



# HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

*AIDS Behav.* Author manuscript; available in PMC 2018 May 01.

Published in final edited form as:

*AIDS Behav.* 2017 May ; 21(5): 1376–1382. doi:10.1007/s10461-017-1739-0.

## Use of Pre-exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) in Young Men Who Have Sex with Men is Associated with Race, Sexual Risk Behavior and Peer Network Size

Lisa M. Kuhns<sup>1,2</sup>, Anna L. Hotton<sup>3</sup>, John Schneider<sup>4,5,6</sup>, Robert Garofalo<sup>1,2</sup>, and Kayo Fujimoto<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Division of Adolescent Medicine, Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital, Chicago, IL

<sup>2</sup>Department of Pediatrics, Northwestern University, Feinberg School of Medicine, Department of Pediatrics, Chicago, IL

<sup>3</sup>Division of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, University of Illinois at Chicago School of Public Health, Chicago IL

<sup>4</sup>Chicago Center for HIV Elimination, University of Chicago

<sup>5</sup>Department of Medicine, University of Chicago

<sup>6</sup>Department of Public Health Sciences, University of Chicago

<sup>7</sup>Department of Health Promotion & Behavioral Sciences, School of Public Health, The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston

### Abstract

Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) is efficacious to prevent HIV infection, however, uptake among young men who have sex with men (YMSM) is relatively low. The purpose of this study was to describe PrEP use and related factors in a representative sample of YMSM in two cities, Chicago and Houston. YMSM, ages 16–29, were recruited via respondent-driven sampling (RDS) from 2014–2016. Correlates of PrEP uptake were assessed in weighted multivariable logistic regression models. A total of 12.2% of participants (of 394) reported ever taking PrEP; Black YMSM had the lowest rates of uptake (4.7%) and Whites the highest (29.5%). In a multivariable regression model, having an HIV positive sex partner, reporting recent group sex, peer network size, and city (Chicago) were significantly and positively associated with use of PrEP, while Black race was negatively associated with it. Given evidence of racial/ethnic disparities in PrEP uptake in this study, further research is needed to identify potential mechanisms of action and points of intervention.

---

Corresponding Author: Lisa M. Kuhns, PhD, MPH, Division of Adolescent Medicine, Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital, 225 E. Chicago Avenue, Box 161, Chicago, IL. 60611.

**Conflicts of Interest:** Author A. Hotton declares no conflicts of interest.

**Ethical Approval:** : All procedures performed involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional review boards at the participating institutions and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

**Informed Consent:** Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants involved in this study.

## Keywords

Pre-exposure prophylaxis; Young Men Who Have Sex with Men; Social Network; HIV Prevention

---

## INTRODUCTION

Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP), defined as the use of antiretroviral medications to prevent HIV infection, is an efficacious prevention strategy for high-risk populations, particularly men who have sex with men (MSM) (1, 2). Among young men who have sex with men (YMSM), a risk group for whom new cases of HIV infection have continued to increase in recent years (3), evidence indicates that PrEP is efficacious (4), however, there is limited evidence of widespread use outside of randomized controlled trials. Recent studies have estimated that <10% of YMSM have ever used PrEP (5–7). To date, various factors have been associated with PrEP awareness among YMSM, including greater education and income (7), healthcare access, and social network factors (6, 8); while PrEP uptake among YMSM has been associated with greater income (5) and indicators of sexual risk (5, 7). Among all adults, as well as adult men who have sex with men (MSM), some evidence suggests that uptake differs by race. For example, White adults disproportionately accessed PrEP at retail pharmacies between 2012 and 2015 in comparison to other races (9) and White MSM were more likely to report taking PrEP than Blacks in the 2014 National HIV Behavioral Surveillance System (NHBS) data (10). A recent white paper published by the California HIV/AIDS research program suggests that uptake of PrEP may be differential by race/ethnicity among YMSM as well (11). Results stem from an on-line survey conducted between July and August of 2015 among 602 male residents of California with male sex partners, ages 18–29, which found low PrEP uptake overall (9.6%), with White YMSM significantly more likely to use PrEP (13.9%) in comparison to Latinos (6.6%; but not Blacks at 9.8%). Given findings from these studies to date, the purpose of the study was to describe PrEP uptake in a diverse sample of YMSM in two cities, Chicago and Houston (with differing Medicaid Expansion status), as well as assess demographic, health access, sexual risk and social network correlates of PrEP use.

## METHODS

### Study Sample

Findings reported herein come from an analysis of baseline data collected in an on-going longitudinal network study of HIV risk in YMSM, ages 16–29, collected between 2014 and 2016 in two cities, Chicago and Houston (Young Men’s Affiliation Project or YMAP). The purpose of YMAP is to investigate the HIV risk and protective factors associated with multiplex and multilevel social and affiliation networks of YMSM (12). Eligible participants were within the target age-range at baseline, assigned male at birth and identified as male, reported oral or anal sex with another male in the prior year, resided in Chicago or Houston metro area and were available for follow-up over the subsequent year and were English-speaking. We restricted analysis in this study to the subgroup of participants who were 18 years and older and reported HIV-negative serostatus. Research participants were recruited using respondent-driven sampling (RDS)(13), in which index participants were instructed to

recruit up to four eligible members of their social network for study participation. Institutional Review Board approval was obtained for all participating institutions. We obtained assent/consent from all participants; parental permission was waived for minors under 18 years of age. Participants were compensated at \$50 for their time and travel with an additional \$20 for each peer network member recruited.

### Data Collection and Measures

We collected data via computer-assisted personal interviewing which included questions about sociodemographic characteristics, HIV/STI risk and protective behaviors, and network characteristics. In terms of demographic indicators, the questionnaire included items regarding participant age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, highest level of education, student status and current employment status.

We included three variables to serve as proxy indicators of healthcare and/or PrEP access, including having health insurance (“Do you currently have health insurance of any kind, government or private?”), site (Chicago or Houston; Illinois is a Medicaid expansion state and Texas is not)(14), and year of enrollment (2014, 2015, 2016).

Two social affiliation and network variables were created, including the level of gay community affiliation (“How much do you feel a part of the gay community?”; response options included: very much, somewhat, not very much, not at all) and YMSM (peer) network size, per the standard approach to estimate peer network size in RDS-based studies (13) (“Of the guys that you know by name in [Chicago or Houston] that have sex with other guys, how many are young men between the ages of 16–29? Keep in mind these are people who you know and who know you, who you know how to contact directly, and who you have seen in person in the last six months.”)

In terms of indicators of sexual risk, we included any prior history of a sexually transmitted infection (“Have you ever been told by a doctor, nurse or other health care provider that you have: HPV-Human papillomavirus, syphilis, anal or genital warts?”), HIV testing history (“Have you ever been tested for HIV? When was the last time you were tested for HIV? What was the result of your most recent HIV test?”), recent history of group sex (“In the past 6 months, how often have you engaged in group sex?”). To measure serostatus of sexual partners and recent history of condomless anal sex, we asked participants to list up to 5 recent (last 6 months) sexual partners by name or initials and then asked about their perceived serostatus (“Is [NAME] HIV-positive, negative? Response options include: positive, negative, don’t know) and history of condom use for anal sex (“In the last 6 months, when you had sex with [NAME], how often did you use condoms? Response options included: Always, Usually, Sometimes, Rarely, Never). An indicator variable for any HIV-positive sexual partner was created (1=yes, 0=no) and any recent report of condomless anal sex (1=yes, 0=no).

Our primary outcome of interest was “ever” use of PrEP, herein referred to as “PrEP uptake,” which we measured with the question, “Have you ever taken HIV medication before sex because you thought it would lower your chances of getting HIV, also known as

PrEP?” (1=yes, 0=no). We also asked participants if they had taken PrEP in the last six months, and if so, if they were currently taking it.

### Statistical Analysis

RDS weights were calculated in RDSAT (version 7.1) (15). Statistical analyses were completed using SAS software v9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). Bivariate associations between socio-demographics, network characteristics, and sexual behaviors and PrEP uptake were examined in weighted logistic regression models. Variables which were associated with PrEP uptake at a level of  $p < 0.10$  in initial analyses were then entered into a multivariable regression model; those with  $p > 0.05$  were removed one by one in an iterative process to arrive at a final parsimonious model. Only variables with  $p < 0.05$  were maintained in the final model, with the exception of age and health insurance, which were retained in the model for theoretical reasons despite lack of statistical significance.

## RESULTS

Between December of 2014 and January of 2016, we enrolled 553 participants into the YMAP study across both cities. Participants who reported being HIV-positive at baseline were removed from the analysis ( $n=156$ ) as were those who reported an unknown status ( $n=1$ ). An additional two participants were removed from the analysis due to being aged 16–17 and one was removed due to a missing age variable in the dataset. The final dataset for analysis was  $N=394$  (Table 1). The median age in the analytic sample was 24 (Interquartile range=22–26), and in terms of race, the sample was primarily Black (49%), with smaller percentages White (24.1%) and Hispanic/Latino (19.5%). Most participants identified as “gay” (71.8%), with 21.8% and 6.4% identifying as “bisexual” and “straight/heterosexual” respectively. A large percentage of participants reported at least some college education (68.2%) and full or part-time employment (67.0%), with a smaller percentage reporting current student status (30.7%).

### PrEP Uptake

A total of 48 (12.2%) participants reported having ever taken PrEP. Among those reporting ever having taken PrEP, the vast majority, 87.5%, had taken PrEP in the past six months and 77.1% ( $n=37$ ) reported currently taking PrEP.

### Correlates of PrEP

In initial analysis (Table 1), race/ethnicity, health insurance, network size, gay community affiliation, any STI history, recent condomless anal sex, any HIV-positive partner, and recent group sex were significantly associated with PrEP uptake ( $p < 0.10$ ). Because of high intercorrelations between peer network size and gay community affiliation, peer network size was selected for inclusion in the multivariable model for both empirical and substantive reasons. For example, because this is a network-based study, we were most interested in the relationship of network factors to PrEP uptake over affiliation. Similarly, due to high intercorrelations in HIV risk variables (i.e., any STI history, recent condomless anal sex, having an HIV-positive sex partner and recent group sex), we selected the strongest associated factors: HIV-positive partner and group sex to include in the multivariable model.

In the final model (Table 2), city (Chicago), peer network size, reporting an HIV-positive partner, and group sex were significantly and positively associated with having ever used PrEP and Black race (vs. White) negatively associated with it. Given the strong association of Black race with PrEP use, we completed additional tests for interactions between Black race and socioeconomic factors, including health insurance as potential modifiers of the race-PrEP use relationship, however these were not statistically significant (data not shown). Additionally, noting the descriptive difference in PrEP use by year of enrollment, we also tested for a time trend in PrEP use over the enrollment period by year, month, and month/quarter of enrollment, which were also not statistically significant (data not shown).

## DISCUSSION

Findings reported here support prior studies indicating that uptake of PrEP among YMSM is quite low, with only 12.2% of the study sample reporting ever having taken PrEP. In addition, there was no evidence that use of PrEP significantly increased over the period of enrollment from 2014–2016. Furthermore, these data indicate that use of PrEP may be differential by race, similar to findings among adult MSM, with Black YMSM at an 84% reduced odds of having ever used PrEP in comparison to their White counterparts, in the adjusted multivariable model. Prior studies suggest that Black YMSM may be less aware of PrEP and that awareness is associated with education, income, and employment status (7, 11). These factors echo the structural barriers to HIV prevention interventions experienced more generally by Black MSM (16). Given these findings, it will be important to reach racial/ethnic minorities as part of a concerted effort to promote PrEP among YMSM.

Despite low uptake overall, we also found that indicators of risk, including reporting an HIV-positive sex partner and recent group sex were associated with PrEP uptake, which suggest that those YMSM who are using PrEP tend to be those who have higher HIV risk on average. However, recent findings indicate that large percentages of YMSM report recent condomless anal sex (almost 50%) and sex with unknown status partners (17), thus, many more YMSM are likely indicated for PrEP than report prior use.

We also found that YMSM peer network size is related to PrEP uptake, suggesting that having a larger number of YMSM within one's social network is associated with PrEP use. This finding may be due to use of PrEP within one's peer network, being aware of PrEP or discussing it, but limitations in our data prevented us from testing these potential explanations. Prior studies have found that identifying as "gay" (in comparison to bisexual) and affiliation with the "Ball Community" is associated with awareness of PrEP among YMSM (6, 11) which also imply social network benefits in this regard. Because the social network implications for PrEP use have not been studied, this is a potentially important area of inquiry.

Finally, while having health insurance was not significantly associated with PrEP use in the multivariable model, participants in Chicago had over twice the odds of having ever taken PrEP than those in Houston. Limitations in the data did not allow us to explore this finding further (i.e., we did not collect data on how participants accessed PrEP, whether through insurance, PrEP access programs or other programs), but differences may be related to the

larger socioeconomic and public health context in each location. Future studies to determine the social and structural contexts conducive to PrEP uptake are advised.

Findings should be considered in the light of some limitations. For example, the collection of data is limited to two urban areas (Chicago and Houston), thus findings may not generalize to other locations. In addition, the report of sexual partner characteristics and sexual behavior is subject to recall error. We limited reporting to the prior 6 months only and used a timeline anchored to significant events over the prior 6 months to aid recall. Finally, for the exploratory statistical tests, such as the tests of interactions and the time trend analysis, relatively low statistical power limit conclusiveness of findings.

We conclude that the low uptake of PrEP overall among YMSM, and among Black YMSM in particular, in comparison to rates of infection, suggest underutilization of PrEP and the need for expansion of PrEP promotion efforts. Social, relational, and structural contexts conducive to PrEP uptake among YMSM are potentially important areas of future research.

## Acknowledgments

We thank members of the Young Men's Affiliation Project (YMAP) Team in Chicago and Houston for their contribution to sample accrual and data collection.

**Funding:** Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award Numbers R01MH100021 (MPI: K. Fujimoto, J. Schneider) and R21GM113694 (PI: K. Fujimoto). This study was also supported, in part, by Gilead Sciences, Inc. (PI: K. Fujimoto). The project described was also supported, in part, by the Northwestern University Clinical and Translational Science Institute, Grant Number UL1TR000150 from the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, Clinical and Translational Sciences Award (CTSA). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH. The CTSA is a registered trademark of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

Authors L. Kuhns, J. Schneider, and K. Fujimoto have received research grants from Gilead Sciences, Inc. Author R. Garofalo has received speaker honoraria from Gilead Sciences, Inc.

## References

1. Grant RM, Anderson PL, McMahan V, Liu A, Amico KR, Mehrotra M, et al. Uptake of pre-exposure prophylaxis, sexual practices, and HIV incidence in men and transgender women who have sex with men: a cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2014; 14(9):820–9. [PubMed: 25065857]
2. Grant RM, Lama JR, Anderson PL, McMahan V, Liu AY, Vargas L, et al. Preexposure chemoprophylaxis for HIV prevention in men who have sex with men. *New Eng J of Med*. 2010; 363(27):2587–99. [PubMed: 21091279]
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Diagnoses of HIV infection among adolescents and young adults in the United States and 6 dependent areas, 2010–2014. *HIV Surveillance Supplemental Report 2016*. 2016; 21(3)
4. Hosek SG, Siberry G, Bell M, Lally M, Kapogiannis B, Green K, et al. The acceptability and feasibility of an HIV preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP) trial with young men who have sex with men. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2013; 62(4):447–56. [PubMed: 24135734]
5. Holloway I, Dougherty R, Gildner J, Beougher SC, Pulsipher C, Montoya JA, et al. PrEP uptake, adherence, and discontinuation among california YMSM using geosocial networking applications. *Journal Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016
6. Khanna AS, Michaels S, Skaathun B, Morgan E, Green K, Young L, et al. Preexposure prophylaxis awareness and use in a population-based sample of young black men who have sex with men. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2016; 176(1):136–8. [PubMed: 26571368]

7. Strauss BB, Greene GJ, Phillips G 2nd, Bhatia R, Madkins K, Parsons JT, et al. Exploring patterns of awareness and use of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis among young men who have sex with men. *AIDS Behav.* 2016
8. Khanna AS, Schumm P, Schneider JA. Facebook network structure and awareness of preexposure prophylaxis among young men who have sex with men. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2016
9. Bush, S., Magnuson, D., Rawlings, M., Hawkins, T., McCallister, S., Mera Giler, R. American Society for Microbiology (ASM). Boston, MA: Jun 16–20. 2016 Racial characteristics of FTC/TDF for pre-exposure prophylaxis users in the U.S.
10. Hoots BE, Finlayson T, Nerlander L, Paz-Bailey G. Willingness to take, use of, and indications for pre-exposure prophylaxis among men who have sex with men-20 US Cities, 2014. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2016; 63(5):672–7. [PubMed: 27282710]
11. Pulsipher, CA., Montoya, JA., Plant, A., Curtis, P., Holloway, IW., Leibowitz, AA. Addressing PrEP disparities among young gay and bisexual men in California. Los Angeles, CA: California HIV/AIDS Research Program; 2016.
12. Fujimoto K, Wang P, Kuhns LM, Ross MW, Williams ML, Garofalo R, et al. Multiplex competition, collaboration, and funding networks among health and social organizations: Towards organization-based HIV interventions for young men who have sex with men. *Med Care.* 2016
13. Heckathorn DD. Respondent-driven sampling: a new approach to the study of hidden populations. *Social Problems.* 1997; 44(2):174–99.
14. United States Department of Health and Human Resources. State by state 2016. [cited 2016 September 12]. Available from: <https://www.hhs.gov/healthcare/facts-and-features/state-by-state/>
15. Volz, EWC., Cameron, C., Spiller, M., Barash, V., Degani, I., Heckathorn, DD. Respondent-Driven Sampling Analysis Tool (RDSAT). 7.1. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University; 2012.
16. Levy ME, Wilton L, Phillips G 2nd, Glick SN, Kuo I, Brewer RA, et al. Understanding structural barriers to accessing HIV testing and prevention services among black men who have sex with men (BMSM) in the United States. *AIDS Behav.* 2014; 18(5):972–96. [PubMed: 24531769]
17. Garofalo R, Hotton AL, Kuhns LM, Gratz B, Mustanski B. Incidence of HIV infection and sexually transmitted infections and related risk factors among very young men who have sex with men. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2016; 72(1):79–86. [PubMed: 26745827]

**Table 1**

Prevalence of PrEP Use by Participant Characteristics, N=394, YMAP HIV Negative Adult Cohort, Chicago and Houston 2014–2016

	Total, N=394 n (col %)	Ever used PrEP, N=48 n (row %)	Never used PrEP, N=346 n (row %)	p-value <sup>a</sup>
<b>Age, Median (IQR)</b>	24 (22–26)	24 (22–26)	24 (22–27)	0.665
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
White	95 (24.1)	28 (29.5)	67 (70.5)	<0.001
Black	193 (49.0)	9 (4.7)	184 (95.3)	
Hispanic	77 (19.5)	9 (11.7)	68 (88.3)	
Other	29 (7.4)	2 (6.9)	27 (93.1)	
<b>Sexual orientation</b>				
Gay	283 (71.8)	36 (12.7)	247 (87.3)	0.194
Bisexual	86 (21.8)	5 (5.8)	81 (94.2)	
Heterosexual/Other	25 (6.4)	7 (28.0)	18 (72.0)	
<b>Educational attainment</b>				
< HS	34 (8.7)	2 (5.9)	32 (94.1)	0.272
HS or GED	91 (23.2)	9 (9.9)	82 (90.1)	
College	268 (68.2)	36 (13.4)	232 (86.6)	
<b>Student (Full or part time)</b>				
Yes	121 (30.7)	16 (13.2)	105 (86.8)	0.480
No	273 (69.3)	32 (11.7)	241 (88.3)	
<b>Employed (Full or part time)</b>				
Yes	264 (67.0)	36 (13.6)	228 (86.4)	0.402
No	130 (33.0)	12 (9.2)	118 (90.8)	
<b>Health insurance</b>				
Yes	287 (73.8)	45 (15.7)	242 (84.3)	0.048
No	102 (26.2)	3 (2.9)	99 (97.1)	
<b>City</b>				
Chicago	238 (60.4)	37 (15.6)	201 (84.4)	0.151
Houston	156 (39.6)	11 (7.1)	145 (92.9)	
<b>Year of enrollment</b>				
2014	21 (5.3)	3 (14.3)	18 (85.7)	0.564
2015	359 (91.1)	44 (12.3)	315 (87.7)	
2016	14 (3.6)	1 (7.1)	13 (92.9)	
<b>Network size</b>				
0–5	85 (21.6)	5 (5.9)	80 (94.1)	0.002
6–14	85 (21.6)	9 (10.6)	76 (89.4)	
15–39	125 (31.7)	18 (14.4)	107 (85.6)	
>=40	99 (25.1)	16 (16.2)	83 (83.8)	



	Total, N=394 n (col %)	Ever used PrEP, N=48 n (row %)	Never used PrEP, N=346 n (row %)	p-value <sup>a</sup>
Median (IQR)	15 (6–40)	21 (10.5–50)	15 (6–30)	
<b>Gay community affiliation</b>				
Very much a part of	152 (38.7)	26 (17.1)	126 (82.9)	0.020
Somewhat a part of	181 (46.1)	19 (10.5)	162 (89.5)	
Not very much a part of	47 (12.0)	2 (4.3)	45 (95.7)	
Not at all a part of	13 (3.3)	1 (7.7)	12 (92.3)	
<b>Any STI history</b>				
Yes	84 (21.3)	17 (20.2)	67 (79.8)	0.024
No	310 (78.7)	31 (10.0)	279 (90.0)	
<b>Any condomless anal sex</b>				
Yes	284 (72.1)	41 (14.4)	103 (93.6)	0.012
No	110 (27.9)	7 (6.4)	243 (85.6)	
<b>Any HIV positive partner</b>				
Yes	58 (14.7)	15 (25.9)	43 (74.1)	0.002
No	336 (85.3)	33 (9.8)	303 (90.2)	
<b>Any group sex</b>				
Yes	136 (34.5)	31 (22.8)	105 (77.2)	<0.001
No	258 (65.5)	17 (6.6)	241 (83.4)	
<b>HIV test ever</b>				
Yes	374 (94.9)	47 (12.6)	327 (87.4)	0.436
No	20 (5.1)	1 (5.0)	19 (95.0)	
<b>HIV test past 2 years</b>				
Yes	350 (90.0)	45 (12.9)	305 (87.1)	0.187
No	39 (10.0)	1 (2.6)	38 (97.4)	

<sup>a</sup>P-value by logistic regression on ever use of PrEP adjusted for clustering by recruitment chain and RDS weights

**Table 2**

Multivariable Logistic Regression of PrEP Use on Participant Characteristics, N=394, YMAP HIV Negative Adult Cohort, Chicago and Houston 2014–2016

	Multivariable OR <sup>a</sup> (95% CI)	p-value
<b>Age in years</b>	0.93 (0.79–1.08)	0.321
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>		
White	1.0 (ref)	—
Black	0.16 (0.06–0.43)	<0.001
Hispanic	0.56 (0.19–1.69)	0.294
Other	0.49 (0.08–3.17)	0.442
<b>City</b>		
Houston	1.0 (ref)	—
Chicago	2.41 (1.01–5.75)	0.048
<b>Health insurance</b>	4.55 (0.65–31.8)	0.122
<b>Network size, median split ( 15 vs. &lt;15)</b>	2.29 (1.10–4.79)	0.029
<b>Any HIV positive partner</b>	4.71 (1.69–13.1)	0.004
<b>Any group sex</b>	3.37 (1.45–7.86)	0.006

<sup>a</sup>Odds ratios generated from logistic regression on ever use of PrEP adjusted for clustering by recruitment chain and RDS weights. Odds ratios are adjusted for all variables for which estimates are presented. Age and health insurance status were retained in the model based on conceptual relevance despite lack of statistical significance.