Participants’ perceived barriers to adherence vs. empirically-based barriers to adherence: Do they differ by age and race and ethnicity?
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Background

Race and ethnic disparities in ART adherence persist for variety of reasons.

Association between age and ART Adherence.

Disparities and depression w/non-adherence as a treatment interruption?

Barriers to ART adherence are extensively studied, yet little is known about barriers vary based on a person’s age or race and ethnicity.

(Oh et al., 2009; Hinking et al., 2004; Simoni et al., 2012; Sauceda et al., 2016)
Objective

We used an empirically-based analytic approach to examine the importance of barriers stratifying by age and race and ethnicity.

Secondary hypothesis: the most important barriers would be invariant across race/ethnicity and age subgroups (i.e., empirically)
1. Dominance analysis is a class of Relative Important Analysis
   - Identify the “most important predictor(s) from a set of predictors.”

2. Problems with traditional regression approaches (short list)
   A. Adherence barriers are correlated
   B. Std. regression objective of “impact on Y per change in X” not ideal for “importance.”
   C. $R^2$ is influenced by order, other factors and model dependent

3. Advantage of dominance analysis
   A. General pair-wise regression approach tests all possible barriers against one another.
   B. Weight = average squared semi-partial correlation – i.e., each barrier in relation to the outcome of ART non-adherence.
Interpreting Dominance Weights and Patterns

1. Does one barrier **consistency outperform** other barriers in predicting ART non-adherence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General (Least dominant)</th>
<th>Conditional (Somewhat dominant)</th>
<th>Complete (Most dominant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Based on every possible comparison</strong></td>
<td>Average variance contributed by one barrier is greater than the average variance contributed by another barrier</td>
<td>Amount of additional variance one barrier has singularly contributed is greater than any amount of variance contributed by any other barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average variance contributed by one barrier is greater in size than any one contribution of another barrier</td>
<td>Average variance contributed by one barrier is greater in size than any one contribution of another barrier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics

• Sample Characteristics
  • Mean age was 46.7 (SD = 10.9, Median = 48)
  • 44% reported a college-level education
  • 57% reported annual income of less than $40,000
  • 76.3% self-identified as non-Latino White

HIV and ART Adherence-related Information
  • 13% reported a detectable VL
  • 69.8% reported once-daily dosed ART
  • 28.8% twice-daily dosed ART
  • 14% reported at least one, 4-day Tx interruption in past 3 months
Sample Characteristics

Dominance Analyses
1. Stratified analysis by selecting out race/ethnic groups from total sample:
   a. Non-Latino Whites, $n = 929$
   b. Latinos, $n = 154$
   c. African Americans, $n = 110$
2. Stratified analysis by selecting out age subgroups from total sample:
   a. Young adults (18-29 years), $n = 104$
   b. Middle-aged adults (30-49 years), $n = 590$
   c. Older adults (> 50 years), $n = 524$
Results: Comparisons by Race and Ethnicity and Age
### Dominance analysis ranking by race and ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adherence Barrier</th>
<th>Dominance Weights</th>
<th>Adherence Barrier</th>
<th>Dominance Weights</th>
<th>Adherence Barrier</th>
<th>Dominance Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Latino White (n=929)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latinos (n=148)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>African Americans (n=110)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Day-to-day life</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>#1 Asleep/slept through dose time</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>#1 Alcohol or using illicit drugs</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Asleep/slept through dose time</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>#2 Day-to-day life</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>#2 Felt sick or ill</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Problems with pharmacy/insurance</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>#3 Ran out of pills</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>#3 Simply forgot</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Simply forgot</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>#4 Simply forgot</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>#4 Wanted to avoid side-effects</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Felt depressed/overwhelmed</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>#5 Alcohol or using illicit drugs</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>#5 Felt depressed/overwhelmed</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Alcohol or using illicit drugs</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>#6 Problems with pharmacy/insurance</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>#6 Day-to-day life</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 Felt sick or ill</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>#7 Felt sick or ill</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>#7 Asleep/slept through dose time</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8 Wanted to avoid side-effects</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>#8 Felt depressed/overwhelmed</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>#8 Problems with pharmacy/insurance</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9 Ran out of pills</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>#9 Wanted to avoid side-effects</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>#9 Ran out of pills</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dominance analysis rankings by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young Adults (n=104) 18-29 yrs</th>
<th>Middle-aged Adults (n=590) 30-49 yrs.</th>
<th>Older Adults (n=524) &gt;50 yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adherence Barrier</td>
<td>Dominance Weights</td>
<td>Adherence Barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Alcohol or using illicit drugs</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>#1 Felt depressed/overwhelmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Felt sick or ill</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>#2 Day-to-day life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Simply forgot</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>#3 Alcohol or using illicit drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Wanted to avoid side-effects</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>#4 Wanted to avoid side-effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Felt depressed/overwhelmed</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>#5 Problems with pharmacy/insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Day-to-day life</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>#6 Asleep/slept through dose time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 Asleep/slept through dose time</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>#7 Ran out of pills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8 Problems with pharmacy/insurance</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>#8 Felt sick or ill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9 Ran out of pills</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>#9 Simply forgot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Discussion: Race and Ethnicity

1. Stratified dominance analyses showed that **no one barrier to adherence** was most important to all groups.
   - Similar patterns did emerge.

2. Non-Latino White and Latino subgroups were most similar.
   - “Day-to-day life” and “Fell asleep/slept through dose” barriers were two most important for these groups.

3. African American subgroup had different pattern of results.
   - “Alcohol & drugs” yielded largest dominance weight (.521).
   - “Felt sick or ill” yielded second largest weight (.183).
Discussion: Age

6. Young Adults:
   – #1 ranked barrier = “Drinking alcohol or using illicit drugs” (.521).
   – Also ranked #3 for middle-age and older adult subgroups.

7. Middle-aged adult subgroup:
   – #1 ranked barrier = “Felt depressed/overwhelmed” (.454).
   – More important vs. other age subgroups.

8. Older adult subgroup:
   – #1 ranked barrier = “Fell asleep/slept through dose” (.580).

10. “Drinking alcohol or using illicit drugs” and “wanted to avoid side-effects” barriers was most consistent across age subgroups.
Implications

- Examine how barriers to adherence express themselves and vary based on the target population characteristics.
  - Younger versus older-aged groups experiences with HIV.

*It is important to address those barriers that are most strongly linked to clinical outcomes and not necessarily those that are most frequently reported.*
Limitations

1. All data were self-reported.
   - No incentives to participate were provided & the direction of the effect of interest was predicting non-adherence.

2. A replication study is needed to support the stability of weights.
   - Statistical power is not directly related to dominance analysis because it is not a null hypothesis significance test.

3. Total sample consisted of mostly college educated and gay-identified men with access to online social media.

4. We could not determine conclusively the chronological order of effect for a treatment interruption on an HIV VL outcome.
1. Stratified analyses were for exploratory purposes.

2. A replication study is needed to support the stability of weights.
   – Each stratified dominance analysis consisted of smaller and restrictive sample.
   – Age groups were selected arbitrarily.
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