Impact of a Personalized Text Messaging ART Adherence **Tool for Nonurban Substance Users with HIV**

Karen Ingersoll, Rebecca Dillingham, George Reynolds, Jason Freeman, Avi Hosseinbor, Jennifer Hettema, and Mark Conaway

Purpose: Our aim was to develop and test the impact and feasibility of a personalized, bidirectional text messaging tool for poorly adherent non-urban substance users with HIV.

Rationale: ART adherence is lower among nonurban patients who are disproportionately poor, isolated, stigmatized, and lack transportation. Additional challenges to consistent adherence include active substance use and mental disorders. Familiar technology like text messaging could query adherence, substance use, and mood and intervene "just in time" with personalized and tailored (but automated) messages.

Intervention: Treatment Extension by Text (TxText) sent daily ART medication, mood, and substance use queries. Personalized responses were delivered automatically for replies indicating situations of taking medication, not taking medication, avoiding drinking and drug use, engaging in drinking and drug use, positive mood, and negative mood. Participants created a variety of affirming and encouraging messages tailored to each contingency. Some examples of the personalized messages designed by participants were: Keep your head up, God loves you, Don't forget your grandchildren, Great job!, You need to clear it up, Stay smiling, Be more responsible, Keep up the good work, and Yay!

Sample: Participants were recruited from 2 clinics serving mostly nonurban patients. They were adults prescribed ART who reported substance use in the last 30 days and <95% adherence in the past 14 days. Mean age was 42.4 (SD=10) with mean reading at the 10th grade level. There were significant substance use and mental disorders in the sample, with alcohol, cocaine, and marijuana the most commonly abused drugs.

Methods: Following baseline assessment, 63 participants were randomized to (TxText, n=33) or treatment as usual (TAU, n=30). TxText participants received a study phone. The intervention was 12 weeks, with 3M and 6M follow-ups. Primary outcomes included pharmacy refill rate, missed visit proportion (MVP), and substance use days on TLFB.



Results

TXTEXT



Positive Mood

Mood EMA1/EMA2 Mood Response

Neutral Mood

Negative Mood

kareningersoll@virginia.edu

HEALTH SYSTEM



School of I

Funded by NID



frequently. For the full sample at baseline, 6 month pharmacy refill rate was 64%, past 6-months (MVP) was 26.9%, and proportion of 30-day substance use days was 53%.

<u>Feasibility</u>. Responses to adherence, substance use and mood queries were high and persisted across the intervention period; rates ranged from 64%-70%.

<u>Outcomes</u>. Both groups improved on key outcomes at 3M. MVP data show that the TxText group had 13% fewer missed visits than TAU at 3M, p=.11. Pharmacy refill data show that the TxText group had 12.2% better adherence than TAU at 3M, p=.04. Analyses of substance use days showed a non-significant decrease of 3% of days in the TxText group at 3M compared to TAU. There were no differences between groups at 6M.

Conclusions: TxText was feasible and engaging, and participants responded equally frequently to all 3 types of queries. TxText improves adherence, engagement, and substance use post-intervention more than TAU, and these return nearly to baseline levels at 6M, reflecting an intervention effect that fades after it ends. Outcomes indicate a treatment response; TxText merits a fully-powered subsequent trial to confirm results.

alth Decision hnologies							
N A	/le	di		n 316	e 540		
pression (n=62)							
All Text Control							
33 (52.4%) 18 (54.5%) 15 (50%)							
27 (42.9%) 16 (48.5%) 11 (36.7%)							
ce Use (n=63)							
All Toxt Control							
All Text Control							
30 (47.6%) 17 (51.5%) 13 (43.3%)							
dence or Abuse (n=30)							
Toyt			Contro	a			
6)	12 (70.6%)		5 (38.5%)				
6)	6 (35.3%	6) 5	5 (38.5	5%)			
	1 (5.9%))	2 (15.4	-%)			
	1 (5.9%)) 1	1 (7.7%	6)			
	2 (11.8%	6) (0				
AST (n=63)							
	All		Text		Contro	bl	
31 (49.2%)			20 (60.6%)		11 (36.7%)		
17 (27.0%)			14 (42.4%)		3 (10%	3 (10%)	
ence 26 (41.3%) 16 (48.5%) 10 (3						.3%)	
Dependence Level (n=63)							
А	II	Te	ext		Control		
2	1 (33.3%)	1	1 (33.3	3%)	10 (33.3	3%)	
1	2 /10 00/)	E	115 20	()	7 (22 20	1	

8 (24.2%)

15 (23.8%) 9 (27.3%) 6 (20%)

7 (23.3%)