

## BACKGROUND

Gay, bisexual & other men who have sex with men (GBMSM) continue to be disproportionately impacted by HIV.

Scale up of, and access to, sexual health services are urgently needed to ameliorate the HIV pandemic.

This study examined impacts of **Structural Violence** & **Resiliency** factors on **Access to Sexual Health Services** among GBMSM worldwide.

## METHODS

**DATA** n=2,172 GBMSM  
30-minute online 2019 Global Men's Health & Rights Survey, open November 2019 through January 2020  
10 languages: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Indonesian, Kiswahili, Portuguese, Spanish, Russian, & Vietnamese  
Online convenience sampling (e.g. email, listservs, gay dating apps, networks & websites)

## ANALYSES

GEE logistic regression models with robust standard errors, accounting for clustering by country to assess associations between structural violence & resiliency factors and accessibility of 12 different sexual health services.

## MEASURES

### Structural Violence

**Childhood Sexual Abuse (CSA):** CSA if response to: "How old were you the first time you had a sexual experience?" was less than 16; AND "Was it against your will" was "Yes"; AND response to "How old was the person with whom you had sex" was "About five or more years older than I was".

**Criminalization-related Discrimination Experience:** 13 item question asking, "Have you ever experienced any of the following because you were perceived to be gay | bisexual | MSM?" check all that apply. (e.g., "Someone called the police on you. or, Someone evicted you from your home"). Criminalization-related discrimination was coded if 1 or more was checked.

**Sexual Stigma:** 7 item scale (e.g., "In your country, how many people believe that male homosexuals are disgusting?") ranging from "none" to "all".

**Health Provider Discrimination:** 3 item scale (e.g., "In the last 6 months, has a health care provider refused to treat you because you are gay | bisexual | MSM?") ranging from "No, never" to "Yes more than 5 times".

### Resiliency

**Comfort w/ Provider:** 2 item scale (e.g., "In your country, how comfortable do you feel discussing your sexual health concerns with your health care provider?") ranging from "very comfortable" to "very uncomfortable".

**Community Engagement:** 10 item scale (e.g., "During the past 6 months, how often have you participated in gay | bisexual | MSM social groups or in activities such as a book or cooking club?") ranging from "Never"; to "More than 12 times".

### Health Services Access

Accessibility of 12 different HIV services (e.g., "In your community, how accessible is free or affordable HIV testing?") along a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Completely accessible" to "Completely inaccessible". For current analysis we dichotomized the continuous outcome as poor access for anything less than "Somewhat accessible".

# Structural Violence Hinders & Resiliency Enables Access to Sexual Health Services for Gay, Bisexual and other men who have Sex with Men Worldwide: New #GMHR Findings

Sonya Arreola<sup>1</sup>, Doan Thanh Tung<sup>2</sup>, Jeffrey Walimbwa<sup>3</sup>, Diego Solares<sup>4</sup>, & George Ayala<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Mpact Global, Oakland, United States

<sup>2</sup>Lighthouse Social Enterprise, Ha Noi

<sup>3</sup>ISHTAR, Nairobi, Kenya

<sup>4</sup>Consultant for MPact, Hong Kong, Hong Kong, SAR of China



[www.MPactglobal.org](http://www.MPactglobal.org)

## RESULTS

**Structural Violence:** Poor access to all 12 services were significantly associated with greater sexual-stigma. Additionally, poor access to condoms, lubricants, and HIV-treatment services were associated with more provider-stigma; and poor access to lubricants, HIV-testing, PrEP, STI-testing, STI-treatment, and PWUD-support services were associated with criminalization-related discrimination.

**Resiliency:** Good access to all 12 services were associated with having comfort with providers. Additionally, good access to HIV-prevention, lubricants, HIV-testing, PrEP, STI-testing, STI-treatment, HIV-care, PWUD-support and community-support services access were each associated with being community engaged.

Structural Violence and Resiliency by Sexual Health Services for GBMSM Worldwide

	Prevention Programs			Condoms			Lubricants			HIV Testing		
	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value
<b>Structural Violence</b>												
CSA	1.4	0.84, 2.36	0.197	0.97	0.65, 1.43	0.861	0.75	0.45, 1.26	0.278	1.02	0.68, 1.51	0.940
Discrim Experiences	0.81	0.62, 1.05	0.114	0.98	0.79, 1.21	0.823	0.72	0.57, 0.92	0.008	0.76	0.61, 0.94	0.011
Sexual Stigma	0.90	0.86, 0.94	0.000	0.94	0.90, 0.97	0.000	0.95	0.91, 0.99	0.007	0.96	0.93, 0.99	0.016
Health Provider Discrimination	0.99	0.92, 1.07	0.819	0.95	0.91, 0.999	0.046	0.90	0.83, 0.97	0.007	1.00	0.95, 1.04	0.883
<b>Resiliency</b>												
Comfort w/ Provider	1.23	1.16, 1.31	0.000	1.13	1.08, 1.17	0.000	1.17	1.11, 1.24	0.000	1.20	1.15, 1.26	0.000
Community Engagement	1.04	1.01, 1.06	0.005	1.02	1.00, 1.04	0.083	1.04	1.01, 1.06	0.002	1.05	1.03, 1.07	0.000

	PrEP			STI Testing			STI Tx			Mental Health		
	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value
<b>Structural Violence</b>												
CSA	1.798	0.93, 3.47	0.080	0.67	0.41, 1.08	0.102	0.97	0.55, 1.71	0.906	0.81	0.35, 1.90	0.627
Discrim Experiences	0.771	0.55, 1.08	0.127	0.62	0.49, 0.78	0.000	0.58	0.45, 0.74	0.000	0.77	0.55, 1.09	0.144
Sexual Stigma	0.872	0.82, 0.92	0.000	0.93	0.90, 0.97	0.000	0.87	0.84, 0.91	0.000	0.90	0.84, 0.95	0.000
Health Provider Discrimination	0.893	0.79, 1.00	0.058	0.98	0.93, 1.04	0.577	0.96	0.90, 1.03	0.284	0.93	0.83, 1.03	0.173
<b>Resiliency</b>												
Comfort w/ Provider	1.186	1.09, 1.29	0.000	1.19	1.13, 1.25	0.000	1.24	1.17, 1.32	0.000	1.26	1.15, 1.38	0.000
Community Engagement	1.054	1.02, 1.08	0.000	1.04	1.02, 1.06	0.001	1.03	1.01, 1.06	0.010	1.01	0.98, 1.05	0.518

	HIV Care			HIV Tx			PWUD Services			Community Support		
	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value
<b>Structural Violence</b>												
CSA	1.10	0.68, 1.77	0.700	1.42	0.92, 2.19	0.115	0.57	0.25, 1.26	0.162	0.45	0.18, 1.17	0.102
Discrim Experiences	0.79	0.62, 1.00	0.053	0.81	0.64, 1.02	0.076	0.72	0.53, 0.98	0.035	0.84	0.61, 1.16	0.296
Sexual Stigma	0.92	0.88, 0.96	0.000	0.93	0.90, 0.97	0.000	0.93	0.89, 0.98	0.005	0.94	0.89, 0.99	0.023
Health Provider Discrimination	0.98	0.93, 1.04	0.570	1.08	1.02, 1.13	0.004	0.93	0.84, 1.02	0.108	1.04	0.97, 1.13	0.268
<b>Resiliency</b>												
Comfort w/ Provider	1.26	1.20, 1.33	0.000	1.27	1.21, 1.34	0.000	1.22	1.13, 1.31	0.000	1.32	1.21, 1.44	0.000
Community Engagement	1.02	1.00, 1.05	0.037	1.02	1.00, 1.04	0.084	1.04	1.01, 1.07	0.013	1.07	1.04, 1.10	0.000

## CONCLUSIONS

Although bivariate analyses reveal associations between poor service access and CSA, no significant associations were found in current multivariable analyses. This may be because CSA is a distal determinant to outcome variables of interest in this study.

Findings support the importance of **structural interventions designed to decriminalize homosexuality, reduce societal sexual stigma, sensitize healthcare providers, and support community engagement among GBMSM.**