilizing INAs from non-governmental and health networks.

### Strengths and Limitations

- These predictors can be used to enhance CVCT promotions in Zambia and may be extended as a framework to other locales, with adaptation based on location-specific predictors of CVCT promotions.
- Country-specific differences in CVCT promotions indicate that more research into site-specific predictors of CVCT may be necessary for successful CVCT promotions in other locales.

## BACKGROUND

In 2009, 68% of the global HIV-positive population resided in sub-Saharan Africa, equating to roughly 22.5 million cases. Zambia has one of the largest HIV burdens, with roughly 980 000 prevalent and 76 000 incident cases in 2009,[1] and HIV prevalence roughly twice as high in urban (20%) versus rural (<10%) areas.[2]

Heterosexual transmission is the primary cause of incident HIV infections in sub-Saharan Africa where discordant couples (an HIV+ and HIV- partner) in long-term relationships represent the largest group at-risk for HIV.[1, 3] In urban Zambia, roughly 60% of new

1  
2  
3 infections occurred between married/cohabiting heterosexual couples [3], and 17% of pregnant  
4  
5 couples in Lusaka were discordant.[4]  
6  
7

8 Knowledge of HIV serostatus is critical for transmission prevention. According to the  
9  
10 2007 Zambia Demographic and Health Survey, although most adults know where to receive an  
11  
12 HIV test, only 35% of women and 20% of men have ever tested and received results.[2]  
13  
14 Voluntary HIV counseling and testing [VCT] is an evidence-based strategy to increase serostatus  
15  
16 awareness, decrease high-risk behavior, and decrease transmission.[5] Couples' VCT [CVCT],  
17  
18 in which both partners are tested and mutually disclose results, addresses issues with disclosure,  
19  
20 allows for risk-reduction planning based on partner serostatus, and decreases high-risk  
21  
22 behavior.[6-8] However, though CVCT effectively targets the highest at-risk group in sub-  
23  
24 Saharan Africa, it has not been widely disseminated due to lack of demand and supply, and lack  
25  
26 of funding. Lack of demand primarily results from insufficient knowledge about the possibility  
27  
28 of couple serodiscordance and CVCT services.[8-11]  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The Zambia-Emory HIV Research Project [ZEHRP], based in Lusaka, provides CVCT  
35  
36 services. ZEHRP and other groups have shown clinic and community-based CVCT promotions  
37  
38 can increase CVCT awareness and demand.[4, 11-14] Social networks and community leaders  
39  
40 are critical in changing perceptions towards HIV/AIDS and other health issues in sub-Saharan  
41  
42 Africa. [15-18] At ZEHRP, CVCT promotional efforts are directed by influential network  
43  
44 leaders [INLs] and agents [INAs], based on the Social Networks and Social Support Theory.[19]  
45  
46 This study assessed the ability of INLs and INAs to promote CVCT and identified predictors of  
47  
48 CVCT uptake in Lusaka.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

## 55 **METHODS**

56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### **INL and INA recruitment and training**

ZEHRP CVCT promotions maximize program impact by utilizing two existing social networks levels -- INLs and INAs. INL and INA recruitment and training methods are described elsewhere.[13, 20] Briefly, INLs were identified from CVCT consensus meetings and national/citywide umbrella referrals from four social networks (faith-based/religious, health, private, and community-based/non-governmental organizations [CBO/NGO]). INLs identified INA candidates from their respective networks, and final selection was made after interviewing with experienced ZEHRP counselors. INLs and INAs completed IRB-approved written informed consents, completed demographic questionnaires, and selected a network category that best described their role when promoting CVCT. Enrolled INAs received four-day training in HIV/AIDS health advocacy/outreach, social networking, CVCT promotions, and observation of successful door-to-door ZEHRP promotional strategies. During training, INLs and INAs were offered CVCT or VCT.

### **CVCT promotions**

CVCT promotional activities took place from July 2004-December 2005 in two randomly selected neighborhoods as described elsewhere.[21] Briefly, of eight neighborhoods assessed as potential sites, two were selected based on similar population size, infrastructure, and with consideration of geographic distance to minimize spillover effects. CVCT promotions and services were implemented in these neighborhoods, and a mobile unit operated in one neighborhood and crossed over to the other mid-way through the study. Given the catchment areas of these two neighborhoods (99,280 and 85,022 individuals), it was assumed that couples would rarely receive multiple invitations. INAs distributed invitations to couples or individuals within their neighborhoods that detailed CVCT facility directions and procedures. Couples

1  
2  
3 could be cohabiting or non-cohabiting. Invitations included a unique ID, INA identifier, and a  
4  
5 receipt portion that the INA retained and submitted bi-weekly. The receipt portion contained the  
6  
7 invitation ID and space to record the date, time, place of invitation, relationship of the INA and  
8  
9 recipient, recipient description (man, woman, or couple), recipients' age(s), residence, marital  
10  
11 status, and INA's perception of the difficulty of invitation delivery.  
12

13  
14  
15 Before March 18, 2005, INAs received \$0.21/invitation issued and an additional  
16  
17 \$4.20/couple attending CVCT. Beginning March 19, 2005, payment/invitation was reduced to  
18  
19 \$0.11 and payment/couple attending CVCT was increased to \$5.25 to deter fraudulent  
20  
21 completion of invitation receipts. In addition to fixed CVCT sites, which could serve 30  
22  
23 couples/day, a mobile HIV testing unit, which could serve an additional 30 couples/day, was  
24  
25 available for nine months in one neighborhood and then nine months in the other. Mobile testing  
26  
27 sites were selected based on facility (churches, schools, and community centers) availability. For  
28  
29 perspective, Purchasing Power Parity in Zambia, an adjusted measure of per-capita-income  
30  
31 number, is \$1500/year,[22] and the proportion of Zambians living on less than \$1/day is  
32  
33 63.6%.[23]  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 **CVCT procedures**

39  
40 CVCT procedures are described elsewhere.[13] Briefly, couples participate in group counseling,  
41  
42 joint pre-test counseling, and, for those testing, confidential informed consent procedures,  
43  
44 phlebotomy, rapid HIV testing,[24] and joint post-test counseling and test result delivery. CVCT  
45  
46 services were free and transportation to testing sites was reimbursed. Invitation receipts were  
47  
48 collected from INA-invited couples and the invitation ID was linked to the couple ID number.  
49  
50 The study was approved by the Emory University IRB and the University of Zambia Research  
51  
52 Ethics committee. Informed consent was obtained from all study participants.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Statistical analysis

Counts (percentages) for categorical variables and means (standard deviations) for continuous variables were calculated for INL, INA, couple, and invitation-level characteristics. Number of invitations distributed was tabulated by INA characteristic as were success rates (the number couples tested/number invitations distributed). Analyses were stratified by couple cohabitation status to identify differences in CVCT uptake and predictors of success. INAs not achieving  $\geq 1.5\%$  success were excluded from analyses to prevent inclusion of INAs systematically returning fraudulent receipts.

Crude odds ratios [ORs], 95% CIs, and p-values evaluated associations between INA-level characteristics predictive of successful invitations. Generalized estimating equation [GEE] methods evaluated the association between couple and invitation-level characteristics predictive of successful invitations. Since couple and invitation-level data are clustered at two-levels, within individual INAs and INLs, GEE methods accounted for non-independence of observations.

INA, couple, and invitation-level variables significant (Bonferroni corrected p-value=0.002) in univariate analyses were entered into a multivariate logistic regression model, and variables were examined for multi-collinearity. GEE methods accounted for clustering of couple and invitation-level characteristics within individual INAs and INLs. We fit the marginal multilevel logistic regression model using PROC GENMOD. GEE analysis methods with an exchangeable correlation structure accounted for two-level clustering of couple and invitation level characteristics within individual INAs and INLs. We hypothesized a priori that an exchangeable correlation structure would be appropriate since couples within a cluster should not



1  
2  
3 be increasingly/decreasingly correlated. We also considered other correlation structures, such as  
4  
5 unstructured. Data analysis was conducted with SASv9.2 (North Carolina, USA).  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **RESULTS**

### 11 **INL characteristics**

12  
13 Sixty-eight INLs were recruited from CBO/NGO, faith-based, health, and private sector  
14  
15 networks. Average INL age was 45 (inter-quartile range [IQR]=36-52), and 68% were men.  
16  
17 Average years living in Lusaka was 25 (IQR=15-34), and 72% were married. Almost all INLs  
18  
19 understood Nyanja and/or Bemba or English, roughly half owned their home, and most had  
20  
21 previously tested for HIV (Table 1).  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 **INA characteristics associated with couples' testing (Tables 1-2)**

27  
28 INLs recruited 320 INAs (excluding 70 INAs with <1.5% success), and overall, INAs distributed  
29  
30 29,119 invitations with 1727 couples tested for an average of 91 invites/INA and 5 couples  
31  
32 tested/INA. INAs affiliated with CBO/NGOs distributed more than average invitations/INA and  
33  
34 were more likely to successfully invite cohabiting couples relative to private network INAs.  
35  
36 Health network INAs also distributed a high number of average invitations/INA and were more  
37  
38 successful among all couples relative to private network INAs (Tables 1-2).  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Most INAs were women, and performance with respect to invitations delivered, success  
45  
46 rates, and average number of couples tested was similar by gender (Table 1). Average INA age  
47  
48 was 37 (IQR=29-44), and older INAs were significantly more successful among cohabiting, but  
49  
50 less successful among non-cohabiting, couples relative to younger INAs (Table 2). The average  
51  
52 number of years living in Lusaka was 21 (IQR=11-30) (data not shown), and years living in  
53  
54 Lusaka significantly predicted successful invitation among cohabiting couples (Table 2).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Married INAs were significantly more successful among cohabiting couples relative to divorced, widowed, or single INAs (Table 2). Divorced INAs had very low success rates among non-cohabiting couples (Table 1). Among INAs with a partner, years of current relationship had a similar effect as age, with longer unions associated with significantly decreased success among non-cohabiting couples.

Seventy-four percent of INAs were sales/service industry employees, and these INAs were significantly more successful among cohabiting and non-cohabiting couples relative to unskilled manual laborers. Professional and agricultural sector employees were also more successful among non-cohabiting couples (Table 2). Eighty percent of INAs could read English (Table 1), and this was associated with successful invitations among non-cohabiting couples only.

Over half of INAs rented their home. The 38% who owned a home were less successful than those who rented or lived in housing provided by others; with stratification this remained significant only among cohabiting couples (Table 2). Two percent of INAs had housing provided by an employer and were substantially more successful among cohabiting couples (Table 1).

Only 57% of INAs had tested for HIV with a partner (22%) or alone (35%) (Table 1). INAs testing for HIV with a partner were more successful among all couples, and testing alone was associated with higher success among non-cohabiting couples relative to never testing (Table 2).

Seventy INAs did not achieve 1.5% success and were excluded from analyses as their invitation receipts were suspected to have been fraudulently completed. These INAs distributed 125 invitations/INA and were similar to INAs in the analysis by gender ( $\chi^2$  test of association=0.8, p=0.4), age (t-statistic=-1.9, p=0.06), and network ( $\chi^2=3.7$ , p=0.3). The average

1  
2  
3 success of these 70 INAs was 0.57%, and when adding these INAs to those included in the  
4  
5 analysis, overall INA success was 4.97%.  
6  
7

### 8 **Couple and invitation characteristics associated with couples' testing (Table 3)**

9

10 The mean age of men was 33 and of women was 27 years. Couples' testing were slightly older  
11  
12 than those not testing ( $p < 0.001$ ). Most couples were cohabiting, and these were significantly  
13  
14 more likely to test versus non-cohabiting couples. The mean duration of relationship was 6  
15  
16 years, and tested couples had been together on average one year longer than non-tested couples.  
17  
18

19  
20 INAs initiated contact 93% of the time, though in the rare instances when the couple or  
21  
22 the woman initiated contact with the INA, the couple was more likely to test. Inviting a couple  
23  
24 together also resulted in increased testing. Couples who were family members or social  
25  
26 acquaintances of the INA were more likely to test versus those previously unacquainted. Ease of  
27  
28 invitation delivery (operationalized as not being time-consuming, requiring long explanations,  
29  
30 challenging because of invitee resistance or scheduling conflicts) was also associated with  
31  
32 couples' testing. Interestingly, though public endorsements were predictive of testing during a  
33  
34 pilot study [13], they were not associated with increased uptake of testing in this larger study.  
35  
36 Similarly, the presence of mobile units was not associated with increased testing.  
37  
38

### 39 **Multivariate model of couples' testing predictors (Table 4)**

40

41 Age of the man and woman were collinear and woman's age was excluded from the multivariate  
42  
43 model. Couple cohabitation status was an effect measure modifier, and multivariate analyses  
44  
45 were stratified by cohabitation status. All adjusted ORs [aORs] presented below were  
46  
47 statistically significant in multivariate analyses accounting for two-level clustering.  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 Health sector INAs were most successful (aOR=1.5) followed by CBO/NGO INAs  
53  
54 (aOR=1.3) relative to private sector INAs. Married INAs were more successful versus others  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 among cohabiting couples (aOR=1.3). Sales/service industry employees (aOR=1.5) versus  
4  
5 unskilled manual laborers were more successful overall. Among non-cohabiting couples, INAs  
6  
7 who could read English were more successful (aOR=2.0) whereas among cohabiting couples,  
8  
9 INAs owning homes were less successful (aOR=0.7). INAs who had tested for HIV with a  
10  
11 partner were more successful among all couples (aOR=1.4), while those who had tested for HIV  
12  
13 alone were more successful among non-cohabiting couples (aOR=2.1), versus INAs who had  
14  
15 never tested. Cohabiting couples were more likely to test (aOR=1.4) versus non-cohabiting  
16  
17 couples.  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Invitation-level predictors of testing among cohabiting couples included inviting the  
23  
24 couple versus the woman alone (aOR=1.3); also couple (aOR=1.4) versus INA initiated contact  
25  
26 was predictive. Being socially acquainted with the INA (aOR=1.6) versus having just met was  
27  
28 predictive among all couples, while home CVCT invitation delivery (aOR=1.4) versus  
29  
30 elsewhere, and easy invitation delivery (aOR=1.9) versus difficult were predictive among  
31  
32 cohabiting couples.  
33  
34  
35

## 36 **DISCUSSION**

37  
38 In an African capital city where very few couples have jointly tested for HIV, a promotional  
39  
40 program using INLs and INAs prompted approximately 100 couples/month to seek CVCT. INA  
41  
42 network, occupation, marital status, and testing history, as well as couple cohabitation status and  
43  
44 the INA-invitee relationship, influenced invitation success. Invitations delivered to the couple,  
45  
46 in the home, and invitations initiated by the woman partner were also significant CVCT uptake  
47  
48 predictors.  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 CBO/NGO and health network INAs were more successful than faith-based or private  
54  
55 sector INAs. CBO/NGO networks included parent teacher, legal aid, skills training, and health  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 information organizations. Health networks included clinical officers, nurses, home healthcare  
4  
5 visitors, community health workers, neighborhood health committee members, and traditional  
6  
7 birth attendants. The private sector included individuals who were self-employed or those  
8  
9 involved in providing the public with goods or services. Previous studies have similarly  
10  
11 demonstrated the ability of influential people to effectively disseminate information and change  
12  
13 attitudes and behaviors towards HIV in sub-Saharan Africa.[16-18] Unlike health and  
14  
15 CBO/NGO INAs, private sector INAs may have been preoccupied with income generation  
16  
17 and/or did not have similar opportunities to integrate CVCT promotions into their daily routine.  
18  
19 The marginal performance of faith-based INAs was surprising given Zambia is strongly  
20  
21 religious; however, though religious leaders have opportunities to promote from the pulpit, the  
22  
23 stigma associated with sexually transmitted infections [STIs] may inhibit open discussion of  
24  
25 CVCT.[17, 25]  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 Cohabiting couples were more likely than non-cohabiting couples to test, and married  
33  
34 INAs delivered more successful invitations than unmarried INAs. Fear of stigma among married  
35  
36 couples is common,[9, 26, 27] and perhaps married INAs were able to more successfully  
37  
38 overcome this barrier with their fellow married couples. INAs who previously tested for HIV  
39  
40 with a partner were also more successful than those who had not tested, likely due to their  
41  
42 firsthand knowledge of CVCT procedures and ability to speak personally to perceived CVCT  
43  
44 barriers.  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 INAs socially acquainted with the invitee were more successful versus those who were  
50  
51 previously unacquainted. The strength of INA-invitee relationship may facilitate open discussion  
52  
53 of CVCT and engender confidence. INAs inviting the couple together versus either partner  
54  
55 alone, potentially removing pressure for one partner to propose testing to the other, were also  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 more successful. Previous studies support the effectiveness of couple-level targeted prevention  
4 strategies.[13, 28-31]  
5  
6

7  
8       Though most invitations were initiated by INAs, when the woman partner initiated  
9 contact with the INA, CVCT uptake increased. This finding likely reflects pre-existing  
10 motivation to discuss or participate in CVCT.  
11  
12

13  
14       Invitations delivered in the home versus community were more effective. Previous  
15 studies indicate that home and workplace HIV counseling and testing promotions are more  
16 successful in Zambia, Uganda, and Malawi relative to community locations.[32-35] These  
17 findings are likely due to increased discretion and comfort associated with home settings.  
18  
19

20  
21       Results from a similar study using both INLs and INAs in Kigali, Rwanda highlight  
22 country-specific similarities and differences. Similar to Zambia, Rwandan health INAs were  
23 more successful relative to private network INAs. Married Rwandan INAs were more successful  
24 than single INAs, and cohabiting couples were more likely to test than non-cohabiting couples in  
25 univariate analyses. We similarly found that invitations delivered to couples socially acquainted  
26 with the INA, woman partner initiated contact, and invitations delivered in the home were more  
27 successful in multivariate analyses in Rwanda. In contrast to this study, Rwandan faith-based  
28 INAs were more successful in univariate analyses relative to private network INAs, and the  
29 overall INA success rate in Rwanda was higher (18%). Mobile units were also associated with  
30 increased testing in Rwanda.[20] We were surprised that the mobile unit was not predictive of  
31 testing in this analysis as in Rwanda, not because of mitigated transportation costs, which were  
32 reimbursed, but because of the increased convenience and decreased time commitments  
33 engendered by mobile testing. More research is needed to determine why the mobile testing  
34 units did not increase uptake.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Kigali and Lusaka, though both capital cities, differ in several important ways: Kigali has  
4 a monolingual population of 800,000 with easy and inexpensive transportation. In contrast,  
5  
6 Lusaka's 1.7 million inhabitants represent all 73 Zambian languages/dialects, the city is large,  
7  
8 and transportation is expensive. Another study in the Bemba-speaking Copperbelt region of  
9  
10 Zambia combined INA promotions with mass media strategies in two cities of 600,000 each and  
11  
12 obtained success rates between those found in Lusaka and Kigali.[14] These linguistic and  
13  
14 infrastructural differences highlight the importance of testing and adapting network-based  
15  
16 promotional models to different environments.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Results from a pilot study of promotions in Lusaka with 33 INAs (no INLs) showed that,  
23  
24 while invitation-level predictors were similar to those found in this larger study, the small sample  
25  
26 size did not allow simultaneous detection of INA, couple, and invitation-level characteristics in  
27  
28 hierarchical analysis.[13] Similarly, the Copperbelt study described previously did not examine  
29  
30 INA, couple, or invitation-level predictors of success.[14]  
31  
32  
33

34 The exclusion of the 70 INAs who did not achieve 1.5% success was considered  
35  
36 necessary in order to determine the INA-level predictors of successful invitation delivery among  
37  
38 INAs not returning fraudulent invitation receipts. We acknowledge that this exclusion may  
39  
40 discount INAs who were poor performers in addition to INAs returning fraudulent receipts  
41  
42 thereby reducing the generalizability of our findings to more productive INAs..  
43  
44  
45

46 Overall, this study demonstrated the feasibility of CVCT promotions in Lusaka, and we  
47  
48 believe success rates could be considerably increased by utilizing the modifiable predictors of  
49  
50 CVCT uptake identified: recruiting INAs who have tested with partners, focusing invitations on  
51  
52 INA acquaintances, issuing invitations to couples and in a discreet location, and utilizing INAs  
53  
54 from CBO/NGO and health networks. It should be noted that most of the statistically significant  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 aORs are close to the null suggesting cautious interpretation of these associations. More  
4  
5 research is especially needed to encourage faith-based leaders in Zambia to more effectively  
6  
7 promote CVCT.  
8  
9

## 10 11 12 **CONCLUSION**

13  
14  
15 CVCT is an evidence-based testing strategy shown to reduce transmission of HIV and other STIs  
16  
17 and to help prevent unintended pregnancies in sub-Saharan Africa. However, CVCT has yet to  
18  
19 be widely implemented in this region.[4, 6, 7, 36-40] Here, we demonstrated not only the  
20  
21 feasibility of CVCT promotions using INAs and INLs, but also identified practical INA, couple,  
22  
23 and invitation-level factors which were marginally though significantly predictive of CVCT  
24  
25 uptake in these analyses. These predictors can be used to enhance CVCT promotions in Zambia  
26  
27 and may be extended as a framework to other locales, with adaptation based on location-specific  
28  
29 predictors of CVCT promotions.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### Contributorship statement

Kristin M Wall – made substantial contributions to the analysis and interpretation of data, drafting the article and revising it critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

William Kilembe - made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

Azhar Nizam – made substantial contributions to the analysis and interpretation of data, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

Cheswa Vwalika – made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

Michelle Kautzman – made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

Elwyn Chomba - made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

Amanda Tichacek - made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published

1  
2  
3 Gurkiran Sardar - made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the  
4 article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be  
5 published  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Deborah Casanova - made substantial contributions to data acquisition, revising the article  
11 critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be  
12 published  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 Faith Henderson - made substantial contributions to data acquisition, revising the article critically  
18 for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published  
19  
20  
21

22 Joseph Mulenga - made substantial contributions to data acquisition, revising the article critically  
23 for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published  
24  
25  
26

27 David Kleinbaum - made substantial contributions to the analysis and interpretation of data,  
28 revising the article critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the  
29 version to be published  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Susan Allen - made substantial contributions to study conception and design, revising the article  
35 critically for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be  
36 published  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Acknowledgements**

44 We would like to acknowledge and thank the study participants, staff, interns, and Project  
45 Management Group members of the Zambia-Emory HIV Research Project in Lusaka, Zambia.  
46  
47  
48

49 We would also like to thank Drs Joseph Telfair, David L Roth, Leslie Clark, and Alan Haworth  
50 for participating in the development of this intervention.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Competing interests

The authors have no competing interests, including relevant financial interests, activities, relationships, and affiliations.

### Data sharing statement

There is no additional data available.

### Funding

This work was supported by funding from the National Institute of Mental Health [R01 66767]; the AIDS International Training and Research Program Fogarty International Center [D43 TW001042]; the Emory Center for AIDS Research [P30 AI050409]; National Institutes of Health [R01s AI40951, AI51231, HD40125]; and the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative.

**REFERENCES**

1. Global Report: UNAIDS report on the global AIDS epidemic 2010. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) 2010.  
[http://www.unaids.org/documents/20101123\\_GlobalReport\\_em.pdf](http://www.unaids.org/documents/20101123_GlobalReport_em.pdf) (accessed 19 Dec 2010).
2. Zambia Demographic and Health Survey 2007. Central Statistical Office (CSO), Ministry of Health (MOH), Tropical Diseases Research Centre (TDRC), University of Zambia, and Macro International Inc. 2009. Calverton, Maryland, USA: CSO and Macro International Inc.
3. Dunkle KL, Stephenson R, Karita E, et al. New heterosexually transmitted HIV infections in married or cohabiting couples in urban Zambia and Rwanda: an analysis of survey and clinical data. *Lancet* 2008;**371**(9631):2183-91.
4. Conkling M, Shutes EL, Karita E, et al. Couples' voluntary counselling and testing and nevirapine use in antenatal clinics in two African capitals: a prospective cohort study. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2010;**3**(1):10.
5. UNAIDS Technical Update: Voluntary counselling and testing (VCT). Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) 2000. <http://www.who.org> (accessed 4 Dec 2010).
6. Allen S, Tice J, Van de Perre P, et al. Effect of serotesting with counselling on condom use and seroconversion among HIV discordant couples in Africa. *BMJ* 1992;**304**(6842):1605-9.

- 1  
2  
3 7. The Voluntary HIV-1 Counseling and Testing Efficacy Study Group. Efficacy of  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
10. 8. Painter TM. Voluntary counseling and testing for couples: a high-leverage intervention  
for HIV/AIDS prevention in sub-Saharan Africa. Soc Sci Med 2001;**53**(11):1397-411.
9. Roth DL, Stewart KE, Clay OJ, et al. Sexual practices of HIV discordant and concordant  
couples in Rwanda: effects of a testing and counselling programme for men. Int J STD  
AIDS 2001;**12**(3):181-8.
10. Bakari JP, McKenna S, Myrick A, et al. Rapid voluntary testing and counseling for HIV.  
Acceptability and feasibility in Zambian antenatal care clinics. Ann NY Acad Sci  
2000;**918**:64-76.
11. McKenna SL, Muyinda GK, Roth D, et al. Rapid HIV testing and counseling for  
voluntary testing centers in Africa. AIDS 1997;**11**(Suppl 1):S103-10.
12. Chomba E, Allen S, Kanweka W, et al. Evolution of couples' voluntary counseling and  
testing for HIV in Lusaka, Zambia. JAIDS 2008;**47**(1):108-15.
13. Allen S, Karita E, Chomba E, et al. Promotion of couples' voluntary counselling and  
testing for HIV through influential networks in two African capital cities. BMC Public  
Health 2007;**7**:349.
14. Lambdin BH, Kanweka W, Inambao M, et al. Local residents trained as 'influence agents'  
most effective in persuading African couples on HIV counseling and testing. Health Aff  
(Millwood) 2011;**30**(8):1488-97.

- 1  
2  
3 15. Baiden F, Akanlu G, Hodgson A, et al. Using lay counsellors to promote community-  
4 based voluntary counselling and HIV testing in rural northern Ghana: a baseline survey  
5 on community acceptance and stigma. *J Biosoc Sci* 2007;**39**(5):721-33.  
6  
7
- 8  
9  
10 16. Helleringer S, Kohler HP. Social networks, perceptions of risk, and changing attitudes  
11 towards HIV/AIDS: new evidence from a longitudinal study using fixed-effects analysis.  
12 *Popul Stud (Camb)* 2005;**59**(3):265-82.  
13  
14
- 15  
16  
17 17. Trinitapoli J. Religious Responses to AIDS in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Examination of  
18 Religious Congregations in Rural Malawi. *Review of Religious Research* 2006;**47**:253-  
19 270.  
20  
21
- 22  
23  
24 18. Kohler HP, Behrman JR, Watkins SC. Social networks and HIV/AIDS risk perceptions.  
25 *Demography* 2007;**44**(1):1-33.  
26  
27
- 28  
29  
30 19. Heaney CA, Israel BA. Social Networks and Social Support. In: Glanz K, Rimer BK,  
31 Lewis FM, eds. *Health Behavior and Health Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass  
32 2002.  
33  
34
- 35  
36  
37 20. Wall KM, Karita E, Nizam A et al. Influence network effectiveness in promoting couples'  
38 HIV voluntary counseling and testing in Kigali, Rwanda. *AIDS* 2012;**26**(2):217-227.  
39  
40
- 41  
42  
43 21. Kelley A, Karita E, Sullivan P, et al. Knowledge and perceptions of couples' voluntary  
44 counseling and testing in urban Rwanda and Zambia: a cross-sectional household survey.  
45 *PLoS One* 2011;**6**(5):e19573.  
46  
47
- 48  
49  
50 22. Zambia GDP - per capita (PPP). IndexMundi 2011.  
51 [http://www.indexmundi.com/zambia/gdp\\_per\\_capita\\_\(ppp\).html](http://www.indexmundi.com/zambia/gdp_per_capita_(ppp).html) (accessed 29 Feb 2012).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
23. *Zambian Economy Statistics. NationMaster 2003-2012.*  
[http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/eco\\_pop\\_und\\_1\\_a\\_day-economy-population-under-1-day](http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/eco_pop_und_1_a_day-economy-population-under-1-day) (accessed 29 Feb 2012).
  24. Boeras DI, Luisi N, Karita E, et al. Indeterminate and discrepant rapid HIV test results in couples' HIV testing and counselling centres in Africa. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2011;**14**:18.
  25. Ucheaga DN, Hartwig KA. Religious leaders' response to AIDS in Nigeria. *Glob Public Health* 2010;**5**(6):611-25.
  26. Kilewo C, Massawe A, Lyamuya E, et al. HIV counseling and testing of pregnant women in sub-Saharan Africa: experiences from a study on prevention of mother-to-child HIV-1 transmission in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *JAIDS* 2001;**28**(5):458-62.
  27. Keogh P, Allen S, Almedal C, et al. The social impact of HIV infection on women in Kigali, Rwanda: a prospective study. *Soc Sci Med* 1994;**38**(8):1047-53.
  28. Kakimoto K, Kanal K, Mukoyama Y, et al. Influence of the involvement of partners in the mother class with voluntary confidential counseling and testing acceptance for prevention of mother to child transmission of HIV programme (PMTCT programme) in Cambodia. *AIDS Care* 2007;**19**:381-384.
  29. Desgrees du Lou A, Brou H, Djohan G, et al. Beneficial Effects of Offering Prenatal HIV Counselling and Testing on Developing a HIV Preventive Attitude Among Couples, Abidjan 2002-2005. *AIDS Behav* 2009;**13**(2):348-55.
  30. El-Bassel N, Witte SS, Gilbert L, et al. The efficacy of a relationship-based HIV/STD prevention program for heterosexual couples. *Am J Public Health* 2003;**93**(6):963-9.

- 1  
2  
3 31. Were WA, Mermin JH, Wamai N, et al. Undiagnosed HIV infection and couple HIV  
4  
5 discordance among household members of HIV-infected people receiving antiretroviral  
6  
7 therapy in Uganda. *JAIDS* 2006;**43**(1):91-5.
- 8  
9  
10 32. Angotti N, Gaydos L, Kimchi E, et al. The Fear Factor in HIV Testing: Local Reactions  
11  
12 to Door-to-Door Rapid Blood Testing for HIV in Rural Malawi. *American Sociological*  
13  
14 *Association Annual Conference*. New York, NY: 2007.
- 15  
16  
17 33. Fylkesnes K, Siziya S. A randomized trial on acceptability of voluntary HIV counselling  
18  
19 and testing. *Trop Med Int Health* 2004;**9**(5):566-572.
- 20  
21  
22 34. Corbett E, Dauya E, Matambo R, et al. Uptake of workplace HIV counselling and testing:  
23  
24 a clusterrandomised trial in Zimbabwe. *PLoS Med* 2006;**3**:e238.
- 25  
26  
27 35. Wolff B, Nyanzi B, Katongole G, et al. Evaluation of a home-based voluntary  
28  
29 counselling and testing intervention in rural Uganda. *Health Policy Plan* 2005;**20**:109-  
30  
31 116.
- 32  
33  
34 36. Allen S, Meinzen-Derr J, Kautzman M, et al. Sexual behavior of HIV discordant couples  
35  
36 after HIV counseling and testing. *AIDS* 2003;**17**(5):733-40.
- 37  
38  
39 37. King R, Allen S, Serufilira A, et al. Voluntary confidential HIV testing for couples in  
40  
41 Kigali, Rwanda. *AIDS* 1993;**7**(10):1393-4.
- 42  
43  
44 38. Carpenter LM, Kamali A, Ruberantwari A, et al. Rates of HIV-1 transmission within  
45  
46 marriage in rural Uganda in relation to the HIV sero-status of the partners. *AIDS*  
47  
48 1999;**13**(9):1083-9.
- 49  
50  
51 39. Fideli US, Allen SA, Musonda R, et al. Virologic and immunologic determinants of  
52  
53 heterosexual transmission of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 in Africa. *AIDS Res*  
54  
55 *Hum Retroviruses* 2001;**17**(10):901-10.
- 56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

40. Allen S, Serufulira A, Gruber V, et al. Pregnancy and contraception use among urban Rwandan women after HIV testing and counseling. Am J Public Health 1993;**83**(5):705-

10.

For peer review only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

**Table 1** INL and INA characteristics by invitations distributed, success rate, and couple cohabitation status

	INL (N=68)		INA (N=320)		Invitations Distributed	Couples Tested	Average invites/INA	Average couples tested/INA	Success Rate (%)	% invitations given to cohabiting couples	% couples tested who are cohabiting	Success Rate (%)	
	N	%	N	%								Cohab Couples	Non- Cohab Couples
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>		<b>320</b>		<b>29119</b>	<b>1727</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>Network</b>													
Private	16	24%	73	23%	5592	302	77	4	5%	79%	82%	6%	3%
Religious	19	28%	62	19%	5530	282	89	5	5%	85%	95%	6%	4%
Health	12	18%	95	30%	9529	617	100	6	6%	80%	86%	7%	5%
CBO/NGO	21	31%	90	28%	8468	526	94	6	6%	82%	87%	7%	4%
<b>Gender</b>													
Man	46	68%	131	41%	11620	700	89	5	6%	81%	85%	6%	5%
Woman	22	32%	189	59%	17499	1027	93	5	6%	82%	88%	6%	4%
<b>Relationship status</b>													
Married	49	72%	208	65%	18814	1178	90	6	6%	82%	88%	7%	4%
Divorced	5	7%	21	7%	2033	86	97	4	4%	82%	94%	5%	1%
Single	7	10%	38	12%	2902	131	76	3	5%	74%	83%	5%	3%
Widow	7	10%	45	14%	4212	303	94	7	7%	83%	84%	7%	7%
Missing	0	0%	8	3%	1158	29	145	4	3%	78%	79%	3%	2%
<b>Occupation</b>													
Professional/technical/ managerial	28	41%	68	21%	5605	330	82	5	6%	80%	81%	6%	5%
Sales/service	22	32%	163	51%	11462	793	70	5	7%	81%	88%	7%	5%
Agricultural	1	1%	6	2%	739	43	123	7	6%	75%	77%	6%	5%
Unskilled manual labor	12	18%	42	13%	5352	278	127	7	5%	84%	90%	6%	3%
Do not work for money	2	3%	33	10%	4912	253	149	8	5%	82%	90%	6%	3%
Missing	3	4%	8	3%	1049	30	131	4	3%	82%	100%	3%	0%
<b>Read English</b>													
Yes	64	94%	265	83%	23744	1439	90	5	6%	81%	86%	6%	4%

No	4	6%	55	17%	5375	288	98	5	5%	82%	92%	6%	2%
<b>Housing</b>													
Provided by employer (free)	5	7%	6	2%	372	38	62	6	10%	83%	95%	12%	3%
Rental home	22	32%	166	52%	16341	985	98	6	6%	81%	86%	6%	4%
Free housing by other means	10	15%	26	8%	1611	113	62	4	7%	80%	89%	8%	4%
Own home	30	44%	120	38%	10583	585	88	5	6%	82%	87%	6%	4%
Missing	1	1%	2	1%	212	6	106	3	3%	62%	100%	5%	0%
<b>Ever tested for HIV</b>													
Yes with partner	41	60%	71	22%	6274	303	88	4	5%	82%	93%	5%	2%
Yes alone	14	21%	113	35%	10424	608	92	5	6%	81%	87%	6%	4%
No	13	19%	135	42%	12207	802	90	6	7%	81%	85%	7%	5%
Missing	0	0%	1	0%	214	14	214	14	7%	86%	86%	7%	7%

INL: influential network leader

INA: influential network agent

**Table 2** Bivariate association between INA characteristics and couples' testing by couples' cohabitation status

INA characteristics	All Couples				Cohabiting Couples				Non-cohabiting Couples			
	Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value	Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value	Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value
<b>Network</b>												
Private	Ref				Ref				Ref			
CBO/NGO	1.23	1.06	1.43	0.01	1.21	1.03	1.42	0.02	1.35	0.88	2.06	0.17
Health	1.29	1.12	1.49	0.001	1.25	1.07	1.46	0.01	1.56	1.04	2.35	0.03
Religious	1.06	0.90	1.26	0.48	1.07	0.90	1.27	0.47	1.02	0.63	1.66	0.94
<b>Gender</b>												
Male	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Female	0.97	0.88	1.07	0.58	1.01	0.91	1.12	0.84	0.79	0.60	1.03	0.09
Age (per year increase)	1.01	1.00	1.01	0.07	1.01	1.00	1.01	0.002	0.98	0.96	0.99	0.001
Years living in Lusaka (per year increase)	1.01	1.00	1.01	<0.001	1.01	1.01	1.01	<0.001	1.00	0.99	1.01	0.80
<b>Relationship status</b>												
Other (divorced, widowed, single)	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Married	1.19	1.07	1.32	0.001	1.22	1.09	1.36	0.001	0.96	0.73	1.26	0.75
Years of relationship (per year increase)*	1.00	0.99	1.01	0.97	1.01	1.00	1.01	0.09	0.95	0.93	0.97	<0.001
<b>Occupation</b>												
Unskilled manual labor	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Professional	1.14	0.97	1.35	0.11	1.02	0.86	1.22	0.82	2.25	1.42	3.57	0.001
Sales/service	1.36	1.18	1.56	<0.001	1.31	1.13	1.52	<0.001	1.73	1.12	2.67	0.01
Agricultural	1.13	0.81	1.57	0.48	0.95	0.66	1.38	0.79	2.24	1.01	4.97	0.05
Do not work for money	0.99	0.83	1.18	0.92	0.99	0.82	1.18	0.87	1.09	0.63	1.88	0.76
<b>Read English</b>												
No	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Yes	1.14	1.00	1.30	0.05	1.06	0.92	1.21	0.44	2.12	1.35	3.33	0.001
<b>Housing</b>												
Other housing (rental, free)	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Own home	0.89	0.80	0.98	0.02	0.89	0.79	0.99	0.03	0.88	0.66	1.16	0.36

**Ever tested for HIV**

No	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Yes with partner	1.39	1.21	1.59	<0.001	1.26	1.09	1.45	0.002	2.97	1.85	4.78	<0.001
Yes alone	1.22	1.06	1.41	0.01	1.13	0.97	1.31	0.11	2.42	1.48	3.95	<0.001

\*Among those with a partner  
 INL: influential network leader  
 INA: influential network agent

For peer review only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

**Table 3** Bivariate association between couple and invitation characteristics and couples' testing accounting for clustering within INAs and INLs

	All couples		Couples not tested		Couples tested		Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value
	N	%	N	%	N	%				
<b>Couple Characteristics</b>										
Age of man (mean, SD)	33.25	9.03	33.16	8.99	34.61	9.43	1.01	1.01	1.02	<0.001
Age of woman (mean, SD)	27.12	7.75	27.03	7.72	28.60	8.15	1.02	1.02	1.03	<0.001
<b>Relationship of couple</b>										
Not cohabiting	5275	18%	5058	19%	217	13%	Ref			
Cohabiting	23664	82%	22161	81%	1503	87%	1.58	1.38	1.81	<0.001
Years of relationship (mean, SD)	6.27	6.42	6.22	6.35	7.18	7.38	1.02	1.01	1.03	<0.001
Number of children (mean, SD)	2.04	2.16	2.04	2.16	2.06	2.12	1.01	0.99	1.03	0.29
<b>Invitation Characteristics</b>										
<b>Invitee (1st contact)</b>										
Woman	8934	31%	8426	31%	508	30%	Ref			
Couple	8567	30%	7972	29%	595	35%	1.24	1.08	1.43	0.002
Man	11467	40%	10851	40%	616	36%	0.91	0.81	1.03	0.13
<b>Who initiated contact?</b>										
INA	26620	93%	25103	93%	1517	89%	Ref			
Couple	527	2%	475	2%	52	3%	1.71	1.34	2.18	<0.001
Man	877	3%	811	3%	66	4%	1.18	0.88	1.58	0.26
Woman	690	2%	624	2%	66	4%	1.59	1.20	2.10	0.001
<b>Relationship to INA</b>										
Just met/unknown	19688	68%	18749	69%	939	55%	Ref			
Co-worker	287	1%	269	1%	18	1%	1.35	0.89	2.06	0.16
Family	1697	6%	1525	6%	172	10%	2.08	1.75	2.49	<0.001
Social acquaintance (neighbor, friend, church member)	7186	25%	6601	24%	585	34%	1.64	1.43	1.87	<0.001
<b>Place of invitation</b>										
Community	9828	34%	9339	35%	489	29%	Ref			
Couple home	15460	54%	14532	54%	928	55%	1.41	1.23	1.61	<0.001
INA home	1636	6%	1461	5%	175	10%	2.25	1.87	2.71	<0.001
Couple or INA work	1812	6%	1702	6%	110	6%	1.21	0.97	1.51	0.09

**Public endorsement**

No	18148	63%	17080	63%	1068	62%	Ref				
Yes	10715	37%	10066	37%	649	38%	1.04	0.92	1.17	0.53	

**Delivering invitation**

Difficult/somewhat difficult	3030	10%	2912	65%	118	0.4%	Ref				
Easy	25860	89%	1599	35%	24261	99.5%	1.60	1.33	1.93	<0.001	

**Mobile unit present at time of invitation**

No	14268	49%	13713	50%	909	53%	Ref				
Yes	14622	51%	13679	50%	818	47%	1.12	0.89	1.39	0.33	

**Neighborhood of invitation**

Neighborhood 1	13705	47%	12911	47%	794	46%	Ref				
Neighborhood 2	15414	53%	14481	53%	933	54%	0.97	0.79	1.18	0.74	

---

Community: church/mosque, clinic, market, street/public place, social gathering

INL: influential network leader

INA: influential network agent



**Table 4** Multivariate model of INA level, couple level, and invitation level characteristics associated with couples' testing

	All Couples				Cohabiting Couples				Non-cohabiting Couples			
	Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value	Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value	Odds Ratio	95% CI		p-value
<b>INA characteristics</b>												
<b>Network</b>												
Private	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Religious	1.01	0.71	1.43	0.95	1.01	0.73	1.40	0.94	1.16	0.49	2.77	0.74
Health	1.53	1.15	2.04	0.004	1.48	1.11	1.97	0.01	1.80	0.96	3.35	0.07
CBO/NGO	1.34	1.01	1.77	0.04	1.31	0.98	1.76	0.07	1.53	0.84	2.79	0.16
<b>Years living in Lusaka</b>	1.01	1.00	1.02	0.14	1.01	1.00	1.02	0.07	1.01	0.99	1.04	0.24
<b>Age (per 1 year increase)</b>	1.00	0.99	1.02	0.79	1.00	0.99	1.02	0.53	0.99	0.97	1.01	0.35
<b>Marital status</b>												
Other (divorced, widowed, single)	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Married	1.23	0.99	1.53	0.06	1.28	1.02	1.60	0.03	1.06	0.70	1.62	0.77
<b>Occupation</b>												
Unskilled manual labor	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Professional	1.19	0.77	1.84	0.45	1.06	0.69	1.64	0.79	1.98	0.92	4.27	0.08
Sales/service	1.45	1.01	2.10	0.05	1.37	0.94	1.99	0.11	1.67	0.88	3.19	0.12
Agricultural	1.14	0.65	2.01	0.64	0.97	0.55	1.72	0.93	1.68	0.60	4.67	0.32
Do not work for money	0.95	0.62	1.45	0.81	0.95	0.62	1.45	0.80	0.69	0.26	1.82	0.45
<b>Reads English</b>												
No	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Yes	1.18	0.90	1.55	0.22	1.15	0.87	1.51	0.32	1.98	1.05	3.72	0.03
<b>Housing</b>												
Other housing (rental, free)	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Own home	0.74	0.59	0.92	0.01	0.73	0.58	0.91	0.01	0.93	0.62	1.38	0.71
<b>Ever tested for HIV</b>												
No	Ref				Ref				Ref			
Yes with partner	1.36	1.07	1.72	0.01	1.29	1.01	1.66	0.04	2.13	1.27	3.57	0.004
Yes alone	1.28	1.00	1.64	0.05	1.21	0.94	1.56	0.15	1.92	1.10	3.35	0.02
<b>Couple Characteristics</b>												

<b>Age of man (per 1 year increase)</b>	1.00	1.00	1.01	0.30	1.01	1.00	1.02	0.10	1.03	1.00	1.05	0.02
<b>Years of relationship (per 1 year increase)</b>	1.01	0.99	1.02	0.35	1.02	1.01	1.03	<0.001	0.45	0.37	0.55	<0.001
<b>Relationship of couple</b>										n/a		n/a
Not cohabiting	Ref											
Cohabiting	1.39	1.19	1.63	<0.001								
<b>Invitation Characteristics</b>												
<b>Invitee (1st contact)</b>												
Individual (Woman/Man)	Ref				Ref					Ref		
Couple	1.20	1.04	1.39	0.01	1.27	1.09	1.49	0.003	0.82	0.52	1.28	0.38
<b>Who initiated contact?</b>												
INA	Ref				Ref					Ref		
Couple	1.35	1.03	1.78	0.03	1.43	1.05	1.94	0.02	0.94	0.27	3.20	0.92
Man	1.22	0.89	1.67	0.22	1.26	0.90	1.75	0.18	1.00	0.47	2.12	1.00
Woman	1.60	1.17	2.19	0.003	1.53	1.10	2.12	0.01	1.54	0.73	3.27	0.26
<b>Relationship to INA</b>												
Just met/unknown	Ref				Ref					Ref		
Co-worker	1.48	0.89	2.43	0.13	1.47	0.84	2.55	0.18	1.11	0.27	4.56	0.89
Social acquaintance (neighbor, friend, church member, family)	1.62	1.41	1.87	<0.001	1.60	1.37	1.87	<0.001	1.60	1.15	2.24	0.01
<b>Place of invitation</b>												
Other (Community or couple/INA work)	Ref				Ref					Ref		
Couple or INA home	1.30	1.14	1.48	<0.001	1.39	1.21	1.61	<0.001	0.93	0.68	1.27	0.65
<b>Delivering invitation</b>												
Difficult/somewhat difficult	Ref				Ref					Ref		
Easy	1.75	1.41	2.17	<0.001	1.87	1.47	2.37	<0.001	1.15	0.67	1.99	0.61

INA: influential network agent

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found
<b>Introduction</b>		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses
<b>Methods</b>		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up (b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
<b>Results</b>		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period

Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses
<b>Discussion</b>		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results
<b>Other information</b>		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at <http://www.strobe-statement.org>.