S MONASH University

AlfredHealth

Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences

Behavioural interventions improve condom use and HIV testing uptake among female sex workers in China: A systematic review and meta-analysis

<u>Eric P.F. Chow^{1,2}, Keith Tung³, Joseph D. Tucker^{4,5}, Kathryn E. Muessig^{4,6}, Shu Su³, Xiaohu Zhang^{7,8}, Jun Jing⁸, and Lei Zhang^{1,3,8}</u>

"Central Clinical School, Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences, Monsch University, Mebourne, VIC, Australia: "Medicume Sexual Health Centre, Afred Health, Mebourne, VIC, Australia: "The Kirby Institute, UNSV Australia, Sydney, NSV, Australia, "The University of North Carolina Project-Chrina, Guargehou, Chrina: "London, School of Hypeine and Topcied Medicine, London, United Kingdom, "Obejartment of Health Behavior, Gillings School of Clobal Public Health at the University of North Carolina a: Chrina Food and Drug Administration Institute of Executive Development, Beijing, Chrina. "Research Center for Public Health, School of Medicine, Tangtua University, Beijing, Chrina."

Background

- A meta-analysis showed the risk of HIV among FSW is 50 times higher than that of the general female worldwide¹
- Chinese FSW
 - Officially illegal in China
 - low education level & HIV knowledge
- HIV intervention for Chinese FSW
 - Health Education Programs
 - Comprehensive Intervention Programs

¹Baral S et al. Lancet Infect Dis. 2012; 12:538-549.

SMONASH University 🌉 AlfredHealth

Aim

- To examine the differences in the effectiveness of these intervention strategies.
 - Types of intervention
 - Health Education Programs
 - Comprehensive Intervention Programs
 - Duration of the intervention strategies
 ≤ 12 months vs > 12 months
 - Number of follow-up sessions in the intervention
 One vs more than one follow-ups

MONASH University

Methods

Five databases were used

> English: PubMed, Embase

Publiced Www.enkinet

12

14

- Chinese: VIP Chinese Journal Database, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), Wanfang Data
- Publication from Jan 2000 to Dec 2013
- MeSH and free-text terms: ('human immunodeficiency virus' OR 'HIV' OR 'Acquired immune deficiency syndrome' OR 'AIDS') AND ('prevention' OR 'intervention' OR 'control') AND ('female sex workers' OR 'commercial sex workers' OR 'wome who sell sex' OR 'FSW' or 'CSW') AND ('China' OR 'Chinese')

S MONASH University AlfredHealth

Selection criteria

- Studies
 - Randomised controlled trails
 - Non-randomised before-and-after studies
- Participants
 - Females who self-reported as sex workers and who were specifically targeted by intervention
- Interventions
 - Behavioural or social interventions that were designed to increase condom use, HIV testing uptake
 - Excluded pharmaceutical (e.g. PEP), cognitive (e.g. HIV knowledge) interventions

S MONASH University 🌉 AlfredHealth

۱5

13

Outcome measures

- Changes in condom use
 - > In the last sex act, always condom use in the past 1 month
 - Unspecified, regular partners, commercial clients
- HIV testing uptake
 - > Any testing within the past 12 months

1

Results

- 569 records based on keyword searches
- 128 studies were included in the meta-analysis
 > 98 (77%) used comprehensive intervention
 - program ≥ 29 (23%) used health education program only
 - > 1 used mixed methods

MONASH University 🌉 AlfredHealth

No RCT

Results – condom use (last act)			
Outcomes	Effect of intervention Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Significance between interventions (p-value)	
Condom use with any partners	5.0 (3.4-7.2)***		
Comprehensive Intervention Program	3.9 (2.6-5.9)***	0.162	
Health Education Program	7.6 (3.3-17.3)***	0.162	
Intervention period ≤12 months	3.8 (2.4-6.1)***	0.146	
Intervention period >12 months	6.9 (3.6-12.9)***		
Intervention with 1 follow-up	4.0 (2.8-5.7)***	0.022	
Intervention with >1 follow-ups	20.3 (5.2-78.8)***	0.023	
Condom use with regular partners	2.3 (1.8-2.9)***	100 C	
Comprehensive Intervention Program	2.5 (1.9-3.2)***	0.004	
Health Education Program	1.3 (0.9-1.9)***		
Intervention period ≤12 months	2.3 (1.8-2.9)***	0.971	
Intervention period >12 months	2.3 (1.5-3.6)***		
Intervention with 1 follow-up	2.1 (1.6-2.7)***	0.164	
Intervention with >1 follow-ups	3.4 (1.8-6.5)***		
Condom use with commercial clients	3.5 (3.1-4.1)***	100 C	
Comprehensive Intervention Program	3.5 (3.0-4.1)***	0.638	
Health Education Program	3.8 (2.7-5.3)***		
Intervention period ≤12 months	3.4 (2.8-4.2)***	0.673	
Intervention period >12 months	3.6 (3.0-4.4)***		
Intervention with 1 follow-up	3.3 (2.8-3.8)***	0.006	
Intervention with >1 follow-ups	5.6 (4.0-7.8)***		

Results – condom use (past one month)				
Outcomes	Effect of intervention Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Significance between interventions (p-value)		
Always condom use with any partners	3.1 (2.0-4.7)***	-		
Comprehensive Intervention Program	3.4 (2.1-5.4)***	0.595		
Health Education Program	2.6 (1.1-6.3)***			
Intervention period ≤12 months	2.5 (1.5-4.2)***	0.083		
Intervention period >12 months	5.3 (2.7-10.5)***			
Intervention with 1 follow-up	3.3 (2.0-5.6)***	0.517		
Intervention with >1 follow-ups	2.5 (1.3-4.8)***			
Always condom use with regular partners	2.3 (1.7-3.1)***	-		
Comprehensive Intervention Program	2.5 (1.67-3.6)***	0.139		
Health Education Program	1.6 (1.13-2.4)**			
Intervention period ≤12 months	2.0 (1.40-2.9)***	0.326		
Intervention period >12 months	2.8 (1.63-4.9)***			
Intervention with 1 follow-up	2.4 (1.7-3.4)***	0.293		
Intervention with >1 follow-ups	1.6 (0.8-3.2)			
Always condom use with commercial clients	3.4 (2.8-4.0)***	-		
Comprehensive Intervention Program	3.2 (2.6-3.9)***	0.212		
Health Education Program	4.1 (3.0-5.6)***			
Intervention period ≤12 months	3.2 (2.5-4.0)***	0.492		
Intervention period >12 months	3.6 (2.8-4.7)***			
Intervention with 1 follow-up	3.2 (2.7-3.8)***	0.355		
Intervention with >1 follow-ups	4.3 (2.4-8.0)***			

Results – HIV testing

Outcomes	Effect of intervention Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Significance between interventions (p-value)
Tested for HIV in the past 12 months	4.6 (2.9-7.4)***	100 C
Comprehensive Intervention Program	8.1 (4.0-16.7)***	0.015*
Health Education Program	2.7 (1.6-4.5)***	
Intervention period ≤12 months	3.8 (2.3-6.4)***	0.246
Intervention period >12 months	8.1 (2.5-26.1)***	
Intervention with 1 follow-up	3.9 (2.4-6.4)***	0.331
Intervention with >1 follow-ups	11.6 (1.4-97.6)***	

S MONASH University AlfredHealth

l 10

ation title 28th February 2011 12

Conclusions

- Summarised 128 behavioural intervention studies.
- Increased condom use is more likely in programs with multiple session interventions.
 - Allow space and time for establishing the necessary trust between FSW and health promotion educators
 - Reinforce messages for safer sex at each follow-up visit
 Allow more time for the individuals to adopt a new
 - behaviour

Conclusions

- Comprehensive intervention programs are more effective in increasing HIV testing uptakes than health education alone.
 - \succ CIP not only promotes safe sex information, but also links FSW to HIV testing services
 - Regular HIV testing is important
- Intervention with extended duration of implementation (over 12 months) do not further improve condom use and HIV testing uptake.

```
MONASH University 🌉 AlfredHealth
```

sentation title 28th February 2011 | 11

17

MONASH University 🌉 AlfredHealth

Implications

- Condom use and HIV testing uptake were improved by the behavioural interventions
- High risk subgroups of FSW remain high priority for intervention
 - Poor working environment
 - Low education level
 - Inconsistent condom use
- Extend to male clients of FSW
- Effectiveness of intervention should focus on the content and delivery through multiple sessions.

MONASH University 🌉 AlfredHealth

Presentation title 28th February 2011 | 13

Citation

Chow EPF, Tung K, Tucker JD, Muessig KE, Su S, Zhang X, Jing J, Zhang L. Behavioral interventions improve condom use and HIV testing uptake among female sex workers in China: A systematic review and meta-analysis. <u>AIDS Patient Care and STDs</u>. 2015; 29(8): 454-460. PMID 26217931.

Dr Eric Chow echow@mshc.org.au

SMONASH University 🌉 AlfredHealth

l 14