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Abstract

Objectives: To assess the prevalence and predictors of unprotected sex among HIV+ individuals in clinical care in urban KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.

Design: Cross-sectional survey of 152 HIV+ individuals attending a hospital-based HIV-clinic.

Methods: Structured interviews were conducted by bilingual interviewers. Sexual risk behaviour in the preceding 3 months was assessed via event counts.

Results: In one of the first studies of its kind in South Africa we found that nearly half of the sample reported vaginal or anal sex during the preceding 3 months, and 30% of these patients reported unprotected vaginal or anal sex. Among sexually active patients, a total of 171 unprotected sex events were reported, 40% of which were with partners perceived to be HIV-negative or HIV-status unknown. Nine such partners were potentially exposed to HIV. Alcohol use during sex, being forced to have sex, sex with a perceived HIV+ partner, and sex with a casual partner predicted more unprotected sex, whereas HIV-status disclosure was related to less unprotected sex.

Conclusions: HIV+ individuals in clinical care in South Africa may engage in unprotected sex that place others at risk of HIV infection and themselves at risk for infection with STIs. With a national ARV rollout currently underway in South Africa, increasing numbers of HIV+ individuals are entering care. This affords a crucial opportunity to link HIV prevention with HIV care, an approach that aims to reduce transmission risk behaviour among HIV+ individuals and is consistent with international agencies’ current prevention priorities.
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Introduction

South Africa is facing a devastating HIV pandemic with nearly 5 million people or 16.2% of the population between the ages of 15 and 49, currently HIV-infected [2]. Reducing unprotected sex in this population, in part by linking HIV prevention with HIV clinical care, is recommended as a priority HIV/AIDS prevention strategy by UNAIDS [3], WHO [4] and the Global HIV Prevention Working Group [5].

At present, very little is known about the prevalence and predictors of unprotected sexual behaviour among HIV+ individuals in South Africa, and even less is known about this behaviour among HIV+ persons who are in HIV clinical care in this country. Moreover, the few studies that have examined unprotected sex among HIV+ individuals in South Africa have assessed it solely in relation to condom use or nonuse at the last sexual encounter [2,6,7]. Assessing unprotected sex using this approach yields a narrow and potentially misleading perspective on the magnitude of risk of transmission of HIV from those infected because it does not provide information about unprotected sex in terms of the numbers of unprotected sex events or the number of partners potentially exposed to HIV over meaningful intervals of time [8]. An alternative and potentially more informative measurement approach is to use event-counts in which participants are asked to indicate the number of times they engaged in intercourse with each of their partners over a specified time period, and how many of those intercourse events involved the use of a condom, thus yielding the number of intercourse events that were unprotected over a given interval of time [8].

In addition to measurement concerns, none of the studies in South Africa to date have examined unprotected sex among HIV+ individuals on antiretroviral therapy (ARV). Only one study examined correlates of unprotected sex among HIV+ individuals [6]. However, in addition
to only measuring condom use at last intercourse, this study failed to assess disclosure and sexual partner characteristics, which may be important predictors of risk behaviour. With a national ARV rollout underway in South Africa [9,10], comprehensive information about unprotected sexual behavior among HIV+ individuals on ARV therapy is especially critical in order to know how to direct secondary prevention efforts. Prevention efforts in South Africa are also an important method to protect against risk compensation—or increases in unprotected sex due to reduced perceptions of the threat posed by HIV/AIDS (Cassell et al., 2006). Because an increasing number of HIV+ individuals are entering clinical care [9,10], there is now a critical opportunity to deliver HIV prevention interventions in the context of HIV care, to assist HIV+ individuals to avoid transmission of the virus and to protect themselves from sexually transmitted infections (STIs). Such interventions can be aided by carefully collected information concerning the prevalence and correlates of unprotected sex among HIV+ individuals on ARV therapy.

The present study fills this gap in the literature by measuring unprotected sex with event counts and by investigating the correlates of this behaviour among HIV+ individuals attending HIV clinical care in South Africa. The goals of the present study were to: 1) assess the prevalence of unprotected vaginal and anal sex amongst this population; and 2) examine whether levels of unprotected sex vary as a function of taking ARVs, partner type (steady vs. casual), perceived-partner HIV serostatus, alcohol use during sex, and other demographic and behavioural variables.
Methods

Study Population

Participants were 152 HIV-infected patients attending an urban hospital-based HIV care clinic in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa that provides highly subsidized treatment services. The University and the Hospital ethics boards approved the study’s procedures, and written informed consent was obtained from all participants. Participant demographics appear in Table 1.

Measurement

The in-depth structured individual interviews were conducted in a private room in either isi-Zulu or English. Unprotected sex was assessed separately for each of the 5 most recent sexual partners in the preceding 3 months, as relevant, with participants reporting the number of sexual events (vaginal, anal, and oral sex) with each partner, whether a condom was used for each type of sexual event (excluding oral sex), each partner’s perceived HIV-serostatus (HIV-positive, HIV-negative, or unknown), the partner type (steady or casual), and whether or not they had disclosed their HIV-status to the partner [11]. Yes-no questions assessed if participants had disclosed their HIV-status to someone outside of the clinic and if they had been physically forced to have sex in the prior 3 months. Alcohol use during sex in the prior 3 months was assessed on a 5-point scale with 1 = ‘never’ and 5 = ‘always’ [12].

Statistical Analyses

A regression model was estimated using generalized estimating equations (GEE) and specifying a Poisson distribution, simultaneously entering demographic and behavioral variables as potential predictors of the number of unprotected (vaginal or anal) sex events among sexually active participants. GEE were used to account for the correlated nature of the data (i.e., repeated observations for those reporting more than one partner) as well as the Poisson distribution that is
appropriate for count data [13-15]. Results from this model and descriptive statistics for the
demographic and behavioural variables that were significant correlates of unprotected sex appear
in Table 2. Data were analyzed using SPSS version 11.5 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) and
HLM version 6.02 (Scientific Software International Inc., Lincolnwood, IL, USA) for Windows.

Results

Prevalence of Unprotected Sexual Behavior

Approximately half (47%) of the 152 HIV+ patients reported having vaginal or anal sex
in the past 3 months for a total of 676 vaginal and 12 anal sex events, while only 3% reported
having oral sex in the past 3 months for a total of 17 oral sex events. Of the sexually active
patients (N=71), 23 (30%) reported one or more unprotected vaginal or anal sex events for a total
of 171 unprotected sex events in the prior 3 months with 27 different partners. Sixty-seven
(39.2%) of the unprotected sex events were with partners perceived to be HIV-negative or HIV-
status unknown with a total of nine such partners potentially exposed to HIV. Only four (5.6%)
sexually active participants reported having more than one sexual partner. There were no gender
differences in sexual behaviour.

Predictors of Unprotected Sexual Behaviour

According to the GEE model, those who used alcohol during sex during the prior 3
months reported 3 times more unprotected sex events, those reporting forced sex in the prior 3
months reported greater than 3 times more unprotected sex events, individuals who had sex with
a perceived HIV+ partner had 2.5 times more unprotected sex events, individuals who had sex
with a casual partner had 3.5 times more unprotected sex events, and individuals who disclosed
their HIV status to someone outside the clinic reported only one fourth as many unprotected sex
events as those who had not disclosed to someone outside the clinic. Event rate ratios with
confidence intervals and the mean numbers of unprotected sexual events based on these factors are given in Table 2. There were no effects of gender, age, length of time since HIV diagnosis, ethnicity, SES, employment, education level, urban vs. rural residence, taking ARVs, reported STI diagnosis in prior 3 months, or for disclosure of HIV-status to the partner on levels of risk behaviour.

**Discussion**

These results indicate that unprotected sex occurs at nontrivial rates among HIV+ individuals in clinical care in South Africa, with 30% of those who were sexually active--15% of all those sampled--having had unprotected vaginal or anal sex. Some 40% of the reported unprotected sex events occurred with perceived HIV-negative or status unknown partners, which may be a conservative estimate because perceptions of a partner’s HIV status are often speculative and inaccurate [16-18]. Moreover, HIV+ individuals remain at risk for STIs, as evidenced in our findings, and consistent with overall high prevalence of STIs in South Africa [19]. Overall, these findings highlight the need for the development and implementation of HIV prevention interventions for HIV-infected individuals in South Africa. Such interventions can be delivered efficiently in tandem with newly available HIV treatment and care in this country [9,10]. In addition, linking prevention to STI treatment for HIV+ individuals would be useful for reaching HIV+ individuals who are engaging in unprotected sexual behaviors.

The finding that those who reported recent forced sex had higher rates of unprotected sex is an important acknowledgement of the power dynamics and circumstances that might affect one’s ability to practice safer behaviour [25,26], although perplexingly this finding did not differ by gender. Even though alcohol use in our sample was relatively low, its use in sexual situations predicted more unprotected sex and therefore HIV prevention interventions with HIV+ patients
should address this critical risk factor. Status disclosure to a partner was not related to lower levels of unprotected sex, although disclosure to someone outside of the clinic was related to lower levels of unprotected sex. This lends support to promoting general HIV-status disclosure. Given the existence of widespread HIV stigma in South Africa, we note that individuals must carefully consider the decision to disclose. However, disclosure may become more viable as stigma lessens with the current ARV rollout [27]. Contrary to speculation about the impact of ARVs on unprotected sexual behaviour in sub-Saharan Africa [28], patients who reported taking ARVs engaged in no more unprotected sex than those who were not taking ARVs. Many of our patients had initiated ARV therapy within the past 2 months, however, and it is unknown what the effect of ARVs will be on patients’ unprotected sexual behaviours longitudinally.

This study represents one of the first investigations of the prevalence and correlates of unprotected sex in an HIV+ clinical care population in South Africa. It is also the first to assess the levels of unprotected sexual behaviour among this population in terms of the number of unprotected sex events, and the first to examine unprotected sex among HIV+ South Africans taking ARVs. Not only is this study the first of its kind in South Africa but it is one of only a small number of such studies in Africa.

With a national ARV rollout currently underway in South Africa, increasing numbers of HIV+ individuals are entering clinical care [9,10], affording the opportunity to deliver HIV prevention interventions in this setting that will assist HIV+ individuals to avoid transmission of the virus to others and protect themselves from STIs. This approach is advocated by international agencies [3-5,29] as an essential HIV prevention strategy because it takes advantage of the efficiencies and potential synergy of linking treatment and prevention. Such an approach is especially relevant because the linkage provides opportunities for risk reduction interventions to
be delivered to HIV+ patients repeatedly and routinely over the course of clinical care, in a safe and supportive environment.
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| Table 1. Demographic characteristics of HIV+ patients attending an HIV care clinic in urban South Africa |
|---------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| **No. (%)**                                       | **Gender**                                       |
| Male                                              | 65 (42.8)                                       |
| Female                                            | 87 (57.2)                                       |
| **Age**                                           |                                                  |
| < 30                                               | 42 (27.6)                                       |
| 30 – 39                                           | 80 (52.6)                                       |
| ≥ 40                                               | 30 (19.7)                                       |
| **Employed**                                      |                                                  |
| Yes                                                | 45 (29.6)                                       |
| No                                                 | 103 (67.8)                                      |
| **SES\(^a\)**                                     |                                                  |
| Not enough money for food                          | 85 (56.7)                                       |
| Enough for food, but not for other basics          | 25 (16.7)                                       |
| Enough for food & basics but not for other things | 32 (21.3)                                       |
| Enough for most important things but no luxury goods | 6 (4.0)                                       |
| Some money for luxury goods                        | 2 (1.3)                                         |
| **Ethnicity**                                     |                                                  |
| Zulu                                               | 139 (91.4)                                      |
| Other African ethnicity                            | 6 (4.0)                                         |
| Indian                                            | 3 (2.0)                                         |
| Coloured (mixed race)                              | 1 (0.7)                                         |
| White                                             | 1 (0.7)                                         |
| Other                                             | 2 (1.3)                                         |
| **Residence**                                     |                                                  |
| Urban                                              | 118 (77.6)                                      |
| Rural                                              | 33 (21.7)                                       |
Education
- < high school: 67 (44.1)
- high school: 66 (43.4)
- > high school: 19 (12.5)

Marital Status
- Single: 120 (78.9)
- Married: 27 (17.8)
- Widowed: 4 (2.6)

Length of time since HIV diagnosis
- < 1 year: 65 (42.8)
- 1 – 2 years: 44 (28.9)
- > 2 years: 43 (28.3)

Taking ARVs
- Yes: 114 (75.0)
- No: 35 (23.0)

STI diagnosis in past 3 months
- Yes: 53 (34.9)
- No: 99 (65.1)

\a SES was assessed using a measure utilized in a national representative sample of individuals in South Africa [2].
Table 2. Descriptive statistics and predictors of sexual risk events among sexually active participants from GEE Poisson Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>Mean # Risk Events</th>
<th>Event Rate Ratio (CI)</th>
<th>t(65)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol use during sex&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.08 (1.77 – 5.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced sex</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.37 (1.56 – 7.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV-positive partner</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2.34 (1.05 – 5.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual partner</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.48 (1.56 – 7.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosed HIV-status</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>.24 (.15 - .39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001. Mean risk events are calculated from the GEE model estimates and represent the number of sexual risk events in the prior 3-months.

<sup>a</sup> Alcohol use, although assessed with a continuous measure, was reported infrequently and was thus positively skewed and was therefore dichotomised into “alcohol use during sex” and “no alcohol use during sex.”