



The **Into?** Study: Report of Results

**Curtis Chan
Benjamin R. Bavinton
Mohamed Hammoud
Phillip Keen
Steven Philpot
Martin Holt
Andrew E. Grulich
Cherie Power
Garrett Prestage**
on behalf of the NSW HIV Prevention
Partnership Project



UNSW
SYDNEY



Kirby Institute

The *INTO?* Study: Report of Results

Curtis Chan¹, Benjamin R. Bavinton¹, Mohamed Hammoud¹, Phillip Keen¹, Steven Philpot¹, Martin Holt², Andrew E. Grulich¹, Cherie Power³, Garrett Prestage¹ on behalf of the NSW HIV Prevention Partnership Project

¹Kirby Institute, UNSW Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

²The Centre for Social Research in Health, UNSW Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

³NSW Ministry of Health, Sydney, Australia.

© Kirby Institute

Kirby Institute, UNSW Sydney

Sydney NSW 2052

Telephone: +61 2 9385 0900

Website: www.kirby.unsw.edu.au

Email: recpt@kirby.unsw.edu.au

ISBN: 978-0-7334-3934-6

Suggested citation:

Chan C, Bavinton B, Hammoud M, Keen P, Philpot S, Holt M, Grulich A, Power C, Prestage G on behalf of the NSW HIV Prevention Partnership Project (2020). The *INTO?* Study: Report of Results. Kirby Institute, UNSW Sydney: Sydney, Australia.

DOI: 10.26190/5f04f089b1067

This report is available online: <https://kirby.unsw.edu.au/report/into-study-report-results>

Report contact: Garrett Prestage, gprestage@kirby.unsw.edu.au

Report design: Mario Purba, mariofpurba@gmail.com

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all the participants of the study and the community partners who assisted with recruitment. We thank Neil Fraser of Positive Life NSW for assistance with recruitment.

The *INTO?* Study was developed with input from the Behavioural Surveillance Working Group of the NSW HIV Prevention Partnership Project. The members of the working group are Garrett Prestage (Co-chair), Cherie Power (Co-chair), Andrew Grulich, Matthew Vaughan, Martin Holt, Benjamin R Bavinton, Neil Fraser, Mohamed A Hammoud, Dale Halliday, and Phillip Keen.

The *INTO?* Study was supported by funding from a NHMRC Partnership Grant (GNT1092852), the NSW Ministry of Health, and UNSW Sydney.

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Acknowledgements | 2 |
| Contents | 3 |
| Executive Summary | 4 |
| List of tables | 5 |
| Introduction | 7 |
| Methods | 8 |
| Eligibility criteria | 8 |
| Recruitment and Data Collection | 8 |
| Measures | 8 |
| Results | 9 |
| Participant-level results | 9 |
| Demographics | 9 |
| Social Networks | 12 |
| HIV testing, PrEP use and HIV Viral Load | 13 |
| Dating and hook up app use | 15 |
| Sexual Behaviour in Previous 6 Months | 16 |
| Drug use in previous 6 months | 20 |
| Knowledge and Beliefs | 21 |
| Event-level results | 24 |
| Number of participants per event type | 24 |
| Partner demographics | 25 |
| Disclosure of HIV status, PrEP use and Viral Load | 27 |
| Sexual behaviour | 31 |
| Context of sex event | 33 |
| Drug use | 34 |
| Drug use without sex | 38 |
| Conclusion | 40 |
| References | 42 |

Executive Summary

The *INTO?* study was a cross-sectional survey of gay and bisexual men (GBM) in Australia conducted between December 2019 and March 2020. *INTO?* examined recent sexual and drug use events, with a focus on how biomedical HIV prevention methods may affect the negotiation of sex and drug use practices. Focusing on specific events rather than behaviour over a period of time can be useful to understand the complexities and specifics of intentions, behaviours, and disclosure of HIV status as individuals negotiate sex with different partners. Overall, 1045 participants who were recruited online via social media completed the survey.

Summary of key findings include:

- Participants had a mean age of 40 years, 77.9% were born in Australia, 59.2% were university educated and 65.5% were in full time employment. 78.7% were HIV-negative, 9.0% were HIV-positive and 12.3% either did not know their status or had never had an HIV test.
- Among participants who used a dating/hook up app, 63.4% disclosed their HIV status on their profile and 38.8% disclosed whether or not they were on PrEP.
- Among non-HIV-positive respondents, 22.3% reported not currently using PrEP and had anal sex without a condom with a casual partner in the last 6 months.
- More than a third of the sample (38.2%) reported illicit drug use. The most commonly used illicit drugs were cannabis (23.2%), ecstasy (16.6%), and cocaine (16.4%).
- Nearly all non-HIV-positive respondents (95.6%) believed they were unlikely or very unlikely to get infected with HIV.
- PrEP users were more knowledgeable than non-PrEP users about PrEP, HIV testing and undetectable viral load.
- Questions about five event categories were asked. Among participants who had casual sex in the last 6 months (n=750), a 'no condoms plus drug use' event was reported by 17.6% of participants, a 'no condoms plus no drug use' event was reported by 52.9% of participants, a 'condoms plus drug use' event by 3.1% and 'condoms plus no drug use' by 33.6%. Among all participants (n=1045), 'drug use plus no sex' was reported by 16.8% of participants.
- There was good coverage of condomless sex events by biomedical HIV prevention methods was high, with 79.6% of 'no condoms plus drug use' events and 65.2% of 'no condoms plus no drug use' events being covered by either pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) or treatment as prevention (TasP). Disclosure of HIV status was more likely during condomless sex events compared to events with covered by condom use.

List of tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. Gender identity | 9 |
| Table 2. Age | 9 |
| Table 3. Sexual identity | 10 |
| Table 4. Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander status | 10 |
| Table 5. Region of birth | 10 |
| Table 6. Highest level of education | 11 |
| Table 7. Employment status | 11 |
| Table 8. Student status | 11 |
| Table 9. Proportion of gay men in postcode of residence | 12 |
| Table 10. Proportion of friends who are gay men | 12 |
| Table 11. Proportion of free time spent with gay men | 12 |
| Table 12. Proportion of gay friends who use drugs | 13 |
| Table 13. HIV test recency | 13 |
| Table 14. HIV status | 14 |
| Table 15. HIV-positive participants on treatment and viral load | 14 |
| Table 16. Current PrEP use among non-HIV-positive men | 14 |
| Table 17. Participants who reported currently having a profile on a dating/hook up app | 15 |
| Table 18. Information on profile about status, PrEP and viral load among those who used apps | 15 |
| Table 19. Information on profile about sex and drug preferences among those who used apps | 16 |
| Table 20. Number of sexual partners in previous 6 months | 16 |
| Table 21. Types of sexual partners | 17 |
| Table 22. Boyfriend/spouse's status, PrEP use, and HIV viral load among those who had had sex with a boyfriend/spouse in the last 6 months | 17 |
| Table 23. Condom use with boyfriend/spouse among those who had had sex with a boyfriend/spouse in the last 6 months | 18 |
| Table 24. Frequency of group sex with casual partners among those who had sex with a casual partner in the last 6 months | 18 |
| Table 25. Frequency of chemsex with casual partners among those who had sex with a casual partner in the last 6 months | 19 |
| Table 26. Condom use with casual partners by sexual position among those who had sex with a casual partner in the last 6 months | 19 |
| Table 27. Any anal sex by condom use among those who had sex with a casual partner in the last 6 months | 19 |
| Table 28. Any anal sex with a casual partner in the last 6 months without condoms or PrEP among non-HIV-positive participants | 20 |
| Table 29. Drug use in the previous 6 months | 20 |
| Table 30. Perceived likelihood of getting HIV among non-HIV-positive men | 21 |
| Table 31. Agreement to statements about accessing PrEP | 21 |
| Table 32. Agreement to statements about PrEP and Undetectable Viral Load | 22 |
| Table 33. Agreement to statements about HIV testing and treatment | 23 |
| Table 34. Number of participants who reported a casual sex event by condom and drug use | 24 |
| Table 35. Number of participants who engaged in drug use event with no sex | 24 |
| Table 36. Partner's age | 25 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 37. Partner's country of birth _____ | 25 |
| Table 38. Partner's Sexual Identity _____ | 26 |
| Table 39. Number of prior sexual engagements with partner _____ | 26 |
| Table 40. Reported last casual sex event was a group sex event _____ | 27 |
| Table 41. Number of partners at group sex event _____ | 27 |
| Table 42. Disclosure to and from partner of HIV status _____ | 27 |
| Table 43. Method of disclosure of HIV status among those who knew their partner's HIV status and their partner knew their HIV status _____ | 28 |
| Table 44. Partner's HIV status _____ | 29 |
| Table 45. Coverage of PrEP and undetectable viral load _____ | 30 |
| Table 46. Disclosure to partner of PrEP use and viral load _____ | 30 |
| Table 47. Method of disclosure of PrEP use _____ | 31 |
| Table 48. Condom use and positioning _____ | 31 |
| Table 49. Withdrawal by sexual position during a sex event without condoms _____ | 32 |
| Table 50. Explanations provided for not using condoms during a sex event without condoms _____ | 32 |
| Table 51. Explanations provided for using condoms during a sex event with condoms _____ | 33 |
| Table 52. Location of sex event _____ | 33 |
| Table 53. Planned or unplanned sex event _____ | 34 |
| Table 54. Respondent's drug and alcohol use during event _____ | 34 |
| Table 55. When respondent took drugs _____ | 35 |
| Table 56. Respondent's reasons for drug use _____ | 36 |
| Table 57. Planned or unplanned drug use _____ | 36 |
| Table 58. Method of obtaining drugs _____ | 37 |
| Table 59. Partner/other people's drug use _____ | 37 |
| Table 60. People around when taking drugs without sex _____ | 38 |
| Table 61. Number of people around when taking drugs without sex _____ | 38 |
| Table 62. Where they took drugs without sex _____ | 39 |
| Table 63. Planned to have sex _____ | 39 |

Introduction

The introduction of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) and treatment as prevention (TasP) as HIV prevention strategies has raised questions about how gay and bisexual men (GBM) incorporate these strategies in negotiating sex. Beyond PrEP and TasP, drug use is another key factor in negotiating sex practices. There is evidence that GBM are more likely to use illicit drugs than their heterosexual counterparts (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2017). There is evidence that drug use is associated with HIV infection (Eu & Roth, 2014; Holt et al., 2015; Prestage et al., 2009) and sexual risk taking (Rawstorne, Digiusto, Worth, & Zablotska, 2007). Due to the association between drug use and HIV risk, further research of drug use behaviours among GBM would be useful to understand the effect of drug use on sexual behaviour. Previous research on sexual behaviour and drug use has typically relied on behavioural data aggregated over a period of time (such as the previous six months), which makes it difficult to understand the nuance of PrEP, TasP and drug use when GBM negotiate sex practices.

In the *INTO?* study, we sought to examine this complexity by analysing event-level data: what did people do during the last time they had sex or took drugs? Questions were asked about their sexual behaviour, knowledge of their partner's HIV status, PrEP use, HIV viral load and drug use, as well as disclosure of their HIV status, PrEP use, HIV viral load and drug use to their partner.

Methods

Eligibility criteria

Participants were eligible to participate if they resided in Australia, were 16 years of age or above, and if they identified as a gay or bisexual man, or identified as a man and reported sex with another man in the previous year.

Recruitment and Data Collection

Participants were recruited using targeted Facebook advertising and other social media websites such as Instagram and Twitter. Participants were also recruited via email if they had previously participated in other studies and had consented to being contacted for future research opportunities, and through an email to contacts of Positive Life NSW. Data were collected through the FAME system, using SurveyGizmo as the online survey platform. Recruitment began in December 2019 and ended in March 2020.

Measures

INTO? included questions concerning:

- Demographics
- Knowledge and beliefs about HIV, HIV testing, PrEP and HIV viral load
- HIV testing, HIV status, PrEP use and viral load
- Sexual behaviour over the last 6 months
- Drug use over the last 6 months

Beyond sexual behaviour and drug use over the last 6 months, focussed questions were asked about specific sexual encounters the participant had experienced in the last 6 months. Participants could provide information on multiple events. Each participant could receive questions about up to five events:

1. A casual sex event involving condomless sex and drug use at the event ('no condoms plus drug use' events)
2. A casual sex event involving condomless sex but no drug use at the event ('no condoms plus no drug use' events)
3. A casual sex event involving condom use and drug use at the event ('condoms plus drug use' events)
4. A casual sex event involving condom use but no drug use at the event ('condoms plus no drug use' events), and
5. An event where drugs were used but there was no sexual activity at the event ('drug use plus no sex' events).

For each of these event types, questions were asked about (where appropriate):

- Demographics of their sexual partner
- Condom and drug use
- Disclosure of HIV status, PrEP use and viral load
- Their sexual partner's HIV status, PrEP use, viral load and drug use
- Reasons for using and not using condoms
- Environmental and contextual factors (e.g. where they had sex, when they took drugs, etc)

Results

The results are presented in two sections. First, we report 'participant-level results' (that is, information about the individuals participating in the survey) and second, we report 'event-level results' (that is, information about the five types of events examined in the survey).

Participant-level results

Demographics

Gender identity

Nearly all participants identified as male. Most participants who identified as an identity other than male identified as non-binary (n=6).

Table 1. Gender identity

| | n | % |
|--------------|-------------|------|
| Man | 1037 | 99.2 |
| Other | 8 | 0.8 |
| Total | 1045 | |

Age

Participants ranged in age from 16 years to 76 years. The mean age was 40 years (SD=14.1) and the median age was 39 (IQR = 29-51).

Table 2. Age

| | n | % |
|--------------|-------------|------|
| Under 25 | 143 | 13.7 |
| 25-29 | 148 | 14.2 |
| 30-39 | 253 | 24.2 |
| 40-49 | 192 | 18.4 |
| 50-59 | 198 | 19.0 |
| Over 60 | 111 | 10.6 |
| Total | 1045 | |

Sexual identity

Participants were mostly gay men, with 12% identifying as bisexual. The most common sexual identities reported by those who selected 'other' were queer (n=10), pansexual (n=3), and asexual (n=3).

Table 3. Sexual identity

| | n | % |
|------------------|-------------|------|
| Gay / homosexual | 880 | 84.2 |
| Bisexual | 128 | 12.3 |
| Heterosexual | 13 | 1.2 |
| Other | 24 | 2.3 |
| Total | 1045 | |

Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander status

1.9% of the participants were of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent.

Table 4. Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander status

| | n | % |
|----------------|-------------|------|
| Non-Indigenous | 1025 | 98.1 |
| Indigenous | 20 | 1.9 |
| Total | 1045 | |

Region of birth

More than three-quarters (77.9%) of the participants were born in Australia. 11.1% came from other high-income English-speaking countries (New Zealand, United Kingdom, Republic of Ireland, United States, or Canada). Asian-born men made up 5.9% of the participants.

Table 5. Region of birth

| | n | % |
|---|-------------|------|
| Australia | 814 | 77.9 |
| High-income English-speaking countries ¹ | 116 | 11.1 |
| Asia ² | 62 | 5.9 |
| Europe ³ | 16 | 1.5 |
| Latin America and Caribbean | 23 | 2.2 |
| Africa | 7 | 0.7 |
| Other ⁴ | 7 | 0.7 |
| Total | 1045 | |

¹NZ, UK, Ireland, US, Canada

²Includes East Asia, South-East Asia, South Asia

³Russia is included as part of Europe

⁴Includes sub-Saharan Africa, Middle East, Northern Africa, Central Asia and the Pacific and Oceania

Education

59.2% of participants were university educated. A fifth of participants (20.2%) had a diploma or certificate. 13.7% of participants did not complete year 12.

Table 6. Highest level of education

| | n | % |
|---------------------------------|-------------|------|
| Up to year 10 | 72 | 6.9 |
| Completed high school (year 12) | 142 | 13.7 |
| Diploma or certificate | 209 | 20.2 |
| Undergraduate degree | 316 | 30.5 |
| Postgraduate degree | 298 | 28.7 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 8 | |
| Total | 1045 | |

Employment

Nearly two-thirds (65.5%) of participants were employed full time. 17.3% of participants were in part-time or casual employment.

Table 7. Employment status

| | n | % |
|------------------------------|-------------|------|
| Full-time | 681 | 65.5 |
| Part-time or casual | 180 | 17.3 |
| On pension/social security | 40 | 3.8 |
| Retired | 61 | 5.9 |
| Unemployed or unable to work | 77 | 7.4 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 6 | |
| Total | 1045 | |

Student status

One fifth (20.3%) of the sample were studying. Of those studying, 59.5% were studying full time.

Table 8. Student status

| | n | % |
|---------------------|-------------|------|
| Not studying | 824 | 79.7 |
| Full time | 125 | 12.1 |
| Part time | 85 | 8.2 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 11 | |
| Total | 1045 | |

Postcode

A previous analysis using Australian Census data classified all Australian postcodes by the proportion of men in the postcode who are estimated to identify as gay (Callander et al., 2020). Most participants in *INTO?* lived in postcodes in which fewer than 5% of the men identified as gay. More than a quarter (28.2%) lived in a postcode where greater than 5% of the men identified as gay.

Table 9. Proportion of gay men in postcode of residence

| | n | % |
|----------------|-------------|------|
| ≥20% gay | 83 | 8.0 |
| 10 to <20% gay | 59 | 5.7 |
| 5 to <10% gay | 149 | 14.4 |
| <5% gay | 741 | 71.8 |
| Not reported | 13 | |
| Total | 1045 | |

Social Networks

More than a quarter of participants (26.6%) reported that most or all their friends were gay men.

Table 10. Proportion of friends who are gay men

| | n | % |
|--------------|-------------|------|
| None | 53 | 5.1 |
| A few | 336 | 32.2 |
| Some | 379 | 36.3 |
| Most | 267 | 25.6 |
| All | 10 | 1.0 |
| Total | 1045 | |

About half (50.9%) spent at least some of their free time with gay male friends while 10.0% did not spend any free time with gay male friends.

Table 11. Proportion of free time spent with gay men

| | n | % |
|--------------|-------------|------|
| None | 104 | 10.0 |
| A little | 410 | 39.2 |
| Some | 356 | 34.1 |
| A lot | 175 | 16.8 |
| Total | 1045 | |

More than one third (34.1%) of participants believed they did not have any gay friends who used drugs. More than one eighth (13.6%) believed most or all their gay friends used drugs.

Table 12. Proportion of gay friends who use drugs

| | n | % |
|---------------------|-------------|------|
| None | 355 | 34.1 |
| A few | 419 | 40.2 |
| About half | 126 | 12.1 |
| Most | 122 | 11.7 |
| All | 20 | 1.9 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 3 | |
| Total | 1045 | |

HIV testing, PrEP use and HIV Viral Load

More than half (55.9%) of participants had had an HIV test within the last 6 months, while 12.0% had never had an HIV test.

Table 13. HIV test recency

| | n | % |
|-----------------------|-------------|------|
| Never had an HIV test | 124 | 12.0 |
| Less than a week ago | 37 | 3.6 |
| 1-4 weeks ago | 179 | 17.3 |
| 1-6 months ago | 363 | 35.0 |
| 7-12 months ago | 83 | 8.0 |
| 1-2 years ago | 91 | 8.8 |
| 2-5 years ago | 73 | 7.0 |
| More than 5 years ago | 86 | 8.3 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 9 | |
| Total | 1045 | |

Most of the participants indicated that they were HIV-negative, while 9.0% were HIV-positive and 12.3% either did not know their status or had never had an HIV test.

Table 14. HIV status

| | n | % |
|-----------------------|-------------|------|
| HIV-positive | 94 | 9.0 |
| HIV-negative | 819 | 78.7 |
| Don't know/unsure | 4 | 0.4 |
| Never had an HIV test | 124 | 11.9 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 4 | |
| Total | 1045 | |

Almost all 94 HIV-positive participants were on antiretroviral treatment (94.7%). Of the 89 HIV-positive participants on treatment, all reported having an undetectable viral load.

Table 15. HIV-positive participants on treatment and viral load

| | n | % |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------|
| On treatment | 89 | 94.7 |
| Undetectable | 89 | 94.7 |
| Defectable | 1 | 1.1 |
| Don't know/unsure of viral load | 4 | 4.3 |
| Total | 94 | |

Two-thirds (66.5%) of the 951 HIV-negative and untested (non-HIV-positive) men were not currently on PrEP. Of those on PrEP, most were taking daily PrEP (64.3%).

Table 16. Current PrEP use among non-HIV-positive men

| | n | % |
|------------------------|------------|------|
| Non-PrEP user | 630 | 66.5 |
| Daily PrEP user | 276 | 29.1 |
| Event-driven PrEP user | 41 | 4.3 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 4 | |
| Total | 951 | |

Dating and hook up app use

At the time of the survey, over two-thirds of the participants (68.4%) currently had a profile on a dating/hook-up mobile app (e.g. Grindr, Scruff, Tinder).

Table 17. Participants who reported currently having a profile on a dating/hook up app

| | n | % |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------|
| Had a profile on app | 714 | 68.4 |
| Did not have profile on app | 330 | 31.6 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 1 | |
| Total | 1045 | |

Just under two-thirds (63.4%) of the 714 participants with a profile on a dating/hook up app disclosed their HIV status on their profile. Most of these were HIV-negative men. Over a third of men who reported having a profile on an app (38.8%) disclosed their PrEP use or non-use, and most of these were PrEP users. Nearly one third of participants (30.3%) disclosed when they had their last HIV/STI test.

Table 18. Information on profile about status, PrEP and viral load among those who used apps

| | n | % |
|-------------------------|------------|------|
| HIV Status | 453 | 63.4 |
| Negative | 416 | 58.3 |
| Positive | 37 | 5.2 |
| PrEP use or non-use | 277 | 38.8 |
| PrEP user | 248 | 34.7 |
| Non-PrEP user | 29 | 4.1 |
| Undetectable viral load | 37 | 5.2 |
| Last HIV/STI test | 216 | 30.3 |
| Total | 714 | |

Over one third (35.3%) of the 714 participants with a profile on a dating/hook up app indicated their condom preferences on their profile. Of this group, 63.5% indicated they would prefer sex with condoms and 39.7% indicated a preference for sex without condoms, with 8 respondents selecting both options. One third of the participants with app profiles indicated that they did not use drugs. More than one eighth (13.6%) disclosed that they preferred not to have sex with drug users, and roughly the same proportion of respondents (13.3%) indicated they were open to using drugs themselves.

Table 19. Information on profile about sex and drug preferences among those who used apps

| | n | % |
|---|------------|------|
| Condom preference | 252 | 35.3 |
| Prefers sex with condoms | 160 | 22.4 |
| Prefers sex without condoms | 100 | 14.0 |
| Does not use drugs | 240 | 33.6 |
| Prefers to not have sex with drug users | 97 | 13.6 |
| Open to drug use | 95 | 13.3 |
| Seeking chemsex | 38 | 5.3 |
| Total | 714 | |

Sexual Behaviour in Previous 6 Months

In the last 6 months, 7.2% of participants reported having no sexual partners, and one quarter (24.6%) reported only one sexual partner. Of those who had only one sexual partner, three quarters (75.8%) indicated they had a boyfriend/spouse. More than a quarter (26.1%) of the sample reported having more than 11 sexual partners in the last 6 months.

Table 20. Number of sexual partners in previous 6 months

| | n | % |
|--------------|-------------|------|
| None | 75 | 7.2 |
| One | 257 | 24.6 |
| 2 - 5 | 292 | 27.9 |
| 6 - 10 | 148 | 14.2 |
| 11 - 20 | 130 | 12.4 |
| More than 20 | 143 | 13.7 |
| Total | 1045 | |

Half the sample (50.4%) had had sex with a boyfriend or spouse in the last 6 months, while 71.9% reported having sex with a casual partner or fuckbuddy. 29.6% of participants (n=309) reported having sex with both a boyfriend/spouse and one or more casual partners in the last 6 months.

Table 21. Types of sexual partners

| | n | % |
|--|-------------|------|
| No sexual partners | 75 | 7.2 |
| Had sex with boyfriend or spouse | 526 | 50.4 |
| Had sex with casual partner or fuckbuddy | 750 | 71.9 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 2 | |
| Total | 1045 | |

Of the 526 participants who had sex with a boyfriend/spouse in the last 6 months, 84.0% had partners who were HIV-negative and 19.2% had a partner on PrEP. 8.7% had an HIV-positive partner, most of whom had an undetectable viral load. 6.3% did not know their partner's HIV status. Of the 46 respondents who had an HIV-positive partner, 27 (58.7%) were not HIV-positive. Of these 27 non-positive respondents with an HIV-positive partner, 11 (40.7%) were currently on PrEP.

Table 22. Boyfriend/spouse's status, PrEP use, and HIV viral load among those who had had sex with a boyfriend/spouse in the last 6 months

| Status | n | % |
|-------------------------|------------|------|
| Negative | 442 | 84.0 |
| On PrEP | 101 | 19.2 |
| Positive | 46 | 8.7 |
| Undetectable | 44 | 8.4 |
| Detectable | 0 | 0 |
| Don't know viral load | 2 | 0.4 |
| Don't know/never tested | 33 | 6.3 |
| Total | 526 | |

Of the 526 participants who had sex with a boyfriend/spouse in the last 6 months, 79.6% never used condoms with their boyfriend/spouse. 8.1% always used condoms with their boyfriend/spouse. A small proportion (5.4%) did not have any anal sex with their boyfriend/spouse.

Table 23. Condom use with boyfriend/spouse among those who had had sex with a boyfriend/spouse in the last 6 months

| | n | % |
|---------------------|------------|------|
| Never | 413 | 79.6 |
| Occasionally | 23 | 4.4 |
| Most of time | 13 | 2.5 |
| Every time | 42 | 8.1 |
| No anal sex | 28 | 5.4 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 7 | |
| Total | 526 | |

Of the 750 participants who reported having sex with casual partners (including fuckbuddies) in the last 6 months, half did not have any group sex in the last six months. 16.8% had group sex once and one third (33.5%) had group sex more than once with casual partners.

Table 24. Frequency of group sex with casual partners among those who had sex with a casual partner in the last 6 months

| | n | % |
|---------------------|------------|------|
| Never | 357 | 49.7 |
| Once | 121 | 16.8 |
| Occasionally | 189 | 26.3 |
| Often | 42 | 5.8 |
| Always | 10 | 1.4 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 31 | |
| Total | 750 | |

Of those who reported having sex with casual partners (including fuckbuddies) in the last 6 months, three quarters (74.7%) had never engaged in chemsex with casual partners. One sixth (17.0%) had chemsex at least once with casual partners in the last six months.

Table 25. Frequency of chemsex with casual partners among those who had sex with a casual partner in the last 6 months

| | n | % |
|---------------------|------------|------|
| Never | 537 | 74.7 |
| Once | 60 | 8.3 |
| Occasionally | 74 | 10.3 |
| Often | 28 | 3.9 |
| Always | 20 | 2.8 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 31 | |
| Total | 750 | |

Three-quarters of those who reported having sex with casual partners (73.5%) reported having some condomless anal sex in the last 6 months. This did not vary by sexual position (whether they were insertive or receptive). Nearly six out of ten (58.3%) reported having some sex with condoms. This also did not vary by sexual position. Nearly half (n=340, 45.3%) reported having sex with condoms and sex without condoms in the last six months.

Table 26. Condom use with casual partners by sexual position among those who had sex with a casual partner in the last 6 months

| | Sex with condoms while insertive | Sex with condoms while receptive | Sex without condoms while insertive | Sex without condoms while receptive |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Never | 411 (57.2) | 397 (55.3) | 281 (39.1) | 301 (41.9) |
| Once | 83 (11.6) | 86 (12.0) | 79 (11.0) | 78 (10.8) |
| Occasionally | 130 (18.1) | 131 (18.2) | 155 (21.6) | 132 (18.4) |
| Often | 56 (7.8) | 62 (8.6) | 107 (14.9) | 112 (15.6) |
| Always | 38 (5.3) | 42 (5.8) | 97 (13.5) | 96 (13.4) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 32 | 32 | 31 | 31 |
| Total | | | 750 | |

Table 27. Any anal sex by condom use among those who had sex with a casual partner in the last 6 months

| | n | % |
|------------------------------|------------|------|
| Any anal sex with condoms | 437 | 58.3 |
| Any anal sex without condoms | 552 | 73.5 |
| Total | 750 | |

Of the 951 non-HIV-positive participants, 22.3% reported not currently using PrEP (either daily or event driven) and also having sex with a casual partner without condoms.

Table 28. Any anal sex with a casual partner in the last 6 months without condoms or PrEP among non-HIV-positive participants

| | n | % |
|--|------------|------|
| Had anal sex without condoms and not on PrEP | 212 | 22.3 |
| Total | 951 | |

Drug use in previous 6 months

61.7% of all participants reported some drug use. The most common drugs used were amyl, Viagra and cannabis. 11.8% used crystal methamphetamine in the last 6 months. 4.8% reported any injecting drug use.

Table 29. Drug use in the previous 6 months

| | n | % |
|---------------------------------|-------------|------|
| Amyl | 452 | 45.3 |
| Viagra | 301 | 30.2 |
| Cannabis | 231 | 23.2 |
| Ecstasy | 166 | 16.6 |
| Cocaine | 164 | 16.4 |
| Crystal Methamphetamine | 118 | 11.8 |
| GHB | 87 | 8.7 |
| Ketamine | 65 | 6.5 |
| Speed | 32 | 3.2 |
| Heroin | 4 | 0.4 |
| Injected drugs in last 6 months | 48 | 4.8 |
| Any drug use | 645 | 64.7 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 48 | |
| Total | 1045 | |

Knowledge and Beliefs

Nearly all respondents (95.6%) believed they were unlikely to get infected with HIV, with more than half (51.6%) believing it was very unlikely.

Table 30. Perceived likelihood of getting HIV among non-HIV-positive men

| | n | % |
|---------------------|------------|------|
| Very unlikely | 514 | 51.6 |
| Unlikely | 377 | 38.8 |
| Slightly unlikely | 50 | 5.2 |
| Slightly likely | 32 | 3.2 |
| Likely | 6 | 0.5 |
| Very likely | 6 | 0.6 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 2 | |
| Total | 947 | |

Knowledge about accessing PrEP was very high overall. As expected, PrEP users (those who reported current PrEP use, either daily or event driven) were more knowledgeable about how to access PrEP than non-PrEP users or HIV-positive men. This included knowing where to purchase PrEP, that the cost of PrEP is subsidised by the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme and knowing what health checks are involved in accessing PrEP.

Table 31. Agreement to statements about accessing PrEP

| | All participants n=1045 | Non-PrEP users n=630 | PrEP users n=318 | HIV-positive men n=94 |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| You need a doctor's prescription to get PrEP | 738 (90.4) | 433 (87.8) | 243 (97.2) | 61 (83.6) |
| Pharmacies in Australia sell PrEP | 723 (88.5) | 419 (84.8) | 239 (95.6) | 64 (87.7) |
| The cost of PrEP is subsidised by the government | 664 (81.4) | 357 (72.4) | 240 (96.0) | 67 (91.8) |
| While taking PrEP you should have a sexual health check every three months | 797 (97.7) | 476 (96.6) | 249 (99.6) | 72 (98.6) |
| Ordering PrEP from an online pharmacy can be cheaper than buying it at a local pharmacy in-store | 464 (57.8) | 274 (56.3) | 153 (61.9) | 38 (55.1) |
| Everyone who takes PrEP is required to have annual heart checks | 240 (29.8) | 193 (39.8) | 22 (8.9) | 24 (33.3) |
| Anyone who wants PrEP can get a prescription from their doctor | 581 (71.6) | 358 (73.2) | 166 (66.4) | 58 (79.5) |
| Only someone who is at risk of HIV is eligible for PrEP | 367 (45.5) | 192 (39.5) | 145 (58.5) | 29 (40.3) |
| Everyone who takes PrEP should have regular kidney function tests | 680 (84.2) | 384 (79.2) | 229 (91.6) | 67 (91.8) |
| It is illegal to import PrEP off the internet | 393 (48.9) | 303 (62.1) | 67 (27.4) | 24 (33.8) |

PrEP users and HIV-positive men were more knowledgeable than non-PrEP users about the efficacy of PrEP, that PrEP does not prevent other STIs, and that HIV-positive men with an undetectable viral load cannot transmit HIV. PrEP users were more likely than non-PrEP users and HIV-positive men to know about the effectiveness of 'on-demand' PrEP dosing, but this was known by only half of the PrEP users.

Table 32. Agreement to statements about PrEP and Undetectable Viral Load

| | All participants n=1045 | Non-PrEP users n=630 | PrEP users n=318 | HIV-positive men n=94 |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Taking PrEP can stop an HIV-negative person from getting HIV | 715 (87.2) | 405 (81.5) | 239 (95.6) | 71 (97.3) |
| Taking PrEP can reduce the chance of getting other sexually transmitted infections | 108 (13.2) | 92 (18.6) | 11 (4.4) | 6 (8.2) |
| Everyone who takes PrEP is expected to use condoms as well | 420 (51.8) | 291 (59.6) | 110 (44.0) | 19 (26.0) |
| One effective way to take PrEP is by taking a pill every day | 757 (93.2) | 447 (91.4) | 240 (96.0) | 70 (95.9) |
| One effective way to take PrEP is to take two pills before sex, one a day later, and one the day after that | 310 (38.3) | 149 (30.6) | 130 (52.2) | 31 (42.5) |
| HIV-positive men with an undetectable viral load cannot transmit HIV | 565 (70.5) | 280 (58.3) | 214 (86.3) | 71 (97.3) |
| In the absence of PrEP or undetectable viral load, being a top or bottom makes no difference to an HIV-negative person's risk of getting HIV | 349 (44.1) | 229 (48.3) | 85 (34.7) | 34 (46.6) |

Across the whole sample, knowledge about HIV testing and treatment was high. Similar levels of knowledge were observed between groups. However, PrEP users and HIV-positive men were slightly more likely than non-PrEP users to believe that HIV is no longer a death sentence because of treatment and were less likely to believe that you can only receive an HIV test at a sexual health centre.

Table 33. Agreement to statements about HIV testing and treatment

| | All participants n=1045 | Non-PrEP users n=630 | PrEP users n=318 | HIV-positive men n=94 |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| In Australia, most people who get HIV are gay and bisexual men. | 490 (61.6) | 277 (58.0) | 165 (67.4) | 47 (64.4) |
| Treatments mean that HIV is no longer a death sentence | 748 (93.5) | 433 (90.4) | 244 (98.4) | 71 (97.3) |
| When someone is diagnosed with HIV, it is good for their health to go on treatment as soon as possible | 783 (97.9) | 469 (97.9) | 245 (98.8) | 69 (94.5) |
| Gay men who are sexually active should get tested at least once a year | 742 (92.4) | 450 (93.4) | 225 (90.7) | 67 (91.8) |
| If a gay man has condomless sex with casual partners he should get tested about 4 times a year | 779 (97.1) | 460 (95.6) | 246 (99.2) | 73 (100) |
| If an HIV-negative man is not on PrEP and doesn't always use condoms he should get tested every three months | 778 (97.0) | 459 (95.4) | 246 (99.2) | 73 (100) |
| If you're in a monogamous relationship you don't need to have regular sexual health checks | 255 (31.8) | 158 (32.8) | 81 (32.8) | 15 (20.6) |
| You can only get tested for HIV at a sexual health centre | 83 (10.4) | 62 (12.9) | 15 (6.1) | 5 (6.9) |
| The AIDS Council or HIV organisation in my state offers HIV testing at several locations | 758 (94.9) | 452 (94.6) | 239 (96.4) | 66 (90.4) |

Event-level results

The following section shows analyses divided by the five previously described event types. These results are specifically about the most recent casual sex or drug use events stratified whether condoms or drugs were used. Participants could complete questions about multiple event types.

Number of participants per event type

The most common type of event reported by the 750 participants who had any casual sex in the last 6 months was a 'no condoms plus no drug use' event (52.9%), followed by a 'condoms plus no drug use' event (33.6%). Very few participants reported a 'condoms plus drug use' event (n=23, 3.1%) and further interpretations of results from this category should be treated with caution due to its small sample size. A quarter of the total sample (n=274, 26.2%) reported engaging in two or more event types. The most common combination was engaging in both types of event without drug use (n=162, 15.5%). 16.8% of all 1045 participants reported a 'drug use plus no sex' event.

Table 34. Number of participants who reported a casual sex event by condom and drug use

| | n | % |
|--|------------|------|
| No condoms plus drug use | 132 | 17.6 |
| No condoms plus no drug use | 397 | 52.9 |
| Condoms plus drug use | 23 | 3.1 |
| Condoms plus no drug use | 252 | 33.6 |
| Did not report on any sex event type | 163 | 21.7 |
| Had casual sex in last 6 months | 750 | |

Table 35. Number of participants who engaged in drug use event with no sex

| | n | % |
|---|-------------|------|
| Reported drug use plus no sex event | 176 | 16.8 |
| Did not report drug use plus no sex event | 869 | 83.2 |
| Total | 1045 | |

Partner demographics

Participants were asked about what they knew about their sexual partner on this occasion.

Partners were believed to be slightly older in the 'no condoms with drug use' event and youngest in the 'condoms with drug use' event.

Table 36. Partner's age

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Under 25 | 7 (5.8) | 46 (12.5) | 6 (27.3) | 27 (13.9) |
| 25-29 | 11 (9.2) | 61 (16.5) | 5 (22.7) | 43 (22.2) |
| 30-39 | 49 (40.8) | 130 (35.2) | 4 (18.2) | 72 (37.1) |
| 40-49 | 32 (26.7) | 80 (21.7) | 6 (27.3) | 33 (17.0) |
| 50-59 | 18 (15.0) | 40 (10.8) | 1 (4.5) | 14 (7.2) |
| Over 60 | 3 (2.5) | 12 (3.3) | 0 (0) | 58 (29.9) |
| Mean (SD) | 38.0 (9.8) | 35.7 (10.6) | 31.4 (9.7) | 33.8 (10.2) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 12 | 28 | 1 | 58 |
| Total | 132 | 397 | 23 | 252 |

In most cases, participants believed that most of their partners were born in Australia, except for the small number of participants reporting 'condom and drug use' events.

Table 37. Partner's country of birth

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Australia | 73 (58.4) | 245 (64.5) | 8 (36.4) | 127 (55.5) |
| Overseas | 43 (34.4) | 111 (29.2) | 13 (59.1) | 87 (38.0) |
| Don't know | 9 (7.2) | 24 (6.3) | 1 (4.5) | 15 (6.6) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 7 | 17 | 1 | 23 |
| Total | 132 | 397 | 23 | 252 |

Partners were more likely to be thought to be gay in both types of 'no condoms' events compared to both types of 'condoms' events. There was a higher proportion of perceived bisexual partners in both 'condoms' event categories.

Table 38. Partner's Sexual Identity

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Gay / homosexual | 109 (87.2) | 308 (81.1) | 16 (72.7) | 168 (73.0) |
| Bisexual | 10 (8.0) | 57 (15.0) | 5 (22.7) | 42 (18.3) |
| Heterosexual | 1 (0.8) | 3 (0.8) | 1 (4.5) | 6 (2.6) |
| Don't know | 5 (4.0) | 12 (3.2) | 0 (0) | 13 (5.7) |
| Other | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0.4) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 7 | 17 | 1 | 22 |
| Total | 132 | 397 | 23 | 252 |

Respondents were more likely to have previously had sex with their partner in the 'no condoms' event categories compared to the condom use event categories.

Table 39. Number of prior sexual engagements with partner

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| First time | 54 (42.9) | 173 (45.5) | 13 (59.1) | 129 (56.1) |
| Once | 12 (9.5) | 39 (10.3) | 2 (9.1) | 26 (11.3) |
| 2-5 times | 28 (22.2) | 89 (23.4) | 3 (13.6) | 50 (21.7) |
| 6-10 times | 12 (9.5) | 26 (6.8) | 0 (0) | 15 (6.5) |
| Over 10 times | 20 (15.9) | 53 (13.9) | 4 (18.2) | 10 (4.3) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 6 | 17 | 1 | 22 |
| Total | 132 | 397 | 23 | 252 |

Group sex event

Group sex events were more likely to be reported in the 'drug use' event categories compared to the 'no drug use' event categories. The number of partners at group sex events was most likely to be 2-5 for all event categories.

Table 40. Reported last casual sex event was a group sex event

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Was group sex event | 55 (41.7) | 64 (16.2) | 7 (46.7) | 36 (15.4) |
| Not reported | 0 | 1 | 8 | 18 |
| Total | 132 | 397 | 23 | 252 |

Table 41. Number of partners at group sex event

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 2-5 | 43 (78.2) | 53 (82.8) | 6 (100) | 28 (80.0) |
| 6-10 | 8 (14.5) | 7 (10.9) | 0 (0) | 6 (17.1) |
| Over 10 | 4 (7.3) | 2 (3.1) | 0 (0) | 1 (2.9) |
| Not reported | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 55 | 64 | 7 | 36 |

Disclosure of HIV status, PrEP use and Viral Load

Disclosure of HIV status between partners was least common at 'condoms plus no drug use' events, and most common in 'no condoms and drug use' events. There were similar levels of disclosure from and to partners in all the event categories.

Table 42. Disclosure to and from partner of HIV status

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Knew partner's status | 82 (66.7) | 236 (63.3) | 14 (60.9) | 129 (55.8) |
| Partner knew their status | 85 (69.1) | 243 (65.1) | 15 (65.2) | 142 (61.5) |
| Not reported | 9 | 24 | 0 | 21 |
| Total | 132 | 397 | 23 | 252 |

Methods of disclosure were not mutually exclusive. Of respondents who knew their partner's HIV status from Table 42, most were told before sex in all the event categories. Similarly, respondents who disclosed their HIV status to their partners from Table 42 generally did so before sex in all the event categories. Many disclosed their HIV status on their profile on a dating/hookup app and had also seen their partner's status on their profile.

Table 43. Method of disclosure of HIV status among those who knew their partner's HIV status and their partner knew their HIV status

| Disclosure to partner | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| App profile | 36 (42.4) | 107 (44.0) | 2 (13.3) | 81 (57.0) |
| Told before sex | 64 (75.3) | 182 (74.9) | 14 (93.3) | 101 (71.1) |
| Told after sex | 4 (4.7) | 13 (5.3) | 0 (0) | 5 (3.5) |
| Other method | 2 (2.4) | 11 (4.5) | 0 (0) | 2 (1.4) |
| Total | 85 | 243 | 15 | 142 |

| Disclosure from partner | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| App profile | 37 (45.1) | 90 (38.1) | 3 (21.4) | 58 (45.0) |
| Told before sex | 55 (67.1) | 180 (76.3) | 13 (92.9) | 94 (72.9) |
| Told after sex | 6 (7.3) | 12 (5.1) | 0 (0) | 5 (3.9) |
| Assumed, but not discussed | 8 (9.8) | 13 (5.5) | 0 (0) | 7 (5.4) |
| Other method | 2 (2.4) | 11 (4.7) | 0 (0) | 3 (2.3) |
| Total | 82 | 236 | 14 | 129 |

Partners were most likely to be believed to be HIV-positive by participants in 'no condoms plus drug use' events. In this event category, having HIV-positive partners was most likely to be reported by HIV-positive respondents (n=13) and PrEP users (n=8). Respondents were more likely to report that partners were on PrEP in 'no condoms' event categories compared to 'condoms' event categories.

Table 44. Partner's HIV status

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Negative | 58 (47.2) | 223 (59.9) | 13 (56.5) | 127 (55.0) |
| On PrEP | 44 (35.8) | 112 (30.1) | 2 (8.7) | 28 (12.1) |
| Not on PrEP | 11 (8.9) | 67 (18.0) | 8 (34.8) | 62 (26.8) |
| Don't know | 3 (2.4) | 41 (11.0) | 3 (13.0) | 35 (15.2) |
| Positive | 24 (19.5) | 12 (3.2) | 1 (4.3) | 2 (0.9) |
| Undetectable | 14 (11.4) | 9 (2.4) | 0 (0) | 1 (0.4) |
| Detectable | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Don't know viral load | 10 (8.1) | 3 (0.8) | 1 (4.3) | 1 (0.4) |
| Don't know | 41 (33.3) | 137 (36.8) | 9 (39.1) | 102 (44.2) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 9 | 25 | 0 | 21 |
| Total | 132 | 397 | 23 | 252 |

In 'condoms' events, there was a high level of use of biomedical prevention strategies by participants and partners, with the majority of 'no condoms plus drug use' events (79.6%) being covered by either daily PrEP or undetectable viral load use by participants or their partners and 65.2% of 'no condoms plus no drug use' events being covered. Even in the 'condoms plus no drug use' event, biomedical prevention was still used half the time (50.8%). However, a small number of participants reported non-daily PrEP use who also reported engaging in one of the 'no condoms' event categories, so there may be additional events covered by PrEP.

Table 45. Coverage of PrEP and undetectable viral load

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Respondent was on PrEP | 62 (47.0) | 184 (52.9) | 7 (30.4) | 102 (46.4) |
| Partner was on PrEP | 44 (35.8) | 112 (30.1) | 2 (8.7) | 28 (12.1) |
| Either respondent or partner was on PrEP | 77 (58.3) | 228 (57.4) | 7 (30.4) | 120 (47.6) |
| Respondent had an UVL | 32 (24.2) | 36 (9.1) | 1 (4.4) | 8 (3.2) |
| Partner had an UVL | 14 (11.4) | 9 (2.4) | 0 (0) | 1 (0.4) |
| Either respondent or partner had an UVL | 41 (31.1) | 43 (10.8) | 1 (4.4) | 9 (3.6) |
| Event was covered by either PrEP or UVL from respondent or partner | 105 (79.6) | 259 (65.2) | 8 (34.8) | 128 (50.8) |
| Total | 132 | 397 | 23 | 252 |

Respondent PrEP use (only daily PrEP) and viral load were derived from participant-level data indicated in Table 14 and 15. Partner PrEP use and viral load were derived from event-level data indicated in Table 44.

Among HIV-negative respondents whose partners knew their HIV status, most disclosed whether they were on PrEP or not in all event categories. Disclosing PrEP use was most common when the respondent was on PrEP.

Table 46. Disclosure to partner of PrEP use and viral load

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Partner knew their PrEP use | 52 (85.3) | 167 (79.1) | 10 (76.9) | 92 (69.7) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 61 | 214 | 13 | 133 |
| Partner knew their viral load | 14 (63.6) | 11 (55.0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 23 | 20 | 1 | 1 |

Methods of disclosing PrEP use were similar to how respondents disclosed their HIV status. Similar methods were used by partners to disclose PrEP use. The totals in these tables are the number of respondents whose partners knew the respondent's PrEP use from Table 46 and the number of respondents who knew their partner's PrEP use from Table 44.

Table 47. Method of disclosure of PrEP use

| Disclosure to partner | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| App profile | 24 (46.2) | 76 (45.5) | 1 (10.0) | 48 (52.2) |
| Told before sex | 40 (76.9) | 138 (82.6) | 9 (90.0) | 76 (82.6) |
| Told after sex | 4 (7.7) | 9 (5.4) | 1 (10.0) | 4 (4.3) |
| Other method | 1 (1.9) | 4 (2.4) | 0 (0) | 1 (1.1) |
| Total¹ | 52 | 167 | 10 | 92 |
| Disclosure from partner | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
| App profile | 17 (30.9) | 53 (29.6) | 1 (10.0) | 23 (23.0) |
| Told before sex | 38 (69.1) | 142 (79.3) | 8 (80.0) | 70 (70.0) |
| Told after sex | 6 (10.9) | 12 (6.7) | 1 (10.0) | 7 (7.0) |
| Assumed, but not discussed | 3 (5.5) | 10 (5.6) | 1 (10.0) | 5 (5.0) |
| Other method | 2 (3.6) | 9 (5.0) | 0 (0) | 2 (2.0) |
| Total² | 55 | 179 | 10 | 100 |

¹Total is the number of participants whose partners knew their PrEP use or non-use

²Total is the number of participants who knew their partner's PrEP use or non-use

Sexual behaviour

The sexual positions adopted during anal sex were similar in both event categories without drug use. There was a lower proportion of only insertive respondents and a greater proportion of respondents who reported both insertive and receptive anal sex in 'no condoms plus drug use' events.

Table 48. Condom use and positioning

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Insertive | 31 (26.1) | 157 (43.0) | 5 (21.7) | 104 (46.0) |
| Receptive | 47 (39.5) | 145 (39.7) | 12 (52.2) | 83 (36.7) |
| Both | 41 (34.5) | 63 (17.3) | 6 (26.1) | 39 (17.3) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 13 | 32 | 0 | 26 |
| Total | 132 | 397 | 23 | 252 |

In the 'no condoms' event categories, withdrawal was more likely when drug use was not involved. Within each event category, withdrawal did not appear to vary depending on sexual position.

Table 49. Withdrawal by sexual position during a sex event without condoms

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Participant withdrew while participant was insertive | 33 (46.5) | 131 (59.8) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 72 | 220 |
| Partner withdrew while participant was receptive | 45 (50.6) | 125 (63.1) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 0 | 10 |
| Total | 89 | 208 |

Explanations provided for using or not using condoms

The most common explanation for not using condoms in both types of 'no condoms' event categories was that the respondent did not want to. This was followed by the respondent and their partner not thinking about using condoms. Most who reported a reason other than the pre-specified responses included that either or both them and their partner were on PrEP. These explanations were not mutually exclusive.

Table 50. Explanations provided for not using condoms during a sex event without condoms

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| I did not want to use them | 76 (57.6) | 213 (53.7) |
| He insisted we don't use them | 10 (7.6) | 34 (8.6) |
| We didn't really think about it | 42 (31.8) | 110 (27.7) |
| I didn't know he wasn't using a condom | 1 (0.8) | 1 (0.3) |
| Other | 17 (12.9) | 74 (18.6) |
| Total | 132 | 397 |

The most common explanation for using condoms in 'condoms' event categories was that the respondent wanted to use them. The respondent's partner was more likely to insist on using them in the 'condoms plus no drug use' event, but this may be due to low sample in the drug use event.

Table 51. Explanations provided for using condoms during a sex event with condoms

| | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| I wanted to use them | 11 (47.8) | 117 (46.4) |
| He insisted we use them | 5 (21.7) | 93 (36.9) |
| We didn't really talk about it | 7 (30.4) | 32 (12.7) |
| Other | 1 (4.3) | 17 (6.7) |
| Total | 23 | 252 |

Context of sex event

The sex event usually occurred at either the respondent's or their partner's home for all event categories.

Table 52. Location of sex event

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Respondent's home | 39 (33.3) | 138 (38.1) | 9 (39.1) | 92 (40.9) |
| Partner's home | 51 (43.6) | 120 (33.1) | 7 (30.4) | 62 (27.6) |
| Someone else's home | 3 (2.6) | 8 (2.2) | 2 (8.7) | 6 (2.7) |
| Sauna/sex club | 10 (8.5) | 37 (10.2) | 5 (21.7) | 35 (15.6) |
| Motel/hotel | 8 (6.8) | 26 (7.2) | 0 (0) | 19 (8.4) |
| Beat | 2 (1.7) | 28 (7.7) | 0 (0) | 9 (4.0) |
| Other | 4 (3.4) | 5 (1.4) | 0 (0) | 2 (0.9) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 15 | 35 | 0 | 27 |
| Total | 132 | 397 | 23 | 252 |

For most event categories, the sexual encounter was generally planned.

Table 53. Planned or unplanned sex event

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Planned | 80 (68.4) | 233 (64.4) | 12 (52.2) | 153 (68.3) |
| Unplanned | 37 (31.6) | 129 (35.6) | 11 (47.8) | 71 (31.7) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 15 | 35 | 0 | 28 |
| Total | 132 | 397 | 23 | 252 |

Drug use

Crystal methamphetamine was the most common drug in the 'no condoms plus drug use' event, followed by GHB and ecstasy. During 'drug use plus no sex' events, the most common drug was ecstasy, followed by cocaine and crystal methamphetamine.

Table 54. Respondent's drug and alcohol use during event

| | No condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Drug use plus no sex |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Amyl | 62 (47.0) | 12 (52.2) | 43 (24.4) |
| Viagra | 57 (43.2) | 8 (34.8) | 17 (9.7) |
| Alcohol | 39 (29.5) | 8 (34.8) | 108 (61.4) |
| Cannabis | 16 (12.1) | 6 (26.1) | 34 (19.3) |
| Crystal methamphetamine | 62 (47.0) | 3 (13.0) | 40 (22.7) |
| Speed | 2 (1.5) | 0 (0) | 8 (4.5) |
| Cocaine | 18 (13.6) | 8 (34.8) | 68 (38.6) |
| Ecstasy | 26 (19.7) | 8 (34.8) | 84 (47.7) |
| GHB | 37 (28.0) | 3 (13.0) | 19 (10.8) |
| Ketamine | 8 (6.1) | 3 (13.0) | 23 (13.1) |
| Other drug/don't know | 14 (10.6) | 4 (17.4) | 3 (1.7) |
| Injecting drug use | 22 (16.7) | 0 (0) | 16 (9.1) |
| Total | 132 | 23 | 176 |

In 'no condoms and drug use' events, most respondents reported taking drugs multiple times before, during and after sex (n=114, 86.4%). This was similar when condoms were used (n=21, 91.3%). In 'drug use plus no sex' events, this mostly happened when the respondent was with someone else with only a minority (13.1%) reporting taking drugs alone.

Table 55. When respondent took drugs

| | No condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Drug use plus no sex |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| At event before sexual encounter | 36 (27.3) | 10 (43.5) | - |
| Just before the sexual encounter started | 47 (35.6) | 6 (26.1) | - |
| Just before having sex | 57 (43.2) | 8 (34.8) | - |
| During sex | 51 (38.6) | 8 (34.8) | - |
| After sex | 15 (11.4) | 2 (8.7) | - |
| Before I met up with anyone | - | - | 8 (4.5) |
| When I was with someone else | - | - | 142 (80.7) |
| Took drugs alone | - | - | 23 (13.1) |
| Total | 132 | 23 | 176 |

The most common reason given for using drugs in all event categories was that the respondent enjoyed getting high. In 'no condoms plus drug use' events, the next most common reason was to have sex for longer, followed by wanting to have chemsex. In 'drug use plus no sex' events, the next most common reason given was that the participant was out with friends and because other were taking drugs.

Table 56. Respondent's reasons for drug use

| | No condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Drug use plus no sex |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| To have chemsex | 52 (39.4) | 6 (26.1) | - |
| Enjoy getting high | 72 (54.5) | 17 (73.9) | 131 (74.4) |
| Needed for sex | 9 (6.8) | 3 (13.0) | - |
| Craved high/couldn't resist | 9 (6.8) | 2 (8.7) | 29 (16.5) |
| To lose inhibitions | 41 (31.1) | 6 (26.1) | 36 (20.5) |
| Because he was taking them | 22 (16.7) | 1 (4.3) | - |
| I felt pressured into taking them | 1 (0.8) | 0 (0) | 6 (3.4) |
| I was out with friends | 13 (9.8) | 4 (17.4) | 94 (53.4) |
| I had already taken drugs for fun at an event | 30 (22.7) | 8 (34.8) | - |
| To have sex for longer | 57 (43.2) | 8 (34.8) | - |
| To help bottom | 0 (0) | 5 (21.7) | - |
| Because others were taking drugs | - | - | 37 (21.0) |
| Total | 132 | 23 | 176 |

Roughly half of the drug use in all event categories was planned, and half was unplanned.

Table 57. Planned or unplanned drug use

| | No condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Drug use plus no sex |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Unplanned, took drugs after sexual encounter began | 27 (23.5) | 3 (14.3) | - |
| Unplanned, but already on drugs from previous event | 30 (26.1) | 3 (14.3) | - |
| Unplanned | - | - | 73 (42.2) |
| Planned | 58 (50.4) | 15 (71.4) | 100 (57.8) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 17 | 2 | 3 |
| Total | 132 | 23 | 176 |

The drugs were most often supplied by the respondent or their sexual partner.

Table 58. Method of obtaining drugs

| | No condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Drug use plus no sex |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| I provided them | 42 (36.8) | 10 (47.6) | 36 (23.8) |
| He provided them | 42 (36.8) | 4 (19.0) | - |
| A friend provided them | - | - | 89 (58.9) |
| Someone else provided them | 22 (19.3) | 6 (28.6) | 26 (17.2) |
| Other | 8 (7.0) | 1 (4.8) | 0 (0) |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 18 | 2 | 25 |
| Total | 132 | 23 | 176 |

Partner drug use was uncommon when the respondent was not also taking drugs. The most common drugs used by partners mirrored the respondents' drug use in Table 54. Denominators are based on the number of respondents who indicated that their partner took drugs during this occasion.

Table 59. Partner/other people's drug use

| | No condoms plus drug use | No condoms plus no drug use | Condoms plus drug use | Condoms plus no drug use | Drug use plus no sex |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Crystal methamphetamine | 54 (63.5) | 1 (6.7) | 2 (15.4) | 0 (0) | 26 (17.0) |
| Speed | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (10.0) | 13 (8.5) |
| Cocaine | 10 (11.8) | 1 (6.7) | 7 (53.8) | 1 (10.0) | 81 (52.9) |
| Ecstasy | 17 (20.0) | 2 (13.3) | 3 (23.1) | 0 (0) | 90 (58.8) |
| GHB | 34 (40.0) | 1 (6.7) | 3 (23.1) | 0 (0) | 27 (17.6) |
| Ketamine | 5 (5.9) | 1 (6.7) | 1 (7.7) | 0 (0) | 29 (19.0) |
| Other drug | 5 (5.9) | 9 (60.0) | 2 (15.4) | 6 (60.0) | - |
| Don't know | 3 (3.5) | 2 (13.3) | 0 (0) | 1 (10.0) | 18 (11.8) |
| Total | 85 | 15 | 13 | 10 | 153 |

This table refers to the sexual partner's drug use in event categories that involve casual sex. In the 'drug use plus no sex' event, this refers to the drug use of other people who were present at the event.

Drug use without sex

Several questions were asked concerning events where party drugs were used but no sex occurred.

Respondents were most commonly with friends when they took drugs, followed by their boyfriend or an acquaintance.

Table 60. People around when taking drugs without sex

| | n | % |
|------------------|------------|------|
| Took drugs alone | 23 | 13.1 |
| Boyfriend | 56 | 31.8 |
| Fuckbuddy | 19 | 10.8 |
| Friend | 138 | 78.4 |
| Acquaintance | 55 | 31.3 |
| Stranger | 25 | 14.2 |
| Other | 10 | 5.7 |
| Total | 176 | |

Two out of five (40.7%) participants took drugs with 2-5 other people. More than a third (36.6%) took drugs with more than 6 people. An eighth took drugs alone (13.8%).

Table 61. Number of people around when taking drugs without sex

| | n | % |
|---------------------|------------|------|
| Took drugs alone | 23 | 13.8 |
| One | 15 | 9.0 |
| 2-5 | 68 | 40.7 |
| 6-10 | 38 | 22.8 |
| More than 10 | 23 | 13.8 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 9 | |
| Total | 176 | |

Most took drugs either at their home or someone else’s home. A quarter (27.8%) took drugs at either a gay or straight bar or event.

Table 62. Where they took drugs without sex

| | n | % |
|----------------------|------------|------|
| My place | 53 | 30.6 |
| Someone else’s place | 62 | 35.8 |
| Gay bar/event | 28 | 16.2 |
| Straight bar/event | 20 | 11.6 |
| Motel/hotel | 4 | 2.3 |
| Other | 6 | 3.5 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 3 | |
| Total | 176 | |

One in six respondents planned to have sex at events when drug use occurred without sex, but the majority did not.

Table 63. Planned to have sex

| | n | % |
|--------------------------|------------|------|
| Planned to have sex | 29 | 16.7 |
| Did not plan to have sex | 145 | 83.3 |
| <i>Not reported</i> | 2 | |
| Total | 176 | |

Conclusion

The *INTO?* study aimed to use event-level data to understand sexual behaviours and drug use in different contexts rather than aggregated over time. This was to understand contextual factors that influence negotiation of different sexual behaviours and drug use. Respondents consisted of mostly gay- and bisexual-identified and slightly older men compared to other studies. 77.9% were born in Australia, with a small proportion who were born in Asia (5.9%) or Latin America and the Caribbean (2.2%). Overseas-born GBMSM are a priority population in HIV prevention (The Kirby Institute, 2018), so these results may not be representative of this population more generally. Most had university degrees and two-thirds were in full-time employment. Three-quarters were HIV-negative, and a third were on PrEP. In the last six months, 50.4% had sex with a boyfriend or spouse, and 71.9% had sex with a casual partner or fuckbuddy. 61.7% reported some drug use in the last 6 months.

Knowledge about PrEP, undetectable viral load and HIV testing was generally high. Unsurprisingly, PrEP users were more knowledgeable compared to non-PrEP users about accessing PrEP, PrEP efficacy, and HIV testing. This could be due to PrEP users having greater experience with health services. From previous research, PrEP users are also more likely to be socially connected to the gay men (Hammoud et al., 2020) and have had greater exposure to information about PrEP (Holt et al., 2016). More than a quarter of non-PrEP users (27.6%) were not aware that the cost of PrEP is subsidised by the government.

INTO? explored sexual behaviours and drug use at the event level to better understand how men negotiate these practices. We explored five different event types, based on whether sex, condom use, and drug use occurred at the event: 'no condoms plus drug use' events, 'no condoms but no drug use' events, 'condoms plus drug use' events, 'condoms but no drug use' events, and 'drug use plus no sex' events. Participants were able to answer questions about multiple events, as relevant. 'No condoms plus no drug use' was the most common event type (52.6%), followed by 'condoms plus no drug use' (33.6%) and 'no condoms plus drug use' (17.6%). 'Condoms plus drug use' was rare (3.1%). 'Drug use plus no sex' was reported by 16.8% of respondents.

In the event where respondents did not use condoms and took drugs, there was evidence that respondents used more information to negotiate these practices. They were more likely to have previously had sexual contact with their partner, to disclose their HIV status and be aware of their partner's HIV status, and utilised biomedical prevention strategies, such as PrEP and UVL, more than any other casual sex events.

Conversely, in 'condoms plus no drug use' events, they were less likely to disclose their HIV status or be aware of their partner's HIV status and were more likely to have partners who were not on PrEP. These respondents were also the least likely to have sex with an HIV-positive partner despite having engaged in lower risk practices compared to those reported for the other event categories. This may also be due to disclosure as participants during 'condoms plus no drug use' events reported a higher proportion of sexual partners with unknown HIV status. These events were still covered by PrEP or UVL half (50.8%) of the time.

Regardless of whether condoms or drugs were used, the most common way that participants disclosed their HIV status and had their partner's HIV status disclosed to them was discussing this before sex. More than two-thirds of the sample had a profile on a dating/hook up app, and a significant proportion passively disclosed their HIV status by featuring it on their profile. However, these results suggest that active disclosure was still the main method of disclosure among these men.

In both 'no condoms' event categories, the main two reasons that participants gave when not using condoms was because they did not want to or that they and their partner did not think about it. This was similar to events when condoms were used, as mostly respondents indicated they wanted to use them. However, a significantly greater proportion of partners during events with condoms insisted on using them. As expected, this implies that communication about condom use is more explicit when condoms are used than when condoms are not used. In other words, a higher proportion of people who did not use condoms did not discuss condom use at all rather than explicitly stating they did not want to use them, but those who did use condoms were more likely to explicitly state that they wanted to use them.

These data further indicate that drug use among GBM is not uncommon, with cannabis, ecstasy and cocaine being the most commonly used drugs overall. In the two event categories where drugs were used with sex, overall, it appears that crystal methamphetamine was the most commonly used drug during a sex event. Most participants indicated that they took drugs multiple time throughout initiating and after engaging in sex. Respondents often reported using drugs because they enjoyed getting high and specifically for sex, either for chemsex or to have sex for longer. However, few reported that they needed drugs for sex. Half of these events were planned, with the unplanned drug use also being divided evenly between taking drugs before and after the sex encounter began.

The findings using event-level data largely reflect previous work using aggregated data. Using these event-level data demonstrate that event categories not covered by condoms are largely protected using biomedical prevention. Patterns of behaviour emerge when comparing different event categories. GBM are more likely to disclose information about themselves and strategies, such as PrEP and TasP, to mitigate their HIV risk in 'no condom' event categories than 'condom' event categories. Taken together, there is little evidence of HIV risk in most events captured in this study. *INTO?* demonstrates that event-level data further reinforces findings of aggregated data, but allows comparison between event categories to understand the nuance of negotiation of HIV risk via disclosure, condom use, and biomedical prevention in different contexts.

References

- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2017). *National Drug Strategy Household Survey 2016: detailed findings*.
- Callander, D., Mooney-Somers, J., Keen, P., Guy, R., Duck, T., Bavinton, B. R., . . . Prestage, G. (2020). Australian 'gayborhoods' and 'lesborhoods': a new method for estimating the number and prevalence of adult gay men and lesbian women living in each Australian postcode. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 1-17. doi:10.1080/13658816.2019.1709973
- Eu, B., & Roth, N. (2014). Association between known recent HIV infections and methamphetamine use (ASK HIM study) in Melbourne between 2011 and 2013: a case-control study. *Sex Health*, 11(6), 583-584. doi:10.1071/SH14141
- Hammoud, M. A., Jin, F., Maher, L., Bourne, A., Haire, B., Saxton, P., . . . Prestage, G. (2020). Biomedical HIV Protection Among Gay and Bisexual Men Who Use Crystal Methamphetamine. *AIDS Behav*, 24(5), 1400-1413. doi:10.1007/s10461-019-02739-7
- Holt, M., Lea, T., Asselin, J., Hellard, M., Prestage, G., Wilson, D., . . . Stooze, M. (2015). The prevalence and correlates of undiagnosed HIV among Australian gay and bisexual men: results of a national, community-based, bio-behavioural survey. *J Int AIDS Soc*, 18, 20526. doi:10.7448/IAS.18.1.20526
- Holt, M., Lea, T., Kippax, S., Kolstee, J., Ellard, J., Velecky, M., . . . de Wit, J. (2016). Awareness and knowledge of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis among Australian gay and bisexual men: results of a national, online survey. *Sex Health*. doi:10.1071/SH15243
- Prestage, G., Jin, F., Kippax, S., Zablotska, I., Imrie, J., & Grulich, A. (2009). Use of illicit drugs and erectile dysfunction medications and subsequent HIV infection among gay men in Sydney, Australia. *J Sex Med*, 6(8), 2311-2320. doi:10.1111/j.1743-6109.2009.01323.x
- Rawstone, P., Digiusto, E., Worth, H., & Zablotska, I. (2007). Associations between crystal methamphetamine use and potentially unsafe sexual activity among gay men in Australia. *Arch Sex Behav*, 36(5), 646-654. doi:10.1007/s10508-007-9206-z
- The Kirby Institute. (2018). *HIV, viral hepatitis and sexually transmissible infections in Australia: annual surveillance report 2018*.

