

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## **Preventive Medicine Reports**



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/pmedr

# Barriers to post exposure prophylaxis use among men who have sex with men in sub-Saharan Africa: An online cross-sectional survey

Sandra Isano<sup>a,\*</sup>, Rex Wong<sup>a,b</sup>, Jenae Logan<sup>a</sup>, Soha El-Halabi<sup>c</sup>, Ziad El-Khatib<sup>a,d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of Global Health Equity (UGHE), Rwanda

<sup>b</sup> Yale University, USA

<sup>c</sup> Department of Learning, Informatics, Management and Ethics (LIME), Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

<sup>d</sup> World Health Programme, Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue (UQAT), Québec, Canada

#### ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Post-exposure prophylaxis MSM Key population HIV prevention Sub-Saharan Africa

#### ABSTRACT

*Background:* Curbing new HIV infections among MSM in SSA remains problematic, due to cultural beliefs, norms that oppose same-sex acts, and criminalization of same-sex acts. No study focused on barriers to PEP use in SSA region has been conducted. Our study focused on identifying barriers to Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP) use among MSM in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA).

*Methods:* An online cross-sectional survey was sent out to members of 14 Lesbian, Gay, Transgender, Bisexual, Queer (LGBTQ) associations in SSA, to identify barriers to PEP utilization in MSM. A total of 207 MSM from 22 countries in SSA completed the survey between 8 January 2019 and 23 February 2019. Descriptive statistics were generated, chi-square and backward stepwise logistic regression analysis were performed to evaluate the association between the outcome "PEP use" and other variables.

*Results*: Most of the MSM were aged 18 to 30, and the majority (220, 74.6%) described themselves as gay. Rwanda had the highest number of respondents (117, 39.7% of the total), followed by Nigeria, Ghana and South-Africa.

The majority of respondents reported having heard about PEP (234, 80.7%), and the average PEP correct knowledge level was 59%.

Five characteristics were associated with increased odds of using PEP: Age, having vocational education, having heard of PEP, knowledge of where to get PEP, and having been refused housing.

*Conclusion:* There is a need for a collaborative effort between policy makers, key players in HIV prevention, and MSM associations in SSA to remove barriers to PEP uptake to promote optimal PEP utilization amongst MSM.

## 1. Introduction

Globally, men who have sex with men (MSM) have 27 times higher risk of acquiring HIV infection than do their heterosexual counterparts (UNAIDS, 2018). The risk is even higher among MSM in SSA (King and Al, 2013) as a result of negative stigma and prohibitive policies against homosexuality (Laar and Debruin, 2017).

Post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) can be used to help prevent HIV transmission (Rotheram-borus et al., 2010). However, optimal HIV prevention requires more than just a biomedical strategy; behavioral and structural interventions are also needed (WHO, 2016). Accordingly, the WHO recommends that all countries provide access to PEP for all populations at high risk for HIV, including MSM. However, access to PEP among MSM remains low (Hugo et al., 2016).

Studies among MSM in SSA have consistently found that despite the high prevalence of HIV, access to HIV prevention information and healthcare services is low (Hugo et al., 2016; King and Al, 2013).

MSM in SSA rarely publically reveal their sexual orientations due to stigma, discrimination, and social hostility, which pose difficulties to their accessing and utilizing existing HIV prevention, care, and treatment services (Laar and Debruin, 2017)

Studies have found that some MSM in SSA engaged in sexual activities with women, either because they were also attracted to women or they used sexual relationships with women to conceal their sexual identities (Gbais and Al, 2015; Hladik et al., 2012) – suggesting a heightened risk of contracting HIV not only among MSM but also in the general population. Understanding the use of PEP among MSM can help not only to create effective programs to improve the access to PEP and

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: isanosandex@gmail.com (S. Isano).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2020.101100

Received 7 September 2019; Received in revised form 29 February 2020; Accepted 19 April 2020 Available online 28 April 2020

2211-3355/ © 2020 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/BY-NC-ND/4.0/).

Abbreviations: MSM, Men who have sex with men; PEP, Post-Exposure Prophylaxis; SSA, Sub-Saharan Africa

other HIV services for MSM, but also to reduce HIV incidence in the general population (CDC, 2015).

While some studies have been conducted to understand PEP use among MSM, none had identified barriers to PEP use in SSA (Chomchey et al., 2017; Hugo et al., 2016). Accordingly, this study aimed to identify the factors that prevent MSM from using PEP in SSA context.

## 2. Methods

## 2.1. Study design and setting

The survey utilized a cross-sectional, multi-country study design. Data were collected using an online survey.

## 2.2. Sample and sampling

Men who self-identified as MSM or bi-sexual, who were 18 years old or above, and who resided in SSA countries during the survey period were eligible to participate in the online survey.

Lesbian Gay Transgender Bisexual Queer (LGBTQ) organizations were identified through internet searching and through referrals. Invitation letters and links to the survey were shared with focal persons of each LGBTQ organization, who then disseminated the survey to their members. Follow-up emails were sent to organizations one week after the initial email, if they did not reply. Invitation letters were sent to 17 LGTBQ organizations, 14 agreed to share our questionnaires with their members

## 2.3. Data collection tools and methods

An online questionnaire was developed to collect data for this study. The questions were adapted from the European Men-who-have-sexwith-men Internet Survey (EMIS) 2010 (Research et al., 2010). Initially 33 questions were selected and then pretested through face-to-face interviews with three MSM in Kigali, Rwanda. Revisions were made based on the feedback from the pre-test. The final questionnaire contained 24 questions, with five questions gathering demographic information, seven asking about sexual behaviours, five about HIV knowledge and PEP knowledge, five about PEP use and barriers to PEP utilization, and two about MSM experiences related to stigma and discrimination. The questionnaire was originally designed in English, then translated into Kinyarwanda and French, and then back-translated by two different individuals to ensure content validity. The online questionnaire was hosted on SurveyMonkey Audience and was available in all three languages.

Respondents could choose between English, French and Kinyarwanda as the survey language they preferred. The survey was optimized for use on any Internet enabled device, including cellphones, tablets and/or computer. The average time to complete the survey during pre-test was 25 min. The first page of the online survey provided the introduction and purpose of the study, a checkbox served as consent was included at the bottom of the page. After indicating their consent, the respondents were given access to the survey. No name or other personal identification was recorded in the survey. To avoid duplication of answers, the survey allowed only one response per person. The survey was available online between January and February 2019.

The study was approved by the University of Global Health Equity (UGHE) Institutional Review Board (IRB) (Protocol #: 0052).

## 3. Measures

There were two key measures in this study:

- 1) PEP utilization rate among MSM
- 2) Factors affecting PEP utilization

#### 3.1. Data management and analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize respondents' demographics, risky sexual behaviours, HIV/PEP knowledge, and barriers to PEP utilization. The cut-off knowledge was set to 80%, based on some previously published peer-reviewed articles for knowledge assessment (Hui-Chin et al., 2015; Kaliyaperumal, 2004). Respondents who reported that they did not know PEP were excluded in the analysis. A chisquare test was used to evaluate the association between PEP use and all other variables. The variables tested were:Country of residence. sexual orientation, education level, access to condom, having heard of PEP, source of PEP information, knowledge about where to get PEP, availability of PEP at health facility, comfort to discuss sexuality with a healthcare provider, PEP being free, ability to afford PEP, age group, knowledge level of PEP, knowledge level of HIV, discrimination in the society, stigma, being blackmailed, physical violence, refused housing, refused access to healthcare, and services, detained by Police, fired or refused a job, and facing abusive language or insults at the church or place of worship. All variables with P < 0.2 at bivariate analysis were further analyzed using logistic regression with backward stepwise approach to detect the strength of association. All statistical tests were conducted using Stata v.14. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

## 4. Results

During the study period, 307 surveys were completed. Three surveys were discarded due to the respondents not being residents of a country in SSA, and seven were discarded because they were incomplete. Resulting in a final sample size of 297 from 22 countries. The completion rate was 96.7%. The majority of respondents were from Rwanda (n = 117, 39.7%), Nigeria (n = 35, 11.9%), South Africa (n = 27, 9.2%), and Ghana (n = 25, 8.5%). The mean age was 35.9 years old and ranged from 18 to 69, with 145 (49.3%) respondents between 18 and 30 years old and 106 (36.1%) between 31 and 50. The majority of respondents were single (n = 206, 70.1%); 58 (19.7%) were reportedly married to women and 30 (10.2%) were reportedly married to men. A total of 113 (38.6%) had achieved only secondary school education whereas 96 (32.8%) had attained University-level education. Nearly three quarters (220, 74.6%) identified themselves as homosexual and 57 (19.3%) as bisexual (Table 1). A high proportion of respondents (n = 284, 95.6%) exhibited at least one risky behavior (either not always using condoms or having more than one sex partner), 203 (69.3%) reported they never or sometimes use condoms when having sex, while 266 (90.7%) had more than one male sexual partner over the last six months. Among 297 respondents, 234 reported that they have heard of PEP. The 63 who had not heard of PEP were excluded from the analysis.

The utilization of PEP was 41.2% (n = 121) among the respondents. Half of the respondents (n = 148, 50%) indicated that they knew where to get PEP, and 140 (47.5%) said PEP was available at the health facilities. Only 43 (15.4%) of 298 respondents reported that PEP was free in their countries, and only 84 (29.1%) reported they could afford to buy PEP (Table 1). Most respondents (80.7%) heard of information about PEP. Friends (18.3%) and journals (13.3%) were the two main sources of PEP information (Table 1).

More than half of the respondents (53.3%) felt uncomfortable to discuss sexuality with their healthcare providers; 66.3% reported having experienced discrimination, stigma (62.3%), abusive language or insults at church or place of worship (29.3%), physical violence (25.6%), detainment by the police (21.9%); blackmailing (20.2%); being fired from or refused a job (19.5%); or being refused access to healthcare and services (17.5%) due to their sexual orientation (Table 2).

The mean knowledge score percentage of correct answers related to HIV was 79%. The three questions answered correctly by most

#### Table 1

Sociodemographic characteristics, sexual behaviour, and barriers to access.

Sample Ordention     Gay Biscuil     207 (2044%)       Country     Biscuil     57 (19.3%)       Country     Not categorized     15 (5.1%)       Not categorized     35 (11.8%)       Sensh Africa     27 (0.1%)       Gara     22 (8.4%)       Karpal     15 (5.1%)       Ghana     22 (8.4%)       Karpal     16 (4.7%)       Gara     23 (8.4%)       Gara     23 (1.8%)       Gara     23 (1.4%)       Gara     23 (1.4%)       Gara     23 (1.4%)       Gara     33 (1.4%)       Gara     33 (1.4%)       Vagada     13 (4.4%)       Primary     33 (1.5%)       Vacation     15 (5.1%)       Primary     33 (1.5%)       Vacation     50 (1.5%)       Married to canan     30 (1.2%)       Married to canan     30 (1.2%)       Age (years)     Married to canan     30 (1.2%)       Age (years)     Married to man     20 (0.2%)       Sexoul activities     Hor mais ex with men     <			N (%)
Binalin Sinalin 5198)   Sinajin Sinajin 1019   Country Ramada Categorizad 15190   Natagorizad 321138   South Africa 321138   South Africa 321041   Glana 13149   South Africa 13149   Marcial South Africa 13149   Marcial South Africa 13149   Marcial South Africa 13138   Marial South Africa 13138	Sample		297
<table-container><table-row><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-row></table-container>	Orientation	Gay	220 (74.6%)
CountryNot determined10.7(39.4%)RwandaRwanda35 (1.1%)RwandaSouth Africa37 (1.9%)South Africa27 (9.3%)RandaSouth Africa27 (9.3%)GhanaGana16 (3.1%)Ranzania10.200013 (3.4%)Tanzania10.200013 (3.4%)Ugada10.200013 (3.4%)Marcia decisional level achieved10.200013 (3.4%)Marcia tastus10.200013 (3.6%)Marcia tastus10.200013 (3.6%)Marcia tastus10.200013 (3.6%)Age queen10.100013 (3.6%)Age queen10.100013 (3.6%)Age queen10.100013 (3.6%)Age queen10.100013 (3.6%)Age queen10.200013 (3.6%)Age queen10.200013 (3.6%)Age queen13 (3.6%)13 (3.6%)Age queen13 (3.6%)14 (3.6%)Age queen13 (3.6%)14 (3.6%)Age queen13 (3.6%)14 (3.6%)Age queen13 (3.6%)14 (3.6%)Age queen14 (3.6%)1			57 (19.3%)
CountryNigra'17/9/milNigra'Nigra'35(11.8%)Nigra'Solta35(11.8%)SoltaSolta25(8.4%)GhanCasa25(8.4%)KayaSolta15(15%)SourceSource13(4.4%)UandaUanda13(4.4%)UandaCountry13(3.1%)Nigret elevational level activeNot centrian13(3.1%)Martal stataSource33(1.3%)Arrafa stataSource33(1.3%)Martal stataSource33(1.3%)Agret paraSource33(1.3%)Agret paraSource33(1.3%)Agr		Straight	• •
Note     35 (11.8%)       South Africa     35 (11.8%)       South Africa     35 (11.8%)       South Africa     35 (11.8%)       Raya     35 (11.8%)       Raya     35 (11.8%)       Raya     35 (11.8%)       Baser     36 (11.8%)       Highest educational level achieved     36 (11.9%)       Martial status     36 (11.9%)       Age order     35 (11.9%)       Martial status     36 (11.9%)       Martial status     36 (11.9%)       Age order     36 (11.9%)       Age order     36 (11.9%)       Martial status     30 (10.2%)       Martial status     31 (15.9%)       Age order     31 (10.9%)       Martial status     31 (10.9%)       Marine order			
<table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container>	Country	Rwanda	117 (39.4%)
Image: Section of the section of th			
kmp kmp 15 (1%)   Innarain 13 (4%)   Innarain 13 (4%)   Innarain 13 (4%)   Inperiment 15 (1%)   Unders 15 (1%)   Inperiment 15 (1%)   Primary 16 (1%)   Primary<			
<table-container><table-row><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row></table-row><table-row></table-row><table-row></table-row><table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-row></table-container>			
<table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container>			
<table-container>IgnadaIgnada11 (3.7%)Higher educational level achievedNo education15 (3.1%)No educationNo education15 (3.1%)AcoutationSecondary11 (3.8%)Higher educational level achievedNo education15 (3.1%)AcoutationNo education15 (3.1%)Marital statusNo education96 (3.28%)Age (years)Maried to man achieved with men96 (3.1%)Age (years)10 Solyaars106 (3.1%)Secondary10 Solyaars106 (3.1%)Age (years)10 Solyaars106 (3.1%)Age (years)10 Solyaars10 (3.1%)Secondary10 solyaars10 (3.1%)Age (years)10 solyaars10 (3.1%)Age (years)10</table-container>		-	
Pighese decisional level achieved90/mary93 (1.9%)Pinany70 (3.0%)70 (3.0%)Pinany70 (3.0%)70 (3.0%)Vacational70 (3.0%)70 (3.0%)Martial status80 (0.0%)70 (3.0%)Martial status80 (0.0%)70 (0.0%)Age (year)Martiel to man80 (0.0%)Age (year)100 30 years106 (3.0%)Sexual activities90 (9.0%)70 (3.0%)Age (years)100 30 years106 (3.0%)Sexual activities100 50 years70 (3.0%)Age (years)100 50 years70 (3.0%)Sexual activities70 (3.0%)70 (3.0%)Age (years)100 50 years70 (3.0%)Sexual activities100 (3.0%)70 (3.0%)Sexual activities100 (3.0%)70 (3.0%)Age (years)100 (3.0%)70 (3.0%)Sexual activities100 (3.0%)70 (3.0%)<			
Higher educational level achievedNo education15 (1.1%) (1000)HimaryScondary13 (36.0%)ScondaryVactoral13 (1.3%)Martial statusUniversity or above96 (23.8%)Martial statusSingle30 (1.0%)Age (years)Marind to man30 (10.3%)Age (years)Marind to man30 (10.3%)Age (years)Marind to man35 0 (18.6%)Age (years)Marind to man10 (50.6%)Sexual activitiesMarin (range)35 0 (18.6%)Age (years)So Joars10 (50.6%)Sexual activitiesNo so parts10 (50.6%)Age (years)So Joars10 (50.6%)Age (years)So Joars10 (18.6%)Sexual activitiesHave and sex with women81 (19.6%)Age (years)So Joars10 (18.6%)Age (years)So Joars10 (18.6%)Age (years)So Joars10 (18.6%)Sexual activitiesHave and sex with women81 (19.6%)Age (years)So Joars10 (18.6%)Age (years)So Joars10 (18.6%)Age (years)So Joars10 (18.6%)Age (years)Interve sometimes use condow when have sex with men10 (18.6%)Age (years)Interve sometimes use condow when have sex with men10 (18.6%)Age (years)Interve sometimes use condow when have sex with men10 (18.6%)Age (years)Interve sometimes use condow when have sex with men10 (18.6%)Age (years)Interve sometimes use			
PrimaryPrimarySi (1.9%)Narial scanseNocarional33 (1.3%)Marital statusNocarional33 (1.3%)Marital statusSingle96 (23.8%)Maried to man30 (0.2%)36 (0.7%)Age (years)Married to woman36 (0.9%)Age (years)Is to 50 years145 (49.3%)15 to 50 years15 (50 years16 (36.1%)Sexual activities50 years43 (14.6%)Age verants50 years43 (14.6%)Married to woman50 (12.3%)31 to 50 yearsSexual activities16 (30.1%)31 to 50 yearsAge verantsWith women43 (14.6%)Maxturbate with women61 (23.7%)Age verants ex with women96 (23.7%)Age verants ex with women136 (23.8%)Masturbate with women136 (26.9%)Tofal sex130 (14.9%)Age ver or sometimes use condom when have sex with women136 (26.9%)Access to condom when needed136 (14.9%)Access to condom when needed16 (15.7%)Access to condom when needed16 (15.7%)Access to condom when needed16 (16.9%)Madio YL16 (16.9%)Access to condom when needed13 (13.9%)Madio YL16 (16.9%)Access to condom when needed16 (16.9%)Madio YL16 (16.9%)Access to condom when needed16 (16.9%)Madio YL16 (16.9%)Access to condom when needed16 (16.9%)Madio YL16 (16.9%)			
secondarysecondary13 (38.6%)Marical statusNarical vanove36 (13.8%)Marical statusSingle206 (70.1%)Marical to nuan30 (10.2%)36 (13.8%)Age (years)Maricel to nuan36 (13.8%)Age (years)10 50 years105 (04.8%)Sexual activities50 years36 (14.6%)Kareve anal sex with men28 (14.6%)Have vanal sex with women29 (04.8%)Maturbate with women29 (04.8%)Maturbate with women20 (04.8%) <t< td=""><td>Highest educational level achieved</td><td></td><td>• •</td></t<>	Highest educational level achieved		• •
Nearial statusVicationVicationVicationMariad statusSingleOce (70.1%)Maried to man farried			
IndexIndex96 (32,8%)Married to man30 (10,2%)Age (years)Married to woman35 (10,2%)Age (years)Married to woman35 (10,2%)Age (years)Married to woman35 (10,2%)Age (years)Man (range)145 (43,3%)Age anal sex with woman16 (10,1%)Age vanal sex with women81 (27,3%)Age vanal sex with women81 (27,3%)Age vanal sex with women29 (37,3%)Age vanal sex with women29 (38,3%)Agatarbak twith women29 (38,3%)Agatarbak twith women29 (38,3%)Agatarbak twith women20 (38,3%)<		•	
Marial statusSingle206 (70.1%)Married to man30 (102%)Age (years)Married to woman58 (19.7%)Age (years)Married to woman55 (19.3%)B to 30 years40 (64.9%)31 to 50 years40 (16.%)Sexual activities421 (94.6%)Bave anal sex with women82 (19.4%)Have anal sex with women56 (18.9%)Masturbate with women56 (18.9%)Masturbate with women56 (18.9%)Masturbate with women29 (98.%)Masturbate with women20 (98.%)Masturbate with women20 (69.%)Pille risk behavior20 (69.%)High risk behavior20 (69.%)Pille risk behavior20 (69.%)Access to condom when have sex with women136 (62.9%)Pille risk behavior20 (69.%)Access to condom when needed161 (55.7%)Access to condom shen neededNoYearYearSource of PEP information51 (18.3%)Heard of PEPNoMasturbate with and51 (18.3%)Access to get per information51 (18.3%)Heard of PEPNoMasturbate with and51 (18.3%)Access to get per information51 (18.3%)Gurder per per fill per			
Age (years)     Married to man     30 (10.2%)       Age (years)     Married to woman     35 (19-40)       Age (years)     Main (range)     35 (19-40)       18 10 30 years     145 (49.3%)       15 05 years     43 (14.6%)       Arev anal sex with men     26 (24.6%)       Have anal sex with women     81 (27.3%)       Masturbate with women     81 (27.3%)       Masturbate with women     29 (38.6%)       Masturbate with women     20 (36.8%)       Year or sometimes use condom when have sex with men     20 (36.9%)       Masturbate with women     20 (36.9%)       Year or sometimes use condom when have sex with men     20 (36.9%)       Year or sometimes use condom when have sex with men     20 (36.9%)       Year or sometimes use condom when have sex with men     20 (36.9%)       Year or sometimes use condom when have sex with men     20 (36.9%)       Year or sometimes use condom when have sex with men     20 (36.9%)       Year or sometimes use condom when have sex with men     20 (36.9%)       Year or sometimes use condom when have sex with men     20 (36.9%)       Year or sometimes use condom when have sex with men     20 (36.9%)			
Age (years)Married to womanSk (197%) Mean (range)Sk (197%) Mean (range)Sk (197%) Mean (range)Sk (197%) Mean (range)Sk (197%) Mean (range)Sk (197%) Mean (range)Sk (197%) 	Marital status	Single	206 (70.1%)
Age (years)Men (range)S5,9 (14-9)18 to 30 years106 (36.1%)3 10 50 years20 (94.6%)Sexual activitiesFave anal sex with men281 (94.6%)Have anal sex with men81 (27.5%)Have value sex with men97 (32.7%)Have value sex with men97 (32.7%)Masturbate with men97 (32.7%)Masturbate with men97 (32.7%)Masturbate with men20 (98%)Masturbate with men20 (98%)Masturbate with men20 (98%)Masturbate with men20 (98%)Masturbate with men20 (98%)Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with women20 (98%)Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with women20 (98%)Access to condoms when needed>1 lanals sex partner concurrently26 (90.7%)Access to condoms when neededNo24 (95.6%)Masturbate with pelle information128 (43.8%)128 (43.8%)Masturbate with pelle information128 (43.7%)128 (43.7%)Masturbate with pelle information13 (13.5%)128 (43.7%)Masturbate with pelle information13 (13.5%)128 (43.7%)Masturbate with pelle information13 (13.6%)13 (13.5%)Masturbate with pelle information13 (13.5%)13 (13.5%)Masturbate with pelle information <td< td=""><td></td><td>Married to man</td><td></td></td<>		Married to man	
Note18 to 30 years145 (49.3%)31 to 50 years106 (36.1%)35 0 years43 (14.6%)Sexual activitiesHave anal sex with men281 (24.6%)Have anal sex with women81 (27.3%)Have anal sex with women50 (18.9%)Have vaginal sex with women97 (32.7%)Masturbate with women97 (32.7%)Masturbate with women29 (9.8%)Oral sex130 (43.8%)Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with women203 (69.3%)Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with women266 (00.7%)> 1 male sex partner concurrently266 (00.7%)> 1 female sex partner concurrently264 (90.7%)> 1 female sex partner concurrently264 (90.7%)Access to condoms when neededNoKere or Sometimes use condom when have sex with women136 (52.7%)Maying at least 1 risky behavior264 (90.7%)Access to condoms when neededNoNo161 (55.7%)Journals37 (13.3%)Journals37 (13.3%)Journals37 (13.3%)Journals37 (13.3%)Journals37 (13.3%)Journals37 (13.3%)Know where to get PEPNoVeseNoVeseNoYesYesConfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare providerYesYesNoYesNoYesNoYesYesYesYesYesNoYesYes		Married to woman	58 (19.7%)
Sexual activities31 50 years43 (14.0%)Sexual activitiesHave anal sex with women81 (27.3%)Have anal sex with women65 (18.9%)Have anal sex with women65 (18.9%)Have anal sex with women67 (32.7%)Have avalues with men97 (32.7%)Masurbate with men130 (43.8%)Oral sex130 (43.8%)High risk behavior136 (43.9%)Have avalues women have sex with men136 (43.9%)Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with women136 (43.9%)Access to condoms when needed136 (43.9%)Access to condoms when needed136 (43.9%)Having at least 1 risky behavior284 (55.6%)Access to condoms when needed128 (44.3%)Heard of PEPNoNo128 (43.9%)Having at least 1 risky behavior31 (18.3%)Having at least 1 risky behavior31 (18.3%)March PEPNoNormals31 (18.3%)Having at least 1 risky behavior31 (18.3%)Having at least 1 risky behavior3	Age (years)	Mean (range)	35.9 (18–69)
Sexual activities> 50 years43 (14.6%)Sexual activitiesHave anal sex with women81 (27.3%)Have anal sex with women56 (18.9%)Have ayainal sex with women56 (18.9%)Masturbate with men92 (9.8%)Masturbate with women20 (9.6%)Oral exe10 (48.8%)High risk behavior13 (63.2%)Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with women203 (69.3%)- 1 male sex partner concurrently26 (07.9%)- 1 male sex partner concurrently28 (07.9%)- 1 male sex partner concurrently26 (07.9%)- 1 male sex partner concurrently28 (07.9%)- 1 male sex partner concurrently <td< td=""><td></td><td>18 to 30 years</td><td>145 (49.3%)</td></td<>		18 to 30 years	145 (49.3%)
Sexual activitiesHave and sex with men281 (94.%)Have anal sex with women81 (27.3%)Have anal sex with women97 (32.7%)Maturbate with women97 (32.7%)Maturbate with women90 (98%)Trisk behavior130 (43.8%)Hijh risk behaviorNever or sometimes use condom when have sex with women36 (82.9%)Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with women36 (82.9%)Access to condoms when needed1 male sex partner concurrently266 (90.7%)Access to condom shen needed16 (55.7%)Hard of PEPNo21 (43.8%)Source of PEP information57 (13.3%)Jurnals97 (13.3%)Jurnals97 (13.3%)Jurnals37 (13.3%)Jurnals <t< td=""><td></td><td>31 to 50 years</td><td>106 (36.1%)</td></t<>		31 to 50 years	106 (36.1%)
Have anal sex with women81 (27.3%)Have vaginal sex with women56 (18.9%)Have vaginal sex with women70 (32.7%)Masturbate with women29 (9.8%)Oral sex70 al sexPright six behavior70 al sexHigh risk behavior100 (43.8%)Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with men103 (69.3%)Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with women136 (82.9%)> 1 male sex partner concurrently67 (24.9%)> 1 female sex partner concurrently67 (24.9%)Access to condom shen neededNoNo156 (55.7%)Heard of PEPNoSource of PEP information57 (18.3%)Heard of PEPFriendsNo234 (80.7%)Masturbate with Momen56 (13.9%)Heard of PEPNoSource of PEP information51 (18.3%)Heard of PEPNoMasturbate method51 (13.3%)Heard of PEPNoMasturbate method51 (13.9%)JurnalsSource of PEP informationFriendsNoMasturbate method51 (51.4%)Heard of PEPNoMasturbate method151 (51.9%)Used PEPNoNo121 (41.2%)FriendsNoMasturbate method140 (45.9%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNoYesNoGonfortableYesFriend Fer PEP in the countryNoNo160 (33.4%)Friend Fere		> 50 years	43 (14.6%)
Have vaginal sex with women56 (18.%)Maturbate with men97 (32.%)Maturbate with men29 (9.%)Oral sex130 (43.8%)High risk behavior136 (82.9%)Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with women136 (82.9%)> 1 male sex partner concurrently66 (00.7%)> 1 male sex partner concurrently67 (24.9%)> 1 enale sex partner concurrently67 (24.9%)Access to condom shen needed70 (24.9%)Access to condom shen needed70 (24.9%)Hard of PEPNo128 (44.3%)Fer dof PEPNo234 (95.6%)Source of PEP information51 (18.3%)Madio TV30 (19.3%)Madio TV30 (19.3%)Journals30 (19.3%)Madio TV30 (19.3%)Madio TV30 (19.3%)Used PEPNo31 (18.3%)Used PEPNo31 (19.3%)Used PEPNo31 (19.3%)Per readily available at the health facilityNo140 (47.5%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNo140 (47.5%)Per readily available at the health facilityNo140 (47.5%)Free PEP in the countryNo140 (47.5%)Free PEP in the countryNo140 (47.5%)Able to afford PEPNo36 (19.9%)Able to afford PEPNo140 (47.5%)Able to afford PEPNo140 (47.5%)Able to afford PEPNo140 (47.5%)Able to afford PEPNo140 (47.5%)<	Sexual activities	Have anal sex with men	281 (94.6%)
High risk behavior97 (32.%)High risk behavior29 (9.%)High risk behavior130 (43.8%)High risk behaviorNever or sometimes use condom when have sex with men236 (9.3%)- 1 male sex partner concurrently266 (9.0%)- 1 lemale sex partner concurrently266 (9.0%)- 1 lemale sex partner concurrently266 (9.0%)- 1 lemale sex partner concurrently284 (95.6%)Access to condoms when needed161 (55.7%)Access to condoms when needed264 (9.0%)Hard of PEPNo264 (9.0%)FerdedYes244 (9.0%)Jurnals244 (9.0%)Source of PEP information56 (19.3%)Herd of PEPNo37 (13.3%)Hard of PEPNo37 (13.3%)Jurnals37 (13.3%)Jurnals37 (13.3%)High risk behavior36 (19.%)High risk behavior36 (19.%)High risk behavior36 (19.%)Jurnals37 (13.3%)High risk behavior36 (19.%)High risk behavior36 (19.%)High risk behavior12 (41.2%)High risk behavior12 (41.2%)High risk behavior13 (19.%)High risk behavior13 (19.%)High risk behavior13 (19.%)High risk behavior14 (19.%)High risk behavior14 (19.%)High risk behavior14 (19.%)High risk behavior14 (19.%)High risk behavior13 (19.%)High risk behavior13 (19.%) <tr< td=""><td></td><td>Have anal sex with women</td><td>81 (27.3%)</td></tr<>		Have anal sex with women	81 (27.3%)
Add between seven se		Have vaginal sex with women	56 (18.9%)
PresentionOral sexOral sex100 (d3.8%)High risk behaviorNever or sometimes use condom when have sex with women203 (69.5%)Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with women266 (90.7%)> 1 male sex partner concurrently266 (90.7%)> 1 male sex partner concurrently266 (90.7%)> 1 female sex partner concurrently266 (90.7%)Access to condoms when needed161 (55.7%)Heard of PEPNo161 (55.7%)Heard of PEPNo234 (80.7%)Source of PEP information51 (18.3%)Heard of PEPNo234 (80.7%)Source of PEP information51 (18.3%)JournalsJournals31 (1.9%)HCPNo234 (80.7%)HCPNo31 (1.9%)HCPNo31 (1.9%)More to get PEPNo151 (51.4%)FP eradily available at the health facilityNo148 (50%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNo148 (50%)Fee comfortableDo Not fee comfortable130 (33.4%)Fee PEP In the countryNo150 (53.4%)Fee PEP In the countryNo30 (33.4%)Able to afford PEPNo33.4%)Able to afford PEPNo33.4%)HCPSo30.5%)HCPSo30.5%)HCPSo30.5%)HCPSo30.5%)HCPSo30.5%)HCPSo30.5%)HCPSo30.5%)HCP		Masturbate with men	97 (32.7%)
High risk behavior     Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with menn     203 (69.3%)       Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with womenn     136 (82.9%)       > 1 nale sex partner concurrently     266 (90.7%)       > 1 female sex partner concurrently     67 (24.9%)       Access to condoms when needed     161 (55.7%)       Access to condoms when needed     128 (44.3%)       Heard of PEP     No     128 (44.3%)       Heard of PEP     No     26 (90.7%)       Source of PEP information     Friends     56 (19.3%)       Journals     37 (13.3%)     37 (13.3%)       Journals     37 (13.3%)     37 (13.3%)       Ves     No     56 (23.4%)       Used PEP     No     37 (13.3%)       Know where to get PEP     No     121 (41.2%)       Yes     No     121 (41.2%)       PEP readily available at the health facility     No     124 (47.5%)       Yes     No     124 (47.5%)       Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare provider     No     124 (41.2%)       Feel comfortable     No     43 (15.5%)       Feel c		Masturbate with women	29 (9.8%)
Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with women     136 (82.9%)       > 1 male sex partner concurrently     266 (90.7%)       Having at least 1 risky behavior     67 (24.9%)       Access to condoms when needed     No     161 (55.7%)       Heard of PEP     No     128 (44.3%)       Fear of PEP     No     234 (80.7%)       Source of PEP information     57 (13.3%)     234 (80.7%)       Gurves of PEP information     Friends     77 (13.3%)       Machine Conception     130 (11.9%)     33 (11.9%)       Machine Conception     No     33 (11.9%)       Machine Conception     130 (13.3%)     33 (11.9%)       Machine Conception     130 (13.3%)     33 (11.9%)       Machine Conception     130 (13.9%)     34 (13.9%)       Machine Conception     130 (13.9%)		Oral sex	130 (43.8%)
> 1 male sex partner concurrently266 (90.7%)> 1 female sex partner concurrently67 (24.9%)+ having at least 1 risky behavior284 (95.6%)Access to condoms when neededNo161 (55.7%)PeaceNo128 (44.3%)Heard of PEPNo234 (80.7%)Source of PEP informationYes234 (80.7%)Source of PEP informationFriends234 (80.7%)Access to condoms when needed51 (18.3%)33 (13.3%)Bource of PEP informationFriends33 (13.3%)Access to condoms when needed65 (23.4%)33 (13.3%)Bource of PEP information65 (23.4%)33 (13.3%)Bource of PEP information154 (51.3%)33 (13.3%)Bource of PEP informationNo35 (13.3%)Bource of PEP informationNo35 (13.3%)Bource of PEP informationNo140 (50%)Fer pace of PEP informationYes148 (50%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNo148 (50%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNo140 (53.3%)Fer peP in the countryNo150 (53.3%)Fer PEP in the countryNo150 (53.3%)For PEP in t	High risk behavior	Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with men	203 (69.3%)
> 1 female sex partner concurrently67 (24.9%)Having at least 1 risky behavior284 (95.6%)Access to condoms when needed161 (55.7%)No162 (54.3%)Heard of PEPNoSource of PEP information56 (19.3%)Source of PEP information57 (18.3%)Jurnals37 (13.3%)Jurnals33 (11.9%)Used PEPNoAdio/TV65 (23.4%)Used PEPNoHer MSM65 (23.4%)Used PEPNoKnow where to get PEPNoNo121 (41.2%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNoPEP readily available at the health facilityNoPEP readily available at the health facilityNoPEP readily available at the health facilityNo Not feel comfortableFree PEP in the countryPeel comfortableFree PEP in the country60 (33.4%)Free PEP in the country60 (33.4%)Able to afford PEPNoAble to afford PEPNo<		Never or sometimes use condom when have sex with women	136 (82.9%)
Having at least 1 risky behavior284 (95.6%)Access to condoms when neededNo161 (55.7%)Access to condoms when neededYes128 (43.4%)Heard of PEPNo234 (80.7%)Source of PEP informationFriends234 (80.7%)Source of PEP informationFriends37 (13.3%)Access to condoms when needed33 (11.9%)33 (11.9%)Source of PEP informationHCP65 (23.4%)Used PEPOther MSM46 (16.5%)Used PEPNo121 (41.2%)Know where to get PEPNo148 (50%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNo148 (50%)VesNo148 (50%)148 (50%)Free PEP in the countryDo Not feel confortable153 (53.3%)Free PEP in the countryNo156 (55.9%)Able to afford PEPNo156 (55.9%)Able to afford PEPNo156 (55.9%)Able to afford PEPNo140 (47.5%)Able to afford PEPNo140 (45.5%)Able to afford PEPNo156 (55.9%)Able to afford PEPNo140 (45.5%)		> 1 male sex partner concurrently	266 (90.7%)
Access to condoms when needed     No     161 (55.7%)       Yes     128 (44.3%)       Heard of PEP     No     56 (19.3%)       Source of PEP information     Friends     234 (80.7%)       Source of PEP information     Friends     37 (13.3%)       Maio/TV     33 (11.9%)     33 (11.9%)       Access to condoms when eeded     Other MSM     65 (23.4%)       Used PEP     No     65 (23.4%)       Ves     0ther MSM     151 (51.4%)       Used PEP     No     151 (51.4%)       Ves     No     151 (51.4%)       PEP readily available at the health facility     No     148 (50%)       PEP readily available at the health facility     No     143 (50%)       Free PEP in the country     Do Not feel comfortable     153 (53.3%)       Free PEP in the country     No     153 (55.9%)       Able to afford PEP     No     156 (55.9%)       Able to afford PEP     No     140 (48.6%)		> 1 female sex partner concurrently	67 (24.9%)
Yes128 (4.3%)Heard of PEPNo56 (19.3%)Source of PEP informationYes234 (80.7%)Source of PEP informationJournals51 (18.3%)Journals33 (11.9%)33 (11.9%)Kadio/TV65 (23.4%)65 (23.4%)Used PEPNo65 (23.4%)Know where to get PEPNo151 (16.1%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNo148 (50%)YesYes144 (50%)Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare providerDo Not feel comfortable140 (47.5%)Free PEP in the countryNo153 (53.3%)Able to afford PEPNo153 (55.9%)Able to afford PEPNo153 (55.9%)Able to afford PEPNo153 (55.9%)Able to afford PEPNo154 (54.5%)Able to afford PEPNo140 (48.6%)Able to afford PEPNo140		Having at least 1 risky behavior	284 (95.6%)
Heard of PEPNo56 (19.3%)Yes234 (80.7%)Source of PEP informationFriendsJournals37 (13.3%)Journals37 (13.3%)Radio/TV36 (16.5%)HCP65 (23.4%)Used PEPNoYes121 (41.2%)Know where to get PEPNoYes148 (50%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNoYes148 (50%)Yes140 (47.5%)Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare providerDo Not feel comfortableFree PEP in the countryNoAble to afford PEPNoAble to afford PEPNoAble to afford PEPNoAble to afford PEPNoAble to afford PEPNoYes140 (48.6%)Yes151 (51.3%)Yes153 (53.3%)Yes153 (53.3%)Yes153 (55.9%)Yes153 (55.9%)Yes153 (55.9%)Yes154 (55.9%)<	Access to condoms when needed	No	161 (55.7%)
Yes23 ( 80.7)Source of PEP informationFriends51 ( 18.3%)Journals37 ( 13.3%)Radio/TV33 ( 11.9%)HCP65 ( 23.4%)Other MSM46 ( 16.5%)Used PEPNo61 ( 15.4%)Know where to get PEPNo121 ( 41.2%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNo48 ( 50%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNo48 ( 28.5%)Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare providerDo Not feel comfortable153 ( 53.3%)Free PEP in the countryNo153 ( 53.3%)Able to afford PEPNo56 ( 55.9%)Able to afford PEPNo43 ( 15.4%)		Yes	128 (44.3%)
Source of PEP information     Friends     51 (18.3%)       Journals     37 (13.3%)       Radio/TV     33 (11.9%)       Radio/TV     65 (23.4%)       Used PEP     No       Verse     121 (41.2%)       Know where to get PEP     No       PEP readily available at the health facility     No       Verse     148 (50%)       Yes     140 (47.5%)       Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare provider     Do Not feel comfortable       Free PEP in the country     No       Free PEP in the country     No       Able to afford PEP     No       Able to afford PEP     No	Heard of PEP	No	56 (19.3%)
Journals     Journals     37 (13.3%)       Radio/TV     33 (11.9%)     33 (11.9%)       HCP     65 (23.4%)     65 (23.4%)       Used PEP     No     46 (16.5%)       Know where to get PEP     No     151 (51.4%)       PEP readily available at the health facility     No     148 (50%)       PEP readily available at the health facility     No     148 (50%)       Free PEP in the country     Zes     140 (47.5%)       Free PEP in the country     No Not feel comfortable     153 (53.3%)       Free PEP in the country     No     153 (55.9%)       Able to afford PEP     No Comfortable     153 (55.9%)		Yes	234 (80.7%)
Radio/TV 33 (1.9%)   HCP 65 (23.4%)   Other MSM 46 (16.5%)   Used PEP No   Yes 121 (41.2%)   PEP readily available at the health facility No   Yes 148 (50%)   PEP readily available at the health facility No   Yes 140 (47.5%)   Free PEP in the country No   Free PEP in the country No   Able to afford PEP No   Able to afford PEP No	Source of PEP information	Friends	51 (18.3%)
HCP     65 (23.4%)       Other MSM     46 (16.5%)       Used PEP     No     151 (51.4%)       Yes     121 (41.2%)       Know where to get PEP     No     148 (50%)       PEP readily available at the health facility     No     448 (50%)       PEP readily available at the health facility     No     448 (50%)       Fee PEP in the country     Yes     140 (47.5%)       Free PEP in the country     No     56 (53.4%)       Able to afford PEP     No     56 (55.9%)       Able to afford PEP     No     30 (15.4%)		Journals	37 (13.3%)
Other MSM     46 (16.5%)       Used PEP     No     151 (51.4%)       Know where to get PEP     No     121 (41.2%)       PEP readily available at the health facility     No     148 (50%)       PEP readily available at the health facility     No     84 (28.5%)       Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare provider     No feel comfortable     140 (47.5%)       Free PEP in the country     No     153 (53.3%)       Free PEP in the country     No     156 (55.9%)       Able to afford PEP     No     156 (55.9%)			
Used PEP     No     151 (51.4%)       Know where to get PEP     Yes     121 (41.2%)       Know where to get PEP     No     148 (50%)       Yes     148 (50%)     148 (50%)       PEP readily available at the health facility     No     84 (28.5%)       Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare provider     Do Not feel comfortable     140 (47.5%)       Free PEP in the country     Feel comfortable     96 (33.4%)       Free PEP in the country     No     156 (55.9%)       Able to afford PEP     No     140 (48.6%)		HCP	65 (23.4%)
Yes     121 (41.2%)       Know where to get PEP     No     148 (50%)       Yes     148 (50%)     148 (50%)       PEP readily available at the health facility     No     84 (28.5%)       Yes     140 (47.5%)     140 (47.5%)       Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare provider     Do Not feel comfortable     153 (53.3%)       Free PEP in the country     Feel comfortable     156 (55.9%)       Able to afford PEP     No     43 (15.4%)		Other MSM	46 (16.5%)
Know where to get PEPNo148 (50%)Yes148 (50%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNo84 (28.5%)Yes140 (47.5%)Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare providerDo Not feel comfortable153 (53.3%)Free PEP in the countryNo96 (33.4%)Free PEP in the countryNo156 (55.9%)Able to afford PEPNo140 (48.6%)	Used PEP	No	151 (51.4%)
Yes148 (50%)PEP readily available at the health facilityNo84 (28.5%)Yes140 (47.5%)Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare providerDo Not feel comfortable153 (53.3%)Free PEP in the countryFeel comfortable96 (33.4%)Free PEP in the countryYes33 (15.4%)Able to afford PEPNo140 (48.6%)		Yes	121 (41.2%)
PEP readily available at the health facility     No     84 (28.5%)       Yes     140 (47.5%)       Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare provider     Do Not feel comfortable     153 (53.3%)       Free PEP in the country     Feel comfortable     96 (33.4%)       Free AEP in the country     No     156 (55.9%)       Able to afford PEP     No     43 (15.4%)	Know where to get PEP	No	148 (50%)
Yes140 (47.5%)Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare providerDo Not feel comfortable153 (53.3%)Feel comfortable96 (33.4%)Free PEP in the countryNo156 (55.9%)Yes43 (15.4%)Able to afford PEPNo140 (48.6%)		Yes	148 (50%)
Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare providerDo Not feel comfortable153 (53.3%)Feel comfortable96 (33.4%)Free PEP in the countryNoYes43 (15.4%)Able to afford PEPNoNo140 (48.6%)	PEP readily available at the health facility	No	84 (28.5%)
Feel comfortable     96 (33.4%)       Free PEP in the country     No     156 (55.9%)       Yes     43 (15.4%)       Able to afford PEP     No     140 (48.6%)			
Free PEP in the country     No     156 (55.9%)       Yes     43 (15.4%)       Able to afford PEP     No     140 (48.6%)	Comfortable to discuss sexuality with healthcare provider	Do Not feel comfortable	153 (53.3%)
Yes     43 (15.4%)       Able to afford PEP     No     140 (48.6%)		Feel comfortable	96 (33.4%)
Able to afford PEP No 140 (48.6%)	Free PEP in the country	No	156 (55.9%)
		Yes	43 (15.4%)
Yes 84 (29.2%)	Able to afford PEP	No	140 (48.6%)
		Yes	84 (29.2%)

\* Other countries included (Togo n=7; Cameroon n=5; Burundi n=4; Democratic Republic of Congo n=3; Cote d'Ivoire n=3; Burkina Faso n=2; Lesotho n=2; Congo n=1; Cape Verde n=1; Gabon n=4; Malawi n=1; Mozambique n=1; Papa New Guinea n=1; Swaziland n=1; Zimbabwe n=1).

respondents were: 1) One can get HIV from hugging (99%), 2) Anal sex with women could transmit HIV infection (95.8%); and 3) Condoms reduce chances of acquiring HIV infection during sex (94.6%). The three questions with the least respondents answering correctly were: 1) It takes six months for one to transmit HIV (42.7%), 2) One can get HIV from oral sex without ejaculation (58.2%), 3) Pulling out the penis before a man ejaculates can prevent getting HIV during sex (65.7%) (Table 3).

The mean knowledge score percentage of correct answers related to PEP was 59%. The three questions with the most respondents

answering correctly were: 1) It's preferable to take PEP within 72 h following HIV exposure (90.7%), 2) PEP is taken for 28 days (83.7%) and 3) PEP is indicated after potential exposure to HIV (75.8%). The two questions answered correctly by the fewest participants were: 1) The effectiveness of PEP is < 100%, and 2) PEP can prevent further HIV infection (8.3%) (Table 4).

Eight factors were found associated with PEP use: 1) Highest educational level achieved (p = 0.045), 2) Having heard of PEP (p < 0.001), 3) Knowledge about where to get PEP (p < 0.001), 4) PEP availability at the health facility (p < 0.001), 5) Comfort to

#### Table 2

Summary of knowledge score.

HIV Knowledge	Score
You can get HIV from hugging	288 (99%)
You can get HIV from anal sex with a woman	277 (95.8%)
You can get HIV from kissing	209 (74.1%)
You can get HIV from anal sex with a man	265 (94%)
You can get HIV from oral sex with ejaculation	239 (83.9%)
You can get HIV from oral sex without ejaculation	165 (58.2%)
You can get HIV from vaginal sex with a woman	265 (94.6%)
Condoms reduce chances of acquiring HIV infection during sex	263 (94.6%)
Washing one's genitals after sex keeps a person from getting HIV	213 (76.9%)
One can reduce HIV infection by having one faithful sex partner	176 (62.9%)
If someone becomes infected with HIV it may take 6 months	120 (42.7%)
before he/she can transmit it	
Pulling out the penis before a man ejaculates can prevent from	182 (65.7%)
getting HIV during sex	
There is a vaccine for HIV	222 (81.9%)
Overall HIV knowledge score	79%
Respondents with high HIV knowledge level (> 80%)	141 (48.1%)
PEP knowledge	Score
PEP is indicated after potential exposure to HIV	225 (91.5%)
PEP can prevent further HIV infection	20 (8.3%)
It's preferable to take PEP within 72 h following HIV exposure	215 (90.7%)
It's preferable to take PEP after 72 h following HIV exposure.	131 (56%)
PEP is taken for 28 days	190 (83.7%)
PEP is taken for six months	147 (66.5%)
The effectiveness of PEP is 100%	90 (39.5%)
The effectiveness of PEP is $< 100\%$	82 (35.8%)
Overall PEP knowledge score	<b>59%</b>
Respondents with high PEP knowledge level (> 80%)	32 (10.8%)

discuss sexuality with a healthcare provider (p = 0.007) and 6) PEP being free in the country (p < 0.001), 7) being refused housing (p < 0.041), 8) Experiencing abusive language or insults at the church or place of worship (p < 0.006) (Table 3).

Further testing on the extent of association found MSM who were aged 31–50 had 1.24 time decreased in odds of PEP use than those aged 18–30 (95%CI: 0.086–0.966, p < 0.044), MSM who were aged > 50 had 1.36 times decreased in odds of PEP use than those aged 18 – 30 (95%CI: 0.072–0.915, p < 0.036), MSM who had vocational education had 1.46 times increased in odds of PEP use than those who had no education (95%CI: 1.617–11.560, p = 0.04), MSM who had not heard of PEP had 1.86 times decreased in odds of PEP use than those who had neard of it (95%CI: 0.034–0.711, p = 0.016), while MSM who did not know where to get PEP had 3.93 times decreased in odds of PEP use than those who had heard of it (95%CI: 0.034–0.711, p = 0.016), while MSM who did not know where to get PEP had 3.93 times decreased in odds of PEP use than those who knew where to get it (95%CI: 0.007–0.052, p < 0.001), MSM who were refused housing had 1.04 times decreased in odds of PEP use than those who knew where refused housing had 1.04 times decreased in odds of PEP use than those 4.001), mode of PEP use than those who weren't (95%CI: 0.131–0.938, p < 0.037) (Table 4).

## 5. Discussion

Our results showed the utilization rate of PEP among our respondents was only 41.2%. This uptake was higher than what was reported in other previous studies (Hugo et al., 2016; Chomchey et al., 2017; Goedel et al., 2018). Similar to other self-reported data, verification of accuracy of the information is a limitation to our study.

Respondents had relatively high level of knowledge related to HIV (79%). However, some basic questions related to HIV infection and prevention were not correctly answered by many respondents. More than half of respondents believed that it takes six months for an HIV infected person to be able to transmit the disease. It is possible that they were confused that it can take up to six months to test HIV positive, but transmission can happen within six months (Nelson et al., 2010). Having a faithful partner was not perceived by all respondents as a means to reduce the chance of acquiring HIV. Such belief was reflected in the results - the majority of them have multiple partners. For any intervention to reduce HIV transmission among MSM; it is important to

Table 3			
Factors associated	with	PFP	1156

		PEP not used	PEP used	P-value
Country	Rwanda	53 (35.6%)	61 (50.8%)	0.438
	Nigeria	21 (14.1%)	11 (9.2%)	
	South Africa	14 (9.4%)	11 (9.2%)	
	Ghana	15 (10.1'%)	9 (7.5%)	
	Kenya	9 (6%)	6 (5%)	
	Senegal	6 (4%)	4 (3.3%)	
	Tanzania	7 (4.7%)	3 (2.5%)	
	Uganda	8 (5.4%)	3 (2.5%)	
	Others	16 (10.7%)	12 (10%)	
Orientation	Homosexual	114 (76%)	88 (73%)	0.845
	Bisexual	27 (18%)	24 (20%)	
	Straight	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.7%)	
	Not	8 (5.3%)	6 (5%)	
	categorized			
Education level	No education	10 (6.7%)	4 (3.4%)	0.045*
	Primary	19 (12.7%)	14 (12.0%)	
	Secondary	52 (34.7%)	57 (48.7%)	
	Vocational	21 (14.0%)	6 (5.1%)	
	University	48 (32.0%)	36 (30.8%)	
Access to condom	No	82 (55.0%)	69 (59.0%)	0.535
	Yes	67 (45.0%)	48 (41.0%)	
Heard of PEP	No	40 (27%)	4 (3.4%)	< 0.001
	Yes	108 (73%)	113 (96.6%)	
Source of information	Friends	26 (24.3%)	24 (21.2%)	0.275
	Journals	21 (19.6%)	15 (13.3%)	
	Radio/TV	13 (12.1%)	17 (15.0%)	
	HCP	25 (23.4%)	39 (34.5%)	
	Other MSM	22 (20.6%)	17 (15.0%)	
	Others	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	
Know where to get	No	118 78.1%)	12 10.0%)	< 0.001
PEP	Yes	33 21.9%)	108 90.0%)	
PEP available at	No	53 (35.1%)	21 (17.5%)	< 0.001
health facility	Yes	50 (33.1%)	84 (70.0%)	. 0.001
neurur ruenney	Don't know	48 (31.8%)	15 (12.5%)	
Comfortable to	No	91 (61.1%)	47 (41.6%)	0.007*
discuss sexuality	Yes	43 (28.9%)	47 (41.6%)	0.007
with health care provider	Don't know	15 (10.1%)	19 (16.8%)	
Free PEP in the	No	72 (48.6%)	74 (66.7%)	< 0.001
country	Yes	16 (10.8%)	26 (23.4%)	. 0.001
country	Don't know	60 (40.5%)	11 (9.9%)	
Able to afford PEP	No	64 (65.3%)	67 (62.6%)	0.689
	Yes	34 (34.7%)	40 (37.4%)	0.005
Age group	18 to 30 years	73 (48.7%)	62 (51.7%)	0.054
inge group	31 to 50 years	61 (40.7%)	35 (29.2%)	0.001
	> 50 years	16 (10.7%)	23 (19.2%)	
Knowledge level of	Low	73 (48.7%)	66 (55.5%)	0.272
HIV	knowledge $(\leq 80)$	/ 0 (10./ /0)	00 (00.070)	0.272
	High	77 (51.3%)	53 (44.5%)	
	knowledge			
	(> 80)			
Knowledge level of	Low	101 (86.3%)	103 (88.0%)	0.845
PEP	knowledge			
	(≤80)			
	High	16 (13.7%)	14 (12.0%)	
	knowledge (> 80)		(,	
Discrimination in the	No	52 (34.4%)	43 (35.5%)	0.475
society	Yes	99(65.6%)	78 (64.5%)	
Stigma	No	52 (34.4%)	50 (41.3%)	0.149
0	Yes	99 (65.6%)	71 (58.5%)	
Blackmailed	No	115 (76.2%)	101 (83%)	0.091
	Yes	36 (23.8%)	20 (16.5%)	
Physical violence	No	113 (74.8%)	89 (73.6%)	0.459
	Yes	38 (25.2%)	32 (26.4%)	
Refused housing	No	121 (80.1%)	85 (70.2%)	0.041*
	Yes	30 (19.9%)	36 (29.8%)	
Keruseu nousing	100	30 (19.9%) 124 (82.1%)	101 (83.5%)	0.449
-	No		101 (00.0%)	0.772
Refused access to healthcare and	No Yes	27 (17.9%)	20 (16.5%)	
Refused access to healthcare and services	Yes	27 (17.9%)		0 109
Refused access to healthcare and			20 (16.5%) 90 (74.4%) 31 (25.6%)	0.198

Table 3 (continued)

		PEP not used	PEP used	P-value
Fired or refused a job	No Yes	120 (79.5%) 31 (20.5%)	97 (80.2%) 24 (19.8%)	0.505
Abusive language or insults at the church or place of worship	No Yes	117 (77.5%) 34 (22.5%)	76 (62.8%) 45 (37.2%)	0.006

\*Significant at P = 0.05.

### Table 4

Results of logistic regression on using PEP.

Variable		OR	CI (95%)	P-value
Age group	18 – 30 years	Ref	NA	NA
	31 - 50 years	-1.25	0.09; 0.97	0.04
	> 50 years	-1.36	0.07; 0.91	0.04
Education level	No education	Ref	NA	NA
	Vocational	1.46	1.62, 11.56	0.04
Heard of PEP	No	Ref	NA	NA
	Yes	-1.86	0.03, 0.71	0.02
Know where to get PEP	No	Ref	NA	NA
	Yes	- 3.93	0.01, 0.05	< 0.001
Refused housing	No	Ref	NA	NA
	Yes	-1.05	0.13, 0.94	0.04

help them reduce the number of casual partners. Our study found that some MSM incorrectly believed that washing one's genitals after sex and pulling out the penis ejaculation were effective methods to prevent from getting HIV during sex. Effort to correct this misconception is needed.

Eight factors were associated with the use of PEP. Consistent with previous literature, education level was associated with the use of PEP (Hugo et al., 2016). PEP being free in the country was associated with PEP use. Many countries in Sub Sahara regions are still impoverished, having free PEP available at health facility can be an important facilitator to the utilization of the services. Comfort to discuss sexuality with a healthcare provider was associated with PEP use, however, it is concerning that a significant number of respondents found themselves uncomfortable to discuss their sexuality with health care providers. Correspondingly, Okall, and colleagues (Okall et al., 2016) found over 60% of MSM uncomfortable seeking health services from public hospitals. A possible explanation for MSM discomfort with healthcare providers, and healthcare system is that healthcare providers may not adequately be equipped with skills to serve MSM. For instance, if MSM meet health care providers who hold judgmental views towards same sex acts; it can result in stigma, discrimination or prejudice, which may result in discomfort in healthcare delivery systems. This not only can affect them in using PEP, but can also potentially affect quality of healthcare services as concealed information could be detrimental to clinical decision. There is a need to improve sensitivity competency of health care providers when serving MSM patients. Although such finding is not exactly unexpected - MSM in many sub-Saharan Africa countries faced various homophobic experiences (Fay et al., 2011). In our study, > 95% of respondents experienced at least one form of harassment, with stigma, discrimination, abuse or insult at church or place of worship, physical violence, housing refusal and blackmail being the most common forms. Our study found being refused housing to be associated with PEP use. Being refused housing is rooted in the rampant stigma that MSM face at different levels: family, community, and the larger society. These human rights violations should be removed to effectively decrease the HIV incidence among MSM population, and to promote maximum use of existing health care services. Previous studies have documented association between homophobic experiences and mental health problems in MSM (Choi and Paul, 2013; Safren and Mitchell, 2017). Future research contribution to identify

mental health challenges in MSM is needed. It is also worth noting that our results showed a percentage of MSM were married to women, presumably to avoid the harassment and stigmatism when labelled as homosexual (Chakrapani and Boyce, 2011). This has important social and public health implications as their sexual interactions with female partners made the HIV transmission not only restricted to the MSM population.

With all factors considered, MSM who had heard of PEP and knew where to get PEP had increased odds of using PEP. This is not surprising. However, having heard of PEP did not translate to actually understanding what PEP was. The results of our study showed the knowledge on PEP was relatively low (59%), with the biggest misconception being that about 92% of respondents thought PEP could prevent further HIV infection. This requires urgent clarifications, as the implication is significant. People wrongly believe PEP could completely prevent HIV infection could potentially be wrongfully encouraged to practice unprotected sex, and in turn increase their risk of contracting infection. Similar to the results from a previous study on PEP in South Africa (Hugo et al., 2016) increasing PEP awareness alone may not be sufficient; promoting the correct PEP messages is essential.

In this study, only half of respondents knew where to get PEP suggesting in order to promote optimal PEP use, it is paramount to ensure the locations that provides PEP are made known to the public. LGBTQ organizations, Ministries of Health and healthcare providers must take an active role in ensuring the availability of PEP but also share such information to the MSM population.

This study identified PEP use among MSM in 22 Sub-Saharan African countries and some of the barriers to the utilization. However, the results of the study must be seen in light of some limitations. First, the respondents of this survey were referred by the MSM/LGBTQ associations, they may have already received similar education related to HIV prevention and PEP use from the associations. Such selection bias can limit our generalizability.

Second, the sample size reached was relatively small, which may affect the generalizability of our study findings. We had relatively lower response rates from West Africa countries despite the LGBTQ organizations based in those countries accepted to participate in the study compared to East Africa - where Rwanda had the largest percentage of respondents. Cautions must be taken when generalizing our results to countries with a lower number of respondents.

Third, although PEP was clearly explained in the introduction of the study, in both invitation letters sent to the LGBTQ organizations and participants, and in the consent message, we could not eliminate the potential for misclassification between PEP and PrEP. Furthermore the variations in HIV programmes among different countries may affect the interpretation of data.

Additionally, PEP uptake in our study seemed higher than other studies, since it was an online survey, we were unable to verify accuracy of the self reported numbers.

Based on our findings, efforts to continue strengthen educational programs among MSM are needed in many areas – understanding of PEP, promoting safe sex practices, reducing number of sexual partners. Establishing stigma-free healthcare settings, where MSM can comfortably discuss their healthcare needs is also necessary. Providing free or affordable PEP services at health facilities and properly marketing PEP availability can facilitate the use of PEP.

## Credit authorship contribution statement

Sandra Isano: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing, Project administration. Rex Wong: Formal analysis, Writing - original draft, Writing review & editing, Supervision. Jenae Logan: Resources, Writing - original draft. Soha El-Halabi: Methodology, Software. Ziad El-Khatib: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Methodology, Project Administration, Supervision, Writing - review & editing.

## Acknowledgements

We thank the men belonging to LGBTQ associations who participated in the study, and the University of Global Health Equity for approving this study.

## Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

## Authors' contributions

SI, and ZEK developed the initial research proposal of this study. SI led the manuscript writing with significant support from RW, ZEK, and JL. SH contributed in setting up the online survey and study design. All authors have contributed to the manuscript.

## **Competing interest**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

## Ethics approval and consent to participate

We obtained Informed consent from all study participants. This study was approved by The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Global Health Equity in Rwanda (Protocol #: 0052).

## **Consent for publication**

Consent was obtained from the study participants.

## Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2020.101100.

## References

CDC, 2015. Effectiveness of prevention strategies to reduce the risk of acquiring or transmitting HIV, 365 (December): 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/583627.

- Chakrapani, V., Boyce, P., 2011. India 'MSM Situation Paper' Series Technical Brief 2, (September).
- Choi, K., Paul, J., 2013. Experiences of discrimination and their impact on the mental health among African American, Asian and Pacific Islander, and latino men who have sex with men, 103(5): 868–874. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2012.301052.
- Fay, H., Baral, S.D., Trapence, G., Motimedi, F., Umar, E., Iipinge, S., Beyrer, C., 2011. Stigma, health care access, and HIV knowledge among men who have sex with men in Malawi, Namibia, and Botswana. AIDS Behav. 15 (6), 1088–1097. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s10461-010-9861-2.
- Chomchey, N., Woratanarat, T., Hiransuthikul, N., Lertmaharit, S., Lohsoonthorn, V., Teeratakulpisarn, N., Phanuphak, N., 2017. Factors associated with intention to take non-occupational HIV post-exposure prophylaxis among Thai men who have sex with men, 128–139.
- Gbais, H.G., Al., E., 2015. Exploring risk behaviors and vulnerability for HIV among men who have sex with men in Abidjan, Cote d 9 Ivoire: poor knowledge, homophobia and sexual violence, 9(6). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0099591.
- Goedel, W.C., Hagen, D., Halkitis, P.N., Greene, R.E., Griffin-tomas, M., Brooks, F.A., et al., 2018. HHS public access, 29(5), 579–586. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540121. 2016.1259455.Post-exposure.
- Hladik, W., Barker, J., Ssenkusu, J.M., Opio, A., Tappero, J.W., Hakim, A., Serwadda, D., 2012. HIV infection among men who have sex with men in Kampala, Uganda-a respondent driven sampling survey. PLoS ONE 7 (5), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1371/ journal.pone.0038143.
- Hugo, J.M., Stall, R.D., Rebe, K., Egan, J.E., Jobson, G., Swardt, G. De, et al., 2016. Knowledge, attitudes and beliefs regarding post exposure prophylaxis among South African men who have sex with men, 350–357. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-016-1520-9.
- Hui-Chin, K., Poh, B., Ruzita A.T., 2015. Assessment of knowledge, attitude and practice towards whole grains among children aged 10 and 11, Int. J. Food Sci., Nutr. Dietetics (IJFS) (January). ISSN 2326-3350. https://doi.org/10.19070/2326-3350-1500032.
- Kaliyaperumal, K., 2004. Guideline for conducting a knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP) study. AECS Illumination 4, 7–9.
- King, R., Al, E., 2013. Men at risk; a qualitative study on hiv risk, gender identity and violence among men who have sex with men who report high risk behavior in Kampala, Uganda, 8(12). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0082937.
- Laar, A., Debruin, D., 2017. Key populations and human rights in the context of HIV services rendition in Ghana, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12914-017-0129-z.
- Nelson, K.M., Thiede, H., Hawes, S.E., Golden, M.R., Hutcheson, R., Carey, J.W., et al., 2010. Why the wait ? Delayed HIV diagnosis among men who have sex with men, 87(4): 642–655. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-010-9434-8.
- Okall, D., Ken, O., Monicah, N., Fredrick, O., Felicia, H., Turner, K., et al., 2016. HHS Public Access, 61(12): 1712–1726. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014. 951261.Men.
- Research, S., Koch Institute, R., College Maastricht, U., the EMIS network, for, 2010. EMIS-2010 English language version of the online questionnaire (as published).
- Rotheram-borus, M.J., Swendeman, D., Chovnick, G., 2010. NIH public access, 143–167. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.032408.153530.
- Safren, A.W.B., Mitchell, A.D., 2017. Mental health in 2020 for men who have sex with men in the United States, 59–71.

UNAIDS, 2018. UNAIDS data 2018.

WHO, 2016. Policy brief: consolidated guidelines on HIV prevention, diagnosis, treatment and care for key populations, 2016 update, 1–8.