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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The rapidly accelerating rate of new HIV infection in the past years has been a cause of great concern. From 2000 until 2005, an average of one new case was registered every three days. In 2010, however, the average accelerated to four new cases a day. From 1984 until March 2010, the country had a cumulative case of 4,817. Of these, 393 were recorded in the first quarter of 2010 alone.

In light of the alarming increase in the number of new cases of HIV, there is a need to generate more information to better understand the extent of the phenomenon, as well as to identify the interplay of different factors that contributes to the growing epidemic.

One of the biggest and most immediate challenges in effectively responding to HIV in the Philippines is confronting the truly startling rates of infection among men having sex with men (MSM) and transgender persons. Starting 2007, there has been a shift from the predominant trend of transmission from heterosexual to male-to-male sex. From 56 percent of annual reported cases in 2007, proportion of sexual transmission through male-to-male sex has increased to 73 percent in 2009. By end of 2010, MSM accounted for 81 percent for reported sexual tramsnission of HIV.

This document is an in-depth analysis of the data on the MSM population generated by the 2009 Integrated HIV Behavioral and Serologic Surveillance System (IHBSS). IHBSS is a biennial study of the Department of Health to collect, analyze, and interpret data on HIV and AIDS in 20 selected sites across the country. Blood samples were taken from the respondents and the serologic result for each of them was then matched with the behavioral survey they have completed using an identification number assigned to them.

## In-depth study research methodology

The Research Team, composed of demographers and statisticians, employed different stages of data validation to clean the data. The stages included correcting irregular and missing data entries or odd codes, and matching the behavioral and serologic data. This process proved critical as it allowed the researchers to correct any inconsistencies they have uncovered before analyzing the data.

The researchers limited the analysis to descriptive univariate with the addition of semi-bivariate tables. Only frequencies, rate, ratio, proportion, measures of central tendencies, and measure of dispersion were used. No inferential analysis was done because of certain data limitations.

The study focused on the following variables:

1. STI and HIV prevalence among MSM respondents,
2. Demographic and socio-economic characteristics,
3. Prevailing knowledge om HIV and AIDS and its modes of transmission and prevention,
4. Risky sexual behaviors and non-sexual behaviors
5. Mitigating non-sexual behaviors particularly alcohol and drug use;
6. Exposure to STI and HIV interventions

## Significant findings

## Demographic and socio-economic characteristic

The survey had 4,372 MSM respondents unevenly distributed across 20 study sites.
The respondents were relatively young with a median age of 22 ; majority of the respondents were in the 15-19 and 20-24 age groups.

In terms of marital status, 94 percent of the respondents were single and about five percent were married. About 17 percent of the respondents were living with a partner at the time of the interview.

The researchers also looked into the educational background of the respondents, as well as their work and income status. Majority of the them received at least secondary education (49.5\%). 43.6 percent had vocational, college, or postgraduate studies. Only a minimal number of respondents had only elementary education. However, the level of their education did not necessarily translate to employment. Of those who had vocational and higher level of education, only 55.1 percent were working at the time of the interview. Overall, only 49 percent of the respondents surveyeyed were working. It is interesting to note that respondents who earned an income the month before the survey reported an average income (P7,733.44) slightly higher than the poverty threshold of P6,274.00.

## HIV Prevalence

The serologic component of the IHBSS revealed that 45 out of the 4,327 respondents are HIV positive (about $1 \%$ ). Davao and Manila had 11 cases each, while the rest of the sites had five or less. It should be noted that in the 2007 IHBSS, only three MSM respondents tested positive.

Those who tested positive had a median age of 24 . Ten were in the 15-19 age group, while 15 were in the 20-24 age group. All of the HIV-positive MSM were single, 60 percent had reached college, and 60 percent were working.

## Sexual risk behaviors

Knowledge on STI
Majority (82\%) of the MSM respondents had ever heard of sexually transmitted infections (STI). They also had a relatively high knowledge on the symptoms of STI on men, with only 9.9 percent of them saying that they did not know any symptoms.

The most common known symptoms were genital discharge and burning pain when urinating with 64 percent each. The least known symptom was "can't retract foreskin" which may be due to the fact that majority of Filipino males are circumcised.

## Knowledge on HIV and AIDS

A high percentage of the respondents knew of HIV (77.9\%) and AIDS (89.7\%). Similarly, majority of the respondents agreed that a healthy looking person can be infected ( $80 \%$ ) and that HIV can be prevented ( $87 \%$ ). There is also a high level of knowledge on prevention and transmission, with 87 percent agreeing that untreated STI increases the risk of transmission and 85 percent saying that using condom may prevent the transmission of HIV.

Unfortunately, knowledge does not automatically translate to practice. A high percentage of respondents who reported anal sex (53.5\%) \%) in the past 12 months preceding the survey had unprotected anal sex (70\%). Interestingly, only 31.4 percent of the respondents who reported to have had vaginal sex had unprotected vaginal sex.

A large proportion of MSM had sex in exchange for money or in kind. This was most evident among MSM in the younger age groups, those who only had elementary level of education, and those who were not working.

The data on the age of first sex reveal early sexual initiation among MSM respondents. Most of them had their sexual debut during their adolescent years, with some having had their first sex between the age of five and ten. Some of these first sexual encounters were either forced or in exchange for money or in kind.

A relatively low percentage of MSM (15.9\%) engaged in group sex, although there is a significant variation across study sites. Cebu City had the highest number of respondents who engaged in group sex (34\%), followed by Quezon City (32.5\%) and Manila (20\%). The mean number of male partners in last group sex was 3.77 , while the mean number of female partners was 1.95. Aside from the risk of multiple sex partners, majority of the respondents were under the influence of alcohol during their last group sex. Nine percent also took drugs. Alarmingly, 54.5 percent of those who joined group sex never used condom. In terms of HIV status, more HIV positive MSM (25\%) ever experienced group sex compared to non-HIV positive MSM (15.9\%).

## Non-sexual risk behaviors

The survey also looked into alcohol and drug use among MSM. While these two may not directly put a person at risk to HIV, alcohol and drug use could impair a person's judgement which may then expose them to certain risks.

Majority of the respondents (73\%) were under the influence of alcohol during their sexual encounters in the last 12 months preceding the survey. Of those who were under the influence of alcohol, only 18.6 used condoms during their sexual encounter. Drug use is also quite evident, with 55 percent saying that they have had sexual encounters while under the influence of drugs.

## Exposure to HIV interventions

The most accessible intervention is condom distribution, with 41 percent of respondents having received condom from a person or institution. The least accessible is lubricant distribution, with only one in nine respondents having received lubricants. Access to information is also quite low, with one in three approached by someone to discuss STI and HIV prevention, and one in four having attended a seminar or meeting on prevention.

Nevertheless, access to interventions does not necessarily translate to safer sex behavior. Of those who have received condom, only 46 percent used it in their anal sex encounters.

## Policy and program implications

Given the findings, the Research Team came up with the following recommendations:

- Prioritize prevention and treatment of STI and HIV among MSM. There is a need to scale up existing programs to prevent the further spread of STI and HIV infection among this population. A more favorable environment should be created to remove stigma and discrimination against HIV and same sex relations.
- There is a need to develop comprehensive programs specifically for adolescents. As the data have shown, those in the younger age groups, particularly those aged 15 to 19 , exhibited a higher degree of risky behaviors. The programs should also address the larger issue of sexual health and human rights, considering that adolescents are more prone to violence, seduction, and sexual abuse.
- Address the socio-economic drivers of HIV infection. It is evident from the data presented that the socio-economic status of an MSM may force him to engage in paid sex, which magnifies his risk for HIV infection.
- Communication strategies, particularly the promotion of condom, should be reviewed to assess how knowledge can be translated into practice. While MSM had a generally high level of knowledge on STI and HIV, condom use among this population remains low. Communication strategies should also look into the interplay of non-sexual behaviors such as alcohol and drug consumption.

SECTION 1

## A. Background

As of March 2010, the Philippine HIV and AIDS Registry recorded a total of 4,817 cumulative cases since HIV surveillance was started in 1984 (DOH, Philippine HIV and AIDS Registry, 2010). While the country's current Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) cases remain below the epidemic level, the number of new cases is increasing to a record high.

From January to March 2010, 393 additional cases were already reported, or about four (4) new cases everyday. The new cases were almost half of the total cases recorded in 2009 (835). The National Epidemiological Center (NEC) projected that there would be 1,500 new cases by the end of 2010. (Tayag, 2010).

Table 1. Data from the Philippine HIV and AIDS Registry

| Demographic <br> data | March 2010 | Jan-Mar 2010 | Cumulative <br> data: 1984-2010 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total reported <br> cases | 120 | 393 | 4,817 |
| Asymptomatic <br> cases | 117 | 387 | 3,979 |
| AIDS cases | 3 | 6 | 838 |
| Males | 104 | 349 | 3,581 |
| Females | 16 | 44 | 850 |
| Youth (15-24 <br> years old) | 35 | 126 | 85 |

The "low and slow" characterization of the HIV and AIDS situation in the Philippines in the past has put the issue at the low end of development agenda. Today, however, it is widely recognized that unless appropriate programs are in place, the situation is "going to get worse before it gets better." (Tayag, 2010)

Figure 1. Number of new HIV cases per month (2008-2010)


Source: Philippine HIV and AIDS Registry, 2010
About 89 percent of the new cases of infections (349) in 2010 were males and 32 percent were youth aged 15-24 years old. Most of the infections were transmitted through sexual contacts.

The need to take action to prevent HIV infection from becoming an outbreak cannot be overemphasized as the Philippines is committed to totally halt the spread of HIV infection by 2015 in line with Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 6. However, it is only in recent years when the magnitude of the problem is becoming more apparent.

Without in-depth knowledge on the phenomenon and on the people involved, taking appropriate action becomes difficult. In this context, the effort of the government and non-government agencies to track down the movement of infection and understand the behavioral aspects necessary for policy and program design becomes very significant. It is likewise from this context that this paper derives its relevance. This paper aims to contribute to the existing body of knowledge on the behavioral and nonbehavioral drivers of HIV infections that would serve as a basis for policy and program development.

The IHBSS. The first systematic attempt of the Department of Health (DOH) to track HIV and AIDS in the Philippines was the HIV and AIDS Registry established in 1984. This was followed by the HIV Serologic Surveillance (HSS) in 1993 and, subsequently, by the Behavioral Sentinel Surveillance (BSS) in 1997. These surveillance systems aimed to unearth information needed to address the prevailing HIV infection.

To make these systems more effective in producing information needed by program managers and policymakers, reviews and consultations were conducted. The review of
these systems by the DOH and all concerned agencies led to the 2005 Integrated HIV Behavioral and Serologic Surveillance System (IHBSS). The IHBSS is the ongoing systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of HIV and AIDS data and the dissemination of information as basis for planning, policy, and program development. To date, three IHBSS have already been conducted in 2005, 2007, and 2009. Despite its limitations, the IHBSS contains a wealth of serologic and behavioral information necessary for the understanding of the HIV phenomenon.

The 2009 IHBSS covered distinct subsets of population whose behavior put them at risk for HIV transmission. This report focuses mainly on males who have sex with males (MSM), a subpopulation defined as males in cruising areas and streets, parks, establishments, others who engaged in oral and/or anal sex with other males in the past year preceding the survey for economic reasons or pleasure. (IHBSS, 2009)

The interest in studying sexual behaviors of MSM is rationalized by the increasing HIV infection among this particular population segment in the epidemic. Data from the Philippine HIV and AIDS Registry showed that from 2007, there has been a shift in the predominant trend of sexual transmission of HIV infection from heterosexual contact (29\%) to MSM (71\%)(PNAC, 2010). Moreover, for most-at-risk-population (MARP) for 2010, ten (10) males engaged in risky sexual behaviors for every one (1) female who did the same. Of the reported cases of HIV infection in 2010, 62 percent were MSM (cited in Tayag, 2010).

## B. Objectives of the study

This further study of the results of the 2009 IHBSS generally aims to analyze the HIV prevalence and behavioral risk factors among MSM as basis for plan and program development. Specifically, this study aims to:

- determine the prevalence and incidence of HIV among MSM across the 20 sentinel and study sites;
- describe the behavioral factors among MSM and the interplay of their demographic and socio-economic characteristics as well as some non-behavioral factors with these behavioral factors;
- determine the exposure of MSM to STI and HIV and AIDS intervention programs to further assess the progress of these interventions in reaching out to this segment of population; and
- identify major policy and program implications based on the key findings of this study.


## C. Research methodology

This study is a descriptive analysis of the data gathered by the 2009 IHBSS conducted in twenty (20) study sites. All of the sites are urbanized areas where HIV prevalence is more pronounced.

## C.1. Sampling methodology

The 2009 IHBSS applied the Time-Location Sampling/TLS (equal probability) method - an appropriate sampling technique for some hard-to-reach or hidden populations such as the MSM. It involves time and location dimensions where a complete list of all target population is not available but members of this segment of population can be associated with physical location/site at a specific time.

A significant step in the TLS method was the assigning of weights for each cluster of respondents/cases within a specific venue (i.e. gay bars, theaters, parks) for each city. In this step, the proportion of the actual sample against the population of a specific location (venue) for a specific time (hour or day) was generated as weight of each case. The weights were used to adjust for probability of inclusion and thus helped to make inference to the population from where the sample was drawn.

For the 2009 IHBSS, the basis of the weights was the event-tracking data sheet which included the event number, venue, total counts of MARPs in each event, and number of completed interview/respondents. The consultants prepared a worksheet where all data were keyed-in and weights were generated and applied to the Statistical Package for Social Sciences statistical software. It was, however, necessary to consult the site coordinators of the survey as there was inconsistency in the number of respondents between the event tracking data and survey data within the city.

There are three sources for this inconsistency. The first one is the non-random selection of events. The supposedly random selection of respondents from establishments such as gay bars, clubs, street parks, among others was not adhered to but instead included non-random events or those events outside of their calendar. These included beauty contests for "Miss Gay" and town fiesta. To resolve this, zero weights or "wild cards" were assigned to specific venues and therefore to the corresponding respondents or cases from these venues.

The data in Table 2 provide the number of zero weights for each site. Across the sites, there were two cities which had zero weights for all cases, namely, Angeles and Puerto Princesa.

The other two sources of inconsistency are the non-representativeness of universevenue list of all MSM and non-random intervention at the individual level. Other respondents were tapped because they conform to the stereotypes of MSM. The MSM in this study, therefore, excluded those that could not be easily identified as MSM, those in men's institutions (e.g. prisons and seminaries), and those not frequenting the venues from which the respondents were gathered.

Table 2. Number of zero weights within each and across sentinel sites

| Study Sites | Actual number of cases/respondents in the survey | Number of cases with zero weights |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Angeles City | 300 | 300 |
| Baguio City | 308 | 1 |
| Butuan City | 300 | 48 |
| Cebu City | 300 | 0 |
| Davao City | 300 | 0 |
| General Santos City | 304 | 11 |
| Puerto Galera | 165 | 0 |
| Puerto Princesa | 300 | 300 |
| Santiago City | 171 | 39 |
| Tuguegarao City | 76 | 12 |
| Zamboanga City | 299 | 33 |
| Surigao | 114 | 3 |
| Metro Manila |  |  |
| Caloocan City | 150 | 38 |
| Makati City | 140 | 0 |
| Mandaluyong City | 154 | 0 |
| City of Manila | 300 | 36 |
| Marikina City | 117 | 1 |
| Pasig City | 100 | 0 |
| Pasay City | 200 | 145 |
| Quezon City | 274 | 25 |
| Total | 4,372 | 992 |

## C.2. Data collection, cleaning, and processing

As mentioned earlier, the IHBSS is the integration of the serologic and behavioral surveillance systems. The serologic surveillance was undertaken by taking, testing, and analyzing blood samples from the respondents. Data on the serologic surveillance were then matched with the behavioral survey, using the identification number assigned to each respondent.

For the behavioral component of the study, a standard questionnaire was designed to collect information on behavioral risk factors and co-factors associated with the spread of HIV. Most of the questions were similar for all groups except for the sexual behavior questions and more in-depth questions for injecting drug use and injection risk for IDU. Face-to-face interviews with the respondents were employed for data gathering.

Part of the deliverables of the Research Team in undertaking this study was to clean the data before analyzing it. This process proved to be a critical aspect of the data management since a 100-percent validation uncovered significant inconsistencies between the questionnaire and the encoded data. The data cleaning process entailed several stages of data validation which included the correction of irregular and missing data entries or odd codes based on the completed questionnaires.

The 2009 IHBSS covered a total of 4,372 MSM respondents. The sample respondents were distributed by geographic location as follows:

Table 3. Distribution of MSM respondents by geographic location

| Study Sites | No. of Completed Be- <br> havioral Survey | Percent (within total <br> respondents |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Angeles City | 300 | 6.9 |
| Baguio City | 308 | 7.0 |
| Butuan City | 300 | 6.9 |
| Cebu City | 300 | 6.9 |
| Davao City | 300 | 6.9 |
| General Santos City | 304 | 7.0 |
| Puerto Galera | 165 | 3.8 |
| Puerto Princesa | 300 | 6.9 |
| Santiago City | 171 | 3.9 |
| Tuguegarao City | 76 | 1.7 |
| Zamboanga City | 299 | 6.8 |


| Study Sites | Actual number of <br> cases/respondents in <br> the survey | Number of cases with <br> zero weights |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Surigao | 114 | 2.6 |
| Caloocan City | 150 | 3.4 |
| Makati City | 140 | 3.2 |
| Mandaluyong City | 154 | 3.5 |
| City of Manila | 300 | 6.9 |
| Marikina City | 117 | 2.7 |
| Pasig City | 100 | 2.3 |
| Pasay City | 200 | 6.3 |
| Quezon City | 274 | 100 |
| Total |  |  |

In matching the behavioral and serologic data, there were excess blood samples relative to accomplished questionnaires. Specifically in Marikina City, a significant number of questionnaires were not spared from flood brought about by typhoon Ondoy last September 2009. All blood samples in the site were, however, intact because these were transported to the DOH STI/AIDS Central Cooperative Laboratory (SACCL) for testing and encoding after sample blood collection. In other cities, some questionnaires were terminated because the respondents did not have sex with men.

## C.3. Statistical methods of analysis

This study is a descriptive analysis of the HIV prevalence and behavioral factors among MSM based on the 2009 IHBSS data set using the SPSS format. It is limited to descriptive univariate analysis with an addition of semi-bivariate tables which include more than one variable in a table but without testing for statistical significance. For this analysis, only frequencies, rate, ratio, proportion, measures of central tendencies (mean, median, mode), and measure of dispersion (standard deviation and range) were used. The nature of the data would not warrant any inferential analysis because of the above mentioned data limitations.

The dataset was aggregated without altering the weights previously assigned to each case. These weights were meaningless when used in aggregated data because these were specific to the site that had a corresponding events tracking and was clusterspecific. It is also important to note that no additional weight was assigned per site to account for weights of site across total sites, thus, univariate tables were generated per site for the weighted and unweighted sites. Multivariate regression modeling for the whole dataset was not advisable because site-specific data were highly skewed to particular characteristics. For example, majority of respondents from Quezon City were male sex workers and bisexual, 85 percent of respondents from Cebu were homosexuals, a great majority of the respondents from Surigao were students, almost all respondents from Pasig were bisexuals, some sites had large number of parlorista respondents and almost 90 percent to 100 percent were single and young, 15-24 years old. Basic data requirement to proceed for multivariate regression analysis, such as normal distribution of important variables, could not be guaranteed with the present MSM dataset, thus higher inferential statistical test will be differed.

## D. Analytical framework

The analytical framework used for conceptualizing and analyzing the 2009 IHBSS, as shown below, was adopted in guiding the analysis undertaken in this study. The framework describes the various direct and indirect factors that affect HIV incidence, prevalence, and seropositivity.

Figure 2. Analytical framework in analyzing the factors related to HIV incidence, prevalence and seropositivity (2009 IHBSS) among MSM


As can be seen from the framework, prevailing knowledge and attitudes on HIV and AIDS directly affect HIV infection. On one hand, knowledge on the mode of transmission and prevention influences sexual and non-sexual behaviors of individuals. Sexual and non-sexual behaviors, on the other hand, put individuals at risk of HIV and STI infections. As included in the IHBSS, sexual risks behaviors among MSM include: a) engagement in oral and anal sex with men; b) engagement in sexual activities with women; c) engagement in sex with multiple partners; and d) non-use of condom during these sexual engagements. Factors that mitigate the possibility of STI and HIV infection may include use of alcohol and drugs before or during the sexual activity.

Demographic and socio-economic factors are likewise significant factors in HIV infections. Age, sex, marital status, level of income, and education directly influence individual's sexual decisions. All these factors can shed light on areas that need to be addressed to halt HIV infection.

## E. Coverage of the study

Using the MSM data set of the 2009 IHBSS, this study focuses on the description of the following variables:
a. STI and HIV prevalence among MSM respondents;
b. Demographic and some socio-economic characteristics of MSM respondents;
c. Prevailing knowledge on HIV and AIDS and its mode of transmission and prevention among MSM respondents;
d. Risky sexual behaviors and non-sexual behaviors of MSM respondents;
e. Mitigating non-sexual behaviors among MSM respondents particularly alcohol and drug use; and
f. Exposure to some STI and HIV interventions.

## SECTION 2: DEMOGRAPHIC \& SOCIO-ECONOMIC

## A. Understanding males who have sex with males (MSM)

## A.1. MSM as a behavioral category

MSM are men and boys who engage in sexual activity with members of the same sex, regardless of how they sexually identify themselves. This concept describes a behavior rather than a specific group of people. The term was conceptualized in the 1990s by epidemiologists in order to study the spread of disease among men who have sex with men, regardless of identity (UNAIDS).

MSM as a behavior concept was constructed to provide better categories that would offer better analytical concepts for the study of disease risk than identity-based categories such as "gay," "homosexual," "bisexual," or "straight or heterosexual." A man who selfidentifies as gay or bisexual may not necessarily be sexually active with men, while someone who identifies as straight might be sexually active with men. MSM, therefore, includes self-identified gay, bisexual, or heterosexual men, many of whom may not consider themselves gay or bisexual. HIV responses for transgender populations are also often considered alongside MSM initiatives (UNAIDS).

Many of the MSM in the country are not easily identifiable because of the prevailing social stigma on the sexual behavior they exhibit. A significant proportion of them is "invisible" and "hidden" and not open about their sexual activities. This makes it difficult for program managers and planners to fully capture the condition of the infection among this group.

In the 2009 IHBSS, MSM included men in cruising areas (streets, parks, establishments, others) who engaged in oral and/or anal sex with other males in the past year preceding the survey for economic reasons or for pleasure. These included callboys, parloristas, "pa-men"gays or bakla, homosexuals, bisexuals, straight macho dancers, and "pusong babae."

## A.2. The need to focus on MSM's sexual behavior

The number of HIV cases among MSM is on the rise. Moreover, there are MSM who engage in sexual activities with women which may have implications in HIV prevention programs since these female partners often remain largely unaware of their partners' other sexual activities.

Owing to stigma and discrimination, MSM rarely access sexual health services, making them all the more vulnerable to HIV infections. Given these considerations, the need to focus on the sexual and non-sexual behaviors of MSM is vital in the design of appropriate interventions to halt HIV infections.

## B. The demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of MSM

As shown in the analytical framework, the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of MSM are assumed to be determinants of sexual behaviors. The IHBSS collected information on a number of basic characteristics of the MSM respondents including: age, educational level, occupation, current relationship status, and marital status. This section provides a demographic and socio-economic profile of the MSM respondents.

## B. 1 Demographic Characteristics

## Age Composition

MSM respondents were relatively young with a median age of 22 years. About two out of three respondents were young adults - approximately one-third (30.2\%) were teenagers (15-19 years) and another one-third (34.8\%) were in the 20-24 age-group.

Table 4. Age composition

| Age groups | Percent | $\mathrm{n}(4,367)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $15-17$ | 4 | 180 |
| $18-19$ | 26 | 1,142 |
| $20-24$ | 34.8 | 1,520 |
| $25-29$ | 7.8 | 774 |
| $30-34$ | 4.4 | 340 |
| $35-39$ | 2.8 | 190 |
| $40-44$ | 2.3 | 99 |
| 45 and over |  |  |

Mean Age: 24.17 years
Median Age: 22 years
*Note: Data on minors aged 15 to 17 were further disaggregated from the 15 to 19 age group since this particular age group is considered as children by the Unicef.

About four percent of MSM were children, 15-17 years old. This expands the issue of HIV infection among MSM to the issues surrounding the welfare of children. In the succeeding analysis, the sexual behaviors of this particular MSM population will be specifically analyzed to draw out the factors that put minors and children into health and development risks and threats.

Among study sites, General Santos City and Surigao had the youngest MSM respondents with a median age of 19 years. These two sites had the highest percentage of MSM $15-19$ years old - 56 percent for Surigao and 55 percent for General Santos City. Respondents from Puerto Galera posted the oldest median age of 27, followed by respondents from Marikina (26). One out of five (22.6\%) MSM respondents from Puerto Galera were 35 years old and older.

Overall, a substantial proportion of the MSM respondents ( $65 \%$ ) were adolescents and young adults $15-24$ year old. The risk associated with these age groups is associated with the biological, social, and physiological changes that occur during their transition to adulthood. Given these realities, there is a need for policymakers and program planners to consider the sexual and reproductive health needs of these age groups.

Table 5. Percent distribution of MSM respondents by age-group and by study site

| Study sites | Age group |  |  |  |  |  |  | Median age | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 15- \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20- \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25- \\ & 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30- \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35- \\ & 39 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40- \\ & 44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \\ & \text { \&over } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Angeles* | 29.3 | 33.3 | 17.7 | 9.0 | 5.7 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 22.0 | 300 |
| Baguio | 14.8 | 36.4 | 14.4 | 5.9 | 11.8 | 8.2 | 8.5 | 24.0 | 305 |
| Butuan | 44.4 | 39.3 | 9.9 | 3.2 | 2.0 | 1.2 | -- | 20.0 | 252 |
| Cebu | 45.5 | 37.9 | 11.0 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 20.0 | 301 |
| Davao | 31.0 | 32.3 | 18.4 | 10.9 | 4.1 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 22.0 | 294 |
| General Santos | 55.1 | 30.6 | 7.8 | 5.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 19.0 | 294 |
| Puerto Galera | 9.8 | 33.1 | 17.8 | 16.6 | 11.0 | 5.5 | 6.1 | 27.0 | 163 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 49.7 | 33.7 | 11.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 20.0 | 300 |
| Santiago | 27.7 | 25.2 | 23.4 | 5.4 | 8.1 | 6.3 | 3.6 | 24.0 | 111 |
| Tuguegarao | 35.5 | 16.1 | 22.6 | 6.5 | 9.7 | 6.5 | 3.2 | 23.0 | 31 |
| Zamboanga | 31.3 | 30.9 | 17.7 | 8.3 | 5.3 | 4.2 | 2.3 | 22.0 | 265 |


| Surigao | 55.9 | 32.4 | 3.6 | 4.5 | 1.8 | 1.8 | -- | 19.0 | 111 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Caloocan | 32.5 | 28.1 | 11.4 | 8.8 | 5.3 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 22.0 | 114 |
| Makati | 16.4 | 44.0 | 25.4 | 5.2 | 1.5 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 23.8 | 134 |
| Mandaluyong | 21.9 | 28.4 | 26.5 | 9.0 | 8.4 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 24.0 | 155 |
| Manila | 14.4 | 36.4 | 33.0 | 11.0 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 24.0 | 264 |
| Marikina | 15.5 | 31.8 | 20.9 | 14.7 | 14.0 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 26.0 | 129 |
| Pasig | 35.3 | 22.5 | 18.6 | 13.7 | 4.9 | 2.0 | 2.9 | 21.7 | 102 |
| Pasay | 12.8 | 48.9 | 12.8 | 17.0 | 4.3 | 4.3 | -- | 23.1 | 47 |
| Quezon City | 16.6 | 45.2 | 22.1 | 13.4 | 0.9 | -- | 1.8 | 23.0 | 217 |

* unweighted


## Marital status

The MSM covered by the survey were mostly single. Nine out of ten (94\%) MSM respondents were single and only about five percent were married. All MSM respondents from Surigao City were single while Quezon City had the highest percentage of married respondents (17\%). One in ten MSM respondents from Puerto Galera (11.2\%) and Baguio (10.8\%) were married.

Table 6. Percent distribution of MSM respondents by marital status

| Marital Status | Percent | $\mathbf{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Single | 94.0 | 3,077 |
| Married | 5.1 | 167 |
| Separated/Widowed | 0.9 | 30 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 2 9 3}$ |

Table 7. Percent distribution of MSM respondents by marital status and by study site

| Study Sites | Civil Status |  |  | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Single | Married | Separated/ Widowed |  |
| Angeles* | 91.2 | 6.8 | 2.0 | 296 |
| Baguio | 88.6 | 10.8 | 0.7 | 297 |
| Butuan | 96.0 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 252 |
| Cebu | 97.0 | 2.3 | 0.7 | 299 |
| Davao | 99.0 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 294 |
| General Santos | 99.0 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 293 |
| Puerto Galera | 87.6 | 11.2 | 1.2 | 161 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 98.0 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 300 |
| Santiago | 93.7 | 6.3 | -- | 111 |
| Tuguegarao | 96.8 | 3.2 | -- | 31 |
| Zamboanga | 95.1 | 4.5 | 0.4 | 266 |
| Surigao | 100.0 | -- | -- | 111 |
| Caloocan | 96.5 | 2.6 | 0.9 | 115 |
| Makati | 89.6 | 7.5 | 3.0 | 134 |
| Mandaluyong | 93.4 | 6.6 | -- | 151 |
| Manila | 93.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 264 |
| Marikina | 91.5 | 7.0 | 1.6 | 129 |
| Pasig | 98.0 | 2.0 | -- | 100 |
| Pasay | 97.9 | 2.1 | -- | 48 |
| Quezon City | 82.1 | 17.0 | 0.9 | 218 |

[^0]The marital status of MSM respondents provides a different picture from most of the global situation. Asian studies on the differences on sexual behaviors between married and unmarried men revealed different patterns of HIV infections. On one hand, findings from the study of Ruan et al. (2008) showed that unmarried men who had sex with other men in Jinan, China were more than six time likely to be HIV-infected than married men with both male and female partners. On the other hand, Feng et al. (2009) found that married men who had sex with men in Chongqing, China were more than twice as likely to be infected than their non-married counterparts. More than the differences in the findings, these studies establish the relevance of marital status on the sexual behaviors of MSM.

Ageneralization that most of the MSM in the country are single, however, might be difficult to assume given the limitations in the recruitment of the respondents. Nonetheless, the data indicate significant realities that should be considered in programming.

## Current relationship status

Maintaining a current relationship has an impact on the sexual behaviors of MSM. It also indicates the level of exposure of the MSM and his partner to risky behaviors and to HIV infection. From among the respondents, 17 percent were living with a partner at the time of the interview. Almost one in ten (8.2\%) MSM in the 15-19 age group was currently living with a partner. Moreover, while the proportion is minimal, there were also minors (15-17) who were living with a partner.

Table 8. Background characteristics of MSM who are currently living with a partner

| Background <br> characteristics | Currently living <br> with a partner | Not currently <br> living with a <br> partner | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total | 16.8 | 83.2 | 4,304 |
| Age | 8.2 | 91.8 | 1,311 |
| 15-19 <br> *593 are in the 15- <br> 17 age category; <br> 6.2\% of whom are <br> currently living with <br> a partner | 23.9 | 76.1 |  |
| $20-24$ | 23.9 | 76.1 | 1,505 |
| $25-29$ | 22.0 | 78.0 | 760 |
| $30-34$ | 20.0 | 80.0 | 180 |
| $35-39$ | 24.0 | 76.0 | 120 |
| $40-44$ |  |  | 96 |
| 45 and above |  |  | see next page |


| Background <br> characteristics | Currently living <br> with a partner | Not currently <br> living with a <br> partner | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Civil Status | 14.8 | 85.2 | 4,041 |
| Single | 52.0 | 221 |  |
| Married | 48.0 | 67.2 | 58 |
| Separated/ <br> Widowed |  |  |  |

## B.2. Socio-economic characteristics

## Educational level

The level of education of MSM is significant not only for their socio-economic standing but also on their capacity to protect themselves from the threat of HIV by having appropriate knowledge and information. Researches have shown that the knowledge and practice of individuals on development concerns are highly dependent on their level of education. In a study among women served by family planning clinics in Tanzania, it was found out that women with highly educated partners were five times more likely to be infected with HIV than those women whose partners had no schooling (World Bank, 1997).

In the Philippines, MSM respondents were generally educated. Most of them attained at least secondary level of education - about half (49.5\%) have finished high school while the other half ( $43.6 \%$ ) have attained vocational, college, and higher level of education. About seven percent have only attained elementary level of education.

Table 9. Percent distribution of MSM respondents by highest educational attainment

| Educational <br> Attainment | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elementary and lower <br> level | 6.9 | 299 |
| Secondary | 49.5 | 2,151 |
| Vocational, college and <br> higher | 43.6 | 1,892 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 3 4 2}$ |

All MSM respondents from Makati City and Pasig City have attained at least secondary level of education, while about 83 percent of respondents from Manila have attained vocational and higher level of education. Cebu City and Zamboanga City had the highest percentage of respondents who have attained only elementary level of education at about 14 percent for each site.

Table 10. Percent distribution of MSM respondents by highest educational attainment and by study site

* unweighted

| Study Sites | Educational Attainment |  | n |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Elemen- <br>  <br> lower <br> level | Socational, <br> dary <br>  <br> higher |  |  |
| Angeles* | 8.1 | 68.5 | 23.4 | 295 |
| Baguio | 1.3 | 34.1 | 64.6 | 305 |
| Butuan | 7.9 | 46.4 | 45.6 | 252 |
| Cebu | 13.7 | 55.7 | 30.7 | 300 |
| Davao | 6.3 | 57.7 | 36.0 | 286 |
| General Santos | 6.8 | 50.5 | 42.7 | 293 |
| Puerto Galera | 4.3 | 67.3 | 28.4 | 162 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 9.3 | 46.3 | 44.3 | 300 |
| Santiago | 4.5 | 51.4 | 44.1 | 111 |
| Tuguegarao | 9.4 | 31.3 | 59.4 | 32 |
| Zamboanga | 14.3 | 48.5 | 37.2 | 266 |
| Surigao | 4.5 | 46.8 | 48.6 | 111 |
| Caloocan | 5.4 | 44.6 | 50.0 | 112 |
| Makati | -- | 42.9 | 57.1 | 133 |
| Mandaluyong | 5.8 | 61.0 | 33.1 | 154 |
| Manila | 3.0 | 14.1 | 82.9 | 263 |
| Marikina | 53.5 | 43.3 | 127 |  |
| Pasig | 1.8 | 54.8 | 43.3 | 217 |
| Pasay | 61.3 | 38.7 | 93 |  |
| Quezon City | 39.6 | 58.3 | 48 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Work and income status

Work status and income of an individual are critical factors in HIV prevention. While the association of income status with HIV infection is complex, evidences point to income and associated patterns of multi-partner; quasi-commercial sex being as important as the issue on poverty per se in terms of vulnerability to HIV infection (Reproductive Health Matters, 2007). For example, the study of Sunil Nair Health Informatics Dalhousie University in 2000 showed that women whose main partners had higher education and income were more likely to be infected with HIV than others. A policy paper of World Bank likewise indicated that HIV and AIDS usually strike adults in their economic prime (World Bank, 1997).

The IHBSS data show that many of the MSM were not currently working during the time of the interview. About 51 percent were not working and with only 49 percent working. Moreover, there was also a minimal percentage (4.7\%) of who had ever worked abroad.

Table 11. Percent distribution of MSM by work status and percent of MSM who ever worked abroad

| Work Status | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Working | 49.3 | 2,061 |
| Not working | 50.7 | 2,116 |
| Ever worked abroad | 4.7 | 155 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 1 1 7}$ |

Interestingly, while most of the respondents were educated, their education did not match their current work status. This is indicated by only about half (55.1\%) of respondents with vocational and higher level of education who were employed during the time of the interview. Moreover, only 44.1 percent of those who completed secondary level of education were working.

Table 12. Percent distribution of MSM respondents by highest educational attainment by work status

| Educational <br> Attainment |  | Work Status | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Working | Not working |  |
| Elementary and lower <br> level | 50.7 | 49.3 | 286 |
| Secondary | 44.1 | 55.9 | 2,038 |
| Vocational, college and <br> higher | 55.1 | 44.9 | 1,836 |

Overall, MSM respondent had an average income of $\mathrm{PhP} 7,733.44$ in the last month, an amount slightly higher than the 2006 monthly poverty threshold of P6,274.00¹.

Regional disparities on work status and their monthly income provide some revealing information. In Puerto Galera, all respondents were unemployed but had declared higher income than in areas with high proportion of currently working MSM (e.g. Zamboanga City and Surigao City). Three out of four (75\%) respondents in Quezon City were not working, but MSM in the area had one of the highest income (PhP12,361.03) earned in the last month across study sites.

MSM in Metro Manila had earned relatively higher income in the last month than those in other sites with respondents from Pasay City (PhP14,208.23) and Manila (PhP13,996.79) posting the highest income for the last month. MSM in Puerto Princesa had the lowest income (PhP4,298.27); almost half of the average income earned by all respondents ( $\mathrm{PhP7}, 733.44$ ).

Nonetheless, extreme caution should be applied in analyzing the data on income since the number of valid cases $(2,072)$ is only less than half of the total number of respondents $(4,372)$. There were also some inconsistencies in the responses on income.

Table 13. Percent distribution of MSM not currently working and mean income

| Study Sites | Percent of <br> MSM not cur- <br> rently work- <br> ing | $\mathbf{n}$ | Mean income <br> in the past <br> month (PhP) | $\mathbf{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All sentinel sites** | $\mathbf{4 8 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 1 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 7 3 3 . 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 7 2}$ |
| Angeles* | 44.3 |  | $6,782.52$ |  |
| Baguio | 35.4 | 305 | $8,212.88$ | 271 |
| Butuan | 43.2 | 243 | $5,496.55$ | 124 |
| Cebu | 66.3 | 300 | $4,719.76$ | 164 |
| Davao | 40.8 | 289 | $7,056.96$ | 193 |
| General Santos | 54.3 | 293 | $5,358.31$ | 123 |
| Puerto Galera | 100.0 | 45 | $4,445.78$ | 150 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 40.8 |  | $4,298.27$ |  |
| Santiago | 25.2 | 111 | $6,470.82$ | 84 |
| Tuguegarao | 38.7 | 31 | $7,877.56$ | 23 |
| Zamboanga | 41.8 | 263 | $4,269.49$ | 111 |
| Surigao | 49.1 | 110 | $4,450.73$ | 65 |
| Caloocan | 61.5 | 109 | $7,184.24$ | 49 |


| Sentinel Sites | Percent of <br> MSM not cur- <br> rently work- <br> ing | n | Mean income <br> in the past <br> month (PhP) | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Angeles* | 44.3 | 133 | $10,612.28$ | 76 |
| Makati | 49.6 | 149 | $6,778.30$ | 117 |
| Mandaluyong | 29.5 | 261 | $13,996.79$ | 168 |
| Manila | 40.6 | 128 | $7,314.82$ | 82 |
| Marikina | 39.1 | 46.9 | $8,722.76$ | 46 |
| Pasig | 43.5 | 216 | $12,361.03$ | 195 |
| Pasay | 75.5 |  |  | 32 |
| Quezon City |  |  |  |  |

* unweighted
** does not include Angeles and Puerto Princesa (areas with zero weights)


## B.3. Summary

The data on the background characteristics of the MSM respondents provide significant considerations for policy and program development. Most of the MSM respondents who participated in the survey were relatively young (15-24 years old) and unmarried. A significant proportion of them were teenagers (15-19 years old) and also children or minors (15-17 years old).

Generally, the respondents were educated with at least secondary level of education. While they were educated, only half of the respondents were currently working. Interestingly, MSM respondents who have earned income (for the past month) had an average income slightly higher than the poverty threshold. Because of some limitations in the way sample respondents were gathered, it is, however, very difficult to assume that MSM in the country, in general, have the same demographic and socio-economic characteristics.

## SECTION 3: HIV <br> PREVALENCE AMONG MSM

## A. Data from HIV and AIDS Registry

In the March data of the HIV and AIDS Registry, sexual risk behavior has become the most significant factor in HIV infection. Of the 4,817 HIV cases recorded from January 1984 to March 2010, 89 percent ( 4,305 cases) were infected through sexual contact, one percent (50 cases) through mother-to-child transmission and two percent (76 cases) through needle sharing among injecting drug users. Other reported mode of transmission was needle prick injury, while eight percent (364) of the cases could not be accounted for lack of information.

Table 14. Reported mode of HIV transmission

| Mode of Transmission | Jan-Mar 2010 | Cumulative |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sexual Contact | 311 | 4,305 <br> Heterosexual contact <br> Homosexual contact <br> Bisexual contact |
| (22\%) <br> $159(51 \%)$ <br> $85(27 \%)$ | $1,330(31 \%)$ <br> $694(16 \%)$ |  |
| Blood/Blood Products | 0 | 19 |
| Injecting Drug Use | 68 | 76 |
| Needle Prick Injury | 0 | 3 |
| Mother-to-Child | 1 | 50 |
| No Data Available | 13 | 364 |

Source: Philippine HIV and AIDS Registry
Current HIV data highlight the growing concern on MSM. Cumulative data show that 53 percent $(2,281)$ were infected through heterosexual contact, 31 percent $(1,330)$ through homosexual contact, and 16 percent (694) through bisexual contact. Starting in 2007, however, the predominant mode of transmission has shifted from heterosexual contact (30\%) to MSM (70\%). In 2010 alone, more than half (51\%) of those infected through sexual contact were among MSM (see Figure 3). It is also worth noting that all 85 cases of infected bisexuals are males.

Figure 3. Proportion of types of sexual transmission, Jan 1998-March 2010


## B. Data from IHBSS

In order to track the prevalence of HIV infections among most-at-risk-populations (MARPs), the IHBSS has employed serologic testing to determine the level of HIV infections. Blood samples were extracted from the respondents and were subjected to serologic testing with utmost confidentiality.

Among MSM respondents, there were a total of 45 respondents, or about one percent of the total respondents $(4,327)$, who tested positive for HIV. While the figure may seem small at first glance, it is worth noting that in the 2007 IHBSS, only three tested positive. Moreover, from the perspective of program managers and development players, one case of infection should already be considered a tragedy to which appropriate response should be accorded.

Davao and Manila had the highest number of HIV infections with 11 cases each while the rest of the sites had five or less number of HIV-positives.

Table 15. Number of HIV-positive MSM respondents by sentinel sites

| Sentinel sites | No. of cases |
| :--- | :--- |
| Angeles | 1 |
| Butuan | 1 |
| Cebu | 3 |
| Davao | 11 |
| General Santos | 2 |
| Puerto Princesa | 1 |
| Caloocan | 1 |
| Makati | 5 |
| Mandaluyong | 11 |
| Manila | 1 |
| Marikina | 3 |
| Pasay | 45 |
| TOTAL | 1 |

MSM who tested positive were relatively young with a median age of 24 years. Ten (10) cases of HIV infections were among those in the 15-19 age group, including two minors aged 15-17. In the 20-24 age group, fifteen (15) cases were recorded.

All MSM respondents who tested positive were single. Sixty percent of those infected have attained college level of education and fourteen percent had secondary level of education. Six out of ten were currently working. Of those currently working, 16 respondents were employed in service industries while two respondents work in call centers.

Table 16. Background characteristics of HIV-positive respondents

| Background characteristics | No. of Cases |
| :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |
| Median age | 24 years |
| Minimum | 15 years |
| Maximum | 37 years |
| 15-19 | 10 (*2 of whom were between 15 and 17) |
| 20-24 | 15 |
| 25-29 | 14 |
| 30-34 | 5 |
| 35-39 | 1 |
| Civil Status |  |
| Single | 45 (100\%) |
| Educational Attainment |  |
| Elementary | 1 (2.2\%) |
| High school | 14 (31\%) |
| Vocational | 1 (2.2\%) |
| College | 27 (60\%) |
| Post-baccalaureate | 2 (4.4\%) |


| Background characteristics | No. of Cases |
| :--- | :--- |
| Work Status | $27(61.4 \%)$ |
| Working | $18(38.6 \%)$ |
| Not-working |  |
| Type of work during the past 12 months |  |
| Working in a parlor/beauty industry | 6 |
| Call center agent | 2 |
| Service crew (food industry) | 1 |
| Supervisor | 3 |
| Businessmen | 10 |
| Other service industries | 2 |

## C. Summary

The increasing concern for the sexual risk behaviors of MSM is intensified by the growing HIV infection among this population. In recent years, the mode of transmission of HIV infection has shifted from heterosexual intercourse to sex between males. As such, it is imperative to discover new information that could provide understanding on the phenomenon.

The seemingly small number of MSM respondents who tested positive should not be a reason for complacency considering that the number significantly went up from three (3) in the 2007 IHBSS to 45 in the 2009 IHBSS.

The prevalence of HIV infection among the young is also alarming. More than half (25) were minors and young adults ( 15 to 24 years old).

Most of the HIV-infected respondents were educated, most of them with college degree. Even in the absence of statistical evidence, this apparently shows that education does not necessarily protect MSMs from HIV infection. This implies that communication strategies need more than education activities to change behaviors.

All MSM who are HIV-positive are single. This does not imply, however, that married MSM are less likely to be infected with HIV.

## SECTION 4: SEXUAL RISK BEHAVIORS AMONG MSM

MSM is primarily a behavioral category; it is a concept that focuses on sexual activity and behavior among men regardless of their sexual identity. As such, in-depth information on the sexual behaviors that put MSM at risk of HIV infection forms the core of needed data in conceptualizing programs and interventions for this population.

This section delves into the identification and analysis of the various behavioral factors that put MSM at risk of HIV infection. These factors include knowledge and attitudes on HIV, AIDS, and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs); sexual behaviors (various types of sexual activities); use of condom and protection; and sexual preference and identity.

## A. Prevailing knowledge of MSM on HIV and AIDS and its prevention

Acquiring accurate knowledge and information on HIV is an important factor in the prevention and treatment of the disease. In the 2009 IHBSS, information on the knowledge of STI and HIV was gathered by asking the respondents on whether they have ever heard of diseases that can be transmitted through sexual intercourse such as HIV and AIDS and on what they know about the symptoms, mode of transmission, and prevention measures.

## A.1. Knowledge on STI

STI is transmitted between humans through vaginal intercourse, oral sex, and anal sex. Previously, these infections were commonly known as sexually transmitted diseases or venereal diseases. In recent years, the term STI has been preferred as it has a broader range of meaning; a person may be infected, and may potentially infect others. Some STIs can also be transmitted via the use of unclean needles or syringes or through mother to child transmission.

Some of the observable symptoms of STI on men include: abdominal pain, genital discharge, burning pain on urination, genital ulcers, swelling in the groin area, and itching, among others.

In Table 17, a high percentage ( $82 \%$ ) of MSM respondents had ever heard of diseases that can be transmitted through sexual intercourse. In general, only ten percent of the respondents indicated no awareness and knowledge on STI symptoms on men. Across sites, however, MSM from Zamboanga had the highest percentage (46\%) of those who did not know any symptom of STI.

The most common known symptoms on men were genital discharge and burning pain in urination with 64 percent each. Disparity on the knowledge on the symptoms on men is also observable. For instance, many MSM in most study sites knew of genital discharge as a symptom of STI but only 22 percent from Marikina City knew of the symptom. For another, almost half ( $48 \%$ ) of the MSM respondents in Pasay City
knew "itching" as a symptom while the rest of the study sites had low knowledge on this symptom (ranging from $0.3 \%$ to $33 \%$ ). The least known symptom in all sentinel sites is "can't retract foreskin." This may be due to the fact that most Filipino men are circumcised, therefore, this symptom is not commonly known.
Table 17. Percent distribution of MSM respondents who had heard of STI and know the


| Sites | Ever <br> heard <br> of STI | Don't <br> know any <br> symptoms | Genital <br> discharge | Burning <br> pain in <br> urination | Genital <br> ulcers/ <br> sores | Swelling in <br> the groin <br> area | Can't <br> retract <br> foreskin | Ulcers/ <br> sores in <br> the anus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All sites | 82.4 | 9.9 | 63.8 | 63.3 | 13.6 | 11.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 |

see next page

| Sites | Ever <br> heard <br> of STl | Don't <br> know any <br> symptoms | Genital <br> discharge | Burning <br> pain in <br> urination | Genital <br> ulcers/ <br> sores | Swelling in <br> the groin <br> area |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tuguegarao |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*unweighted

## A.2. Knowledge on HIV and AIDS ${ }^{2}$

HIV is a retrovirus that infects cells of the human immune system (mainly CD4 positive $T$ cells and macrophages - key components of the cellular immune system), and destroys or impairs their function. Infection with this virus results in the progressive deterioration of the immune system, leading to immune deficiency.

AIDS stands for acquired immunodeficiency syndrome and describes the collection of symptoms and infections associated with the deficiency of the immune system that stems from infection with HIV.

HIV is transmitted through:

- Unprotected penetrative (vaginal or anal) and oral sex with an infected person
- Blood transfusion with contaminated blood
- By using contaminated syringes, needles, or other sharp instruments
- From an infected mother to her child during pregnancy, childbirth and breastfeeding

HIV is not transmitted by day-to-day contact in social settings, schools, or in the workplace. A person cannot be infected by shaking someone's hand, by hugging someone, by using the same toilet or drinking from the same glass as an HIV-positive person, playing sports with, or by being exposed to coughing or sneezing by anyone living with HIV.

Most people infected with HIV do not know that they have become infected, because they do not feel ill immediately after infection. The only way to determine whether HIV is present in a person's body is by testing for HIV antibodies.

Knowledge about HIV and AIDS were asked in the IHBSS to determine the information gaps among the most-at-risk-populations (MARPs). As the data in Table 18 show, a high percentage of MSM respondents said that they knew of HIV (77.9\%) and AIDS (89.7\%). The highest percentage of the respondents who did not know HIV and AIDS can be found in Angeles City.

Table 18. Percent distribution of MSM respondents who know HIV and AIDS and agree that a healthy-looking person can get HIV and that HIV can be prevented

| Sites | Know what HIV is | Know what AIDS is | A healthy-looking person can have HIV | HIV can be prevented |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All sites | 77.9 | 89.7 | 79.9 | 87.2 |
| Angeles* | 60.0 | 68.0 | 55.4 | 64.2 |
| Baguio | 87.9 | 88.3 | 50.7 | 94.2 |
| Butuan | 65.6 | 78.3 | 91.9 | 95.8 |
| Cebu | 78.5 | 92.7 | 73.6 | 65.9 |
| Davao | 85.6 | 92.3 | 83.6 | 82.9 |
| General Santos | 60.8 | 96.2 | 67.4 | 97.3 |
| Puerto Galera | 96.0 | 97.6 | 91.6 | 96.0 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 70.0 | 89.3 | 80.7 | 82.3 |
| Santiago | 80.6 | 94.3 | 82.7 | 92.6 |
| Tuguegarao | 79.7 | 96.7 | 90.3 | 94.7 |
| Zamboanga | 74.0 | 88.9 | 75.8 | 81.5 |
| Surigao | 78.0 | 87.3 | 70.7 | 81.8 |
| Caloocan | 79.9 | 92.9 | 87.9 | 88.6 |
| Makati | 89.4 | 95.7 | 85.8 | 97.0 |
| Mandaluyong | 65.0 | 86.5 | 83.1 | 85.7 |
| Manila | 94.6 | 95.0 | 91.3 | 97.4 |
| Marikina | 85.1 | 98.5 | 90.9 | 95.5 |
| Pasig | 79.1 | 88.8 | 92.4 | 83.0 |
| Pasay | 96.8 | 96.9 | 98.4 | 98.4 |
| Quezon City | 89.0 | 97.1 | 96.5 | 91.9 |

About 80 percent of the respondents agreed that a healthy-looking person can be infected with HIV while 87 percent agreed that HIV can be prevented. A large disparity on this variable can be seen across sentinel sites. Only about half of the respondents in Baguio and Angeles positively indicated that regardless of looks a person can be infected with HIV. Respondents from Angeles, on the other hand, had the lowest percentage of those who agreed that HIV can be prevented.

Table 19 shows the level of knowledge of the respondents on the prevention and transmission of HIV. Generally, the respondents exhibited high level of knowledge of the mode of transmission and prevention of HIV infection. About 87 percent affirmatively responded that untreated STI increases the risk of HIV transmission and 85 percent agreed that using condom reduces the risk of transmission.

In terms of mode of transmission, serious gap on awareness and knowledge is manifested by the low percentages of respondents agreeing that HIV cannot be transmitted through mosquito bites (68\%), sharing of food with infected person (64\%), and using toilet bowls or urinals in public places (70\%). This means that about one in three respondents still had misconceptions on these specific mode of transmissions.

The misconception that HIV can be transmitted by sharing food with an infected person was most evident in Davao with 62 percent of the respondents in the site expressing this belief. About 47 percent of MSM respondents from Tuguegarao City agreed that a person cannot be infected with HIV through using toilet bowls in public places while close to half ( $48 \%$ ) in the same site agreed that the disease can be transmitted through mosquito bites.

Most of the respondents from the different sites, except in Cebu City (41\%), believed that sex with only one faithful and uninfected partner reduces risk of HIV transmission. Most (90\%) of the MSM respondents were also aware that sharing of needles after an HIV-infected person had used it increases the risk of HIV infection.
Table 19. Percent distribution of MSM respondents who know means of prevention and various modes of transmission
of HIV
$\stackrel{y}{\leftrightarrows}$
$\left.\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Sites } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Untreated } \\ \text { STI } \\ \text { increases } \\ \text { the risk of } \\ \text { HIV trans- } \\ \text { mission }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Using } \\ \text { condom } \\ \text { reduces } \\ \text { risk }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Sex with } \\ \text { only one } \\ \text { faithful, } \\ \text { uninfec- } \\ \text { ted partner } \\ \text { reduces risk }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { A person } \\ \text { cannot get } \\ \text { HIV by using } \\ \text { toilet bowls/ } \\ \text { urinals } \\ \text { in public } \\ \text { places }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { A person } \\ \text { cannot get } \\ \text { HIV from } \\ \text { mosquito } \\ \text { bites }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Sharing of } \\ \text { needles with } \\ \text { infected person } \\ \text { increases the } \\ \text { risk }\end{array} \\ \text { cannot } \\ \text { get HIV by } \\ \text { sharing food } \\ \text { with infected } \\ \text { person }\end{array}\right]$
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| Sites | Untreated STI increases the risk of HIV transmission | Using condom reduces risk | Sex with only one faithful, uninfected partner reduces risk | A person cannot get HIV by using toilet bowls/ urinals in public places | A person cannot get HIV from mosquito bites | Sharing of needles with infected person increases the risk | A person cannot get HIV by sharing food with infected person |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Puerto Galera | 91.4 | 88.7 | 85.8 | 59.9 | 52.6 | 94.2 | 48.4 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 85.3 | 82.0 | 81.3 | 55.0 | 47.7 | 94.0 | 48.7 |
| Santiago | 88.6 | 91.8 | 88.8 | 69.5 | 75.6 | 93.5 | 70.2 |
| Tuguegarao | 90.1 | 88.6 | 90.5 | 46.7 | 48.0 | 82.8 | 50.2 |
| Zamboanga | 86.0 | 80.6 | 78.9 | 68.3 | 69.0 | 86.0 | 65.2 |
| Surigao | 91.0 | 78.0 | 67.5 | 70.8 | 73.7 | 88.5 | 66.4 |
| Caloocan | 91.9 | 82.0 | 76.5 | 66.6 | 71.1 | 91.2 | 69.1 |
| Makati | 89.0 | 87.3 | 95.3 | 70.5 | 64.6 | 90.0 | 62.1 |
| Mandaluyong | 83.9 | 85.7 | 79.8 | 73.0 | 77.0 | 85.6 | 73.5 |
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| Sites | Untreated STI increases the risk of HIV transmission | Using condom reduces risk | Sex with only one faithful, uninfected partner reduces risk | A person cannot get HIV by using toilet bowls/ urinals in public places | A person cannot get HIV from mosquito bites | Sharing of needles with infected person increases the risk | A person cannot get HIV by sharing food with infected person |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manila | 89.2 | 89.0 | 86.5 | 78.2 | 75.2 | 92.7 | 79.3 |
| Marikina | 93.4 | 90.4 | 83.2 | 63.1 | 49.6 | 96.6 | 66.3 |
| Pasig | 81.7 | 92.8 | 78.3 | 50.3 | 64.2 | 90.8 | 61.4 |
| Pasay | 100.0 | 98.4 | 96.9 | 81.3 | 72.6 | 98.4 | 79.6 |
| Quezon City | 95.5 | 90.1 | 78.0 | 63.8 | 63.0 | 91.5 | 61.1 |
| Caloocan | 91.9 | 82.0 | 76.5 | 66.6 | 71.1 | 91.2 | 69.1 |
| Makati | 89.0 | 87.3 | 95.3 | 70.5 | 64.6 | 90.0 | 62.1 |
| Mandaluyong | 83.9 | 85.7 | 79.8 | 73.0 | 77.0 | 85.6 | 73.5 |

*unweighted

Another useful information for programming is on how MSM respondents perceive and assess their personal risk to HIV infection. This can provide some explanations on their sexual behaviors, use of protective measures, and also their health-seeking behaviors. The data in Tables 20 and 21 provide clues on how MSM themselves assess their current conditions and the risk brought about by their sexual behaviors.
Table 20. Percent distribution of MSM respondents who feel that they are at risk and the reasons why they
are at risk of HIV infection







,

| $\cdots$ | 10 | $\bigcirc$ | $\ulcorner$ |  |  |  |  | $\leftharpoondown$ | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 10 | 0 | 10 | I | \| | I | I | $\dot{*}$ | $\ulcorner$ |


| $\pm$ | $\cdots$ | $\sigma$ | $\ulcorner$ | $\cdots$ | N | 9 | $\square$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\Gamma$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\cdots$ | 0 | $\stackrel{\square}{+}$ | $\pm$ | $\cdots$ | N | ホ | $\bigcirc$ |
|  |  | 15 | $\bigcirc$ | $\downarrow$ | $\bigcirc$ | ம | $\bullet$ | N | N |

All sites
Angeles*
Baguio
Butuan
Cebu
Davao
General Santos
Puerto Galera
Puerto Princesa*
Santiago
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| Sites | Feel that respondent is at risk of HIV infection (\%) | Reasons why respondents are at risk of HIV infection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | They already have HIV | Had sex with an HIV positive partner | Many sex partners | Do not always use condom | Sharing needles when injecting drugs |
| Tuguegarao | 48.5 | -- | -- | -- | 55.0 | -- |
| Zamboanga | 55.1 | -- | -- | 23.0 | 25.5 | 1.2 |
| Surigao | 51.8 | 2.9 | 5.8 | 59.6 | 60.7 | 6.8 |
| Caloocan | 66.7 | 4.0 | 12.3 | 46.7 | 32.7 | -- |
| Makati | 74.0 | -- | -- | 73.9 | 51.4 | -- |
| Mandaluyong | 69.3 | 0.6 | 9.6 | 83.1 | 56.1 | 4.6 |
| Manila | 71.4 | 8.9 | 20.7 | 58.1 | 52.1 | 3.9 |
| Marikina | 34.7 | -- | 2.1 | 79.9 | 24.6 | -- |
| Pasig | 60.6 | 0.6 | 33.7 | 47.0 | 27.1 | 1.1 |
| Pasay | 21.9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Quezon City | 67.6 | 9.5 | 17.0 | 63.8 | 53.3 | 14.2 |

*unweighted

In general, there is a low level of recognition and acceptance of respondents' risk and vulnerability to HIV infection. Only about six out of ten respondents have expressed that they feel at risk of HIV infection. They mostly associated the risk with having multiple sex partners and not always using condom during their sexual activities.

The recognition by MSM of their risk to HIV infection also varies across sentinel sites. Most of the MSM respondents from Pasay City and Marikina City believed that they are not at risk to HIV infection as indicated by only 22 percent of the respondents from Pasay and 35 percent from Marikina saying so.
Table 21. Percent distribution of MSM respondents who feel that they are NOT at risk and the reasons why they are at risk of HIV infection

| Study Sites | Feel that <br> respondent <br> is NOT at <br> risk of HIV <br> infection (\%) | Only have <br> one partner | Always <br> use <br> Condom | Convinced <br> partner is <br> clean | Never <br> do anal <br> sex |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All sites* | 39.6 | 22.3 | 17.2 | 36.1 | Never <br> share <br> needle |
| Angeles* | 57.7 | 14.5 | 9.2 | 17.3 | 12.2 |
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| Study Sites | Feel that <br> respondent is <br> NOT at risk of <br> HIV infection <br> (\%) | Only have <br> one partner | Always use <br> Condom | Convinced <br> partner is clean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tuguegarao | 51.6 | 31.3 | 25.0 | Never do <br> anal sex |
| Zamboanga | 44.9 | 8.4 | 12.5 | Never share <br> needle |
| Surigao | 48.1 | 26.8 | 28.6 | 10.9 |

## A.3. Perfect Knowledge on HIV

To have a summary for the knowledge on HIV, a single variable was created to pertain to "perfect knowledge." In this study, an MSM is said to have a perfect knowledge if he correctly answered the following questions:

1. Can having sex with only one faithful, uninfected partner reduce the risk of HIV transmission?
2. Can using condoms reduce the risk of HIV transmission?
3. Can a healthy-looking person have HIV?
4. Can a person get HIV from mosquito bites?
5. Can a person get HIV by sharing a meal or food with someone who is infected?

If respondents answered "yes" to the first three (3) questions and "no" to the succeeding two (2) questions they are considered to have a "perfect" knowledge on HIV. Respondents who have four or less affirmative responses on the given questions or statements have "imperfect" knowledge on HIV.

Table 22. Percent distribution of MSM respondents by perfect and imperfect knowledge on HIV

| Study Sites | With perfect <br> knowledge | With imperfect <br> knowledge | $\mathbf{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All sites | 34.9 | 65.1 | 3,296 |
| Angeles* | 37.3 | 62.7 | 300 |
| Baguio | 31.3 | 68.8 | 304 |
| Butuan | 57.9 | 42.1 | 252 |
| Cebu | 8.0 | 87.1 | 300 |
| Davao | 12.9 | 56.6 | 294 |
| General Santos | 43.4 | 74.1 | 166 |
| Puerto Galera | 25.9 | 75.7 | 300 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 24.3 | 44.6 | 112 |
| Santiago |  |  |  |


| Study Sites | With perfect <br> knowledge | With imperfect <br> knowledge | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tuguegarao | 18.8 | 81.3 | 32 |
| Zamboanga | 35.2 | 64.8 | 267 |
| Surigao | 31.5 | 68.5 | 111 |
| Caloocan | 40.9 | 59.1 | 115 |
| Makati | 44.0 | 56.0 | 134 |
| Mandaluyong | 40.5 | 47.3 | 154 |
| Manila | 52.7 | 67.4 | 129 |
| Marikina | 32.6 | 31.1 | 37.5 |
| Pasig | 62.5 | 48.4 | 217 |
| Pasay | 63.6 |  |  |
| Quezon City |  |  | 103 |

Table 23 shows that there is no significant difference across sub-groups of background characteristics. Respondents aged 15-19 and those with only elementary level of education (73.6\%) had a high percentage of imperfect knowledge. Specifically, MSM aged 15 to 17 showed the highest percentage of with imperfect knowledge (75.7\%)

There appears to be no significant difference between singles and married couples in terms of knowledge on HIV.

Table 23. MSM respondents with perfect and imperfect knowledge on HIV by background characteristics

| Background character- <br> istics | With imperfect <br> knowledge | With perfect <br> knowledge | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Age | 72.0 | 28.0 | 1,322 |
| *15-19 |  |  |  |
| 596 of the respondents in <br> this age group were mi- <br> nors aged 15 to 17; 75.7 <br> percent of whom had <br> imperfect knowledge | 64.1 | 35.9 | 1,520 |
| $20-24$ |  |  | see next page |


| Background characteristics | With imperfect knowledge | With perfect knowledge | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |
| 25-29 | 61.5 | 38.5 | 774 |
| 30-34 | 60.0 | 40.0 | 340 |
| 35-39 | 65.8 | 34.2 | 190 |
| 40-44 | 63.9 | 36.1 | 122 |
| 45 and above | 57.6 | 42.4 | 99 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 73.6 | 26.4 | 299 |
| Secondary | 69.8 | 30.2 | 2,151 |
| Vocational, college and higher | 59.6 | 40.4 | 1,892 |
| Civil status |  |  |  |
| Single | 66.1 | 33.9 | 4,057 |
| Married | 61.5 | 38.5 | 234 |
| Separated/widowed | 53.4 | 46.6 | 58 |

## A.4. Sources of Information on HIV and AIDS

The data on the source of information imply where the respondents can be reached by communication interventions. Table 24 shows the sources of information on HIV and AIDS among the MSM respondents. Television was the primary source of information, with almost half of the respondents ( $47.6 \%$ ) citing the medium. This is most notable in Baguio (72.4\%), General Santos (76.7\%), Marikina (76.0\%), and Pasay (68.8\%). In Zamboanga City, however, television was the least popular source of information on HIV (9.4\%).

Second to television, radio was also a popular source of information on HIV and AIDS. More than half (52\%) of MSM respondents from Marikina City accessed their information from the radio.

A substantial percentage (30.3\%) of MSM respondents also identified their friends as source of information on HIV and AIDS, especially in Angeles City (72.3\%). However, the issue on accuracy of information given by their friends cannot be ascertained by the survey.

MSM respondents seldom got information from their parents and relatives. Some got their information from newspapers, printed materials, peer educators, and social hygiene clinic. A relatively high proportion (58.3\%) from Pasay City have accessed their information from printed materials. The source of these printed materials, however, was not identified.
Table 24. Percent of MSM respondents by sources of information on HIV and AIDS
Study

Sites TV | Ra- |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| dio |

Study

Sites TV | Ra- |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| dio |

[^1]Both respondents with perfect and imperfect knowledge had access to different sources of information. However, more respondents with perfect knowledge utilized these sources, compared to those with imperfect knowledge. The most noticeable difference between these groups can be noted in accessing information from internet, printed materials, and peer educators

Next to television, friends were the second significant sources of information on HIV for both those with perfect and imperfect knowledge. The survey, however, cannot ascertain the quality of information from these sources.

Table 25. Percent distribution of MSM respondents with perfect and imperfect knowledge on HIV by sources of information

| Sources of infor- <br> mation | With imperfect <br> knowledge | $\mathbf{n}$ | With perfect <br> knowledge | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Television | 46.7 | 2,864 | 46.8 | $\mathbf{1 , 5 0 2}$ |
| Radio | 22.8 | 2,863 | 27.7 | 1,500 |
| Newspaper/Mag- <br> azine/ <br> Tabloid | 11.2 | 2,864 | 14.1 | 1,501 |
| Internet | 9.6 | 2,864 | 14.7 | 1,501 |
| Printed <br> materials | 9.3 | 2,864 | 17.4 | 1,504 |
| Friends | 34.5 | 2,864 | 33.0 | 1,502 |
| Parents/ relatives | 3.4 | 2,864 | 3.1 | 1,500 |
| Teachers | 11.2 | 2,863 | 12.9 | 22.4 |
| Peer educators | 14.2 | 2,863 | 3.9 | 1,502 |
| Counselors | 2.9 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 1,563 |
| Social hygiene <br> clinic | 1,509 |  |  |  |

## B. Sexual identity and orientation of MSM

Sexual identity is how an individual self-identifies in terms of one's attraction to the same sex or members of the other sex based on one's own experiences, thoughts, and reactions; it is independent of the gender or sex of the sexual partner(s). Sexual orientation and sexual preference are two terms that are interchangeably used to refer to the sex of someone to whom one is sexually attracted. The forms of sexual orientation include:

- Heterosexual - someone who is mainly attracted to someone of the opposite sex;
- Homosexual - someone who is attracted to someone of the same sex; and
- Bisexual - someone attracted to both sexes. (Glossary of Terms in Gender and Sexuality, 2nd Edition).

Information on sexual identity and orientation helps in understanding prevailing sexual behaviors. MSM as a concept focuses on the sexual behavior, sexual preference, and identity. Data on sexual orientation and identity were gathered by self-determination by the respondents on whether they are "homosexual" or "bisexual." Respondents were also directly asked to identify their sexual preference.

Most (60\%) of the MSM respondents were sexually attracted to males. One in four ( $24.7 \%$ ) were attracted to females and one sixth ( $15.3 \%$ ) were attracted to both. More (66.4\%) MSM respondents identified themselves as homosexual than bisexual (33.6\%). The same sexual preference and identity were expressed by MSM respondents in almost all study sites except for Surigao (61.9\%), Manila (53.8\%), Puerto Princesa (59.1\%), and Butuan (52.7\%), where more MSM have self-identified as bisexual.

The data on sexual preference and identity affirm that the term MSM does not correspond to a single social identity. This means that MSM are not easily identifiable by sexual preference nor by sexual identity because the data show that MSM are also attracted to females. In fact, there are MSM who are married to women.
Table 26. Percent distribution of MSM respondents by sexual preference and sexual identity per study site

| Study Sites | Sexual Preference |  |  |  | Sexual Identity |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Both sexes | n | Homosexual | Bisexual | N |
| All sites | 60.0 | 24.7 | 15.3 | 3,257 | 66.4 | 33.6 | 2,774 |
| Angeles* | 60.7 | 9.2 | 30.2 |  | 66.8 | 33.2 |  |
| Baguio | 73.7 | 14.1 | 12.2 | 304 | 76.7 | 23.3 | 300 |
| Butuan | 30.9 | 55.0 | 14.1 | 249 | 47.3 | 52.7 | 201 |
| Cebu | 55.3 | 34.0 | 10.7 | 300 | 84.9 | 15.1 | 179 |
| Davao | 79.6 | 12.7 | 7.7 | 284 | 80.7 | 19.3 | 254 |
| General Santos | 45.2 | 46.6 | 8.2 | 294 | 78.9 | 21.1 | 152 |
| Puerto Galera | 79.9 | 11.0 | 9.1 | 154 | 78.7 | 21.3 | 150 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 41.7 | 25.3 | 33.0 |  | 40.9 | 59.1 |  |
| Santiago | 70.9 | 18.2 | 10.9 | 110 | 76.2 | 23.8 | 101 |
| Tuguegarao | 66.7 | 23.3 | 10.0 | 30 | 73.3 | 26.7 | 30 |
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| Study Sites | Sexual Preference | Sexual Identity |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Male | Female | Both sexes | n | Homosexual | Bisexual | N |
|  | 53.2 | 12.0 | 34.8 | 267 | 54.5 | 45.5 | 266 |
| Zamboanga | 34.9 | 25.7 | 39.4 | 109 | 38.1 | 61.9 | 97 |
| Surigao | 76.5 | 8.7 | 14.8 | 115 | 67.6 | 32.4 | 102 |
| Caloocan | 57.6 | 25.8 | 16.7 | 132 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 99 |
| Makati | 65.1 | 15.1 | 19.7 | 152 | 62.9 | 37.1 | 140 |
| Mandaluyong | 79.9 | 1.9 | 18.2 | 264 | 46.2 | 53.8 | 262 |
| Manila | 58.9 | 26.4 | 14.7 | 129 | 75.5 | 24.5 | 94 |
| Marikina | 85.1 | 6.9 | 7.9 | 101 | 78.2 | 21.8 | 101 |
| Pasig | 70.2 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 47 | 78.6 | 21.4 | 42 |
| Pasay | 27.3 | 57.4 | 15.3 | 216 | 56.4 | 43.6 | 204 |
| Quezon City |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*unweighted

Sexual identity influences one's sexual preference. As can be seen in Table 27, MSM who identified themselves as homosexuals expressed preference for males as sexual partners ( $90.5 \%$ ) with only a few preferring females (7.3\%) or both sex (2.2\%). Only about 28 percent of MSM who identified themselves as bisexuals exclusively prefer male as sex partners; 29 percent prefer females exclusively; and, 43 percent prefer both sexes. These data show that the sexual identity that one ascribes to influences one's preference for sexual partners.

Table 27. Percent distribution of MSM respondents by sexual partner preference and sexual identity

| Sexual identity | Sexual Preference |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Male | Female | Both sexes | n |
| Homosexual | 90.5 | 7.3 | 2.2 | 1,840 |
| Bisexual | 27.7 | 28.6 | 43.4 | 928 |

## Sexual identity by background characteristics

In terms of background characteristics, a pattern can be drawn out from the available data. Seemingly, data in Table 28 show that as MSM mature by age, they become more open and definitive in identifying themselves as homosexuals. As expected, since young adults are still in the process of establishing their self as well as their sexual identity, they might not be able to identify themselves in a straight-forward manner. Stigma on homosexuality may also be highly operative in the stage of adolescence. This is also manifested by data among minors showing that half of them categorically identified themselves as homosexuals and the other half as bisexuals.

The difference across level of education appears insignificant in terms of identifying MSM' sexual identity. However, the difference can be seen among groups within civil status. Rationally, more single MSM have identified themselves as homosexuals than among married persons.

Table 28. MSM respondents who identified themselves as homosexual and bisexual by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Identified themselves as homosexual | Identified themselves as bisexual | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |
| *15-19 | 58.1 | 41.9 | 1,033 |
| 20-24 | 60.3 | 39.7 | 1,306 |
| 25-29 | 62.8 | 37.2 | 685 |
| 30-34 | 68.6 | 31.4 | 315 |
| 35-39 | 68.9 | 31.1 | 183 |
| 40-44 | 79.8 | 20.2 | 114 |
| 45 and above | 75.0 | 25.0 | 96 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 56.7 | 43.3 | 231 |
| Secondary | 63.4 | 36.6 | 1,814 |
| Vocational, college and higher | 61.6 | 38.4 | 1,671 |
| Civil status |  |  |  |
| Single | 64.2 | 35.8 | 3,482 |
| Married | 31.2 | 68.8 | 186 |
| Separated/ widowed | 38.0 | 62.0 | 50 |

*440 were in the 15-17 age group. Of these, $57.3 \%$ self-identified as homosexuals and 42.7 self-identified as bisexuals.

## C. Sexual activities of MSM

## C.1. Types of sexual activities with another men

The transmission of HIV among MSM can involve anal or oral sex, blood transfusion, contaminated hypodermic needles, or other exposure to body fluids possibly infected with HIV.

Oral sex refers to sexual activities involving the stimulation of the genitalia with the use of mouth, tongue, teeth, or throat. In IHBSS, oral sex is categorized into receiving and inserting. Oral receivers in this study were those respondents who put their partners' penises in their mouths, while oral inserters refer to respondents who inserted their penises into the mouths of their partners.

Anal sex, which has been popularly associated with male homosexuality and MSM, most often refers to the sex act involving insertion of the penis into the anus. Among those who have anal sex, the inserting partner is referred to as the top or active partner. The receiver is referred to as the bottom or passive partner. Preference for either is referred to as versatile.

Anal sex can sometimes include other sexual acts involving the anus, including but not limited to anilingus and fingering. It is a form of sexual behavior considered to be comparatively high risk, due to the vulnerability of the tissues and the septic nature of the anus. As the rectal mucosa provides little natural lubrication, a lubricant is often required or preferred when penetrating the anus. Although the likelihood of transmitting infection varies a great deal by activity, in general, all sexual activities between two (or more) people is considered a two-way route for the transmission of STIs; "giving" or "receiving" are both risky, although anal receiving carries a higher risk.

Overall, oral sex is more common than anal sex among MSM respondents. There is a higher percentage of respondents who ever experienced oral sex $(70.9 \%$ as receiver and $69.8 \%$ as inserter) than those who ever experienced anal sex ( $53.8 \%$ as receiver and $47.2 \%$ as inserter). The data imply that MSM usually assume the role of the receiver in both of their oral and anal experience.

MSM across sentinel sites had common sexual experience - as receiver in anal and oral sex - with little variation across sentinel sites. MSM respondents in Surigao preferred the inserter role for both oral and anal sex than that of the receiver. In Angeles, the preference for receiving partner in anal sex was more pronounced than in any other sites. Lastly, high incidence of anal receiving (bottom) can be found in Butuan City (80\%), Surigao (89\%), Zamboanga (86\%), Pasig (83\%), and Puerto Galera (91\%).
Table 29. Percent distribution of MSM respondents who experienced oral and anal sex

| Study Sites | Oral Sex |  | Anal Sex |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Receiving | $n$ | Inserting | $n$ | Receiving | $n$ | Inserting | $n$ |
| All sites* | 70.9 | 2,706 | 69.8 | 2,550 | 53.8 | 1,919 | 47.2 | 1,629 |
| Angeles* | 63.2 | 250 | 56.7 | 289 | 66.0 | 250 | 19.0 | 248 |
| Baguio | 74.5 | 288 | 41.8 | 245 | 50.2 | 261 | 22.5 | 236 |
| Butuan | 96.0 | 151 | 94.7 | 126 | 80.1 | 74 | 69.7 | 83 |
| Cebu | 68.2 | 277 | 74.9 | 283 | 54.2 | 273 | 50.5 | 274 |
| Davao | 86.9 | 292 | 56.7 | 276 | 59.7 | 286 | 36.0 | 275 |
| General Santos | 58.4 | 248 | 84.4 | 277 | 47.0 | 245 | 60.1 | 269 |
| Puerto Galera | 91.7 | 137 | 61.4 | 81 | 90.6 | 117 | 50.7 | 72 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 47.8 | 299 | 60.7 | 300 | 41.7 | 300 | 54.2 | 299 |
| Santiago | 91.4 | 102 | 69.1 | 87 | 79.1 | 86 | 42.7 | 75 |
| Tuguegarao | 71.7 | 30 | 58.0 | 29 | 40.3 | 30 | 31.8 | 29 |

[^2]| Study Sites | Oral Sex |  | Anal Sex |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Receiving | $n$ | Inserting | $n$ | Receiving | $n$ | Inserting | $n$ |
| Zamboanga | 91.4 | 166 | 82.9 | 143 | 86.1 | 142 | 76.7 | 148 |
| Surigao | 93.9 | 57 | 95.1 | 59 | 88.7 | 39 | 91.6 | 51 |
| Caloocan | 79.1 | 113 | 63.3 | 100 | 48.6 | 106 | 37.6 | 99 |
| Makati | 63.4 | 134 | 74.6 | 134 | 41.9 | 133 | 41.1 | 134 |
| Mandaluyong | 81.0 | 142 | 57.7 | 121 | 63.8 | 133 | 33.7 | 118 |
| Manila | 88.6 | 235 | 87.3 | 234 | 65.3 | 219 | 72.8 | 227 |
| Marikina | 66.0 | 126 | 75.1 | 127 | 32.9 | 124 | 27.4 | 125 |
| Pasig | 84.8 | 100 | 39.3 | 71 | 82.9 | 95 | 20.2 | 64 |
| Pasay | 79.1 | 47 | 47.3 | 47 | 49.7 | 46 | 15.5 | 45 |
| Quezon City | 40.0 | 216 | 78.3 | 217 | 20.2 | 216 | 42.6 | 216 |

*unweighted

Table 30 demonstrates the sexual behaviors of respondents with HIV. More HIV-positive MSM experienced oral and anal sex as inserters, compared to non-HIV positive MSM. However, HIV-positive MSM posted a lower percentage on anal sex as receiver.

The data for this specific MSM group are contrary to the general behavior shown in Table 29 where majority of respondents were passive (receiver) partners. While data cannot indicate which specific sexual activity has caused the infection among respondents with HIV, it is evident that HIV-positive MSM had a higher percentage of oral and anal sex experience compared to the site average.

Table 30. Percent of MSM HIV-positive respondents who experienced oral and anal sex

|  | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Experienced oral receiving | 82.9 | 34 |
| Experienced oral inserting | 75.0 | 33 |
| Experienced anal receiving | 52.6 | 20 |
| Experienced anal inserting | 62.5 | 25 |

As literature says, anal sex provides greater risk of HIV infection. Analyzing the background characteristics of respondents who ever had anal sex (see Table 31), most of them, either as the receiver and inserter, were relatively young adults specifically belonging to $15-19$ years of age; not currently living with a partner; had at least attained secondary level of education; and did not have perfect knowledge on HIV. The difference between the characteristics of those who experienced receiving and inserting anal sex is not significant. Those who had experienced the inserter role during such anal sex were younger. Most of the receivers were working at the time of the interview, while most of the inserters were not working. A little higher proportion of inserter in anal sex were married, with only elementary level of education, and currently living with a partner.

Table 31. Background characteristics of MSM respondents who ever experienced anal sex

| Background characteristics | Receiving | n | Inserting | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  | 1,919 |  | 1,629 |
| 15-19 | 24.5 |  | 32.9 |  |
| *15-17 (minors) | 10.6 |  | 14.9 |  |
| 20-24 | 32.9 |  | 34.6 |  |
| 25-29 | 19.5 |  | 18.2 |  |
| 30-34 | 9.9 |  | 7.2 |  |
| 35-39 | 6.2 |  | 3.2 |  |
| 40-44 | 4.0 |  | 2.1 |  |
| 45 and above | 2.9 |  | 1.7 |  |
| Currently living with a p | partner | 1,894 |  | 1,613 |
| Yes | 13.9 |  | 18.9 |  |
| No | 86.1 |  | 81.1 |  |
| Educational attainment |  | 1,908 |  | 1,623 |
| Elementary | 5.9 |  | 9.1 |  |
| Secondary | 48.0 |  | 47.1 |  |
| Vocational, college and higher | 46.2 |  | 43.9 |  |
| Civil status |  | 1,913 |  | 1,624 |
| Single | 97.5 |  | 91.9 |  |
| Married | 1.8 |  | 6.7 |  |
| Separated/widowed | 0.7 |  | 1.5 |  |


| Background characteristics | Receiving | n | Inserting | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work status |  | 1,815 |  | 1,577 |
| Working | 55.6 |  | 44.6 |  |
| Not working | 44.4 |  | 55.4 |  |
| Knowledge on HIV |  | 1,919 |  | 1,629 |
| Perfect knowledge | 37.0 |  | 31.7 |  |
| Imperfect knowledge | 63.0 |  | 68.3 |  |

## C.2. Multiple sex partners

Having multiple partners is one of the factors that increase the risk of HIV infection. Having more than one sexual partner is common among MSM as data on Table 32 indicate that respondents did not stick with one regular male sex partners. Across the study sites, the respondents had an average of one male sex partner per week (3.89 sex partners) in the last thirty days or month preceding the interview. MSM in Cebu, Davao, Zamboanga, Mandaluyong, Manila, Pasig and Quezon City had a mean number of male sex partners in the last month higher than the average number for all sites. MSM in Davao City had an average of almost two male sex partners (6.84) per week in the past month.
Table 32. Average number of sex partners and percent of MSM respondents with multiple paid, paying and non-paying male sex partners in the past 30 days

## $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Mean } & \text { Percent } \\ \text { no. of } & \text { with mul- } \\ \text { sex } & \text { tiple sex } \\ \text { partner } & \text { partner }\end{array}$

| Study Sites | Mean no. of sex partner | Percent with multiple sex partner | n | Percent with multiple paid sex partners | n | Percent with multiple paying sex partners | n | Percent with multiple non-paying sex parter | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All sites | 3.89 | 60.5 | 3,242 | 65.1 | 814 | 60.3 | 1.167 | 39.0 | 1,756 |
| Angeles* | 2.83 | 73.6 | 217 | 86.0 | 117 | 62.6 | 67 | 23.8 | 51 |
| Baguio | 2.75 | 59.8 | 304 | 59.7 | 129 | 41.8 | 79 | 3.3 | 180 |
| Butuan | 2.61 | 45.5 | 246 | 82.9 | 35 | 49.3 | 71 | 44.4 | 142 |
| Cebu | 4.78 | 68.5 | 298 | 61.0 | 59 | 57.2 | 145 | 39.5 | 124 |
| Davao | 6.84 | 72.8 | 287 | 66.7 | 105 | 61.8 | 102 | 39.7 | 189 |
| General Santos | 2.57 | 48.6 | 294 | 48.0 | 50 | 30.8 | 133 | 18.9 | 95 |
| Puerto Galera | 1.60 | 36.9 | 149 | 53.3 | 30 | 50.8 | 61 | 29.3 | 82 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 3.10 | 65.6 | 208 | 67.4 | 29 | 58.9 | 53 | 41.9 | 72 |
| Santiago | 2.41 | 46.8 | 109 | 50.0 | 38 | 43.6 | 39 | 44.6 | 56 |
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| Study Sites | Mean no. of sex partner | Percent with multiple sex partner | n | Percent with multiple paid sex partners | n | Percent with multiple paying sex partners | n | Percent with multiple non-paying sex parter | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuguegarao | 3.67 | 46.7 | 30 | (62.5) | 16 | (60.0) | 10 | 37.5 | 16 |
| Zamboanga | 4.30 | 78.7 | 267 | 88.0 | 125 | 84.4 | 128 | 56.8 | 162 |
| Surigao | 3.71 | 60.6 | 109 | (92.3) | 13 | 63.6 | 55 | 60.8 | 74 |
| Caloocan | 3.53 | 61.9 | 113 | 63.0 | 27 | (57.9) | 19 | 49.4 | 79 |
| Makati | 3.17 | 67.7 | 133 | 77.1 | 35 | 64.2 | 53 | 30.3 | 66 |
| Mandaluyong | 5.26 | 48.0 | 150 | 57.6 | 33 | 57.5 | 40 | 39.4 | 104 |
| Manila | 5.06 | 71.3 | 261 | (72.7) | 11 | (80.0) | 20 | 51.7 | 180 |
| Marikina | 3.67 | 79.7 | 128 | 66.7 | 45 | 96.3 | 54 | 39.0 | 41 |
| Pasig | 4.55 | 66.7 | 102 | 55.9 | 34 | (85.7) | 7 | 55.4 | 83 |
| Pasay | 1.51 | 27.3 | 47 | (37.5) | 8 | (44.4) | 9 | 7.1 | 28 |
| Quezon City | 3.98 | 23.0 | 215 | (19.0) | 21 | 74.6 | 142 | 45.5 | 55 |

*unweighted

In terms of proportion, there are about six in ten (60.5\%) MSM respondents who had more than one male sex partner within the past month. The percentages of MSM with multiple male sex partners were relatively high in Marikina (79.7\%), Zamboanga (78.7\%), Angeles (73.6\%), Davao (72.8\%), and Manila (71.3\%). The proportion that had paid sex partners is very high; this may be due to sampling only obvious gays at cruising areas.

MSM respondents also had sex with male sex partners of various types - such as regular, casual, paid, and paying sex partners. About 69 percent had multiple paid partners, 64 percent with multiple paying sex partners, and 58 percent with multiple nonpaying (regular or casual) male sex partners. All these sexual encounters happened during the last thirty days prior to the interview. It can be noted that there is a higher proportion of MSM who had multiple paid sexual encounters ( $65.1 \%$ ) compared to when they were being paid for sex (60.3). Interestingly, the figure is much lower when there is no money involved (39\%). The figures, however, should be considered with caution in as much as valid responses are extremely lower than the total number of respondents $(4,372)$.

Zamboanga City, which had the highest percentage of MSM with multiple sex partners, had higher percentages of respondents with paid (84.4\%) and paying (88.0\%) sex partners than non-paying (56.8\%) male sex partners. It is also interesting to note that while MSM in Davao City had the highest average number (6.84) of male sex partners in the month preceding the survey, about 73 percent had multiple sex partners; 67 percent had multiple paid sex partners; 62 percent had multiple paying partners; and, 40 percent with multiple non-paying partners.

The risk of having HIV infection with multiple sex partners is likewise demonstrated in the data in Table 33. Among HIV-positive MSM, 78 percent or 25 cases had multiple male sex partners in the past month before the interview. Two (2) HIV-positive MSM had more than one paid partners; nine (9) with multiple paying sex partners; and eleven (11) with multiple non-paying partners.

Table 33. Percent of MSM HIV-positive respondents who had multiple sex partners

|  | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| With multiple sex partners | 78.1 | 32 |
| With multiple paid partners | 50.0 | 4 |
| With multiple paying partners | 69.2 | 13 |
| With multiple non-paying partners | 50.0 | 22 |

The percentage of MSM respondents with multiple partners does not vary much by background characteristics. A higher percentage of respondents from the 35-39 age group had multiple sex partner in the month preceding the survey, while those from the 45 and above group had the lowest. Similarly, a higher percentage of respondents who were not living with a partner, only had elementary education, and single had multiple sex partners..

In terms of number of sex partners in the last month, the same groups had much higher number of partners in the last month than the other groups.

MSM belonging to 15-17 age group exhibited an active sexual activity. Within the past month prior to the survey, the minors had about three (3) male partners on the average. In addition, 60 percent of them had admitted having more than one sexual partner in the past month.

Table 34. Mean number of sex partners and percent with multiple partners in the last month by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Mean no. of sex partners | n | Percent with multiple sex partner | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| *15-19 | 4.32 | 970 | 60.2 | 966 |
| 20-24 | 3.81 | 1.114 | 61.3 | 1,111 |
| 25-29 | 4.01 | 563 | 62.3 | 562 |
| 30-34 | 3.79 | 271 | 58.9 | 270 |
| 35-39 | 3.15 | 159 | 64.2 | 159 |
| 40-44 | 2.49 | 93 | 53.8 | 93 |
| 45 and above | 2.29 | 82 | 46.3 | 82 |
| Currently living with a partner |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 3.39 | 548 | 52.8 | 547 |
| No | 3.99 | 2,657 | 62.0 | 2,648 |


| Background <br> characteristics | Mean no. of <br> sex partners | n | Percent with <br> multiple sex <br> partner | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Civil status | 3.97 | 3,048 | 61.3 | 3,038 |
| Single | 2.83 | 159 | 45.9 | 159 |
| Married | 2.54 | 30 | 53.3 | 30 |
| Separated/ <br> widowed |  |  |  |  |

*591 were minors (15-17). Of these, 59.9 percent had multiple sex partner, with 3.28 mean no of sex partners

## C.3. First sex with men

MSM respondents had their first sexual encounter with the same sex at the very young age of 16 years on the average (see Table 35). Majority of the respondents had their first sexual encounter when they were 20 years old or younger. There were MSM who had their first sex with male partner as early as the age of 5 to 10 years (5.8\%) and $11-15$ years (40.8\%).

Table 35. Age of MSM respondents during first penetrative sex with another men

| Age Groups | Percent | $\mathrm{n}=4,372$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $5-10$ | 5.8 | 255 |
| $11-15$ | 40.8 | 1,782 |
| $16-20$ | 48.7 | 2,128 |
| $21-25$ | 4.0 | 173 |
| $26 \&$ above | 0.8 | 34 |
| Mean Age | 16.3 |  |

Table 36 indicates that many of the first sexual encounters of MSM were forced (27.9\%). More disturbingly, about 36 percent of those who experienced first sex with men at the age of 5-10 years; 30 percent for those at the age of 11-15 years; and 26 percent for those at 21-25 years were forced.

A substantial proportion (33.1\%) of MSM was also paid with cash or kind during their first sexual encounter with men. About 16, 33, and 36 percents of those who had their first sex with men at the age of 5-10, 11-15, 16-20 years, respectively, had their first sex with a man for payment during their first sexual encounter.
Table 36. Percent distribution of MSM respondents whose first sex with a man was forced and with considerations of cash and kind by age of
first sex with men

| Age Groups | Percent of MSM who were forced during their first sex with a man | n | Percent of MSM who had their first sex with a man for cash or kind | n | Percent of MSM who were forced and paid with cash during their first sex with a man | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-10 | 35.6 | 253 | 15.7 | 255 | 6.3 | 237 |
| 11-15 | 30.1 | 1,767 | 33.2 | 1,770 | 9.1 | 1488 |
| 16-20 | 25.9 | 2,114 | 36.0 | 2,115 | 13.2 | 2206 |
| 21-25 | 18.6 | 172 | 22.1 | 172 | 13.1 | 350 |
| 26\&above | (29.2) | 24 | (29.2) | 24 | 6.0 | 50 |
| All ages | 27.9 | 4,330 | 33.1 | 4,336 | 11.3 | 4331 |

Most (33.8\%) of the first sexual encounter of MSM were with their friends (see Table 37). About 16 percent were with their boyfriends and 36 percent were with acquaintance and with persons with whom they had no relationship at all. For those who were forced, the perpetrators were their friends ( $32.7 \%$ ) and persons with whom they had no relation at all (27.9\%). Some were also forced by their boyfriends (11.9\%) and by their own relatives (5.1\%)

Table 37. Percentage of MSM respondents by relationship with first male sexual partner and relationship of MSMs who were forced during first sex with men

| Relationship | Percent for <br> all MSMs | $\mathbf{n}$ | Percent for <br> MSMs who were <br> forced during <br> first sex with <br> men | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Boyfriend | 16.3 | 664 | 11.9 | 133 |
| Spouse/live-in <br> partner | 0.7 | 29 | $(0.3)$ | 3 |
| Friend | 33.8 | 1,380 | 32.7 | 366 |
| Relative | 3.8 | 155 | 5.1 | 57 |
| Paying sex <br> partner | 8.3 | 340 | 9.3 | 104 |
| Paid sex partner | 1.0 | 42 | $(1.4)$ | 16 |
| Acquaintance | 12.9 | 525 | 11.4 | 127 |
| No relation | 23.2 | 946 | 27.9 | 312 |

The information on the sexual debut of MSM respondents has serious implications for policy and program development, not only from a health perspective but also the entire development aspects of children and adolescent. Male to male sex is often initiated during adolescent years as they undergo sexual experimentation to develop their sexual identity. This is a stage in their life when they are learning to relate sexually with others and experimenting with different behaviors. However, the current sexual health services are not designed to accommodate minors. Without appropriate intervention specific to them, they are left exposed to the threats of risky behaviors. It is also noteworthy that a significant number of MSM had forced sexual debut. Education therefore, should also focus on how MSM, particularly the minors, can protect themselves from sexual abuse. This information should be at the core of HIV programming aimed at minors and young people.

## C.3. Use of condom

Safe or protected sex significantly reduces the risk of STI and HIV infections. The use of condoms in either oral or anal sex greatly reduces the risk of contracting and/or transmitting STIs, including HIV.

Table 38 shows that majority of respondents did not use condom during oral (70\%) or anal sex (53.5) in the last twelve months preceding the survey. Interestingly, only $31.4 \%$ of MSM did not use a condom during their vaginal sex encounters in the last 12 months before the survey.

Table 38. Percent of MSM respondents who had oral and anal sex with men in the past 12 months without condom

|  | Percent | $\mathbf{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Had oral sex without condom | 70.0 | 4,159 |
| Had anal sex without condom | 53.5 | 3,903 |
| Had vaginal sex without condom | 31.4 | 3,619 |

MSM usually get condoms from the pharmacies (65\%). Some get it from supermarket (18\%) and from friends and relatives (13\%).
Table 39. Sources of condom

| Sources of condom | $n=$ <br> 4,200 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Government hospital | 1.6 | 8.7 |
| City health center | 2.1 |  |
| Barangay Health Station | 2.7 |  |
| Botika sa Barangay | 0.8 |  |
| Private hospital/clinic | 65.3 |  |
| Pharmacy | 0.7 |  |
| Private doctor | 0.3 |  |
| Private nurse/midwife | 3.5 |  |
| NGO | 17.6 |  |
| Supermarket |  |  |


| Sources of condom | $n=$ <br> 4,200 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Church | 0.3 |  |
| Friends/relatives | 12.9 |  |
| Bars/nightspots | 2.5 |  |

The data on the use of condom of respondents with HIV during oral and anal sex with men is also indicative of the risk of HIV infection brought about by unprotected sex. Most of HIV-positives did not use condom during their oral (73.8\%) and anal (57.9\%) sexual encounters with male partners (see Table 40). 27 percent of the respondent who had vaginal sex did not use a condom.

Table 40. Percent of MSM HIV-positive respondents who had oral and anal sex in the last 12 months without using condom

|  | Percent | $\mathbf{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| With oral sex without using condom | 73.8 | 42 |
| With anal sex without using condom | 57.9 | 38 |
| With vaginal sex without using condom | 26.5 | 34 |

Table 41 indicates that knowledge on HIV, particularly on its mode of transmission and prevention, does not necessarily translate to practice. For example, those who knew that HIV can be prevented still engaged in unprotected oral (71.4\%) and anal (55.1\%) sex. More interestingly, a large percentage of those who said they knew that condom reduces the risk of HIV infection had unprotected oral (71.4\%) and anal (54.1\%) sex. A lesser proportion of those who knew that HIV can be prevented (31.9\%) and those who knew that condom use reduces the risk of HIV infection (31.6\%) had vaginal sex without using condom. These data imply the need for stronger communication and related interventions to strengthen its behavior change components.

Table 41. Percent of MSM who knows that HIV can be prevented and that condom use reduces the risk of HIV infection who had oral and anal sex in the past 12 months without using condom

|  | Percent with oral sex without using condom | n | Percent with anal sex without using condom | n | Percent with vaginal sex without using condom | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Knows that HIV can be prevented | 71.4 | 3,608 | 55.1 | 3,388 | 31.9 | 3,144 |
| Knows that condom use reduces the risk of HIV infection | 71.4 | 3,526 | 54.1 | 3,903 | 31.6 | 3.054 |
| With perfect knowledge on HIV | 74.1 | 1,460 | 55.2 | 1,378 | 31.2 | 1,280 |
| With imperfect knowledge on HIV | 67.8 | 2,699 | 52.6 | 2,525 | 31.5 | 2,339 |

Moreover, even among respondents with perfect knowledge on HIV, condom use is not being practiced. 74 percent MSM with perfect knowledge on HIV did not use condom during their oral sex; 55 percent during their anal sex; and 31 percent during their vaginal sex in the last 12 months. The difference of condom use between those with perfect and imperfect knowledge on HIV is not evident from the data.

Condom use is less popular among younger MSM, increasing their risk to HIV infection (see Table 42). Those in the 15-19 (72.8\%) and 20-24 age groups (67.7\%) had the highest proportion of unprotected oral, anal, and vaginal sex. An alarming trend is also noticeable in terms of condom use among the minors (15-17 years old). 74 percent had oral sex; 58 percent had anal sex and 32 percent had vaginal sex without using condom among this group of MSM.

Table 42. Percent of MSM respondents who had oral and anal sex with men and vaginal sex in the past 12 months without condom by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | With oral sex without using condom | n | With anal sex without using condom | n | With vaginal sex without using condom | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 72.8 | 1,243 | 56.7 | 1,164 | 33.5 | 1,085 |
| 20-24 | 67.7 | 1,462 | 53.1 | 1,360 | 34.8 | 1,272 |
| 25-29 | 69.4 | 741 | 50.9 | 695 | 30.4 | 645 |
| 30-34 | 73.8 | 321 | 54.2 | 308 | 26.4 | 273 |
| 35-39 | 69.0 | 184 | 54.2 | 177 | 20.1 | 154 |
| 40-44 | 67.2 | 116 | 43.9 | 114 | 12.6 | 111 |
| 45 and above | 67.4 | 92 | 45.9 | 85 | 21.5 | 79 |
| Currently living with a partner |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 68.7 | 697 | 48.0 | 666 | 42.2 | 637 |
| No | 70.5 | 3,409 | 54.8 | 3,188 | 29.0 | 2,938 |
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There appears to be a difference between singles and married MSM in terms of condom use. Single MSM had higher percentage of unprotected oral (70.4\%) and anal sexual encounter (54.9\%) compared to married MSM. Single MSM, however, tend to use condom during vaginal sex, with only 29 percent of the respondents engaging in unprotected vaginal sex. Interestingly, a higher percentage (63.9\%) of married MSM usually did not use condom during their vaginal sex experience. This implies the serious risk faced by the women partners of the married MSM.

## C.4. Non-paying sex partners

The data from Table 43 indicate that many of the respondents had regular as well as casual partners who had sex with them without monetary considerations. MSM respondents had an average of two (2.4) regular sex partners in a month and about one casual sex partners in a week (4.4) during the past month preceding the interview. In general, casual sex or one time sex ("one-night-stand" ) with male partners was more frequent than sex with regular non-paying partner.

Respondents engaged in at least one each of oral and anal sex with a usual nonpaying male partner in a week within the past month. Overall, oral sex with non-paying partners is slightly more frequent than anal sex.

Table 43. Number of regular and casual non-paying partners and number of anal and oral sex in the month preceding the survey

|  | Mean | Median | Range | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of regular non- <br> paying partners | 2.4 | 1.0 | $1-60$ | 2.329 |
| Number of casual non- <br> paying partners | 3.5 | 2.0 | $1-50$ | 2,233 |
| Number of oral sex with <br> usual non-paying partner | 4.4 | 2.0 | $1-60$ | 1,608 |
| Number of anal sex with <br> usual non-paying partner | 3.8 | 2.0 | $1-100$ | 1,307 |

MSM in the 15-19 and 20-24 age groups appear to have relatively more regular and casual sex partners than the rest (see Table 44). Respondents 15-19 years old had an average of 2.5 regular and 3.6 casual male sex partners in a month. The minors had likewise an active sexual activity with non-paying partners ( 2.4 regular and 3.3 casual sex partners in a month). There is not much observable difference across subgroups of background characteristics in terms of the number of regular and casual non-paying partners. In general, respondents were more actively engaging in sexual activities with casual than regular non-paying partners.

What is observable, however, is the difference in the number of regular and casual sex between HIV-positive and non-positive MSM. HIV-positive MSM had an average of 4.2 regular and 5.28 casual male sex partners per month compared to 2.4 regular and 3.4 casual sex partners for non-positive MSM .

In terms of the frequency of oral and anal sex with non-paying partners, younger group of MSM also showed more active pattern. Those younger than 35 years of age had roughly two times more oral and anal sex with non-paying partners in the last month
than those aged 35 years and above. There is likewise not much observable difference across sub-groups of background characteristics in terms of the number of oral and anal sex with non-paying partners.

What is striking, however, is the high incidence of oral (4.0 partners in a month) and anal (3.5 partners in a month) sex with non-paying partners among the minors. This means that even in their young age, minors are already actively involved in sexual activities with either regular or one time partners.

Table 44. Average number of regular and casual non-paying partners and number of anal and oral sex in the month preceding the survey by background characteristics
$\left.\begin{array}{lllllllll}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Background } \\ \text { characteristics }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Mean no. } \\ \text { of regular } \\ \text { non- } \\ \text { paying } \\ \text { partners }\end{array} & n & \begin{array}{l}\text { Mean } \\ \text { no. of } \\ \text { casual } \\ \text { non- } \\ \text { paying } \\ \text { partners }\end{array} & n & \begin{array}{l}\text { Mean } \\ \text { no. of } \\ \text { oral } \\ \text { sex } \\ \text { with } \\ \text { usual } \\ \text { non- } \\ \text { paying } \\ \text { partner }\end{array} & & \begin{array}{l}\text { Mean } \\ \text { no. of } \\ \text { anal } \\ \text { sex } \\ \text { with } \\ \text { usual } \\ \text { non- } \\ \text { pay }\end{array} & \\ \text { partner }\end{array}\right]$
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| Background characteristics | Mean no. of regular nonpaying partners | n | Mean no. of casual non-paying partners | n | Mean no. of oral sex with usual non-paying partner | n | Mean no. of anal sex with usual nonpaying partner | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Currently living with a partner |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 2.37 | 392 | 3.64 | 295 | 4.71 | 248 | 4.75 | 208 |
| No | 2.46 | 1,907 | 3.45 | 1,920 | 4.28 | 1,343 | 3.65 | 1,085 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 2.43 | 143 | 3.58 | 146 | 5.51 | 104 | 5.26 | 87 |
| Secondary | 2.27 | 1,097 | 3.34 | 1,061 | 4.00 | 759 | 3.64 | 621 |
| Vocatio-nal, college and higher | 2.60 | 1,097 | 3.59 | 1,015 | 4.56 | 736 | 3.81 | 592 |
| Work status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working | 2.50 | 1,197 | 3.43 | 1,124 | 4.35 | 847 | 3.80 | 687 |
| Not working | 2.38 | 1,037 | 3.51 | 1,037 | 4.39 | 705 | 3.89 | 578 |

see next page

| Background characteristics | Mean no. of regular nonpaying partners | n | Mean no. of casual non-paying partners | n | Mean no. of oral sex with usual non-paying partner | n | Mean no. of anal sex with usual nonpaying partner | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civil status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single | 2.46 | 2,214 | 3.50 | 2,143 | 4.39 | 1,545 | 3.86 | 1,258 |
| Married | 2.10 | 79 | 2.00 | 63 | 2,78 | 45 | 3.09 | 35 |
| Separated/ widowed | 1.86 | 29 | 3.81 | 21 | 5.93 | 15 | 3.67 | 12 |
| HIV status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive | 4.17 | 30 | 5.28 | 32 | 5.14 | 21 | 2.94 | 17 |
| Negative | 2.27 | 1,097 | 3.34 | 1,061 | 4.00 | 759 | 3.64 | 621 |

It is also of concern that many MSM having sex with their non-paying male sex partners are not using condom as protection from STI and HIV infections. From Table 45, only about 31 percent who had their last anal sex and 13 percent who had their last oral sex with non-paying partners have used condom.

An analysis of the background characteristics of respondents who did not use condom during their last anal sex with non-paying partner revealed that most of them belong to the 15-24 age group (54.3\%) (see Table 46). A larger percentage of these noncondom users were also not living in with a partner (83.3\%), with at least secondary level of education (92\%), currently working (54\%), and single (96.9\%). Most (70\%) of those who did not use condom during their last anal sex with non-paying partner have imperfect knowledge on HIV.

Table 45. Percent of respondents who used condom during the last anal and oral sex with non-paying male sex partner

|  | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| Used condom during the last anal sex | 31.4 | 1,377 |
| Used condom during the last oral sex | 12.8 | 1,615 |

Table 46. Background characteristics of MSM respondents who did not use condom during their last anal sex with non-paying male sex partner

| Background characteristics | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Age |  | 944 |
| $* 15-19$ | 31.7 |  |
| $20-24$ | 32.6 |  |
| $25-29$ | 18.1 |  |
| $30-34$ | 4.6 |  |
| $35-39$ | 3.2 |  |
| $40-44$ | 1.7 |  |
| 45 and above |  |  |


| Background characteristics | Percent | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Currently living with a partner |  | 934 |
| Yes | 16.7 |  |
| No | 83.3 |  |
| Educational attainment |  | 937 |
| Elementary | 8.0 |  |
| Secondary | 48.2 |  |
| Vocational, college and higher | 43.8 |  |
| Working status |  | 917 |
| Working | 54.0 |  |
| Not working | 46.0 |  |
| Civil status |  | 941 |
| Single | 96.9 |  |
| Married | 2.2 |  |
| Separated/widowed | 1.2 |  |
| Knowledge on HIV |  | 944 |
| With perfect knowledge | 30.0 |  |
| With imperfect knowledge | 70.0 |  |

## C.5. Paid and paying sex partners

The data in Table 47 show that there are more respondents who had sex in exchange for cash than those who paid for sex in the last 12 months. About three in four ( $71.9 \%$ ) respondents had sex in exchange for cash or kind and seven in ten (67.9\%) MSM paid their male partners for sex. The information in this section, however, should be taken with caution considering that the valid cases are extremely lower than the total number of respondents $(4,372)$.

Table 47. Percent of MSM respondents who paid male sex partners for sex and who had sex with male partner in exchange of cash or kind in the last 12 months

| Sites | MSM respondents who paid male sex partners |  | MSM respondents who had sex in exchange for cash or kind |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| All sites | 67.9 | 1,245 | 71.9 | 1,743 |
| Angeles* | 80.4 | 138 | 85.4 | 157 |
| Baguio | 81.1 | 159 | 79.0 | 100 |
| Butuan | 37.1 | 89 | 48.1 | 162 |
| Cebu | 58.2 | 110 | 76.2 | 210 |
| Davao | 74.1 | 147 | 63.4 | 172 |
| General Santos | 72.1 | 68 | 80.1 | 166 |
| Puerto Galera | 81.4 | 90 | 81.1 | 90 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 54.4 | 57 | 82.1 | 56 |
| Santiago | 66.1 | 59 | 69.0 | 58 |
| Tuguegarao | (84.2) | 19 | (85.7) | 14 |
| Zamboanga | 85.3 | 150 | 84.8 | 158 |
| Surigao | 31.9 | 47 | 67.9 | 84 |
| Caloocan | 55.8 | 52 | 48.8 | 43 |
| Makati | 92.5 | 40 | 72.0 | 75 |
| Mandaluyong | 62.9 | 62 | 57.3 | 89 |
| Manila | 43.3 | 30 | 56.8 | 37 |
| Marikina | 82.7 | 52 | 80.3 | 71 |
| Pasig | 80.0 | 50 | 41.7 | 36 |
| Pasay | (66.7) | 15 | (56.3) | 16 |
| Quezon City | 53.8 | 39 | 93.2 | 162 |

(\% )- Less than 25 cases

* unweighted

Differences in terms of experience of MSM with paid and paying partners across sentinel sites are noticeable. The highest percentage of MSM respondents who had paid their male partners for sex can be found in Makati City (92.5\%), while the highest percentage of those who had sex with men in exchange for cash or kind came from Quezon City ( $93.2 \%$ ). Quezon City also had the highest difference in terms of the proportion of those who paid (53.8\%) and those we were paid by male sexual partners (93.2\%). The pattern is also observable in Butuan, Cebu, General Santos, Puerto Galera, and Surigao. The rest of the sites had higher percentage of those who paid their male sexual partners for sex.

The difference in the experience of MSM in paying and being paid for sex with males is glaring across the age of respondents (see Table 48). During the last 12 months preceding the survey, majority of younger respondents had more active in having sex with male paying partners while older respondents had more sexual experience with paid partners. Another disturbing data is the high percentage ( $81 \%$ ) of minors who had sex in exchange for monetary considerations. About 60 percent of them also experienced paying their sex partners in the last 12 months.

Table 48. Percent of MSM respondents who paid male sex partners for sex and who has sex with male partners in exchange for cash of kind in the last 12 months by background characteristics

| Background <br> characteristics | MSM respondents <br> who paid male <br> sex partners | n | MSM respondents <br> who had sex in <br> exchange for <br> cash or kind | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Age | 57.0 | 302 | 79.3 | 789 |
| $15-19$ | 68.1 | 505 | 77.5 | 839 |
| $20-24$ | 73.0 | 315 | 72.9 | 410 |
| $25-29$ | 76.5 | 183 | 60.6 | 155 |
| $30-34$ | 81.9 | 127 | 63.2 | 68 |
| $35-39$ | 75.6 | 86 | 45.7 | 46 |
| $40-44$ | 74.2 | 119 | 81.0 | 41.9 |
| 45 and above | 58.8 |  |  | 369 |
| $* 15-17$ (minors) |  |  |  |  |


| Background characteristics | MSM respondents who paid male sex partners | n | MSM respondents who had sex in exchange for cash or kind | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civil status |  |  |  |  |
| Single | 70.3 | 1,526 | 73.5 | 2,135 |
| Married | 48.7 | 39 | 87.0 | 162 |
| Separated/widowed | (50.0) | 12 | 85.3 | 34 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 67.7 | 96 | 81.5 | 200 |
| Secondary | 68.5 | 726 | 77.8 | 1,268 |
| Vocational, college and higher | 70.9 | 753 | 68.4 | 860 |
| Work status |  |  |  |  |
| Working | 75.3 | 916 | 66.7 | 1,001 |
| Not working | 61.4 | 604 | 80.7 | 1,241 |
| HIVstatus |  |  |  |  |
| Positive | (58.3) | 12 | (77.8) | 27 |
| Negative | 69.8 | 1,572 | 74.6 | 2,311 |

(\%)-Less than 25 cases
A lower percentage (52.5\%) of those living with a partner had paid for sex in the past 12 months than respondents who were not living with a partner (72.4\%). A lower percentage $(70.3 \%)$ of married persons likewise paid for sex compared to single respondents. The difference in terms of having sex with paying partner between these sub-groups, however, is not pronounced. The data also show that four in five (80.7\%) respondents who were not working had sex with male partners in exchange for cash or kind. There is a lesser percentage of those who experienced having sex with male partners for payment from among those who were working (66.7\%). Moreover, those currently working tend to pay their sex partners.

Lastly, HIV-positive respondents had higher percentage of having sex with paying (77.8\%) than paid partner (58.3).

## Frequency of sexual partner and activity among MSM

The data on the frequency of sex with paid and paying partners indicate an active sex life among MSM respondents. Respondents who had sex with male partners for monetary considerations had an average of 3.78 partners. In comparison, respondents who paid for sex had an average of 3.07 male partners (see Table 49). There is not much difference in terms of the frequency of oral and anal sex between paid and paying partners. Both groups have engaged into an average of three anal and oral sex in the last month.

Table 49. Average number of paid and paying partners and oral and anal sex in a month by MSM respondents who have paid and paying partners

| Sites | MSM respondents who paid male sex partners in the last 12 months |  |  | MSM respondents who had sex with male sex partners in exchange for cash or kind in the last 12 months |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean no. of male sex partners | Mean <br> no. of <br> oral <br> sex <br> in a <br> month | Mean no. of anal sex in a month | Mean no. of male sex partners | Mean no. of oral sex in a month | Mean no. of anal sex in a month |
| All sites* | 3.07 | 3.12 | 2.97 | 3.78 | 3.49 | 3.07 |
| Angeles* | 2.49 | 2.49 | 1.62 | 2.43 | 2.38 | 1.95 |
| Baguio | 2.26 | 2.66 | 2.40 | 2.37 | 3.07 | 2.71 |
| Butuan | 2.94 | 3.38 | 3.08 | 2.08 | 2.17 | 2.36 |
| Cebu | 2.90 | 3.02 | 3.58 | 3.86 | 3.35 | 4.10 |
| Davao | 3.03 | 2.71 | 2.52 | 5.27 | 4.37 | 3.78 |
| General Santos | 2.26 | 1.96 | 1.92 | 1.72 | 1.67 | 1.59 |
| Puerto Galera | 5.13 | 7.30 | 7.89 | 1.65 | 1.88 | 1.92 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 3.79 | 2.88 | 2.90 | 2.14 | 2.34 | 2.27 |
| Santiago | 2.98 | 2.67 | 2.56 | 2.57 | 2.68 | 2.74 |
| Tuguegarao | 3.53 | 3.94 | 2.94 | 2.33 | 2.63 | 2.80 |


| Sites | MSM respondents who paid <br> male sex partners in the <br> last 12 months |  | MSM respondents who had <br> sex with male sex partners <br> in exchange for cash or <br> kind in the last 12 months |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Mean <br> no. of <br> male <br> sex <br> part- <br> ners | Mean <br> no. of <br> oral <br> sex <br> in a <br> month | Mean <br> no. of <br> anal <br> sex <br> in a <br> month | Mean <br> no. of <br> male <br> sex <br> part- <br> ners | Mean <br> no. of <br> oral <br> sex <br> in a <br> month | Mean <br> no. of <br> anal <br> sex <br> in a <br> month |
| Zamboanga | 3.97 | 3.89 | 3.88 | 3.24 | 3.74 | 3.22 |
| Surigao | 3.82 | 4.22 | 5.07 | 3.96 | 4.15 | 4.03 |
| Caloocan | 3.18 | 3.55 | 3.19 | 6.00 | 7.54 | 7.57 |
| Makati | 3.91 | 2.82 | 2.63 | 2.40 | 2.33 | 2.35 |
| Mandaluyong | 2.19 | 2.24 | 2.82 | 2.74 | 2.03 | 1.73 |
| Manila | 3.73 | 4.00 | 6.71 | 11.88 | 7.80 | 9.53 |
| Marikina | 3.79 | 3.37 | 2.75 | 6.06 | 5.94 | 4.81 |
| Pasig | 2.32 | 3.28 | 2.46 | 8.00 | 7.20 | 4.82 |
| Pasay | 2.21 | 2.24 | 2.12 | 3.81 | 3.04 | 3.28 |
| Quezon City | 1.89 | 1.63 | 1.63 | 6.87 | 5.79 | 2.95 |

* unweighted

In most sentinel sites, MSM having sex in exchange for money had more male sex partners than those who were paying for sex. MSM sex workers from Manila had an average of 12 male partners in just a month. This, however, needs further validation in as much as the figure is extremely high compared to other sites.

There is a difference between those who were paying their partners and those who were paid by their partners in terms of the type of sexual role they assumed during anal sex (see Table 50). Seemingly, MSM who paid for sex usually assumed the receiver or the less active partner while those who received some financial considerations assumed the inserting or the more active role.

Table 50. Percent of MSM respondents who paid male sex partners for sex and the type of sexual activities during last anal sex in the last 12 months

| Sites | MSM respondents who paid male sex partners in the last 12 months |  |  | MSM respondents who had sex with male sex partners in exchange for cash or kind in the last 12 months |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Re-ceiving | Inserting | Both | Re-ceiving | Inserting | Both |
| All sites* | 83.8 | 1.2 | 9.6 | 30.7 | 61.6 | 7.7 |
| Angeles* | 40.7 | 1.0 | 1.3 | -- | -- | -- |
| Baguio | 79.6 | 10.0 | 10.4 | 37.6 | 57.8 | 4.6 |
| Butuan | 84.6 | a | 15.4 | 13.1 | 85.3 | 1.7 |
| Cebu | 90.6 | 5.4 | 4.1 | 51.2 | 46.0 | 2.8 |
| Davao | 76.3 | 13.5 | 10.2 | 60.9 | 25.8 | 13.3 |
| General Santos | 70.1 | 19.7 | 10.2 | 4.9 | 94.3 | 0.8 |
| Puerto Galera | 81.7 | 8.7 | 18.3 | 74.4 | 24.5 | 1.1 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 11.3 | 1.7 | 0.7 | --- | --- | --- |
| Santiago | 83.6 | 6.9 | 9.5 | 47.2 | 27.5 | 25.3 |
| Tuguegarao | 88.7 | 5.5 | 5.8 | 40.3 | 47.6 | 12.2 |
| Zamboanga | 90.0 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 19.1 | 77.5 | 3.3 |
| Surigao | 53.1 | 10.9 | 36.0 | 35.2 | 59.5 | 5.2 |
| Caloocan | 83.5 | 11.8 | 4.7 | 43.7 | 46.2 | 10.1 |
| Makati | a | 7.9 | 10.8 | 63.1 | 36.9 | 0.0 |
| Mandaluyong | 7.9 | 8.6 | 7.3 | 66.1 | 21.8 | 12.0 |
| Manila | 44.8 | 0.0 | 55.2 | 9.0 | 59.3 | 31.7 |


| Sites | MSM respondents who paid <br> male sex partners in the <br> last 12 months | MSM respondents who had <br> sex with male sex partners <br> in exchange for cash or <br> kind in the last 12 months |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Re- <br> ceiv- <br> ing | Insert- <br> ing | Both | Re- <br> ceiv- <br> ing | Insert- <br> ing | Both |
| Marikina | 63.4 | 6.5 | 30.1 | 63.1 | 24.2 | 12.8 |
| Pasig | 93.6 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 52.7 | 41.1 | 6.2 |
| Pasay | 7.8 | 7.8 | a | 83.6 | 16.4 | 0.0 |
| Quezon City | a | 70.6 | 29.4 | 12.9 | 84.4 | 2.7 |

*unweighted
a - Less than 30 cases
Four in five (83.8\%) MSM who paid their male sex partners assumed the receiver role. On the other hand, six in ten (61.6\%) MSM who had paying partners had been the inserter.

In one perspective, the difference in the roles of MSM who are paying and being paid for sex implies some dynamics in the power relations between MSM and their sexual partners. It appears, albeit without statistical evidence, that money plays a critical role in defining the role of MSM partners in a sexual activity.

## Means and sources for male sex partners

Information on the venues or places where MSM meet their male sex partners and how they meet them tells important clues on where and how to reach out to the MSM. This is particularly significant in as much as sex between males is stigmatized in the Philippines.
Table 51. Means by which MSM got their paid sex partners in the last month


| All sites | 75.9 | 93.0 | 80.0 | 91.9 | 34.7 | 99.2 | 95.9 | 88.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Angeles | 42.0 | 43.3 | 10.0 | 26.7 | 2.7 | 46.0 | 35.3 | 46.0 |
| Baguio | 69.8 | 51.8 | 93.7 | 75.2 | 42.4 | 99.7 | 42.4 | 76.3 |
| Butuan | 82.9 | 71.8 | 57.1 | 92.7 | 14.3 | 98.9 | 14.0 | 97.2 |
| Cebu | 46.0 | 97.0 | 69.1 | 79.1 | 23.5 | 100.0 | 21.4 | 98.4 |
| Davao | 36.2 | a | -- | 88.3 | 40.1 | 100.0 | 90.9 | 77.7 |
| General <br> Santos | 66.3 | 89.0 | 76.1 | 61.6 | 18.5 | 96.6 | 16.9 | 81.6 |
| Puerto <br> Galera | 89.1 | 87.7 | 98.4 | 45.8 | 25.5 | 98.4 | 98.4 | 98.4 |
| Puerto <br> Princesa | 9.0 | 14.7 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 15.7 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 15.3 |

see next page

| Sites | Stay in cruising sites | Pimp in an establishment | Pimp on the street | Referrals from friends | Referrals from others | Who referred |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Escort service | Internet | Cellphone network |
| Santiago | 91.7 | 93.8 | 59.5 | 74.7 | 38.4 | 36.3 | 93.4 | 93.4 |
| Tuguegarao | a | a | a | a | 53.1 | 97.4 | a | a |
| Zamboanga | 73.0 | 99.1 | 96.3 | 88.4 | 49.6 | 97.7 | 94.9 | 94.9 |
| Surigao | 71.3 | a | a | 94.1 | 35.8 | 31.6 | 93.4 | 93.4 |
| Caloocan | a | a | a | a | 26.8 | 73.2 | a | a |
| Makati | 51.8 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 68.3 | 27.9 | 85.7 | 81.2 | 81.2 |
| Mandaluyong | 88.5 | -- | a | 54.8 | 26.7 | 96.2 | 98.4 | 98.4 |
| Manila | 99.4 | 99.3 | 99.3 | 97.7 | 93.4 | 99.2 | 99.5 | 99.5 |
| Marikina | 58.1 | 89.8 | 89.8 | 78.6 | 34.9 | 95.4 | 95.9 | 95.9 |
| Pasig | 92.7 | a | a | 54.6 | 39.1 | 92.1 | 91.2 | 91.2 |
| Pasay | a | a | a | a | 31.6 | 31.6 | 31.6 | 31.6 |
| Quezon City | a | a | a | a | 9.8 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 |

MSM respondents mostly got their paid male sexual partners through a pimp in establishments (93\%) and through referrals from friends (91.9\%) in the last 30 days preceding the survey (see Table 51). A substantial proportion (75.9\%) of the respondents got their male sex partners by staying in cruising sites. Others got their sex partners through referrals mostly through escort service, Internet, and cell phone networks.

MSM who had paying partners usually get their partners from a variety of places. These places include: Internet café, malls, cinemas, gay bars, massage parlors, spa, videoke, park, hotel, school, restaurants, coffee houses, and streets (see Table 52).

Since sex between men is stigmatized, negotiations for sexual favors are not concentrated in single and selected venues. This only means that sex between men is prevalent in many possible places and that interventions should cover as many possible venues where MSM can be reached.
Table 52. Usual places where MSM got their paying sex partners

| Sites | Inter- <br> net <br> cafe | Malls |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

[^3]| Sites | Internet cafe | Malls | Cinemas | Gay <br> Bars | Massage parIors | Spa | Vid-eoke | Park | Hotel | School | Restaurants | Coffee Houses | Streets |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Caloocan | a | a | 18.3 | 18.3 | 51.5 | 18.3 | 18.3 | a | a | 100 | a | a | a |
| Makati | 88.1 | 69.2 | 98.7 | 42.4 | 55.7 | 93.1 | 94.5 | 98.7 | 85.5 | 100 | 89.2 | 99.1 | 42.1 |
| Mandaluyong | 90.0 | 81.5 | 96.9 | 84.4 | 18.3 | 98.9 | 95.6 | 92.2 | 95.4 | 96.8 | 100 | 95.3 | 56.6 |
| Manila | 98.6 | 94.0 | 97.7 | 95.2 | 83.3 | 94.1 | 99.1 | 99.6 | 99.8 | 94.1 | 99.9 | 99.2 | 97.4 |
| Marikina | 98.3 | 66.0 | 95.8 | 97.6 | 46.5 | 46.5 | 46.5 | 29.5 | 98.0 | 96.9 | 96.4 | 98.7 | 42.9 |
| Pasig | a | a | 20.6 | a | 100.0 | 20.6 | a | 20.6 | 20.6 | a | 100 | 98.3 | 47.2 |
| Pasay | a | a | 23.5 | a | 23.5 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 96.0 | a | 100 | 87.5 | 85.5 |
| Quezon City | 97.2 | 89.0 | 89.2 | 68.2 | 80.4 | 92.6 | 89.3 | 93.8 | 91.8 | 98.7 | 97.1 | 99.1 | 85.1 |

## C.6. Group Sex

Group sex or "orgy" is a high risk sexual activity which involves a group of more than two persons in which partners are exchanged. The risk is further increased when drugs and alcohol are likewise involved.

From among the MSM in the survey, about 16 percent have ever participated in a group sex. Cebu (34\%) and Quezon City (32.5\%) had the highest proportions of MSM who had ever participated in an "orgy" (see Table 53).

In the last orgy that the MSM respondents engaged in, there were about four (4) male sex partners and two (2) female sex partners. Moreover, in most of these cases, many ( $54.5 \%$ ) of the respondents did not use condom at all. The risk of HIV infection brought by unprotected group sex is more pronounced as shown by the six (or more than half of) HIV positive respondents who did not use protection in any of their group sex encounters.

Table 53. Percent of MSM who ever participated in group sex by sentinel sites

| Sentinel Sites | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| All Sites | 15.9 | 4,358 |
| Angeles City | 8.7 | 300 |
| Baguio City | 12.7 | 304 |
| Butuan City | 16.4 | 252 |
| Cebu City | 34.0 | 300 |
| Davao City | 14.9 | 294 |
| General Santos City | 16.1 | 295 |
| Puerto Galera | 8.3 | 166 |
| Puerto Princesa | 11.0 | 300 |
| Santiago City | 14.5 | 111 |
| Tuguegarao City | 19.2 | 31 |
| Zamboanga City | 16.7 | 266 |


| Sentinel Sites | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| Surigao | 10.9 | 110 |
| Caloocan City | 19.4 | 114 |
| Makati City | 15.0 | 134 |
| Mandaluyong City | 15.3 | 153 |
| City of Manila | 20.0 | 262 |
| Marikina City | 16.4 | 129 |
| Pasig City | 16.5 | 99 |
| Pasay City | 12.8 | 47 |
| Quezon City | 32.5 | 217 |

Table 54. Average number of times respondents participated in group sex in the last 12 months and the mean number of male and female partners in the last group sex

|  | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mean no. of times <br> participated in group <br> sex | 1.94 | 483 |
| Mean no. of male <br> partners in last <br> group sex | 3.77 | 631 |
| Mean no. of female <br> partners in last <br> group sex | 1.95 | 190 |

Majority of MSM respondents (56.0\%) who participated in an orgy were under the influence of alcohol during their last group sex (see Table 55). More dangerously, about nine (9) percent has taken drugs, some of which were injected (14.3\%) to them.

Table 55. Percent of MSM respondents who used condom in all group sex, never used condom, under the influence of alcohol during last group sex, taken drugs during last group sex, injected the drugs used and HIV positive who never used condom during last group sex

|  | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Used condom in all group sex | 12.8 | 674 |
| Never used condom | 54.5 | 674 |
| Under the influence of alcohol during last <br> group sex | 56.0 | 671 |
| Taken drugs during last group sex | 9.0 | 671 |
| Injected the drugs used | 14.3 | 63 |
| HIV positive who never used condom | $54.5(6)$ | 11 |

Table 56. Percent of MSM respondents who ever experienced group sex and who used condom in all group sex by background characteristics

| Background <br> characteristics <br> Percent of MSM <br> respondents <br> who ever expe- <br> rienced group <br> sex | $n$ | MSM respondents <br> who used con- <br> dom in all group <br> sex | $n$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Age | 14.6 | 1,318 | 6.4 | 187 |
| $15-19$ | 16.1 | 1,518 | 13.5 | 237 |
| $20-24$ | 19.5 | 771 | 19.2 | 146 |
| $25-29$ | 14.9 | 336 | 14.3 | 49 |
| $30-34$ |  |  |  |  |


| Background characteristics | Percent of MSM respondents who ever experienced group sex | n | MSM respondents who used condom in all group sex | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 35-39 | 15.8 | 190 | 20.7 | 29 |
| 40-44 | 14.0 | 121 | (6.3) | 16 |
| 45 and above | 10.1 | 99 | --- | 10 |
| 15-17 (minors) | 14.5 | 594 | 4.7 | 85 |
| Currently living with a partner |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 19.3 | 720 | 19.0 | 137 |
| No | 15.3 | 3,751 | 11.4 | 528 |
| Civil status |  |  |  |  |
| Single | 15.8 | 4,044 | 11.8 | 619 |
| Married | 18.0 | 233 | 28.6 | 42 |
| Separated/widowed | 19.0 | 58 | 9.1 | 11 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 13.7 | 299 | 9.8 | 41 |
| Secondary | 13.9 | 2,146 | 12.2 | 288 |
| Vocational, college and higher | 18.8 | 1,883 | 13.7 | 344 |
| Work status |  |  |  |  |
| Working | 16.1 | 2,054 | 13.7 | 322 |
| Not working | 16.1 | 2,110 | 12.0 | 334 |


| Background    <br> characteristics Percent of MSM <br> respondents <br> who ever expe- <br> rienced group <br> sex $n$ MSM respon- <br> dents who used <br> condom in all <br> group sex | n |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HIV status | 25.0 | 44 | 9.1 | 11 |
| Positive | 15.9 | 4,314 | 12.8 | 663 |
| Negative |  |  |  |  |

(\% )- Less than 25 cases
The incidence of group sex is relatively low across background characteristics. What is glaring is the low use of condom in all the group sex that the respondents have taken part. Condom use during group sex is particularly low among the younger MSM, especially among the minors; those with elementary level of education; and MSM with HIV.

In general, the data about the group sexual behaviors of MSM show that group sex, while not as common as sex with single partner, is a high risk behavior since it involves the confluence of sexual and non-sexual behaviors that make an individual more vulnerable to infection.

## C.7. Sex with Women

MSM also have sex with women, and may thus potentially infect their female partners especially when such sexual activity is unprotected. As such, the information on MSM' sexual engagement with women provides understanding in tracing the chain of HIV infection which is vital in designing comprehensive and appropriate HIV and AIDS interventions.

Table 57. Percent of MSM and of HIV positive respondents who have had vaginal, oral, and anal sex with women

| Study Sites | Percent who have had vaginal sex with woman | Percent who have had oral sex with woman | Percent who have had anal sex with woman | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Sites | 79.2 | 41.9 | 9.8 | 2,314 |
| Angeles | 80.7 | 49.6 | 5.0 | 119 |
| Baguio | 91.7 | 37.9 | 4.1 | 169 |
| Butuan | 97.1 | 37.1 | 2.9 | 175 |
| Cebu | 97.0 | 56.1 | 29.5 | 132 |
| Davao | 99.0 | 48.5 | 4.1 | 99 |
| General Santos | 99.3 | 13.5 | 4.1 | 148 |
| Puerto Galera | 90.2 | 63.9 | 34.4 | 61 |
| Puerto Princesa | 91.5 | 37.3 | 12.4 | 177 |
| Santiago | 90.1 | 59.2 | 11.3 | 71 |
| Tuguegarao | 96.6 | (24.1) | 17.2 | 29 |
| Zamboanga | 21.1 | 7.7 | 2.7 | 299 |
| Surigao | 81.7 | 35.2 | 21.1 | 71 |
| Caloocan | 90.3 | 64.5 | 22.6 | 31 |
| Makati | 96.9 | 39.1 | 7.8 | 64 |
| Mandaluyong | 89.1 | 46.9 | 4.7 | 64 |


| Study Sites | Percent <br> who have <br> had vaginal <br> sex with <br> woman | Percent <br> who have <br> had oral <br> sex with <br> woman | Percent <br> who have <br> had anal <br> sex with <br> woman | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Manila | 90.3 | 52.2 | 10.6 | 113 |
| Marikina | 43.9 | 38.6 | 7.0 | 57 |
| Pasig | 13.1 | 7.1 | 6.1 | 99 |
| Pasay | 89.2 | 74.6 | 8.8 | 102 |
| Quezon City | 98.7 | 85.0 | 15.4 | 234 |
| HIV-Positive MSM | $87.0(\mathbf{2 0})$ | $\mathbf{3 4 . 8}$ (8) | $\mathbf{4 . 3} \mathbf{( 1 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ |

A revealing reality from IHBSS points to the variety of MSM' sexual activities. As the data in Table 57 point out, almost four out of five (79.2\%) MSM have experienced vaginal sex with women. Four in ten (41.9\%) respondents had engaged in oral sex and one in ten ( $9.8 \%$ ) in anal sex with women.

Table 58. Percentage of MSM respondents and HIV positives by relationship with female sex partner

| Relationship | Percent for <br> all MSMs | $\mathbf{n}$ | Percent <br> for HIV- <br> positive <br> MSMs | $\mathbf{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Girlfriend | 56.3 | 1,100 | 42.1 | 8 |
| Spouse/live-in <br> partner | 15.8 | 308 | 5.3 | 1 |
| Friend | 13.1 | 257 | 15.8 | 3 |
| Relative | 0.5 | 10 | 5.3 | 1 |
| Paying sex partner | 1.6 | 31 | 5.3 | 1 |
| Paid sex partner | 0.6 | 11 | 5.3 | 1 |
| Acquaintance | 4.8 | 93 | 5.3 | 1 |
| No relation | 7.4 | 145 | 15.8 | 3 |

The data among respondents with HIV emphasize the real threat of HIV infection among MSM and their partners. Twenty (20) MSM who were diagnosed with HIV infection said that they ever had vaginal sex with women, while eight have had oral sex with women. Although the data lack empirical evidence to show that such sexual encounter with women happened before or after they were diagnosed with HIV, an important realization is the fact that MSM are potential sources of infection among women especially during unprotected sex.

Apparently, most of the MSM respondents had sex with their girlfriends (56.3\%) and their spouse or live-in partner (15.8\%). The data, however, cannot show whether the sexual encounters with their female partners were done prior to their regular sexual activities with males and whether such sexual relationships are continuing. The more important concern, nonetheless, is whether their female partners know the sexual behaviors of their male partners. Some studies and policy documents reason out that MSM' sexual relationship with women may be due to cultural and socially constructed factors. In areas where discriminatory laws or social stigma of male sexual relations exist, relationships with women may become a "façade" or "disguise." Likewise, largely because of the taboo, the female partners of MSM are often unaware of their partner's other liaisons, and may therefore be exposed to additional HIV risks (UNAIDS).

The data in Table 59 showing that most (86.2\%) MSM did not use condom during their last sex with woman emphasizes the risk that female partners have to face in engaging in sexual relations with MSM who are sexually active. Most of the MSM did not use condom because they did not like it (34.2\%), while (33.7\%) cited the non-availability of condom as reason.

Table 59. Percent of MSM who did not use condom during last sex with woman and reasons for not using condom

|  | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Percent who did not use condom during last sex with <br> woman | 85.4 | 1,982 |
| Reasons for not using condom | 33.7 | 389 |
| Condom not available | 0.4 | 5 |
| Expensive | 7.0 | 81 |
| Partner objected | 34.2 | 48 |
| Does not like condom | 4.1 | 395 |
| Does not know how to use condom | 3.0 | 202 |
| Not necessary | 34 |  |
| Forgot to use condom |  |  |

In addition, sex with a woman tend to occur during the adolescence period of the respondents (mean age- 16.8 years) (see Table 60). About 34 percent of those who ever had sexual experience with women had their first sex with women when they were 15 years old and below ( $2.5 \%$ for $6-20$ years and $31.5 \%$ for $11-15$ years). These data reinforce the need to focus interventions in addressing the sexual and reproductive health concerns of the adolescents and young adults.

Table 60. Age of MSM respondents during first penetrative sex with a woman

| Age group | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6-10$ | 2.5 | 35 |
| $11-15$ | 31.4 | 439 |
| $16-20$ | 56.8 | 795 |
| $21-25$ | 6.7 | 94 |
| $26 \& a b o v e$ | 2.5 | 35 |
|  | Mean Age | 16.8 |

## D. Summary

MSM have relatively high knowledge on STI, HIV, and AIDS particularly on its symptoms, mode of transmission, and prevention. MSM aged 15 to 19 and those with only elementary level of education manifested the widest gap in terms of perfect knowledge on HIV. Lower level of knowledge is also manifested among the minors.

Most of the MSM identified themselves as homosexuals; as such, attraction to male sex partner is evident. As MSM mature by age, they tend to identify themselves as homosexuals. This is probably because young adults are still in the process of establishing their identities; they might not be able to identify themselves as homosexuals in a straight-forward manner. This entails qualitative probing to establish the pattern since this is important in guiding the young in their sexual development.

The data on the sexual activities of MSM clearly illustrate that MSM are actively engaged in various sexual activities. MSM maintain regular sex with non-paying partners as well as engage in casual sex with male sex partners.

Apparently, a significant percentage of the respondents are engaging in sex trade as manifested by the large proportion of respondents having sex in exchange for cash or kind. This, however, should be further validated considering the limitations of the survey.

Sex with a paying partner is more common than sex with paid partners among MSM respondents. Having sex in exchange for monetary considerations is most manifest among the younger groups, among those with lower level of education, and among those who are not currently working. A large group of MSM also pay their male sex partners. Those having sex with paying partners are mostly the younger group of respondents while those paying their partners for sex are mostly among the older groups.

Some data on the first sex experience of MSM are also revealing and disturbing. Some MSM started their sexual exposures as early as when they were children (e.g. 5-10 years old). Most of the MSM had their sexual debut with males during their adolescence. A disturbing information points to the incidence of forced and paid sex during MSM' first sexual encounter with males. This constitutes rape and seduction which might have legal, health, social, mental, and psychological repercussions for the victims.

While most of the MSM are singles, they also have sex with women, thus exposing this population to the risk of the infection.

The preference for sexual role varies by the type of partners an MSM has. In general, MSM act as the receiver during sexual activities with their male partners, particularly when engaging in anal sex with a paid partner.

Another risky behavior among MSM is their participation in group sex. While there is no significant percentage among MSM respondents engaging in this type of sexual activity, the practice is not rare. The exposure to the risk of HIV infection is intensified
through this sexual behavior.
Lastly, the risk associated with these sexual behaviors is made more threatening by the low use of condom among MSM in all their sexual activities. The data show that knowledge of HIV, STI and AIDS does not translate to use of condom during oral, anal, and group sex. There is a very low percentage of MSM using condom during sex with their paid, paying, non-paying and even among their women partners. Low condom use is most evident among the young, especially among the minors.

## SECTION 5: NON-SEXUAL RISK BEHAVIORS AMONG MSM

The sexual behaviors of MSM respondents interplay with some of their non-sexual behaviors such as alcohol and drug use. Given their importance for programming, information on the non-sexual risk behaviors of MSM, specifically alcohol and drug use, was included in the survey.

Table 61. Percent of MSM who have had sex while under the influence of alcohol when having sex

|  | Percent | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent who ever had sex while under the influence of alcoholic drinks in the past 12 months | 73.4 | 2,612 |
| Relationship with sex partner last time had sex while under the influence of alcohol |  |  |
| Boyfriend | 22.2 | 389 |
| Husband/live-in | 4.1 | 5 |
| Friend | 26.7 | 81 |
| Relative | 14.9 | 48 |
| Paying sex | 14.9 | 395 |
| Paid sex | 2.6 | 202 |
| Acquaintance | 10.0 | 34 |
| No relation | 19.2 |  |
| Percent who used condom the last time they had sex while under the influence of alcoholic drinks | 18.6 | 1,888 |

In the sexual encounters of 73 percent of MSM respondents during the last 12 months, they were under the influence of alcohol (see Table 61). Most of their sexual encounters under the influence of alcohol were with their friends (26.7\%) and boyfriends (22.2\%). Coincidentally, most of these sexual activities were unprotected (with only about 19 percent who admitted using condom during such sexual encounter).

Drug use is likewise prevalent among MSM during their sexual encounters. Fifty-five percent of MSM have ever experienced having sex while on drugs (see Table 62). The pattern suggests that alcohol and drug use during sex is commonly happening with persons with whom they maintain a degree of intimacy. Condom use is also low during sexual activities involving drug use.

Table 62. Percent of MSM who have had sex while under the influence of drugs

|  | Percent | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Percent who ever had sex while on drugs | 54.8 | 465 |
| Relationship with sex partner last time had sex while on drugs |  |  |
| Boyfriend | 16.5 | 389 |
| Husband/live-in | 7.0 | 5 |
| Friend | 29.8 | 81 |
| Relative | 18.6 | 395 |
| Paying sex | 2.9 | 202 |
| Paid sex | 8.7 | 34 |
| Acquaintance | 16.5 |  |
| No relation | 16.2 | 242 |
| Percent who used condom last time had sex while on   |  |  |

Table 63. Background characteristics of MSM who have had sex while under the influence of drugs and alcohol

| Background characteristics | Percent of MSM respondents under the influence of alcohol during last sex | n | MSM respondents who ever had sex while on drugs | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 76.6 | 752 | 46.6 | 133 |
| 20-24 | 70.3 | 925 | 53.4 | 163 |
| 25-29 | 70.2 | 494 | 52.1 | 94 |
| 30-34 | 79.9 | 199 | 75.0 | 36 |
| 35-39 | 78.8 | 113 | (72.2) | 18 |
| 40-44 | 73.4 | 79 | (80.0) | 10 |
| 45 and above | 78.0 | 50 | (81.8) | 11 |
| 15-17 (minors) | 77.6 | 322 | 39.3 | 61 |
| Currently living with a partner |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 69.0 | 497 | 58.3 | 103 |
| No | 74.5 | 2,075 | 54.4 | 355 |
| Civil status |  |  |  |  |
| Single | 73.4 | 2,481 | 54.6 | 421 |
| Married | 73.3 | 146 | 56.8 | 37 |
| Separated/widowed | 82.9 | 35 | (40.0) | 5 |


| Background <br> characteristics | Percent of MSM <br> respondents <br> under the influ- <br> ence of alcohol <br> during last sex | n | MSM respon- <br> dents who ever <br> had sex while on <br> drugs | n |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Educational attainment | 157 | 47.7 | 44 |  |
| Elementary | 76.4 | 1,282 | 52.5 | 255 |
| Secondary | 75.8 | 1,157 | 60.4 | 164 |
| Vocational, col- <br> lege and higher | 70.3 | 1,231 | 58.9 | 190 |
| Work status | 73.5 | 1,268 | 47.9 | 238 |
| Working | 71.9 | 23 | $50.0(3)$ | 6 |
| Not working | 60.9 | 2,589 | 54.9 | 459 |
| HIV status | 73.5 |  |  |  |
| Positive |  |  |  |  |
| Negative |  |  |  |  |

(\% )-Less than 25 cases

## Summary

The data on alcohol and drug use imply that the risk of HIV infection is a confluence of sexual and non-sexual behaviors. Drug use and taking of alcohol were mostly done with their boyfriends and friends, giving the message that these non-sexual risky behaviors are being done by MSM mostly with persons whom they have more intimate relationships with.

Sex while under the influence of alcohol and drugs is most prevalent among the younger group of MSM especially among the minors. This type of sexual behavior is also prevalent among those who are working. The hidden nature of these acts, however, challenges policymakers and program managers to unfold other factors that explain the interplay. This means that addressing HIV and AIDS issues and concerns entails a broader look into the cultural, social, structural, political, and other environment challenges facing the MSM and other at-risks populations.

## SECTION 6: EXPOSURE OF MSM TO HIV INTERVENTIONS

The information on the mode, type, and level of access of the MSM to information and services on HIV help in identifying more appropriate and more effective program interventions. For this purpose, the IHBSS gathered information on the following:

Intervention 1: Attendance of respondent to a seminar or meeting or a discussion that addressed the prevention of infection with STI or HIV;

Intervention 2: If the respondent was approached by anyone who discussed the prevention of sexual transmission of HIV;

Intervention 3: Receipt of condom (s) from a person or organization who gives it for free;

Intervention 4: Receipt of lubricant (s) from a person or organization who gives it for free; and

Intervention 5: If the respondent was approached by anyone who talked about how to prevent HIV transmission when injecting drugs.

## A. Access to information and commodity for prevention

As can be seen in Table 64, there is low level of access to information and commodities to prevent STI and HIV infection among the respondents in the past 12 months preceding the survey. The provision of condom (Intervention 3) appears to be the most accessible intervention among MSM with 41 percent of them having received condom from a person or institution. One in three ( $32.7 \%$ ) MSM was approached by someone who discussed STI and HIV prevention (Intervention 2). One in four (24.5\%) likewise attended a seminar or meeting that discussed STI and HIV prevention (Intervention 1) while almost the same proportion (25.6\%) was approached by someone who discussed prevention of HIV when injecting drugs (intervention 5). The least accessible intervention among the respondents was the provision of lubricant with only about one in ten (9.1\%) able to access such commodity for free from someone or from an institution in their locality (Intervention 4).

A glaring difference in terms of access and provision of interventions across sentinel sites can also be seen. Quezon City had the highest percentage (70.5\%) of respondents who have received condom for the last 12 months. A relatively high percentage of respondents from Zamboanga (56.5\%), Surigao (54.2\%), Davao (52.6\%), and Tuguegarao (51.6\%) have accessed condom. Pasay City had the least percentage of respondents (17\%) who have accessed condom for free.

Respondents from Quezon City, Davao, Puerto Galera, Tuguegarao, and Zamboanga had relatively high exposure to almost all program interventions (except access to lubricants which has generally low access). Respondents from Pasay, Baguio, Caloocan, Manila, and Marikina, had relatively low exposure to almost all the program interventions.
Table 64. Percent of MSM respondents who received specific type of intervention on STI and HIV

| Sites | Intervention 1 | n | Intervention 2 | n | Intervention 3 | n | Intervention 4 | n | Intervention 5 | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Sites* | 24.5 | 4,326 | 32.7 | 3,327 | 41.0 | 4,321 | 9.1 | 4,323 | 25.6 | 4,280 |
| Angeles* | 12.0 | 300 | 19.0 | 300 | 28.0 | 300 | 3.7 | 299 | 31.8 | 299 |
| Baguio | 11.2 | 304 | 11.1 | 305 | 28.9 | 304 | 2.0 | 304 | 5.6 | 304 |
| Butuan | 25.5 | 247 | 39.9 | 248 | 40.9 | 247 | 5.6 | 248 | 38.6 | 251 |
| Cebu | 29.1 | 299 | 24.4 | 299 | 41.1 | 297 | 9.4 | 299 | 8.4 | 296 |
| Davao | 42.9 | 294 | 41.8 | 294 | 52.6 | 291 | 8.5 | 293 | 21.9 | 292 |
| General Santos | 17.7 | 295 | 26.9 | 294 | 24.1 | 295 | 2.4 | 294 | 13.2 | 281 |
| Puerto Galera | 30.9 | 162 | 38.6 | 166 | 44.4 | 162 | 23.5 | 162 | 64.4 | 149 |
| Puerto Princesa* | 18.3 | 300 | 33.7 | 300 | 36.7 | 300 | 4.0 | 300 | 26.2 | 294 |
| Santiago | 27.9 | 299 | 37.8 | 111 | 41.4 | 111 | 14.4 | 111 | 30.0 | 110 |
| Tuguegarao | 35.5 | 35 | 39.7 | 31 | 51.6 | 31 | 9.7 | 31 | 32.3 | 31 |

[^4]| Sites | Inter- <br> vention <br> $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{n}$ | Inter- <br> vention <br> $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{n}$ | Inter- <br> vention <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{n}$ | Inter- <br> vention <br> $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{n}$ | Inter- <br> vention <br> $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zamboanga | 46.0 | 265 | 45.8 | 264 | 56.5 | 262 | 7.3 | 260 | 26.0 | 262 |
| Surigao | 27.4 | 106 | 54.5 | 101 | 54.2 | 107 | 8.5 | 106 | 41.4 | 99 |
| Caloocan | 16.7 | 114 | 22.8 | 114 | 35.1 | 114 | 8.8 | 114 | 23.5 | 115 |
| Makati | 15.0 | 133 | 37.6 | 133 | 48.5 | 132 | 8.3 | 133 | 21.6 | 134 |
| Mandaluyong | 13.2 | 152 | 29.6 | 152 | 47.7 | 151 | 15.2 | 151 | 18.8 | 149 |
| Manila | 5.0 | 260 | 36.3 | 262 | 29.0 | 262 | 8.8 | 261 | 44.4 | 261 |
| Marikina | 9.3 | 129 | 8.7 | 127 | 29.1 | 127 | 7.8 | 128 | 11.2 | 125 |
| Pasig | 7.5 | 93 | 38.3 | 94 | 49.0 | 96 | 10.3 | 97 | 28.9 | 97 |
| Pasay | 12.8 | 47 | 8.7 | 46 | 17.0 | 47 | -- | 46 | 4.3 | 47 |
| Quezon City | 54.2 | 216 | 62.2 | 217 | 70.5 | 217 | 31.8 | 217 | 38.4 | 216 |

unweighted

By background characteristics (see Table 65), it appears that the younger age groups, especially the minors and young adults (15-24 years old), had generally the lowest level of access to the various interventions. Higher age groups had greater access to these interventions.

Respondents who were living with a partner had consistently higher access to information, condom, and lubricants used to prevent HIV infection than those who were not living with their partner. Higher percentage of respondents with access to all of these interventions is also evident among those who were married, with at least secondary level of education, and those who were working.

As expected, those with perfect knowledge on HIV also had higher access to information on preventing HIV during sexual engagements and when injecting drugs as well as access to condom and lubricants than those who had incomplete knowledge.

Interestingly, there is a higher percentage of respondents with HIV who had access to information on how to prevent HIV during sexual intercourse and when injecting drugs than those who were negatively diagnosed with HIV. However, respondents with HIV had smaller proportion of those who have received condom for free for the last 12 months.
Table 65. Background characteristics of MSM who access to various program
interventions on STI and HIV

| Background characteristics | Intervention 1 | n | Intervention 2 | n | Intervention 3 | n | Intervention 4 | n | Intervention 5 | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 17.1 | 1,307 | 27.7 | 1,304 | 32.2 | 1,305 | 5.1 | 1,307 | 19.6 | 1,287 |
| 20-24 | 25.7 | 1,509 | 32.1 | 1,512 | 42.2 | 1,511 | 9.7 | 1,510 | 25.8 | 1,501 |
| 25-29 | 33.7 | 766 | 37.8 | 767 | 48.3 | 764 | 11.9 | 765 | 32.0 | 757 |
| 30-34 | 31.3 | 335 | 37.9 | 335 | 46.3 | 335 | 12.6 | 334 | 29.0 | 332 |
| 35-39 | 32.3 | 189 | 38.3 | 188 | 48.4 | 186 | 11.2 | 187 | 31.9 | 189 |
| 40-44 | 28.3 | 120 | 30.8 | 120 | 45.8 | 118 | 10.3 | 117 | 26.7 | 120 |
| 45 and above | 30.5 | 95 | 42.7 | 96 | 45.4 | 97 | 16.3 | 98 | 32.3 | 96 |
| 15-17 (minors) | 15.2 | 591 | 27.3 | 590 | 30.5 | 591 | 5.4 | 591 | 18.2 | 581 |

[^5]| Background characteristics | Intervention 1 | n | Intervention 2 | n | Intervention 3 | n | Intervention 4 | n | Inter- <br> vention <br> 5 | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Currently living with a partner |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 35.1 | 716 | 38.2 | 718 | 50.1 | 715 | 14.5 | 717 | 29.0 | 717 |
| No | 23.3 | 3,545 | 31.5 | 3,548 | 39.1 | 3,544 | 8.0 | 3,544 | 24.8 | 3,503 |
| Civil status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single | 24.5 | 4,015 | 32.3 | 4,016 | 40.9 | 4,011 | 8.7 | 4,014 | 25.3 | 3,970 |
| Married | 35.9 | 231 | 39.8 | 231 | 42.2 | 230 | 16.2 | 229 | 28.6 | 231 |
| Separated/ widowed | 44.8 | 58 | 32.8 | 58 | 39.7 | 58 | 8.6 | 59 | 29.8 | 57 |
| 45 and above | 30.5 | 95 | 42.7 | 96 | 45.4 | 97 | 16.3 | 98 | 32.3 | 96 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 18.8 | 298 | 24.4 | 299 | 33.4 | 296 | 8.1 | 297 | 16.6 | 295 |
| Secondary | 23.5 | 2,126 | 30.1 | 2,125 | 39.3 | 2,122 | 8.9 | 2,124 | 24.0 | 2,090 |
| Vocational, college and higher | 28.5 | 1,874 | 37.0 | 1,875 | 43.9 | 1,875 | 9.7 | 1,874 | 29.0 | 1,867 |

see next page

| Background characteristics | Intervention 1 | n | Intervention 2 | n | Intervention 3 | n | Inter- <br> vention <br> 4 | n | Intervention 5 | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working | 26.1 | 2,046 | 35.0 | 2,048 | 42.3 | 2,044 | 9.4 | 2,046 | 26.2 | 2,032 |
| Not working | 24.8 | 2,049 | 30.5 | 2,086 | 39.9 | 2,086 | 8.5 | 2,085 | 23.3 | 2,065 |
| Knowledge on HIV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perfect | 31.6 | 1,495 | 41.3 | 1,495 | 48.7 | 2,829 | 9.7 | 1,492 | 36.0 | 1,484 |
| Imperfect | 22.1 | 2,831 | 28.1 | 2,832 | 36.9 | 2,839 | 8.9 | 2,831 | 20.1 | 2,796 |
| HIV status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive | 18.2 | 298 | 24.4 | 299 | 33.4 | 296 | 8.1 | 297 | 16.6 | 295 |
| Negative | 25.5 | 4,282 | 32.5 | 4,283 | 41.1 | 4,277 | 9.1 | 4,279 | 25.5 | 4,238 |

## B. Sexual behavior and exposure to interventions

Exposure to intervention supposedly encourages protected sexual behaviors among the beneficiaries. In the case of the respondents however, the exposure to information and access to condom did not necessarily translate to protected sex. While the low valid cases in Table 66 do not give stable conclusions, the table indicates that there is low use of condom even among respondents who were given the information and condom for preventing HIV infection.

Only about 46 percent who had received condom for free in the past 12 months used condom in their anal sex during the same period. There is an extremely low prevalence of condom use in all sexual acts. This provides serious implications on program development and implementation in as much as provision in condom use and information does not match the actual behavior of the MSM.
Table 66. Percent of MSM respondents who receive specific interventions who used condom in specific sexual activity

| Background characteristics | Intervention 1 | n | Intervention 2 | n | Intervention 3 | n | Intervention 5 | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Had anal sex using a condom (past 12 months) | 49.2 | 779 | 47.1 | 1,026 | 45.7 | 1,280 | 47.9 | 743 |
| Used condom last time had sex with woman | 17.9 | 347 | 16.6 | 459 | 20.1 | 590 | 18.9 | 344 |
| Used condom during last sex with paying partner | 55.0 | 291 | 49.3 | 251 | 48.9 | 464 | 46.3 | 255 |
| Used condom during last sex with paid partner | 48.9 | 359 | 40.4 | 275 | 45.1 | 417 | 45.3 | 322 |
| Used condom during all sex acts in group sex | 23.2 | 211 | 17.5 | 269 | 17.4 | 251 | 18.3 | 180 |
| Used condom last time had sex under the influence of alcohol | 27.6 | 557 | 23.8 | 692 | 24.7 | 880 | 28.8 | 532 |


| Used condom last time had sex <br> under the influence of alcohol | 29.5 | 78 | 23.8 | 105 | 17.4 | 351 | 21.9 | 32 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## C. Summary

In general, there is a low level of access to information and commodities to prevent STI and HIV infection among the respondents in the past 12 months. The gap in the access to information and prevention measures is widely evident among the younger groups. Moreover, exposure to interventions does not necessarily translate to protected sex.

## SECTION 7: CONCLUSION

The Integrated HIV Behavioral and Serologic Surveillance System (IHBSS) is an institutional system that aims to gather needed information to address the prevailing STI and HIV and AIDS infection in the country. In 2009, the third of the IHBSS series was conducted.

This particular study is focused on analyzing the results of the survey that pertains to the HIV prevalence and behaviors of males having sex with males (MSM). The focus on MSM is driven by the increasing HIV infection among males and the increasing contribution of this segment of population in the epidemic.

The study was specifically undertaken to a) determine the prevalence of HIV among MSM across the 20 study sites; b) describe the demographic, socio-economic and behavioral factors exhibited by MSM that influence their exposure to the risk of HIV infection; c) determine the MSM' exposure to STI and HIV interventions and its effect to condom use; and d) identify major policy, program and research implications based on the results of the analysis.

Based on the objectives, the following are the main findings of the study:

## HIV prevalence among MSM

- The latest data of the Philippine HIV and AIDS Registry show the shift of HIV transmission from heterosexual contact (30\%) to MSM (70\%). In 2010, more than half of the HIV infections through sexual contact were among MSM.
- The IHBSS serologic surveillance has detected 45 cases of HIV positives among the MSM respondents. Davao and Manila have the highest number of cases with 11 each. Respondents with HIV are relatively young, with a median age of 24 years. 12 cases involved teenagers, two of whom were in the $15-17$ age group.
- All respondents with HIV are single and most of them have attained college level of education. Most of them are likewise currently working.


## Demographic and socio-economic characteristics of MSM

The survey had a total of 4,372 MSM respondents unevenly distributed in 20 study sites.

Because of some serious limitations in the random sampling method applied in the gathering of respondents and some inconsistencies in the responses, the results of the study only pertains to the respondents and not to the general population of the MSM.

- MSM respondents were relatively young with a median age of 22 years. A substantial proportion were young adults 15 to 19 years old. Surigao City had the youngest respondents with a median age of 19 years.
- Nine out of ten respondents were single. Only about five percent were married. Most of them were not living with a partner.
- In general, the MSM respondents are educated with at least secondary level of education. About half of the total respondents have attained vocational, college and higher level of education. Only about seven percent have attained elementary level.
- There is a higher percentage ( $51 \%$ ) of respondents who were not working and only a minimal percentage who have ever worked abroad. Moreover, respondents had a relatively high monthly income ( $\mathrm{P} 7,733.44$ ). There are regional disparities in terms of income with those from Metro Manila having higher income than those from the rest of the study sites.


## Sexual risk behaviors among MSM

- Overall, most of respondents said that they know of STI, HIV and AIDS. A high percentage ( $82 \%$ ) of respondents have heard of diseases that can be transmitted through sexual intercourse. However, about one in four respondents did not know any symptoms of STI. The most known symptom of STI among women is abdominal pain while genital discharge is the most known symptoms in men.
- One in five respondents did not know about HIV and one in ten does not know about AIDS. A relatively high percentage of the respondents know that a healthylooking person can be infected with HIV and that HIV can be prevented. Generally, the respondents had high level of knowledge of the mode of transmission and prevention of HIV infection.
- There is, however, a gap in terms of the "perfect knowledge' on HIV. Only about one in three knows that HIV can be prevented; sex with only one faithful, uninfected partner reduces risk of HIV transmission; a person cannot get HIV by sharing food with infected person; using condom reduces risk of HIV transmission; and a person
cannot get HIV from mosquito bites. Most of the respondents got their knowledge and information from the television, radio, and their friends.
- Majority of the respondents ( $60 \%$ ) expressed their preference for males as sexual partner. More respondents also identified themselves as homosexual (66\%). As MSMs mature by age, more MSM tend to identify themselves as homosexuals.
- Oral sex is more common than anal sex among MSM respondents. Most of the respondents assume the role of the receiver in both anal and oral sex experience. Respondents with HIV have higher percentage of reported experience on oral and anal sex than the percentage for all sites.
- Most of those who ever had anal sex are adolescents and minors; not currently living with a partner; have at least attained secondary level of education; and do not have perfect knowledge on HIV.
- Having multiple partners is a common practice among MSM. Across the study sites, the respondents had an average of one male sex partner per week in the past month. MSM in Davao had an average of almost two male sex partners per week in the last thirty days. In terms of proportion, there are about six in ten respondents who had more than one male sex partner within the past month.
- About 69 percent had multiple paid partners, 64 percent with multiple paying partners, and 58 percent with multiple paying partners in the past thirty days. There seems to be a higher proportion of MSM who have multiple paying partners than multiple paid partners.
- MSM with HIV are likewise actively having sex with multiple partners. Respondents in younger age groups, not currently living with a partner, with lower level of education, and who are singles have higher proportion with multiple sex partners. Minors, likewise, had multiple partners. There are a number of young MSM who make a living selling sex.
- MSM respondents had their sexual debut when they were 16 years old. There are also respondents who were forced to have sex as when they were between the age of 5 and 10. Other had their first sex with males for monetary considerations and most of the first sexual encounters were with their friends.
- A high 70 percent had oral sex and 54 percent who had anal sex in the last six months without using condom. Respondents usually get their condom from the pharmacies.
- Moreover, knowledge of HIV and AIDS does not match use of condom among respondents. While there is high knowledge that HIV can be prevented and that condom can reduce the risks, condom use is still low among those who expressed knowledge about this information. Condom use is also particularly low among the minors. Married MSM have higher percentage of condom use than singles.
- MSM also maintain sexual activity with their regular non-paying partners and also have casual sex with males. Casual sex is more common than sex with regular non-paying partner. Younger MSM have more regular and casual sex partners. Moreover, respondents with HIV have higher number of regular and casual nonpaying partners than those without HIV.
- Condom use is also not being practiced by respondents in sex with non-paying partners.
- More respondents experienced sex with paying partners than paid partners. About three in four respondents have paying partners and seven in ten have paid partners. The highest percentage of respondents who have paid partners is found in Makati while the highest percentage of respondents who have paying partner is from Quezon City.
- Younger respondents appear to be more active with paying partners while older had more paid partners. This means that more younger respondents tend to sell sex and the older respondents tend to pay for sex. Likewise, $81 \%$ of minors had sex with paying partners in the last 12 months.
- Respondents who had sex with paying and paid partners had sex with three partners for the last month. MSM respondents from Manila had as many as 12 partners on the average in the past month. MSM who pay for sex usually assume the receiver and those who are being paid assume the inserter. Respondents usually get their partners through pimps and referrals from friends. Respondents likewise get their paying partners from a wide variety of places.
- Respondents also participate in group sex. While this is rarer than sex with an individual, the involvement of multiple partners in one sex act makes the risk higher. In the last group sex that the respondents participated, there was an average of four males and two female sex partners. In most of these sexual acts, condom use is low particularly among the younger respondents. In addition, a high percentage of those who participated in group sex had taken drugs and were under the influence of alcohol.
- Almost four in five respondents have ever experienced vaginal sex with women. Almost half of the respondents with HIV had also sex with women. Most of their women partners are their girlfriends or their live-in partners.
- Most of the sexual encounters with women were unprotected. Most of the respondents said that they deliberately did not use condom because they did not like it. Condom was not also available during the time of the sexual encounter with female partners.


## Non-sexual risk behaviors among MSM

- Alcohol and drug use during sex is also common among MSM. In the sexual encounters of 73 percent of the respondents, they were under the influence of alcohol. Moreover, 50 percent of the respondents had also experienced sex with male partners while on drugs. This behavior was most prevalent among the minors. Condom use is also low during these encounters.


## Exposure to STI and HIV interventions

- In general, there is low level of access to information and means to prevent infection among respondents. The provision of condom appears to be the more accessible intervention among the respondents.
- The younger age groups especially the minors and the young adults (15-24 years old) have generally the lowest level of access to interventions.
- Quezon City has the highest percentage (70.5\%) of respondents who have received condom for the last 12 months. Pasay City has the least proportion (17\%) of respondents who have accessed condom for free.
- Among those with access to information and condom, unprotected sex is still prevalent. This means that exposure to interventions did not produce the intended behaviors among MSM

SECTION 8: POLICY AND
PROGRAM IMPLICATIONS

The HIV infection among MSM is a growing concern not only for health but for development in general. There is a need to generate more information to better understand the issue and to allow program managers to design an appropriate and effective policy and program to address the concern among this subject group.

In a substantial degree, the study has unfolded significant information that could help in the development of appropriate and effective interventions for MSM. These information specifically provide some implications for policy development and programming or areas for actions. These include the following:

- Prevention and treatment of STI and HIV infection among MSM should be urgently prioritized. The data from the IHBSS reinforce the increasing seriousness of HIV infection among MSM. While there are existing programs and interventions from the government and non-government organizations in some sentinel sites, the increasing infection and prevalent risky sexual behaviors among MSM imply the need to scale-up efforts to prevent the further spread of the disease. There is a need to put the issue on the highest priority of the government's health and development programs before the issue goes out of hand. Scaling-up likewise entails the creation of a more favorable environment to facilitate accurate identification of people at risk, more objective understanding of their sexual behaviors, and timely treatment for people who are already infected with the disease.
- There is a need to guide the young or adolescents in their sexual development to protect them from the threats of sexually transmitted diseases and HIV and AIDS. The study showed that young MSM tend to practice all the most risky sexual behaviors that put individuals at risk of HIV infection. This group exhibits very dynamic, active, and high-risk sexual behaviors including unprotected oral and anal sex with men, women, and multiple partners. The threat is imminent in as much as almost half of the HIV-positive cases recorded by the IHBSS belong to the 15-24 age group.

As emphasized in this study, the need to protect the young from the threats of STI and HIV is rationalized by the fact that most of the young respondents are undergoing a transition period in their lives. Such period is also characterized by sexual experimentation and reluctance to seek health information and services because of their feeling of invulnerability and invincibility. Without appropriate guidance, their effort to realize their growth and potentials may be compromised. Adolescents and young adults should be informed of the various changes that are occurring to them to enable them to avoid factors that may affect their welfare and development. Appropriate information is necessary for their sexual development, particularly in defining their sexual identity and developing responsible means of expressing their sexuality.

It is within this context that education and behavior change interventions become relevant. Knowledge is critical for adolescents and young people to protect their health. While the AIDS Prevention Law provides for mandatory education on STI and HIV among the young, there is a need to monitor and ensure that these mandated interventions are being enforced in concerned institutions.

Moreover, there is a need to strengthen the existing adolescent sexual and reproductive health programs in the country with a focus on providing the children and youth with appropriate information and skills. The program should also be connected with other programs that could protect the young from violence,
seduction, and forced sex. Value-laden and age-appropriate information on sexuality, STI, and HIV and AIDS should be reinforced in school curriculums and values formation programs.

- There is a need to address the socio-economic drivers of HIV infection among MSM. Apparently, the socio-economic conditions of MSM have an impact on the sexual risk behaviors of MSM. For example, most MSM who were not working admitted having sex with paying partners. This implies that many of the MSM are sex workers and their income is derived from engaging into sex with males. Moreover, most of these sexual activities are unprotected. Addressing the socioeconomic conditions of this segment of MSM can stop them from engaging in sex work, thereby reducing their exposure to HIV infection. Improving their socioeconomic conditions also means providing them with the means and opportunities for self-empowerment to enable them to define and achieve their goals. Counseling is most relevant in this regard.
- There is a need to remove the stigmatizing and discriminating barriers to encourage MSM to be counted in studies and their needs addressed. The increasing incidence of HIV infections is indicative that there are more MSM who might be suffering from HIV infections and are not being counted in the survey. The social stigma attached to MSM' sexual behaviors forces them to hide although they know that they are at risk of infection. MSM need to know their HIV status in order for them to seek appropriate help and enable them to communicate their status with their partners.
- Communication strategies need to focus on promoting protected sex. Apparently, MSM respondents are highly sexually active. Their knowledge is high in terms of the consequences and means of preventing HIV infection but most of them are still engaging actively in unprotected sex. The way condom use is being promoted should be reviewed and scaled up to focus on changing the behaviors of MSM. Designing communication strategies for promoting condom needs qualitative and in-depth study on the behavioral factors that influence condom use. Condom use could be promoted especially among MSM who are willing to use condom but cannot access it during the time of their sexual encounters and also among MSMs who usually prefer the role of the inserter since they have the opportunity to decide on using such protection. MSM, however, should also be trained and provided with skills in negotiating for condom use with their partners.

Involving MSM peers and friends in promoting information on STI and HIV and AIDS can be an effective communication and behavior change strategy. As the study has shown, many MSM usually get their information from friends and peers. Providing their peers and friends with accurate information can help MSM obtain knowledge on STI and HIV. Furthermore, HIV positive MSM should be encouraged and tapped to join education and information campaigns. The results of this study could be used in information campaigns targeting MSM to provide concrete evidence on the epidemic and the emerging sexual behaviors among their group.

- Protection and negotiating skills among women with MSM partners should be strengthened. As women are also vulnerable to HIV infection with MSM partners, communication and capacity-building strategies should also be focused on informing and building the skills of women to communicate with their partners on HIV and condom use. MSM should also be encouraged to communicate their conditions with their female partners to protect them from infection.
- Communication and appropriate strategies addressing non-sexual behaviors should also be designed to address these mitigating factors. The interplay of sexual and non-sexual behaviors that put MSM and their partners at risk of HIV infection is indeed a dangerous combination. Communication strategies targeting MSM should also include non-sexual behaviors and its relationships to sexual behaviors should also be emphasized.
- The need for substantiating the data with qualitative research. The study only provides quantitative indicators that need to be substantiated with qualitative data for more in-depth understanding and as a sound basis of programming.

In view of the limitations of the data set as mentioned in the discussion of the methodology, there are critical areas that can be improved. Specifically, the following are recommended:

- The Respondent ID (which includes respondent ID, venue ID, event ID, type of MARP and type of sampling and questionnaire number) should be indicated in each page of the questionnaire. This will ensure that even if there will be loose pages, the questionnaire is intact as it is traceable via the respondent ID with proper pagination.
- There should be a standard operating procedure in completing the questionnaire. Questionnaire number should be written prior to interview to control the number of questionnaires reproduced to maintain integrity of each questionnaire. If it is incomplete (refused, partial), interviewers should indicate properly. During validation, the Research Team noted that some questionnaires were filled-out only in the identification page.
- Result of the HIV test should not be asked face to face because the interviewer might get a misleading response. The survey should be in accordance with ethical issues in health research, e.g., confidentiality of research data. Not a single respondent found to be serologically positive of HIV have answered correctly on question J36 "What was the result of your HIV test." If this will be continued to ask in the future IHBSS round, this will seriously affect the integrity of the survey results.
- The analysis of the data will have to be in two layers:
» The first layer should be the analysis of all variables. This was part of data cleaning to sift through variables which are likely to be included in the second layer of analysis.
» The second layer will be a deepening analysis wherein the logic of the research framework is applied using bivariate analysis. The first layer of analysis will be very useful not only to the site concerned but also in fully documenting the recommendations for the revision of the questionnaire.
» Bivariate analysis must be performed to determine whether one variable influences the distribution of another. This is used to investigate the relationship between two different variables that maybe associated. Some types of bivariate analysis which may be used for the IHBSS study, such as Test for association using the chi-square test and Test for trend using the chi-square test and higher multivariate regression analysis, however, cannot be guaranteed given the nature of the data.
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## ANNEX

## Regression results

Determinants of Condom Use last anal sex, Logistic Regression Results with Considered Variables Taken Simultaneously by Sentinel Sites, 2009 IHBSS MSM Dataset

| Explanatory Variables | Baguio |  |  |  |  | Butuan |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.46 | 0.94 | 0.98 | -0.35 | 0.16 | 2.81 |
| Age squared | -0.01 | 0.80 | 1.00 | 0.01 | 0.18 | 0.98 |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.14 | 0.00 | 0.74 | 0.07 | 0.74 | 0.96 |
| High school or below | 0.77 | 0.45 | 0.66 | 0.28 | 0.93 | 1.06 |
| Not working | 0.81 | 0.56 | 0.69 | -0.27 | 0.20 | 0.42 |
| Bi-sexual | -0.72 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.54 | 0.24 | 0.29 |
| Engaged in anal sex | -2.81 | 0.05 | 0.06 | -3.00 | 0.40 | 0.50 |
| Preferred male sex partners | 2.30 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.36 | 0.02 | 0.04 |
| Preferred both male and female | 0.81 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.58 | 0.21 | 0.27 |
| Have sex with both male and female | 2.23 | 0.00 | 73.62 | 0.60 | 0.74 | 0.70 |
| Engaged in group sex | 0.63 | 0.34 | 1.91 | 0.28 | 0.31 | 1.93 |
| With multiple partners | 0.15 | 0.21 | 2.79 | 2.30 | 0.86 | 1.14 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -0.28 | 0.05 | 0.32 | -0.79 | 0.69 | 1.28 |
| No HIV test | 0.55 | 0.03 | 9.24 | -2.63 | 0.62 | 0.57 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 1.13 | 0.03 | 6.60 | 1.02 | 0.85 | 1.14 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.03 | 0.17 | 2.27 | 0.71 | 0.44 | 1.68 |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | -1.10 | 0.00 | 0.04 | -0.09 | 0.01 | 0.13 |
| Constant | -8.65 | 1.00 | 0 | 2.85 | 0.29 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Cebu |  |  |  |  | Davao |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.10 | 0.97 | 0.99 | 0.50 | 0.75 | 1.10 |
| Age squared | 0.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | -0.01 | 0.98 | 1.00 |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.02 | 0.26 | 1.08 | 0.01 | 0.50 | 1.05 |
| High school or below | 0.37 | 0.06 | 0.37 | -0.40 | 0.83 | 1.13 |
| Not working | 0.30 | 0.60 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.75 | 0.82 |
| Bi-sexual | 2.42 | 0.24 | 2.79 | -2.63 | 0.21 | 3.00 |
| Engaged in anal sex | -1.16 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -2.99 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Preferred male sex partners | 1.75 | 0.62 | 0.56 | -3.45 | 0.13 | 0.07 |
| Preferred both male and female | 0.73 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -3.20 | 0.92 | 0.84 |
| Have sex with both male and female | -1.20 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 0.34 | 0.43 |
| Engaged in group sex | 0.92 | 0.57 | 0.75 | 0.02 | 0.83 | 1.16 |
| With multiple partners | 2.01 | 0.28 | 2.84 | 1.69 | 0.69 | 0.77 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | 0.47 | 0.32 | 1.63 | -0.06 | 0.97 | 0.98 |
| No HIV test | -0.35 | 0.55 | 0.37 | -2.07 | 0.94 | 0.84 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 0.46 | 0.48 | 1.41 | 0.67 | 0.08 | 2.75 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.32 | 0.10 | 3.15 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 12.53 |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | -0.43 | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.56 |
| Constant | -3.39 | 0.88 | 0.58 | -3.59 | 0.59 | 0.07 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | General Santos |  | Puerto Galera |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.79 | 0.83 | 1.09 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.78 |
| Age squared | -0.01 | 0.75 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 1.00 |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.05 | 0.36 | 1.08 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 1.33 |
| High school or below | -0.20 | 0.87 | 1.09 | -1.02 | 0.49 | 1.50 |
| Not working | 0.93 | 0.75 | 1.18 | 0.29 | 0.72 | 0.66 |
| Bi-sexual | 0.36 | 0.04 | 7.67 | -4.07 | 0.61 | 0.62 |
| Engaged in anal sex | -19.75 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.73 | 0.43 | 4.09 |
| Preferred male sex partners | 16.28 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.29 | 0.12 | 8.72 |
| Preferred both male and female | 18.00 | 0.36 | 2.33 | -1.19 | 0.35 | 2.08 |
| Have sex with both male and female | -2.12 | 0.92 | 1.06 | 0.24 | 0.10 | 3.70 |
| Engaged in group sex | 0.09 | 0.80 | 0.86 | 1.33 | 0.04 | 3.04 |
| With multiple partners | 2.67 | 0.03 | 3.18 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 6.24 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | 0.36 | 0.04 | 0.12 | 21.40 | 0.98 | 1.05 |
| No HIV test | 0.45 | 0.67 | 0.78 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.60 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 2.04 | 0.91 | 1.06 | -0.14 | 0.50 | 1.47 |
| With perfect knowledge | -1.84 | 0.63 | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.04 | 0.36 |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | -0.22 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -24.87 | 0.40 | 0.02 |
| Constant | -29.82 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Santiago |  |  |  | Tuguegarao |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |  |
| Age | 0.36 | 0.98 | 0.00 | -0.10 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Age squared | -0.01 | 0.98 | 1.98 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.60 |  |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.01 | 0.98 | 31942.21 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| High school or below | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.47 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Not working | -0.18 | 0.99 | 0.00 | -0.74 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Bi-sexual | -0.03 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 2.51 | 1.00 | 84.07 |  |
| Engaged in anal sex | -20.95 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -2.29 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Preferred male sex partners | -1.86 | 0.99 | 0.00 | 3.72 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Preferred both male and female | -0.87 | 0.98 | 0.00 | 1.64 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Have sex with both male and female | -1.20 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.51 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Engaged in group sex | 0.16 | 0.98 | 0.00 | 3.63 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| With multiple partners | 0.36 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.53 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Feel invincible with HIV | 0.15 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.55 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| No HIV test | -0.95 | 0.99 | 0.00 | -2.37 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -0.29 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.54 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| With perfect knowledge | -0.33 | 0.98 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 1.00 | 0.23 |  |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | -0.85 | 0.99 | 0.00 | -2.08 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Constant | -2.92 | 0.99 | - | -1.09 | 1.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Surigao |  |  | Caloocan |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 29.08 | 0.16 | 2.69 | 1.23 | 0.99 |  |
| Age squared | -0.10 | 0.16 | 0.98 | -0.02 | 0.99 | 0.85 |
| Age of sexual debut | -72.61 | 0.64 | 1.11 | -0.43 | 0.99 |  |
| High school or below | -410.75 | 0.01 | 18.83 | -0.62 | 0.98 |  |
| Not working | -142.73 | 0.39 | 2.62 | 1.62 | 0.99 | 0.00 |
| Bi-sexual | 217.89 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |
| Engaged in anal sex | -20.22 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -2.15 | 0.98 |  |
| Preferred male sex partners | 492.24 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 22.17 | 0.99 |  |
| Preferred both male and female | 586.74 | 0.53 | 0.47 | -2.00 | 0.99 |  |
| Have sex with both male and female | 177.02 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 1.82 | 0.98 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in group sex | -471.22 | 0.61 | 2.39 | 2.56 | 0.98 | 0.00 |
| With multiple partners | 212.50 | 0.21 | 0.25 | 1.56 | 0.99 | 0.00 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -202.05 | 0.38 | 0.39 | 2.78 | 0.98 |  |
| No HIV test | 603.01 | 0.71 | 1.47 | 1.10 | 0.98 | 0.00 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 26.39 | 0.77 | 0.59 | -0.96 | 0.99 |  |
| With perfect knowledge | 91.65 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 1.58 | 0.98 |  |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | -247.99 | 1.00 | 1494.69 | 2.32 | 0.99 |  |
| Constant | -676.76 |  |  | -43.08 | 0.98 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Makati |  |  | Mandaluyong |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.10 | 0.90 | 1.06 | -0.15 | 0.14 | 2.03 |
| Age squared | 0.00 | 0.63 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.99 |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.08 | 0.03 | 0.75 | -0.08 | 0.79 | 0.96 |
| High school or below | 0.58 | 0.96 | 0.96 | -0.69 | 0.16 | 4.78 |
| Not working | -1.17 | 0.04 | 0.21 | 1.65 | 0.76 | 0.65 |
| Bi-sexual | 1.80 | 0.18 | 3.29 | -0.30 | 0.59 | 3.13 |
| Engaged in anal sex | -36.06 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -1.73 | 0.10 | 0.06 |
| Preferred male sex partners | 2.59 | 0.96 | 0.90 | 0.34 | 1.00 |  |
| Preferred both male and female | 1.36 | 0.78 | 1.69 | 0.25 | 1.00 |  |
| Have sex with both male and female | -0.88 | 0.39 | 0.43 | 0.88 | 0.07 | 0.03 |
| Engaged in group sex | 0.29 | 0.36 | 2.44 | -0.03 | 0.05 | 0.04 |
| With multiple partners | 0.05 | 0.54 | 1.93 | 1.60 | 0.03 | 25.67 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -20.55 | 0.27 | 0.02 | -1.18 | 0.04 | 10.65 |
| No HIV test | 0.10 | 0.47 | 0.39 | 20.71 | 0.04 | 171.97 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -1.13 | 0.43 | 1.78 | 0.48 | 0.04 | 23.25 |
| With perfect knowledge | -1.16 | 0.59 | 0.70 | 0.16 | 0.74 | 1.47 |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | 21.64 | 0.25 |  | -1.44 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Constant |  |  |  | -17.92 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Manila |  |  |  |  | Pasig |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.27 | 0.68 | 1.07 | -0.92 | 0.49 | 1.42 |
| Age squared | -0.01 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.01 | 0.58 | 1.00 |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.01 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.22 | 0.98 | 1.00 |
| High school or below | 0.12 | 0.20 | 1.87 | -4.18 | 0.75 | 0.64 |
| Not working | -0.04 | 0.55 | 1.30 | -1.78 | 0.07 | 0.03 |
| Bi-sexual | -1.27 | 0.00 | 0.33 | -1.15 | 0.46 | 4.64 |
| Engaged in anal sex | -2.49 | 0.09 | 0.22 | -37.28 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Preferred male sex partners | 17.20 | 1.00 |  | -14.02 | 0.70 | 0.43 |
| Preferred both male and female | 17.95 | 1.00 |  | -13.18 | 1.00 |  |
| Have sex with both male and female | 0.60 | 0.06 | 2.56 | -20.06 | 0.79 | 0.66 |
| Engaged in group sex | 0.45 | 0.00 | 3.90 | 1.96 | 0.46 | 21.94 |
| With multiple partners | -0.04 | 0.37 | 0.66 | 37.34 | 0.45 | 0.48 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -1.22 | 0.55 | 1.32 | -2.31 | 0.14 | 0.02 |
| No HIV test | 1.40 | 0.01 | 0.14 | -20.90 | 0.51 | 0.39 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 0.12 | 0.62 | 1.25 | 1.79 | 0.23 | 4.72 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.18 | 0.51 | 1.30 | -3.21 | 0.22 | 5.23 |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | -0.23 | 0.35 | 1.45 | 1.18 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Constant | -21.33 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 29.39 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Pasay |  | Quezon City |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 1.06 | 1.00 |  | 0.65 | 0.60 | 1.64 |
| Age squared | -0.02 | 1.00 | 0.47 | -0.01 | 0.56 | 0.99 |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.03 | 1.00 |  | -0.05 | 0.08 | 1.22 |
| High school or below | 0.69 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.69 | 0.79 | 0.80 |
| Not working | 1.41 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.81 | 0.11 | 5.00 |
| Bi-sexual | -18.87 | 1.00 | 0.57 | 1.95 | 0.12 | 0.22 |
| Engaged in anal sex | -1.78 | 1.00 |  | -2.79 | 0.45 | 0.34 |
| Preferred male sex partners | -15.90 | 1.00 |  | -0.07 | 0.61 | 1.62 |
| Preferred both male and female | -2.31 | 1.00 |  | -1.17 | 0.04 | 52.50 |
| Have sex with both male and female | -15.56 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -1.22 | 0.02 | 9.44 |
| Engaged in group sex | 4.33 | 1.00 | 5949.86 | 0.43 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| With multiple partners | -1.80 | 1.00 |  | 1.96 | 0.62 | 1.47 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | 1.27 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.11 | 0.27 | 0.29 |
| No HIV test | -0.90 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.81 | 0.03 | 0.14 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -0.76 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -1.16 | 0.04 | 0.13 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.66 |  |  | 0.69 | 0.30 | 0.41 |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | 1.30 |  |  | 0.38 | 0.67 | 0.01 |
| Constant | 0.57 |  |  | -9.85 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Marikina |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.38 | 0.55 | 1.47 |
| Age squared | -0.01 | 0.41 | 0.99 |
| Age of sexual debut | 0.04 | 0.81 | 1.04 |
| High school or below | 1.54 | 0.11 | 4.68 |
| Not working | -5.85 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Bi-sexual | 7.56 | 0.02 | 1927.61 |
| Engaged in anal sex | -4.33 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| Preferred male sex partners | -5.11 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Preferred both male and female | 2.85 | 0.20 | 17.35 |
| Have sex with both male and female | 1.41 | 0.21 | 4.11 |
| Engaged in group sex | 3.46 | 0.10 | 31.88 |
| With multiple partners | 1.61 | 0.15 | 5.01 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -0.27 | 0.88 | 0.76 |
| No HIV test | 3.98 | 0.02 | 53.49 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 1.28 | 0.17 | 3.60 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.70 | 0.68 |  |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | 0.14 | 0.00 |  |
| Constant |  |  | 0.72 |
|  |  | 0.04 |  |

Determinants of Lubricant Use in any sex episode, Logistic Regression Results with Considered Variables Taken Simultaneously by Sentinel Sites, 2009 IHBSS MSM Dataset
$\left.\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Explanatory Variables } & & \text { Baguo } & & \text { Butuan } \\ & \text { Logit } \\ \text { Coeffi- } \\ \text { cients }\end{array}\right)$

| Explanatory Variables | Cebu |  |  |  |  | Davao |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.10 | 0.63 | 0.91 | 0.50 | 0.05 | 1.65 |
| Age squared | 0.00 | 0.64 | 1.00 | -0.01 | 0.05 | 0.99 |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.02 | 0.71 | 0.98 | 0.01 | 0.82 | 1.01 |
| High school or below | 0.37 | 0.39 | 1.45 | -0.40 | 0.35 | 0.67 |
| Not working | 0.30 | 0.43 | 1.35 | 0.78 | 0.05 | 2.19 |
| Bi-sexual | 2.42 | 0.00 | 11.20 | -2.63 | 0.00 | 0.07 |
| Engaged in anal sex | -1.16 | 0.07 | 0.31 | -2.99 | 0.00 | 0.05 |
| Preferred male sex partners | 1.75 | 0.14 | 5.75 | -3.45 | 0.02 | 0.03 |
| Preferred both male and female | 0.73 | 0.55 | 2.08 | -3.20 | 0.03 | 0.04 |
| Have sex with both male and female | -1.20 | 0.15 | 0.30 | 0.87 | 0.10 | 2.40 |
| Engaged in group sex | 0.92 | 0.02 | 2.52 | 0.02 | 0.97 | 1.02 |
| With multiple partners | 2.01 | 0.06 | 7.44 | 1.69 | 0.01 | 5.43 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | 0.47 | 0.23 | 1.59 | -0.06 | 0.88 | 0.94 |
| No HIV test | -0.35 | 0.83 | 0.71 | -2.07 | 0.13 | 0.13 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 0.46 | 0.23 | 1.58 | 0.67 | 0.10 | 1.95 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.32 | 0.61 | 1.37 | 0.06 | 0.91 | 1.06 |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | -0.43 | 0.30 | 0.65 | 0.28 | 0.46 | 1.33 |
| Constant | -3.39 | 0.30 | 0.03 | -3.59 | 0.37 | 0.03 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | General Santos |  | Puerto Galera |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.79 | 0.05 | 2.21 | 0.213 | 0.19 | 1.24 |
| Age squared | -0.01 | 0.09 | 0.99 | -0.003 | 0.16 | 1.00 |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.05 | 0.54 | 0.95 | 0.045 | 0.68 | 1.05 |
| High school or below | -0.20 | 0.71 | 0.82 | -1.020 | 0.06 | 0.36 |
| Not working | 0.93 | 0.10 | 2.52 | 0.290 | 0.79 | 1.34 |
| Bi-sexual | 0.36 | 0.74 | 1.44 | -4.069 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| Engaged in anal sex | -19.75 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.734 | 0.57 | 0.48 |
| Preferred male sex partners | 16.28 | 1.00 |  | -0.287 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Preferred both male and female | 18.00 | 1.00 |  | -1.189 | 0.10 | 0.30 |
| Have sex with both male and female | -2.12 | 0.04 | 0.12 | 0.236 | 0.78 | 1.27 |
| Engaged in group sex | 0.09 | 0.89 | 1.09 | 1.332 | 0.00 | 3.79 |
| With multiple partners | 2.67 | 0.00 | 14.41 | 0.299 | 0.59 | 1.35 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | 0.36 | 0.53 | 1.44 | 21.395 | 1.00 |  |
| No HIV test | 0.45 | 0.69 | 1.57 | 0.484 | 0.44 | 1.62 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 2.04 | 0.00 | 7.66 | -0.136 | 0.79 | 0.87 |
| With perfect knowledge | -1.84 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.799 | 0.11 | 2.22 |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | -0.22 | 0.72 | 0.80 | -24.865 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Constant | -29.82 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Santiago |  |  |  | Tuguegarao |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.36 | 0.20 | 1.43 | -0.10 | 0.87 | 0.90 |
| Age squared | -0.01 | 0.28 | 0.99 | 0.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.01 | 0.94 | 0.99 | 0.10 | 0.70 | 1.11 |
| High school or below | 0.99 | 0.15 | 2.68 | -0.47 | 0.85 | 0.63 |
| Not working | -0.18 | 0.81 | 0.83 | -0.74 | 0.74 | 0.48 |
| Bi-sexual | -0.03 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 2.51 | 0.31 | 12.28 |
| Engaged in anal sex | -20.95 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -2.29 | 0.24 | 0.10 |
| Preferred male sex partners | -1.86 | 0.24 | 0.16 | 3.72 | 0.40 | 41.29 |
| Preferred both male and female | -0.87 | 0.57 | 0.42 | 1.64 | 0.71 | 5.15 |
| Have sex with both male and female | -1.20 | 0.21 | 0.30 | 1.51 | 0.45 | 4.54 |
| Engaged in group sex | 0.16 | 0.83 | 1.18 | 3.63 | 0.10 | 37.86 |
| With multiple partners | 0.36 | 0.58 | 1.43 | -0.53 | 0.81 | 0.59 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | 0.15 | 0.81 | 1.16 | -0.55 | 0.77 | 0.58 |
| No HIV test | -0.95 | 0.39 | 0.39 | -2.37 | 0.49 | 0.09 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -0.29 | 0.62 | 0.75 | 0.54 | 0.84 | 1.71 |
| With perfect knowledge | -0.33 | 0.58 | 0.72 | 0.06 | 0.97 | 1.06 |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | -0.85 | 0.18 | 0.43 | -2.08 | 0.26 | 0.12 |
| Constant | -2.92 | 0.54 | 0.05 | -1.09 | 0.92 | 0.34 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Surigao |  |  |  | Caloocan |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |  |
| Age | 29.08 | 0.98 |  | 1.231 | 0.02 | 3.42 |  |
| Age squared | -0.10 | 1.00 | 0.903 | -0.017 | 0.02 | 0.98 |  |
| Age of sexual debut | -72.61 | 0.97 | 0.000 | -0.431 | 0.01 | 0.65 |  |
| High school or below | -410.75 | 0.97 | 0.000 | -0.622 | 0.53 | 0.54 |  |
| Not working | -142.73 | 0.97 | 0.000 | 1.624 | 0.18 | 5.08 |  |
| Bi-sexual | 217.89 | 1.00 |  | 0.999 | 0.41 | 2.71 |  |
| Engaged in anal sex | -20.22 | 0.99 | 0.000 | -2.154 | 0.04 | 0.12 |  |
| Preferred male sex partners | 492.24 | 0.99 |  | 22.171 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Preferred both male and female | 586.74 | 0.97 |  | -1.999 | 1.00 | 0.14 |  |
| Have sex with both male and female | 177.02 | 0.97 |  | 1.821 | 0.26 | 6.18 |  |
| Engaged in group sex | -471.22 | 0.97 | 0.000 | 2.555 | 0.06 | 12.88 |  |
| With multiple partners | 212.50 | 0.97 |  | 1.560 | 0.22 | 4.76 |  |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -202.05 | 0.97 | 0.000 | 2.781 | 0.03 | 16.14 |  |
| No HIV test | 603.01 | 0.99 |  | 1.099 | 0.54 | 3.00 |  |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 26.39 | 1.00 |  | -0.958 | 0.35 | 0.38 |  |
| With perfect knowledge | 91.65 | 0.98 |  | 1.580 | 0.15 | 4.86 |  |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | -247.99 | 0.97 | 0.000 | 2.315 | 0.09 | 10.13 |  |
| Constant | -676.76 | 0.99 | 0.000 | -43.082 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Makati |  | Mandaluyong |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |  |
| Age | -0.10 | 0.75 | 0.90 | -0.15 | 0.43 | 0.86 |  |
| Age squared | 0.00 | 0.89 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.43 | 1.00 |  |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.08 | 0.46 | 0.92 | -0.08 | 0.34 | 0.93 |  |
| High school or below | 0.58 | 0.45 | 1.78 | -0.69 | 0.22 | 0.50 |  |
| Not working | -1.17 | 0.09 | 0.31 | 1.65 | 0.01 | 5.23 |  |
| Bi-sexual | 1.80 | 0.05 | 6.06 | -0.30 | 0.80 | 0.74 |  |
| Engaged in anal sex | -36.06 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.82 | 1.40 |  |
| Preferred male sex partners | 2.59 | 0.27 | 13.38 | 0.25 | 0.81 | 1.28 |  |
| Preferred both male and female | 1.36 | 0.56 | 3.89 | 0.88 | 0.34 | 2.41 |  |
| Have sex with both male and female | -0.88 | 0.34 | 0.41 | -0.03 | 0.97 | 0.97 |  |
| Engaged in group sex | 0.29 | 0.78 | 1.33 | 1.60 | 0.01 | 4.94 |  |
| With multiple partners | 0.05 | 0.96 | 1.05 | -1.18 | 0.05 | 0.31 |  |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -20.55 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 20.71 | 1.00 |  |  |
| No HIV test | 0.10 | 0.92 | 1.11 | 0.48 | 0.62 | 1.62 |  |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -1.13 | 0.09 | 0.32 | 0.16 | 0.79 | 1.17 |  |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.08 | 0.31 | -1.44 | 0.01 | 0.24 |  |  |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | -1.16 | 1.00 |  | -17.92 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Constant |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.18 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Manila |  |  |  | Marikina |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |  |
| Age | 0.27 | 0.35 | 1.31 | 0.38 | 0.55 | 1.47 |  |
| Age squared | -0.01 | 0.30 | 0.99 | -0.01 | 0.41 | 0.99 |  |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.01 | 0.82 | 0.99 | 0.04 | 0.81 | 1.04 |  |
| High school or below | 0.12 | 0.79 | 1.13 | 1.54 | 0.11 | 4.68 |  |
| Not working | -0.04 | 0.92 | 0.96 | -5.85 | 0.01 | 0.00 |  |
| Bi-sexual | -1.27 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 7.56 | 0.02 |  |  |
| Engaged in anal sex | -2.49 | 0.00 | 0.08 | -4.33 | 0.00 | 0.01 |  |
| Preferred male sex partners | 17.20 | 1.00 |  | 3.74 | 0.31 | 42.04 |  |
| Preferred both male and female | 17.95 | 1.00 |  | -5.11 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |
| Have sex with both male and female | 0.60 | 0.15 | 1.82 | 2.85 | 0.20 | 17.35 |  |
| Engaged in group sex | 0.45 | 0.28 | 1.57 | 1.41 | 0.21 | 4.11 |  |
| With multiple partners | -0.04 | 0.93 | 0.96 | 3.46 | 0.10 | 31.88 |  |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -1.22 | 0.01 | 0.30 | 1.61 | 0.15 | 5.01 |  |
| No HIV test | 1.40 | 0.06 | 4.05 | -0.27 | 0.88 | 0.76 |  |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 0.12 | 0.77 | 1.13 | 3.98 | 0.02 | 53.49 |  |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.18 | 0.59 | 1.20 | 1.28 | 0.17 | 3.60 |  |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | -0.23 | 0.52 | 0.79 | -0.38 | 0.70 | 0.68 |  |
| Constant | -21.33 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -12.72 | 0.14 | 0.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Pasig |  |  | Pasay |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.92 | 0.27 | 0.40 | 1.06 | 0.40 | 2.87 |
| Age squared | 0.01 | 0.30 | 1.01 | -0.02 | 0.38 | 0.98 |
| Age of sexual debut | 0.22 | 0.28 | 1.25 | -0.03 | 0.88 | 0.97 |
| High school or below | -4.18 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.69 | 0.61 | 1.99 |
| Not working | -1.78 | 0.31 | 0.17 | 1.41 | 0.36 | 4.10 |
| Bi-sexual | -1.15 | 0.58 | 0.32 | -18.87 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in anal sex | -37.28 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -1.78 | 0.26 | 0.17 |
| Preferred male sex partners | -14.02 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -15.90 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Preferred both male and female | -13.18 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -2.31 | 1.00 | 0.10 |
| Have sex with both male and female | -20.06 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -15.56 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in group sex | 1.96 | 0.23 | 7.08 | 4.33 | 0.19 | 76.15 |
| With multiple partners | 37.34 | 1.00 |  | -1.80 | 0.27 | 0.17 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -2.31 | 0.13 | 0.10 | 1.27 | 0.51 | 3.58 |
| No HIV test | -20.90 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.90 | 1.00 | 0.41 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 1.79 | 0.36 | 6.00 | -0.76 | 0.56 | 0.47 |
| With perfect knowledge | -3.21 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 1.93 |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | 1.18 | 0.43 | 3.26 | 1.30 | 0.59 | 3.66 |
| Constant | 29.39 | 1.00 |  | 0.57 | 1.00 | 1.77 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Quezon City |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.65 | 0.33 | 1.91 |
| Age squared | -0.01 | 0.44 | 0.99 |
| Age of sexual debut | -0.05 | 0.52 | 0.95 |
| High school or below | -0.69 | 0.16 | 0.50 |
| Not working | -0.81 | 0.19 | 0.45 |
| Bi-sexual | 1.95 | 0.00 | 7.01 |
| Engaged in anal sex | -2.79 | 0.00 | 0.06 |
| Preferred male sex partners | -0.07 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Preferred both male and female | -1.17 | 0.12 | 0.31 |
| Have sex with both male and female | -1.22 | 0.19 | 0.30 |
| Engaged in group sex | 0.43 | 0.41 | 1.53 |
| With multiple partners | 1.96 | 0.02 | 7.13 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -0.11 | 0.83 | 0.90 |
| No HIV test | 0.81 | 0.18 | 2.24 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -1.16 | 0.04 | 0.31 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.69 | 0.27 | 2.00 |
| Reached with less than 2 interventions | 0.38 | 0.50 | 1.46 |
| Constant | 0.23 | 0.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Determinants of MSM who engaged in group sex, Logistic Regression Results with Considered Variables Taken Simultaneously by Sentinel Sites, 2009 IHBSS MSM Dataset

| Explanatory Variables | Baguio |  |  |  | Butuan |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 1.28 | 0.03 | 3.59 | 0.08 | 0.86 | 1.08 |
| Age Squared | -0.02 | 0.03 | 0.98 | 0.00 | 0.98 | 1.00 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.52 | 0.05 | 0.60 | -0.08 | 0.62 | 0.92 |
| Not working | 0.27 | 0.81 | 1.31 | -0.77 | 0.30 | 0.46 |
| High School or Below | -0.94 | 0.35 | 0.39 | -1.02 | 0.18 | 0.36 |
| Use condom last anal sex | 3.87 | 0.01 | 47.71 | 0.05 | 0.94 | 1.05 |
| Engaged in recent female Sex | -0.72 | 0.61 | 0.49 | -0.39 | 0.62 | 0.68 |
| With perfect knowledge | -3.03 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 1.61 | 0.04 | 5.00 |
| Non user of lubricant | 3.42 | 0.01 | 30.56 | 0.09 | 0.90 | 1.09 |
| No HIV test | 1.36 | 0.48 | 3.90 | 1.61 | 0.57 | 5.01 |
| With Multiple partners | -25.22 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -20.24 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in sex in exchange of cash | -0.52 | 0.69 | 0.60 | 0.06 | 0.94 | 1.06 |
| Preferred Male sex partners | -0.87 | 0.65 | 0.42 | -1.61 | 0.17 | 0.20 |
| Preferred both male and female | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | -1.72 | 0.05 | 0.18 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -2.55 | 0.21 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.76 | 1.31 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 3.47 | 0.06 | 32.28 | -0.05 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Constant | -14.40 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 1.29 | 0.83 | 3.64 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Cebu |  |  |  |  | Davao |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.12 | 0.65 | 1.13 | 0.33 | 0.40 | 1.39 |
| Age Squared | 0.00 | 0.72 | 1.00 | -0.01 | 0.34 | 0.99 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.10 | 0.13 | 0.91 | 0.05 | 0.58 | 1.05 |
| Not working | 0.40 | 0.33 | 1.49 | 0.88 | 0.13 | 2.41 |
| High School or Below | 0.95 | 0.05 | 2.58 | 1.27 | 0.02 | 3.54 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -0.05 | 0.90 | 0.95 | 0.18 | 0.78 | 1.20 |
| Engaged in recent female Sex | 0.40 | 0.48 | 1.50 | -0.10 | 0.93 | 0.91 |
| With perfect knowledge | -1.96 | 0.05 | 0.14 | -0.85 | 0.29 | 0.43 |
| Non user of lubricant | -0.11 | 0.79 | 0.89 | 0.05 | 0.94 | 1.05 |
| No HIV test | -0.56 | 0.70 | 0.57 | 2.87 | 0.12 | 17.65 |
| With Multiple partners | -21.04 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -19.57 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in sex in exchange of cash | 0.25 | 0.61 | 1.29 | 0.25 | 0.65 | 1.28 |
| Preferred Male sex partners | -0.11 | 0.86 | 0.90 | -1.50 | 0.32 | 0.22 |
| Preferred both male and female | -1.60 | 0.03 | 0.20 | -3.03 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 1.14 | 0.01 | 3.13 | -0.35 | 0.49 | 0.70 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -0.54 | 0.19 | 0.58 | -0.59 | 0.27 | 0.55 |
| Constant | 1.92 | 0.57 | 6.82 | -2.70 | 0.60 | 0.07 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | General Santos |  |  | Puerto Galera |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.81 | 0.36 | 0.45 | 2.76 | 0.13 | 15.86 |
| Age Squared | 0.02 | 0.26 | 1.02 | -0.05 | 0.13 | 0.95 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.44 | 0.02 | 0.64 | -0.16 | 0.66 | 0.85 |
| Not working | -0.22 | 0.81 | 0.80 | 1.62 | 0.28 | 5.06 |
| High School or Below | 1.51 | 0.16 | 4.51 | -2.43 | 0.11 | 0.09 |
| Use condom last anal sex | 1.57 | 0.11 | 4.80 | -15.85 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in recent female Sex | -0.26 | 0.78 | 0.77 | 19.32 | 1.00 |  |
| With perfect knowledge | 5.31 | 0.00 | 203.01 | 1.19 | 0.33 | 3.28 |
| Non user of lubricant | -0.09 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 68.29 | 1.00 |  |
| No HIV test | -4.28 | 0.09 | 0.01 | -26.47 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| With Multiple partners | -31.99 | 0.99 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Engaged in sex in exchange of cash | -4.53 | 0.07 | 0.01 |  | 0.09 |  |
| Preferred Male sex partners | 3.21 | 0.12 | 24.85 | 26.87 | 1.00 |  |
| Preferred both male and female | 1.11 | 0.43 | 3.03 | 12.92 | 1.00 |  |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 1.15 | 0.32 | 3.17 | 2.51 | 0.07 | 12.30 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 1.66 | 0.05 | 5.26 | -0.72 | 0.64 | 0.49 |
| Constant | 6.06 | 0.54 | 426.92 | -80.52 | 0.99 | 0.00 |


| Explanatory Variables | Santiago |  |  |  | Tuguegarao |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.43 | 0.57 | 0.65 | -18.91 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Age Squared | 0.01 | 0.65 | 1.01 | 0.46 | 1.00 | 1.59 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.09 | 0.72 | 0.92 | -30.23 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Not working | 0.45 | 0.82 | 1.56 | -10.33 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| High School or Below | -2.02 | 0.32 | 0.13 | 99.80 | 1.00 |  |
| Use condom last anal sex | 1.77 | 0.35 | 5.85 | 39.48 | 1.00 |  |
| Engaged in recent female Sex | 2.55 | 0.73 | 12.79 | 22.90 | 1.00 |  |
| With perfect knowledge | -0.72 | 0.66 | 0.49 | 89.40 | 1.00 |  |
| Non user of lubricant | 2.77 | 0.21 | 15.97 | 104.25 | 1.00 |  |
| No HIV test | 3.29 | 0.22 | 26.79 | 206.06 | 1.00 |  |
| With Multiple partners | -23.30 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -31.66 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in sex in exchange of cash | -3.68 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 220.82 | 1.00 |  |
| Preferred Male sex partners | 0.92 | 0.90 | 2.50 | 8.90 | 1.00 |  |
| Preferred both male and female | 16.46 | 1.00 |  | 1.24 | 1.00 | 3.47 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 2.07 | 0.25 | 7.92 | -135.80 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 2.67 | 0.13 | 14.46 | -31.93 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Constant | -12.89 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 273.75 | 1.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Zamboanga |  |  |  | Caloocan |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.63 | 0.11 | 1.87 | -71.53 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Age Squared | -0.01 | 0.12 | 0.99 | 0.93 | 1.00 | 2.53 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.19 | 0.13 | 0.83 | -3.28 | 1.00 | 0.04 |
| Not working | -0.01 | 0.98 | 0.99 | 290.98 | 1.00 |  |
| High School or Below | -0.78 | 0.23 | 0.46 | -0.60 | 1.00 | 0.55 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -1.63 | 0.01 | 0.20 | 172.23 | 1.00 |  |
| Engaged in recent female Sex | -0.69 | 0.26 | 0.50 | -138.70 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| With perfect knowledge | -0.29 | 0.61 | 0.75 | -84.25 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Non user of lubricant | 1.57 | 0.02 | 4.81 | 44.67 | 1.00 |  |
| No HIV test | 0.88 | 0.23 | 2.41 | -331.32 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| With Multiple partners | -19.17 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -47.28 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in sex in exchange of cash | 0.45 | 0.63 | 1.57 | -39.07 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Preferred Male sex partners | 0.84 | 0.42 | 2.32 | 103.65 | 1.00 |  |
| Preferred both male and female | 1.40 | 0.12 | 4.07 | -13.58 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 0.46 | 0.43 | 1.59 | 68.85 | 1.00 |  |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -0.33 | 0.66 | 0.72 | -84.43 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Constant | -7.86 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 961.64 | 1.00 | . |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Makati |  |  | Mandaluyong |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 2.12 | 0.18 | 8.32 | -1.07 | 0.19 | 0.34 |
| Age Squared | -0.04 | 0.16 | 0.96 | 0.02 | 0.14 | 1.02 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.16 | 0.42 | 0.85 | -0.16 | 0.53 | 0.86 |
| Not working | -3.26 | 0.25 | 0.04 | -0.56 | 0.78 | 0.57 |
| High School or Below | -4.10 | 0.19 | 0.02 | 3.04 | 0.06 | 20.98 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -4.69 | 0.15 | 0.01 | 1.67 | 0.26 | 5.29 |
| Engaged in recent female Sex | -2.93 | 0.31 | 0.05 | -20.20 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| With perfect knowledge | 4.32 | 0.16 | 74.83 | -0.56 | 0.69 | 0.57 |
| Non user of lubricant | 0.29 | 0.90 | 1.34 | -1.79 | 0.26 | 0.17 |
| No HIV test | 3.68 | 0.29 | 39.84 | 40.34 | 1.00 |  |
| With Multiple partners | -25.99 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -40.71 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in sex in exchange of cash | 0.89 | 0.66 | 2.43 | 0.21 | 0.87 | 1.24 |
| Preferred Male sex partners | 1.39 | 0.70 | 4.00 | 22.38 | 1.00 |  |
| Preferred both male and female | -3.47 | 0.40 | 0.03 | 40.64 | 1.00 |  |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 4.08 | 0.20 | 59.18 | -1.20 | 0.35 | 0.30 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -6.53 | 0.16 | 0.00 | -0.15 | 0.93 | 0.86 |
| Constant | -17.41 | 0.36 | 0.00 | -25.27 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Manila |  |  |  | Marikina |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 1.65 | 0.22 | 5.23 | -10.22 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Age Squared | -0.03 | 0.20 | 0.97 | 0.13 | 1.00 | 1.14 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.57 | 0.06 | 0.57 | -0.82 | 1.00 | 0.44 |
| Not working | 0.25 | 0.90 | 1.29 | 37.02 | 1.00 |  |
| High School or Below | 0.87 | 0.69 | 2.38 | 31.46 | 1.00 |  |
| Use condom last anal sex | 1.34 | 0.36 | 3.82 | 89.82 | 1.00 |  |
| Engaged in recent female Sex | 1.11 | 0.54 | 3.04 | -76.50 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| With perfect knowledge | 2.84 | 0.19 | 17.09 | -72.91 | 0.99 | 0.00 |
| Non user of lubricant | -0.94 | 0.71 | 0.39 | -30.37 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| No HIV test |  |  |  | 25.37 | 1.00 |  |
| With Multiple partners | -23.30 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -34.87 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in sex in exchange of cash | -2.29 | 0.35 | 0.10 | 38.64 | 1.00 |  |
| Preferred Male sex partners | -18.80 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -26.27 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Preferred both male and female | -19.59 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 13.97 | 1.00 |  |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -1.40 | 0.37 | 0.25 | -56.78 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -2.74 | 0.27 | 0.06 | 166.27 | 0.99 |  |
| Constant | 7.49 | 1.00 | $1,788.87$ | -3.75 | 1.00 | 0.02 |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Pasig |  |  | Surigao |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 9.94 | 1.00 |  | 58.59 | 1.00 |  |
| Age Squared | -0.13 | 1.00 | 0.88 | -1.06 | 1.00 | 0.35 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.36 | 1.00 | 1.44 | -22.03 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Not working | 59.56 | 1.00 |  | 14.17 | 1.00 |  |
| High School or Below | 43.20 | 1.00 |  | 14.05 | 1.00 |  |
| Use condom last anal sex | 28.46 | 1.00 |  | 20.66 | 1.00 |  |
| Engaged in recent female Sex | 34.84 | 1.00 |  | -57.33 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| With perfect knowledge | -98.87 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 5.14 | 1.00 | 169.89 |
| Non user of lubricant | -7.12 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -157.03 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| No HIV test | -8.71 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -28.17 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| With Multiple partners | -64.81 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -42.88 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in sex in exchange of cash | 95.21 | 1.00 |  | 175.30 | 0.99 |  |
| Preferred Male sex partners | 350.13 | 1.00 |  | 66.22 | 1.00 |  |
| Preferred both male and female | 279.88 | 1.00 |  | 38.97 | 1.00 |  |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 72.18 | 1.00 |  | -5.02 | 1.00 | 0.01 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 30.95 | 1.00 |  | -602.31 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Constant | -612.14 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Quezon City |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 2.00 | 0.02 | 7.41 |
| Age Squared | -0.04 | 0.03 | 0.96 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.20 | 0.04 | 0.82 |
| Not working | -0.03 | 0.95 | 0.97 |
| High School or Below | 0.04 | 0.94 | 1.04 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -0.83 | 0.13 | 0.44 |
| Engaged in recent female Sex | 0.49 | 0.59 | 1.63 |
| With perfect knowledge | -0.26 | 0.63 | 0.77 |
| Non user of lubricant | 0.28 | 0.60 | 1.33 |
| No HIV test | 0.69 | 0.23 | 1.99 |
| With Multiple partners | -20.86 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in sex in exchange of cash | 21.75 | 1.00 |  |
| Preferred Male sex partners | -2.22 | 0.09 | 0.11 |
| Preferred both male and female | -2.94 | 0.00 | 0.05 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 0.73 | 0.24 | 2.07 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -0.54 | 0.41 | 0.58 |
| Constant | -39.35 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |

Have sex in exchange of cash, Logistic Regression Results with Considered Variables Taken Simultaneously by Sentinel Sites, 2009 IHBSS MSM Dataset

| Explanatory Variables | Baguio |  |  | Butuan |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Logit Coefficients | Pvalue | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit Coefficients | Pvalue | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.45 | 0.36 | 0.64 | 0.04 | 0.91 | 1.04 |
| Age Squared | 0.01 | 0.48 | 1.01 | 0.00 | 0.82 | 1.00 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.22 | 0.30 | 0.80 | 0.16 | 0.13 | 1.18 |
| Not working | -1.98 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.26 | 0.58 | 1.30 |
| High School or Below | 1.68 | 0.09 | 5.37 | 0.14 | 0.77 | 1.15 |
| Use condom last anal sex | 0.69 | 0.53 | 2.00 | 0.73 | 0.10 | 2.08 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | 0.22 | 0.88 | 1.25 | 0.65 | 0.17 | 1.91 |
| With perfect knowledge | 2.21 | 0.07 | 9.10 | 0.41 | 0.46 | 1.50 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 0.05 | 0.97 | 1.05 | 0.13 | 0.83 | 1.14 |
| Non user of lubricant | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.04 | 0.94 | 1.04 |
| No HIV test | -1.21 | 0.39 | 0.30 | -0.25 | 0.85 | 0.78 |
| With Multiple partners | -2.20 | 0.08 | 0.11 | -1.49 | 0.01 | 0.23 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | 5.32 | 0.02 | 205.34 | 1.08 | 0.17 | 2.95 |
| Prefer both male and female | 4.76 | 0.01 | 116.99 | -0.36 | 0.57 | 0.70 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 0.84 | 0.57 | 2.33 | 1.22 | 0.03 | 3.37 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 1.75 | 0.20 | 5.74 | -0.51 | 0.30 | 0.60 |
| Constant | 4.94 | 0.55 | 139.42 | -5.46 | 0.18 | 0.00 |


| Explanatory Variables | Cebu |  |  |  |  | Davao |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.09 | 0.70 | 0.91 | -0.17 | 0.52 | 0.84 |
| Age Squared | 0.00 | 0.92 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.90 | 1.00 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.09 | 0.21 | 1.09 | 0.05 | 0.43 | 1.06 |
| Not working | 0.20 | 0.65 | 1.22 | -0.77 | 0.10 | 0.46 |
| High School or Below | -0.65 | 0.15 | 0.52 | -0.20 | 0.70 | 0.82 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -0.42 | 0.32 | 0.66 | 0.29 | 0.58 | 1.33 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | 0.71 | 0.27 | 2.04 | 1.64 | 0.13 | 5.16 |
| With perfect knowledge | 1.10 | 0.16 | 3.00 | -0.88 | 0.25 | 0.42 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | -0.18 | 0.71 | 0.84 | -0.24 | 0.67 | 0.78 |
| Non user of lubricant | -0.37 | 0.39 | 0.69 | 0.28 | 0.57 | 1.33 |
| No HIV test | -0.16 | 0.88 | 0.85 | 1.67 | 0.22 | 5.29 |
| With Multiple partners | -0.29 | 0.68 | 0.75 | -1.05 | 0.15 | 0.35 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -0.22 | 0.75 | 0.80 | 1.57 | 0.24 | 4.82 |
| Prefer both male and female | 0.86 | 0.19 | 2.37 | 2.13 | 0.13 | 8.44 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -0.88 | 0.06 | 0.42 | -0.04 | 0.93 | 0.96 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -0.72 | 0.09 | 0.49 | -1.00 | 0.03 | 0.37 |
| Constant | 1.42 | 0.65 | 4.12 | 3.00 | 0.42 | 20.04 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | General Santos |  | Puerto Galera |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.58 | 0.44 | 1.78 | 0.90 | 0.06 | 2.47 |
| Age Squared | -0.02 | 0.33 | 0.98 | -0.01 | 0.09 | 0.99 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.36 | 0.02 | 1.43 | -0.15 | 0.42 | 0.86 |
| Not working | 0.45 | 0.56 | 1.57 | 0.24 | 0.84 | 1.27 |
| High School or Below | -2.43 | 0.00 | 0.09 | -0.49 | 0.68 | 0.61 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -1.28 | 0.07 | 0.28 | 3.59 | 0.05 | 36.09 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -1.03 | 0.29 | 0.36 | 1.88 | 0.10 | 6.58 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.19 | 0.81 | 1.21 |  |  |  |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 0.93 | 0.41 | 2.54 |  |  |  |
| Non user of lubricant | 1.51 | 0.13 | 4.54 | -18.71 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| No HIV test | -3.77 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.29 | 0.79 | 1.33 |
| With Multiple partners | -2.45 | 0.01 | 0.09 | -24.47 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | 3.44 | 0.00 | 31.11 | -3.41 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
| Prefer both male and female | 1.78 | 0.06 | 5.92 | -1.27 | 0.41 | 0.28 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -0.45 | 0.54 | 0.64 | -2.02 | 0.08 | 0.13 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -0.55 | 0.48 | 0.58 | 0.70 | 0.62 | 2.01 |
| Constant | -9.31 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 8.52 | 1.00 | $5,011.48$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Santiago |  |  |  | Tuguegarao |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -1.02 | 0.15 | 0.36 | -0.79 | 0.13 | 0.45 |
| Age Squared | 0.02 | 0.20 | 1.02 | 0.01 | 0.30 | 1.01 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.43 | 0.17 | 1.54 | -0.01 | 0.94 | 0.99 |
| Not working | -1.41 | 0.34 | 0.24 | 0.72 | 0.49 | 2.05 |
| High School or Below | -0.47 | 0.73 | 0.62 | 0.73 | 0.48 | 2.08 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -0.53 | 0.69 | 0.59 | 0.68 | 0.54 | 1.97 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -2.11 | 0.43 | 0.12 | 1.45 | 0.26 | 4.27 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.38 | 0.74 | 1.46 | 1.37 | 0.17 | 3.92 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 3.07 | 0.12 | 21.56 | -0.95 | 0.44 | 0.39 |
| Non user of lubricant | 5.07 | 0.01 | 159.20 | 2.58 | 0.06 | 13.18 |
| No HIV test | 4.69 | 0.04 | 108.51 | -2.62 | 0.06 | 0.07 |
| With Multiple partners | -2.43 | 0.16 | 0.09 | -6.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | 9.98 | 0.05 |  | 3.18 | 0.07 | 24.04 |
| Prefer both male and female | 3.40 | 0.30 | 29.99 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 2.03 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -1.84 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 3.70 | 0.02 | 40.36 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -1.76 | 0.16 | 0.17 | 1.29 | 0.44 | 3.64 |
| Constant | 0.68 | 33.55 | 12.00 | 0.10 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Surigao |  |  | Caloocan |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |  |
| Age | -0.43 | 0.49 | 0.65 | -0.98 | 0.15 | 0.37 |  |
| Age Squared | 0.01 | 0.50 | 1.01 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 1.02 |  |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.17 | 0.31 | 1.18 | -0.06 | 0.82 | 0.94 |  |
| Not working | -0.01 | 0.99 | 0.99 | -3.26 | 0.12 | 0.04 |  |
| High School or Below | -0.38 | 0.63 | 0.68 | 0.79 | 0.57 | 2.21 |  |
| Use condom last anal sex | 0.38 | 0.61 | 1.46 | -0.77 | 0.69 | 0.46 |  |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -0.65 | 0.46 | 0.52 | 6.06 | 0.10 | 430.41 |  |
| With perfect knowledge | -0.92 | 0.28 | 0.40 | -0.05 | 0.98 | 0.95 |  |
| Engaged in grouped sex | -1.03 | 0.42 | 0.36 | -0.42 | 0.85 | 0.66 |  |
| Non user of lubricant | 1.92 | 0.05 | 6.83 | 0.60 | 0.76 | 1.82 |  |
| No HIV test | -0.58 | 0.58 | 0.56 | 7.59 | 0.06 |  |  |
| With Multiple partners | -0.23 | 0.84 | 0.79 | -3.44 | 0.20 | 0.03 |  |
| Feel invincible with HIV | 0.48 | 0.58 | 1.62 | 1.26 | 0.71 | 3.51 |  |
| Prefer both male and female | -0.18 | 0.80 | 0.83 | 3.29 | 0.34 | 26.93 |  |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions |  |  |  | -1.57 | 0.37 | 0.21 |  |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -0.12 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 3.73 | 0.15 | 41.70 |  |
| Constant | 0.48 | 165.64 | 8.80 | 0.47 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Makati |  | Mandaluyong |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.27 | 0.54 | 1.31 | 0.03 | 0.91 | 1.03 |
| Age Squared | 0.00 | 0.49 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.15 | 0.41 | 1.16 | -0.09 | 0.35 | 0.91 |
| Not working | -1.90 | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.38 | 0.61 | 1.46 |
| High School or Below | 0.17 | 0.90 | 1.19 | -0.56 | 0.37 | 0.57 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -0.29 | 0.83 | 0.75 | 0.38 | 0.54 | 1.46 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | 1.32 | 0.47 | 3.73 | 0.17 | 0.86 | 1.19 |
| With perfect knowledge | -1.77 | 0.20 | 0.17 | -0.14 | 0.82 | 0.87 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | -0.91 | 0.50 | 0.40 | -0.51 | 0.57 | 0.60 |
| Non user of lubricant | -0.16 | 0.89 | 0.85 | 0.20 | 0.76 | 1.22 |
| No HIV test | 0.50 | 0.88 | 1.65 | -21.02 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| With Multiple partners | -0.34 | 0.78 | 0.71 | -0.59 | 0.47 | 0.55 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -1.42 | 0.51 | 0.24 | 2.27 | 0.02 | 9.71 |
| Prefer both male and female | 3.05 | 0.09 | 21.04 | 1.34 | 0.21 | 3.82 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -1.50 | 0.35 | 0.22 | 1.32 | 0.06 | 3.76 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -1.85 | 0.19 | 0.16 | -2.26 | 0.17 | 0.10 |
| Constant | -1.75 | 0.80 | 0.17 | 1.32 | 0.76 | 3.74 |


| Explanatory Variables | Manila |  |  |  | Marikina |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 9.99 | 0.15 |  | -29.24 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Age Squared | -0.19 | 0.14 | 0.83 | 0.43 | 1.00 | 1.54 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 3.68 | 0.17 | 39.62 | 10.17 | 1.00 |  |
| Not working | -9.42 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 15.90 | 1.00 |  |
| High School or Below | -35.03 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 4.19 | 1.00 | 65.72 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -9.96 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 33.69 | 1.00 |  |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -20.65 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 91.76 | 1.00 |  |
| With perfect knowledge | 4.19 | 0.55 | 65.71 | -26.50 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 15.82 | 0.14 |  | -53.63 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Non user of lubricant | 49.98 | 1.00 |  | 23.72 | 1.00 |  |
| No HIV test | -2.29 | 1.00 | 0.10 | 88.15 | 1.00 |  |
| With Multiple partners | 63.78 | 1.00 |  | 72.04 | 1.00 |  |
| Feel invincible with HIV | 62.91 | 1.00 |  | -26.57 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Prefer both male and female | 11.11 | 0.34 |  | -37.26 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -0.93 | 0.92 | 0.40 | -40.65 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -215.58 | 0.99 | 0.00 | 46.63 | 1.00 |  |
| Constant |  |  |  | 325.42 | 1.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Pasig |  | Quezon City |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 6.36 | 1.00 | 578.80 | -2.07 | 0.37 | 0.13 |
| Age Squared | -0.15 | 1.00 | 0.86 | 0.03 | 0.46 | 1.03 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -4.40 | 1.00 | 0.01 | 0.20 | 0.38 | 1.22 |
| Not working | -41.23 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -1.01 | 0.50 | 0.36 |
| High School or Below | -6.40 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.32 | 0.80 | 0.72 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -31.14 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.15 | 0.49 | 3.17 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | 78.49 | 1.00 |  | 5.19 | 0.02 | 179.58 |
| With perfect knowledge | 30.45 | 1.00 |  | -1.75 | 0.25 | 0.17 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | -43.37 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -18.47 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Non user of lubricant | 28.75 | 1.00 |  | 2.16 | 0.28 | 8.67 |
| No HIV test | -24.76 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 2.47 | 0.23 | 11.81 |
| With Multiple partners | -38.61 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 0.65 | 2.05 |
| Feel invincible with HIV | -65.33 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.74 | 0.71 | 0.48 |
| Prefer both male and female | -61.10 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -1.20 | 0.58 | 0.30 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -42.96 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -2.60 | 0.19 | 0.07 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 18.89 | 1.00 |  | -0.49 | 0.82 | 0.61 |
| Constant | 123.34 | 1.00 |  | 50.10 | 0.99 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Determinants of having multiple partners in any sex episode, Logistic Regression Results with Considered Variables Taken Simultaneously by Sentinel Sites, 2009 IHBSS MSM Dataset

| Explanatory Variables | Baguio |  |  |  | Butuan |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.02 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.19 | 0.66 | 1.20 |
| Age Squared | 0.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.75 | 1.00 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.30 | 0.06 | 1.35 | -0.41 | 0.01 | 0.66 |
| Not working | 0.67 | 0.38 | 1.96 | -0.98 | 0.12 | 0.37 |
| High School or Below | -0.06 | 0.94 | 0.95 | -1.09 | 0.10 | 0.34 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -0.26 | 0.78 | 0.77 | -0.32 | 0.60 | 0.72 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | 0.30 | 0.76 | 1.36 | 1.63 | 0.02 | 5.10 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.21 | 0.79 | 1.24 | -1.01 | 0.15 | 0.36 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 20.69 | 1.00 |  | 20.60 | 1.00 |  |
| Non user of lubricant | -0.12 | 0.91 | 0.89 | 3.47 | 0.00 | 32.22 |
| No HIV test | 0.45 | 0.68 | 1.56 | -4.44 | 0.10 | 0.01 |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | 1.63 | 0.13 | 5.12 | 1.53 | 0.02 | 4.60 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | -2.66 | 0.04 | 0.07 | -1.25 | 0.32 | 0.29 |
| Prefer both male and female | -0.71 | 0.46 | 0.49 | -0.07 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -0.96 | 0.33 | 0.38 | 0.32 | 0.69 | 1.38 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -1.70 | 0.11 | 0.18 | 1.75 | 0.02 | 5.75 |
| Constant | -1.57 | 0.79 | 0.21 | 3.28 | 0.51 | 26.45 |


| Explanatory Variables | Cebu |  |  |  |  | Davao |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.21 | 0.54 | 1.23 | -0.28 | 0.35 | 0.75 |
| Age Squared | -0.01 | 0.34 | 0.99 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 1.00 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.23 | 0.07 | 0.79 | -0.05 | 0.63 | 0.95 |
| Not working | 0.76 | 0.29 | 2.15 | 0.62 | 0.37 | 1.85 |
| High School or Below | -0.01 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.03 | 0.97 | 1.03 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -0.05 | 0.94 | 0.95 | 0.38 | 0.57 | 1.46 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -0.64 | 0.42 | 0.53 | -0.23 | 0.84 | 0.79 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.63 | 0.68 | 1.89 | 0.82 | 0.36 | 2.27 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 21.06 | 1.00 |  | 19.61 | 1.00 |  |
| Non user of lubricant | 0.53 | 0.47 | 1.70 | 0.93 | 0.24 | 2.54 |
| No HIV test | -2.74 | 0.29 | 0.06 | -3.03 | 0.11 | 0.05 |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | 0.42 | 0.59 | 1.53 | 0.73 | 0.31 | 2.07 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | -1.72 | 0.06 | 0.18 | -2.16 | 0.09 | 0.12 |
| Prefer both male and female | -0.54 | 0.58 | 0.58 | -2.32 | 0.19 | 0.10 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -0.24 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.38 | 0.54 | 1.47 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -0.77 | 0.26 | 0.46 | -0.64 | 0.34 | 0.53 |
| Constant | 4.33 | 0.33 | 76.20 | 8.24 | 0.08 |  |


| Explanatory Variables | General Santos |  |  |  | Puerto Galera |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.14 | 0.67 | 1.15 | -0.34 | 0.32 | 0.71 |
| Age Squared | 0.00 | 0.81 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.43 | 1.00 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.18 | 0.12 | 0.84 | -0.27 | 0.15 | 0.76 |
| Not working | -0.52 | 0.24 | 0.60 | 0.49 | 0.54 | 1.64 |
| High School or Below | 1.01 | 0.06 | 2.74 | -0.81 | 0.31 | 0.45 |
| Use condom last anal sex | 0.36 | 0.43 | 1.43 | -2.38 | 0.04 | 0.09 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | 0.80 | 0.09 | 2.22 | 0.25 | 0.77 | 1.29 |
| With perfect knowledge | -0.26 | 0.56 | 0.77 | 19.14 | 1.00 |  |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 21.65 | 1.00 |  | 0.13 | 0.87 | 1.14 |
| Non user of lubricant | 0.80 | 0.09 | 2.23 |  |  |  |
| No HIV test | 2.80 | 0.07 | 16.48 |  |  |  |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | 1.98 | 0.01 | 7.22 | -17.16 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | -1.21 | 0.07 | 0.30 | 2.61 | 0.00 | 13.57 |
| Prefer both male and female | -0.89 | 0.23 | 0.41 | 0.14 | 0.89 | 1.16 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -0.28 | 0.58 | 0.75 | 1.41 | 0.10 | 4.10 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 0.04 | 0.93 | 1.04 | 0.88 | 0.43 | 2.42 |
| Constant | -0.54 | 0.89 | 0.58 | 8.39 | 0.14 |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Santiago |  |  |  | Tuguegarao |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -2.72 | 0.08 | 0.07 | -6.29 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Age Squared | 0.05 | 0.07 | 1.06 | 0.16 | 1.00 | 1.17 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.28 | 0.15 | 1.32 | 34.96 | 1.00 |  |
| Not working | 0.75 | 0.62 | 2.12 | 214.03 | 1.00 |  |
| High School or Below | 3.09 | 0.08 | 21.99 | -101.79 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Use condom last anal sex | 1.21 | 0.29 | 3.35 | -33.02 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | 2.31 | 0.22 | 10.07 | 180.12 | 1.00 |  |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.27 | 0.81 | 1.31 | 112.18 | 1.00 |  |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 21.79 | 1.00 |  | 247.59 | 1.00 |  |
| Non user of lubricant | -0.01 | 0.99 | 0.99 | -103.77 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| No HIV test | -3.54 | 0.26 | 0.03 | 398.99 | 1.00 |  |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | 1.62 | 0.33 | 5.03 | -239.93 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | -1.98 | 0.20 | 0.14 | -3.84 | 1.00 | 0.02 |
| Prefer both male and female | 4.03 | 0.07 | 56.28 | 1.06 | 1.00 | 2.88 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 1.94 | 0.17 | 6.98 | -75.01 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 1.93 | 0.19 | 6.88 | 33.89 | 1.00 |  |
| Constant | 19.48 | 0.20 |  | -495.97 | 1.00 | 0.00 |


| Explanatory Variables | Zamboanga |  |  |  | Caloocan |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 0.51 | 0.47 | 1.66 | 12.16 | 1.00 |  |
| Age Squared | -0.01 | 0.68 | 0.99 | -0.14 | 1.00 | 0.87 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.46 | 0.17 | 1.58 | 8.41 | 1.00 |  |
| Not working | 0.54 | 0.61 | 1.71 | -37.75 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| High School or Below | -1.32 | 0.26 | 0.27 | 59.43 | 1.00 |  |
| Use condom last anal sex | -1.32 | 0.32 | 0.27 | -43.44 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -0.07 | 0.96 | 0.94 | 148.08 | 1.00 |  |
| With perfect knowledge | -0.56 | 0.60 | 0.57 | 47.09 | 1.00 |  |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 17.48 | 1.00 | 38,947, | 45.36 | 1.00 |  |
| Non user of lubricant | 0.41 | 0.75 | 1.51 | -44.43 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| No HIV test | 3.54 | 0.15 | 34.39 | -49.56 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | 7.80 | 0.01 | $2,438.75$ | -0.08 | 1.00 | 0.92 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | -3.82 | 0.14 | 0.02 | 19.37 | 1.00 |  |
| Prefer both male and female | -0.61 | 0.64 | 0.54 | 175.70 | 1.00 |  |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -1.10 | 0.32 | 0.33 | -26.93 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 0.97 | 0.44 | 2.63 | -41.12 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Constant | -13.84 | 0.09 | 0.00 | -401.667 | 0.999 | 0.000 |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Makati |  |  | Mandaluyong |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.30 | 0.54 | 0.74 | 0.08 | 0.85 | 1.08 |
| Age Squared | 0.00 | 0.56 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.82 | 1.00 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.10 | 0.65 | 0.91 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 |
| Not working | -0.82 | 0.53 | 0.44 | 1.23 | 0.23 | 3.42 |
| High School or Below | -1.34 | 0.34 | 0.26 | -0.50 | 0.65 | 0.60 |
| Use condom last anal sex | -0.31 | 0.80 | 0.73 | 0.22 | 0.80 | 1.25 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | 0.33 | 0.85 | 1.39 | -2.29 | 0.06 | 0.10 |
| With perfect knowledge | 2.22 | 0.05 | 9.24 | 2.35 | 0.01 | 10.54 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 20.02 | 1.00 |  | 22.38 | 1.00 |  |
| Non user of lubricant | 0.49 | 0.70 | 1.63 | 2.95 | 0.01 | 19.04 |
| No HIV test | 20.53 | 1.00 |  | -20.21 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | 0.12 | 0.92 | 1.13 | 0.03 | 0.97 | 1.03 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | -0.97 | 0.61 | 0.38 | -1.63 | 0.28 | 0.19 |
| Prefer both male and female | 0.53 | 0.78 | 1.70 | -1.74 | 0.29 | 0.18 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 0.57 | 0.69 | 1.76 | -0.35 | 0.76 | 0.70 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 1.10 | 0.50 | 3.00 | -1.08 | 0.59 | 0.34 |
| Constant | 0.530 | 193.022 | 0.221 | 0.970 | 1.247 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Manila |  |  |  | Marikina |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.73 | 19.04 | 1.00 |  |
| Age Squared | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | -0.37 | 1.00 | 0.69 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 3.43 | 1.00 | 30.99 | -0.23 | 1.00 | 0.80 |
| Not working | -16.48 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -83.09 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| High School or Below | -14.17 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 5.27 | 1.00 | 194.99 |
| Use condom last anal sex | 3.26 | 1.00 | 25.93 | -61.86 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -19.57 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 96.67 | 0.99 |  |
| With perfect knowledge | 15.90 | 1.00 |  | -49.21 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 13.64 | 1.00 |  | 82.38 | 1.00 |  |
| Non user of lubricant |  |  |  | 33.79 | 1.00 |  |
| No HIV test | 24.69 | 1.00 |  | 26.84 | 1.00 |  |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | 1.17 | 1.00 | 3.23 | -68.62 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | 35.11 | 1.00 |  | -21.44 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Prefer both male and female | 38.36 | 1.00 |  | 62.68 | 1.00 |  |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 12.92 | 1.00 |  | 20.85 | 1.00 |  |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 5.38 | 1.00 | 217.44 | -12.83 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Constant | -87.795 | 1.000 | 0.000 | -139.223 | 0.999 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Pasig |  |  | Surigao |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -5.72 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.37 | 0.82 | 0.69 |
| Age Squared | 0.03 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 0.01 | 0.78 | 1.01 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -2.69 | 1.00 | 0.07 | -0.45 | 0.48 | 0.64 |
| Not working | 58.83 | 1.00 |  | -3.17 | 0.49 | 0.04 |
| High School or Below | 52.77 | 1.00 |  | -4.26 | 0.31 | 0.01 |
| Use condom last anal sex | 15.77 | 1.00 |  | -5.26 | 0.27 | 0.01 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | 41.56 | 1.00 |  | 4.41 | 0.30 | 82.62 |
| With perfect knowledge | -72.40 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 9.15 | 0.35 |  |
| Engaged in grouped sex | -2.65 | 1.00 | 0.07 | 34.28 | 1.00 |  |
| Non user of lubricant | 48.24 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |
| No HIV test | 23.74 | 1.00 |  | -4.31 | 0.41 | 0.01 |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | 37.74 | 1.00 |  | -0.19 | 0.94 | 0.83 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | 31.89 | 1.00 |  | -28.88 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Prefer both male and female | 36.32 | 1.00 |  | -5.72 | 0.08 | 0.00 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -21.83 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 5.78 | 0.33 | 323.67 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -11.03 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.54 | 0.91 | 0.58 |
| Constant | 100.492 | 1.000 |  | 38.652 | 0.995 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Quezon City |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 2.18 | 0.07 | 8.82 |
| Age Squared | -0.05 | 0.06 | 0.96 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.23 | 0.14 | 1.26 |
| Not working | 0.02 | 0.99 | 1.02 |
| High School or Below | -1.15 | 0.20 | 0.32 |
| Use condom last anal sex | 1.76 | 0.15 | 5.79 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -1.53 | 0.02 | 38.65 |
| With perfect knowledge | 19.10 | 1.00 | 0.22 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 2.44 | 0.08 | 11.46 |
| Non user of lubricant | 1.17 | 0.38 | 3.23 |
| No HIV test | -1.32 | 0.38 | 0.27 |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | 0.11 | 0.94 | 1.12 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | -20.57 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Prefer both male and female | 0.57 | 0.55 | 1.77 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 0.999 | 0.001 |  |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -1.48 | 0.20 | 0.23 |
| Constant |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Determinants of non use of condom in any sex episode, Logistic Regression Results with Considered Variables Taken Simultaneously by Sentinel Sites, 2009 IHBSS MSM Dataset

| Explanatory Variables |  | Baguio |  |  | Butuan |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.47 | 0.55 | 0.63 | -4.14 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| Age Squared | 0.01 | 0.38 | 1.01 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 1.10 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.39 | 0.17 | 1.48 | -0.08 | 0.64 | 0.92 |
| Not working | -1.36 | 0.26 | 0.26 | -1.91 | 0.05 | 0.15 |
| High School or Below | -1.46 | 0.20 | 0.23 | -0.42 | 0.60 | 0.66 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -1.90 | 0.28 | 0.15 | -1.23 | 0.14 | 0.29 |
| With perfect knowledge | -0.53 | 0.64 | 0.59 | 1.26 | 0.19 | 3.54 |
| With Multiple sex partners | 1.82 | 0.29 | 6.14 | -1.53 | 0.17 | 0.22 |
| Non user of lubricant | 0.17 | 0.86 | 1.19 | -2.24 | 0.02 | 0.11 |
| No HIV test | 1.42 | 0.48 | 4.15 | 1.93 | 0.33 | 6.91 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | -0.45 | 0.72 | 0.64 | -2.84 | 0.01 | 0.06 |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | -1.51 | 0.42 | 0.22 | 1.17 | 0.23 | 3.24 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | -0.95 | 0.58 | 0.38 | -2.09 | 0.14 | 0.12 |
| Prefer both male and female | -3.44 | 0.02 | 0.03 | -1.14 | 0.26 | 0.32 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -4.08 | 0.06 | 0.02 | -3.15 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 0.63 | 0.73 | 1.87 | -0.85 | 0.38 | 0.43 |
| Constant | 4.47 | 0.72 | 87.46 | 53.82 | 0.01 |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Cebu |  |  |  |  | Davao |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.35 | 0.22 | 0.70 | -0.19 | 0.59 | 0.83 |
| Age Squared | 0.01 | 0.20 | 1.01 | 0.00 | 0.76 | 1.00 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.05 | 0.43 | 0.95 | -0.05 | 0.65 | 0.95 |
| Not working | 0.41 | 0.35 | 1.51 | -1.79 | 0.04 | 0.17 |
| High School or Below | -1.09 | 0.03 | 0.33 | 0.27 | 0.74 | 1.31 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -1.29 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.21 | 0.86 | 1.23 |
| With perfect knowledge | -0.19 | 0.86 | 0.83 | 2.48 | 0.01 | 11.89 |
| With Multiple sex partners | -0.94 | 0.16 | 0.39 | 0.69 | 0.41 | 2.00 |
| Non user of lubricant | -0.38 | 0.38 | 0.68 | 1.91 | 0.03 | 6.73 |
| No HIV test | -2.84 | 0.05 | 0.06 | -0.13 | 0.95 | 0.88 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 0.05 | 0.91 | 1.06 | 0.62 | 0.51 | 1.86 |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | 0.41 | 0.40 | 1.50 | -1.20 | 0.18 | 0.30 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | -0.22 | 0.74 | 0.81 | -3.37 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
| Prefer both male and female | -1.47 | 0.05 | 0.23 | 0.52 | 0.72 | 1.68 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 0.37 | 0.45 | 1.45 | -1.34 | 0.05 | 0.26 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 0.36 | 0.42 | 1.43 | 0.57 | 0.41 | 1.76 |
| Constant | 0.06 | $1,394.35$ | 5.34 | 0.33 | 208.05 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | General Santos |  |  |  | Puerto Galera |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.22 | 0.70 | 0.80 | 0.54 | 0.07 | 1.72 |
| Age Squared | 0.01 | 0.68 | 1.01 | -0.01 | 0.09 | 0.99 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.08 | 0.47 | 1.09 | -0.10 | 0.51 | 0.90 |
| Not working | -0.15 | 0.80 | 0.86 | 0.37 | 0.62 | 1.45 |
| High School or Below | -1.14 | 0.08 | 0.32 | 1.23 | 0.35 | 3.42 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -0.96 | 0.20 | 0.38 | 0.06 | 0.93 | 1.06 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.31 | 0.63 | 1.36 | 0.55 | 0.45 | 1.74 |
| With Multiple sex partners | -0.07 | 0.91 | 0.94 |  |  |  |
| Non user of lubricant | -0.30 | 0.63 | 0.74 |  |  |  |
| No HIV test | -1.83 | 0.14 | 0.16 |  |  |  |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 0.77 | 0.39 | 2.16 | 1.58 | 0.01 | 4.87 |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | -1.13 | 0.13 | 0.32 | -0.90 | 0.35 | 0.41 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | 2.06 | 0.03 | 7.88 | -0.41 | 0.67 | 0.67 |
| Prefer both male and female | 1.77 | 0.03 | 5.89 | -0.68 | 0.57 | 0.51 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | 0.01 | 0.99 | 1.01 | -1.08 | 0.11 | 0.34 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -1.01 | 0.11 | 0.36 | -1.10 | 0.31 | 0.33 |
| Constant | 1.87 | 0.77 | 6.47 | -5.52 | 0.30 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Santiago |  |  |  | Zamboanga |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -74.51 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.83 | 1.07 |
| Age Squared | 1.56 | 1.00 | 4.75 | 0.00 | 0.91 | 1.00 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 10.94 | 1.00 |  | -0.28 | 0.02 | 0.76 |
| Not working | -75.78 | 0.99 | 0.00 | -0.80 | 0.11 | 0.45 |
| High School or Below | -1.04 | 1.00 | 0.35 | -1.35 | 0.02 | 0.26 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -115.50 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.14 | 0.06 | 3.12 |
| With perfect knowledge | -0.72 | 1.00 | 0.49 | -0.66 | 0.23 | 0.52 |
| With Multiple sex partners | 186.53 | 1.00 |  | 0.20 | 0.86 | 1.22 |
| Non user of lubricant | 177.12 | 0.99 |  | 0.34 | 0.54 | 1.40 |
| No HIV test | -206.38 | 0.99 | 0.00 | -1.96 | 0.02 | 0.14 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 179.04 | 1.00 |  | 0.15 | 0.82 | 1.16 |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | -122.50 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -1.28 | 0.20 | 0.28 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | -35.17 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 0.71 | 1.43 |
| Prefer both male and female | 18.62 | 1.00 |  | 2.19 | 0.01 | 8.90 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -142.92 | 0.99 | 0.00 | -1.06 | 0.06 | 0.35 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 15.17 | 1.00 |  | 0.74 | 0.24 | 2.09 |
| Constant | 851.58 | 1.00 | - | 5.47 | 0.22 | 237.81 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Surigao |  |  |  | Caloocan |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.85 | 0.26 | 0.43 | 11.05 | 1.00 |  |
| Age Squared | 0.02 | 0.24 | 1.02 | -0.15 | 1.00 | 0.86 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.41 | 0.07 | 0.67 | 16.74 | 1.00 |  |
| Not working | 0.96 | 0.30 | 2.62 | -31.01 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| High School or Below | 4.61 | 0.00 | 100.61 | 109.91 | 1.00 |  |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | 2.74 | 0.04 | 15.49 | -69.78 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| With perfect knowledge | 0.19 | 0.87 | 1.21 | -5.28 | 1.00 | 0.01 |
| With Multiple sex partners | -3.00 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 102.84 | 1.00 |  |
| Non user of lubricant | -3.04 | 0.09 | 0.05 | -20.93 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| No HIV test |  |  |  | -57.06 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | -1.28 | 0.47 | 0.28 | 69.48 | 1.00 |  |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | 0.62 | 0.50 | 1.86 | 26.64 | 1.00 |  |
| Prefer male as sex partners | -0.05 | 0.98 | 0.95 | -5.80 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Prefer both male and female | -0.20 | 0.88 | 0.82 | -108.16 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -1.22 | 0.17 | 0.30 | -62.07 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 0.51 | 0.62 | 1.66 | -42.31 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Constant | 14.95 | 0.10 |  | -221.09 | 1.00 | 0.00 |


| Explanatory Variables |  | Makati |  |  | Mandaluyong |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.11 | 0.87 | 0.90 | -11.29 | 0.22 | 0.00 |
| Age Squared | 0.00 | 0.69 | 1.00 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 1.25 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | 0.35 | 0.06 | 1.42 | 0.41 | 0.35 | 1.51 |
| Not working | -0.77 | 0.51 | 0.46 | 2.11 | 0.42 | 8.21 |
| High School or Below | -0.86 | 0.52 | 0.42 | -0.95 | 0.62 | 0.39 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -5.65 | 0.37 | 0.00 | -7.02 | 0.21 | 0.00 |
| With perfect knowledge | 1.31 | 0.32 | 3.72 | 8.12 | 0.09 |  |
| With Multiple sex partners | 2.28 | 0.17 | 9.74 | 5.54 | 0.17 | 253.63 |
| Non user of lubricant | -2.25 | 0.11 | 0.10 |  |  |  |
| No HIV test | -19.81 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.54 | 0.77 | 1.71 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | -0.09 | 0.95 | 0.92 | 7.03 | 0.08 |  |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | -0.51 | 0.69 | 0.60 | -3.20 | 0.12 | 0.04 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | 2.70 | 0.66 | 14.88 | 1.08 | 0.77 | 2.95 |
| Prefer both male and female | 5.32 | 0.39 | 204.09 | -3.26 | 0.48 | 0.04 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -1.18 | 0.47 | 0.31 | -4.41 | 0.18 | 0.01 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -1.81 | 0.32 | 0.16 | 1.73 | 0.65 | 5.62 |
| Constant | -5.81 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 136.63 | 0.23 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Manila |  |  |  |  | Pasig |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | 1.92 | 0.14 | 6.80 | -15.09 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Age Squared | -0.03 | 0.17 | 0.97 | 0.27 | 1.00 | 1.30 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.13 | 0.57 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 1.00 | 2.39 |
| Not working | -1.94 | 0.34 | 0.14 | -65.20 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| High School or Below | -0.51 | 0.74 | 0.60 | -22.99 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | 1.70 | 0.36 | 5.46 | -59.54 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| With perfect knowledge | -1.08 | 0.74 | 0.34 | 98.54 | 1.00 |  |
| With Multiple sex partners | 0.47 | 0.71 | 1.60 | 2.74 | 1.00 | 15.48 |
| Non user of lubricant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No HIV test | -0.86 | 0.70 | 0.43 | -19.78 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | 0.64 | 0.63 | 1.90 | -53.45 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | -2.09 | 0.32 | 0.12 | 86.79 | 1.00 |  |
| Prefer male as sex partners | 22.69 | 1.00 |  | -3.35 | 1.00 | 0.04 |
| Prefer both male and female | 23.54 | 1.00 |  | -48.85 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -0.70 | 0.63 | 0.50 | 53.76 | 1.00 |  |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | 1.00 | 0.59 | 2.71 | -32.04 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Explanatory Variables | Quezon City |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Logit <br> Coeffi- <br> cients | P- <br> value | Odds- <br> Ratios |
| Age | -0.04 | 0.98 | 0.97 |
| Age Squared | 0.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Age of Sexual Debut | -0.09 | 0.54 | 0.91 |
| Not working | -1.26 | 0.29 | 0.28 |
| High School or Below | -1.12 | 0.36 | 0.33 |
| Recently Engaged in female Sex | -4.86 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| With perfect knowledge | -0.31 | 0.81 | 0.74 |
| With Multiple sex partners | -8.18 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| Non user of lubricant | -0.02 | 0.99 | 0.98 |
| No HIV test | -2.06 | 0.20 | 0.13 |
| Engaged in grouped sex | -3.80 | 0.05 | 0.02 |
| Engaged in sexin exchange of cash | 4.92 | 0.15 | 137.23 |
| Prefer male as sex partners | -2.51 | 0.26 | 0.08 |
| Prefer both male and female | 1.48 | 0.45 | 4.39 |
| Reached with lessthan2 interventions | -0.70 | 0.57 | 0.50 |
| Do not know confidential HIV test place | -2.00 | 0.08 | 0.14 |
| Constant | 4.24 | 0.77 | 69.21 |

## Statistical Annex: Respondent's background characteristics

| MSM DATA IHBSS 2009 |  |  |  |  |  | $1 / 0^{\frac{0}{0}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mid \underset{0^{\circ}}{\text { ô}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section A. Respondent's Background Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {A1 }}$ Interviewed in HIV survey this year | \% Yes |  |  |  |  | 7.1 | 19.7 | 7.7 | 3.5 | 6.3 | 13.7 | 1.4 | 4.8 | 1.0 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 7.2 | 11.4 | 9.0 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 6.6 | 4.8 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 21.4 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,305 | 284 | 304 | 250 | 299 | 290 | 294 | 165 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 262 | 109 | 112 | 132 | 151 | 260 | 125 | 94 | 45 | 217 |
| A2 <br> Received coupon and went to a place to be interviewed | \% Yes | 18.9 | 3.6 | n=3 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | n=2 | - | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | n=1 | - | - | n=4 | n=1 | $\mathrm{n}=5$ | n=1 | 0.0 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | - | - | 6.9 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 244 | 55 | 24 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 17 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 46 |
| ${ }^{43}$ <br> Received yellow band and went to a place for interview | \% Yes | 0.7 | . | - | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.4 | - | - | 0.3 | 0.3 | 4.0 | 1.9 | . | 3.6 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 9.2 | . | - |
|  | n= | 4,122 | - | 304 | 249 | 298 | 281 | 290 | 161 | 300 | 109 | 30 | 221 | 41 | 112 | 131 | 149 | 262 | 107 | 91 | 45 | 217 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { A4 Month } \\ \text { Month of birth } \end{array}$ | ALPHANuMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline A 4 \text { Year of birth } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ALPHANUMERIC Variable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { A5 } \\ \text { Age } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mean | 24.0 | 24.0 | 28.3 | 21.0 | 20.8 | 24.0 | 20.4 | 28.7 | 20.8 | 25.6 | 25.4 | 24.5 | 20.2 | 26.2 | 25.0 | 25.7 | 25.2 | 26.6 | 23.7 | 25.4 | 24.0 |
|  | Median | 22.0 | 22.0 | 24.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 22.0 | 19.0 | 27.0 | 20.0 | 24.0 | 23.0 | 22.0 | 19.0 | 22.0 | 23.8 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 26.0 | 21.7 | 23.1 | 23.0 |
|  | Range | 15-65 | 15-51 | 16.56 | 15-45 | 15-47 | 16-48 | 15-47 | 15.58 | 15-48 | 15-53 | 15-45 | 15-56 | 15-57 | 15-65 | 16-56 | 15-59 | 16-62 | 15-53 | 15-48 | 17-42 | 15-52 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,367 | 295 | 304 | 252 | 300 | 294 | 295 | 166 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 111 | 115 | 134 | 154 | 264 | 129 | 102 | 48 | 217 |
| A6 Municipality/City of birth | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE (ALL SITES ONLY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A6 Province of birth <br> A7 Place already a city at time of birth | ALPHANuMERIC Variable (ALL sites only) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \% Yes | 67.3 | 86.1 | 43.3 | 69.2 | 88.0 | 81.7 | 68.9 | 19.6 | 68.2 | 22.1 | 15.3 | 86.8 | 70.1 | 79.9 | 73.9 | 62.4 | 87.2 | 26.7 | 57.8 | 95.7 | 76.5 |
|  | N= | 4,065 | 244 | 304 | 252 | 293 | 286 | 295 | 147 | 289 | 108 | 31 | 262 | 111 | 109 | 89 | 148 | 233 | 79 | 98 | 46 | 213 |
| A8 Cities/countries lived in during pat 12 months-1 | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A8 Cities/countries lived in during pat 12 months-2 | ALPHANuMERIC Variable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A8 Cities/countries lived in during pat 12 months- 3 | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A9 City where respondent presently live | ALPHANUMERIC VARIA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A10 No. of months living in the city (where R is currenty living in) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A10 No. of years living in the city (where $R$ is currenty living in) | Mean | 16.4 | 20.2 | 13.8 | 15.1 | 17.0 | 16.7 | 15.6 | 15.5 | 15.7 | 20.9 | 16.0 | 18.7 | 13.5 | 18.0 | 10.3 | 15.3 | 19.8 | 17.7 | 16.0 | 23.2 | 13.0 |
|  | Median | 18.0 | 20.0 | 12.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 17.0 | 15.5 | 17.0 | 21.0 | 14.9 | 20.0 | 16.0 | 18.0 | 5.0 | 15.5 | 21.0 | 18.0 | 15.0 | 22.0 | 12.7 |
|  | Range | $1-54$ | 1.51 | $1-51$ | $1-41$ | 1.47 | 1.48 | 1 1-40 | 1.50 | 1 1-48 | $1-53$ | 1 -45 | $1-49$ | $1-40$ | 1.51 | 1-33 | 1.50 | 1.54 | 1-53 | 1-46 | 4.42 | $1-34$ |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,705 | 266 | 259 | 219 | 267 | 257 | 279 | 113 | 277 | 91 | 27 | 247 | 83 | 101 | 99 | 126 | 237 | 125 | 83 | 43 | 134 |
| Al1 ${ }^{\text {Educational A Attainment }}$ | No grade completed | 0.3 | 0.3 | . | . | 0.5 | 0.5 | . | . | . | . | . | 3.5 | . | . | . | - | 0.4 | - | . | . |  |
|  | Pre-school | 0.1 |  |  | . | 0.4 | 0.3 |  | . | 0.3 | . | . | 0.3 | . |  |  |  |  | . | 0.2 |  |  |
|  | Elementary | 6.5 | 7.8 | 1.3 | 8.0 | 12.6 | 5.3 | 6.9 | 4.3 | 9.0 | 4.7 | 8.4 | 10.6 | 4.7 | 5.4 | 0.4 | 5.6 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 1.9 |
|  | High School | 49.5 | 68.5 | 34.1 | 46.3 | 55.8 | 57.7 | 50.4 | 67.4 | 46.3 | 51.3 | 30.6 | 48.5 | 46.9 | 44.6 | 42.9 | 61.2 | 14.1 | 53.3 | 60.8 | 39.6 | 55.0 |
|  | Vocational | 6.4 | 5.8 | 13.1 | 2.0 | 4.6 | 5.8 | 3.8 | 7.6 | 5.7 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 2.0 | - | 4.5 | 15.7 | 7.1 | 7.7 | 14.5 | 9.8 | 6.1 | 5.7 |
|  | College | 36.3 | 17.6 | 51.3 | 40.9 | 26.1 | 30.1 | 37.9 | 20.1 | 38.7 | 40.9 | 56.7 | 33.4 | 47.7 | 45.5 | 41.1 | 26.0 | 71.0 | 28.9 | 29.0 | 51.8 | 37.4 |
|  | Post Baccalaureate | 0.9 |  | 0.3 | 2.7 |  | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 |  | 1.4 | 2.9 | 1.7 | 0.7 |  |  |  | 4.1 | - |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,342 | 295 | 304 | 252 | 300 | 286 | 294 | 162 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 111 | 112 | 134 | 154 | 263 | 127 | 94 | 48 | 217 |
| A12 Studied in the past school year | Entire school year | 16.4 | 5.4 | 13.6 | 28.2 | 22.7 | 21.5 | 31.9 | 1.9 | 27.7 | 17.3 | 27.6 | 10.6 | 47.1 | 21.4 | 1.4 | 6.5 | 14.9 | 2.4 | 28.3 | 9.8 | 14.9 |
|  | Part of the school year | 6.2 | 1.8 | 6.2 | 7.5 | 3.9 | 7.8 | 9.4 | 2.9 | 12.0 | 4.0 | 7.2 | 1.7 | 8.5 | 7.7 | 1.0 | 8.8 | 7.8 | 4.9 | 9.7 | 7.4 | 5.0 |
|  | No | 77.3 | 92.9 | 80.2 | 64.2 | 73.4 | 70.6 | 58.8 | 95.2 | 60.3 | 78.7 | 65.2 | 87.7 | 44.3 | 70.9 | 97.5 | 84.7 | 77.3 | 92.7 | 62.0 | 82.8 | 80.1 |
|  | n= | 4,261 | 280 | 304 | 248 | 297 | 279 | 295 | 162 | 300 | 109 | 30 | 266 | 111 | 108 | 131 | 152 | 220 | 129 | 100 | 48 | 217 |


| MSM DA <br> IHBSS 20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ATA } \\ & 009 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | - | $0^{3}$ | $00^{\frac{10}{0}}$ |  |  |  | $\omega_{\infty}^{\infty}$ | $5{ }^{5}$ | - | \% | - | 20 | $5{ }^{80}$ |  | ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | $0^{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section A. Respondent's Background Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A13 Kinds of work during the past 12 months | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A14 Current work/day job | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A15 City where $R$ is currently working | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A16 | Without income | 27.4 | 6.3 | 11.1 | 49.4 | 44.7 | 23.6 | 55.6 | 3.7 | 50.80 | 21 | $\mathrm{n}=5$ | 17.2 | 37.1 | 37.4 | 25.2 | 5.2 | 24.2 | 30.9 | 48.4 | 33.6 | 10 |
| Earning in the past month | With income | 72.6 | 93.7 | 88.9 | 50.9 | 55.3 | 76.4 | 44.4 | 96.3 | 49.20 | 79 | n=23 | 82.8 | 62.9 | 62.6 | 74.8 | 94.8 | 75.8 | 69.1 | 51.6 | 66.4 | 90 |
|  | Mean | 7,673 | 6,783 | 8,213 | 5,497 | 4,720 | 7,057 | 5,358 | 4,446 | 4,299 | 6,471 | 7,878 | 4,269 | 4,451 | 7,184 | 10,612 | 6,778 | 13,997 | 7,315 | 8,723 | 14,208 | 12,361 |
|  | Median | 5,500 | 6,000 | 7,600 | 4,000 | 4,000 | 5,000 | 4,000 | 35,000 | 3,500 | 5,000 | 5,458 | 2,485 | 3,500 | 6,000 | 9,000 | 5,000 | 11,000 | 6,000 | 6,200 | 12,000 | 1,000 |
|  | Range | $\begin{array}{r} 100- \\ 86000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500- \\ 35000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500- \\ 60000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 200- \\ 60000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100- \\ 20000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 200- \\ 65000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100- \\ 60000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100- \\ 40000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1000- \\ & 20000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 350- \\ 32000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 800- \\ 30000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 200- \\ 47000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 500- \\ 21000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 300-5000 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1500- \\ & 40000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 360- \\ 50000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2000- \\ & 80000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 600- \\ 25000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 150- \\ 86000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1200- \\ & 45000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500- \\ 70000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ (with income) | 2,853 | 266 | 271 | 124 | 164 | 193 | 123 | 150 | 147 | 84 | 23 | 111 | 65 | 49 | 76 | 117 | 168 | 82 | 46 | 32 | 195 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ (with + w/o income) | 3,931 | 284 | 304 | 244 | 296 | 252 | 278 | 166 | 299 | 107 | 28 | 134 | 103 | 78 | 102 | 123 | 222 | 118 | 89 | 48 | 217 |
| A17 | \% Yes | 3.9 | 2.4 | 10.2 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 3.2 | . | 3.9 | 1.3 | 6.4 | 3.9 | 7.8 | 1.5 | 4.6 | 7.4 | 2.8 | 6.4 | 5.4 | 1.5 | 3.8 | 10.3 |
| Ever worked abroad | $\mathrm{N}=$ | 4,352 | 292 | 304 | 252 | 298 | 290 | 295 | 164 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 110 | 115 | 134 | 154 | 263 | 127 | 102 | 48 | 217 |
| A18 Work done abroad | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A19 Month left (last trip abroad) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A19 Year left (last trip abroad) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A19 Month returned (last trip abroad) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A19 Year returned (last trip abroad) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A20 | Single | 9.3 | 91.2 | 88.7 | 96.2 | 96.9 | 99.0 | 98.8 | 86.8 | 98.0 | 93.5 | 97.0 | 95.2 | 99.6 | 96.6 | 90.0 | 92.5 | 94.0 | 91.6 | 96.0 | 98.5 | 82.4 |
| Civil Status | Married | 5.5 | 6.8 | 10.6 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 11.2 | 1.7 | 6.5 | 3.0 | 4.6 | 0.4 | 2.9 | 7.2 | 7.5 | 2.9 | 7.1 | 3.6 | 1.5 | 16.9 |
|  | Separated | 1.2 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 0.3 | - | . | 0.2 | - | - | 2.1 | . | 2.3 | 1.3 | 0.3 | - | 0.6 |
|  | Widowed | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 162.0 | . | - | . | . | - | 0.5 | 0.8 | - | 0.7 | - | - | - | 0.1 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,355 | 296 | 297 | 252 | 299 | 294 | 294 |  | 300 | 111 | 31 | 265 | 111 | 115 | 134 | 152 | 264 | 129 | 102 | 48 | 217 |
|  | \% Yes | 82.5 | $\mathrm{n}=17$ | 85.9 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | $\mathrm{n}=5$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | n=2 | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | n=5 | $\mathrm{n}=7$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | - | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | n=8 | n=3 | n=6 | n=2 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 88.9 |
| Married (currently living with wife) | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 223 | 24 | 32 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 13 | - | 2 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 37 |
| A22 <br> Separated (legallylformally married to spouse) | \% Yes | 69.0 | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | 77.6 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | - | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=15$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | n=6 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | $\mathrm{n}=10$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $n=10$ | $\mathrm{n}=7$ | $\mathrm{n}=10$ | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | - | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 85.3 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 274 | 24 | 34 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 17 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 38 |
| A23 <br> Single (currently living with partner) | \% Yes | 14.8 | 10.1 | 24.0 | 8.3 | 11.7 | 13.6 | 9.0 | 28.6 | 4.1 | 17.5 | $\mathrm{N}=2$ | 15.1 | 10.6 | 10.0 | 15.8 | 25.2 | 13.7 | 9.4 | 4.1 | 6.4 | 31.8 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,014 | 268 | 263 | 241 | 290 | 286 | 290 | 140 | 293 | 103 | 29 | 251 | 94 | 110 | 120 | 139 | 248 | 106 | 98 | 47 | 179 |
| A23 <br> Widowed (currently living with partner) | \% Yes | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | - | - | . | - | . | - | . | . | . | . | - | . | . | . | . | . | . | - | . | - |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | - | - | - | - |







## Statistical Annex: Condom use

| MSM DATA IHBSS 2009 |  | $/ \frac{5}{\nabla^{5}}$ |  |  |  | $0^{8^{2}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section C. Condom Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C1 Know what condom is | Yes | 96.1 | 94.6 | 98.7 | 95.3 | 95.6 | 98.3 | 98.0 | 98.4 | 98.3 | 98.6 | 97.0 | 93.7 | 87.2 | 95.5 | 98.7 | 93.5 | 91.3 | 96.0 | 99.2 | 97.4 | 99.6 |
|  | n= | 4,353 | 295 | 304 | 252 | 300 | 294 | 295 | 161 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 111 | 115 | 133 | 154 | 264 | 129 | 102 | 47 | 217 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { C2 } \\ \text { Condom shown } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Yes | 15.4 | 13.5 | 6.3 | 16.3 | 13.0 | 15.9 | 3.6 | 22.8 | 9.5 | 5.5 | 9.4 | 30.5 | 17.3 | 17.7 | 15.7 | 14.1 | 33.4 | 8.4 | 7.1 | 2.0 | 25.7 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,133 | 275 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 294 | 287 | 158 | 295 | 108 | 30 | 250 | 88 | 109 | 130 | 143 | 237 | 122 | 101 | 45 | 216 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { C3 } \\ & \text { Condoms easy to get in the } \\ & \text { community } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | 69.5 | 47.2 | 80.5 | 80.8 | 66.6 | 80.7 | 64.6 | 90.4 | 64.1 | 69.0 | 48.9 | 46.1 | 68.9 | 358.2 | 42.5 | 66.0 | 95.0 | 65.6 | 39.8 | 87.6 | 90.6 |
|  | n= | 4,144 | 267 | 301 | 235 | 284 | 271 | 288 | 255 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 248 | 93 | 110 | 129 | 143 | 240 | 123 | 98 | 45 | 216 |
| C4 Source of condom *Multiple answers, ticked categories shown | Goverment hospital | 1.6 | 0.0 | 6.8 | . | 0.3 | . | 2.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 | - | 2.8 | . | 0.3 | 1.5 | 10.9 | 2.0 | 98.0 | 3.6 | 0.7 | . | 0.5 |
|  | n= | 4,200 | 300 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 47 | 216 |
|  | City health center | 8.7 | 7.0 | 10.6 | 98.0 | 12.0 | 2.0 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 8.8 | 9.6 | 33.2 | 11.6 | 9.0 | 5.3 | 4.1 | 17.0 | 1.7 | 10.5 | 5.9 | 3.5 | 11.4 |
|  | n= | 4,200 | 284 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 47 | 216 |
|  | Brgy. Heath Station | 2.1 | 3.2 | 0.3 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 4.7 | 9.2 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 2.5 | 0.7 | . | 0.7 | . | 2.7 | . | 1.7 | 5.1 | . | 2.5 |
|  | n= | 4,200 | 284 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 47 | 216 |
|  | Botika sa barangay | 2.7 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 5.8 | . | 3.1 | 4.7 | - | 13.9 | 0.1 | 4.8 | 8.5 | 10.9 | 2.7 |
|  | n= | 4,200 | 300 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 47 | 216 |
|  | Private hospitallclinic | 0.8 | 1.4 | 0.3 | . | 0.8 | 1.5 | 0.6 | - | 0.0 | 1.6 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 4.3 | - | 1.6 | 2.2 | 0.7 | - | - | 0.3 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,151 | 284 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 196 | 124 | 102 | 46 | 216 |
|  | Pharmacy | 65.3 | 70.8 | 92.6 | 87.5 | 71.0 | 65.3 | 82.3 | 68.6 | 67.5 | 71.3 | 24.9 | 24.9 | 40.5 | 58.0 | 68.4 | 60.0 | 63.1 | 60.2 | 39.8 | 61.4 | 67.2 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,200 | 284 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 250 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 47 | 216 |
|  | Private doctor | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 2.8 | - | . | . | 0.0 | . |  | 1.5 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 0.4 | . | 2.8 | - | , 5 | . | . |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,200 | 284 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 47 | 216 |
|  | Private nurse/midwife | 0.3 | 0.0 | - | . | 0.7 | - | 0.2 | - | 0.0 | 0.7 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.1 | - | - | - |
|  | $n=$ | 4,200 | 300 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 47 | 216 |
|  | NGO | 3.5 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 7.6 | 0.2 | . | 0.0 | . | 1.1 | 3.9 | 16.7 | 1.3 | 40.3 | 3.6 | . | 2.3 | 1.9 | 1.5 |  |
|  | $n=$ | 4,200 | 284 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 47 | 216 |
|  | Supermarket | 17.6 | 36.6 | 10.9 | 12.2 | 6.1 | 29.8 | 1.7 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 1.4 | 23.0 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 6.8 | 4.9 | 21.2 | 55.2 | 37.5 | 3.7 | 66.3 | 25.5 |
|  | $n=$ | 4,200 | 284 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 47 | 216 |
|  | Sari Sari Store | 6.2 | 20.1 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 5.9 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 8.3 | 11.5 | . | 1.1 |  | 3.1 | 9.9 |  | 1.5 | 10.7 | 11.2 | 1.4 | 10.6 | 6.9 |
|  | $n=$ | 4,200 | 284 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 47 | 216 |
|  | Church | 0.3 | 0.7 | . | . | 0.8 | . | . | 0.4 | 0.0 | - |  |  |  | . |  | - | 2.7 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
|  | $n=$ | 4,200 | 284 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 46 | 216 |
|  | Friendsirelatives | 12.9 | 19.0 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 12.2 | 4.2 | 7.1 | 4.1 | 19.7 | 10.7 | 9.0 | 7.9 | 26.5 | 13.0 | 19.5 | 21.9 | 12.4 | 18.3 | 26.3 | 18.3 | 11.5 |
|  | $n=$ | 4,200 | 284 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 47 | 216 |
|  | Barslight spots | 2.5 | 1.1 | 1.6 |  | 1.9 | 1.5 | , | 2.2 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 3.8 | 1.5 | 3.9 | . | 1.0 | 1.3 | 7.1 | - | 0.5 | - | 4.7 |
|  | $n=$ | 4,200 | 284 | 301 | 240 | 287 | 289 | 290 | 163 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 97 | 110 | 132 | 144 | 241 | 124 | 102 | 47 | 216 |
|  | Others (n) | 180 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 18 | , | , | 2 | 2 | 1 | . | 10 | 10 | 6 | 21 | 3 | . | 2 | 3 | 2 | 47 |
|  | Others (categories) | ALPHAN | ERIC VA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C 5 <br> Had oral sex without condom | Yes | 70.0 | 43.9 | 51.2 | 71.0 | 50.8 | 87.2 | 96.6 | 55.4 | 79.7 | 65.6 | 54.8 | 63.7 | 52.9 | 64.2 | 93.0 | 75.8 | 81.3 | 83.4 | 47.7 | 75.0 | 64.2 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,159 | 278 | 301 | 236 | 287 | 287 | 290 | 157 | 295 | 109 | 30 | 250 | 93 | 109 | 130 | 144 | 241 | 123 | 99 | 45 | 216 |
| C6 <br> Had anal sex without condom | Yes | 53.5 | 48.2 | 40.7 | 44.9 | 50.4 | 70.4 | 66.7 | 56.9 | 72.4 | 57.2 | n=13 | 64.4 | 42.3 | 54.9 | 80.8 | 49.7 | 54.1 | 15.6 | 45.5 | 37.1 | 35.4 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,903 | 278 | 301 | 202 | 228 | 278 | 290 | 148 | 295 | 104 | 29 | 250 | 88 | 109 | 99 | 141 | 237 | 96 | 96 | 44 | 206 |
| C7 <br> Had vaginal sex without condom | Yes | 31.4 | 19.5 | 15.0 | 46.1 | 30.6 | 20.2 | 35.3 | 34.2 | 39.3 | 14.7 | n=5 | 24.2 | 25.4 | 23.7 | 45.2 | 26.2 | 19.6 | 26.6 | 14.6 | 38.8 | 55.3 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,619 | 267 | 301 | 193 | 198 | 224 | 288 | 94 | 267 | 103 | 28 | 245 | 81 | 108 | 87 | 136 | 161 | 107 | 98 | 33 | 209 |



## Statistical Annex: Non-paying sex partners



| MSM DA IHBSS 2 | TA | $\begin{gathered} \text { 出 } \\ \text { 今 } \\ \text { y } \end{gathered}$ |  | 耏 | $\infty_{0}^{5}$ |  | $0_{0}^{3}$ | なo ed eive |  |  | $\underset{\substack{\circ}}{\substack{0}}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{5}{5}_{0}^{\circ}$ |  | － |  | $\frac{\pi}{\approx}$ | － |  | $0^{i s}$ | $2^{\overrightarrow{0}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section E．Non－paying sex partners |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E8 <br> Reason why did not use condom | Condom not available | 41.3 | n＝4 | 75.3 | 32.3 | 19.3 | 40.2 | 57.7 | 18.9 | 48.9 | 54.7 | 53.7 | 68.1 | 28.7 | 70.2 | 43.9 | 33.5 | 14.5 | 70.2 | 56.1 | 13.7 | 41.6 |
|  | Expensive | 1.4 | 0.0 | － | － | 9.5 | 2.0 | － | － | 1.1 | $\cdot$ | － | － | － | － | － | － | 1.2 | － | － | － | － |
|  | Partner objected | 10.5 | n＝3 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 5.3 | 4.1 | 2.5 | － | 7.8 | 5.8 | 9.9 | 3.2 | 8.2 | 9.6 | 3.4 | 6.4 | 27.5 | 29.8 | 3.0 | 8.6 | 15.7 |
|  | Doesn＇t know ow to use | 2.4 | － | 13.8 | － | 15.5 | 2.3 | － | － | 1.1 | － | － | 1.5 | 9.2 | － | － | 1.6 | 1.2 | － | 24.5 | － | － |
|  | Doesn＇t like condom | 33.7 | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | － | 64.2 | 33.9 | 45.1 | 32.6 | 52.3 | 35.6 | 37.1 | 36.4 | 26.4 | 27.4 | 17.4 | 6.5 | 50.1 | 36.6 | － | 12.8 | 64.5 | 34.0 |
|  | Not necessary | 7.7 | n＝3 | 9.2 | 1.1 | 13.6 | 4.8 | 3.9 | 21.2 | 2.2 | 2.3 | － | 0.9 | 22.7 | － | 31.6 | 6.7 | 13.4 | － | 1.8 | 13.2 | 5.1 |
|  | Forgot to use condom | 2.9 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | － | － | 2.8 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 7.6 | 3.3 | － | － | － | 3.7 | 2.7 | 14.6 | 1.7 | 5.6 | － | 1.8 | － | 3.6 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 901 | 23 | 55 | 34 | 76 | 108 | 37 | 12 | 90 | 25 | 4 | 87 | 36 | 35 | 25 | 38 | 81 | 4 | 39 | 14 | 18 |
|  | Others | 87 | － | 0 | 6 | 18 | 10 | 4 | － | 7 | 2 | － | － | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | － | ． | 8 | － | 1 |
|  | Others（categories） | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E9 <br> Person who suggested use of condom | Respondent | 80.0 | 84.6 | 84.2 | 100.0 | 78.9 | 80.9 | 80.1 | 88.1 | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | 71.0 | 50.0 | 92.2 | 92.1 | 48.4 | 100.0 | 42.3 | 57.8 | 88.3 | 41.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Partner | 20.0 | 15.4 | 15.8 | － | 21.1 | 19.1 | 19.9 | 11.9 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 29.0 | 50.0 | 78.0 | 7.9 | 51.6 |  | 57.7 | 42.2 | 11.7 | 58.9 | － | － |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 340 | 78 | 16 | 7 | 11 | 27 | 12 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 33 | 11 | 9 | 12 | 5 | 37 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 10 |
|  | Others | 75 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | ． | － | 31 | 4 | 1 | 11 | ． | 2 | 1 | － |
|  | Others（categories） | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E10 <br> Used lubricant last time had anal sex with non－paying male sex partner | Yes | 46.6 | 18.8 | 34.2 | 66.0 | 56.5 | 30.7 | 52.0 | 93.1 | 12.3 | 45.8 | 62.7 | 69.2 | 28.8 | 33.8 | 51.5 | 61.6 | 63.3 | 53.2 | 26.0 | 58.6 | 66.4 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 1，273 | 128 | 73 | 43 | 76 | 136 | 127 | 29 | 92 | 32 | 6 | 89 | 49 | 46 | 39 | 49 | 121 | 11 | 59 | 17 | 29 |

## Statistical Annex: paid sex partners (respondent is the buyer)



| MSM DA IHBSS 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ATA } \\ & 009 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section F. Paid sex partners (Respondent is the buyer) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E6 <br> Used condom last time had oral sex with a paid sex partner | Yes | 16.6 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 11.8 | 3.3 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 62.0 | 0.7 | 16.5 | n=16 | 18.3 | $\mathrm{n}=13$ | n-28 | 18.7 | 22.3 | $\mathrm{n}=16$ | 10.5 | 14.0 | $\mathrm{n}=10$ | n=2- |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 1,037 | 168 | 128 | 32 | 57 | 105 | 50 | 30 | 260 | 39 | 16 | 125 | 13 | 28 | 35 | 30 | 16 | 44 | 31 | 10 | 20 |
| F7 <br> Number of anal sex in a month | Mean | 2.97 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 8.0 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 2.4 | 2.93 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 1.6 |
|  | Median | 2.00 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 8.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
|  | Range | 1-30 | 1-6 | 1-9 | 1-10 | 1-20 | 1-20 | 1-8 | 1-25 | 1-12 | 1-20 | 1-19 | 1-30 | 1-15 | 1-10 | 1-15 | 1-20 | 1-22 | 1-10 | 1-20 | 1-6 | 1-3 |
|  | n= | 3,556 | 128 | 76 | 26 | 44 | 86 | 38 | 27 | 41 | 29 | 7 | 107 | 10 | 20 | 27 | 22 | 6 | 19 | 24 | 4 | 11 |
| F7a (6 months) Ticked categories | Ticked | 96.3 | 7.6 | 68.6 | $\mathrm{n}=27$ | 96.5 | 91.0 | 82.3 | 23.7 | 0.5 | 31.0 | n=8 | 42.8 | 31.6 | $\mathrm{n}=20$ | n=27 | 94.7 | 16.0 | 89.8 | 15.2 | $\mathrm{n}=9$ | 5.1 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 1,244 | 100 | 76 | 27 | 51 | 95 | 43 | 166 | 100 | 77 | 8 | 266 | 76 | 20 | 27 | 154 | 264 | 129 | 102 | 9 | 206 |
| F7b (12 months) Ticked categories | Ticked | 97.7 | 58.3 | 66.3 | 10.8 | 98.2 | 97.8 | 90.8 | 23.7 | 97.6 | 31.0 | 26.8 | 42.8 | 31.6 | 26.8 | 97.4 | 20.2 | 89.8 | 15.2 | 26.6 | 83.5 | 5.1 |
|  | n= | 1,244 | 300 | 76 | 252 | 51 | 95 | 43 | 166 | 300 | 77 | 31 | 266 | 76 | 94 | 134 | 154 | 264 | 129 | 102 | 48 | 206 |
| F7c <br> Range <br> E8 <br> Last anal sex with a paid male sex partner inserter/receiver | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Inserter (top) | 1.2 | 1.0 | 10.0 | - | 5.4 | 13.5 | 19.7 | 8.7 | 1.7 | 6.9 | 5.5 | 5.0 | 10.9 | 11.8 | 7.9 | 8.6 | - | 6.5 | 3.4 | 7.8 | 70.6 |
|  | Receiver (bottom) | 83.8 | 40.7 | 79.6 | 84.6 | 90.6 | 76.3 | 70.1 | 81.7 | 11.3 | 83.6 | 88.7 | 90.0 | 53.1 | 83.5 | . | 7.9 | 44.8 | 63.4 | 93.6 | 7.8 | - |
|  | Both | 9.6 | 1.3 | 10.4 | 15.4 | 4.1 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 18.3 | 0.7 | 9.5 | 5.8 | 4.9 | 36.0 | 4.7 | 10.8 | 7.3 | 55.2 | 30.1 | 3.0 | - | 29.4 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 819 | 129 | 76 | 26 | 44 | 86 | 38 | 27 | 41 | 29 | 8 | 107 | 13 | 19 | 27 | 22 | 2 | 19 | 24 | 44 | 11 |
| F9 <br> Used condom last anal sex with a paid male sex partner | Yes | 39.9 | 37.0 | 50.1 | n=26 | 26.1 | 14.1 | 32.1 | n=27 | 0.3 | n=29 | $\mathrm{n}=8$ | 24.6 | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | $\mathrm{n}=20$ | n=21 | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | - | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | $\mathrm{n}=11$ |
|  | n= | 814 | 129 | 71 | 26 | 43 | 85 | 38 | 27 | 41 | 29 | 8 | 107 | 12 | 20 | 21 | 19 | 262 | 19 | 21 | 4 | 11 |
| F10 <br> Reason why did not use condom | Condom not available | 47.7 | 57.1 | 90.4 | 13.1 | 50.3 | 44.3 | 41.4 | 37.6 | 30.0 | 35.9 | 48.9 | 63.2 | 31.9 | 74.9 | 27.1 | 31.7 | 0.0 | 63.2 | 52.6 | - | - |
|  | Expensive | 0.9 | - | - | - | 5.3 | - | - | - | 2.5 | 3.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - |
|  | Partner objected | 6.2 | 14.3 | - | 1.8 | 6.3 | 3.0 | - | 19.1 | 5.0 | 7.1 | - | 0.7 | - | 7.1 | - | 7.6 | 0.0 | - | 11.3 | 23.5 | 27.7 |
|  | Doesn't know how to use | 2.1 | - | 4.4 | - | 13.7 | - | - | - | 2.5 | - | - | 2.6 | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - |
|  | Doesn't like condom | 34.9 | 7.1 | 4.2 | 85.2 | 17.6 | 47.5 | 50.0 | 43.3 | 52.5 | 47.7 | 42.2 | 31.0 | 41.8 | 18.0 | 22.0 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 24.3 | 38.2 | 72.3 |
|  | Not necessary | 4.3 | 4.7 | 0.9 | - | 3.9 | 2.4 | 6.6 | - | 5.0 | - | 8.9 | 2.5 | 12.9 | - | 17.3 | 3.6 | 0.0 | - | 3.9 | 38.2 | - |
|  | Forgot to use condom | 4.0 | 14.3 | - | - | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.0 | - | 2.5 | 6.1 | - | - | 13.4 | - | 33.6 | - | 0.0 | 19.8 | 7.9 | - | - |
|  | Others | 0.8 | 0.3 | - | 0.1 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 10.4 | 11.7 | - | 1.3 | 3.0 | - | 0.4 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 0.0 | - | 3.7 | - | - |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 470 | 100 | 304 | 251 | 294 | 290 | 295 | 166 | 100 | 110 | 30 | 266 | 111 | 112 | 131 | 154 | 264 | 129 | 99 | 48 | 217 |
| F11 <br> Person who suggested use of condom at the time | Respondent | 81.518.5 | 85.5 | n=28 | n=18 | n=11 | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | n=12 | n=17 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=8$ | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | n=29 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | $\mathrm{n}=7$ | n=5 | n=2 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | n=3 | $\mathrm{n}=8$ | $\mathrm{n}=4$ |
|  | Partner |  | 14.5 | n=28 | $\mathrm{n}=18$ | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | $\mathrm{n}=17$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=8$ | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | n=29 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | $\mathrm{n}=7$ | n=5 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | $\mathrm{n}=3$ | $\mathrm{n}=8$ | $\mathrm{n}=4$ |
|  | Others | 0.0 | 0.0 | n=28 | $\mathrm{n}=18$ | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | $\mathrm{n}=17$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=8$ | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | $\mathrm{n}=29$ | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | $\mathrm{n}=7$ | $\mathrm{n}=5$ | n=2 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | $\mathrm{n}=3$ | $\mathrm{n}=8$ | $\mathrm{n}=4$ |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 271 | 76.0 | 28 | 18 | 289 | 11 | 12 | 17 | 100 | 8 | 4 | 29 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 4 |
| F12 Used lubricant last time had anal sex with a paid male sex partner | Yes | 48.6 | 20.2 | 37.7 | 37.2 | 37.2 | 31.1 | 52.7 | $\mathrm{n}=27$ | 46.3 | $\mathrm{n}=29$ | n=8 | 68.8 | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | 33.3 | n=20 | n=22 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | $\mathrm{n}=24$ | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | $\mathrm{n}=11$ |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 804 | 129 | 76 | 26 | 43 | 85 | 38 | 27 | 41 | 29 | 8 | 97 | 12 | 36 | 20 | 22 | 2 | 19 | 24 | 4 | 11 |

## Statistical Annex: paying sex partners (respondent is the seller)



| MSM DATA IHBSS 2009 |  |  |  |  | $8$ | $0^{\circ}$ | $0_{0}^{\overrightarrow{0}}$ |  |  |  |  | $1$ |  |  | $/ 0^{\frac{0}{0}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section G. Paying sex partners (Respondent is the seller) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G4 Usual way/s of getting paying male sex partners | Stay in crusing sites | 68.1 | 43.1 | 73.5 | 80.1 | 53.1 | 26.4 | 56.4 | 91.3 | 52.5 | 84.7 | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | 69.1 | 53.2 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | 30.7 | 78.2 | 97.4 | 49.8 | 90.6 | 87.5 | 78.1 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 2,058 | 130 | 79 | 81 | 161 | 112 | 133 | 80 | 101 | 70 | 19 | 137 | 62 | 21 | 56 | 100 | 248 | 60 | 81 | 37 | 151 |
|  | Pimp in an establishment | 84.1 | 90.7 | 49.4 | 77.3 | 88.5 | 99.1 | 85.2 | 40.9 | 97.0 | 90.7 | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | 99.1 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | 95.1 | 89.1 | 97.8 | 91.2 | 94.0 | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | 75.7 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 2,057 | 129 | 79 | 81 | 161 | 112 | 133 | 80 | 101 | 70 | 19 | 137 | 62 | 21 | 56 | 100 | 248 | 60 | 81 | 11 | 151 |
|  | Pimp on the streets | 85.2 | 66.9 | 80.4 | 92.2 | 64.7 | 100.0 | 80.9 | 98.3 | 75.2 | 57.3 | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | 98.6 | 92.1 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | 97.3 | 64.2 | 97.5 | 75.9 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | 91.4 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 2,059 | 130 | 79 | 81 | 161 | 182 | 133 | 80 | 101 | 41 | 12 | 137 | 62 | 21 | 56 | 54 | 248 | 60 | 21 | 11 | 151 |
|  | Referrals from friends | 83.4 | 98.5 | 96.9 | 51.8 | 87.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.0 | 89.1 | 78.7 | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | 96.2 | 97.3 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | 97.4 | 96.2 | 99.0 | 92.9 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | 100.0 | 73.2 |
|  | n= | 2,059 | 130 | 79 | 81 | 161 | 182 | 133 | 80 | 101 | 41 | 12 | 137 | 62 | 21 | 56 | 54 | 248 | 60 | 21 | 37 | 151 |
|  | Referral frm others | n=17 | 0.0 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\mathrm{n}=8$ |
|  | n= | $\mathrm{n}=17$ | 0 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | n=1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\mathrm{n}=8$ |
|  | Who | 92.2 | 98.5 | 96.9 | 51.8 | 87.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.0 | 89.1 | 78.7 | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | 83.8 | 96.2 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | 97.4 | 96.2 | 99.0 | 92.9 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | 100.0 | 73.2 |
|  | n= | 2,059 | 130 | 79 | 81 | 161 | 182 | 133 | 80 | 101 | 41 | 12 | 137 | 62 | 21 | 56 | 54 | 248 | 60 | 21 | 37 | 151 |
|  | Escort service | 98.9 | 98.5 | 99.7 | 99.5 | 100.0 | 98.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.5 | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | 91.8 | 95.7 | 99.3 | 97.6 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | 100.0 | 99.4 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 2,058 | 130 | 79 | 81 | 161 | 182 | 133 | 80 | 184 | 41 | 12 | 137 | 62 | 21 | 56 | 54 | 248 | 60 | 21 | 37 | 151 |
|  | Internet cafe | 96.2 | 98.5 | 98.9 | 98.7 | 94.4 | 91.6 | 96.2 | 98.4 | 99.0 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | 96.6 | 97.2 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | 96.2 | 97.6 | 97.8 | 94.9 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | 96.0 | 98.4 |
|  | n= | 2,058 | 99 | 79 | 81 | 161 | 112 | 133 | 80 | 101 | 70 | 12 | 137 | 62 | 21 | 56 | 54 | 248 | 60 | 21 | 37 | 151 |
|  | Cellphone network | 90.5 | 96.1 | 80.4 | 100.0 | 94.6 | 85.5 | 97.4 | 97.7 | 56.4 | 97.7 | 93.0 | 95.3 | 65.1 | 73.0 | 93.3 | 89.1 | 97.9 | 92.9 | 91.9 | 96.0 | 93.2 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 2,057 | 129 | 79 | 81 | 161 | 112 | 133 | 80 | 101 | 41 | 12 | 137 | 62 | 21 | 56 | 54 | 248 | 60 | 21 | 37 | 151 |
| G5 <br> Number of paying male sex partners (30 days) | Mean | 3.78 | 2.43 | 1.96 | 2.97 | 2.86 | 2.86 | 2.29 | 5.21 | 2.14 | 2.57 | 4.46 | 3.84 | 4.14 | 2.34 | 4.13 | 2.34 | 2.85 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 1.40 | 1.35 |
|  | Median | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.46 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
|  | Range | 1-60 | 1-20 | 1-22 | 1-10 | 1-50 | 1-60 | 1-20 | 1-5 | 1-14 | 1-40 | 1-6 | 1-10 | 1-12 | 1-50 | 1-15 | 1-25 | 1-32 | 1-25 | 1-31 | 1-10 | 1-25 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 1,563 | 107 | 129 | 35 | 59 | 104 | 50 | 30 | 90 | 39 | 15 | 125 | 14 | 27 | 35 | 33 | 11 | 45 | 34 | 9 | 21 |
| G5a (6 months) | Ticked | 96.1 | 91.0 | 94.5 | 100.0 | 93.9 | 90.3 | 91.2 | $\mathrm{n}=17$ | 97.5 | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | $\mathrm{n}=29$ | 98.4 | 100.0 | 97.0 | 99.0 | 95.0 | 100.0 | 98.7 | 100.0 | 93.1 | 85.4 |
| Ticked categories | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,770 | 300 | 284 | 252 | 250 | 231 | 621 | 17 | 285 | 19 | 29 | 266 | 79 | 91 | 113 | 154 | 248 | 129 | 102 | 41 | 206 |
| G5b (12 months) | Ticked | 96.9 | 91.0 | 88.6 | 98.9 | 95.0 | 94.8 | 87.8 | $\mathrm{n}=17$ | 98.6 | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | $\mathrm{n}=29$ | 100.0 | 96.4 | $\mathrm{n}=24$ | 97.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.7 |
| Ticked catecories | n= | 3,664 | 300 | 284 | 252 | 250 | 231 | 621 | 17 | 285 | 19 | 29 | 266 | 79 | 24 | 113 | 154 | 248 | 129 | 102 | 1.21 | 206 |
| G6 <br> Number of oral sex in a month | Mean | 3.49 | 2.38 | 2.23 | 3.37 | 3.12 | 2.50 | 2.03 | 7.28 | 2.34 | 2.57 | 4.83 | 3.87 | 4.13 | 2.43 | 3.09 | 2.54 | 2.93 | 3.47 | 2.71 | 100.00 | 1.67 |
|  | Median | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.47 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.06 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.87 | 1.21 | 1.51 |
|  | Range | 1-60 | 1-10 | 1-30 | 1-10 | 1-50 | 1-60 | 1-25 | 1-10 | 1-10 | 1-40 | 1-5 | 1-6 | 1-15 | 1-50 | 1-15 | 1-8 | 1-30 | 1-20 | 1-31 | 1-10 | 1-60 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 2,809 | 104 | 128 | 34 | 60 | 105 | 50 | 30 | 90 | 39 | 16 | 124 | 14 | 27 | 35 | 16 | 11 | 45 | 34 | 20 | 20 |
| G6a (6 months) | Ticked | 17.2 | 89.7 | 94.7 | 100.0 | 94.6 | 92.7 | 91.0 | 100.0 | 97.4 | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 97.1 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 88.9 | 74.1 | 97.1 | 97.8 |
| Ticked categories | n= | 1,504 | 300 | 283 | 252 | 240 | 228 | 261 | 166 | 274 | 19 | 31 | 266 | 32 | 28 | 113 | 154 | 246 | 129 | 102 | 41 | 190 |
| G6b (12 months) | Ticked | 97.1 | 89.7 | 88.9 | 98.5 | 96.2 | 95.2 | 86.8 | 100.0 | 98.2 | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | 92.3 | 100.0 | 97.0 | $\mathrm{n}=28$ | 98.0 | 99.6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.4 |
| Ticked catecories | n= | 3,662 | 300 | 283 | 252 | 240 | 228 | 261 | 166 | 274 | 19 | 31 | 266 | 32 | 28 | 113 | 154 | 246 | 129 | 102 | 41 | 190 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { G6c } \\ \text { Range } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G7 | Yes | 17.2 | 10.4 | 14.6 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 12.2 | 1.0 | 28.3 | 4.5 | 13.1 | $\mathrm{n}=10$ | 12.6 | 29.1 | $\mathrm{n}=15$ | 23.5 | 18.4 | $\mathrm{n}=18$ | 7.1 | $\mathrm{n}=8$ | $\mathrm{n}=7$ | 41.3 |
| Used condom last time had oral | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 1,504 | 96 | 78 | 63 | 135 | 99 | 115 | 56 | 89 | 37 | 10 | 118 | 52 | 15 | 45 | 35 | 18 | 54 | 8 | 7 | 134 |
| G8 | Mean | 3.07 | 1.95 | 2.44 | 3.02 | 3.76 | 2.25 | 1.87 | 7.95 | 2.27 | 2.59 | 4.55 | 3.96 | 4.18 | 2.43 | 2.93 | 3.31 | 3.19 | 2.86 | 2.37 | 1.24 | 1.59 |
| Number of anal sex in a month | Median | 2.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.02 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 8.52 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.000 |
|  | Range | 1-40 | 1-10 | 1-20 | 1-5 | 1-29 | 1-30 | 1-20 | 1-6 | 1-10 | 1-20 | 2-5 | 1-10 | 1-15 | 1-30 | 1-7 | 1-5 | 1-40 | 1-20 | 1-15 | 1-10 | 1-15 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,389 | 44 | 76 | 26 | 44 | 86 | 338 | 27 | 86 | 29 | 7 | 107 | 10 | 20 | 27 | 22 | 6 | 19 | 24 | 4 | 11 |
| G8a (6 months) | Ticked | 97.7 | 100.0 | 98.2 | 100.0 | 97.6 | 96.4 | 93.2 | 100.0 | 97.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.9 | 100.0 | 98.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 93.1 | 98.9 |
| Ticked categories | n= | 3,230 | 300 | 240 | 252 | 181 | 212 | 221 | 166 | 270 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 32 | 31 | 113 | 154 | 247 | 129 | 102 | 41 | 123 |
| G8b (12 months) | Ticked | 98.0 | 100.0 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 98.5 | 96.5 | 92.9 | 100.0 | 97.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 99.5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 94.8 |
| Ticked categories | n= | 3,230 | 300 | 240 | 252 | 181 | 212 | 221 | 166 | 270 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 32 | 31 | 113 | 154 | 247 | 129 | 102 | 41 | 123 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { G8c } \\ \text { Range } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | alphanumeric variable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Inserter (top) | 61.6 | 7.3 | 57.8 | 85.3 | 46.0 | 25.8 | 94.3 | 24.5 | 22.7 | 27.5 | 47.6 | 77.5 | 59.5 | 46.2 | 36.9 | 21.8 | 59.3 | 63.1 | 52.7 | 83.6 | 84.4 |
| Last anal sex with a paying male sex partner inserter/receiver | Receiver (bottom) | 30.7 | 3.7 | 37.6 | 13.1 | 51.2 | 60.9 | 4.9 | 74.4 | 5.0 | 47.2 | 40.3 | 19.1 | 35.2 | 43.7 | 63.1 | 66.1 | 9.0 | 24.2 | 41.1 | 16.4 | 12.9 |
|  | Both | 7.7 | 3.7 | 4.6 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 13.3 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 25.3 | 12.2 | 3.3 | 5.2 | 10.1 |  | 12.0 | 31.7 | 12.8 | 6.2 |  | 2.7 |
|  | n= | 1,003 | 44 | 35 | 22 | 77 | 74 | 91 | 62 | 86 | 21 | 4 | 107 | 39 | 13 | 25 | 32 | 18 | 18 | 6 | 4 | 67 |
| G10 | Yes | 35.7 | 48.9 | 62.3 | 17.3 | 27.9 | 26.6 | 14.8 | 33.3 | 8.2 | $\mathrm{n}=21$ | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n}=27$ | 24.7 | 33.2 | $\mathrm{n}=13$ | $\mathrm{n}=25$ | 54.0 | $\mathrm{n}=18$ | $\mathrm{n}=7$ | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | 67.6 |
| Used condom last anal sex with a | n= | 1,012 | 45 | 35 | 21 | 78 | 74 | 93 | 61 | 85 | 21 | 31 | 27 | 106 | 44 | 13 | 25 | 30 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 68 |





| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MSM DA } \\ & \text { IHBSS } 2( \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TA } \\ & 009 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\leqslant$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section I. Alcohol and drug use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 <br> Ever had sex while under the influence of alcoholic drinks (past 12 months) | Yes | 60.6 | 12.7 | 69.1 | 66.1 | 60.2 | 84.6 | 66.9 | 71.6 | 81.0 | 55.0 | 33.4 | 48.4 | 61.1 | 68.3 | 57.3 | 59.2 | 44.3 | 38.6 | 61.2 | 66.2 | 70.9 |
|  | n= | 4,325 | 300 | 304 | 252 | 300 | 293 | 295 | 166 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 111 | 114 | 133 | 153 | 242 | 129 | 102 | 47 | 217 |
| 12 <br> Under influence of alcoholic drinks last time had sex | Yes | 73.4 | 76.3 | 65.6 | 94.6 | 68.2 | 70.5 | 67.1 | 93.9 | 85.6 | 85.3 | 91.1 | 89.1 | 81.8 | 82.7 | 50.9 | 78.1 | 58.5 | 48.6 | 79.8 | 64.1 | 67.0 |
|  | n= | 2,612 | 38 | 210 | 162 | 181 | 246 | 197 | 118 | 243 | 61 | 10 | 129 | 67 | 78 | 76 | 90 | 110 | 50 | 63 | 31 | 153 |
| 13 <br> Relationship with sex partner last time had sex while under the influence of alcoholic drinks | Boyfriend | 22.2 | - | 15.1 | 12.2 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 11.1 | 36.5 | 7.7 | 30.3 | 28.7 | 21.5 | 13.1 | 41.1 | 14.7 | 32.8 | 31.4 | 30.6 | 41.6 | 24.4 | 15.9 |
|  | Husband/live-in | 4.1 | - | 14.6 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 10.0 | 1.4 | 2.8 | - | 2.9 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 27.0 | 11.9 | 7.4 | 8.6 | - | . | 9.0 |
|  | Friend | 26.7 | n=5 | 18.4 | 53.4 | 20.7 | 25.4 | 9.4 | 9.6 | 40.4 | 18.8 | 4.8 | 29.6 | 48.5 | 28.3 | 24.2 | 23.2 | 22.4 | 18.9 | 33.4 | 32.0 | 24.6 |
|  | Relative | 14.9 | - | - | - | 0.7 | - | - | - | 0.5 | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | 2.0 |  | - | - | - |
|  | Paying sex partner | 14.9 | $\mathrm{n}=10$ | 11.2 | 1.9 | - | 4.1 | 10.0 | 23.8 | 5.3 | 10.1 | 4.8 | 28.1 | 23.0 | 6.5 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 2.9 | 16.5 | 1.3 | 30.4 | 13.9 |
|  | Paid sex partner | 2.6 | - | 6.9 | - | - | 2.5 | 1.8 | 5.1 | 1.9 | 5.9 | 19.0 | 2.9 | - | - | - | 0.9 | - | - | 12.2 | 2.6 | 0.3 |
|  | Acquaintance | 10.0 | n=3 | 18.7 | 9.6 | 25.6 | 23.2 | 5.1 | 6.8 | 4.3 | 5.5 | 25.9 | 10.5 | 9.3 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 18.8 | - | 7.5 | 4.2 | 0.8 |
|  | No relation | 19.2 | $\mathrm{n}=8$ | 15.2 | 20.7 | 29.3 | 21.7 | 4.0 | 8.2 | 38.5 | 26.6 | 16.8 | 4.5 | 5.2 | 19.9 | 55.1 | 27.6 | 15.1 | 25.4 | 3.9 | 6.4 | 35.6 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 1,801 | 26 | 138 | 146 | 110 | 156 | 124 | 99 | 208 | 51 | 9 | 112 | 54 | 62 | 37 | 65 | 56 | 23 | 48 | 17 | 84 |
|  | Others (n) | 119 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 3 | 13 | 1 | . | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 20 |
|  | Others (categories) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 <br> Used condom last time had sex while under the influence of alcoholic drinks | Yes | 18.6 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | 14.4 | 22.6 | 8.4 | 15.3 | 9.8 | 49.7 | 4.3 | 12.6 | 13.0 | 21.1 | 19.4 | 9.1 | 12.8 | 16.5 | 22.9 | 37.5 | 19.0 | 16.7 | 34.2 |
|  | n= | 1,888 | 29 | 138 | 148 | 120 | 169 | 128 | 106 | 208 | 52 | 9 | 115 | 55 | 64 | 38 | 70 | 60 | 23 | 50 | 20 | 101 |
| 15 <br> Took drugs in the past 12 months | Yes | 23.1 | 22.6 | 17.5 | 34.6 | 27.0 | 18.8 | 22.7 | 36.3 | 4.8 | 34.7 | 21.4 | 17.8 | 29.1 | 11.8 | 17.8 | 26.8 | 19.0 | 21.5 | 8.1 | 5.8 | 51.8 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 2,094 | 31 | 138 | 172 | 139 | 186 | 143 | 126 | 209 | 57 | 10 | 121 | 64 | 69 | 43 | 76 | 68 | 22 | 51 | 20 | 138 |
| 16 <br> Drugs used in the past 12 months (Ticked Categories only; Mutiple answers) | Amalnitrate | 0.2 | - | - | - | . | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Cocaine | 1.2 | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | . | . | 6 | . | . | - | - | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | - | - | . | - | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | 1 |
|  | Ecstasy | 6.4 | . | . | . | . | - | - | . | n=3 | - | - | . | - | . | . | . | - | - | - | - | . |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | - | . | . | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | 1 | - | 13 |
|  | Heroin | 0.4 | - | - | - | . | . | - | - | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | . | - | - | - | - | . | . | . | . | . | - | - |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | - | . | . | . | . | . | - | - | - | . | - | - | . | . | . | . | . | . | - | - | - |
|  | Marijuana | 47.9 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | . | . | . | . | - | - | $\mathrm{n}=7$ | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | . | . | . | . |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | - | - | 23 | 18 | 17 | 15 | 27 | 22 | - | 9 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 4 | 4 | - | 1 | 28 |
|  | Nubain, Nalbuphine | 2.1 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | . | . | . | - | . | . | - | . | . | - | . | - |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | - | - | . | . | 7 | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | . | . | . | - | - | - |
|  | Rugby | 9.8 | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | - | . | - | . | - | - | . |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | - | . | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | - | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | - | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Shabu | 55.6 | n=6 | . | - | . | . | . | - | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | - | - | - | - | . | . | - | . | - | - | - | . |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 482 | 7 | 7 | 35 | 23 | 23 | 9 | 28 | 10 | 11 | 1 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 56 |
|  | Others (n) | 8 | . | 1 | . | 3 | - | . | - | . | - | . | . | . | . | . | - | . | . | . | . | - |
|  | Others (categories) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 Injected any of the drugs used | Yes | 6.4 | - | 22.8 | 12.4 | 24.2 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 8.9 | - | - | - | - | 3.6 | - | - | 9.7 | 26.9 | 26.4 | 33.9 | - | 0.8 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 514 | 7 | 24 | 57 | 39 | 35 | 32 | 46 | 10 | 21 | 3 | 30 | 25 | 8 | 9 | 22 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 87 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & \text { Drugs/substance injected } \end{aligned}$ | Cocaine (n) | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | - | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Heroin (n) | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | - | - | . | . | . | - | . | . | . | . | . | . | - | . | . | . | . | . | . | - |
|  | Nubain (n) | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | - | . | . | . | - | . | . | . | . | - | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | - | . | . |
|  | Shabu (n) | $\mathrm{n}=7$ | . | - | . | - | . | . | . | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Others (n) | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | . | . | 2 | . | 3 | . | . | - | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | - | . | 1 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 24 | - | . | . | - | . | - | . | . | - | - | - | - | - | . | . | . | . | . | . | - |



| MSM DATA IHBSS 2009 |  | $/ \hat{\nabla}^{\text {ry }}$ |  |  |  |  | $0^{0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $0^{\frac{0}{0}}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $e^{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}} / e^{\overrightarrow{\theta_{0}^{0}}} / \sigma^{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section I. Alcohol and drug use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $117$ <br> Place went to last time donated | Social Hygiene <br> Clinic/RH or Welliness Clinic | 2.9 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 0.6 | - | - | - | - | 8.8 | - | - | - | 4.7 | - | 6.9 | - | 26.6 | - | - | 23.0 | - | 0.7 |
|  | Government hospital | 39.4 | n=5 | 29.2 | 9.7 | 42.2 | 28.0 | - | - | n=4 | 70.4 | 83.3 | 6.1 | 36.7 | 45.4 | 48.5 | 62.9 | 40.4 | 56.8 | 43.1 | - | 50.3 |
|  | Rural Health Clinic | 2.6 | - |  | 6.9 | . | - | - | - | - | 15.5 | . | . | 29.0 | 7.3 | . | - | 1.9 | 5.9 | . | . | 1.3 |
|  | Private Clinic | 10.1 | . | 17.1 | 13.2 | 20.1 | 3.9 | 19.6 | 23.5 | - | 14.1 | . | - | 34.3 | 30.7 | 17.6 | - | 7.6 | 3.1 | 9.2 | . | 12.9 |
|  | Red Cross | 38.2 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 34.2 | 52.7 | 37.8 | 57.0 | 68.8 | 46.4 | $\mathrm{n}=18$ | - | 16.7 | 89.2 |  | 9.7 | 33.8 | 10.5 | 40.0 | 20.9 | 19.5 | . | 13.5 |
|  | Main Health Center | 2.9 | - | 18.9 | 16.5 | . | - | - | 21.3 | - | - | . | . | . | . | - | . | . | 6.3 |  | . | 1.8 |
|  | Barangay Health Station | 4.0 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | - | 1.0 | - | 11.1 | 11.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10.0 | 7.1 | 5.1 | - | 19.5 |
|  | n= | 348 | 9 | 29 | 24 | 20 | 17 | 22 | 8 | 22 | 9 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 19 | 31 | 7 | - | 32 |
|  | Others (n) | 81 | - | 2 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 14 |  | 2 | 4 | . | 21 |
|  | Others (categories) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 118 <br> Reason why donated blod | For sick relativelfriend | 60.4 | $\mathrm{n}=5$ | 55.0 | 48.2 | 53.0 | 48.8 | 48.0 | 20.2 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | 64.9 | 62.7 | 51.3 | 92.6 | 60.4 | 85.4 | 75.3 | 60.7 | 65.0 | 78.9 | - | 52.6 |
|  | Mass Blood Donation | 36.0 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | 44.5 | 48.5 | 47.0 | 47.7 | 52.0 | 79.8 | $\mathrm{n}=15$ | 35.1 | 24.8 | 48.7 | 7.4 | 16.1 | 9.8 | 24.7 | 39.3 | 35.0 | 21.1 | - | 30.3 |
|  | Totest for HIV | 1.5 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 0.5 | 3.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.1 | 3.6 | . | . | - | . | . | 15.7 |
|  | To test for other disease | 2.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | $\mathrm{n}=2$ |  | 12.5 |  |  | 17.4 | 1.2 | - | - | - | - | - | 1.3 |
|  | N= | 394 | 8 | 30 | 24 | 25 | 18 | 24 | 10 | 23 | 10 | 4 | 22 | 3 | 12 | 14 | 19 | 19 | 33 | 6 | - | 39 |
|  | Others | 28 | - | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | - | . | 1 | . | . | 1 | 1 | - | - | 3 | . | 4 | . | 10 |
|  | Others (categories) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| MSM DATA IHBSS 2009 |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { テै } \\ \text { テै } \end{gathered}\right.$ |  |  | $\infty$ | $\stackrel{5}{0_{0}^{0}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1 e^{\vec{\theta}} / e^{\overrightarrow{\theta_{0}}}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section J. STI/HIV Knowledge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I1 | Yes | 82.4 | 59.4 | 86.1 | 69.1 | 79.5 | 93.1 | 99.0 | 94.8 | 85.0 | 81.9 | 83.5 | 74.7 | 83.1 | 79.8 | 81.8 | 70.7 | 81.1 | 85.1 | 65.5 | 98.4 | 92.2 |
| Ever heard of disesses that can be | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,353 | 298 | 304 | 252 | 298 | 293 | 295 | 166 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 265 | 111 | 114 | 134 | 154 | 264 | 129 | 102 | 47 | 217 |
| J2a <br> Symptoms of STI on women R know of (Ticked respones shown; Multiple answers) | Don't know any symptoms | 26.4 | 4.0 | - | - | 2.1 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 60.7 | 0.9 | 4.2 | 1.6 | 3.7 | - | - | 3.6 | 7.8 | 1.1 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,585 | 177 | 262 | 174 | 232 | 272 | 291 | 157 | 255 | 91 | 26 | 198 | 92 | 91 | 110 | 109 | 214 | 110 | 67 | 46 | 200 |
|  | Abdominal pain | 39.8 | 28.8 | 52.1 | 55.8 | 40.0 | 43.3 | 58.3 | 44.0 | 24.7 | 29.0 | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | 53.4 | 50.0 | 19.7 | 33.7 | 40.1 | 24.7 | 27.9 | 33.4 | 50.4 | 58 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,585 | 170 | 262 | 174 | 232 | 269 | 290 | 154 | 255 | 90 | 26 | 78 | 91 | 87 | 108 | 104 | 214 | 110 | 65 | 42 | 197 |
|  | Genital discharge | 37.2 | 52.4 | 32.0 | 58.8 | 45.9 | 48.1 | 22.7 | 30.4 | 31.0 | 40.2 | $\mathrm{N}=17$ | 40.4 | 33.0 | 34.1 | 31.6 | 27.5 | 40.9 | 22.0 | 27.3 | 45.9 | 46.6 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,587 | 170 | 262 | 174 | 232 | 269 | 290 | 154 | 255 | 90 | 26 | 78 | 91 | 87 | 108 | 105 | 214 | 110 | 65 | 42 | 197 |
|  | Foul smelling discharge | 23.5 | 50.6 | 24.3 | 39.1 | 33.8 | 15.4 | 7.3 | 11.1 | 13.3 | 23.3 | $\mathrm{n}=12$ | 34.5 | 26.9 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 9.0 | 29.2 | 23.0 | 19.0 | 31.1 | 26.7 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,586 | 170 | 262 | 174 | 232 | 269 | 290 | 154 | 255 | 90 | 26 | 78 | 91 | 87 | 108 | 105 | 214 | 110 | 65 | 42 | 197 |
|  | Burning pain on urination | 23.8 | 48.8 | 19.2 | 43.1 | 16.1 | 15.2 | 30.7 | 16.2 | 5.9 | 32.7 | 31.3 | 7.7 | 31.9 | 22.8 | 18.1 | 27.6 | 18.8 | 35.4 | 18.6 | 31.5 | 47.8 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,586 | 170 | 262 | 174 | 232 | 269 | 290 | 154 | 255 | 90 | 26 | 78 | 91 | 87 | 108 | 105 | 214 | 110 | 65 | 42 | 197 |
|  | Genital ulcers/sores | 5.5 | 10.0 | 2.4 | 5.2 | 12.7 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 5.5 | 3.2 | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | 4.5 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 5.4 | 3.4 | 8.1 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 9.0 | 10.6 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,586 | 170 | 262 | 174 | 232 | 269 | 290 | 154 | 255 | 90 | 26 | 78 | 91 | 87 | 108 | 105 | 214 | 110 | 65 | 42 | 197 |
|  | Swelling in the groin area | 5.2 | 5.9 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 7.2 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 16.1 | 2.7 | n=3 | 4.0 | 6.6 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 12.3 | 1.3 | . | 5.5 | 4.4 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,586 | 170 | 262 | 174 | 232 | 269 | 290 | 154 | 255 | 90 | 26 | 78 | 91 | 87 | 108 | 105 | 214 | 110 | 65 | 42 | 197 |
|  | Itching | 11.7 | 14.1 | 2.3 | 21.8 | 17.5 | 5.1 | 2.7 | 19.0 | 10.6 | 22.6 | n=7 | 20.1 | 26.3 | 4.1 | 7.2 | 10.3 | 16.3 | 5.1 | 2.7 | 23.6 | 14.7 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,587 | 170 | 262 | 174 | 232 | 269 | 290 | 154 | 255 | 90 | 26 | 78 | 91 | 87 | 108 | 105 | 214 | 110 | 65 | 42 | 197 |
|  | Others (n) | 100 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 29 | 11 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 10 | 5 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  | Others (categories) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| J3 <br> Symptoms of STI on men R know of (Ticked answers shown; Multiple answers) | Don't know any symptoms | 9.9 | 4.6 | - | - | - | 1.3 | - | 0.9 | 0.0 | - | $\mathrm{n}=26$ | 46.1 | - | 2.6 | 0.9 | - | - | - | - | 5.4 | - |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,525 | 173 | 262 | 174 | 237 | 271 | 292 | 156 | 254 | 91 | 26 | 146 | 92 | 91 | 110 | 109 | 214 | 110 | 67 | 44 | 200 |
|  | Genital discharge | 63.8 | 43.0 | 66.9 | 73.6 | 77.5 | 66.0 | 81.4 | 38.0 | 54.7 | 70.0 | $\mathrm{n}=17$ | 81.8 | 59.7 | 38.2 | 80.6 | 55.7 | 74.1 | 22.3 | 50.9 | 79.7 | 68.6 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,524 | 165 | 262 | 174 | 237 | 267 | 291 | 155 | 254 | 91 | 26 | 78 | 91 | 89 | 109 | 109 | 214 | 110 | 67 | 42 | 200 |
|  | Burning pain on urination | 63.3 | 62.4 | 68.5 | 83.0 | 59.7 | 60.6 | 89.8 | 68.9 | 40.6 | 49.2 | $\mathrm{n}=14$ | 61.8 | 77.9 | 29.7 | 68.9 | 56.8 | 54.2 | 69.6 | 50.1 | 78.4 | 73.5 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,527 | 165 | 262 | 174 | 237 | 267 | 291 | 155 | 254 | 91 | 26 | 78 | 92 | 89 | 109 | 109 | 214 | 110 | 67 | 42 | 200 |
|  | Genital ulcers/sores | 13.6 | 7.9 | 9.5 | 30.7 | 25.0 | 8.1 | 2.3 | 6.7 | 9.1 | 10.7 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | 26.7 | 12.1 | 5.0 | 9.9 | 11.8 | 29.6 | 5.8 | 0.5 | 19.4 | 15.7 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,525 | 165 | 262 | 174 | 237 | 267 | 291 | 155 | 254 | 91 | 26 | 78 | 92 | 89 | 109 | 109 | 214 | 110 | 67 | 42 | 200 |
|  | Swelling in the groin area | 11.5 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 8.4 | 12.0 | 8.7 | 2.2 | 5.2 | 23.6 | 5.9 | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | 11.3 | 20.3 | 3.3 | 18.7 | 12.4 | 25.5 | 3.1 | 4.6 | 20.4 | 11.0 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,352 | 0 | 262 | 174 | 237 | 267 | 291 | 155 | 254 | 91 | 26 | 78 | 92 | 89 | 109 | 109 | 214 | 110 | 67 | 42 | 200 |
|  | Can't retract foreskin | 3.5 | 6.1 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 5.1 | 2.0 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | - | 1.0 | 1.9 | 15.3 | 5.3 | 7.8 | 0.9 | - | 4.0 | 1.6 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,525 | 165 | 262 | 174 | 237 | 267 | 291 | 155 | 254 | 91 | 26 | 78 | 92 | 89 | 109 | 109 | 214 | 110 | 67 | 42 | 200 |
|  | Ulcers/sores on the anus | 4.5 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 8.8 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 2.7 | 4.7 | 5.9 | 9.4 | - | 2.3 | 7.9 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 11.5 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 10.0 |
|  | n= | 3,525 | 165 | 262 | 174 | 237 | 267 | 291 | 155 | 254 | 91 | 26 | 78 | 92 | 89 | 109 | 109 | 214 | 110 | 67 | 42 | 200 |
|  | Itching | 17.4 | 27.3 | 13.1 | 24.6 | 22.8 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 16.9 | 15.0 | 21.4 | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | 23.4 | 14.7 | 13.1 | 9.2 | 15.7 | 28.3 | 27.0 | 0.3 | 47.6 | 33.8 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3,525 | 165 | 262 | 174 | 237 | 267 | 291 | 155 | 254 | 91 | 26 | 78 | 92 | 89 | 109 | 109 | 214 | 110 | 67 | 42 | 200 |
|  | Others (n) | 149 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 43 | 19 | - | 2 | 3 |  | 2 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 6 | - | - | . | 1 | 5 |
|  | Others (categories) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sqrt{4}$ <br> Noticed sores/ulcers/scabs or inflammation, pair/swellingsllumps in urethral area (what are they) | None | 96.6 | 100.0 | 98.1 | 98.0 | 94.9 | 98.7 | 91.1 | 98.8 | 99.0 | 99.4 | 91.5 | 96.6 | 92.1 | 97.3 | 98.6 | 96.7 | 92.3 | 100.0 | 98.9 | 99.5 | 94.1 |
|  | Ulicer | 0.8 | - | . 3 | . 7 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | . 6 | - | 0.1 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 1.8 | . 7 | 7 | . | 2.3 |  | 1.1 | . 5 | 1.9 |
|  | Sores | 0.8 | . | . 6 | 1.3 | 1.4 | . 3 | . 7 | . 6 | . | 0.1 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 4.4 | 1.4 | 7 | 1.3 | 1.3 |  |  |  | 2.2 |
|  | Scab | 0.2 | . | . 3 |  | . 3 |  | 6.6 |  | - | - | 1.4 | . 7 | . 9 | . 7 |  | 1.3 | 2.0 |  |  |  | 1.9 |
|  | Pain | 1.3 | - | . 3 |  | 1.4 |  | . 3 |  | 1.0 | 0.3 | 2.8 | . 3 | . 9 |  |  |  | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Inflammation | 0.1 | . | . 3 |  |  |  | . 3 |  | - | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Swelling | 0.1 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,318 | 299 | 308 | 297 | 294 | 297 | 303 | 163 | 297 | 168 | 71 | 298 | 114 | 148 | 140 | 151 | 299 | 117 | 94 | 198 | 269 |
|  | Others (n) | 46 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Others (categories) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  |  | 용 | ㅊ | 令 | － | ๕ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}$ | \％ | E | 号 | E | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{ }$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}$ | ¢ | $\because$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ® | $\%$ | \％ | F | 号 | F | 岕 | F | 응 | $\%$ | ஃ | F | ¢ | F | 岕 | F |
|  |  | $\bar{\circ}$ | 단 | ® | 안 | 尔 | 은 | \％ | 은 | ¢ | \％ | ๕ | \＆ | \％ | ஃ | \％ |  |
|  |  | $\bar{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | ® | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | \％ | ั | 㟫 | ¢ | 劳 | ® | \％ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | 产 | \％ |
|  |  | \％ | 용 | 茄 | 号 | ¢ | $\stackrel{\text { g }}{ }$ | 寺 | $\stackrel{\square}{8}$ | \％ | \％ | ๕ | \％ | ※ | ฐ | \％ | \％ |
|  |  | \％ | $\stackrel{\%}{\square}$ | \％ | 学 | ¢ | 푸ํ | $\stackrel{\text { a }}{0}$ | 풀 | \％ | 푿 | $\stackrel{\otimes}{\circ}$ | ฐ | \％ | ํ | $\stackrel{\sim}{8}$ | ํ |
|  |  | 莮 | 总 | 硈 | 学 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\text { g }}{\text { d }}$ | 응 | $\stackrel{\text { r }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | \％ | 苛 | \％ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\text { 플 }}{ }$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\text { 플 }}{ }$ |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\pm$ | \％ | $\pm$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | \％ | $\cong$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\pm$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{¢}$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | \％ | $\pm$ |
|  |  | \％ | 안 | ¢ | 은 | へ̃ | 안 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\bar{\circ}}$ | ะ | 응 | \％ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{0}$ | 할 | $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{\circ}{8}}$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | ＋ |
|  |  | i | \％ | ® | ¢ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{8}$ | ¢ | ¢ | ® | \％ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | \％ | \％ | \％ | \％ | $\%$ |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | $\overline{5}$ | ¢ֻ． | $\overline{\text { s }}$ | \％ | $\overline{5}$ | \％ | $\bar{\square}$ | －i | $\overline{5}$ | \％ | $\overline{\text { s }}$ | 尔 | 幺 | ® | $\overline{5}$ |
|  |  | \％ | F | \％ | F | ๙ | 울 | \％\％ | 안 | \％ | 운 | ※ | F | \＆ | 은 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\bar{\sigma}}$ | F |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{2}$ | \％ | \％ | \％ | ¢ิ | \％ | ๕ | \％ | \％ | \％ | ¢ | \％ | \％ | \％ | ®ั่ | 8 |
|  |  | \％ | ＋ | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | ¢ | \％ | \％ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | 훟 | $\%$ | \％ | $\because$ | ${ }_{\circ}^{\circ}$ | $\because$ | ¢ | $\because$ |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ | ๕ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | 茞 | 突 | $\stackrel{\%}{5}$ | \％ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ | ¢ | ๕ٌ | ำ | $\stackrel{\circ}{g}$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\text { g }}{\text { ¢ }}$ |
|  |  | \％ | สี | \％ | ฐ | ๕ | ฐี | ๕ั | ¢ | \％ | ฐี | \％ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | สี |
|  |  | \％ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | त | \％ | \％ | $\stackrel{8}{8}$ | \％ | \％ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{8}{8}$ | \％ | 宊 | $\stackrel{\text { H }}{\stackrel{1}{*}}$ | $\stackrel{\text { I }}{ }$ | ิิ | $\stackrel{\text { a }}{\text { g }}$ |
|  |  | \％ | $\bar{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{0}{3}$ | 읗 | ～ٌ | $\stackrel{\circ}{8}$ | $\bar{\sim}$ | ฐั | \％ | 枈 | 굘 | \％ | $\stackrel{\text { I }}{ }$ | 寅 | 产 |
|  |  | $\stackrel{9}{\circ}$ | 志 | \％ | 할 | 合 | tit | \％ | 咅 | \％\％ | tit | ¢ ${ }_{\text {® }}$ | 窵 | ® | \％ | \％ | 항 |
|  |  | \％ | \％ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | \％ | 䓌 | \％ | 午 | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | 앙 | $\stackrel{8}{8}$ | \％ | \％ | \％ | 8 | \％ | 8 |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{¢}$ |  | § | 零 | $\stackrel{\circ}{i}$ | 镸 | \％ | 产 | ※® | 學 | ※ | 等 | $\stackrel{i}{\circ}$ | 長 | \％ | 䎟 |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{2}$ | ＊ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\underline{1}}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{8}$ | \＃ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\because$ | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\underline{2}}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{8}$ | $\because$ | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | \＃ | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | $\stackrel{1}{\underline{2}}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 亳 } \\ \text { 童 } \\ \text { 亳 } \\ \text { 膏 } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| MSM DATA IHBSS 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | os |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section J. STI/HIV Knowledge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| J21 <br> A person can get HV from mosquito bites | No | 68.3 | 91.7 | 77.1 | 71.9 | 75.1 | 67.6 | 73.4 | 52.6 | 47.7 | 75.6 | 48.0 | 69.0 | 73.7 | 71.1 | 64.6 | 77.0 | 75.2 | 49.6 | 64.2 | 72.6 | 63.0 |
|  | $n=$ | 4,329 | 300 | 304 | 249 | 295 | 292 | 295 | 166 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 264 | 106 | 113 | 133 | 152 | 262 | 129 | 98 | 47 | 217 |
| 122 <br> Sharing of needles after an HIV. infected preson used it increase the risk of HIV infection | Yes | 89.6 | 66.3 | 87.7 | 99.0 | 82.8 | 93.0 | 94.4 | 94.2 | 94.0 | 93.5 | 82.8 | 86.0 | 88.5 | 91.2 | 90.0 | 85.6 | 92.7 | 96.6 | 90.8 | 98.4 | 91.5 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,330 | 300 | 304 | 249 | 295 | 292 | 295 | 166 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 103 | 114 | 133 | 150 | 262 | 129 | 98 | 47 | 217 |
| 123 <br> A person can get HIV by sharing food with someone who is infectd with HIV | No | 63.6 | 86.6 | 72.9 | 68.2 | 49.5 | 38.4 | 67.5 | 48.4 | 48.7 | 70.2 | 50.2 | 65.2 | 66.4 | 69.1 | 62.1 | 73.5 | 79.3 | 66.3 | 61.4 | 79.6 | 61.1 |
|  | n= | 4,324 | 300 | 304 | 248 | 293 | 292 | 295 | 165 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 106 | 113 | 133 | 145 | 262 | 129 | 98 | 47 | 217 |
| $J 24$ <br> Respondent feel at risk of HIV infection | Yes | 60.4 | 42.3 | 52.9 | 66.1 | 49.3 | 64.7 | 57.9 | 67.9 | 74.0 | 70.1 | 48.5 | 55.1 | 51.8 | 66.7 | 74.0 | 69.3 | 71.4 | 34.7 | 60.6 | 21.9 | 67.6 |
|  | n= | 4,339 | 300 | 304 | 251 | 296 | 293 | 295 | 166 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 106 | 113 | ${ }^{133}$ | 150 | 264 | 129 | 99 | 47 | 217 |
| 125 <br> Reason why R is at risk of HIV infection (Ticked categories shown; Multiple answers) | Already have HIV | 2.3 | 5.5 | 0.6 | 5.1 |  |  |  | - | 4.1 | 1.9 | n=1 | . | 2.9 | 4.0 |  | 0.6 | 8.9 |  | 0.6 |  | 9.5 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 2,618 | 127 | 161 | 166 | 146 | 103 | 170 | 112 | 222 | 78 | 15 | 147 | 55 | 76 | 99 | 104 | 189 | 45 | 60 | 10 | 146 |
|  | Had sex with an HIV+ pattner | 8.6 | 11.8 | 11.9 | 10.0 | 5.9 | 5.9 | . | 7.1 | 2.7 | 9.2 | n=1 | . | 5.8 | 12.3 | . | 9.6 | 20.7 | 2.1 | 33.7 | - | 17.0 |
|  | n= | 2,617 | 127 | 161 | 166 | 146 | 103 | 124 | 112 | 222 | 78 | 15 | 147 | 55 | 76 | 99 | 104 | 189 | 45 | 60 | 10 | 146 |
|  | Many sex partners | 64.4 | 85.8 | 52.0 | 48.9 | 76.4 | 80.3 | 68.9 | 30.9 | 73.0 | 59.7 | n=8 | 23.0 | 59.6 | 46.7 | 73.9 | 83.1 | 58.1 | 79.9 | 47.0 | n=2 | 63.8 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 2,619 | 127 | 161 | 166 | 146 | 189 | 170 | 112 | 222 | 78 | 15 | 47 | 55 | 76 | 99 | 104 | 189 | 245 | 60 | 10 | 146 |
|  | Do not always use condoms | 56.5 | 88.2 | 75.6 | 64.5 | 47.9 | 61.5 | 58.7 | 48.4 | 60.4 | 52.2 | 55.0 | 25.5 | 60.7 | 32.7 | 51.4 | 56.1 | 52.1 | 24.6 | 27.1 | $\mathrm{n}=10$ | 53.3 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 2,620 | 127 | 161 | 166 | 146 | 189 | 170 | 112 | 222 | 78 | 15 | 147 | 55 | 76 | 99 | 104 | 189 | 45 | 60 | 10 | 146 |
|  | Sharing needles when injecting drugs | 3.4 | 15.0 | - | 7.3 | 3.4 | 0.3 | - | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.2 | n=1 | 1.2 | 6.8 | - | - | 4.6 | 3.9 | - | 1.1 | . | 14.2 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 2,619 | 127 | 161 | 166 | 146 | 189 | 170 | 112 | 222 | 78 | 15 | 147 | 55 | 76 | 99 | 104 | 189 | 45 | 60 | 10 | 146 |
|  | Others ( $n$ ) | 96 | 1 | $\cdot$ | 14 | 15 | 9 | 8 |  | 5 | . | . | 1 | . | 5 | , | 1 | - | 2 | 4 | . | 8 |
| 126 <br> Reasons why feel NOT at risk of HIV infection (Ticked categories shown; Multiple answers) | Only have one partner | 22.3 | 14.5 | 43.7 | 56.7 | 6.0 | 10.0 | 27.9 | 60.7 | 26.9 | 23.4 | $\mathrm{N}=5$ | 8.6 | 26.9 | 24.6 | 27.4 | 17.3 | 46.9 | 13.4 | 18.3 | 12.4 | 25.8 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 1,742 | 173 | 143 | 85 | 154 | 105 | 124 | 53 | 78 | 33 | 16 | 120 | 56 | 39 | 35 | 50 | 76 | 84 | 42 | 38 | 70 |
|  | Always use condoms | 17.2 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 22.2 | 82.8 | 93.9 | 90.3 | 56.8 | 9.0 | 12.3 | n=4 | 12.6 | 28.3 | 30.2 | 2.7 | 11.2 | 10.6 | 13.7 | 19.8 | - | 48.4 |
|  | n= | 1,742 | 173 | 143 | 85 | 154 | 105 | 124 | 53 | 78 | 33 | 16 | 120 | 56 | 39 | 35 | 50 | 76 | 84 | 42 | 38 | 70 |
|  | Convinced partner is | 36.1 | 17.3 | 83.2 | 7.1 | 56.6 | 36.8 | 65.1 | 2.5 | 20.5 | 47.8 | $\mathrm{n}=8$ | 11.3 | 41.1 | 28.1 | 8.2 | 38.2 | 26.4 | 28.7 | 40.6 | 60.4 | 35.4 |
|  | n= | 1,742 | 173 | 143 | 85 | 154 | 105 | 124 | 53 | 78 | 33 | 16 | 120 | 56 | 139 | 35 | 50 | 76 | 84 | 42 | 38 | 70 |
|  | Never do anal sex | 12.2 | 19.7 | 5.0 | 11.1 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 8.0 | - | 9.0 | 8.0 | n=2 | 3.9 | 11.1 | 9.5 | 16.9 | 19.0 | 22.7 | 52.9 | 2.0 | 19.0 | 1.5 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 1,742 | 173 | 143 | 85 | 154 | 105 | 124 | 112 | 78 | 33 | 16 | 120 | 56 | 39 | 35 | 50 | 76 | 84 | 42 | 38 | 70 |
|  | Never share needle | 9.7 | 32.9 | 3.9 | 14.7 | 8.9 | 1.7 | 2.6 | . | 38.5 | 1.7 | n=1 | 3.8 | 7.2 | 9.8 | . | 10.1 | 5.7 | 5.2 | 1.5 | 3.1 | 5.1 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 1,742 | 173 | 143 | 85 | 154 | 105 | 124 | . | 78 | 33 | 16 | 120 | 56 | 39 | 35 | 50 | 76 | 84 | 42 | 38 | 70 |
|  | Others ( $n$ ) | 184 | 2 | 1 | 4 | - | 48 | , | 1 | 6 | 4 | . | 11 | 1 | 11 | 17 |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 19 |


| MSM DATA IHBSS 2009 |  | $1 \frac{v^{\prime}}{v^{\prime}}$ |  |  |  |  |  | な |  |  | Cis) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section J. STI/HIV Knowledge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| J27 <br> Know of person who have HIV <br> J28 <br> Place/s in the city where Respondent can go to have a confidential test to find out if they are infected with HIV (Ticked categories shown; Multiple answers) | Yes | 6.5 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 5.7 | 8.0 | 5.1 | 4.8 | 8.0 | 2.1 | - | 13.8 | 0.5 | 12.3 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 18.8 | 3.3 | 4.1 | - | 11.3 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,302 | 300 | 303 | 250 | 295 | 289 | 284 | 160 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 262 | 102 | 114 | 133 | 151 | 260 | 128 | 99 | 47 | 217 |
|  | Social Hygiene Clinic/RH or Welliness Clinic | 37.0 | 61.3 | 38.6 | 51.2 | 11.0 | 20.6 | 13.4 | 57.2 | 42.7 | 27.2 | 56.7 | 30.4 | 47.8 | 30.6 | 26.8 | 56.1 | 26.8 | 15.8 | 38.9 | 17.1 | 34.7 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,365 | 300 | 304 | 252 | 300 | 294 | 295 | 164 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 111 | 114 | 134 | 154 | 264 | 129 | 102 | 48 | 217 |
|  | SHC Satellite Clinic/Mobile Clinic | 1.1 | - | 1.8 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.3 | - | 2.0 | 0.3 | - | - | - | - | 1.5 | 2.6 | - | 3.9 | 0.9 | 6.8 | - | 1.1 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,364 | 300 | 304 | 252 | 300 | 294 | 295 | 164 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 265 | 104 | 114 | 134 | 154 | 264 | 129 | 102 | 48 | 217 |
|  | Government hospital | 25.3 | 6.3 | 32.2 | 20.3 | 27.8 | 69.9 | 33.0 | 5.2 | 11.0 | 13.5 | 33.7 | 0.7 | 16.3 | 30.1 | 54.6 | 39.9 | 33.4 | 50.9 | 25.6 | 20.4 | 21.7 |
| Note: Rural Health Clinic, Red Cross, Main Health Center and Blood donation center omitted | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,366 | 300 | 304 | 252 | 300 | 294 | 295 | 164 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 111 | 114 | 134 | 154 | 264 | 129 | 102 | 48 | 217 |
|  | Private Clinic | 18.5 | 43.7 | 23.9 | 4.6 | 11.0 | 9.9 | 25.8 | 6.2 | 14.0 | 4.7 | 8.5 | 0.3 | 11.9 | 14.8 | 16.9 | 21.1 | 34.3 | 41.0 | 4.2 | 49.4 | 21.4 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,364 | 300 | 304 | 252 | 300 | 294 | 295 | 164 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 266 | 111 | 114 | 134 | 154 | 264 | 129 | 102 | 48 | 217 |
|  | Others (n) | 204 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 100 | 13 | 18 | - | 5 | 13 | - | , | 1 | 4 | 2 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|  | Others (categories) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 129 | Yes | 8.8 | 2.0 | 8.7 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 7.0 | 3.6 | 2.3 | 8.0 | 8.7 | 22.6 | 2.0 | 8.9 | 4.3 | 3.7 | 9.4 | 8.1 | 5.8 | 3.7 | 28.6 |
| Ever been tested for HIV | n= | 4,325 | 299 | 304 | 250 | 297 | 294 | 295 | 161 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 265 | 105 | 114 | 134 | 153 | 260 | 127 | 99 | 47 | 217 |
| J30a <br> Month of most recent HIV test | TREATED AS ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| J30b <br> Year of most recnt HIV test | TREATED AS ALPHANuMERIC VARIABLES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| J31 <br> Place of of HIV test (number of cases shown except for Cities of Zamboanga and Quezon) | Social Hygiene Clinic/RH or Wellness Clinic | 49.3 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 11.0 | 1.0 | - | 6.0 | 10.0 | - | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | 4.0 | 1.0 | 77.3 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 7.0 | 2.0 | - | - | 33.4 |
|  | SHC Satellite Clinic/Mobile Clinic | 4.1 | - | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | - | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | 1.2 | 1.0 | 2.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1.6 |
|  | Government hospital | 5.4 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 1.0 |  | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | 1.0 | 2.0 | - | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | - | 5.2 |
|  | Rural Health Clinic | 1.9 | - |  | 1.0 |  |  |  | 1.0 | - |  | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.0 | 1.0 | - |
|  | Private Clinic | 15.3 | $\mathrm{n}=3$ | 7.0 | - | 4.0 | 1.0 | 6.0 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | 1.0 | 1.0 | 8.2 | - | - | 2.0 | 3.0 | 11.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | 23.6 |
|  | Red Cross | 1.9 |  |  | - | - |  | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | 5.6 | - | - | - | - | 1.0 |  | - | . |  |
|  | Main Health Center | 6.5 | - | 4.0 | 2.0 | - | - | - | - | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 1.0 | - | 1.3 | - | 1.0 | - | - | - | 1.0 | - | . | 8.0 |
|  | Blood donation center | 1.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\mathrm{n}=1$ |  | - | 1.5 | - | - | - | - | 2.0 | - | - | - | - |
|  | Others | 53.0 | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 2.0 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 |  | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 3.0 | - | 4.9 | - | 1.0 | 3.0 |  | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 28.2 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 367 | 6 | 26 | 7 | 13 | 11 | 20 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 59 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 23 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 62 |
|  | Others (categories) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| J32 <br> Voluntary/required testing last time tested for HIV (number of cases | Voluntary | 67.3 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | 18.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 17.0 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | 8.0 | 1.0 | 84.4 | 1.0 | 6.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | - | 75.9 |
|  | Required | 32.7 | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | 9.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | $\mathrm{n}=3$ | 1.0 | 2.0 | 15.6 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | - | 7.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 24.1 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 373 | 6 | 27 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 21 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 59 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 22 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 62 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\downarrow 33 \mathrm{a}}{} \\ & \text { Person who required the HIV test } \end{aligned}$ | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| J33b <br> Reason for the test (required) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| J34 <br> Got the result of HIV test (number <br> $\mathbf{J 3 5}$ <br> Reasons for not getting the HIV <br> test result (number of cases <br> shown) | Yes | 78.7 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | 24.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 4.0 | $\mathrm{n}=5$ | 7.0 | 2.0 | 87.4 | 1.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 19.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 83.8 |
|  | n= | 376 | 6 | 26 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 21 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 60 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 23 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 62 |
|  | Still waiting for result | 32.9 | . | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | - | - | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | 1.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | . | 2.0 | 1.0 | - | - | 4.0 |
|  | Doesn't want to know | 7.9 | - | - | - | - | - | 3.0 | 1.0 | - | - | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1.0 | - | - | - |
|  | Afraid to know the result | 3.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1.0 | - | - | - | 1.0 |
|  | Forgot to get the result | 34.2 | - | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | - | - | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | 5.0 | - | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 1.0 | 2.0 | - | - | 3.0 |
|  | Clinic is far | 2.6 | . | - | - | - | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 76 | . | 2 | - | . | 2 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 1 | - | 4 | 4 | 2 | . | 10 |
|  | Others ( n ) | 14 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | . | - | 2 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 2 | . | 2 |
|  | Others (categories) | ALPHANUMERIC VARIABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| J 36 <br> Result of the HIV test (number of <br> cases shown except Zamboanga <br> City) | Positive/Reactive | 2.4 | 1.0 | - | - | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.9 | - | - | - | - | 1.0 | - | - | - | 1.0 |
|  | Negative/Non-reactive | 95.2 | 5.0 | 24.0 | 10.0 | 11.0 | 6.0 | 9.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 1.0 | 93.7 | 1.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 12.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 51.0 |
|  |  | 2.4 | 6 | - | - | ${ }^{-}$ | 6 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 3.5 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3.0 | $\cdots$ | - | - | 52 |
|  |  | 290 | 6 | 24 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 5 | 5 | 16 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 52 |

## Statistical Annex: Exposure to HIV intervention



| MSM DATA IHBSS 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K. Exposure to HIV intervention |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K5 <br> Approached by anyone to talk about how to prevent sexual transmission of HIV | Yes | 32.7 | 19.0 | 11.1 | 40.0 | 24.4 | 41.9 | 26.9 | 38.7 | 33.7 | 37.5 | 37.6 | 45.9 | 54.2 | 22.7 | 37.8 | 29.8 | 36.4 | 8.7 | 38.7 | 7.7 | 62.2 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,327 | 300 | 304 | 248 | 299 | 294 | 295 | 166 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 265 | 101 | 114 | 133 | 153 | 262 | 128 | 94 | 46 | 217 |
| K6 <br> Person who explained about how to prevent sexual transmission of HIV (Multiple answers) | Peer Outreach Worker | 54.3 | 50.0 | 70.8 | 83.2 | 12.2 | 20.2 | 35.8 | 87.7 | 74.5 | 59.3 | n=9 | 73.1 | 51.5 | $\mathrm{n}=24$ | 76.0 | 48.5 | 39.2 | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | 9.5 | n=2 | 62.2 |
|  | n= | 689 | 28 | 33 | 96 | 64 | 114 | 77 | 64 | 70 | 35 | 9 | 108 | 52 | 24 | 48 | 37 | 94 | 11 | 31 | 2 | 106 |
|  | NGO Representative | 17.7 | - | 21.1 | - | 52.4 | 48.3 | 18.2 | 2.2 | 5.3 | 6.0 | $\mathrm{n}=9$ | 15.1 | 16.3 | $\mathrm{n}=24$ | 14.9 | 18.0 | 9.5 | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | 67.6 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | 9.7 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 225 | - | 33 | 96 | 64 | 114 | 77 | 64 | 5 | 35 | 9 | 108 | 52 | 24 | 48 | 37 | 94 | 11 | 31 | 2 | 106 |
|  | Schoolteacher | 7.4 | - | 1.1 | 8.2 | 3.8 | 8.5 | 24.7 | 2.0 | 4.3 | 24.1 | $\mathrm{n}=9$ | 5.7 | 11.9 | $\mathrm{n}=24$ | 14.4 | 7.1 | 29.8 | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | 38.2 | - | 6.5 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 94 | - | 33 | 96 | 64 | 114 | 77 | 64 | 4 | 35 | 9 | 108 | 52 | 24 | 48 | 37 | 94 | 11 | 31 | 2 | 106 |
|  | Friend | 19.3 | 50.0 | 7.0 | 7.5 | 30.4 | 22.2 | 19.4 | 8.1 | 16.0 | 27.3 | $\mathrm{n}=9$ | 10.9 | 23.4 | n=24 | 4.7 | 19.0 | 41.3 | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | 7.3 | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | 18.5 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 245 | 28 | 33 | 96 | 64 | 114 | 77 | 64 | 15 | 35 | 9 | 108 | 52 | 24 | 48 | 37 | 94 | 11 | 31 | 2 | 106 |
|  | Family member | 1.0 | - | - | 0.4 | 0.2 | - | 0.2 | - | - | 0.4 | 1.4 | . | 1.5 | - | - | - | 0.4 | $\mathrm{n}=11$ | - | - | 1.0 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 13 | . | 33 | 96 | 64 | 114 | 77 | 64 | - | 35 |  | 108 | 52 | 24 | 48 | 37 | 94 | 11 | 31 | 2 | 106 |
|  | Priest/church worker | 0.2 | . | - | - | - | 0.3 | - | - | - | - | - | . | - | . | - | - | - | 0.6 | . | - | 0.6 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3 | - | 33 | 96 | 64 | 114 | 77 | 64 | - | 35 | 9 | 108 | 52 | 24 | 48 | 37 | 94 | 11 | 31 | 2 | 106 |
|  | Others | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.7 | 2.8 | 5.8 | 4.1 | 1.1 | 5.3 | 100.0 | 3.8 | 14.5 | 3.6 | 8.5 | 2.0 | 10.1 | 10.7 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 4.8 | 5.5 | 16.9 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,372 | 300 | 302 | 245 | 283 | 282 | 291 | 157 | 300 | 107 | 27 | 257 | 102 | 112 | 120 | 137 | 261 | 128 | 97 | 46 | 180 |
| K7 <br> Received condom(s) from a person or organization who gives it for free $\qquad$ | Yes | 41.0 | 28.0 | 29.0 | 40.9 | 41.2 | 52.7 | 24.0 | 44.3 | 36.7 | 41.3 | 50.5 | 56.5 | 54.4 | 34.8 | 48.4 | 47.7 | 29.1 | 29.2 | 49.0 | 16.7 | 70.4 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,321 | 300 | 304 | 248 | 297 | 291 | 295 | 162 | 300.0 | 111 | 31 | 262 | 107 | 114 | 131 | 152 | 262 | 128 | 96 | 47 | 217 |
| K8 <br> Person/s who gave the condom (Multiple answers) | Peer Outreach Worker | 40.0 | 50.6 | 37.2 | 71.2 | 9.1 | 13.2 | 34.1 | 75.4 | 55.5 | 23.6 | 36.0 | 55.2 | 45.4 | 30.8 | 59.9 | 38.6 | 56.3 | 2.2 | 15.9 | 30.1 | 25.4 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 696 | 40 | 88 | 97 | 122 | 151 | 71 | 70 | 61 | 46 | 16 | 145 | 57 | 40 | 64 | 71 | 74 | 36 | 45 | 8 | 151 |
|  | NGO Representative | 15.6 | 1.3 | 18.2 | 2.2 | 28.1 | 38.7 | 8.3 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 9.3 | 6.4 | 11.0 | 16.6 | 5.8 | 18.3 | 16.6 | 14.1 | 19.3 | 12.9 | 45.5 | 13.4 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 272 | 1 | 88 | 97 | 122 | 151 | 71 | 70 | 4 | 46 | 16 | 145 | 57 | 40 | 64 | 71 | 74 | 36 | 45 | 8 | 151 |
|  | Schoolteacher | 0.6 | . | - | - | - | 0.8 | 2.4 | - | 0.9 | - | - | - | - | 8.3 | - | 2.0 | - | - | 1.7 | - | - |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 10 | - | 88 | 97 | 122 | 151 | 71 | 70 | 1 | 46 | 16 | 145 | 57 | 40 | 64 | 71 | 74 | 36 | 45 | 8 | 151 |
|  | Friend | 33.0 | 46.8 | 43.3 | 25.0 | 34.9 | 29.9 | 51.7 | 21.6 | 37.3 | 62.2 | 19.7 | 25.2 | 33.1 | 37.9 | 17.9 | 28.6 | 26.5 | 78.5 | 60.1 | 45.5 | 44.1 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 574 | 37 | 88 | 97 | 122 | 151 | 71 | 70 | 41 | 46 | 16 | 145 | 57 | 40 | 64 | 71 | 74 | 36 | 45 | 8 | 151 |
|  | Family member | 0.7 | - | 0.8 | - | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.6 | . | - | - | 2.4 | - | - | - | . | 2.7 | 1.9 | - | - | . | 4.1 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 12 | - | 88 | 97 | 122 | 151 | 71 | 70 | - | 46 | 16 | 145 | 57 | 40 | 64 | 71 | 74 | 36 | 45 | 8 | 151 |
|  | Priest/church worker | 0.2 | . | - | - | 2.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 3 | - | 88 | 97 | 122 | 151 | 71 | 70 | - | 46 | 16 | 145 | 57 | 40 | 64 | 71 | 74 | 36 | 45 | 8 | 151 |
|  | Others | 99.0 | 3.3 | 0.1 | 3.4 | 14.0 | 9.3 | 2.0 | 7.0 | 6.3 | 5.0 | 23.7 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 5.9 | 13.7 | 21.0 | 0.6 | 3.1 | 7.8 | 6.4 | 12.3 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 1,740 | 300 | 88 | 97 | 122 | 151 | 71 | 70 | 300 | 46 | 16 | 145 | 57 | 40 | 64 | 71 | 74 | 36 | 45 | 8 | 151 |
| K9 <br> Received lubricant(s) from a person or organization who gives it for free <br> K10 <br> Person/s who gave the lubricant/s (Multiple answers) | Yes | 9.1 | 3.7 | 2.1 | 5.5 | 9.5 | 8.5 | 2.5 | 23.5 | 4.0 | 14.1 | 9.9 | 7.4 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 8.5 | 15.1 | 9.0 | 7.7 | 10.2 | 1.0 | 31.7 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 4,323 | 300 | 304 | 248 | 299 | 293 | 295 | 161 | 300 | 111 | 31 | 261 | 106 | 114 | 133 | 150 | 262 | 128 | 96 | 47 | 217 |
|  | Peer Outreach Worker | 27.4 | 90.9 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | $\mathrm{n}=9$ | $\mathrm{n}=25$ | $\mathrm{n}=22$ | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | 73.8 | - | $\mathrm{n}=13$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | n=9 | n=9 | $\mathrm{n}=7$ | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | $\mathrm{n}=18$ | $\mathrm{n}=10$ | $\mathrm{n}=8$ | - | 9.4 |
|  | n= | 94 | 10 | 6 | 9 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 36 | - | 13 | 2 | 19 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 19 | 18 | 10 | 8 | 48 | 58 |
|  | NGO Representative | 14.9 | . | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | $\mathrm{n}=9$ | n=25 | n=22 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | 9.4 | - | $\mathrm{n}=13$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | $\mathrm{n}=9$ | n=9 | n=7 | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | $\mathrm{n}=18$ | $\mathrm{n}=10$ | n=8 | - | - |
|  | n= | 51 | - | 6 | 9 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 36 | - | 13 | 2 | 19 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 19 | 18 | 10 | 8 | 48 | 58 |
|  | School/teacher | 2.3 | . | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | $\mathrm{n}=9$ | n=25 | n=22 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | - | 9.1 | $\mathrm{n}=13$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | n=9 | n=9 | n=7 | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | $\mathrm{n}=18$ | n=10 | n=8 | . | . |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 8 | - | 6 | 9 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 36 | 1 | 13 | 2 | 19 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 19 | 18 | 10 | 8 | 48 | 58 |
|  | Friend | 53.1 | 9.1 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | $\mathrm{n}=9$ | $\mathrm{n}=25$ | $\mathrm{n}=22$ | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | 13.3 | 90 | $\mathrm{n}=13$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | n=9 | n=9 | n=7 | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | $\mathrm{n}=18$ | $\mathrm{n}=10$ | n=8 | - | . |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 182 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 36 | 10 | 13 | 2 | 19 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 19 | 18 | 10 | 8 | 48 | 58 |
|  | Family member | 1.2 | . | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | $\mathrm{n}=9$ | n=25 | n=22 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | 3.5 | - | $\mathrm{n}=13$ | n=2 | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | n=9 | n=9 | $\mathrm{n}=7$ | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | n=18 | $\mathrm{n}=10$ | n=8 | - | . |
|  | n= | 4 | . | 6 | 9 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 36 | . | 13 | 2 | 19 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 19 | 18 | 10 | 8 | 48 | 58 |
|  | Priest/church worker | 1.2 | . | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | $\mathrm{n}=9$ | n=25 | n=22 | $\mathrm{n}=6$ | - | . | $\mathrm{n}=13$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=19$ | n=9 | n=9 | n=7 | n=19 | $\mathrm{n}=18$ | n=10 | n=8 | - | - |
|  | n= | 4 | . | 6 | 9 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 36 | - | 13 | 2 | 19 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 19 | 18 | 10 | 8 | 48 | 58 |
|  | Others | 100.0 | 4.0 | 0.1 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 5.6 | 4.0 | 1.9 | 3.0 | 9.4 | 12.9 | 1.8 | 4.0 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 8.5 | 1.8 | 4.0 | 5.7 |
|  | n= | 4,372 | 300 | 304 | 246 | 294 | 291 | 293 | 156 | 300 | 109 | 30 | 241 | 111 | 113 | 129 | 151 | 260 | 129 | 101 | 48 | 205 |



## TAGALOG VERSION

2009 PHILIPPINES INTEGRATED HIV BEHAVIORAL AND SEROLOGIC SURVEILLANCE
MSM QUESTIONNAIRE

## IDENTIFICATION



## INFORMED CONSENT FOR INTERVIEW

Magandang araw. Ako po si $\qquad$ . Ako po ay nagtatrabaho sa Department of Health. Kami po ay nagsasagawa ng Integrated HIV Behavioral and Serologic Surveillance o IHBSS. Ito ay isang survey kung saan ang mga kalalakihan at kababaihan ay aming tinatanong tungkol sa mga usaping pangkalusugan particular sa HIV at AIDS. Ang inyo pong pagsagot sa aming mga katanungan ay makakatulong sa ating pamahalaan sa pagpaplano ng mga serbisyong pangkalusugan. Inaasahan namin na ang interbiyu sa inyo at tatagal lamang ng 20 hanggang 40 minuto. Ang inyong mga sagot ay mananatiling kumpidensyal.

Hello. My name is $\qquad$ . I am working with the Department of Health. We are conducting the Integrated HIV Behavioral and Serologic Surveillance or IHBSS. This is a survey involving interviews of men and women about various health issues particularly about HIV an AIDs. By answering our questions you will help the government to plan health services. We expect this interview to take only 20 to 40 minutes of your time. All information you provide us will be kept strictly confidential.

Ang pakikilahok mo sa survey na ito ay boluntaryo. Kung mayroong tanong na ayaw ninyong sagutan, maaring ipaalam lamang ninyo sa akin at tayo po ay pupunta sa susunod na tanong. Maari din ninyong ipatigil ang interbiyu ano mang oras. Subalit, inaasahan po namin na kayo ay makipagtulungan sa pagsagot sa aming mga katanungan sapagkat ang inyong mga sagot ay mahalaga. Sa pagkakataong ito, may nais po ba kayong itanong tungkol sa survey?

Participation in this survey is voluntary. If we come to any question that you do not want to answer, just let me know and I will go on to the next question. You can stop the interview at any time. However, we hope that you will participate in this survey since your views are important. At this time, do you want to ask me anything about the survey?

Maaari na po ba akong mag-umpisa sa interview?
May I begin the interview now?
Signature of interviewer:
RESPONDENT AGREES TO BE INTERVIEWED

RESPONDENT DOES NOT AGREE TO BE INTERVIEWED
of Team Leader:
Date:

INFORMED CONSENT FOR SPECIMEN COLLECTION
Papayag ka bang magpa test para sa HIV and syphilis? Ito ay libre at hindi malalaman ang iyong pagkakakilanlan. Ito ay gagawin ng isang medical technologist.

Would you agree to be tested for HIV and syphilis? This is free and anonymous and the testing will be done by a medical technologist.

Kung gugustuhin mo, pwede namin sabihin sa iyo ang resulta ng test. Walang ibang tao ang makakakita ng mga resulta mo.

If you want to know the results, we can release the them to you. No one else will be able to see your test results.

Do you agree to HIV \& Syphilis testing?
RESPONDENT AGREES TO HIV \& SYPHILIS TESTING
RESPONDENT DOES NOT AGREE TO HIV \& SYPHILIS TESTING

Signature
of interviewer:
of Team Leader: $\qquad$
Date:

LABORATORY REQUEST


IHBSS LABORATORY RESULT STUB


SECTION A. RESPONDENT'S BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES |  | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RECORD START TIME. | HOUR <br> MINUTES |  |  |
| A1 | Nainterbiyu ka na ba sa isang HIV survey ngayong taon? <br> Have you been interviewed in an HIV survey this year? | YES <br> NO | $\ldots \quad 1$ $2$ | A3 |
| A2 | May natanggap ka bang kupon at pumunta ka sa isang lugar at doon ka ininterbyu? <br> SHOW A SAMPLE COUPON. <br> Did you receive a coupon and did you go to a place to be interviewed? | YES <br> NO | $\ldots \quad 1$ $\ldots 2$ |  |
| A3 | May natanggap ka bang band na kulay yellow sa nakaraang 2 buwan? <br> SHOW UNICEF BAND. <br> Did you receive yellow band in the last 2 months? | YES <br> NO | $\begin{array}{ll} \ldots & 1 \\ \ldots & 2 \end{array}$ |  |
| A4 | Anong buwan at taon ka ipinanganak? <br> In what month and year were you born? | MONTH <br> YEAR |  |  |
| A5 | Ilang taon ka noong huli mong birthday? <br> REVIEW IF A4 AND A5 ARE INCONSISTENT, VERIFY and CORRECT ACCORDINGLY <br> How old were you at your last birthday? | AGE IN COMPLETED YEARS |  | IF <15yo TERMINATE INTERVIEW |
| A6 | Anong bayan/ siyudad at probinsiya ka ipinanganak? <br> In what municipality/city and province were you born? | MUNICIPALITY/CITY <br> PROVINCE |  |  |
| A7 | Noong ikaw ay ipanganak, ang lugar ba na ito ay isang syudad? <br> At the time of your birth was this place a city? | YES <br> NO <br> DON'T KNOW |  |  |


| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A8 | Anu-ano ang mga siyudad o bansa na iyong tinirahan sa nakaraang 12 buwan? <br> Maaari mo bang banggitin ang tatlong pinakahuling lugar? <br> What cities or countries have you lived in during the past 12 months? <br> Please enumerate the most recent three. | 1 $2$ <br> 3 |  |
| A9 | Anong siyudad ka nakatira ngayon? <br> In which city do you presently live? |  |  |
| A10 | Ilang buwan o taon ka na nakatira sa siyudad na tinitirahan mo ngayon? <br> How many months or years have you been living in the city you are living in? | NO. OF MONTHS <br> (IF > 12 MONTHS) NO. OF YEARS |  |
| A11 | Ano ang pinakamataas na antas ng edukasyon ang iyong natapos? <br> What is your highest educational attainment? | NO GRADE COMPLETED <br> PRE-SCHOOL <br> ELEMENTARY <br> HIGH SCHOOL <br> VOCATIONAL <br> COLLEGE <br> POST BACCALAUREATE |  |
| A12 | Ikaw ba ay nag-aral noong nakaraang pasukan (2008-2009)? Pumasok ka ba buong taon (2008-2009) o bahagi lang? <br> Did you study in the past school year (2008-2009)? For the entire year or part of the year only? | ENTIRE SCHOOL YEAR <br> PART OF THE SCHOOL YEAR NO |  |
| A13 | Anu-ano ang mga naging trabaho mo sa nakalipas na 12 buwan? <br> What kind(s) of work did you do during the past 12 months? <br> PROBE FOR ALL WORK DONE. LIST ALL. SEX WORK INCLUDED. |  |  |
| A14 | Ano ang trabaho mo ngayon sa araw? <br> What is your current work or day job? | NONE |  |
| A15 | Saang siyudad ka nagtatra-trabaho ngayon? <br> In which city do you currently work? |  |  |
| A16 | Magkano kinita mo sa nakaraan buwan? | DID NOT EARN ANYTHING |  |



PLEASE PROCEED TO SECTION B

## SECTION B. SEXUAL BEHAVIOR

Ang susunod kong mga tanong ay tungkol sa pakikipagtalik. Para sa pag-aaral na ito, ang pakikipagtalik ay kung may naganap na pagpasok ng ari ng lalaki sa bibig (ORAL SEX o BLOW JOB o CHUPA), puwet (ANAL SEX o HADA), o puwerta (VAGINAL SEX) ng iyong partner. Ang pagtatalik ay maaring maganap sa parehong lalaki o kaya ay sa lalaki at babae.

My next questions are about sexual behavior. For this study, we consider sexual contact as penetrative sex, i.e. through the mouth (ORAL SEX), anus (ANAL SEX) or sexual organ (VAGINAL SEX). Penetrative sex can be between two men or between a man and a woman.

| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES |  |  | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B1 | Ilang taon ka noong una kang makipagtalik/ makipagsex? <br> How old were you when you first had penetrative sex? | AGE AT FIRST PENETRATIVE SEX ... <br> NEVER HAD PENETRATIVE |  |  | INTERVIEW |
| B2 | Nakipagtalik/nakipag-sex ka na ba sa kapwa lalaki? <br> Have you ever had penetrative sex with another man? | YES $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ 1 <br> NO $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ 2 |  |  | terminate interview |
| B3 | Ilang taon ka noong UNA kang nakipagtalik sa lalaki? <br> How old were you when you first had penetrative sex with another man? | AGE IN COMPLETED YEARS |  |  |  |
| B4 | Ano ang relasyon mo sa una mong katalik na lalaki? <br> What is your relationship with your first male sex partner? |  |  |  |  |
| B5 | Ang una mo bang pakikipagtalik sa lalaki ay nangyari labag sa iyong kalooban? <br> The first time you had sex with a man, were you forced? | YES <br> NO |  | 1 <br> 2 |  |
| B6 | Mayroon bang kapalit na pera o bagay ang una mong pakikipagtalik sa lalaki? <br> Was there a transaction of cash or kind for your first sex act with a male? | YES <br> NO |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| B7 | Alin sa mga sumusunod ang naranasan mo na? <br> Which of the following have you experienced: <br> A Ipinasok sa iyong bibig ang ari ng iyong partner <br> A. ORAL RECEIVER <br> $B$ Ipinasok mo ang iyong ari sa bibig ng iyong partner <br> B. ORAL INSERTER <br> C Ipinasok sa iyong puwet ang ari ng iyong partner <br> C. ANAL RECEIVER (bottom) <br> D Ipinasok mo ang iyong ari sa puwet ng iyong partner <br> D. ANAL INSERTER (top) | A. ORAL RECEIVER <br> B. ORAL INSERTER <br> C. ANAL RECEIVER <br> D. ANAL INSERTER | YES <br> 1 <br> 1 <br> 1 <br> 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 2^{\mathrm{NO}} \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |



| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES |  | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B16 | Sa nakaraang 12 buwan, alin sa mga sumusunod na lugar ang nasubukan mo nang makahanap ng makakatalik na lalaki? <br> READ OUT CATEGORIES ON THE RIGHT ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS <br> Which of the following places have you tried in looking for male sex partners in the past 12 months? | INTERNET CAFÉ <br> MALLS $\qquad$ <br> CINEMAS/MOVIE HOUSES <br> GAY BARS <br> MASSAGE PARLORS <br> SPA <br> VIDEOKE $\qquad$ <br> PARK <br> HOTELS $\qquad$ <br> RESORTS $\qquad$ <br> SCHOOLS <br> RESTAURANTS $\qquad$ <br> COFFEE HOUSES <br> STREET <br> OTHERS, SPECIFY: | A B C D E F G $H$ I J J K L $M$ N |  |
| B17 | Ano ang tatlong (3) pinakamadalas mong puntahan na lugar? <br> Sa nakaraang 30 araw, ilan ang mga lalaking nakatalik mo sa tatlong nabangit mong lugar? <br> Which three (3) venues do you most frequent? <br> How many sexual partners did you find in these venues? <br> IF NONE FOR THE PAST 30 DAYS, USE LONGER TIME PERIODS AND CHECK WHICH WAS USED: DURING THE LAST 6 MONTHS DURING THE LAST 12 MONTHS |  |  |  |
| B18 | Sa nakaraang 12 buwan, paano ka madalas nakakakuha ng makakatalik na lalaki? <br> In the last 12 months, how do you usually get your male sex partners? <br> ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS | STAY IN CRUISING SITES <br> PIMP IN AN ESTABLISHMENT <br> PIMP ON THE STREET <br> PIMP WHO CALLS/TEXTS <br> REFERRALS FROM FRIENDS <br> REFERRALS FROM OTHERS <br> WHO? <br> ESCORT SERVICE INTERNET <br> CELLPHONE NETWORK <br> OTHERS: | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \\ & 4 \\ & 5 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| B19 | Sa loob ng isang buwan, gaano ka dalas ka magpunta sa lugar na ito? (kung asan kayo) <br> How often do you come to this venue? (where you are now) | NUMBER OF TIMES PER MONTH |  |  |
| B20 | Sa siyudad na ito, ilang lalaki na nakikipagtalik sa kapwa lalaki ang kilala mo at kilala ka rin? <br> How many males having sex with other males do you know and also know you? | NUMBER OF MSM HE KNOWS |  |  |
| B21 | Sino ang mas gusto mong katalik, lalaki, babae o parehong lalaki at babae? What is your sexual PREFERENCE? | MALE <br> FEMALE <br> BOTH, MALE \& FEMALE | 1 2 3 |  |


| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES | GO TO |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | homosexual o bisexual? <br> What is your current sexual IDENTITY? | BISEXUAL <br> OTHERS: |  |
|  | PRQCFFn TC SFCTICNC. |  |  |

PROCFFR TO SFCTION C.

## SECTION C. CONDOM USE

Pag-usapan naman natin ngayon ang tungkol sa condom.
Now, let us talk about condom.

| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES |  | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C1 | Alam mo ba kung ano ang condom? <br> Do you know what a condom is? | YES NO |  | Skip to |
| C2 | May dala ka bang condom ngayon? Pwede ko bang makita? <br> NOTE: R SHOULD SHOW HER CONDOM Do you have condom with you now? May I see it? | SHOWN CONDOM <br> NO CONDOM/ NOT SHOWN | 1 |  |
| C3 | Madali bang makakuha ng condom sa inyong lugar? <br> Are condoms easy to get in your community? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |
| C4 | Saan KA kumukuha ng condom? <br> Where DO YOU get a condom? <br> DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSES ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS | GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL CITY HEALTH CENTER BARANGAY HEALTH STATION BOTIKA SA BARANGAY PRIVATE HOSPITAL/CLINIC PHARMACY PRIVATE DOCTOR PRIVATE NURSE/MIDWIFE NGO SUPERMARKET SARI SARI STORE CHURCH FRIENDS/RELATIVES BARS/NIGHTSPOTS OTHERS: | A B C E F G H I J K L $M$ N O |  |
| C5 | Sa nakaraang 12 buwan, nakipag-ORAL sex ka ba na HINDI gumagamit ng condom? <br> In the past 12 months, did you have ORAL sex WITHOUT using a condom? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO } \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |
| c6 | Sa nakaraang 12 buwan, nakipag-ANAL sex ka ba na HINDI gumagamit ng condom? <br> In the past 12 months, did you have ANAL sex WITHOUT using a condom? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO } \end{aligned}$ | 1 2 |  |
| C7 | Sa nakaraang 12 buwan, nakipag-VAGINAL sex ka ba na HINDI gumagamit ng condom? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO } \end{aligned}$ | 1 2 |  |

SECTION D. SEX WITH WOMEN
Dumako naman tayo sa pakikipagtalik sa babae. Let us now move to sex with a woman.


| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES |  | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | Bakit HINDI ka gumamit ng condom sa oras na iyon? <br> Why did you not use a condom at that time? | CONDOM NOT AVAILABLE <br> EXPENSIVE <br> PARTNER OBJECTED DOESN'T KNOW HOW TO USE DOESN'T LIKE CONDOM NOT NECESSARY FORGOT TO USE CONDOM OTHERS, SPECIFY | A <br> B <br> C <br> D <br> E <br> F <br> G | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}  \\ \\ \text { THEI } \\ \text { GO TI } \\ \text { D9 } \end{array}\right.$ |
| D9 | Sino ang nag-suggest na gumamit ng condom sa oras na iyon? <br> Who suggested condom use at that time? | RESPONDENT PARTNER OTHERS: |  |  |
| D10 | Sa nakaraang 12 buwan, may babae bang binayaran mo para makipag-talik sa iyo? <br> In the past 12 months, did you pay a woman in cash or in kind, to have sex with you? | YES <br> NO | 1 2 | D11 <br> D12 |
| D11 | Noong huli kang nakipagtalik sa isang babae na binayaran mo, gumamit ka ba ng condom? <br> The last time you had sex with a woman you paid to have sex with you, did you use condom? | YES <br> NO | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| D12 | Sa loob ng 12 buwan, may babae bang binayaran ka para makipag-sex ka sa kanya? <br> In the past 12 months, has a woman paid you for sex? | YES NO | 1 2 | D13 <br> BECTION E |
| D13 | Noong huli kang nakipagtalik sa babae na nagbayad para makipag-sex ka sa kanya, gumamit ka ba ng condom: <br> The last time you had sex with a woman who paid you for sex, did you use condom? | YES NO | 1 2 |  |

PROCEED TO SECTION E

## SECTION E. NON-PAYING SEX PARTNERS

Dumako naman tayo sa pakikipagtalik sa KAPWA LALAKI. Pag-usapan natin ang iyong mga katalik na hindi kinailangan ng kapalit na pera o ano mang bagay. Kasama na dito ang permanente o karaniwang/regular na partnei o di kaya ay mga casual na partner gaya ng one-night stand.

Let us now move on to sex with non-paying men sex partners. Included here are regular or usual male sex partners and casual male sex partners.



ANAL SEX

| E5 | Sa isang karaniwang sex partner na lalaki na walang kapalit para sa sex, ilang beses ka nakipag ANAL sex sa nakaraang 30 araw? <br> For a usual non-paying male sex partner, how many times did you have ANAL sex in the past 30 days? <br> IF NONE FOR THE PAST 30 DAYS, USE LONGER TIME PERIOD AND CHECK WHICH WAS USED: DURING THE LAST 6 MONTHS <br> DURING THE LAST 12 MONTHS | NUMBER OF ANAL SEX IN A MONTH <br> RANGE: $\qquad$ |  | IF '00' Go to SECTION F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E6 | Noong huling beses kang nakipag-ANAL sex sa lalaki na walang kapalit para sa sex, ikaw ba ay inserter (top) o receiver (bottom)? The last time you had ANAL sex with an non-paying male sex partner, were you an inserter or reciever? | INSERTER (TOP) <br> RECIEVER (BOTTOM) <br> BOTH | 1 2 3 |  |
| E7 | Noong huling beses kang nakipag-ANAL sex sa lalaki na walang kapalit para sa sex, gumamit ba kayo ng condom? The last time you had ANAL sex with a non-paying male sex partner, did you use a condom? | YES <br> NO |  | $\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow E 9 \\ & \rightarrow E 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| E8 | Bakit HINDI ka gumamit ng condom sa oras na iyon? <br> Why did you NOT use a condom at that time? | CONDOM NOT AVAILABLE EXPENSIVE <br> PARTNER OBJECTED DOESN'T KNOW HOW TO USE DOESN'T LIKE CONDOM NOT NECESSARY FORGOT TO USE CONDOM OTHERS, SPECIFY | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~B} \\ & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{E} \\ & \mathrm{~F} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| E9 | Sino ang nag-suggest na gumamit ng condom sa oras na iyon? <br> Who suggested condom use at that time? | RESPONDENT PARTNER OTHERS: | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| E10 | Noong huling beses kang nakipag-ANAL sex sa lalaki na walang kapalit para sa sex, gumamit ba kayo ng pampadulas o "lubricant"? The last time you had ANAL sex with a non-paying male sex partner, was a lubricant used? | YES NO | 1 2 |  |

PROCEED TO SECTION F

## SECTION F. PAID SEX PARTNERS (Respondent is the Buyer)

Pag-usapan naman natin ngayon ang mga sex partners mo na kinailangan binayaran ng pera o anumang bagay kapalit ng sex
Let us now move on to sex with male sex partners that you paid.


ORAL SEX
Sa isang karaniwang lalaking sex partner na kailangan mong bayaran para sa sex, ilang beses kayo nag ORAL sex sa 30 araw o isang buwan?
For a usual PAID male sex partner, how many times did you have ORAL sex in the past 30 days? IF NONE FOR THE PAST 30 DAYS, USE LONGER TIME PERIODS AND CHECK WHICH WAS USED:

DURING THE LAST 6 MONTHS
DURING THE LAST 12 MONTHS


| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F6 | Noong huling beses kang nakipag-ORAL sex sa lalaki na kailangan mong bayaran para sa sex, gumamit ba kayo ng condom? <br> The last time you had ORAL sex with a paid sex partner, did you use a condom? |  |  |

## ANAL SEX

| F7 | Sa isang karaniwang lalaking sex partner na kailangan mong bayaran para sa sex, ilang beses kayo nag ANAL sex sa 30 araw o isang buwan? <br> For a usual PAID male sex partner, how many times did you have ANAL sex in the past 30 days? IF NONE FOR THE PAST 30 DAYS, USE LONGER TIME PERIODS AND CHECK WHICH WAS USED: DURING THE LAST 6 MONTHS <br> DURING THE LAST 12 MONTHS | NUMBER OF ANAL SEX IN A MONTH <br> RANGE: $\qquad$ |  | IF '00' SKIP TO SECTION G |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F8 | Noong huling beses kang nakipag-ANAL sex sa lalaki na kailangan mong bayaran para sa sex, ikaw ba ay inserter or receiver? <br> The last time you had ANAL sex with a PAID male sex partner, were you an inserter or reciever? | INSERTER (TOP) <br> RECIEVER (BOTTOM) <br> BOTH | 1 2 3 |  |
| F9 | Noong huling beses kang nakipag-ANAL sex sa lalaki na kailangan mong bayaran para sa sex, gumamit ba kayo ng condom? <br> The last time you had ANAL sex with an PAID male sex partner, did you use a condom? | YES <br> NO |  | $\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow F 11 \\ & \rightarrow F 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| F10 | Bakit hindi ka gumamit ng condom sa oras na iyon? <br> Why did you not use a condom at that time? | CONDOM NOT AVAILABLE <br> EXPENSIVE <br> PARTNER OBJECTED <br> DOESN'T KNOW HOW TO USE <br> DOESN'T LIKE CONDOM <br> NOT NECESSARY <br> FORGOT TO USE CONDOM <br> OTHERS, SPECIFY | A B C D E F G | SKIP TO <br> F12 |
| F11 | Sino ang nag-suggest na gumamit ng condom sa oras na iyon? <br> Who suggested condom use at that time? | RESPONDENT PARTNER OTHERS: | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| F12 | Noong huli kang nakipag-ANAL sex sa lalaki na kailangan mong bayaran para sa sex, gumamit ba kayo ng pampadulas o lubricant? The last time you had anal sex with a paid male sex partner, was a lubricant used? | YES <br> NO | 1 2 |  |

PROCEED TO SECTION G

SECTION G. PAYING SEX PARTNERS (Respondent is the Seller)
Pag-usapan naman natin ngayon ang mga sex partners mo na binayaran ka ng pera o anumang bagay para makipag sex ka sa kanila
Let us now move on to sex with male sex partners that paid you to have sex with them.

| No. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES |  | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G1 | Ilang taon ka noong UNA kang nakipagtalik sa lalaki na binayaran ka para makipagtalik ka sa kanya? <br> Maaring pera o bagay ang pambayad. <br> How old were you when you were FIRST paid for sex by another man? Payment could be money or things. | AGE AT FIRST <br> PAID SEX <br> I HAVE NEVER BEEN PAID FOR SEX | $99$ | SKIP TO SECTION H |
| G2 | Sa nakaraang 12 buwan, tumanggap ka ba ng bayad mula sa lalaki kapalit ng pakikipag-sex mo sa kanya? <br> In the past 12 months, did you have sex in exchange for cash or kind from a paying male partner? | YES <br> NO | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SKIP TO } \\ & \text { SECTION } \\ & \text { H } \end{aligned}$ |
| G3 | Sa nakaraang 12 buwan, saan ka madalas nakakakuha ng mga lalaki na nagbabayad para makipag-sex sa iyo? <br> In the past 12 months, where did you usually get your paying male sex partners? <br> ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS | INTERNET CAFÉ <br> MALLS <br> CINEMAS/MOVIE HOUSES <br> GAY BARS <br> MASSAGE PARLORS <br> SPA <br> VIDEOKE <br> PARK <br> HOTELS <br> RESORTS <br> SCHOOLS <br> RESTAURANTS <br> COFFEE HOUSES <br> STREET <br> OTHERS, SPECIFY: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \text { C } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { F } \\ & \text { G } \\ & \text { H } \\ & \text { I } \\ & \text { J } \\ & \text { K } \\ & \text { M } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| G4 | Sa nakaraang 12 buwan, paano ka madalas nakakakuha ng lalaki na nagbabayad kapalit ng pakikipag-sex sa iyo? <br> In the past 12 months, how did you usually get your paying male sex partners? <br> ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS | STAY IN CRUISING SITES <br> PIMP IN AN ESTABLISHMENT <br> PIMP ON THE STREET <br> PIMP WHO CALLS/TEXTS <br> REFERRALS FROM FRIENDS <br> REFERRALS FROM OTHERS WHO? <br> ESCORT SERVICE INTERNET CELLPHONE NETWORK OTHERS | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |  |


| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES |  | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G5 | Sa nakaraang 30 araw, ilan ang iyong naging lalaking partners na NAGBAYAD kapalit ng pakikipag sex sa iyo? <br> In the past 30 days, how many paying male sex partners did you have? <br> IF NONE FOR THE PAST 30 DAYS, USE LONGER TIME PERIODS AND CHECK WHICH WAS USED: DURING THE LAST 6 MONTHS <br> DURING THE LAST 12 MONTHS | NUMBER OF PAID PARTNERS IN A MONTH | $1$ |  |
| ORAL SEX |  |  |  |  |
| G6 | Sa isang karaniwang sex partner na nagbayad sa iyo para sa sex, ilang beses ka nakipag ORAL sex sa loob ng nakaraang 30 araw? <br> For a usual paying sex partner, how many times did you have oral sex in the past 30 days? <br> IF NONE FOR THE PAST 30 DAYS, USE LONGER TIME <br> PERIODS AND CHECK WHICH WAS USED: DURING THE LAST 6 MONTHS <br> DURING THE LAST 12 MONTHS | NUMBER OF ORAL SEX <br> IN A MONTH <br> RANGE: $\qquad$ |  |  |
| G7 | Noong huling beses kang nakipag-oral sex sa isang partner na nagbayad para makipag sex gumamit ba kayo ng condom? <br> The last time you had oral sex with an paying sex partner, did you use a condom? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll}  & 1 \\ \ldots & 2 \end{array}$ |  |
| ANAL SEX |  |  |  |  |
| G8 | Sa isang karaniwang sex partner na nagbayad sa iyo para sa sex ilang beses ka nakipag ANAL sex sa loob ng nakaraang 30 araw? <br> For a usual paying sex partner, how many times did you have anal sex in the past 30 days? <br> IF NONE FOR THE PAST 30 DAYS, USE LONGER TIME PERIODS AND CHECK WHICH WAS USED: DURING THE LAST 6 MONTHS DURING THE LAST 12 MONTHS | NUMBER OF ANAL SEX IN A MONTH <br> RANGE: $\qquad$ |  | IF '00' SKIP TO SECTION H |
| G9 | Noong huling beses kang nakipag-anal sex sa isang lalaki na nagbayad para makipag-sex sa sa iyo, ikaw ba ay inserter or receiver? <br> The last time you had anal sex with an paying male sex partner, were you an inserter or reciever? | INSERTER (TOP) <br> RECIEVER (BOTTOM) <br> BOTH | $1$ <br> 2 <br> 3 |  |


| No. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES |  | GOTO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G10 | Noong huling beses kang nakipag-anal sex ka sa isang partner na nagbayad sa iyo para sa sex, gumamit ba kayo ng CONDOM? <br> The last time you had anal sex with a paying sex partner, did you use a condom? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow G 12 \\ & \rightarrow \text { G11 } \end{aligned}$ |
| G11 | Bakit hindi ka gumamit ng condom sa oras na iyon? <br> Why did you not use a condom at that time? | CONDOM NOT AVAILABLE EXPENSIVE <br> PARTNER OBJECTED <br> PARTNER DOESN'T KNOW CONDOM/HOW TO USE <br> R DOESN'T LIKE CONDOM <br> R DOESN'T KNOW CONDOM <br> PARTNER DIDN'T THINK IT <br> WAS NECESSARY <br> R DIDN'T THINK IT WAS NECESSARY DIDN'T THINK OF IT OTHERS, SPECIFY | A B C D E F G G H I |  |
| G12 | Sino ang nag-suggest na gumamit ng condom sa oras na iyon? <br> Who suggested condom use at that time? | RESPONDENT PARTNER OTHERS $\qquad$ SPECIFY | 1 2 |  |
| G13 | Noong huli kang nakipag-anal sex sa iyong partner na nagbayad sa iyo para sa sex, kayo ba ay gumamit ng pampadulas o "lubricant"? <br> The last time you had anal sex with a paying sex partner, was a lubricant used? | YES <br> NO | 1 |  |
| G14 | Ang pinakahuli mo bang sex partner na nagbayad ay isang dayuhan o foreigner? Was your last paying partner a foreigner? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO } \end{aligned}$ | 1 |  |

PROCEED TO SECTIONH

## SECTION H. GROUP SEX

Ang mga susunod kong tanong ay tungkol sa tinatawag na group sex o "orgy" kung saan ang isang grupo na mahigit sa dalawang tao ay nagpapalitan ng katalik.
My next questions pertain to group sex (sex orgy) or sexual activity involving a group of more than two persons in which partners are exchanged.


| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES |  | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H8 | Gumamit ka ba ng condom sa LAHAT ng iyong pagtatalik? <br> Was a CONDOM used during ALL sex acts? | ALL SEX ACTS SOME ONLY, NOT ALL NEVER USED | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| H9 | Gumamit ka ba ng lubricant sa LAHAT ng iyong pagtatalik? <br> Was a LUBRICANT used during ALL sex acts? | ALL SEXACTS <br> SOME ONLY, NOT ALL NOT AT ALL | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| H10 | Noong huli kang sumali sa group sex, nakainom ka ba ng inuming nakakalasing? <br> The last time you participated in a group sex activity, did you drink alcoholic drinks? | YES NO | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| H11 | Noong huli kang sumali sa isang group sex, gumamit ka ba ng droga? <br> The last time you participated in a group sex activity, have you taken drugs or substances that can make you "high"? | YES <br> NO |  | SKIP TO SECTION I |
| H12 | Sa mga droga na iyong nagamit noong huli kang sumali sa isang group sex, may naiturok ka ba na droga? <br> Of the drugs that you have used the last time you participated in a group sex activity, have you injected any? | YES <br> NO |  | SKIP TO SECTION I |
| H13 | Alin ang mga naiturok mo noong huli kang sumali sa isang group sex? <br> DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES <br> Which drugs have you injected? | COCAINE <br> HEROIN <br> NUBAIN <br> SHABU <br> OTHERS: | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~B} \\ & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ |  |

PROCEED TO SECTION I

## SECTION I. ALCOHOL AND DRUG USE



| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES |  | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $i 7$ | Sa mga droga na iyong nagamit, nasubukan mo na bang magturok $o$ mag-inject ng mga ito? Of the drugs that you have used, have you ever tried injecting any? | YES <br> NO | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | i 12 |
| 18 | Alin ang mga naiturok mo na? <br> DO NOT READ OUT RESPONSE CATEGORIES <br> Which drug/substance have you injected? | COCAINE <br> HEROIN <br> NUBAIN <br> SHABU <br> OTHERS: |  |  |
| 19 | Anong taon ka UNANG nagturok ng droga? <br> In what year did you first inject drugs? | YEAR |  |  |
| 110 | Anong buwan at taon ka HULING nagturok ng droga? <br> In what month and year was the last time you injected drugs or "substances"? | MONTH <br> YEAR |  |  |
| i11 | Nakagamit ka na ba ng karayom o hiringgilya na nagamit na ng iba? <br> Have you ever used a needle or syringe that has been used before by another person? | YES <br> NO |  |  |
| 112 | Nakipagtalik ka na ba habang naka-droga? <br> Did you ever have sex while you were on drugs? | YES <br> NO | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | i 15 |
| i13 | Ano ang relasyon mo sa huling nakatalik/ naka-sex mo habang ikaw ay naka-droga? <br> What is your relationship with your sex partner the last time you had sex while you were on drugs? | BOYFRIEND <br> HUSBAND/LIVE-IN <br> FRIEND <br> RELATIVE <br> PAYING SEX PARTNER <br> PAID SEX PARTNER <br> ACQUAINTANCE <br> NO RELATION <br> OTHERS: $\qquad$ | 1 <br> 2 <br> 3 <br> 4 <br> 5 <br> 6 <br> 7 <br> 8 <br>  |  |
| i14 | Sa huli mong pakikipagtalik habang ikaw ay naka-droga, gumamit ba kayo ng condom? <br> The last time you had sex while you were on drugs, was a condom used? | YES NO | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |



## BLOOD DONATION

| i15 | Nakapagbigay o donate ka na ba ng dugo? <br> Have you ever donated blood? | YES <br> NO | Go to Section J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 116 | Anong buwan at taon ka HULING nagdonate ng dugo? <br> In what month and year was the LAST time you donated blood? | MONTH <br> YEAR $\square$ |  |
| i17 | Saan ka HULING nag-donate ng dugo? <br> Where did you go to the LAST time you donated blood? | SOCIAL HYGIENE CLINIC/ <br> RH OR WELLNESS CLINIC SHC SATELLITE CLINIC/ MOBILE CLINIC GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL RURAL HEALTH CLINIC PRIVATE CLINIC RED CROSS MAIN HEALTH CENTER BARANGAY HEALTH STATION OTHERS: |  |
| i18 | Bakit ka nag donate ng dugo? <br> Why did you donate blood? | FOR SICK RELATIVE/FRIEND <br> MASS BLOOD DONATION <br> TO TEST FOR HIV <br> TO TEST FOR OTHER DISEASE OTHER: |  |

PROCEED TO SECTION J

## SECTION J. STI/HIV KNOWLEDGE

Ngayon naman nais kong magtanong tungkol sa iyong kaalaman sa sexually transmitted infections (STI) at HIV.
Now I wish to ask you about what you know of sexually transmitted infections (STI) and HIV.

| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES |  | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J1 | Nakarinig ka na ba ng mga sakit na naipapasa sa pamamagitan ng pakikipagtalik $o$ ang tinatawag na STI? <br> Have you ever heard of diseases that can be transmitted through sexual intercourse (STI)? | YES <br> NO |  | J4 |
| J2 | Anu-ano ang mga alam mong sintomas ng STI sa mga BABAE? <br> PROBE: May iba pa ba? <br> DO NOT READ SYMPTOMS <br> ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS <br> What symptoms of STIs in women do you know? <br> PROBE: Any others? | DON'T KNOW ANY SYMPTOM <br> ABDOMINAL PAIN .... <br> GENITAL DISCHARGE <br> FOUL SMELLING DISCHARGE <br> BURNING PAIN ON <br> URINATION <br> GENITAL ULCERS/SORES <br> SWELLING IN THE <br> GROIN AREA <br> ITCHING <br> OTHER: | 99 A B C D E F F |  |
| J3 | Anu-ano ang mga alam mong sintomas ng STI sa mga LALAKI? <br> PROBE: May iba pa ba? <br> DO NOT READ SYMPTOMS ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS <br> What symptoms of STIs in men do you know? PROBE: Any others? | DON'T KNOW ANY SYMPTOM <br> GENITAL DISCHARGE BURNING PAIN ON URINATION GENITAL ULCERS/SORES SWELLING IN THE GROIN AREA . CAN'T RETRACT FORESKIN ULCERS/SORES ON THE ANUS ITCHING OTHER: | A A B C D E F |  |
| J4 | Sa nakaraang 12 buwan, may napansin ka bang sugat, butlig-butlig o langib sa iyong ari o kaya naman ay nakaramdam ka ng kirot, pamamaga o bukol sa iyong ari? Anu-ano ang mga napansin mo sa sarili mo? <br> In the past 12 months, did you notice sore/s, ulcer/s or scab/s in your urethral area or notice inflammation, pain or swelling/lumps in your urethral area? What are they? | NONE <br> SUGAT/ULCER <br> BUTLIG-BUTLIG/SORES <br> LANGIB/SCAB <br> KIROT/PAIN <br> PAMAMAGAIINFLAMATION <br> BUKOL/LUMP/SWELLING OTHER: | D E F G |  |



IF NONE IN J4 \& J5, SKIP TO J13

| J6 | May kinonsulta ka ba tungkol sa mga sintomas na iyon? <br> Did you consult anyone about those symptoms? | YES $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ 1 <br> NO $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ 2 | $\rightarrow \begin{aligned} & \rightarrow \mathrm{J} 7 \\ & \rightarrow \mathrm{~J} 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J7 | Saan ka pumunta para kumonsulta? <br> Where did you go for medical consultation? | SOCIAL HYGIENE CLINIC/  <br> RH OR WELLNESS CLINIC 1 <br> SHC SATELLITE CLINICI 2 <br> MOBILE CLINIC.......... 3 <br> GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL 4 <br> CITY HEALTH CLINIC 5 <br> MAIN HEALTH CENTER.... 6 <br> BARANGAY HEALTH 7 <br> STATION ....................... 8 <br> OTHER:  |  |
| J8 | Kanino ka kumonsulta? <br> Who did you consult? |  |  |
| J9 | Na-kumpleto mo ba ang medikasyon na iniresta o ipinayo sa iyo? <br> Did you complete the medication prescribed to you? | YES $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ 1 <br> NO $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$  <br> MEDS NOT PRESCRIBED 2 |  |
| J10 | Nabanggit mo ba ito sa iyong partner bago ka nakipagtalik? <br> Did you tell your partner before you had sex? |  |  |
| J11 | Nakipagtalik ka pa rin ba kahit may nararamdaman kang sintomas? <br> Did you continue to have sex despite the symptoms? | YES <br> NO | $\rightarrow{ }_{\rightarrow} \mathrm{J} 12$ |
| J12 | Gumamit ba kayo ng condom? <br> Was a condom used when you had sex? | YES $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ 1 <br> NO $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ 2 |  |

HIV AND AIDS

| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES |  | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J14 | Alam mo ba ang AIDS? <br> Do you know what AIDS is? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| J15 | Maari bang may HIV ang isang taong mukha namang malusog? <br> Can a healthy-looking person have HIV? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| J16 | Maiiwasan ba ang pagkakaroon ng HIV? Can HIV be prevented? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| J17 | Tataas ba ang tyansa na mahawaan ng HIV kung mayroon kang STI na hindi nagamot? Can having an untreated STI increase the risk of HIV transmission? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| J18 | Kung ang iyong sex partner ay nag-iisa lamang, wala syang ibang sex partner, at di pa nagkakaroon ng HIV, bababa ba ang tyansa na maipasa ang HIV? Can having sex with only one faithful, uninfected partner reduce the risk of HIV transmission? | YES <br> NO | 1 2 |  |
| J19 | Pwede bang magka-HIV ang isang tao sa pamamagitan ng paggamit ng inidoro o ihian sa pampublikong banyo o CR? <br> Can a person get HIV by using toilet bowls/urinals in public places? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| J20 | Ang paggamit ba ng condom ay makakapagpababa ng tyansa na maipasa ang HIV? <br> Can using condoms reduce the risk of HIV transmission? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | 1 2 |  |
| J21 | Ang isang tao ba ay pwedeng magka-HIV sa pamamagitan ng kagat ng lamok? <br> Can a person get HIV from mosquitoes bites? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES } \\ & \text { NO } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| J22 | Ang paggamit ba ng karayom na ginamit na ng may HIV sa pagtuturok ng droga ay maaring makataas ang posibilidad na magkaroon ng HIV? <br> Can the sharing of needles after an HIV infected person had used it increase the risk of HIV infection? | YES NO | 1 2 |  |




PROCEED TO SECTION K

## SECTION K. EXPOSURE TO HIV INTERVENTION

Ang susunod na mga tanong ay tungkol sa mga programa para sa STI o HIV
The next questions are on sexually transmitted infections (STI) or HIV intervention programs.

| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K1 | Saan o kanino mo nakuha ang mga impormasyon mo tungkol sa STI o HIV? <br> ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS <br> Where or from whom did you obtain information about STI or HIV? |  |  |
| K2 | Anong impormasyon ang iyong natatandaan? <br> PROBE AND ASK FOR SPECIFIC INFORMATION ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS <br> What information do you remember? |  |  |

Ang mga susunod na katanungan ay tungkol sa nakaraang 12 buwan.
The next questions pertain to the past 12 months.


| NO. | QUESTIONS AND FILTERS | CODING CATEGORIES | GO TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K6 | Sino ang nagpaliwanag sa iyo? <br> Who explained it to you? | PEER OUTREACH WORKER NGO REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL/TEACHER FRIEND FAMILY MEMBER PRIEST/CHURCH WORKER OTHERS: |  |
| K7 | Nakatanggap ka na ba ng libreng condom galing sa isang tao o organisasyon? <br> Have you receive condom(s) from a person or organization who gives it for free? | YES <br> NO | $\rightarrow \mathrm{K} 9$ |
| K8 | Sino ang nagbigay sa iyo? <br> Who gave it to you? | PEER OUTREACH WORKER NGO REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL/TEACHER FRIEND FAMILY MEMBER PRIEST/CHURCH WORKER OTHERS: |  |
| K9 | Nakatanggap ka na ba ng pampadulas/ "lubricant" galing sa isang tao o organisasyon na nagbibigay nito ng libre? <br> Did you receive lubricant(s) from a person or organization who gives it for free? | YES $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ 1 <br> NO $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ 2 | K11 |
| K10 | Sino ang nagbigay sa iyo? <br> Who gave it to you? | PEER OUTREACH WORKER NGO REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL/TEACHER FRIEND FAMILY MEMBER PRIEST/CHURCH WORKER OTHERS: |  |
| K11 | May lumapit ba sa iyo para magpaliwanag kung paano maiiwasan magka HIV pag-nagtuturok ng droga? <br> Has anyone ever approached you to talk about how to prevent HIV transmission when injecting drugs? | YES <br> NO | ERMINATE terview ND TIME |
| K12 | Sino ang nagpaliwanag sa iyo? <br> Who explained it to you? <br> ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS | PEER OUTREACH WORKER NGO REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL/TEACHER FRIEND FAMILY MEMBER PRIEST OR CHURCH WORKER OTHER: |  |
|  | RECORD END TIME. | HOUR |  |


[^0]:    * unweighted

[^1]:    *unweighted

[^2]:    see next page

[^3]:    see next page
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