

Gay Community Periodic Survey: Perth 2002

Author:

Hull, Peter; Brown, Graham; Van de Ven, Paul; Prestage, Garrett; Rawstorne, Patrick; Kippax, Susan; Langdon, Trish

Publication details:

Report No. Monograph 3/2003
1875978615 (ISBN)

Publication Date:

2003

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.4225/53/5750cd22e193b>

License:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/au/>

Link to license to see what you are allowed to do with this resource.

Downloaded from <http://hdl.handle.net/1959.4/10681> in <https://unsworks.unsw.edu.au> on 2024-03-28

gay community periodic survey

PERTH 2002

Peter **HULL**
Graham **BROWN**
Paul **VAN DE VEN**
Garrett **PRESTAGE**
Patrick **RAWSTORNE**
Susan **KIPPAX**
Trish **LANGDON**



NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV SOCIAL RESEARCH

NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL
RESEARCH

WESTERN AUSTRALIA AIDS COUNCIL
CURTIN UNIVERSITY

gay community periodic survey

PERTH
2002

Peter **HULL**¹

Graham **BROWN**^{3,4}

Paul **VAN DE VEN**¹

Garrett **PRESTAGE**²

Patrick **RAWSTORNE**¹

Susan **KIPPAX**¹

Trish **LANGDON**³

¹ NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV SOCIAL RESEARCH

² NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL RESEARCH

³ WESTERN AUSTRALIA AIDS COUNCIL

⁴ CURTIN UNIVERSITY

Monograph 3/2003

National Centre in HIV Social Research
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
The University of New South Wales

Copies of this monograph or any other publications from this project may be obtained by contacting :

National Centre in HIV Social Research

Level 2, Webster Building
The University of New South Wales
Sydney NSW 2052 AUSTRALIA
Telephone (61 2) 9385 6776
Fax (61 2) 9385 6455
Email: nchsr@unsw.edu.au
Website: nchsr.arts.unsw.edu.au

© National Centre in HIV Social Research 2003
ISBN 1 875978 61 5

The National Centre in HIV Social Research is funded by the Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing and is affiliated with the Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences at the University of New South Wales.

Suggested citation: Hull, P., Brown, G., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Rawstorne, P., Kippax, S., & Langdon, T. (2003). *Gay Community Periodic Survey: Perth 2002*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, The University of New South Wales. <http://doi.org/10.4225/53/5750CD22E193B>

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ii
List of Tables	iii
DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY	1
SAMPLE AND RECRUITMENT	2
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	4
Geographic distribution	4
Age	4
Ethnicity	5
Occupation	5
Sexual relationships with women	6
Sexual relationships with men	6
ASSOCIATION WITH GAY COMMUNITY	8
Sexual identity	8
Gay community involvement	8
HIV TESTING AND STATUS	10
Time since most recent HIV-antibody test	10
Combination therapies	11
Viral Load	11
Regular partner's HIV-status	12
SEXUAL PRACTICE AND 'SAFE SEX'	14
Sexual behaviour between men	14
Overview of sexual practices with regular and casual partners	15
Sex with regular male partners	17
Condom Use	17
Agreements	20
Sex with casual male partners	21
Condom use	21
Serostatus	24
INFORMATION ABOUT HIV THERAPIES AND PEP	26
Post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)	27
DRUG USE	29
DISCUSSION	31
REFERENCES	34
QUESTIONNAIRE	36

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the following individuals and organisations for contributing to the success of this project.

FUNDING

Western Australia Health Department and Western Australia AIDS Council

RECRUITMENT

Ashley Abreu, Bill Darby, Bruce Ambrosius, Cipri Martinez, Donna Bannister, Emma Hewitt, Lisa Mori, Mark Ravenscroft, Matt Tilley, Paul, Sam Hastings, Sandra Norman, SK Ngang

NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV SOCIAL RESEARCH

Sahar Behman, Dau-Chuan Chung, June Crawford, Joseph Lopes, Dean Murphy, Judi Rainbow

NATIONAL CENTRE IN HIV EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL RESEARCH

SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

The 790 men who gave their time to ensure that the study was fully inclusive of their particular circumstances.

VENUES

The management and staff of the various gay community venues who assisted in the administration of the survey and gave generous permission for the survey to be administered on their premises.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 :	Source of recruitment	2
Table 2 :	Residential location	4
Table 3 :	Age	5
Table 4 :	Ethnicity	5
Table 5 :	Employment status	5
Table 6 :	Occupation	6
Table 7 :	Sex with women in the previous six months.....	6
Table 8 :	Current relationships with men	7
Table 9 :	Length of relationships with men	7
Table 10 :	Sexual identity	8
Table 11 :	Gay friends	9
Table 12 :	Proportion of free time spent with gay men	9
Table 13 :	HIV test results	10
Table 14 :	Time since most recent HIV test.....	11
Table 15 :	Last tested for a sexually transmitted infection (STI).....	11
Table 16 :	Use of combination antiretroviral therapies	11
Table 17 :	Use of antiretroviral therapy (ART) and viral load	12
Table 18 :	HIV status of regular partners.....	12
Table 19 :	Match of HIV status in regular relationships	13
Table 20 :	Reported sex with male partners in previous six months	14
Table 21 :	Reported sex with male partners in previous six months by recruitment site.....	15
Table 22 :	Number of male sex partners in previous six months.....	15
Table 23 :	Sexual behaviour with regular male partners	16
Table 24 :	Sexual behaviour with casual male partners	17
Table 25 :	Condom use with regular partners	18
Table 26 :	Serostatus and condom use among regular partners	19
Table 27 :	Condom use and match of HIV serostatus in regular relationships	20
Table 28 :	Agreements with regular male partners about sex <i>within</i> the relationship	20
Table 29 :	Agreements with regular male partners about sex <i>outside</i> the relationship	21
Table 30 :	Condom use with casual partners	22
Table 31 :	Serostatus and condom use with casual partners.....	23
Table 32 :	Condom use and anal intercourse with casual partners of unknown, positive and negative serostatus	23
Table 33 :	Participants' disclosure of serostatus to casual partners.....	24
Table 34 :	Casual partners' disclosure of serostatus to participants	24
Table 35 :	Where men look for sex partners	25
Table 36 :	Responses to questions about combination therapy.....	26
Table 37 :	Responses to questions about combination therapy by serostatus	27
Table 38 :	Knowledge of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)	27
Table 39 :	Unprotected anal intercourse and knowledge of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)	28
Table 40 :	People known with HIV or AIDS	28
Table 41 :	Drug use in previous six months	29
Table 42 :	Injecting drug use in previous six months.....	30

Description of the Study

The Perth Gay Community Periodic Survey is a cross-sectional survey of gay and homosexually active men recruited through a range of gay community sites in Perth. The project was funded by the Western Australian Health Department and Western Australia AIDS Council. The Periodic Survey provides a snapshot of sexual and HIV-related practices among gay and homosexually active men. This survey, the third in Perth, was administered in October 2002. The current report contains results of that survey and makes comparisons with data from the previous surveys conducted in October 1998 (Van de Ven et al., 1998) and October 2000 (Brown et al., 2001).

The major aim of the Survey is to provide data on levels of safe and unsafe sexual practice in a broad cross-sectional sample of gay and homosexually active men. With this in mind, men were recruited from a number of gay community venues. In 2002 four sites were used for recruitment: the Fair Day and three gay community venues (one social venue, two sex-on-premises venues). Trained recruiters carried out recruitment at these sites during the month of October.

The questionnaire used in this study is attached to this report. It is a short, self-administered instrument that typically takes 10 minutes to complete. Questions focus on anal intercourse and oral sex, the use of condoms, the nature of sexual relationships, HIV testing and serostatus, aspects of social attachment to gay community, recreational drug use, and a range of demographic items including sexual identity, age, occupation and ethnicity. In the main, the questions in the 2002 survey were the same as those in previous surveys. This ensures that direct comparisons across the three surveys are possible.

Nonetheless, some questions in the current survey were included for the first time this year while other questions that were included in previous surveys were removed. Certain items were omitted from the current survey to make way for these new questions.

This report describes data from the third Perth Gay Community Periodic Survey in comparison with data from the two surveys preceding it. More detailed analyses of the data will continue and will be disseminated as they are completed. As with any data analysis, further examination may necessitate minor reinterpretation of the findings.

Sample and Recruitment

Respondents were recruited through three sites in the Perth metropolitan area and at a large public gay community event (Fair Day). In comparison with the previous survey, in 2002 there was an increase in the proportion of men recruited at the Fair Day and a corresponding decrease in the recruitments from other venues (see Table 1). As in the three previous surveys, most of the sample was recruited from the Fair Day.

The implication of these changes in sample composition is that in certain analyses, for example, unprotected anal intercourse (UAI), there may be a slight underestimation of the percentage engaging in UAI with casual partners (UAI-C) and a corresponding overestimation of the percentage engaging in UAI with regular partners (UAI-R). The basis for this estimation is that in previous surveys, men recruited at the Fair Day engaged in less UAI-C but more UAI-R than their counterparts who were recruited at sex-on-premises and social venues or clinics.

Table 1 : Source of recruitment

	1998	2000	2002
Gay venues	369 (43.6%)	441 (42.6%)	245 (31.0%)
Fair Day	477 (56.4%)	594 (57.4%)	545 (69.0%)
Total	846 (100%)	1035 (100%)	790 (100%)

In 2002, 1041 men were asked to complete a questionnaire and 790 did so. This represents a sound response rate of approximately 76 per cent.

Previous studies such as SMASH (Prestage et al., 1995) have demonstrated that HIV serostatus is an important distinguishing feature among gay men, particularly with regard to sexual practice. For this reason some of the data on sexual practices are reported separately for men who are HIV-positive, those who are HIV-negative, and those who have not been tested or do not know their serostatus.

As indicated in previous Periodic Surveys (Van de Ven et al., 1997), men recruited from events such as the Fair Day are different in some respects from those recruited from clinics and gay venues. Nonetheless, most of the data reported here are for the sample as a whole, giving an account of practices drawn from a *broad* cross-sectional sample of Perth gay men.

Demographic Profile

In terms of demographic variables, the participants in the 1998, 2000 and 2002 surveys were quite similar.

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

There was little variation in the geographic distribution of participants from 1998 to 2002. In all three surveys, the men came primarily from the Perth metropolitan area. A small percentage of men, who indicated that they participated regularly in Perth gay community, came from other parts of Western Australia or from outside the state (see Table 2).

Table 2 : Residential location

	1998	2000	2002
Perth Metropolitan	753 (89.0%)	936 (90.4%)	719 (91.0%)
Other WA	32 (3.8%)	34 (3.3%)	29 (3.7%)
Elsewhere	61 (7.2%)	65 (6.3%)	42 (5.3%)
Total	846 (100%)	1035 (100%)	790 (100%)

AGE

In the 2002 survey, the maximum age of respondents was 79, with a median age of 33. Age range and distribution were fairly similar to those observed in the previous two studies (see Table 3). From 2000 to 2002 there was a slight decrease in the proportion of respondents aged 40 – 49 and a slight increase in those aged over 50 years. Trend analysis shows a significant increase in the proportion of those aged under 25 since 1998 (and this should be taken into account in interpreting the results).

Table 3 : Age

	1998	2000	2002
Under 25	119 (14.5%)	198 (19.9%)	175 (22.8%)
25–29	147 (17.9%)	157 (15.8%)	113 (14.7%)
30–39	309 (37.6%)	336 (33.7%)	256 (33.3%)
40–49	146 (17.8%)	215 (21.6%)	133 (17.3%)
50 and over	101 (12.3%)	90 (9.0%)	92 (12.0%)
Total	822 (100%)¹	996 (100%)²	769 (100%)⁴

¹ Missing data (n=24) ² Missing data (n=39) ³ Missing data (n=21)

ETHNICITY

As with the two previous surveys, the sample was predominantly 'Anglo-Australian' with a slightly lower proportion identifying as such in the current survey (see Table 4). Twenty-eight men (3.6% of the total sample) reported being of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin.

Table 4 : Ethnicity

	1998	2000	2002
Anglo-Australian	676 (79.9%)	856 (82.7%)	622 (78.7%)
European	91 (10.8%)	109 (10.5%)	90 (11.4%)
Other	79 (9.3%)	70 (6.8%)	78 (9.9%)
Total	846 (100%)	1035 (100%)	790(100%)

OCCUPATION

The proportion of men who were not in the workforce was fairly high compared with the general population (see Table 5). After a decrease in 2001 the proportion of men not in employment has returned to a level similar to 1998. The figure is elevated because of the relatively high percentage of HIV-positive men who received some form of social security payment. Most of the sample was employed, with 63% of all respondents being in full-time employment, a significant decrease from the previous year ($p < .01$). Conversely, in 2002 there was a corresponding increase in the proportion of participants who were not employed.

Table 5 : Employment status

	1998	2000	2002
Full-time	508 (61.9%)	698 (68.6%)	494 (63.1%)
Part-time	114 (13.9%)	128 (12.6%)	87 (11.1%)
Unemployed/Other	199 (24.2%)	192 (18.9%)	202 (25.8%)
Total	821 (100%)¹	1018 (100%)²	783 (100%)³

¹ Missing data (n=25) ² Missing data (n=17) ³ Missing data (n=7)

As in 1998 and 2000, and as in most studies of male homosexual populations, there was a substantial over-representation of professionals/managers and an under-representation of manual workers in comparison with the general population (Connell et al., 1991; Hood et al., 1994). The 2002 data show a greater proportion of professionals, tradesmen and plant operator/labourers than in 2000 (see Table 6).

Table 6 : Occupation

	1998	2000	2002
Professional/Managerial			
Professional/ Managerial	250 (37.3%)	322 (40.6%)	281 (47.5%)
Paraprofessional	83 (12.4%)	64 (8.1%)	63 (10.6%)
White collar			
Clerical/Sales	212 (31.6%)	352 (44.3%)	162 (27.4%)
Blue collar			
Trades	87 (13.0%)	22 (2.8%)	33 (5.6%)
Plant operator/Labourer	38 (5.7%)	34 (4.3%)	53 (9.0%)
Total	670 (100%)¹	794 (100%)²	592(100%)³

Note: Missing data here is mainly N/A, ie not currently employed.

¹ Missing data (n=176) ² Missing data (n=241) ³ Missing data (n=198)

SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH WOMEN

As in 1998 and 2000, few respondents had sex with women in the previous six months, and these percentages are remarkably stable across the three survey periods (see Table 7).

Table 7 : Sex with women in the previous six months

	1998	2000	2002
No female partners	719 (88.8%)	845 (90.5%)	702 (90.0%)
One female partner	54 (6.7%)	47 (5.0%)	40 (5.2%)
More than one female partner	37 (4.6%)	42 (4.5%)	31 (4.0%)
Total	810 (100%)¹	934 (100%)²	773 (100%)³

¹ Missing data (n=36) ² Missing data (n=101) ³ Missing data (n=17)

SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH MEN

The majority of men in each of the three samples were in a regular sexual relationship with a man at the time of completing the survey (see Table 8). Trend analysis shows that over the last two surveys there has been decreasing proportion of men in regular relationships who also have casual sex (Mantel-Haenszel, $p < .001$). About 32% of the study participants in 2002 were in a monogamous relationship, slightly higher than in 2000. In 2002 the percentage of men having sex with casual partners only was consistent with the previous survey. A small proportion of the men were not having sex with other men at the time of the survey and this is not significantly different from that reported in the previous two surveys. These changes over time are partly attributable to

slight changes in sample composition, including a greater proportion of men recruited from Fair Day.

Table 8 : Current relationships with men

	1998	2000	2002
None	143 (17.4%)	159 (16.7%)	149 (19.5%)
Casual only	172 (21.0%)	234 (24.6%)	187 (24.4%)
Regular plus casual*	289 (35.2%)	279 (29.4%)	183 (23.9%)
Regular only (monogamous)	217 (26.4%)	278 (29.3%)	246 (32.2%)
Total	821 (100%)¹	950 (100%)²	765 (100%)³

*This category may include either of the partners having casual sex, or both.

¹ Missing data (n=25) ² Missing data (n=85) ³ Missing data (n=15)

About 56% of men in a regular relationship had been in that relationship for at least one year which is a significant decrease from 2000 ($p < .001$) (see Table 9). Correspondingly, more men reported being in a relationship for less than one year.

Table 9 : Length of relationships with men

	1998	2000	2002
Less than one year	166 (37.1%)	199 (35.4%)	192 (43.8%)
At least one year	281 (62.9%)	363 (64.6%)	246 (56.2%)
Total	447 (100%)	562 (100%)	438 (100%)

Association with Gay Community

Similar in composition to 1998 and 2000, and consistent with the recruitment strategies employed, the 2002 participants were highly gay-identified and gay-community-attached.

SEXUAL IDENTITY

The data in all three surveys show that the samples were composed predominantly of men who identified as gay or homosexual (see Table 10), and these percentages are comparable with similar surveys conducted elsewhere (Hull et al, 2002a). There were relatively few men in each sample who identified as heterosexual and a slightly higher proportion who identified as bisexual, and these proportions have been quite consistent across the three survey periods.

Table 10 : Sexual identity

	1998	2000	2002
Gay / homosexual / queer	728 (87.2%)	892 (86.9%)	685 (86.7%)
Bisexual	71 (8.5%)	96 (9.4%)	80 (10.1%)
Heterosexual / other	36 (4.3%)	38 (3.7%)	25 (3.2%)
Total	835 (100%)¹	1026 (100%)²	790 (100%)³

¹ Missing data (n=11) ² Missing data (n=9) ³ Missing data (n=0)

GAY COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

As with the 1998 and 2000 surveys, men in the 2002 sample were highly socially involved with gay men (see Table 11). Forty-five percent of the men in the sample said most or all of their friends were gay men and a just over half reported that some or a few of their friends were gay. Trend analysis shows a significant decrease since 1998 in the proportion of men who report that most or all of their friends are gay, with a corresponding increase in the proportion reporting some or a

few gay friends (Mantel-Haenszel, $p < .01$). These changes over time are partly attributable to variations in the sampling frame.

Table 11 : Gay friends

	1998	2000	2002
None	23 (2.7%)	26 (2.5%)	16 (2.0%)
Some or a few	376 (44.7%)	501 (48.5%)	418 (53.0%)
Most or all	442 (52.6%)	505 (48.9%)	355 (45.0%)
Total	841 (100%)¹	1032 (100%)²	789 (100%)³

¹ Missing data (n=5) ² Missing data (n=3) ³ Missing data (n=1)

Correspondingly, in all three surveys, about 80% of the men said they spent some or a lot of their free time with gay men (see Table 12). There was no significant difference in these proportions from the previous survey.

Table 12 : Proportion of free time spent with gay men

	1998	2000	2002
None	15 (1.8%)	16 (1.5%)	9 (1.1%)
A little	126 (14.9%)	186 (18.0%)	145 (18.4%)
Some	332 (39.4%)	378 (36.6%)	307 (38.9%)
A lot	370 (43.9%)	453 (43.9%)	328 (41.6%)
Total	843 (100%)¹	1033 (100%)²	789 (100%)³

¹ Missing data (n=3) ² Missing data (n=2) ³ Missing data (n=1)

HIV Testing and Status

Most of the men in each of the samples had been tested for antibodies to HIV, and the status of these men is predominantly HIV-negative (see Table 13). There has been no significant change across the three study periods in the respective proportions of men in the sample who are HIV-positive or HIV-negative. However, the proportion of men who had not been tested or did not know their HIV test results, about 20% in the most recent survey, has increased significantly since 1998 (Mantel-Haenszel, $p < .01$). This trend reflects the increasing proportions of younger men (who are less likely to have yet been tested) in later surveys.

Table 13 : HIV test results

	1998	2000	2002
Not tested/No results	123 (14.8%)	182 (17.8%)	162 (20.6%)
HIV-negative	662 (79.8%)	792 (77.3%)	596 (75.9%)
HIV-positive	45 (5.4%)	51 (5.0%)	27 (3.4%)
Total	830 (100%)¹	1025 (100%)²	785 (100%)³

¹ Missing data (n=16) ² Missing data (n=10) ³ Missing data (n=5)

TIME SINCE MOST RECENT HIV-ANTIBODY TEST

Among the non HIV-positive men who had 'ever' had an HIV antibody test, the majority had at least done so within the previous 12 months and that proportion has remained steady across the three study periods (see Table 14). Recency of testing for the remaining men is equally distributed between the categories of 12-24 months and over 24 months, with about 20% of men in each category.

Table 14 : Time since most recent HIV test

	1998	2000	2002
Less than 6 months ago	307 (45.1%)	342 (40.7%)	269 (44.0%)
7–12 months ago	116 (17.0%)	164 (19.5%)	111 (18.1%)
1–2 years ago	131 (19.2%)	143 (17.0%)	114 (18.6%)
Over 2 years ago	127 (18.6%)	192 (22.8%)	118 (19.3%)
Total	681 (100%)	841 (100%)	612 (100%)

Note: This table includes only non HIV-positive men who had been tested for HIV.

In 2002, a question was included asking about the last time respondents were tested for a sexually transmitted infection apart from HIV. Over half of the respondents had been tested in the previous 12 months, while almost a third had not had a test in the last two years (see Table 15).

Table 15 : Last tested for a sexually transmitted infection (STI)

Less than 4 weeks	1-6 months ago	7-12 months ago	1-2 years ago	More than 2 years ago
76 (11.5%)	198 (30%)	96 (14.5%)	90 (13.6%)	195 (30.3%)

Missing data (n=30)

COMBINATION THERAPIES

Of the men who reported that they were HIV-positive, 74% were taking combination therapies at the time of the most recent survey (see Table 16). There was no change in the proportion from 2000 to 2002 in contrast to trends reported in HIV Futures 3, an Australian-wide survey, which found that there had been a decline in the number of people who were taking combination therapy (Grierson et al., 2002). The small number of HIV-positive men in the 2002 periodic survey warrants some caution in the interpretation of these differences.

Table 16 : Use of combination antiretroviral therapies

	1998	2000	2002
Yes	28 (62.2%)	37 (74.0%)	20 (74.1%)
No	17 (37.8%)	13 (26.0%)	7 (25.9%)
Total	45 (100%)	50 (100%)¹	27 (100%)

Note: Includes only HIV-positive men.

¹ Missing data (n=1)

VIRAL LOAD

A question about the viral load of HIV positive men was included in the 2002 survey. Approximately 85% of the respondents who currently use antiretroviral therapies have undetectable viral loads (see Table 17). In comparison, less than 30% of HIV positive men not using this treatment have undetectable viral loads. Again, the numbers here are small and cautious interpretation is in order.

Table 17 : Use of antiretroviral therapy (ART) and viral load

	Using ART	Not using ART
Undetectable viral load	16 (84.2%)	2 (28.6%)
Detectable viral load	3 (15.8%)	5 (71.4%)

REGULAR PARTNER'S HIV-STATUS

In all three surveys, participants were asked about the serostatus of their current regular partner (see Table 18). As the question referred to current partners only, fewer men responded to this item than indicated sex with a regular partner during the previous six months. The majority (about 70%) of the men in a regular relationship reported having a partner who is HIV-negative and about 5% were with partners of HIV-positive status. When viewed across the three study periods, the proportions of men in a relationship with a partner who is HIV-positive, HIV-negative, or HIV-unknown, have remained quite steady.

Table 18 : HIV status of regular partners

	1998	2000	2002
HIV-positive	23 (5.8%)	31 (5.8%)	20 (5.4%)
HIV-negative	272 (68.0%)	346 (64.6%)	259 (69.6%)
HIV status unknown	105 (26.3%)	159 (29.7%)	93 (25.0%)
Total	400 (100%)	536 (100%)	372 (100%)

Note: Includes only those men who had a regular partner at the time of completing the survey.

The survey in 2000 revealed an increase from 1998 in the percentage of HIV-positive men with an HIV-negative partner and the current survey again shows an increase (see Table 19). There was a corresponding decrease in the percentage of HIV-positive men with an HIV-positive partner from 1998 to 2002. However, the decrease in the 2002 survey was only slight and based on small numbers which necessitate cautious reading. HIV-negative respondents are in relationships with predominantly other HIV-negative men and the proportion is slightly higher than in 2000. The proportion of HIV-negative respondents with HIV-positive partners is unchanged from 2000. As in the two previous surveys, men without knowledge of their own serostatus tended not to know the serostatus of their regular partners, or they had HIV-negative regular partners. The proportion of HIV status unknown men with HIV-positive partners is very low and has been unchanged since 1998. The proportion of men who did not know the serostatus of their partner decreased in the period 2000 to 2002.

Table 19 : Match of HIV status in regular relationships

Serostatus of Regular Partner	Respondent's HIV status		
	HIV-Positive	HIV-Negative	Unknown
1998			
HIV-positive	10 (31.3%)	12 (3.8%)	1 (2.2%)
HIV-negative	19 (59.4%)	234 (73.1%)	18 (40.0%)
HIV status unknown	3 (9.4%)	74 (23.1%)	26 (57.8%)
Total (n =397)	32 (100%)	320 (100%)	45 (100%)
2000			
HIV-positive	7 (22.6%)	23 (5.5%)	1 (1.2%)
HIV-negative	20 (64.5%)	294 (70.7%)	29 (34.5%)
HIV status unknown	4 (12.9%)	99 (23.8%)	54 (64.3%)
Total (n =531)	31 (100%)	416 (100%)	84 (100%)
2002			
HIV-positive	3 (20.0%)	16 (5.5%)	1 (1.6%)
HIV-negative	11 (73.3%)	219 (75.0%)	26 (41.9%)
HIV status unknown	1 (6.7%)	57 (19.5%)	35 (56.5%)
Total (n =369)	15 (100%)	292 (100%)	62 (100%)

Note : Includes only those men who had a regular partner at the time of completing the survey.

Sexual Practice and 'Safe Sex'

SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR BETWEEN MEN

Participants were asked to report on a limited range of sexual practices (separately for regular and casual partners): anal intercourse with and without ejaculation, and oral intercourse with and without ejaculation (see Table 20). Based on the responses to the sexual behaviour items and the sort of sexual relationships with men indicated by the participants, about two-thirds of the men in all three surveys were classified as having had sex with a regular male partner and this proportion has been steady across the three study periods. A similar proportion was classified as having had sex with any casual male partners 'in the previous six months' and this proportion is also unchanged over the three surveys. Further interpretation of these findings is reported below.

Table 20 : Reported sex with male partners in previous six months

	1998 (n=846)	2000 (n=1035)	2002 (n=790)
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	527 (62.3%)	679 (65.6%)	500 (63.3%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	551 (65.1%)	683 (66.0%)	494 (62.5%)

Note : These categories are not mutually exclusive

As in 1998 and 2000, men recruited at the Fair Day were more likely to have had regular partners, and less likely to have had casual partners than their counterparts recruited at sex-on-premises and social venues (see Table 21). Such a finding is not surprising as men attending the gay venues, particularly the sex-on-premises venues, do so mainly to find casual partners.

Table 21 : Reported sex with male partners in previous six months by recruitment site

Serostatus of Regular Partner	Fair Day	Venues
1998		
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	329 (69.0%)	198 (53.7%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	265 (55.6%)	286 (77.5%)
Total (N = 846)	477	369
2000		
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	426 (71.7%)	253 (57.4%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	338 (56.9%)	345 (78.2%)
Total (N = 1035)	594	441
2002		
Any sexual contact with <i>regular</i> partners	362 (66.4%)	138 (56.3%)
Any sexual contact with <i>casual</i> partners	297 (54.5%)	197 (80.4%)
Total (N=790)	545	245

Note : These categories are not mutually exclusive.

The number of male sex partners that respondents reported having in the previous six months did not change from 2000 to 2002 (see Table 22). The majority of the men had engaged in sex with between 1 partner and 10 partners 'in the previous six months'.

Table 22 : Number of male sex partners in previous six months

	1998	2000	2002
None	83 (9.8%)	147 (14.3%)	116 (14.8%)
One	207 (24.5%)	202 (19.7%)	164 (20.9%)
2–10	366 (43.4%)	470 (45.8%)	365 (46.5%)
11–50	151 (17.9%)	166 (16.2%)	114 (14.5%)
More than 50	37 (4.4%)	42 (4.1%)	26 (3.3%)
Total	844 (100%)¹	1027 (100%)²	785 (100%)³

¹ Missing data (n=2) ² Missing data (n=8) ³ Missing data (n=5)

OVERVIEW OF SEXUAL PRACTICES WITH REGULAR AND CASUAL PARTNERS

When participants engaged in oral intercourse with ejaculation with their regular male partners, they were equally likely to do so in the insertive as in the receptive role (see Table 23). This result is consistent across the three study periods. About two-thirds of those with regular male partners engaged in any oral intercourse (receptive or insertive) with ejaculation with their partners.

Most respondents engaged in anal intercourse with their regular male partners and the percentage has remained steady across the three study periods. About 75% of the men with regular partners reported engaging in insertive anal intercourse, while a slightly lower proportion reported engaging in receptive anal intercourse.

Table 23 : Sexual behaviour with regular male partners

	Total Sample	Those with regular partners
1998		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	339 (40.1%)	339 (64.3%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	261 (30.9%)	261 (49.5%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	277 (32.7%)	277 (52.6%)
Any anal intercourse	435 (51.4%)	435 (82.5%)
Insertive anal intercourse	376 (44.4%)	376 (71.3%)
Receptive anal intercourse	351 (41.5%)	351 (66.6%)
Base	846	527
2000		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	408 (39.4%)	408 (60.1%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	337 (32.6%)	337 (49.6%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	337 (32.6%)	337 (49.6%)
Any anal intercourse	577 (55.7%)	577 (85.0%)
Insertive anal intercourse	508 (49.1%)	508 (74.8%)
Receptive anal intercourse	470 (45.4%)	470 (69.2%)
Base	1035	679
2002		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	326 (41.3%)	326 (65.2%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	276 (34.9%)	276 (55.2%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	276 (34.9%)	276 (55.2%)
Any anal intercourse	423 (53.5%)	423 (84.6%)
Insertive anal intercourse	370 (46.8%)	370 (74.0%)
Receptive anal intercourse	349 (44.2%)	349 (69.8%)
Base	790	500

Note : These items are not mutually exclusive. The percentages do not sum to 100 per cent as some men engaged in more than one of these practices and some in none of these practices.

Fewer respondents engaged in either oral intercourse with ejaculation or anal intercourse with casual male partners than with regular male partners (see Table 24). There was no change in the 2002 survey in the proportion of men with casual partners who engaged in oral intercourse with ejaculation. A larger proportion of respondents consistently report insertive than receptive fellatio with casual partners. Seventy percent of the men who had sex with casual male partners engaged in anal intercourse with those partners, and again more usually in the insertive than the receptive role. These percentages have not changed since 2000 after showing an increase from 1998 to 2000.

Table 24 : Sexual behaviour with casual male partners

	Total Sample	Those with casual partners
1998		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	269 (31.8%)	269 (47.4%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	209 (24.7%)	209 (36.9%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	188 (22.2%)	188 (33.2%)
Any anal intercourse	355 (42.0%)	355 (62.6%)
Insertive anal intercourse	305 (36.1%)	305 (53.8%)
Receptive anal intercourse	257 (30.4%)	257 (45.3%)
Base	846	567
2000		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	303 (29.3%)	303 (42.4%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	258 (24.9%)	258 (36.1%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	210 (20.3%)	210 (29.4%)
Any anal intercourse	489 (47.2%)	489 (68.5%)
Insertive anal intercourse	433 (41.8%)	433 (60.6%)
Receptive anal intercourse	363 (35.1%)	363 (50.8%)
Base	1035	714
2002		
Any oral intercourse with ejaculation	231 (29.2%)	231 (45.7%)
Insertive fellatio with ejaculation	192 (24.3%)	192 (38.0%)
Receptive fellatio with ejaculation	160 (20.3%)	160 (31.7%)
Any anal intercourse	353 (44.7%)	353 (69.9%)
Insertive anal intercourse	314 (39.7%)	314 (62.2%)
Receptive anal intercourse	265 (33.5%)	265 (52.5%)
Base	790	505

Note: These items are not mutually exclusive. The percentages do not sum to 100 per cent as some men engaged in more than one of these practices and some in none of these practices.

SEX WITH REGULAR MALE PARTNERS

Condom Use

The percentage of men engaging in unprotected anal intercourse (UAI) and the proportion of men who always used condoms has not changed significantly from 2000 (see Table 25). Remaining quite steady across the three study periods are the proportions of men reporting to have been in a regular relationship in the previous six months and the proportion of men who had a partner but did not engage in any anal intercourse.

Table 25 : Condom use with regular partners

	Total Sample	Those with regular partners
1998		
No regular partner	319 (37.7%)	—
No anal intercourse	92 (10.9%)	92 (17.5%)
Always uses condom	181 (21.4%)	181 (34.3%)
Sometimes does not use condom	254 (30.0%)	254 (48.2%)
Base	846 (100%)	527 (100%)
2000		
No regular partner	356 (34.4%)	—
No anal intercourse	102 (9.9%)	102 (15.0%)
Always uses condom	201 (19.4%)	201 (29.6%)
Sometimes does not use condom	376 (36.3%)	376 (55.4%)
Base	1035 (100%)	679 (100%)
2002		
No regular partner	290 (36.7%)	—
No anal intercourse	77 (9.7%)	77 (15.4%)
Always uses condom	149 (18.9%)	149 (29.8%)
Sometimes does not use condom ¹	274 (34.7%)	274 (54.8%)
Base	790 (100%)	1193 (100%)

¹ In the 2002 survey, of the 274 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners 'in the previous 6 months', 58 men only practised withdrawal prior to ejaculation, 84 consistently ejaculated inside, and 132 engaged in both withdrawal and ejaculation inside.

In all three surveys, there were no statistically significant differences between HIV-negative, HIV-positive and 'untested' men in their condom use with regular partners (see Table 26). Moreover, there has been no change from the previous survey in the proportion of men of positive, negative or unknown serostatus who sometimes do not use condoms for anal intercourse. These findings should be treated cautiously as they are based on small numbers of HIV-positive men.

Table 26 : Serostatus and condom use among regular partners

	HIV-Positive	HIV-Negative	Unknown serostatus
1998			
No anal intercourse	4 (13.3%)	75 (18.0%)	9 (12.9%)
Always uses condom	11 (36.7%)	140 (33.6%)	29 (41.4%)
Sometimes does not use condom	15 (50.0%)	202 (48.4%)	32 (45.7%)
Total	30 (100%)	417 (100%)	70 (100%)
2000			
No anal intercourse	3 (9.4%)	72 (13.8%)	25 (21.6%)
Always uses condom	11 (34.4%)	160 (30.7%)	29 (25.0%)
Sometimes does not use condom	18 (56.3%)	290 (55.6%)	62 (53.4%)
Total	32 (100%)	522 (100%)	116 (100%)
2002			
No anal intercourse	1 (5.3%)	52 (13.4%)	24 (26.7%)
Always uses condom	8 (42.1%)	116 (29.9%)	24 (26.7%)
Sometimes does not use condom	10 (52.6%)	220 (56.7%)	42 (46.7%)
Total	19 (100%)	388 (100%)	90 (100%)

In Table 27, the serostatus of each of the participants who had anal intercourse with a regular partner has been compared with that of his regular partner. For each of the nine serostatus combinations, sexual practice has been divided into 'no unprotected anal intercourse' versus 'some unprotected anal intercourse'. The numbers overall are small and these figures should be treated cautiously.

HIV-positive men were less likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with negative partners than with positive partners. HIV-negative men were more likely to have unprotected anal intercourse with negative partners or unknown status partners than with positive partners. However, the percentage of HIV-negative men having unprotected anal intercourse with HIV-positive partners has increased over the previous two surveys. Whereas much of the unprotected anal intercourse was between seroconcordant (positive-positive or negative-negative) couples, in 2002, 53 men had unprotected anal intercourse in a relationship where seroconcordance was absent or in doubt. Separate analyses of these 53 men showed that 33 of them *never* used condoms for anal intercourse with their regular partners (ie. all anal intercourse with their regular partners was without condoms).

Table 27 : Condom use and match of HIV serostatus in regular relationships

Regular Partner's Serostatus	Anal intercourse	Participant's Serostatus		
		HIV-Positive	HIV-Negative	Unknown
1998				
HIV-Positive	No UAI	—	3 (50.0%)	1 (100%)
	Some UAI	7 (100.0%)	3 (50.0%)	—
HIV-Negative	No UAI	10 (76.9%)	35 (23.5%)	1 (14.3%)
	Some UAI	3 (23.1%)	114 (76.5%)	6 (85.7%)
Unknown	No UAI	—	10 (33.3%)	6 (37.5%)
	Some UAI	1 (100.0%)	20 (66.7%)	10 (62.5%)
Total		21	185	24
2000				
HIV-Positive	No UAI	1 (20.0%)	8 (42.1%)	—
	Some UAI	4 (80.0%)	11 (57.9%)	—
HIV-Negative	No UAI	7 (50.0%)	55 (27.4%)	3 (17.6%)
	Some UAI	7 (50.0%)	146 (72.6%)	14 (82.4%)
Unknown	No UAI	—	11 (24.4%)	6 (30.4%)
	Some UAI	2 (100.0%)	34 (75.6%)	16 (69.6%)
Total		21	265	39
2002				
HIV-Positive	No UAI	—	4 (36.4%)	—
	Some UAI	3 (100.0%)	7 (63.6%)	1 (100.0%)
HIV-Negative	No UAI	4 (50.0%)	29 (20.4%)	3 (20.0%)
	Some UAI	4 (50.0%)	113 (79.6%)	12 (80.0%)
Unknown	No UAI	—	7 (26.9%)	5 (33.3%)
	Some UAI	—	19 (73.1%)	10 (66.7%)
Total		11	179	31

Note: UAI = unprotected anal intercourse. Includes only men who had anal intercourse with their 'current' regular partner 'in the previous six months'.

AGREEMENTS

Most participants who had a regular male partner (about 55% of men in the sample) also had an agreement with their partner about sex *within* the relationship and this proportion has remained steady across the three study periods (see Table 28). Moreover, there has been no significant change in the proportions of the various agreements over the three study periods.

Table 28 : Agreements with regular male partners about sex *within* the relationship

	1998	2000	2002
No spoken agreement about anal intercourse	88 (22.3%)	140 (26.5%)	89 (23.9%)
No anal intercourse between regular partners	40 (10.1%)	39 (7.4%)	30 (8.0%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	111 (28.1%)	137 (25.9%)	115 (30.8%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	156 (39.5%)	213 (40.3%)	139 (37.3%)
Total	395 (100%)	529 (100%)	373 (100%)

Note : Percentages are based on men who had a regular partner at the time of completing the survey

Most participants had made an agreement with their regular partner about sex with men *outside* the relationship (see Table 29). The majority of these agreements either specified no casual partners or allowed for there to be anal intercourse with casual partners on the proviso that condoms were used. About one-third of the men had no spoken agreement about sex outside the relationship. Since 2000 there has been no change in the proportions of men who have agreements stipulating no sexual contact with casual partners or no anal intercourse with casual partners. In the most recent survey there has been a significant increase in the proportion of men who have agreements that allow anal intercourse without condoms, although the increase is small and based on small numbers. Conversely, there was a significant decrease in agreements that only allow anal intercourse with casual partners if condoms are used ($p < .05$). However, it appears that this decrease is balanced by increases in the proportion of men with no spoken agreement and agreements that do not allow sexual contact with casual partners (although not significant) as well as an increase in the proportion allowing anal intercourse without condoms.

Table 29 : Agreements with regular male partners about sex *outside* the relationship

	1998	2000	2002
No spoken agreement about sex	108 (28.1%)	164 (32.3%)	152 (35.2%)
No sexual contact with casual partners is permitted	124 (32.3%)	163 (32.1%)	149 (34.5%)
No anal intercourse with casual partners is permitted	34 (8.9%)	27 (5.3%)	23 (5.3%)
Anal intercourse permitted only with condom	113 (29.4%)	148 (29.2%)	95 (22.0%)
Anal intercourse without condom is permitted	5 (1.3%)	5 (1.0%)	13 (3.0%)
Total	384 (100%)	507 (100%)	432 (100%)

Note : Percentages are based on men who had a regular partner at the time of completing the survey

SEX WITH CASUAL MALE PARTNERS

Condom use

Based on the entire sample, about 18% of the men who participated in the 2002 survey engaged in any unprotected anal intercourse with casual male partners 'in the previous six months' (see Table 30). This percentage is similar to that of the previous survey although the rate of UAI-C in the 2000 and 2002 surveys was significantly higher than in 1998 ($p < .001$). A separate analysis revealed that of the 146 men who reported engaging in UAI-C, 61 had also engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with regular partners.

Table 30 : Condom use with casual partners

	Total Sample	Those with casual partners
1998		
No casual partner	295 (34.9%)	—
No anal intercourse	201 (23.8%)	201 (36.5%)
Always uses condom	250 (29.6%)	250 (45.4%)
Sometimes does not use condom	100 (11.8%)	100 (18.1%)
Base	846 (100%)	551 (100%)
2000		
No casual partner	352 (34.0%)	
No anal intercourse	204 (19.7%)	204 (29.9%)
Always uses condom	292 (28.2%)	292 (42.8%)
Sometimes does not use condom	187 (18.1%)	187 (27.4%)
Base	1035 (100%)	683 (100%)
2002		
No casual partner	296 (37.5%)	—
No anal intercourse	146 (18.5%)	146 (29.6%)
Always uses condom	202 (25.6%)	202 (40.9%)
Sometimes does not use condom	146 (18.5%)	146 (29.6%)
Base	790 (100%)	494 (100%)

¹ Of the 146 men who engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners 'in the previous six months', 50 only practised withdrawal prior to ejaculation, 38 consistently ejaculated inside, and 58 engaged in both withdrawal and ejaculation inside.

A comparison of the data in Tables 25 and 30 confirms that more men had unprotected anal intercourse with regular than with casual partners. Furthermore, unprotected anal intercourse with ejaculation inside was more common within regular relationships than between casual partners.

In 1998 there were statistically significant differences between HIV-positive, HIV-negative and 'untested' men in their condom use with casual partners ($p < .05$). Compared to men of unknown serostatus, a greater proportion of HIV-positive men engaged in UAI-C and a smaller proportion of HIV-negative men engaged in UAI-C (see Table 31). These differences in condom use between men of different serostatus were not evident in the 2000 and 2002 surveys. There was no significant difference between HIV-positive, negative or unknown serostatus men, in the proportions that always used condoms in 1998. However in 2002, HIV-negative men were more likely than HIV-positive men to always use condoms, and men of unknown serostatus were less likely than HIV-positive or negative men to use condoms 100% of the time when engaging in anal intercourse with casual partners (although more likely not to have had anal intercourse). Some of the HIV-positive men's unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners may be positive-positive sex (Prestage et al, 1995), which poses no risk of seroconversion per se.

Table 31 : Serostatus and condom use with casual partners

	HIV-Positive	HIV-Negative	Unknown serostatus
1998			
No anal intercourse	6 (18.2%)	164 (37.3%)	27 (37.5%)
Always uses condom	16 (48.5%)	205 (46.6%)	28 (38.9%)
Sometimes does not use condom	11 (33.3%)	71 (16.1%)	17 (23.6%)
Total	33 (100%)	440 (100%)	72 (100%)
2000			
No anal	9 (21.4%)	152 (28.7%)	42 (38.5%)
Always uses condom	22 (52.4%)	230 (43.4%)	40 (36.7%)
Sometimes does not use condom	11 (26.2%)	148 (27.9%)	27 (24.8%)
Total	42 (100%)	530 (100%)	109 (100%)
2002			
No anal	5 (27.8%)	105 (27.6%)	36 (38.3%)
Always uses condom	7 (38.9%)	166 (43.6%)	29 (30.9%)
Sometimes does not use condom	6 (33.3%)	110 (28.9%)	29 (30.9%)
Total	18 (100%)	381 (100%)	94 (100%)

Based on responses to questions 32 to 34 (see Appendix), and consistent with results from the previous survey, almost half of the respondents always used condoms when they did not know the serostatus of their casual partners. Relatively few men reported occasions of sex with casual partners understood to be HIV-positive. On such occasions, consistent condom use was the norm (see Table 32). The proportion of respondents who never used condoms when their casual partners were known to be either HIV-positive, HIV-negative or of unknown status has fallen significantly from about 15% recorded in the previous survey in 2000 to less than 10% in the current survey ($p < .01$). The figures in Table 32 must be treated with caution and interpreted bearing in mind the increased proportions who reported 'No such occasions' in 2002.

Table 32 : Condom use and anal intercourse with casual partners of unknown, positive and negative serostatus

Serostatus of casual partner		Never used condoms	Sometimes used condoms	Always used condoms	No such occasions
Unknown	2000	107 (15.3%)	96 (13.7%)	347 (49.5%)	151 (21.5%)
	2002	28 (5.8%)	90 (18.6%)	233 (48.2%)	132 (27.3%)
Positive	2000	95 (14.1%)	18 (2.7%)	173 (25.6%)	389 (57.6%)
	2002	30 (6.3%)	32 (6.8%)	120 (25.3%)	292 (61.6%)
Negative	2000	97 (14.5%)	82 (12.3%)	237 (35.5%)	251 (37.6%)
	2002	41 (8.7%)	61 (12.9%)	150 (31.7%)	221 (46.7%)

SEROSTATUS

Two questions were asked to obtain a sense of disclosure in the context of sex between casual partners. Many more questions—well beyond the scope of the brief questionnaire used here—would need to be asked to fully understand the issue. Furthermore, the inclusion of the two questions was *not* intended to endorse sexual negotiation between casual partners.

About 56% of respondents with casual partners did not disclose their serostatus to any of their casual partners, a significant decrease from the previous survey ($p < .01$) (see Table 33). Relatively few men disclosed to all casual partners, although in the most recent survey the proportion of men who told some or all of their partners their serostatus increased significantly ($p < .01$).

Table 33 : Participants' disclosure of serostatus to casual partners

	1998	2000	2002
Told none	338 (62.9%)	484 (67.0%)	278 (56.3%)
Told some	104 (19.4%)	117 (16.2%)	108 (21.9%)
Told all	95 (17.7%)	121 (16.8%)	108 (21.9%)
Total	537 (100%)	722 (100%)	494 (100%)

Most of the men who had casual partners were not told the serostatus of those partners in the context of sex (see Table 34). There has been no significant change in the proportions since the last survey, however, the proportion who are never told is showing a decreasing trend since 1998 (Mantel-Haenszel, $p < .01$) and the proportion 'told by some' shows a trend increase since 1998 (Mantel-Haenszel, $p < .05$). Relatively few men had the serostatus of their casual partners routinely disclosed to them.

Table 34 : Casual partners' disclosure of serostatus to participants

	1998	2000	2002
Told by none	368 (68.1%)	477 (65.8%)	294 (61.0%)
Told by some	114 (21.1%)	170 (23.4%)	134 (27.2%)
Told by all	58 (10.7%)	78 (10.8%)	64 (13.0%)
Total	540 (100%)	725 (100%)	492 (100%)

In 2002, the 'Internet' was added to the list of places where men look for male sex partners. Almost half of the men who responded used the internet to look for partners. Gay bars are the most popular places used to find sex partners (approximately 70% of men who responded) followed by saunas (see Table 35). The proportion of respondents who used each of the various places listed was significantly lower than that reported in the 2000 survey. This may be a result of the increase in the proportion of men recruited at Fair Day (who are less likely to have casual sex partners).

Separate analyses revealed that of the men who indicated that they have engaged in sex with casual partners in the last six months, around 75% of respondents looked for partners in gay bars, while around 50% used the internet and sex venues, and 35% used beats.

Table 35 : Where men look for sex partners

Venue		Never	Occasionally	Often	Total
Internet	2002 ¹	394 (53.5%)	264 (35.8%)	79 (10.7%)	737 (100%) ¹
Gay bar	1998	147 (20.1%)	385 (52.7%)	198 (27.1%)	730 (100%)
	2000	149 (16.7%)	468 (52.5%)	274 (30.8%)	891 (100%)
	2002 ²	214 (28.8%)	372 (50.0%)	158 (21.2%)	744 (100%) ²
Beat	1998	352 (55.4%)	218 (34.3%)	65 (10.2%)	635 (100%)
	2000	460 (58.1%)	257 (32.4%)	75 (9.5%)	792 (100%)
	2002 ³	526 (72.2%)	165 (22.6%)	38 (5.2%)	729 (100%) ³
Sauna	1998	323 (47.2%)	268 (39.2%)	93 (13.6%)	684 (100%)
	2000	398 (46.7%)	315 (37.0%)	139 (16.3%)	852 (100%)
	2002 ⁴	440 (60.1%)	215 (29.4%)	77 (10.5%)	732 (100%) ⁴
Private sex party	1998	524 (87.0%)	72 (12.0%)	6 (1.0%)	602 (100%)
	2000	634 (85.6%)	88 (11.9%)	19 (2.6%)	741 (100%)
	2002 ⁵	652 (89.6%)	61 (8.4%)	15 (2.1%)	728 (100%) ⁵
Sex worker	1998	548 (90.7%)	48 (7.9%)	8 (1.3%)	604 (100%)
	2000	683 (92.5%)	46 (6.2%)	9 (1.2%)	738 (100%)
	2002 ⁶	696 (95.6%)	30 (4.1%)	2 (0.3%)	728 (100%) ⁶

¹ Missing data (n=53) ² Missing data (n=46) ³ Missing data (n=61) ⁴ Missing data (n=58) ⁵ Missing data (n=62)

⁶ Missing data (n=62)

Information about HIV Therapies and PEP

Several studies have demonstrated that men in Australian gay communities are on the whole well informed about HIV/AIDS (e.g., Crawford et al., 1998). Less well understood are beliefs in the context of advances in combination antiretroviral therapies. Three questions addressed this issue (questions 57 - 59). Where men gave responses to questions about combination therapy, these were generally in accordance with recognised medical opinion and erring on the side of caution (see Table 36).

Table 36 : Responses to questions about combination therapy

Item	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
New HIV treatments take the worry out of sex.	355 (47.6%)	271 (36.3%)	83 (11.1%)	37 (5.0%)
HIV is less of a threat because the epidemic is on the decline.	407 (55.0%)	263 (35.5%)	49 (6.6%)	21 (2.8%)
HIV/AIDS is a less serious threat than it used to be because of new treatments.	391 (52.7%)	239 (32.2%)	98 (13.2%)	14 (1.9%)

The relationship between the items about combination therapies and the participant's serostatus (see Table 37) was similar to findings in other Australian cities. Most men's responses were generally in line with accepted wisdom.

Table 37 : Responses to questions about combination therapy by serostatus

Serostatus	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
New HIV treatments take the worry out of sex				
HIV-Positive	8 (32.0%)	12 (48.0%)	3 (12.0%)	2 (8.0%)
HIV-Negative	282 (49.8%)	198 (35.0%)	59 (10.4%)	27 (4.8%)
Unknown	63 (41.7%)	61 (40.4%)	20 (13.2%)	7 (4.6%)
HIV is less of a threat because the epidemic is on the decline				
HIV-Positive	12 (48.0%)	12 (48.0%)	1 (4.0%)	0 (0.0%)
HIV-Negative	318 (56.7%)	188 (33.5%)	37 (6.6%)	18 (3.2%)
Unknown	73 (48.7%)	63 (42.0%)	11 (7.3%)	3 (2.0%)
HIV/AIDS is a less serious threat than it used to be because of new treatments				
HIV-Positive	9 (36.0%)	9 (36.0%)	6 (24.0%)	1 (4.0%)
HIV-Negative	309 (55.0%)	165 (29.4%)	77 (13.7%)	11 (2.0%)
Unknown	70 (46.4%)	65 (43.0%)	14 (9.3%)	2 (1.3%)

POST-EXPOSURE PROPHYLAXIS (PEP)

A question about post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP), aimed at assessing respondents' knowledge of the availability of PEP, was added to the survey in 2002. About three-quarters of respondents had never heard of PEP (see Table 38). Less than 20% of the men surveyed knew about the availability of PEP and about 7% believed that PEP would be available in the future.

Table 38 : Knowledge of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)

	2002
It's readily available now	136 (18.5%)
It will be available in the future	49 (6.7%)
I've never heard about it	550 (74.8%)
Total	735 (100%)²

¹Missing data (n=55)

There was no significant difference in knowledge of PEP between respondents who sometimes engaged in UAI-C and those did not engage in UAI-C (see Table 39). Separate analyses indicated that there were 107 men who completed the survey in 2002 and engaged in UAI-C without knowledge that PEP was available.

Similarly, there was no difference between men who did or did not engage in UAI-R in their knowledge of the availability of PEP. Separate analyses showed that in the 2002 sample there were 107 men who engaged in UAI-R in the preceding six months, some of whom were in sero-nonconcordant relationships, and who were unaware of the availability of PEP.

Table 39 : Unprotected anal intercourse and knowledge of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)

	Casual		Regular	
	Some UAI-C	No UAI-C	Some UAI-R	No UAI-R
It's readily available now	33 (23.6%)	103 (17.3%)	45 (17.6%)	91 (19.0%)
It will be available in the future	7 (5.0%)	42 (7.1%)	24 (9.4%)	25 (5.2%)
I've never heard of it	100 (71.4%)	450 (75.6%)	186 (72.9%)	364 (75.8%)
Total	140 (100%)	595 (100%)	255 (100%)	480 (100%)

More than half of the respondents in 2002 knew at least one person infected with HIV or AIDS (see Table 40). Almost 10% of respondents knew more than 10 people infected with HIV/AIDS. Since 1998 there has been a significant decrease in the proportion of men who know at least one person with HIV or AIDS ($p < .001$), which may be partly attributable to the increase in respondents aged less than 25 years.

Table 40 : People known with HIV or AIDS

	1998	2002
None	197 (24.1%)	297 (38.1%)
One	106 (13.0%)	98 (12.6%)
Two	115 (14.1)	103 (13.2%)
3 – 5	239 (29.3)	167 (21.4%)
6 - 10	68 (8.3)	44 (5.6%)
More than 10	91 (11.2)	70 (9.0%)

Drug Use

In 2002, similar to 2000, the most commonly used drugs were marijuana, amyl, ecstasy and speed (see Table 41). However, the proportion of respondents who used marijuana, amyl, ecstasy, speed and cocaine has fallen significantly since 2000 (perhaps reflecting a change in sample composition—fewer participants from gay venues and younger participants— rather than a genuine decreasing trend; see Tables 1 & 3). Few respondents reported having used other drugs.

Table 41 : Drug use in previous six months

	2000	2002
Marijuana**	446 (45.8%)	296 (39.5%)
Amyl/Poppers*	308 (33.4%)	213 (28.5%)
Ecstasy*	299 (31.7%)	203 (27.1%)
Speed/ Crystal meth**	254 (27.3%)	163 (21.7%)
Cocaine/ Crack***	91 (10.3%)	28 (3.8%)
Viagra	46 (5.3%)	55 (7.4%)
Steroids	13 (1.5%)	9 (1.2%)
Heroin	21 (2.4%)	10 (1.3%)
Benzos	31 (3.6%)	20 (2.7%)
Any other drug*	67 (8.0%)	86 (11.5%)

Note : Categories are not mutually exclusive. * p < .05 ; ** p < .01 ; *** p < .001

A small number of men indicated that they had injected drugs/steroids 'in the past six months' (see Table 42). The most commonly injected drug in 2002 was speed. Very few respondents injected any other drugs. Seven men (less than 1%) indicated that they had injected more than one drug 'in the past six months'. A total of 32 men (4.1% of the total sample) had injected any drug in this period.

Table 42 : Injecting drug use in previous six months

	2000	2002
Speed/ Crystal meth	35 (5.9%)	25 (4.7%)
Ecstasy	13 (2.3%)	5 (0.9%)
Cocaine	9 (1.6%)	3 (0.6%)
Steroids	7 (1.2%)	3 (0.6%)
Heroin*	18 (3.2%)	5 (1.0%)
Benzos	3 (0.5%)	1 (0.2%)
Any other drug**	11 (1.9%)	1 (0.2%)

Note : Categories are not mutually exclusive.

Discussion

The findings from the third Perth Gay Community Periodic Survey conducted during October 2002 provide an important update on the social and sexual lives of gay men in Perth. In the main, the findings are quite similar to (and thereby corroborate) the evidence from the two preceding surveys in 1998 (Van de Ven et al., 1999) and 2000 (Brown et al., 2001). Likewise, many of the results parallel findings from Gay Community Periodic Surveys in other Australian cities, for example Sydney (Prestage et al, 1996; Van de Ven et al, 1997), reinforcing the notion that in some respects the gay cultures of the capital cities in Australia are akin.

The 790 participants were recruited at three gay venues and at the Lesbian and Gay Pride Festival. Most of the men lived in the Perth Metropolitan area. They were predominantly of 'Anglo-Australian' background and worked in professional /managerial or white-collar occupations.

Most of the participants identified as gay or homosexual. Correspondingly, most had sex with men only, reflected in the finding that 90% had not had sex with any women 'in the previous six months'. As a whole, the sample was quite involved socially in gay community with high levels of gay friendships and with much free time spent with gay men.

Approximately 20% of the men had not been tested for HIV. This proportion has increased significantly since 1998 when about 15% had not been tested. The majority of those who had been tested for HIV had done so in the preceding 12 months. Overall, 3.4% of the men were HIV-positive.

Among the HIV-positive participants, use of combination antiretroviral therapies remained unchanged in 2002 following a significant increase from 1998 to 2000 – about three-quarters of the HIV-positive men were taking a combination therapy at the time of the 2002 survey, compared to 62% in 1998. These results are in contrast to other Australian cities where use of combination therapy has been declining somewhat over time, but the small numbers involved necessitate some caution in interpreting these findings.

Most men reported 'current' sexual contact with at least one other man: about one-third of the men had a regular partner only. Approximately one-quarter had a regular partner with either or both partners also having casual partners, a decline from 35% in 1998, and approximately one-quarter of the men had casual partners only. In the six months prior to the survey, just under two-

thirds of the men had sex with regular partners and the same proportion had sex with casual partners.

The 2002 survey shows no change in the proportion of men engaging in UAI-R and UAI-C. Of the total 2002 sample and 'in the previous six months', 274 men (34.7%) had any unprotected anal intercourse with a regular partner and 146 men (18.5%) had any unprotected anal intercourse with a casual partner. Some of these men (61 all told) had unprotected anal intercourse with both regular and casual partners. The remainder of the men in the overall sample—the overwhelming majority—indicated no unprotected anal intercourse with either regular or casual partners.

As expected, more men had unprotected anal intercourse with regular than with casual partners. Furthermore, unprotected anal intercourse that involved ejaculation inside was much more likely to occur between regular than between casual partners.

The proportion of men who had an agreement with their partner about sex within the relationship has remained steady since 1998. Furthermore, the types of agreements reached were unchanged over the three survey periods. As with agreements about sex within relationships, the proportion of men who have agreements about sex outside the relationship has been fairly steady since 1998, although there has been some change over time.

Over half of the respondents did not routinely disclose their serostatus to casual partners, a significant decrease from the previous survey. Conversely, the proportion of men who disclosed their status to either some or all of their casual partners increased significantly to about 20% for both categories. Similar to disclosure by participants, about 60% of casual partners did not disclose their serostatus to participants. While there was no change in the latest survey in the proportion of men who sometimes, always or never disclosed their HIV status, over the three survey periods there has been a trend increase in the proportion who are 'told by some' of their partners. Conversely, there has been a trend decrease in the proportion of men who were never told the HIV status of their casual partners.

Detailed analyses of risk reduction strategies such as positive-positive sex (Prestage et al., 1995) and strategic positioning (Van de Ven et al., 2002) have not been reported here. However, interpretations of the findings in this report should bear in mind that some gay men's sex practices involve risk reduction strategies.

Questions about PEP indicated that knowledge about it is still not widespread. Three-quarters of respondents had never heard of PEP, considerably more than reported in recent surveys in Queensland (Hull et al., 2002a), Melbourne (Hull et al., 2002b) and Sydney (Hull et al., 2003). Less than 20% of respondents knew that PEP was available now. There were 107 men who had engaged in unprotected anal intercourse with casual partners in the preceding six months and who had never heard about PEP or who understood that PEP would only be available in the future.

Most of the men had not injected any drugs 'in the past six months', while a total of 32 men (4.1%) indicated that they had injected at least one drug. Marijuana was the most popular drug, with about 40% of respondents using in the previous six months. Just over a quarter of respondents used amyl and ecstasy, while just under one-quarter used speed or crystal methamphetamine. The use of other drugs was uncommon.

In conclusion, the 2003 Perth Gay Community Periodic Survey was conducted very successfully and has provided evidence that can be used by community members, educators, policy makers and others in developing programs aimed at sustaining and improving gay men's sexual and social health. Recruitment at the Fair Day and the three gay community venues attracted a large sample of gay men from the Perth metropolitan area. Except where indicated, the resulting data are robust and comparisons with the data from 1998 and 2000 and other studies are suggestive of sound reliability.

References

- Brown, G., Maycock, B., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Langdon, T. & Shaw, T. (2001). Perth Gay Community Survey: Brief report October 2000. Perth: WA AIDS Council & Centre for Health Promotion Research.
- Connell, R., Dowsett, G., Rodden, P. & Davis, M. (1991). Social class, gay men and AIDS prevention. *Australian Journal of Public Health*, 15, 178–189.
- Crawford, J., Kippax, S., Rodden, P., Donohoe, S. & Van de Ven, P. (1998). *Male Call 96: National telephone survey of men who have sex with men*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.
- Grierson, J., Misson, S., McDonald, K., Pitts, M. & O'Brien, M. (2002). *HIV Futures 3: Positive Australians on Services, Health and Well-being*. Monograph Series No. 37. Melbourne: Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society, La Trobe University.
- Hood, D., Prestage, G., Crawford, J., Sorrell, T. & O'Reilly, C. (1994). *Bisexual activity and non gay-attachment. A report on the BANGAR project*. Western Sydney Area Health Service.
- Hull, P., Rawstorne, P., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Walton, J., Harrison, G., Tunley, F. & Ferguson, G. (2002a). *Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey: June 2002*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.
- Hull, P., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Rawstorne, P., Kippax, S., Horn, G., Kennedy, M., Hussey, G. & Batrouney, C. (2002b). *Gay Community Periodic Survey: Melbourne 2002*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.
- Hull, P., Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Rawstorne, P., Grulich, A., Crawford, J., Kippax, S., Maddedu, D., McGuigan, D., & Nicholas, A. (2003). *Gay Community Periodic Survey: Sydney 1996 - 2002*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.
- Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Noble, J., Crawford, J., Baxter, D. & Cooper, D. (1995). A demographic, behavioural and clinical profile of HIV-positive men in a sample of homosexually active men in Sydney, Australia. Sydney: HIV, AIDS & Society Publications.
- Prestage, G., Kippax, S., Van de Ven, P., French, J., Richters, J., Campbell, D., Crawford, J., Grulich, A., Kinder, P. & Kaldor, J. (1996). *Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey: February 1996*. Sydney: HIV AIDS & Society Publications.
- Van de Ven, P., Kippax, S., Crawford, J., French, J., Prestage, G., Grulich, A., Kaldor, J. & Kinder, P. (1997). Sexual practices in a broad cross-sectional sample of Sydney gay men. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 21, 762–766.

- Van de Ven, P., Kippax, S., Crawford, J., Rawstorne, P., Prestage, G., Grulich, A., & Murphy, D. (2002). In a minority of gay men, sexual risk practice indicates strategic positioning for perceived risk reduction rather than unbridled sex. *AIDS Care*, 14, 471-480.
- Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., French, J., Horn, G. & Brotherton, A. (1998). *Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey: February 1998*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.
- Van de Ven, P., Prestage, G., Kippax, S., French, J., Derrin, L. & Bebbington, M. (1999). *Perth Gay Community Periodic Survey: September/October 1998*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research.

Questionnaire

See next page.

Casual male partners — last 6 months

LAST SIX MONTHS

8. How many different men have you had sex with in the past six months?

Age	Gender	None	1-50 men	2-5 men	6-10 men	One
18-24	Male	1	1	1	1	1
18-24	Female	1	1	1	1	1
25-34	Male	1	1	1	1	1
25-34	Female	1	1	1	1	1
35-44	Male	1	1	1	1	1
35-44	Female	1	1	1	1	1
45-54	Male	1	1	1	1	1
45-54	Female	1	1	1	1	1
55-64	Male	1	1	1	1	1
55-64	Female	1	1	1	1	1
65+	Male	1	1	1	1	1
65+	Female	1	1	1	1	1

9. How many different women have you had sex with in the past six months?

- Regular male partners — last 6 months**

- months?** Yes ☐ No ☐ Go directly to Question 21.
- In the past SIX MONTHS which of the following have you done with your REGULAR male partner/s?**

11. **Oral sex:** I sucked his cock but he did NOT come in my mouth
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

15. I fucked him **with a condom**
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
16. He fucked me **with a condom**
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
17. I fucked him **without a condom** but pulled out before I came

15. I fucked him *with a condom* ☐ Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
16. He fucked me *with a condom* ☐ Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

18. He fucked me **without a condom** but pulled out before he came
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
19. I fucked him **without a condom** and came inside him
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐
20. He fucked me **without a condom** and came inside me
Never ☐ Occasionally ☐ Often ☐

- In the past SIX MONTHS** which of the following have you done with any of your **CASUAL male partners**?

- ### Anal sex

- LAST SIX MONTHS

34. On those occasions I knew my **casual** partner was HIV negative, I used condoms: No such occasions ☐ Never ☐ Sometimes ☐ Always ☐

35. How many of your casual partners in the last 6 months did you tell your HIV status? None ☐ Some ☐ All ☐
36. How many of your casual partners in the last 6 months told you their HIV status? None ☐ Some ☐ All ☐
37. If you are looking for a male sexual partner, where do you go or look?

Internet	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
gay bar	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
beat	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
sauna	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
private sex party	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>
sex workers	Never <input type="checkbox"/>	Occasionally <input type="checkbox"/>	Often <input type="checkbox"/>

38. Have you ever had an HIV antibody test? No ☐ Yes ☐

39. When were you last tested for HIV antibodies?

Less than a week ago ☐ 7–12 months ago ☐
1–4 weeks ago ☐ 1–2 years ago ☐
1–6 months ago ☐ 2–4 years ago ☐
More than 4 years ago ☐

40. Based on the results of your HIV antibody tests, what is your HIV status?

No test/Don't know ☐
Negative ☐
Positive ☐

If you are HIV positive, please complete the next two questions

41. Are you on combination antiviral therapy? No ☐ Yes ☐
42. Is your viral load? Undetectable ☐
Detectable ☐
Don't know / unsure ☐

If you are in a regular relationship with a man at present, please complete the next three questions.

43. Do you know the result of your regular partner's HIV antibody test?
Yes—Positive ☐
Yes—Negative ☐
I don't know/He hasn't had a test ☐

44. Do you have a clear (spoken) agreement with your regular partner about anal sex (fucking) within your relationship?

No agreement ☐
Agreement: No anal sex at all ☐
Agreement: All anal sex is with a condom ☐
Agreement: Anal sex can be without a condom ☐

45. Do you have a clear (spoken) agreement with your regular partner about sex with casual partners?

No agreement ☐
Agreement: No sex at all ☐
Agreement: No anal sex at all ☐
Agreement: All anal sex is with a condom ☐
Agreement: Anal sex can be without a condom ☐

46. Apart from HIV, when were you last tested for an STI (eg gonorrhoea, hepatitis) ? ...

Less than a week ago ☐ 7–12 months ago ☐
1–4 weeks ago ☐ 1–2 years ago ☐
1–6 months ago ☐ 2–4 years ago ☐
More than 4 years ago ☐

47. How old are you? _____ years

48. What country were you born in? Australia ☐

Other (please specify) _____

49. Are you of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin? No ☐ Yes ☐

50. What is your ethnic background? (e.g. Australian Aboriginal, Dutch, Greek, Vietnamese, Lebanese, Chinese)

Anglo-Australian only ☐ Other: _____

51. Are you: (tick one only)

Employed full-time ☐
Employed part-time ☐
Unemployed ☐
A student ☐
A pensioner or on social security benefits ☐
Other ☐

52. What is your occupation? _____

53. Where do you live? Postcode

OR Suburb/Town: _____

54. What is the highest level of education you have had?

Up to 3 years of high school/Year 10 ☐
Year 12/TEE ☐
Tertiary diploma or trade certificate/TAFE ☐
University or CAE ☐

55. How many people do you know who have HIV infection or the illness AIDS? None ☐ 3–5 ☐
One ☐ 6–10 ☐
Two ☐ More than 10 ☐

56. What do you know about post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)?

It's readily available now ☐
It will be available in the future ☐
I've never heard about it ☐

The following statements are about new HIV treatments. For each question tick one box only. If unsure please give your best guess.

57. New HIV treatments take the worry out of sex

Strongly disagree ☐ disagree ☐ agree ☐ strongly agree ☐

58. HIV is less of a threat because the epidemic is on the decline

Strongly disagree ☐ disagree ☐ agree ☐ strongly agree ☐

59. HIV/AIDS is less serious than it used to be because of new treatments.

Strongly disagree ☐ disagree ☐ agree ☐ strongly agree ☐

60. Please look at the resources on the reverse side of the Information Sheet. Which ones have you seen before?

A: No ☐ Yes ☐ B: No ☐ Yes ☐

61. Which of these drugs have you used or injected in the past SIX MONTHS?

Used	Injected
Amyl/Poppers	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Marijuana	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Viagra	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Ecstasy	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Speed / Crystal	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Cocaine / Crack	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Heroin	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Steroids	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Benzos	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Any other drug	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>

62. If you injected in the last 6 months, how many times did you inject?

1–5 times ☐ 6–10 times ☐ More than 10 times ☐

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

2002–03