REVIEW

Open Access



Chengqing Sun¹, Jianjun Li², Xiaoyan Liu², Zhi Zhang², Tao Qiu², Haiyang Hu², You Wang^{3*} and Gengfeng Fu^{1,2*}

Abstract

Background: Late presentation to HIV/AIDS care presents serious health concerns, like increased transmission and high healthcare costs, increased mortality, early development of opportunistic infection, increased risk of antiretroviral therapy drug resistance. Despite the effort to contain the HIV/AIDS epidemic, LP has remained an impediment to individual immune reconstitution and public health.

Objective: This review aimed to estimate the prevalence and determine the factors associated with late presentation to HIV/AIDS care.

Methods: We searched PubMed, Web of Science, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), Chinese Wanfang, and Weipu database for articles published from 2010 to 2020. We utilized *I*² statistics and *Q*-test to estimate heterogeneity between studies. Random-effects meta-analysis models were used to calculate the aggregate odds ratio of late presentation to HIV/AIDS care.

Results: Of 9563 titles and abstracts retrieved, 189 were identified as potentially eligible and 39 fulfilled the inclusion criteria. The pooled prevalence of late presentation to HIV/AIDS care was 43.26%. The major risk factors were patients \geq 50 years old (OR = 2.19, 95% CI: 1.85–2.58; $I^2 = 97.44\%$), married (OR = 1.50, 95% CI: 1.35–1.68; $I^2 = 96.58\%$), with heterosexual contact as risk factor for infection (OR = 1.91, 95% CI: 1.73–2.11; $I^2 = 90.74\%$) and diagnosed in medical institutions (OR = 2.35,95% CI: 2.11–2.62; $I^2 = 96.05\%$). In middle or low HIV prevalence areas, patients \geq 50 years old (P = 0.01), married (P < 0.01) and diagnosed in medical institutions (P = 0.01) were more likely to be presented late than in high prevalence areas. From 2016–2020, the OR of patients who were married and diagnosed in medical facilities were significantly lower than before (P < 0.01).

Conclusion: Patients \geq 50 years old, married, with heterosexual contact as risk factor for infection, and diagnosed in medical institutions were risk factors of LP. Gender had no significant relationship with LP. In middle or low prevalence areas, patients who were \geq 50 years old, married, and diagnosed in medical institutions were more likely to be presented late than in other areas. Married patients and those diagnosed in medical institutions after 2015 have a lower risk of LP than before.

Keywords: China, HIV/AIDS care, Late presentation, Associated factors, Meta-analysis

¹ School of Public Health, Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, People's Republic of China

³ Department of Radiology, Fourth Affiliated Hospitial Of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, Jiangsu, People's Republic of China Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



Introduction

Late presentation (hereon in referred to as LP) to HIV care remains a challenge to HIV prevention and treatment in the world. In Guatemala from 2000 to 2015 [1], 81.1% of new diagnoses were considered late

© The Author(s) 2021. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

^{*}Correspondence: doctoryouwang@126.com; fugf@jscdc.cn

presentations. The prevalence of LP is estimated to range between 36.9% in Estonia to 64.2% in Poland in Europe during 2010–2016 [2]. In China, the percentage of patients with late HIV presentation ranged from 35.5 to 42.1% from 2010 to 2014 [3]. LP may lead to some grave consequences both for individuals and the society, such as increased mortality, development of opportunistic infection [4], increased risk of antiretroviral therapy (ART) drug resistance [5], high healthcare costs [6], and increased transmission because of unawareness of infection status [7]. Some comprehensive strategies, such as extensive study, free testing, and prompt treatment initiation have been taken [8, 9]. However, only 75.7% of people who live with HIV know their infectious status by the end of 2019 in China.

Improving early presentation is of great importance for AIDS prevention and care. Early presentation means early entry to HIV care. Study evidence showed that patients shtarting early ART could have a near-normal life expectancy, provided that they start treatment before their CD4 count decreases below 200 cells/µl [10]. Early ART can also limit the HIV reservoir size [11, 12]. And the smaller the HIV reservoir at treatment interruption, the better the post-treatment control [13]. To some degree, ART also can prevent sexual HIV transmission in both homosexual and heterosexual individuals [14].

To our knowledge, there is only two published systematic review and meta-analysis on HIV late presentation and its predictors [15, 16]. In China, there are no such publications. Therefore, it is necessary to comprehend the situation of LP to HIV care and propose an effective program to promote early presentation in China. This meta-analysis aimed to estimate the pooled prevalence of LP and determine the risk factors from 2010 to 2020 in China. We hope to provide evidence for comprehensive prevention and testing strategy.

Methods

Literature search strategy

We searched PubMed, Web of Science, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), Chinese Wanfang, and Weipu databases for articles published in English and Chinese from 2010 to 2020. Using the following Boolean term to search the databases: (TS="HIV/AIDS" OR TS="human immunodeficiency virus" OR TS="Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome") AND (TS="late presentation" OR TS="late diagnosis" OR TS="late testing" OR TS="delay presentation" OR TS="delay testing") in Chinese and (TS="HIV/AIDS") AND (TS="late entry" OR TS="Advanced HIV disease" OR TS="late presentation" OR TS="late presentation" OR TS="late Diagnosed") in English. We also retrieved the studies referenced in all included studies to obtain

further related studies. Our analyses followed the 2009 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses(PRISMA) statement.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Articles included met all the following criteria: (1) observational studies, including cross-sectional, case–control, and cohort studies; (2) studies reported the prevalence and associated factors of LP to HIV care in China from 2010 to 2020; (3) sufficient data present to estimate the odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs); (4) studies defined late presentation of HIV/AIDS according to the European definition or other definitions recognized appropriate. Articles were excluded based on at least one of the following: (1) studies that do not meet the criteria above; (2) studies absence of original data, such as the number of patient with different factors; (3) studies published based on the same or overlapping data; (4) review, case report or meeting report.

Data extraction and quality assessment

The studies searched were managed by Endnote (version X9) and de-duplicated. The studies were first screened by title and abstracts independently by two investigators according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. If there were any conflicts between the results, all three authors of this review would screen the full text to discuss and resolve it before reaching a consensus. Moreover, the references cited in all included studies were screened by two investigators independently. Information retrieved from each eligible study comprised of:- title, first author, publication year, study design, study period, study time, the definition of LP, geographical locations, source population, number of subjects in each category, the value of odds ratios(OR) and it's 95% CI. The Newcastle-Ottawa quality-assessment scale (NOS) was employed to assess the quality of those included studies. We evaluated the quality of evidence using the "grading of recommendations assessment, development, and evaluation" (GRADE) approach.

Statistical analysis

We estimated heterogeneity between studies with I^2 statistics and Q-test. Random-effect models were administered in testing significant heterogeneity (P < 0.10 or $I^2 \ge 50\%$ implied statistically significant heterogeneity). Otherwise, fixed-effect models were applied. Subgroup analysis focused on study region and period. The study regions were categorized into high prevalence regions (including Yunnan, Guangxi, Henan, Sichuan, Xinjiang, and Guangdong provinces) and others according to the proportion of HIV infected patients in the nationally reported cases [17]. χ^2 test was employed to estimate the proportion difference between the subgroups.

Sensitivity analysis was employed to assess the sensitivity of each included study. Publication bias was measured using the Harbord test and funnel plots (P>0.05 represented no publication bias). We conducted all statistical analysis with Stata 16.0 and SPSS 24.0.

Results

Study review and selection

A total of 4381 Chinese articles and 5182 English articles were obtained (CNKI 2624; Wanfang 1373; Weipu 384; PubMed 3931; Web of Science 1251). After the removal of duplicates, 6462(67.6%) remained. A total of 189 articles were eligible following titles and abstracts screening. After the full-text screening, 39 papers were finally

included (36 Chinese and 3 English studies). The flow-chart of studies identified by the search is in Fig. 1.

General characteristic of the included studies

All of the 39 studies were case–control studies. According to the NOS assessment, the scores of all studies were \geq 5, which denoted good quality. Included papers were from 2010 to 2020. The study regions covered 21 provinces or municipalities: Guangxi, Guangdong, Sichuan, Xinjiang, Yunnan, Jiangsu, Taiwan, Anhui, Beijing, Fujian, Gansu, Guizhou, Jiangxi, Liaoning, Shandong, Shaanxi, Shanxi, Tianjin, Zhejiang, Chongqing, and Hubei. We classified all study regions into high HIV prevalence or middle/ low HIV prevalence groups based on HIV prevalence. Among these provinces and municipalities, Guangxi, Guangdong, Sichuan, Xinjiang, Yunnan are high HIV



prevalence areas. Twenty-six (26) studies investigated the LP rate and evaluated the association between patients with age \geq 50 and LP. The relationship between gender and LP was reported in 32 studies, and 38 publications researched the relationship between being married and LP. The number of studies that investigated the association of risk factor for infection and sample source with LP was 35. There are 12 articles with study time between 2010–2015, while four studies investigated the participants after 2015. The characteristics of the included publications are in Table 1.

Factors associated with LP

Figure 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 showed the overall OR value of factors associated with LP. Generally, patients \geq 50 years old (OR = 2.19, 95% CI: 1.85–2.58; $I^2 = 97.44\%$), married (OR = 1.50, 95% CI: 1.35–1.68; $I^2 = 96.58\%$), with heterosexual contact as risk factor for infection (OR = 1.91, 95% CI: 1.73–2.11; $I^2 = 90.74\%$) and diagnosed in medical institutions (OR = 2.35,95% CI: 2.11–2.62; $I^2 = 96.05\%$) were more likely to be diagnosed late. While male was not a risk factor for LP (OR = 1.02, 95% CI: 0.90–1.15; $I^2 = 95.45\%$). In high prevalence areas, patients \geq 50 years old (P = 0.01), married (P < 0.01) and diagnosed in medical institutions (P = 0.01) were less likely to be presented late than in middle or low areas.

Subgroups analyses by study regions and time

As shown in Table 2, in high prevalence regions, the proportion of LP patients < 50 years old, ≥ 50 years old, male, female, married and other marital status, infected by MSM, diagnosed in medical facilities and other institutions were all higher than middle or low prevalence regions (P < 0.01). For patients < 50 years old, \geq 50 years old, male, female, married, with heterosexual contact as risk factor for infection, diagnosed in medical facilities and other institutions, the LP ratio decreased in 2016-2020 compare to 2010–2015 (P < 0.01). While in middle or low epidemic areas, the proportion of LP during 2016-2020 was high than before, and the difference was statistically significant (P = 0.015). As presented in Table 3. It is displayed in Table 4 that in high epidemic areas, patients \geq 50 years old (*OR* = 1.67, 95% CI:1.35-2.07; $I^2 = 87.85\%$; P = 0.01), male (OR = 1.22, 95% CI:1.00-1.48; $I^2 = 85.94\%$; P = 0.04), married (OR = 1.18, 95%) CI:1.00–1.38; $I^2 = 91.57\%$; P < 0.01) and diagnosed in medical institutions (OR = 1.89, 95% CI:1.58-2.26; $I^2 = 84.38\%$; P = 0.01) were less likely to be presented late than in middle or low areas. There were no statistically significant group differences. The risk of LP from 2020 to 2015 was 1.81, (95% CI: 1.45-2.26; $I^2 = 91.57\%$), 3.00, (95% CI: 2.52–3.58; $I^2 = 84.38\%$) respectively for patients married and diagnosed in medical institutions, whereas from 2016 to 2020 was 0.94, (95% CI: 0.78–1.14; $I^2 = 65.12\%$), 1.57, (95% CI: 1.24–1.99; $I^2 = 74.55\%$). The observed differences in risk estimates between the groups were statistically significant (P < 0.01).

The quality of evidence

The quality grade of age, infection routes, and sample sources were high. The grade score of gender and marital status was moderate. An additional file shows this in more detail (see Additional file 1).

Sensitivity analysis

A leave-one-out sensitivity analysis was adopted to examine the possible cause of heterogeneity across the studies involved in the analysis. The sensitivity analysis results suggested that none of the individual studies influenced the initial total results.

Publication bias

The conventional funnel plots indicated showed almost no publication bias in the meta-analysis. An additional file shows this in more detail (see Additional file 2). We used Harbord-test to confirm the result and found no statistically significant differences (P > 0.05) (Table 4).

Discussion

We conducted 39 publications to identify the related factors of LP in China. It showed that the overall LP proportion from 2010 to 2020 in China was 43.26%. Patients \geq 50 years old, married, with heterosexual contact as risk factor for infection, and diagnosed in medical institutions were risk factors of LP. Gender had no statistically significant relationship with LP. In high prevalence areas, patients who were \geq 50 years old, married, and diagnosed in medical institutions were less likely to be presented late than in other areas. It suggested the need for targeted measures to reduce the occurrence of LP in different regions. Additionally, we have made some suggestions on prevention and policy making of LP to HIV care based on these data.

In the general health environment, the elderly and female should be associated with reduced odds of LP because they have better health seeking behaviours. However, in our study the results were different. In China, partly of the HIV positive female did not realize the risk because they were infected by their husband. That might lead to the result after pooling the articles. Studies have shown that the elderly have limited access and ability to obtain and understand HIV/AIDS prevention information [57–59]. Additionally, the elderly tend to ignore HIV infection due to various comorbidity symptoms

First author (year)	uthor (year) Study design Study period Study region No. of participants					
				Total(%)	Late presentation	Non-late presentation
				229,695(100.00)	105,953	123,742
Xi Hu [18]	Cross-sectional study	2012-2016	Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region	45,118(19.64)	31,663	13,455
Haiyang Hu [19]	Case-control	2011-2014	Jiangsu Province	491(0.21)	188	303
Hongbo Jiang [20]	Case-control	2018-2019	Guangdong Province	997(0.43)	400	597
Lin Jin [21]	Case-control	2011-2015	Anhui province	7073(3.08)	2949	4124
Ji Zeng [22]	Case-control	2013	Beijing City	2770(1.21)	582	2188
Yalan Huang [23]	Case-control	2011-2017	Quanzhou City, Fujian Province	2551(1.11)	901	1650
Jian Li [24]	Case-control	2013-2015	Gansu Province	1965(0.86)	524	1441
Ziming Lin [25]	Case-control	2010-2016	Guangdong Province	47,343(20.61)	19,624	27,719
Wenjie Cao [26]	Case-control	2014-2018	Guizhou Province	33,611(14.63)	10,495	23,116
Li Liu [27]	Case-control	2011-2015	Nanjing City, Jiangsu Province	3112(1.35)	963	2149
Liqiang Xu [28]	Case-control	2010-2015	Changshu City, Jiangsu Province	310(0.13)	120	190
Jinwei Li [29]	Case-control	2010-2015	Jingjiang City, Jiangsu Province	102(0.04)	36	66
Yao Qi [<mark>30</mark>]	Case-control	2011-2014	Yancheng City, Jiangsu Province	411(0.18)	148	263
Pengfei Bing [31]	Case-control	2012-2017	Suzhou City, Jiangsu Province	3605(1.57)	829	2776
Ping Liu [32]	Case-control	2013-2018	Zhangjiagang City, Jiangsu Province	401(0.17)	117	284
Lu Ye [33]	Case-control	2010-2017	Zhengjiang City, Jiangsu Province	972(0.42)	333	639
Qing Yang [34]	Case-control	2014-2018	Jiangxi province	11,557(5.03)	5227	6330
Dan Zhou [35]	Case-control	2015-2018	Liaogning Province	11,043(4.81)	3148	7895
Ying Wang [36]	Case-control	2014-2018	Heze City, Shandong Province	728(0.32)	252	476
Jianzhuo Li [37]	Case-control	2011-2016	Jinan City, Shandong Province	1365(0.59)	273	1092
Li Li [38]	Case-control	2012-2017	Linyi City, Shandong Province	887(0.39)	465	422
Hongmei Liang [39]	Case-control	2011-2016	Shanxi Province	5213(2.27)	1885	3328
Hailan Zhang [40]	Case-control	2011-2017	Xi'an City, Shaanxi Province	7427(3.23)	2088	5339
Zairan Duan [41]	Case-control	2012-2016	Hejiang County, Sichuan Province	693(0.30)	282	411
Yan Guo [42]	Case-control	2011-2015	Tianjin City	2922(1.27)	916	2006
Lirong Liu [43]	Case-control	2011-2015	Yining City, Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region	2449(1.07)	500	1949
Shunzhu Yin [44]	Case-control	2012-2018	Dali Bai Autonomous Prefecture, Yunnan Province	4648(2.02)	1467	3181
Lin Li [45]	Case-control	2015	Dehong Prefecture, Yunnan Province	942(0.41)	526	416
Zuokai Yang [<mark>46</mark>]	Case-control	2015-2017	Shaoxing City, Zhejiang Province	776(0.34)	202	574
Xiaohong Pan [47]	Case-control	2012	Zhejiang Province	1894(0.82)	500	1394
Yong Zhu [<mark>48</mark>]	Case-control	2012-2017	Rongchang District, Chongqing City	931(0.41)	442	489
Conghui Xu [49]	Case-control	2016	Shapingba District, Yubei District, Jiangjin district and Hechuan District of Chongqing City	1035(0.45)	349	686
Zhongrong Yang [50]	Case-control	2015-2017	Huzhou city, Zhejiang Province	757(0.33)	581	176
Qi Sun [51]	Case-control	2013-2019	Weihai City,Shandong Province	807(0.35)	526	281
Jie Ding [52]	Case-control	2010-2018	Wuhan City,Hubei Province	7783(3.39)	4815	2968
Jin Chen [53]	Case-control	2019	Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region	5489(2.39)	4723	766
Jiaxiang Chen [54]	Case-control	2010-2019	Jimei District, Xiamen City, Fujian Province	527(0.23)	368	159
Chenquan Qiu [55]	Case-control	2014-2019	Qujing City, Yunnan Province	7242(3.15)	5295	1947
Chunling Huang [56]	Case-control	2019	Suining City, Sichuan Province	1748(0.76)	1251	497

Table 1 Publication characteristics of the included studies in this meta-analysis

Hu,X (2019) 15, Hongbo Jiang (2020) Yalan Huang (2018) Yalan Huang (2018) Ziming Lin (2017) Li Liu(2017) 5, Liqiang Xu(2017) Yao Qi(2015) Ping Liu(2020) Yao Qi(2015) Lu Ye(2018) Qing Yang(2019) 2, Qing Yang(2019) 2, Dan Zhou(2020) Yao Zhou(2020) Hailan Zhang(2018) Yao Guo(2017) Li Li(2019) Hongmei Liang(2018) Hailan Zhang(2018) Yao Guo(2017) Lirong Liu(2017) Shunzhu Yin(2020) Kiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) Yong Zhu(2019) Tim Chen(2021) Yiaxiang Chen(2021) Viaxiang Chen(2021) Yiaxiang Chen(2021) Deverall Deverall	490 173 314 543 238 48 42 57 136 757 949 46 45 488 494 187	16,173 227 587 13,081 725 72 106 60 197 2,470 2,199 227 420 1,397 1,594 95	4,879 186 439 4,062 215 25 46 85 141 2,603 373 55 16 418 627	8,576 411 1,211 23,657 1,934 165 217 199 498 3,727 6,606 1,037 406 2,910 4,712		1.68 [1.62, 1.75] 1.68 [1.29, 2.19] 1.48 [1.24, 1.76] 2.91 [2.79, 3.05] 2.95 [2.41, 3.62] 4.40 [2.52, 7.68] 1.87 [1.16, 3.02] 2.22 [1.43, 3.46] 2.44 [1.83, 3.25] 1.60 [1.48, 1.72] - 7.64 [6.72, 8.70] 3.82 [2.52, 5.80] 2.72 [1.51, 4.89] 2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	4.32 3.91 4.13 4.32 4.07 2.92 3.19 3.32 3.84 4.29 4.22 3.41 2.82
Hongbo Jiang (2020) Yalan Huang (2018) Ziming Lin (2017) Li Liu(2017) Li Liu(2017) Liqiang Xu(2017) Yao Qi(2015) Ping Liu(2020) Lu Ye(2018) Qing Yang(2019) Qing Yang(2019) Janzhou Zi(2018) Li Li(2019) Hongmei Liang(2018) Hailan Zhang(2018) Zairan Duan(2018) Yan Guo(2017) Lirong Liu(2017) Shunzhu Yin(2020) Kiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) Tie Ding(2021) Jin Chen(2021) Jiaxiang Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021)	173 314 543 238 48 42 57 136 757 949 46 45 488 494 187	227 587 13,081 725 72 106 60 197 2,470 2,199 227 420 1,397 1,594 95	186 439 4,062 215 25 46 85 141 2,603 373 55 16 418 627	411 1,211 23,657 1,934 165 217 199 498 3,727 6,606 1,037 406 2,910 4,712		1.68 [1.29, 2.19] 1.48 [1.24, 1.76] 2.91 [2.79, 3.05] 2.95 [2.41, 3.62] 4.40 [2.52, 7.68] 1.87 [1.16, 3.02] 2.22 [1.43, 3.46] 2.44 [1.83, 3.25] 1.60 [1.48, 1.72] -7.64 [6.72, 8.70] 3.82 [2.52, 5.80] 2.72 [1.51, 4.89] 2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	3.91 4.13 4.32 4.07 2.92 3.19 3.32 3.84 4.29 4.22 3.41 2.82
Yalan Huang (2018) Ziming Lin (2017) Li Liu(2017) Liqiang Xu(2017) Yao Qi(2015) Ping Liu(2020) Lu Ye(2018) Qing Yang(2019) Qing Yang(2019) Dan Zhou(2020) Jianzhuo Li(2018) Li Li(2019) Hongmei Liang(2018) Hailan Zhang(2018) Zairan Duan(2018) Yan Guo(2017) Lirong Liu(2017) Shunzhu Yin(2020) Xiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Jie Ding(2021) Jin Chen(2021) Jiaxiang Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021)	314 543 238 48 42 57 136 757 949 46 45 488 494 187	587 13,081 725 72 106 60 197 2,470 2,199 227 420 1,397 1,594 95	439 4,062 215 25 46 85 141 2,603 373 55 16 418 627	1,211 23,657 1,934 165 217 199 498 3,727 6,606 1,037 406 2,910 4,712		1.48 [1.24, 1.76] 2.91 [2.79, 3.05] 2.95 [2.41, 3.62] 4.40 [2.52, 7.68] 1.87 [1.16, 3.02] 2.22 [1.43, 3.46] 2.44 [1.83, 3.25] 1.60 [1.48, 1.72] 7.64 [6.72, 8.70] 3.82 [2.52, 5.80] 2.72 [1.51, 4.89] 2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	 4.13 4.32 4.07 2.92 3.19 3.32 3.84 4.29 4.22 3.41 2.82
Ziming Lin (2017) 6, Li Liu(2017) 5, Liqiang Xu(2017) 7, Yao Qi(2015) 20, Ping Liu(2020) 2, Lu Ye(2018) 2, Qing Yang(2019) 2, Dan Zhou(2020) 2, Gianzhuo Li(2018) 2, Li Li(2019) 40 Hongmei Liang(2018) 4 Hailan Zhang(2018) 4 Zairan Duan(2018) 4 Yan Guo(2017) 5 Lirong Liu(2017) 5 Shunzhu Yin(2020) 5 Xiaohong Pan(2014) 4 Yong Zhu(2019) 5 Conghui Xu(2019) 5 Jin Chen(2021) 5 Jiaxiang Chen(2021) 5 Verall 5	543 238 48 42 57 136 757 949 46 45 488 494 187	13,081 725 72 106 60 197 2,470 2,199 227 420 1,397 1,594 95	4,062 215 25 46 85 141 2,603 373 55 16 418 627	23,657 1,934 165 217 199 498 3,727 6,606 1,037 406 2,910 4,712		2.91 [2.79, 3.05] 2.95 [2.41, 3.62] 4.40 [2.52, 7.68] 1.87 [1.16, 3.02] 2.22 [1.43, 3.46] 2.44 [1.83, 3.25] 1.60 [1.48, 1.72] - 7.64 [6.72, 8.70] 3.82 [2.52, 5.80] 2.72 [1.51, 4.89] 2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	 4.32 4.07 2.92 3.19 3.32 3.84 4.29 4.22 3.41 2.82
Li Liu(2017) Liqiang Xu(2017) Yao Qi(2015) Ping Liu(2020) Lu Ye(2018) Qing Yang(2019) Qing Yang(2019) Qing Yang(2019) Qing Yang(2019) Li Li(2019) Hongmei Liang(2018) Li Li(2019) Hongmei Liang(2018) Yan Guo(2017) Li Guo(2017) Shunzhu Yin(2020) Xiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) Tie Ding(2021) Jiaxiang Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021) Dverall	238 48 42 57 136 757 949 46 45 488 494 187	725 72 106 60 197 2,470 2,199 227 420 1,397 1,594 95	215 25 46 85 141 2,603 373 55 16 418 627	1,934 165 217 199 498 3,727 6,606 1,037 406 2,910 4,712		2.95 [2.41, 3.62] 4.40 [2.52, 7.68] 1.87 [1.16, 3.02] 2.22 [1.43, 3.46] 2.44 [1.83, 3.25] 1.60 [1.48, 1.72] -7.64 [6.72, 8.70] 3.82 [2.52, 5.80] 2.72 [1.51, 4.89] 2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	4.07 2.92 3.19 3.32 3.84 4.29 4.22 3.41 2.82
Liqiang Xu(2017) Yao Qi(2015) Ping Liu(2020) Lu Ye(2018) Qing Yang(2019) 2, Dan Zhou(2020) Jianzhuo Li(2018) Li Li(2019) Hongmei Liang(2018) Hailan Zhang(2018) Zairan Duan(2018) Yan Guo(2017) Lirong Liu(2017) Shunzhu Yin(2020) Xiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) Jie Ding(2021) Jin Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021)	48 42 57 136 757 949 46 45 488 494 187	72 106 60 197 2,470 2,199 227 420 1,397 1,594 95	25 46 85 141 2,603 373 55 16 418 627	165 217 199 498 3,727 6,606 1,037 406 2,910 4,712		4.40 [2.52, 7.68] 1.87 [1.16, 3.02] 2.22 [1.43, 3.46] 2.44 [1.83, 3.25] 1.60 [1.48, 1.72] 7.64 [6.72, 8.70] 3.82 [2.52, 5.80] 2.72 [1.51, 4.89] 2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	2.92 3.19 3.32 3.84 4.29 4.22 3.41 2.82
Yao Qi(2015) Ping Liu(2020) Lu Ye(2018) Qing Yang(2019) 2, Dan Zhou(2020) Jianzhuo Li(2018) Li Li(2019) Hongmei Liang(2018) Hailan Zhang(2018) Yan Guo(2017) Lirong Liu(2017) Shunzhu Yin(2020) Xiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) Jie Ding(2021) Jin Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021) Dverall	42 57 136 757 949 46 45 488 494 187	106 60 197 2,470 2,199 227 420 1,397 1,594 95	46 85 141 2,603 373 55 16 418 627	217 199 498 3,727 6,606 1,037 406 2,910 4,712		1.87 [1.16, 3.02] 2.22 [1.43, 3.46] 2.44 [1.83, 3.25] 1.60 [1.48, 1.72] - 7.64 [6.72, 8.70] 3.82 [2.52, 5.80] 2.72 [1.51, 4.89] 2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	 3.19 3.32 3.84 4.29 4.22 3.41 2.82
Ping Liu(2020) Lu Ye(2018) Qing Yang(2019) 2, Dan Zhou(2020) 2 Jianzhuo Li(2018) 2 Li Li(2019) 4 Hongmei Liang(2018) 4 Hailan Zhang(2018) 4 Zairan Duan(2018) 4 Yan Guo(2017) 5 Lirong Liu(2017) 5 Shunzhu Yin(2020) 5 Xiaohong Pan(2014) 4 Yong Zhu(2019) 5 Conghui Xu(2019) 5 Jin Chen(2021) 5 Jiaxiang Chen(2021) 5 Verall 5	57 136 757 949 46 45 488 494 187	60 197 2,470 2,199 227 420 1,397 1,594 95	85 141 2,603 373 55 16 418 627	199 498 3,727 6,606 1,037 406 2,910 4,712		2.22 [1.43, 3.46] 2.44 [1.83, 3.25] 1.60 [1.48, 1.72] - 7.64 [6.72, 8.70] 3.82 [2.52, 5.80] 2.72 [1.51, 4.89] 2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	 3.32 3.84 4.29 4.22 3.41 2.82
Lu Ye(2018) Qing Yang(2019) 2, Dan Zhou(2020) 2 Jianzhuo Li(2018) 2 Li Li(2019) 4 Hongmei Liang(2018) 4 Hailan Zhang(2018) 4 Zairan Duan(2018) 4 Yan Guo(2017) 5 Lirong Liu(2017) 5 Shunzhu Yin(2020) 5 Xiaohong Pan(2014) 4 Yong Zhu(2019) 5 Conghui Xu(2019) 5 Jin Chen(2021) 5 Jiaxiang Chen(2021) 5 Dyerall 5	136 757 949 46 45 488 494 187	197 2,470 2,199 227 420 1,397 1,594 95	141 2,603 373 55 16 418 627	498 3,727 6,606 1,037 406 2,910 4,712		2.44 [1.83, 3.25] 1.60 [1.48, 1.72] 	3.84 4.29 4.22 3.41 2.82
Qing Yang(2019)2,Qing Yang(2019)2,Dan Zhou(2020)2Jianzhuo Li(2018)2Li Li(2019)4Hongmei Liang(2018)2Hailan Zhang(2018)2Zairan Duan(2018)2Yan Guo(2017)2Lirong Liu(2017)2Shunzhu Yin(2020)2Xiaohong Pan(2014)2Yong Zhu(2019)2Conghui Xu(2019)2Jin Chen(2021)2Jiaxiang Chen(2021)2Chenquan Qiu(2021)2Dyerall2	757 949 46 45 488 494 187	2,470 2,199 227 420 1,397 1,594 95	2,603 373 55 16 418 627	3,727 6,606 1,037 406 2,910 4,712		1.60 [1.48, 1.72] - 7.64 [6.72, 8.70] 3.82 [2.52, 5.80] 2.72 [1.51, 4.89] 2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	4.294.223.412.82
Dan Zhou(2020) Jianzhuo Li(2018) Li Li(2019) Hongmei Liang(2018) Hailan Zhang(2018) Zairan Duan(2018) Yan Guo(2017) Lirong Liu(2017) Shunzhu Yin(2020) Xiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) Jie Ding(2021) Jin Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021) Dverall	949 46 45 488 494 187	2,199 227 420 1,397 1,594 95	373 55 16 418 627	6,606 1,037 406 2,910 4,712		- 7.64 [6.72, 8.70] 3.82 [2.52, 5.80] 2.72 [1.51, 4.89] 2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	4.22 3.41 2.82
Jianzhuo Li(2018) Li Li(2019) Hongmei Liang(2018) Hailan Zhang(2018) Zairan Duan(2018) Yan Guo(2017) Lirong Liu(2017) Shunzhu Yin(2020) Xiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) Jie Ding(2021) Jin Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021) Dyerall	46 45 488 494 187	227 420 1,397 1,594 95	55 16 418 627	1,037 406 2,910 4,712		3.82 [2.52, 5.80] 2.72 [1.51, 4.89] 2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	3.41 2.82
Li Li(2019) Hongmei Liang(2018) Hailan Zhang(2018) Zairan Duan(2018) Yan Guo(2017) Lirong Liu(2017) Shunzhu Yin(2020) Xiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) Jie Ding(2021) Jin Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021)	45 488 494 187	420 1,397 1,594 95	16 418 627	406 2,910 4,712	+	2.72 [1.51, 4.89] 2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	2.82
Hongmei Liang(2018)Hailan Zhang(2018)Zairan Duan(2018)Yan Guo(2017)Lirong Liu(2017)Shunzhu Yin(2020)Xiaohong Pan(2014)Yong Zhu(2019)Conghui Xu(2019)Jie Ding(2021)Jin Chen(2021)Liraxiang Chen(2021)Chenquan Qiu(2021)Dyerall	488 494 187	1,397 1,594 95	418 627	2,910 4,712		2.43 [2.10, 2.81]	
Hailan Zhang(2018)Zairan Duan(2018)Yan Guo(2017)Lirong Liu(2017)Shunzhu Yin(2020)Xiaohong Pan(2014)Yong Zhu(2019)Conghui Xu(2019)Tie Ding(2021)Jin Chen(2021)Liaxiang Chen(2021)Chenquan Qiu(2021)Dyerall	494 187	1,594 95	627	4,712			4.19
Zairan Duan(2018) Yan Guo(2017) Lirong Liu(2017) Shunzhu Yin(2020) Xiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) Tie Ding(2021) Tin Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021) Dverall	187	95				2.33 [2.04, 2.65]	4.22
Yan Guo(2017) Lirong Liu(2017) Shunzhu Yin(2020) Xiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) fie Ding(2021) Jin Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021) Dverall			231	180		1.53 [1.12, 2.10]	3.75
Lirong Liu(2017) Shunzhu Yin(2020) Xiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) Tie Ding(2021) Tin Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021)	221	695	168	1,838		3.48 [2.80, 4.33]	4.03
Shunzhu Yin(2020) Xiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) Tie Ding(2021) Tin Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021) Dverall	73	427	225	1,724		1.31 [0.99, 1.74]	3.85
Xiaohong Pan(2014) Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) Tie Ding(2021) Tin Chen(2021) Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021)	529	938	972	2,209	• — •	1.28 [1.12, 1.46]	4.22
Yong Zhu(2019) Conghui Xu(2019) (ie Ding(2021) (in Chen(2021) (iaxiang Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021)	126	374	181	1,213		2.26 [1.75, 2.91]	3.93
Conghui Xu(2019) fie Ding(2021) fin Chen(2021) fiaxiang Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021)	322	120	284	205		1.94 [1.47, 2.55]	3.87
ie Ding(2021) in Chen(2021) iaxiang Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021)	189	160	303	383		1.49 [1.15, 1.93]	3.92
in Chen(2021) : iaxiang Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021) :	891	2,077	278	1,569		2.42 [2.08, 2.81]	4.18
iaxiang Chen(2021) Chenquan Qiu(2021)	237	529	678	3,279		2.17 [1.82, 2.58]	4.14
Chenquan Qiu(2021)	27	132	20	189		1.93 [1.04, 3.59]	2.71
Overall	736	1,211	1,105	2,243	-	1.23 [1.10, 1.39]	4.24
5 ver un					•	2.19 [1.85, 2.58]	
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.17$, $I^2 = 97.4$	$4\%, H^2 = 3$	39.04					
First of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(25) = 985.53, p =	= 0.00						
First of $\theta = 0$: $z = 9.20$, $p = 0.00$							
andom-effects REML model					1 2 4	8	
1. 2 The forest plot of the assoc				ion The neide e		mont indicated the OP a	and 95

[60]. Action plan for AIDS containment and prevention in 13th Five-Year Plan in China proposed to improve the pertinence of publicity and education. But the risk of LP by the elderly did not decrease. For different age groups, we need to carry out targeted publicity and education activities. For the elderly, we need to invest even more energy to conduct these activities. Married patients have weak awareness of HIV counseling and testing. That may be due to the influence of family life, discrimination sensitivity, and other factors. Many of them didn't present until the diagnosis of their spouses. Therefore, policies that seek to protect a spouse's right to be notified on time of HIV infection should be encouraged. At present, the main route of HIV infection is sexual contact [61]. Our study found that patients infected by heterosexual contact had a higher occurrence of LP compared with MSM. Prominently, some HIV patients got infected through extramarital and commercial sex. They probably did not get tested in time because of the fear of HIV stigma. Social support is particularly crucial for high-risk groups to teat actively and timely. LP patients are more likely to be found in medical institutions, such as STD

Study	Late pres Male	sentation 1 Female	Non-late pi Male	resentation Female				Odds Ratio with 95% CI	Weight (%)
Xi Hu (2019)	23,307	8,356	8,721	4,734				1.51 [1.45, 1.5	8] 3.94
Hongbo Jiang (2020)	315	85	484	113				0.87 [0.63, 1.1	9] 3.16
Lin Jin (2018)	2,338	611	3,358	766				0.87 [0.78, 0.9	8] 3.82
Ji Zeng (2015)	532	50	2,088	100				0.51 [0.36, 0.7	2] 3.01
Yalan Huang (2018)	743	158	1,328	322				1.14 [0.92, 1.4	1] 3.56
Jian Li (2017)	451	73	1,243	198	-			0.98 [0.74, 1.3	1] 3.27
Ziming Lin (2017)	15,721	3,900	22,535	5,184				0.93 [0.89, 0.9	7] 3.93
Wenjie Cao (2019)	7,738	2,757	15,709	7,407				1.32 [1.26, 1.3	9] 3.93
Li Liu (2017)	850	113	1,998	151				0.57 [0.44, 0.7	3] 3.39
Liqiang Xu (2017)	101	19	171	19 -				0.59 [0.30, 1.1	7] 1.82
Jinwei Li (2017)	31	5	41	25	-			— 3.78 [1.30, 10.9	9] 1.02
Yao Qi (2015)	126	22	222	41		_		1.06 [0.60, 1.8	6] 2.20
Ping Liu (2020)	104	13	231	53			-	1.84 [0.96, 3.5	1] 1.92
Lu Ye (2018)	296	37	534	105				1.57 [1.05, 2.3	5] 2.82
Qing Yang (2019)	4,244	983	4,889	1,441				1.27 [1.16, 1.3	9] 3.87
Dan Zhou (2020)	2,916	232	7,336	559				0.96 [0.82, 1.1	2] 3.72
Ying Wang (2019)	205	47	391	85				0.95 [0.64, 1.4	1] 2.84
Jianzhuo Li (2018)	257	16	1,049	43				0.66 [0.37, 1.1	9] 2.11
Li Li (2019)	1,508	377	2,849	479				0.67 [0.58, 0.7	8] 3.75
Hailan Zhang (2018)	1,884	204	4,927	412	-			0.77 [0.65, 0.9	2] 3.67
Zairan Duan (2018)	229	53	279	132	-	-		2.04 [1.42, 2.9	4] 2.97
Yan Guo (2017)	841	75	1,920	86				0.50 [0.36, 0.6	9] 3.14
Lirong Liu (2017)	307	193	1,064	885	-			1.32 [1.08, 1.6	2] 3.59
Shunzhu Yin (2020)	1,002	416	2,058	1,172				1.37 [1.20, 1.5	7] 3.78
Lin Li (2016)	71	39	310	106				0.62 [0.40, 0.9	7] 2.62
Zuokai Yang (2019)	169	33	457	117	-∔∎			1.31 [0.86, 2.0	0] 2.72
Xiaohong Pan (2014)	390	110	1,121	273				0.86 [0.67, 1.1	1] 3.42
Yong Zhu (2019)	241	101	326	163				1.19 [0.88, 1.6	1] 3.23
Conghui Xu (2019)	263	86	530	156				0.90 [0.67, 1.2	2] 3.22
Zhongrong Yang(2021)	148	28	337	68		-		1.07 [0.66, 1.7	2] 2.50
Jin Chen(2021)	524	242	2,435	1,522	-			1.35 [1.15, 1.6	0] 3.70
Chunling Huang(2020)	382	115	539	215		-		1.32 [1.02, 1.7	2] 3.37
Overall					•			1.02 [0.90, 1.1	5]
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.10$,	$I^2 = 95.45$	$H^2 = 21$.97						
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(31) = 49	9.58, p = 0	0.00							
Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = 0.28$, $p =$	= 0.78								
-				-	1/2 1	2	4 8		

Fig. 3 The forest plot of the association between gender and late presentation. The midpoint and length of each segment indicated the OR and 95% confidence interval. The diamond shape revealed the pooled OR

clinics and pre-surgery. Hence the current work of consulting and testing still needs improvement. For this part of patients, we believe that enriching the consulting and testing methods can effectively improve the poor situation, such as carrying out online consulting and starting high-sensitivity self-testing.

Study	Late pres Married	Others	Non-late pr Married	Others		with 95% CI	(%)
Hu,X (2019)	19,686	11,977	8,184	5,271		1.06 [1.02, 1.10]	3.02
Haiyang Hu (2017)	54	134	62	241		1.57 [1.03, 2.39]	2.11
Hongbo Jiang (2020)	185	215	246	351	+	1.23 [0.95, 1.58]	2.61
Lin Jin (2018)	1,668	1,281	1,673	2,451	-	1.91 [1.73, 2.10]	2.97
Ji Zeng (2015)	224	358	385	1,803		- 2.93 [2.40, 3.58]	2.76
Yalan Huang (2018)	568	333	876	774		1.51 [1.28, 1.78]	2.84
Jian Li (2017)	284	240	593	848		1.69 [1.38, 2.07]	2.76
Ziming Lin (2017)	10,246	9,378	9,960	17,759		1.95 [1.88, 2.02]	3.02
Wenjie Cao (2019)	4,855	5,640	10,348	12,768		1.06 [1.01, 1.11]	3.02
Li Liu (2017)	494	469	548	1,601	-	3.08 [2.62, 3.61]	2.85
Liqiang Xu (2017)	68	52	82	108	_	1.72 [1.09, 2.73]	1.99
Yao Qi (2015)	100	48	135	128		- 1.98 [1.30, 3.01]	2.11
Pengfei Bing (2018)	410	419	950	1,826		1.88 [1.61, 2.20]	2.86
Ping Liu (2020)	81	36	160	124		1.74 [1.10, 2.75]	2.00
Lu Ye (2018)	207	126	287	352		2.01 [1.54, 2.64]	2.57
Qing Yang (2019)	2,968	2,259	3,166	3,164		1.31 [1.22, 1.41]	2.99
Dan Zhou (2020)	980	2,168	1,551	6,344	-	1.85 [1.68, 2.03]	2.97
Ying Wang (2019)	163	89	278	198	+- B	1.30 [0.95, 1.79]	2.43
Jianzhuo Li (2018)	84	189	214	878		1.82 [1.35, 2.45]	2.49
Li Li (2019)	232	233	173	249		1.43 [1.10, 1.87]	2.58
Hongmei Liang (2018)	909	976	1,119	2,209		1.84 [1.64, 2.06]	2.94
Hailan Zhang (2018)	1,039	1,049	1,596	3,743	-	2.32 [2.09, 2.58]	2.96
Zairan Duan (2018)	110	172	114	297		1.67 [1.21, 2.30]	2.41
Yan Guo (2017)	368	548	424	1,582		- 2.51 [2.11, 2.97]	2.83
Lirong Liu (2017)	283	217	1,054	895		1.11 [0.91, 1.35]	2.77
Shunzhu Yin (2020)	950	517	1,948	1,233		1.16 [1.02, 1.32]	2.91
Lin Li (2016)	56	54	200	216		1.12 [0.74, 1.71]	2.11
Zuokai Yang (2019)	98	104	226	348		1.45 [1.05, 2.00]	2.41
Xiaohong Pan (2014)	93	407	222	1,172		1.21 [0.92, 1.58]	2.58
Yong Zhu (2019)	223	219	265	224		0.86 [0.67, 1.11]	2.61
Conghui Xu (2019)	88	261	216	470 -		0.73 [0.55, 0.98]	2.51
Zhongrong Yang(2021)	98	78	180	225		1.57 [1.10, 2.24]	2.31
Qi Sun(2021)	119	162	83	162		1.43 [1.01, 2.04]	2.31
Jie Ding(2021)	802	2,166	296	1,551		1.94 [1.67, 2.25]	2.88
Jin Chen(2021)	324	442	1,696	2,261		0.98 [0.84, 1.14]	2.86
Jiaxiang Chen(2021)	55	104	57	152		1.41 [0.90, 2.20]	2.03
Chenquan Qiu(2021)	1,156	791	1,986	1,362		1.00 [0.89, 1.12]	2.94
Chunling Huang(2020)	248	250	404	349		0.86 [0.68, 1.07]	2.69
Overall					•	1.50 [1.35, 1.68]	
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.10$, I^2	= 96.58%	$H^2 = 29.2$	25				
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(37) = 115	5.79, p = 0	0.00					
Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = 7.23$ n =	0.00						

Random-effects REML model

Fig. 4 The forest plot of the association between marital status and late presentation. The midpoint and length of each segment indicated the OR and 95% confidence interval. The diamond shape revealed the pooled OR

Study	Late presentatio Heterosexual contact	n MSM	Non-late presenta Heterosexual contact	tion MSM		Odds Ratio with 95% CI	Weight (%)
Xi Hu (2019)	30.042	836	11 952	935		2 81 [2 55 3 09]	3 70
Hongho Liang (2020)	300	80	371	196		1.98 [1.47, 2.68]	2.82
L in Ling (2018)	1 960	836	2 089	1 806		2.03 [1.83, 2.25]	3.68
Lii Zeng (2015)	240	334	482	1,600		2.03 [1.05, 2.25]	3 33
Yalan Huang (2018)	745	139	1 221	398		1.75 [1.41 2.16]	3.25
Iian I i (2017)	345	166	799	580		1.51 [1.22 1.87]	3.25
Ziming Lin (2017)	14 329	2 854	15 296	9 203		3.02 [2.88 3.17]	3.80
Wenije Cao (2019)	9.873	432	20.460	1 862		2.08 [1.87, 2.32]	3.66
Li Lin (2017)	508	513	419	1 545	-	3 65 [3 10 4 30]	3.47
Ligiang Xu (2017)	58	61	57	127		2.12 [1.32, 3.41]	2.03
Yao Qi (2015)	106	42	152	111		1 84 [1 20 2 84]	2.21
Pengfei Bing (2018)	368	448	840	1 890		1.85 [1.57 2.17]	3.48
Ping Liu (2020)	73	44	139	145		1.03 [1.07, 2.17]	2.17
I ing Elu (2020)	205	126	297	312		1.75 [1.11, 2.05]	2.17
Oing Vang (2019)	4 634	538	4 897	1 308	-	2 30 [2 06 2 56]	3.66
Dan Zhou (2020)	994	2 042	1 947	5 673		1 42 [1 29 1 55]	3.71
Ying Wang (2019)	144	90	221	222		1.61 [1.16 2.22]	2 72
Lianzhuo Li (2018)	64	206	134	927		2 15 [1 54 3 00]	2.66
LiLi(2019)	204	253	152	257		1 36 [1 04 1 79]	2.00
Hongmei Liang (2018)	1 181	542	1 583	1 620	-	2 23 [1 97 2 52]	3.62
Hailan Zhang (2018)	1 208	828	2 010	3,022		2.19 [1.98, 2.44]	3.67
Zairan Duan (2018)	269	10	363	43		-3.19[1.57, 6.46]	1 30
$\operatorname{Yan} \operatorname{Guo} (2017)$	309	578	390	1 512		2.07 [1.74, 2.47]	3.41
Lirong Liu (2017)	364	7	1 448	49		1.76 [0.79, 3.92]	1.09
Shunzhu Yin (2020)	1 222	30	2 660	145		2 22 [1 49 3 31]	2 36
Zuokai Yang (2019)	137	56	357	185		1 27 [0.89 1.81]	2.50
Xiaohong Pan (2014)	344	137	770	579		1.89 [1.51 2.37]	3.19
Yong Zhu (2019)	425	13	472	33		2 29 [1 19 4 40]	1 43
Conghui Xu (2019)	266	80	507	170		1 11 [0.82, 1.51]	2.81
Zhongrong Yang(2021)	119	53	245	147		1 35 [0.92, 1.98]	2.43
Jie Ding(2021)	1.098	1.851	446	1.377		1.83 [1.61, 2.09]	3.59
Jin Chen(2021)	655	56	3.481	286		0.96 [0.71, 1.30]	2.84
Jiaxiang Chen(2021)	77	81	76	132		1.65 [1.08, 2.51]	2.26
Chenquan Oiu(2021)	1.796	61	3.062	159		1.53 [1.13, 2.07]	2.83
Chunling Huang(2020)	488	8	718	30		2.55 [1.16, 5.61]	1.11
O		-	,				
Uverali Uverali $\mathbf{r}^2 = 0.07 \ \mathbf{I}^2$	$-00.740/10^2 - 10.80$					1.91 [1.73, 2.11]	
Therefore the therefore $\tau = 0.07, 1$ Therefore $\tau = 0.07, 1$	-50.7470, H = 10.80						
Test of $\theta = 0; z = 12.95 = -444$	- 0.00						
$1 \cos 010 - 0.2 = 12.83, p =$	- 0.00					_	
Random-effects REML mod	el				1 2 4		

Fig. 5 The forest plot of the association between risk factor for infection and late presentation. The midpoint and length of each segment indicated the OR and 95% confidence interval. The diamond shape revealed the pooled OR

Study	Late presentati Medical institutions	on Others	Non-late present Medical institutions	ation Others	Odds Ratio with 95% CI	Weight (%)
Xi Hu (2019)	19,348	12,315	6,067	7,388	1.91 [1.84, 1.99]	3.38
Hongbo Jiang (2020)	308	92	375	222		2.75
Lin Jin (2018)	1,740	1,209	1,585	2,539	2.31 [2.09, 2.54]	3.30
Ji Zeng (2015)	428	154	1,028	1,160	3.14 [2.56, 3.84]	3.04
Yalan Huang (2018)	628	273	791	859	2.50 [2.10, 2.97]	3.13
Jian Li (2017)	399	125	737	704	3.05 [2.43, 3.82]	2.96
Ziming Lin (2017)	13,010	6,614	12,239	15,480	2.49 [2.40, 2.58]	3.38
Wenjie Cao (2019)	8,339	2,156	16,105	8,011	1.92 [1.82, 2.03]	3.36
Li Liu (2017)	671	292	694	1,455	4.82 [4.09, 5.68]	3.15
Liqiang Xu (2017)	78	42	67	123	3.41 [2.11, 5.50]	2.05
Jinwei Li (2017)	33	2	40	27	11.14 [2.46, 50.34]	0.45
Yao Qi (2015)	104	44	120	143	2.82 [1.84, 4.32]	2.23
Pengfei Bing (2018)	522	307	1,033	1,743	2.87 [2.44, 3.37]	3.16
Ping Liu (2020)	83	34	149	135	2.21 [1.39, 3.51]	2.11
Lu Ye (2018)	227	106	276	363	2.82 [2.13, 3.72]	2.78
Qing Yang (2019)	4,735	492	5,046	1,284	2.45 [2.19, 2.74]	3.28
Dan Zhou (2020)	2,018	1,130	3,332	4,563	2.45 [2.25, 2.66]	3.32
Ying Wang (2019)	124	128	182	294		2.67
Jianzhuo Li (2018)	105	168	285	807	1.77 [1.34, 2.34]	2.78
Li Li (2019)	208	257	122	300		2.78
Hongmei Liang (2018)	1,258	627	1,332	1,996	3.01 [2.67, 3.38]	3.26
Hailan Zhang (2018)	1,558	530	2,302	3,037	3.88 [3.47, 4.34]	3.27
Zairan Duan (2018)	234	48	246	165	3.27 [2.26, 4.72]	2.45
Yan Guo (2017)	504	412	497	1,509	3.71 [3.15, 4.38]	3.15
Lirong Liu (2017)	154	346	352	1,597	2.02 [1.62, 2.52]	2.98
Shunzhu Yin (2020)	1,007	460	1,727	1,454	1.84 [1.62, 2.10]	3.24
Lin Li (2016)	38	72	76	340	2.36 [1.48, 3.76]	2.10
Zuokai Yang (2019)	137	65	253	321		2.56
Xiaohong Pan (2014)	347	153	643	751	2.65 [2.13, 3.29]	2.99
Yong Zhu (2019)	378	64	360	129		2.58
Conghui Xu (2019)	161	188	241	445		2.84
Jie Ding(2021)	1,687	1,281	806	1,041	1.70 [1.51, 1.91]	3.27
Jin Chen(2021)	326	440	1,182	2,775	1.74 [1.48, 2.04]	3.17
Chenquan Qiu(2021)	1,149	798	1,737	1,611	1.34 [1.19, 1.50]	3.27
Chunling Huang(2020)	382	115	492	162 -	1.09 [0.83, 1.44]	2.80
Overall Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.09$, $\vec{\Gamma}$ Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(34) = 568 Test of $\theta = 0$, $z = 15, 32$, p	$^{2} = 96.05\%, H^{2} = 25.29$ 8.77, p = 0.00				♦ 2.35 [2.11, 2.62]	
$1 \cos 10 = 0$; $z = 15.32$, p	- 0.00				1 2 4 8 16 32	

Fig. 6 The forest plot of the association between sample sources and late presentation. The midpoint and length of each segment indicated the OR and 95% confidence interval. The diamond shape revealed the pooled OR

		High prevalence regions n (LP%))	Middle or low prevalence regions n (LP%)	P-value	2010–2015 n (LP%)	2016–2020 n (LP%)	P-value
Age	≥50	23,968(66.02%)	7390(54.07%)	< 0.01*	748 (46.52%)	599 (33.92%)	< 0.01*
	< 50	32,681(43.60%)	13,612(31.93%)	< 0.01*	2399 (25.28%)	916 (18.36%)	< 0.01*
Gender	Male	41,858(52.14%)	26,376(33.21%)	< 0.01*	6038 (30.85%)	1484 (27.12%)	< 0.01*
	Female	13,399(48.79%)	6150(32.00%)	< 0.01*	1310 (33.08%)	528 (20.84%)	< 0.01*
Marital status	Married	33,244 (56.31%)	17,332 (39.85%)	< 0.01*	3692 (40.71%)	845 (24.80%)	< 0.01*
	Others	24,013 (44.46%)	20,148 (30.60%)	< 0.01*	3808 (25.64%)	1168(25.40%)	0.743
Infection routes	Heterosexual transmission	49,465 (55.69%)	25,685 (38.42%)	0.627	4234(39.06%)	1709(25.18%)	< 0.01*
	MSM	3942 (26.30%)	10,489 (27.56%)	< 0.01*	2674(25.20%)	224(24.72%)	0.752
Sample sources	Medical institutions	35,956 (59.48%)	26,472 (41.04%)	< 0.01*	4496(43.50%)	1177(33.95%)	< 0.01*
	Others	21,300 (40.58%)	10,239 (23.28%)	< 0.01*	2851 (21.60%)	835 (18.81%)	< 0.01*
Overall		57,266(50.66%)	43,041(36.21%)	< 0.01*	7615(31.70%)	2012(25.13)	< 0.01*

Table 2 The overall proportion of LP of subgroups with different characteristics

* Refers to a statistically significant difference (P < 0.05)

Table 3 The overall proportion of different time period in high epidemic areas and middle or low epidemic areas

Study region	Time period	Late presentation	Non Late presentation	P-value
High prevalence regions	2010-2015	720(22.82%)	2435(77.18%)	0.104
	2016-2020	1747(24.3%)	5442(75.70%)	
middle or low prevalence regions	2010-2015	7005(33.28%)	14,045(66.72%)	0.015*
	2016-2020	660(36.07%)	1170(63.93%)	

* Refers to a statistically significant difference (P < 0.05)

Table 4	The results of	f subgroup	meta-anal	vsis b	v study	/ regions an	d time p	eriod
					, ,			

	Pooled OR (95%CI)	P-value	Pooled OR (95%	CI)	P-value	Publication bias	
	High prevalence regions	Middle or low prevalence regions		2010–2015	2016–2020		<i>P</i> -value
Age	1.67 (1.35–2.07)	2.50 (2.04–3.05)	0.01*	2.48 (1.77–3.49)	1.79 (1.43–2.25)	0.12	0.4632
Gender	1.22 (1.00-1.48)	0.94 (0.81–1.08)	0.04*	0.80 (0.63–1.02)	1.11 (0.88–1.41)	0.06	0.6793
Marital status	1.18 (1.00–1.38)	1.65 (1.46–1.87)	< 0.01*	1.81 (1.45–2.26)	0.94 (0.78–1.14)	< 0.01*	0.814
Infection routes	2.08 (1.57–2.74)	1.87 (1.70–2.06)	0.49	2.13 (1.77-2.57)	1.43(0.94–2.17)	0.09	0.1438
Sample sources	1.89 (1.58–2.26)	2.57 (2.28–2.89)	0.01*	3.00 (2.52–3.58)	1.57 (1.24–1.99)	< 0.01*	0.3912

* Refers to a statistically significant difference (P < 0.05)

In subgroup analysis, the proportion of LP in high epidemic areas is higher than in middle or low regions. When comparing the occurrence of LP in two time periods in middle or low epidemic areas, the latter period was significantly higher than the former. Action plan for AIDS containment and prevention in China in 12th Five-Year put forward measures to expand the coverage of publicity and education, comprehensive intervention, testing and treatment [62]. Even though great efforts had done to expand the coverage of testing and treatment of HIV, LP is still a pressing problem in high prevalence regions. In recent years, the situation of LP in middle or low prevalence areas had become more severe than before. Thus, we should continue to expand the coverage of testing and treatment. The government should invest more funds in high prevalence regions to conduct focused testing or even census for high-risk groups to find more patients as early as possible. Besides, we recommend the exemption of additional tests in high LP areas. So that ART can start as soon as HIV positives are confirmed irrespective of national guidelines. In middle or low prevalence regions, people over 50 years old, married, and examined in medical institutions should become the focus of HIV education, counseling, and testing.

There are some other findings in this study. Firstly, previous studies on the influencing factors of LP to HIV care mainly focused on social demographic determinants. There are still many other related factors to be explored, such as behavioral factors, AIDS knowledge level, access to testing and ART, policy, and social support. Secondly, there are few studies on the ART and immune reconstitution of LP patients. There are several limitations. The criteria for LP for the included publications were different, and the results may deviate from the real world. Therefore, there is an urgent need for a consensus definition of LP to facilitate full use of the actual material to reflect the problems and find solutions. Secondly, we included four articles in the 2016–2020 group, which may have led to bias in our results.

Generally, LP remains an obstacle to the prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS in China. Targeted public health interventions to improve early entry into HIV care are urgently needed. We still have a lot to do for HIVrelated policy-making, testing strategy, and health education in the future.

Conclusion

Patients \geq 50 years old, married, with heterosexual contact as risk factor for infection, and diagnosed in medical institutions were risk factors of LP. Gender had no significant relationship with LP. Although the country have expanded the coverage of testing and treatment of HIV through great efforts, LP is still a pressing problem in high prevalence regions. In middle or low prevalence areas, patients who were \geq 50 years old, married, and diagnosed in medical institutions were more likely to be presented late than in other areas. Patients married and diagnosed in medical institutions after 2015 have a lower risk of LP than before. Governments should also take measures to expand the coverage of education, testing, and treatment of HIV.

Abbreviations

HIV: Human immunodeficiency virus; AIDS: Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome; LP: Late presentation (hereon in referred to as LP) to HIV care; ART : Antiretroviral therapy; CNKI: China National Knowledge Infrastructure; NOS: Newcastle–Ottawa quality-assessment scale; GRADE: Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; MSM: Men who have sex with men; STD: Sexually transmitted diseases.

Page 12 of 14

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi. org/10.1186/s12981-021-00415-2.

Additional file 1. The quality grade of patients exposed to different factors with late presentation compare to non-late presentation.

Additional file 2. The conventional funnel plots of different factors.

Acknowledgements

We are delighted to acknowledge all the authors from the included studies.

Authors' contributions

CS, JL: conceptualization of article, preparation of the first draft, writing, and review; XL: data extraction, read and approved the final manuscript; ZZ, TQ and HH: read and approved the final manuscript. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

The authors declare that there is no funding.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article [and its supplementary information files].

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author details

¹School of Public Health, Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, People's Republic of China. ²Jiangsu Provincial Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Jiangsu, People's Republic of China. ³Department of Radiology, Fourth Affiliated Hospitial Of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, Jiangsu, People's Republic of China.

Received: 28 June 2021 Accepted: 11 November 2021 Published online: 11 December 2021

References

- Meléndez J, Reinhardt SW, O'Halloran JA, et al. Late presentation and missed opportunities for HIV diagnosis in Guatemala. AIDS Behav. 2019;23:920–8.
- Late Presentation Working Groups in EuroSIDA and COHERE. Estimating the burden of HIV late presentation and its attributable morbidity and mortality across Europe 2010–2016. BMC Infect Dis. 2020;20(1):728.
- Jin X, Xiong R, Wang LY, Mao YR. Analysis on the 'late diagnosis' (LD) phenomena among newly identified HIV/AIDS cases in China, 2010– 2014. Zhonghua liu xing bing xue za zhi Zhonghua liuxingbingxue zazhi. 2016;37:218–21 (in Chinese).
- Mocroft A, Lundgren JD, Sabin ML, et al. Risk factors and outcomes for late presentation for HIV-positive persons in Europe: results from the Collaboration of Observational HIV Epidemiological Research Europe Study (COHERE). PLoS Med. 2013;10:e1001510.
- Krawczyk CS, Funkhouser E, Kilby JM, et al. Factors associated with delayed initiation of HIV medical care among infected persons attending a southern HIV/AIDS clinic. South Med J. 2006;99:472–81.

- Krentz HB, Auld MC, Gill MJ. The high cost of medical care for patients who present late (CD4 <200 cells/microL) with HIV infection. HIV Med. 2004;5:93–8.
- Marks G, Crepaz N, Janssen RS. Estimating sexual transmission of HIV from persons aware and unaware that they are infected with the virus in the USA. AIDS (London, England). 2006;20:1447–50.
- Lv F. Key strategy of the China action plan for the thirteen five-year plan for combating and prevention of AIDS. Chin J Dis Control Prevent. 2017;51:966–70 (in Chinese).
- 9. Wu ZY. HIV/AIDS prevention strategy with Chinese characteristics. Chin J Dis Control Prevent. 2019;23:885–9 (in Chinese).
- Johnson LF, Mossong J, Dorrington RE, et al. Life expectancies of South African adults starting antiretroviral treatment: collaborative analysis of cohort studies. PLoS Med. 2013;10:e1001418.
- 11. Jain V, Hartogensis W, Bacchetti P, et al. Antiretroviral therapy initiated within 6 months of HIV infection is associated with lower T-cell activation and smaller HIV reservoir size. J Infect Dis. 2013;208:1202–11.
- 12. Deeks SG, Lewin SR, Bekker LG. The end of HIV: Still a very long way to go, but progress continues. PLoS Med. 2017;14:e1002466.
- Martin GE, Frater J. Post-treatment and spontaneous HIV control. Curr Opin HIV AIDS. 2018;13(5):402–7.
- Rodger AJ, Cambiano V, Bruun T, et al. Risk of HIV transmission through condomless sex in serodifferent gay couples with the HIV-positive partner taking suppressive antiretroviral therapy (PARTNER): final results of a multicentre, prospective, observational study. Lancet. 2019;393(10189):2428–38.
- Belay GM, Endalamaw A, Ayele AD. Late presentation of HIV positive adults and its predictors to HIV/AIDS care in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Infect Dis. 2019;19(1):534.
- Gesesew HA, Tesfay Gebremedhin A, Demissie TD, et al. Significant association between perceived HIV related stigma and late presentation for HIV/AIDS care in low and middle-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS ONE. 2017;12(3):e0173928.
- Sun XS, Jing J, Zhang XH. Marketization, population mobility, and HIV/ AIDS——based on Guangdong province. Popul Dev. 2011;17:93–8 (in Chinese).
- Hu X, Liang B, Zhou C, et al. HIV late presentation and advanced HIV disease among patients with newly diagnosed HIV/AIDS in Southwestern China: a large-scale cross-sectional study. AIDS Res Ther. 2019;16:6.
- Hu H, Yan H, Liu X, et al. Trends in late HIV diagnosis among men who have sex with men in Jiangsu province, China: results from four consecutive community-based surveys, 2011–2014. PLoS ONE. 2017;12:e0172664.
- Jiang H, Liu J, Tan Z, et al. Prevalence of and factors associated with advanced HIV disease among newly diagnosed people living with HIV in Guangdong Province, China. J Int AIDS Soc. 2020;23:e25642.
- Jin L, Cheng XL, Qin YZ, Su B. Analysis of the influential factors of late diagnosis among newly identified HIV/AIDS cases in Anhui Province, 2011–2015. Chin J Prev Med. 2018;52:415–8 (in Chinese).
- Zeng J, Li Y, Ye JR, et al. Characteristics of late diagnosis cases of newly reported HIV/AIDS cases in Beijing, 2013. Chin J AIDS STD. 2015;21:388–91 (in Chinese).
- Huang YL, Chen QT, Xu J, et al. Analysis on the late diagnosis of HIV/ AIDS cases and its influencing factors in Quanzhou City, 2011–2017. Strait J Prev Med. 2018;24:26–9 (in Chinese).
- Li J, Wang B, Yang CM, Wang XR, et al. Analysis of late diagnosis cases of newly reported HIV/AIDS cases in Gansu province (2013–2015). Chin J Viral Dis. 2017;7:54–8 (in Chinese).
- Lin ZM, Li Y, Fu XB, et al. Characteristics and influencing factors for latediagnosed HIV/AIDS cases in Guangdong Province, 2010–2016. South China J Prev Med. 2017;43:501–6 (in Chinese).
- Cao W, Yuan Z, Yao Y, et al. Analysis of late diagnosis and its influencing factors of newly reported HIV/AIDS in Guizhou Province from 2014 to 2018. Chin J Dis Control Prev. 2019;23:1436–41 (in Chinese).
- Liu L, Zhu Z, Xu Y, et al. Analysis on the influencing factors of late diagnosis of newly identified HIV/AIDS cases in Nanjing from 2011 to 2015. Chin J Dis Control Prev. 2017;21:1245–9 (in Chinese).
- Xu L, Gu Y, Zhou C, et al. Proportion and factors of late diagnosis of the reported HIV/AIDS cases during 2010–2015 in Changshu county. Chin J Aids STD. 2017;23:613-615,646 (in Chinese).

- 29. Li JW, Shao T. Influencing factors of late diagnosis of patients infected with HIV in Jingjiang city. Jiangsu J Prev Med. 2017;28:32-34,57 (in Chinese).
- Qi Y, Cui Q. Analysis of epidemiological characteristics of HIV/AIDS and influencing factors of late diagnosis in Yancheng. Jiangsu J Prev Med. 2015;26:24–6 (in Chinese).
- Bing PF, Zhao YQ, Zhao XP, et al. Late detection of HIV infection and its influencing factors in Suzhou, 2012–2017. Jiangsu J Prev Med. 2018;29:522-523,540 (in Chinese).
- 32. Liu P, Wu J, Yao MF, et al. Analysis on the late detection of HIV infection cases in Zhangjiagang City, Jiangsu Province from 2013 to 2018. J Med Pest Control. 2020;36:686–8 (**in Chinese**).
- Ye L, Zhang MH, Hu CF, et al. Characteristics and influencing factors of HIV / AIDS late detection cases in Zhenjiang City from 2010 to 2017. Jiangsu J Prev Med. 2018;29:514-515,517 (in Chinese).
- Yang Q, Luo YL, Hu Q. Late diagnosis of newly identified HIV/AIDS cases and influencing factors in Jiangxi province during 2014–2018. Chin J AIDS STD. 2019;25:1153–6 (in Chinese).
- Zhou D, Pan S, Gai X, et al. Analysis on the influencing factors of late diagnosis of newly identified HIV/AIDS cases in Liaoning Province, China, 2015–2018. Chin J Dermatovenereol. 2020;34:910–4 (in Chinese).
- Wang Y, Zhang RH, Huang KP, et al. Analysis on characteristics and influencing factors of newly reported late-diagnosed HIV/AIDS cases, Heze city 2014–2018. Prev Med Tribune. 2019;25:683–6 (in Chinese).
- Li J, Ren Q, Li X, et al. Late diagnosis of HIV infection and its influencing factors in Jinan in 2011–2016. China Prev Med. 2018;19:830–4 (in Chinese).
- Li L, Wang H. Analysis of the first CD4+T test of newly reported HIV/ AIDS cases living in Linyi city from 2012 to 2017. Chinese J AIDS STD. 2019;25:676-679,698 (in Chinese).
- Liang H, Nie X, Mu S, et al. Late diagnosis of newly identified HIV/AIDS cases and its influencing factors in Shanxi, 2011–2016. Chin J Aids STD. 2018;24:1097–100 (in Chinese).
- Zhang HL, Wei XL, Zhao X, et al. Influencing factors of late diagnosis of newly identified HIV/AIDS cases in Xi'an, 2011–2017. China Trop Med. 2018;18:799-803,840 (in Chinese).
- Duan Z, Wang J, Li B, et al. Characteristics and influencing factors of late detected HIV/AIDS cases between 2012 and 2016 in Hejiang County of Sichuan Province. Chin J Dermatovenereol. 2018;32:1047–51 (in Chinese).
- 42. Guo Y, Ning TL, Zhou N. The characteristics of late-diagnosed HIV/AIDS cases in Tianjin from 2011 to 2015 and its influencing factors. Chin J Hum Sex. 2017;26:77–80 (**in Chinese**).
- Liu LR, Wang XM, et al. Late detection and influencing factors of newly reported HIV/AIDS patients in Yining City, Xinjiang, 2010–2015. Chin J AIDS STD. 2017;23:112–5 (in Chinese).
- Yin SZ, Huang LH, Yang LF. Delayed HIV/AIDS diagnosis in Dali Bai Autonomous Prefecture from 2012 to 2018 and its influencing factors. Acad J Chin PLA Med School. 2020;41:260–3 (in Chinese).
- Li L, Yang YL, Cao YF, et al. Proportion and influencing factors of delay on HIV diagnosis among newly reported HIV-infected Myanmar patients in Dehong area of Yunnan Province in 2015. Chin J Dis Control Prev. 2016;20:1253–6 (in Chinese).
- Yang ZK, Wang H, Fang YR, et al. Characteristics of late detection of newly reported HIV/AIDS cases in Shaoxing City. Prev Med. 2019;31:603–5 (in Chinese).
- Pan XY, Chen L, Xu Y, et al. Characteristics and influencing factors of HIV / AIDS patients in Zhejiang Province in 2012. Chin J Prev Med. 2014;48:380–5 (in Chinese).
- Zhu Y, Ma F, Wu W, et al. Analysis on the characteristics of delayed diagnosis of HIV/AIDS cases in Rongchang district of Chongqing from 2012 to 2017. Chin J Aids STD. 2019;25:37-39,51 (in Chinese).
- Xu CH. Late presentation of HIV / AIDS and its influencing factors in Chongqing. Chinese Centre for Disease Control and Prevention; 2019. (in Chinese).
- Yang ZR, Li J, Jin MH, et al. Delayed HIV diagnosis and its associated factors in Huzhou. Prev Med. 2021;33:526–8 (in Chinese).
- Sun Q, Xu L, Zhang HJ. Analysis of the first CD4 cell count test for newly detected HIV/AIDS cases in Weihai. Chin J AIDS STD. 2021;27:539–40 (in Chinese).

- Ding J, Yan H, Wu S, et al. Related factors of first CD4 cell count test for newly detected HIV/AIDS cases in Wuhan from 2010 to 2018. Prev Med. 2021;48:1503–6 (in Chinese).
- Chen J, Ni MJ. Analysis on epidemiological characteristics of late presentation HIV / AIDS cases in Xinjiang in 2019. Bull Dis Control Prev (China). 2021;36(2):18–21 (in Chinese).
- Chen JX, Li BX, Zhang D, et al. Influencing factors of late diagnosis of new HIV/AIDS cases in Jimei District of Xiamen City, 2010–2019. J Community Med. 2021;19:265–8 (in Chinese).
- Qiu CQ, Deng LY, Geng PC, et al. Factors influencing the late detection of HIV infection cases in Qujing from 2014 to 2019. Chin J AIDS STD. 2021;27:177–9 (in Chinese).
- Huang CL. Analysis of late detection of newly reported human immunodeficiency virus-infected people and acquired immune deficiency syndrome patients in Suining City of Sichuan Province. J Clin Med Pract. 2020;24:15–7 (in Chinese).
- 57. Jiang H, Xie N, Fan Y, et al. Risk factors for advanced HIV disease and late entry to HIV care: national 1994–2012 HIV surveillance data for Wuhan, China. AIDS Patient Care STDs. 2015;29:541–9 (**in Chinese**).
- Abel T, Werner M. HIV risk behavior of older persons. Eur J Pub Health. 2003;13:350–2.
- Winningham A, Corwin S, Moore C, et al. The changing age of HIV: sexual risk among older African American women living in rural communities. Prev Med. 2004;39:809–14.
- Althoff KN, Gebo KA, Gange SJ, et al. CD4 count at presentation for HIV care in the United States and Canada: are those over 50 years more likely to have a delayed presentation? AIDS Res Ther. 2010;7:45.
- Lin H, Chen W, Xu Y, et al. Strategy of HIV/AIDS identification in a coastal prefecture in eastern China. Chin J Dis Control Prev. 2015;19:578–81 (in Chinese).
- 62. Notice of the General Office of the State Council on Printing and Distributing "12th Five-Year Plan" Action Plan to Contain and Prevent AIDS in China. Gazette of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, 2012(07): 7–14. (in Chinese)

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

