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HIV Prevention in New York City

- In 2014, NYC had one of the largest HIV epidemics in the US
  - 2,718 new HIV diagnoses
  - More than 119,000 people living with HIV/AIDS

- High burden among men who have sex with men (MSM)
  - 59% of new diagnoses in 2014
  - Among men, MSM represent 74% of diagnoses
  - No significant decrease in new diagnoses between 2001 and 2014

- New focus on biomedical HIV prevention methods, specifically post-exposure (PEP) and pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP)

Pre-exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP)

- Daily pill (Truvada) taken to prevent HIV infection
- US FDA-approved July 2012
- >90% effective if taken every day
- Recommended as part of combination prevention
- Since 2012, NYC Health Department has been measuring PrEP awareness and use in a routine Sexual Health Survey (SHS) conducted among priority populations
Black Party and NYC Health Department

• Black Party is an annual, internationally recognized, circuit party attended by gay men

• March 21, 2015; held at a warehouse in Brooklyn

• NYC DOHMH collaborated with party organizers to:
  • Distribute safer sex products (e.g. condoms and lubricant)
  • Promote PrEP and PEP (postcards at coat check and medical tent)
  • Conduct survey assessing awareness of, attitudes towards and adoption of PrEP
Black Party Survey Aims

Among all Black Party attendees, to assess:
1. PrEP awareness
2. Associations between demographic and behavioral characteristics and recent PrEP use

Among all Black Party attendees who were not taking PrEP, to assess:
1. PrEP eligibility
2. Perceived eligibility for PrEP
3. Interest in daily PrEP
4. Interest in injectable PrEP
Methods

Study Design
• Ad hoc cross-sectional survey that leveraged methods used by NYC’s routinely conducted SHS
• Conducted at Black Party, March 21, 2015 from 10-3am at a warehouse in Brooklyn

Eligibility:
• NYC residence (ZIP code)
• Male sex at birth

Administration method
• Interviewer-administered to determine eligibility and obtain consent
• Tablet turned to respondent, who answered survey questions on their own

Incentive
• $5 drink voucher for non-alcoholic beverage
Staffing & Logistics

Survey Location
- Venue entrance line

Survey Team/Shifts
- Four hour shifts (2, staggered),
- Shift supervisors (3)
- Volunteer surveyors/recruiters (6-8 per shift)
Measures

Sociodemographic Characteristics

- Age: (18-29 vs. 30-40 years)
- Race/ethnicity (black, Hispanic, white vs. other)
- Education (Graduate degree, Bachelors degree vs. some college or less)
- Income (Less than vs greater than $60,000)
- Insurance (Yes vs. No)

Recent Behaviors Reported (past 6 months)

- Number of partners with whom no condom used (receptive or insertive)
- Known HIV-positive sexual partner
- Stimulant drug use
- Injection drug use
# Outcomes and Analysis

## Outcomes

- PrEP use, past 6 months
- Among non-users:
  - PrEP eligibility per NYS guidelines
  - Perceived eligibility for PrEP
  - Interest in daily PrEP
  - Interest in injectable PrEP

## Analysis

- Chi-square or Fisher’s exact (significance level $p<0.05$)
- Descriptive analysis among non-users
Recruitment Summary

- **Approached**: 100% (N=522)
  - **Refused**: 54.0% (n=282)
  - **Screened**: 46.0% (n=240)
    - **Ineligible**: 31.7% (n=76)
    - **Eligible**: 68.3% (n=164)
      - **HIV-positive**: 6.7% (n=11)

- **Analytic Sample**: 93.3% (n=153)
### Sample Characteristics, Black Party Participants with Self-reported HIV-negative/unknown Status, NYC, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Column %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or less</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $60,000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 or more</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insured</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of PrEP</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrEP use, past 6 months</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PrEP Use by Sociodemographic Characteristics, Black Party Participants, NYC, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n PrEP users*</th>
<th>% PrEP users*</th>
<th>p-value‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean, SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or less</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $60,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 or more</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Self-reported use in the past 6 months
‡Chi-square or fisher’s exact
PrEP Use by Behavioral Characteristics, Black Party Participants, NYC, 2015

% reporting PrEP use, past 6 months

- ≥2 partners with whom no condom used, past 6 months: 54% (26/48)
- HIV-positive sexual partner, past 6 months: 53% (17/32)
- Stimulant drug use, past 6 months: 24% (24/100)
- Injection drug use, past 6 months: 60% (3/5)†

- PrEP use, past 6 months

*Significantly associated with PrEP use (p<0.05)
† Note small sample size
**PrEP Eligibility and Interest among PrEP Non-Users**

1. **Reported behaviors consistent with PrEP eligibility (n=108)**
   - Yes: 77%
   - No: 23%

2. **Among PrEP-eligible, perceived their risk was high enough to take PrEP (n=75)**
   - Yes: 52%
   - No: 15%
   - Don't know/Not sure: 33%

3. **Among those not taking PrEP, interest in daily PrEP (n=97)**
   - Very interested: 36%
   - Somewhat interested: 30%
   - Not at all interested: 25%
   - Don't know/Not sure: 9%

4. **Among those not taking PrEP, interest in injectable PrEP, (n=97)**
   - Very interested: 30%
   - Somewhat interested: 30%
   - Not at all interested: 31%
   - Don't know/Not sure: 9%
Limitations

• Data self-reported
  – Potentially subject to recall error and social desirability bias

• Data anonymous and cross-sectional
  – Cannot measure individuals’ changes over time or distinguish temporality between PrEP use and behaviors

• Convenience sample
  – Potential for selection bias

• Results may not be generalizable
Summary

• Report of PrEP use in the past 6 months was high in this special population
  – 29% compared to 16% in routine SHS, conducted approximately 3 months later
  – Sample was highly educated and affluent, which may affect access

• Sociodemographic factors were not associated with PrEP use in the last 6 months, however, use was higher among those with:
  – ≥2 partners with whom no condom used, past 6 months
  – Reporting any HIV-positive sexual partner, past 6 months

• Discrepancy between perceived and actual eligibility for PrEP
  – 77% of PrEP non-users reported behaviors that indicate eligibility per NYS prescription guidelines
  – 52% of those eligible felt their risk of HIV was not high enough to take PrEP

• Among non-PrEP users, interest in taking daily PrEP was high, as was interest in injectable PrEP

• Successfully piloted new survey methodology
Implications

- Although PrEP use appears to be associated with behaviors that increase HIV risk and not with sociodemographic factors, important to continue monitor for potential disparities

- Discrepancy between perceived and actual eligibility for PrEP, based on reported behaviors, underscores importance of discussions between patients and providers

- High interest in PrEP among non-users suggests unmet demand

- NYC DOHMH continues to support PrEP uptake with:
  - Campaigns targeting patients and providers
  - Programs to provide PrEP and related services
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