ELIHOS

Homo-bisexuality and risk-taking during last reported sexual intercourse with a man or a woman in Senegal

<u>J. Larmarange</u>¹, C. Enel¹, A. S. Wade², A. Desgrées du Loû¹ for the study group ELIHoS, ANRS 12139

[1] IRD – CEPED UMR 196 Paris Descartes INED IRD, Paris[2] Division SIDA/IST, Institut d'Hygiène Sociale, Dakar

Contact: joseph.larmarange@ceped.org









Method

- 501 MSM recruited through the snowball sampling method – recruitment by MSM leaders:
 - 306 in Dakar
 - 95 in Saint-Louis
 - 100 in Thiès/Mbour
- Standardized questionnaire:
 - Socio-demographic characteristics
 - Sexual behaviors
 - Detailed questions about the last sexual intercourse with a man and the last sexual intercourse with a woman
- Bisexuality is frequent: 87% of MSM ever had sex with a woman in their life.

- Allows to show relations between risk-taking and:
 - socio-demographic characteristics of ego
 - information level about HIV and STI, built on:
 - Knowledge of a place to be tested
 - Participation in a MSM specific prevention action
 - Membership of a MSM NGO



- Allows to show relations between risk-taking and:
 - socio-demographic characteristics of ego
 - information level about HIV and STI
 - type of homo-bisexuality:
 - ◆ Homo (regular ♂, no sexual partner ♀)
 - ◆ Homo, Hetero occ. (regular ♂, occasional ♀)
 - Bi (regular partners ♂ and ♀)
 - Hetero, Homo occ. (regular ♀, occasional ♂)
 - Homo/Bi occ. (no regular partner)



- Allows to show relations between risk-taking and:
 - socio-demographic characteristics of ego
 - information level about HIV and STI
 - type of homo-bisexuality
 - sex of the partner (male or female)
 - location of the sexual intercourse
 - type of relationship:
 - first time, not in love with an occasional partner
 - middle not in love
 - middle in love
 - >1 year, in love with a regular partner



- Allows to show relations between risk-taking and:
 - socio-demographic characteristics of ego
 - information level about HIV and STI
 - type of homo-bisexuality
 - sex of the partner (male or female)
 - location of the sexual intercourse
 - type of relationship
 - age of the partner



Last sexual intercourse with an man

- Main factor: location of the sexual intercourse
 - 65% of penetrations are unprotected if sex outside (beaches, public gardens, public toilettes...)
 - $N=31 \rightarrow$ no other significant factor.
 - 22% of penetrations are unprotected if sex inside (at home or hotels)
- Sex outside is an important risk factor whatever the type of relationship, age of ego, age of the partner, awareness of HIV/AIDS, ...



Risk-factors with a man (sex inside)

- Main factor: awareness to HIV (p<0,001)
 - Doesn't know where to be tested: 38% of unprotected sex
 - Knows where to be tested (A): 34%
 - (A) + Has participated in a MSM prevention (B): 16%
 - (A) + (B) + Is a member of a MSM NGO (C): 9%
- Other significant factors:
 - Age of *ego* (p=0.081):
 - more unprotected sex among 18-19 (32%) and 35+ (35%)
 - Age of partner (p=0.058):
 - 62% of risk if partner is 19 or less
 - Activity (p=0.007):
 - no activity: 39% / students: 25% / other professions: 22% frequent professions among MSM: 9%



Risk-factors with a man (sex inside)

- No statistically significant (logistic regression):
 - Site
 - Living with his family
 - Type of homo-bisexuality
 - Type of relationship
 - In love or not
 - Regular or occasional partner
 - Duration of the relation



Last sexual intercourse with a woman

- Main factor: marital status of the partner
 - 97% of unprotected vaginal sex if the partner is the <u>spouse</u>
 - N=30
 - ◆ Child desire → not possible to use a condom
 - 36% of unprotected vaginal sex if the partner is <u>not the spouse</u>

• Similar results have been described in anthropological interviews.



Risk-factor with a woman (spouses excluded)

- Main factor: age of the partner (p=0.004)
 - 15 years or less: 75% of unprotected sex
 - 16-19 years old: 36%
 - 20-24 years old: 29%
 - 25 years or more: 19%
- Second factor: awareness to HIV (p=0.038)
 - Doesn't know where to be tested: 48% of unprotected sex
 - Knows where to be tested (A): 41%
 - (A) + Has participated in a MSM prevention (B): 25%
 - (A) + (B) + Is a member of a MSM NGO (C): 31%



December 4th 2008

Risk-factor with a woman (spouses excluded)

- No statistically significant (logistic regression):
 - Age of ego
 - But same profile than sex with a man (more risks among the youngest and the oldest)
 - Instruction level
 - But risks decrease (from 49 to 29%) when instruction increases
 - Activity
 - But same profile than sex with a man
 - Type of homo-bisexuality
 - Type of relationship
 - But risks decrease when the relation is longer



Conclusion

- The two main factors are not characteristics of ego:
 - Sex with a man: location of intercourse (context)
 - Sex with a woman: type of the relation: spouse or not
 - →it's necessary to take these dimensions into account.
- Specific prevention actions are effective to reduce HIV risks, with men but also with women.
- Bisexual practices are frequent and risk factors are not the same → these issues should be integrated in future prevention programs.

ELIHOS

Thank you

for your attention







