|  |
| --- |
| Supplementary table 3. Reasons and frequency given by stakeholders to prioritize or not prioritize certain risk groups in HIV/AIDS control  |
|  |  | Reasons to prioritize risk group (Likert scores 3-5) |  | Reasons to not prioritize group (Likert scores 1-3) |
| Risk groups and stakeholders (# missing reasons) |  | At high HIV risk | Important in spread of HIV epidemic | Large number of people (infected) | Equity: less access to services, more vulnerable | Feasibility: effective interventions are available/ easy group to reach | Feasibility: no effective interventions available/ difficult group to target | Other | At low HIV risk | Not important in spread of HIV epidemic | Small number of people (infected) | Equity: group with relatively high socio economic status  | Equity: own responsibility  | Feasibility: effective interventions are available/ group is already targeted | Feasibility: no effective interventions available/ difficult group to target | No need for services (already show safe behaviour) |
| **IDUs** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy makers (1) |  | 3 | 10 | 5 |  | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Health care workers (1) |  | 16 | 15 | 12 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| PLWHA (1) |  | 20 | 9 | 4 | 4 |  | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |   |
| General population (0) |  | 23 | 3 | 5 | 1 |  | 5 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 3 |
| **FSWs** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy makers (1) |  | 3 | 9 |  | 4 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Health care workers (2) |  | 15 | 15 | 1 | 2 |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| PLWHA (3) |  | 17 | 9 | 2 | 8 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |
| General population (1) |  | 27 | 2 | 4 | 5 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| **Clients of FSWs** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy makers (1) |  | 3 | 13 |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Health care workers (2) |  | 9 | 15 |  | 4 |  | 5 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| PLWHA (4) |  | 9 | 10 |  | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 6 |
| General population (1) |  | 19 | 4 | 3 | 3 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | 2 |  | 7 |
| **MSM** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy makers (1) |  | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 5 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| Health care workers (4) |  | 12 | 2 | 4 | 3 |  | 6 |  | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| PLWHA (6) |  | 13 | 4 | 1 | 5 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 7 |
| General population (4) |  | 11 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 4 |  |  |  | 11 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 |
| **Transgender** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy makers (1) |  | 4 | 3 |  | 3 | 5 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| Health care workers (7) |  | 11 | 9 | 3 | 2 |  | 3 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| PLWHA (6) |  | 14 | 3 |  | 6 |  |  | 4 | 1 |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  | 3 |
| General population (3) |  | 12 |  | 2 | 7 | 2 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 8 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| **Prisoners** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy makers (2) |  | 6 | 3 |  | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Health care workers (6) |  | 22 | 11 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| PLWHA (4) |  | 18 | 3 |  | 9 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |
| General population (3) |  | 13 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |  | 11 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Table 3 (continued) |
|  |  | Reasons to prioritize risk group (Likert scores 3-5) |  | Reasons to not prioritize group (Likert scores 1-3) |
|  |  | At high HIV risk | Important in spread of HIV epidemic | Large number of people (infected) | Equity: less access to services, more vulnerable | Feasibility: effective interventions are available/ easy group to reach | Feasibility: no effective interventions available/ difficult group to target | Other | At low HIV risk | Not important in spread of HIV epidemic | Small number of people (infected) | Equity: group with relatively high socio economic status  | Equity: own responsibility  | Feasibility: effective interventions are available/ group is already targeted | Feasibility: no effective interventions available/ difficult group to target | No need for services (already show safe behaviour) |
| **Partners of HIV+ people** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy makers (1) |  | 9 | 2 |  |  | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Health care workers (2) |  | 25 | 3 |  | 7 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| PLWHA (5) |  | 27 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |
| General population (1) |  | 27 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 4 |
| **People at low risk** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy makers (1) |  | 9 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Health care workers (7) |  |  |  | 3 | 2 |  | 2 | 1 | 18 |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
| PLWHA (7) |  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 12 |  |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| General population (4) |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 5 |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 5 |
| **Total**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy makers (9) |  | 42 | 42 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 26 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Health care workers (31) |  | 110 | 70 | 23 | 21 | 4 | 27 | 3 | 24 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 4 |
| PLWHA (35) |  | 121 | 43 | 9 | 57 | 7 | 11 | 7 | 25 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 20 |
| General population (17) |  | 132 | 13 | 22 | 28 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 29 | 1 | 21 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 29 |
| **All stakeholders** |  | **405** | **168** | **60** | **118** | **38** | **77** | **11** | **84** | **8** | **31** | **6** | **11** | **33** | **8** | **57** |
| IDUs = injecting drug users, PLWHA = people living with HIV/AIDS, MSM = men having sex with men, FSW = female sex workers |