

# 1 Perceived concern and risk of getting infected with monkeypox 2 among MSM: Evidence and perspectives from the Netherlands, July 3 2022

4 Haoyi Wang<sup>1</sup>, Kennedy J.I. d'Abreu de Paulo<sup>1</sup>, Thomas Gültzow<sup>1</sup>, Hanne M.L.  
5 Zimmermann<sup>1</sup>, Kai. J. Jonas<sup>1\*</sup>

6  
7  
8 <sup>1</sup>Department of Work and Social Psychology, Maastricht University, Maastricht, The  
9 Netherlands

10  
11 ORCID:

12 HW: 0000-0002-1844-7156

13 KJIDDP: 0000-0002-9853-5585

14 TG: 0000-0002-9268-1880

15 HMLZ: 0000-0002-1647-8485

16 KJJ: 0000-0001-6607-1993

17  
18 \*Correspondence to: Kai J. Jonas

19 Department of Work and Social Psychology, Maastricht University, Maastricht, 6200ER, the  
20 Netherlands

21 Phone: +31 43 38 84068

22 Email: [kai.jonas@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:kai.jonas@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

## 23 24 Declarations

25 Funding: There was no funding source for this study.

26 Conflicts of interest: The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to  
27 disclose.

28 Ethics approval: The study was assessed and approved by the ERCPN of Maastricht  
29 University (ref.188\_11\_02\_2018\_S32).

30 Consent to participate: Informed consent was provided by all participants.

31 Consent for publication: Not applicable

32 Availability of data and material: Data are available upon request.

33 Code availability: Not applicable

34  
35 Authors' contribution

36 All authors conceptualised this research; KJJ, HW, HMLZ collected the data for this research;  
37 HW analysed the data; HW, KJIDDP, TG, HMLZ and KJJ drafted the manuscript; TG,  
38 HMLZ and KJJ edited the manuscript; all authors critically revised the manuscript for  
39 intellectual content. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

## 40 Abstract

41 The current monkeypox epidemic is most prevalent among men-who-have-sex-with-men  
42 (MSM). PrEP users and MSM with HIV (MSMHIV) are considered having the highest risk  
43 for monkeypox infection in the Netherlands and being targeted for monkeypox vaccination.  
44 Next to the epidemiological evidence, perceived concern/risk are also important in decision  
45 making about health behaviour uptake, e.g., vaccination uptake. It is thus relevant to examine  
46 which subpopulations among MSM consider themselves most at risk and most concerned  
47 about monkeypox. This study aimed to investigate this to complement and to help  
48 determining if the current measures to curb the epidemic are successfully targeted or not in  
49 the Netherlands. We conducted an online survey among 394 Dutch MSM. We first calculated  
50 the prevalence and standardised prevalence ratio (SPR) of high perceived concern/risk of  
51 monkeypox by the PrEP-use and HIV status. We then conducted two multivariable logistic  
52 regression analyses to investigate the perceived concern/risk of monkeypox and their  
53 potential socio-demographic/behavioural/health/psycho-social determinants. Among the  
54 included MSM, 52% showed high perceived concern and 30% showed high perceived risk of  
55 monkeypox. PrEP users (SPR=0.83) showed a significantly lower chance of perceived  
56 concern; and MSMHIV (SPR=2.09) were found to have a significant higher chance of  
57 perceiving high risk of monkeypox. In the multivariable logistic analyses, non-PrEP users  
58 (aOR=2.55) were more likely to perceive high concern, while MSM who were retired  
59 (aOR=0.23) and who had chemsex recently (aOR=0.63) were less likely to perceive high  
60 concern. MSMHIV (aOR=4.29) and MSM who had an unknown/undisclosed HIV status  
61 (aOR=6.07), who had attended private sex parties (aOR=2.10), and who knew people who  
62 have/had monkeypox (aOR=2.10) were more likely to perceive high risk of monkeypox. We  
63 found that a higher perceived risk (aOR=2.97) and a higher concern (aOR=3.13) of  
64 monkeypox were correlated with each other, more results see Table 2. In sum, only one-third  
65 of Dutch MSM considered themselves at a high risk of a monkeypox infection, and only half  
66 of them showed a high concern. We identified a potential discrepancy between the “actual  
67 risk” and the perceived risk and concern of monkeypox among MSM in this early stage of the  
68 monkeypox epidemic in the Netherlands, especially among PrEP users and MSMHIV. More  
69 refined public health communication strategies may be needed to improve the understanding  
70 and knowledge of the “actual risk” of monkeypox infections among these MSM sub-  
71 populations to encourage and facilitate an improved health behaviour uptake.

72

73 Keywords: Monkeypox, MSM, Concern of infection, Perceived risk of infection, Prevention

## 74 Introduction

75 Monkeypox is a zoonotic disease described in the literature as a less-lethal relative of  
76 smallpox disease [1, 2], which is caused by the orthopoxvirus. On average, a few thousand  
77 cases occur in Africa on a yearly basis. However, the rapid development of its spreading  
78 outside the core area has put scientists and the public on high alert for monkeypox [2], and  
79 led to the declaration of a public health emergency by the World Health Organization (WHO)  
80 in July 2022 [3].

81 In the Netherlands, 1,166 cases were reported (assessed on August 31, 2022) with a  
82 majority occurring in Amsterdam [4]. Currently, the major infection routes were skin-to-skin  
83 contact and sexual contact facilitated by frequently changing partners [2, 5]. Most of the  
84 recent infections involved men who have sex with men (MSM) [4, 6]. MSM are thus  
85 considered to be the population with the highest risk of monkeypox [1]. Furthermore, the  
86 current monkeypox epidemic is quite likely to be stigmatised as another “gay epidemic”  
87 similar to the beginning of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) epidemic [5, 7]. This  
88 notion is being corroborated, in the Netherlands but also globally, due to some MSM sub-  
89 populations, such as MSM who use HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP), and MSM with a  
90 diagnosed HIV being labelled as the most at risk population for monkeypox [8, 9], as  
91 evidence also shown that coinfection of monkeypox and HIV is possible [10]. Next to this  
92 epidemiological perspective, it is relevant to understand how members of affected  
93 communities perceive themselves in terms of monkeypox risk, and to examine which  
94 subpopulation among MSM considers themselves most at risk and most concerned about  
95 monkeypox. Such knowledge can complement both the epidemiological as well as the  
96 healthcare provider perspective and can help to determine if the current measures to curb the  
97 epidemic are sufficiently targeted or not. To close this gap, we investigated concern of and  
98 risk for a monkeypox infection among MSM in the Netherlands during the onset of the  
99 epidemic.

100 In psychosocial theories used to explain preventive behaviours towards infectious  
101 diseases, beliefs regarding risks and concerns are often linked to the use of such preventive  
102 behaviours. For example, in the Health Belief Model [11], perceived severity and perceived  
103 risk are two of the key determinants underlying the uptake of health behaviour, and have been  
104 associated with vaccination uptake, such as HPV and COVID-19, in previous studies [12-14].  
105 However, for MSM, monkeypox is a novel health risk [15, 16], and individuals cannot easily  
106 fall back on previous knowledge to determine their infection risk, or to gauge how concerned

107 they should be – as they can for other infections that have a longer history in this  
108 demographic [17, 18]. That said, both feelings of risk and concern might potentially  
109 determine MSM’s motivations to engage in protective behaviours, such as vaccination or risk  
110 reduction behaviours (e.g., reducing one’s number of sex partners) – both have been  
111 recommended for MSM [16, 19]. Two scenarios are possible: there could be 1) MSM who  
112 perceive themselves to be at risk of monkeypox who are actually at risk and should therefore  
113 be concerned; 2) MSM who do *not* perceive themselves to be at risk, while they are actually  
114 at risk and thus pay less attention to the topic, which may lead to more infections [20]. Due to  
115 a lack of knowledge in regards to MSM’s feelings of risk and concern, public health and  
116 health communication interventions may not be efficiently targeted which might make it  
117 more likely that the target group misses opportunities for monkeypox prevention. In the long  
118 run, this may result in protective interventions not being used by MSM sub-populations that  
119 are at the highest risk. It is thus important to understand how MSM understand this epidemic  
120 and perceive themselves in terms of concerns and risks in relation to monkeypox, especially  
121 when they are considered as the most-at-risk population. Consequently, more appropriate and  
122 efficient public health interventions can be designed and implemented to prevent  
123 transmissions among MSM.

124 Therefore, in addition to unravelling the epidemiologic profile of the perceived  
125 concern and risk of monkeypox among MSM, it is also important to identify which MSM  
126 sub-population are more likely to perceive concern and risk of monkeypox, together with  
127 their socio-demographic, behavioural/health, and psycho-social profiles, to understand  
128 whether there is a match of perceived concern and risk and actual risk determinants. A  
129 previous study has provided insights into the determinants of monkeypox vaccination  
130 intention among MSM in the Netherlands [16]. Even though perceived concern and risk were  
131 associated with vaccination intention [16], it is not appropriate to assume the reported  
132 determinants also play similar roles in terms of the perceived concern and risk for  
133 monkeypox, given the different natures of these endpoints.

134 Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the perceived concern and risk of  
135 monkeypox among MSM, and to investigate determinants of perceived concern and risk for  
136 monkeypox in MSM in the Netherlands to better understand the appraisal of the monkeypox  
137 epidemic among this population at the early stages of the current monkeypox epidemic.

## 138 Materials and Methods

### 139 Study design and participants

140 This study has a cross-sectional design. We conducted an online survey among a  
141 convenience sample consisting of 394 MSM in July 2022, of which 257 were from a cohort  
142 established in 2017 [21] and 137 MSM from an online gay dating app. In this study, we only  
143 included data from respondents who indicated they were living in the Netherlands. This study  
144 was assessed and approved by the Ethics Review Committee Psychology and Neuroscience  
145 of Maastricht University (ref.188\_11\_02\_2018\_S32). Informed consent was provided by all  
146 participants. For more information on the design of the online survey, please see our previous  
147 study which used the same data for other endpoints [16].

### 148 Measures

#### 149 Outcomes measures

150 All measures were self-reported. Participants were asked they 1) “How worried are  
151 you to catch monkeypox yourself” (hereinafter perceived concern), and 2) “How likely is it  
152 that you will catch monkeypox yourself” (hereinafter perceived risk). These two endpoints  
153 were measured using an 1-5 Likert scale (with 1 = “Very low” and 5 = “Very high”).

154 Following our previous study on monkeypox vaccination intention and self-isolation  
155 intention [16], we also assessed socio-demographic, behavioural/health, and psycho-social  
156 determinants.

#### 157 Socio-demographic determinants measures

158 For socio-demographic determinants, age in this study was dichotomised as “younger  
159 than 45-year-old” and “older than 45-year-old”, given the median age group in our  
160 participants was 45-55 year-old (for more information, see our previous study [16]).  
161 Relationship status was categorised into “Single”, “Single but dating”, “In a monogamous  
162 relationship”, and “In an open/polygamous relationship”. Education was categorised into  
163 “Lower than Bachelor”, “Bachelor”, “Master”, and “PhD or higher”. Employment status was  
164 categorised into “Employed”, “Unemployed or receiving social welfare”, “Retired”, and  
165 “Student”. Migration status was categorised into “No migration status”, “First generation  
166 immigrant”, and “Second generation immigrant”. For place of residence, given the fact that  
167 most of the current monkeypox cases were diagnosed in Amsterdam and surrounding regions,  
168 we categorised this variable into “The main urban area of the Netherlands” and “The rest of  
169 the country”. The main urban area of the Netherlands entails the agglomeration of cities in  
170 the west of the Netherlands, in particular Amsterdam, Utrecht, Leiden, The Hague, and

171 Rotterdam (in Dutch: Randstad). As the economic and political centre of the Netherlands, the  
172 Randstad accounts for approximately 50% of the national population [22].

#### 173 Behavioural/health determinants measures

174 For behavioural/health determinants, number of sex partners in the previous six  
175 months were categorised into “None”, “1”, “2 to 6”, “7 to 15”, and “More than 15”. HIV  
176 status was measured based on the HIV diagnosis of the participants, and categorised into  
177 “Negative”, “having a positive diagnosis”, and “Unknown or not disclosed”. PrEP use status  
178 was categorised into “current PrEP users” and “PrEP naïve or PrEP discontinued” which  
179 indicates a non-PrEP using status.

180 We also measured past behaviours in the previous 6 months which may associated  
181 with a higher risk of monkeypox infection such as substance use status and gay  
182 subculture/sexual activities [23]. For substances use, we measured whether participants ever  
183 used any type of substance in the previous 6 months (“Ever” / “Never”); ever used any  
184 recreational drug, such as THC, MDMA, ecstasy etc., in the previous 6 months (“Ever” /  
185 “Never”); ever had chemsex, such as using crystal meth/tina, GHB, ketamine etc. in the  
186 previous 6 months (“Ever” / “Never”); ever used poppers in the previous 6 months (“Ever” /  
187 “Never”); ever used erectile dysfunction drugs, such as Viagra® or Kamagra®, in the  
188 previous 6 months (“Ever” / “Never”); ever used alcohol in the previous 6 months (“Ever” /  
189 “Never”). For gay subculture/sexual activities, we measured whether the participants ever  
190 visited a gay sauna in the previous 6 months (“Ever” / “Never”); ever visited a darkroom in  
191 the previous 6 months (“Ever” / “Never”); ever visited a circuit party in the previous 6  
192 months (“Ever” / “Never”); ever visited a Pride event in the previous 6 months (“Ever” /  
193 “Never”); ever visited a gay dance club in the previous 6 months (“Ever” / “Never”); ever  
194 attended to a private sex party in the previous 6 months (“Ever” / “Never”); and ever visit a  
195 fetish event in the previous 6 months (“Ever” / “Never”).

#### 196 Psycho-social determinants measures

197 For psycho-social determinants, we measured whether the participants knew anybody  
198 who has/had monkeypox (“Yes” / “No”). We also measured their perceived problematic  
199 consequences of monkeypox: “how problematic is it to catch monkeypox” using an 1-5  
200 Likert scale (with 1 = Not problematic at all” and 5 = “Very problematic”). To investigate the  
201 association and potential correlation between the two endpoints, we included the perceived  
202 risk and concern of monkeypox for the endpoint of perceived concern and the endpoint of

203 perceived risk of monkeypox respectively using the -5 Likert scale (with 1 = “Very low” and  
204 5 = “Very high”).

## 205 Statistical analysis

206 Given the relatively very small proportion of the participants showing both very high  
207 perceived concern and risk of monkeypox in this study (more details see the Results and  
208 Figure 1) and to better inform public health actions, following the analysis strategy from our  
209 previous studies [16, 19], we dichotomised the two outcome endpoints as “High/very high  
210 (scale 4 and 5)” and “The rest of the scale points (scale 1-3)” for modelling analysis.

## 211 Descriptive analysis

212 We first estimated and compared the crude prevalence and standardised prevalence  
213 ratio (SPR) of the perceived concern and risk of monkeypox by PrEP use status and HIV  
214 status, given that MSM who use PrEP and who are living with HIV are the ones of the  
215 current monkeypox vaccination priority populations in the Netherlands [8]. SPR allows us to  
216 compare the risk levels in different sub-populations if one sub-population has higher (SPR >  
217 1), equal (SPR = 1) or lower (SPR < 1) probability than the overall prevalence in the total  
218 study population [22].

## 219 Multivariable logistic regression modelling

220 We then conducted two multivariable logistic regressions with socio-demographic,  
221 behavioural/health, and psychosocial determinants for each endpoint. Potential collinearity  
222 was not found, for the analysis see [16]. Firstly, we conducted an univariable logistic  
223 regression with each included determinant. All determinants with a  $p < 0.10$  identified in the  
224 univariable modelling analyses were retained in the multivariable model, given the relatively  
225 small sample size. All determinants with a  $p < 0.05$  in the multivariable model were  
226 considered statistically significant. All analyses were conducted in R (version R 4.2.1) (R  
227 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

# 228 Results

## 229 Study population characteristics

230 Of the included 394 MSM, 43% were below the age of 45, 61% were living in Randstad of  
231 the Netherlands, 6% were living with HIV, 66% were currently using PrEP, 26% had  
232 chemsex and 40% had attended to private sex parties in the previous six months, and 17%  
233 knew people who have/had monkeypox (see Table 1 for other study population  
234 characteristics).

## 235 Perceived concern and risk of monkeypox among MSM

236 Among the included MSM, 39% showed “high” and 13% “very high” perceived  
237 concern, and 23% showed “high” and 8% “very high” perceived risk. Figure 1 summarised  
238 the frequencies of the observation of a) monkeypox perceived concern by PrEP use status, b)  
239 perceived risk among MSM by PrEP use status, c) monkeypox perceived concern by HIV  
240 status, d) perceived risk among MSM by HIV status.

241 After combining the “High” and “Very high” scales for the endpoints, among the total  
242 sample, 52% showed high/very high perceived concern, and 30% showed high/very high  
243 perceived risk of monkeypox. When comparing results by PrEP use status, only current PrEP  
244 users (prevalence=47%, SPR=0.83) showed a significantly lower probability of perceived  
245 concern of monkeypox compared to non-PrEP users. No significant difference of probability  
246 of high/very high perceived risk of monkeypox was found between current PrEP users  
247 (prevalence=31%, SPR=1.09) and non-PrEP users (prevalence=23%, SPR=0.82). When  
248 comparing results by HIV status, no significant difference of probability of high/very high  
249 perceived concern of monkeypox was found between MSM living without HIV  
250 (prevalence=51%, SPR=0.98), MSM living with HIV (prevalence=68%, SPR=1.31), and  
251 MSM whose HIV status were unknown or not disclosed (prevalence=56%, SPR=1.06). Only  
252 MSM living with HIV (prevalence=64%, SPR=2.09) were found to have a significant higher  
253 probability of perceived high/very high risk of monkeypox compared to MSM with other  
254 HIV status. See Table 2 for more information of the estimated prevalence and SPR of  
255 perceived concern and risk by PrEP use status and HIV status.

## 256 Determinants of perceived concern and risk among MSM

257 For perceived concern, no socio-demographic determinants were found to be  
258 statistically associated with the end point. Among behavioural/health determinants, MSM  
259 who did not use PrEP (adjusted odds ratio (aOR)=2.55) were more likely to show high/very  
260 high levels of concern about a possible monkeypox infection. On the other hand, MSM who  
261 had chemsex in the previous six months (aOR=0.44) were less likely to show a high/very  
262 high concern about a possible monkeypox infection. Among psycho-social determinants,  
263 MSM who had a higher perceived risk of monkeypox (aOR=3.26) were more likely to  
264 perceive more concern of getting infected of monkeypox.

265 For perceived risk, similarly, no socio-demographic determinants were found to be  
266 associated with this end point. Among behavioural/health determinants, MSM who had a  
267 diagnosed-HIV status (aOR=4.29) and unknown-HIV status (aOR=6.07), and who had ever



268 attended private sex parties in the previous 6 months (aOR=2.10) perceived themselves at  
269 higher risk for monkeypox. PrEP use status was not associated with perceived risk  
270 univariably and multivariably. Among psychosocial determinants, MSM who knew anybody  
271 who had monkeypox (aOR=2.60) and who perceived a higher concern of monkeypox  
272 (aOR=3.24) perceived themselves at higher risk for monkeypox. For results obtained from  
273 univariable logistic regression analyses for both endpoints, see Table 3.

## 274 Discussion

275 To our knowledge, this study is the first study to report perceived concern and risk of  
276 monkeypox and their determinants among MSM. Our findings based on 394 MSM in the  
277 Netherlands showed that 52% of our respondents showed high/very high levels of perceived  
278 concern about monkeypox, but only 30% perceived themselves to be high/very high risk for  
279 monkeypox, based on data collected at an early stage of monkeypox epidemic prior to  
280 vaccination implementation. In addition, these results also highlight there may be a  
281 discrepancy between the “actual risk” according to an epidemiological viewpoint [1, 5, 15, 24,  
282 25] and perceived risk and concern among the population at risk among MSM living in the  
283 Netherlands. Also, there seems to be a mismatch between MSM’s level of concern and level  
284 of risk. Thus these results indicate a lack of understanding and knowledge of the ongoing  
285 monkeypox epidemic among MSM in the Netherlands.

286 Not surprisingly, some of the included psycho-social determinants play a role for both  
287 endpoints in our analysis such as knowing people with monkeypox. Proximity to the health  
288 threat is a typical determinant for concern and risk perception [26]. Our results also indicated  
289 that perceived concern in relation to monkeypox and perceived risk of monkeypox among  
290 MSM were associated with each other positively, similar to perceived severity and perceived  
291 susceptibility in the Health Belief Model [11], which could indicate that beliefs in relation to  
292 concerns and risks about monkeypox should be targeted and included simultaneously.  
293 Another potential explanation for this finding could be that two endpoints do in fact reflect an  
294 underlying psychological construct, such as perceived threat in the Health Belief Model.  
295 However, we also identified other determinants which may influence both determinants  
296 among MSM differently.

297 While non-PrEP users and current PrEP users showed similar levels of perceived risk  
298 of Monkeypox, non-PrEP users showed a significant higher concern of being infected with  
299 monkeypox compared to current PrEP users. This may indicate a potential interaction effect  
300 from the current monkeypox vaccination strategy which is predominantly focusing on PrEP

301 using MSM [8]. As non-PrEP users cannot access the monkeypox vaccine at the moment in  
302 the Netherlands, they may consider themselves not protected against monkeypox epidemic,  
303 which may thus lead to a higher perceived concern of monkeypox infection even when  
304 sharing similar risk beliefs as current PrEP users. Another reason may be the lack of  
305 knowledge and understanding of monkeypox among MSM, especially among the current  
306 PrEP users. After being free of risk of acquiring HIV by using PrEP [27], PrEP users may not  
307 consider themselves to still be at risk for monkeypox. This finding dovetails nicely with other  
308 results showing that risks to acquire other STIs while using PrEP are discounted, too [18].  
309 Given the significantly lower perceived concern of monkeypox infection among PrEP users,  
310 more public health communication may be needed to improve the current understanding of  
311 monkeypox as a novel health risk, which cannot be covered by PrEP. However, before this,  
312 further research should explore the underlying reasons for the differences in perceived risks.

313 Similarly, but in an opposite direction, HIV status also played differential roles in the  
314 level of perceived concern and risk of monkeypox among MSM. A positive and  
315 unknown/non-disclosed HIV status predicted a higher likelihood of perceived risk but not a  
316 higher perceived concern of monkeypox among MSM. This finding could reflect the  
317 awareness for risky sexual behaviour that a higher risk of monkeypox infection is perceived  
318 among this sub-population of MSM, however, given their experience of HIV infection, they  
319 may not regard infecting with monkeypox is as problematic as HIV, similar to the perception  
320 of being infected with other STIs among people living with HIV [28]. In addition, another  
321 reason for this finding may be the unknown risk and pathways of developing a more severe  
322 disease outcomes among people living with HIV [25]. Even though a higher risk of  
323 monkeypox infection is perceived among this population, it is still currently unknown  
324 whether an HIV infection alters a person's risk of acquiring monkeypox after exposure [25],  
325 MSM with HIV or unknown HIV status may not develop a higher perceived concern for this  
326 infection.

327 While our previous study reported no behavioural determinants to be associated with  
328 monkeypox vaccination intention among MSM in the Netherlands [16], we identified several  
329 past behaviours to be associated with the perceived concern and risk of monkeypox among  
330 MSM both univariably and multivariably, indicating that past behaviours are associated with  
331 vaccination intentions and perceived concern and risk differently. For example, our study  
332 showed that people who had chemsex in the previous six months showed a lower likelihood  
333 of perceiving a high/very high concern of monkeypox. One possible reason maybe that MSM  
334 who engage in chemsex activity tend to underestimate their risk for infections that can be

335 transmitted via sexual contacts in general [29]. Our study suggests a potential similar  
336 mechanism behind the lower perceived risk of monkeypox among MSM who had chemsex.  
337 In addition, based on the multivariable model, not surprisingly, MSM who attended private  
338 sex parties in the previous six months were more likely to perceived themselves having  
339 high/very high risk for monkeypox. An elevated number of sex partners and sexual activities  
340 may be associated with this behaviour (a potential negative association was shown between a  
341 higher number of sex partners and never attend private party were shown in our collinearity  
342 analysis [16]), and thus lead to a higher perceived risk of monkeypox, which indicates that  
343 for this sub-population of MSM, they indeed perceived a higher risk when they are actually at  
344 risk for monkeypox. Therefore, there is at least some evidence that certain sub-populations  
345 gauge their risk correctly.

346 Although MSMs' place of residence was found to be associated with both  
347 Monkeypox perceived concern and risk univariably, such effects disappeared after adjusting  
348 for other determinants. Given the fact that most of monkeypox cases were reported from  
349 Amsterdam [4], we hypothesised a higher perceived concern and risk among MSM from the  
350 Randstad. However, no differences in both endpoints between Randstad and the rest of the  
351 country were found. One reason may be due to the ecological fallacy. Even though  
352 Amsterdam rests within the Randstad region, the internal heterogeneity of the likelihood of  
353 perceived concern and risk between different cities within Randstad can be masked when  
354 aggregating data on the Randstad level. It could also be the MSM from the Randstad differ  
355 regarding the other included variables compared to MSM from other regions which led to the  
356 effects disappearing in the multivariable models.

### 357 [Limitations and recommendations for future research](#)

358 Despite the novelty and timely communication of this study on the perceived concern  
359 and risk of monkeypox among MSM with evidence and perspectives from the Netherlands,  
360 there are a few limitations that are applicable to our study.

361 First, we suggested a potential interaction between vaccination strategy and PrEP use  
362 status. However, due to insufficient data, future studies are warranted and should therefore  
363 further investigate such an interaction with both more qualitative and empirical evidence.  
364 Second, our data were collected at the beginning stage of the monkeypox epidemic while the  
365 comprehensive public health communication and public health measures (i.e., vaccination)  
366 were just starting up. This may have influenced MSMs' knowledge of monkeypox, and  
367 eventually led to underestimated levels of perceived concern and risk of monkeypox among

368 MSM. An updated assessment at a later stage could be warranted to measure the change in  
369 perceived concern and risk of monkeypox since more information has been shared with the  
370 public in the meantime. Although, the future case development can be taken into account.  
371 Third, given the relatively small sample size in this study, the power of our models may be  
372 limited. For example, our models did not have the power to investigate the covariations from  
373 the geo-location on a finer geographic scale such as public health services regional level (25  
374 in total), or municipality level (345 in total). Our results on the spatial perspective may thus  
375 be limited and not comprehensive to support local monkeypox prevention. Therefore, future  
376 studies could zoom in on a finer geographical level, to provide more concise estimations with  
377 a larger sample size. Lastly, given that our data were self-reported, our data were thus not  
378 devoid of information biases, especially on the past risky behaviours. This may result in  
379 biased parameters.

## 380 **Conclusions**


381 In conclusion, only a small proportion of MSM living in the Netherlands considered  
382 themselves at a high/very high risk of monkeypox infection, and around half of them showed  
383 a high/very high concern for it. We found that the current PrEP users and non-PrEP users  
384 shared similar perceived risk of monkeypox infection, but non-PrEP users were more  
385 concerned about the monkeypox infections. A potential discrepancy between the “actual risk”  
386 and the perceived risk and concern of monkeypox, may exist among MSM in this early stage  
387 of the monkeypox epidemic. Public health professionals should therefor put more effort on  
388 improving the understanding and knowledge of the “actual risk” of monkeypox infections  
389 among these MSM sub-populations to encourage and facilitate an improved health behaviour  
390 uptake.

391

## 392 Reference

- 393 1. Bunge EM, Hoet B, Chen L, Lienert F, Weidenthaler H, Baer LR, et al. The changing  
394 epidemiology of human monkeypox—A potential threat? A systematic review. PLOS  
395 Neglected Tropical Diseases. 2022;16(2):e0010141.
- 396 2. Kozlov M. Monkeypox goes global: why scientists are on alert. Nature.  
397 2022;606(7912):15-6.
- 398 3. WHO. Responding to the monkeypox outbreak: perspectives of clinicians treating  
399 patients with the disease. 2022.
- 400 4. RIVM. Monkeypox 2022 [Available from: <https://www.rivm.nl/en/monkeypox>.
- 401 5. Zumla A, Valdoleiros SR, Haider N, Asogun D, Ntoumi F, Petersen E, et al. Monkeypox  
402 outbreaks outside endemic regions: scientific and social priorities. The Lancet Infectious  
403 Diseases. 2022;22(7):929-31.
- 404 6. ECDC. Joint ECDC-WHO Regional Office for Europe Monkeypox Surveillance Bulletin  
405 2022 [Available from: <https://monkeypoxreport.ecdc.europa.eu/>.
- 406 7. Gonsalves GS, Mayer K, Beyrer C. Déjà vu All Over Again? Emergent Monkeypox,  
407 Delayed Responses, and Stigmatized Populations. Journal of Urban Health. 2022;99(4):603-6.
- 408 8. RIVM. Monkeypox vaccination 2022 [Available from:  
409 <https://www.rivm.nl/en/monkeypox/vaccination>.
- 410 9. RIVM. Monkeypox (apenpokken) 2022 [Available from:  
411 <https://lci.rivm.nl/richtlijnen/monkeypox-apenpokken>.
- 412 10. Nolasco S, Vitale F, Geremia A, Tramuto F, Maida CM, Sciuto A, et al. First case of  
413 monkeypox virus, SARS-CoV-2 and HIV co-infection. Journal of Infection. 2022.
- 414 11. Champion VL, Skinner CS. The health belief model. Health behavior and health  
415 education: Theory, research, and practice. 2008;4:45-65.
- 416 12. Wong MCS, Wong ELY, Huang J, Cheung AWL, Law K, Chong MKC, et al. Acceptance  
417 of the COVID-19 vaccine based on the health belief model: A population-based survey in  
418 Hong Kong. Vaccine. 2021;39(7):1148-56.
- 419 13. Caserotti M, Girardi P, Rubaltelli E, Tasso A, Lotto L, Gavaruzzi T. Associations of  
420 COVID-19 risk perception with vaccine hesitancy over time for Italian residents. Soc Sci Med.  
421 2021;272:113688.
- 422 14. Gerend MA, Shepherd JE. Predicting human papillomavirus vaccine uptake in young  
423 adult women: comparing the health belief model and theory of planned behavior. Ann  
424 Behav Med. 2012;44(2):171-80.
- 425 15. Simões P, Bhagani S. A viewpoint: The 2022 monkeypox outbreak. J Virus Erad.  
426 2022;8(2):100078.
- 427 16. Wang H, apos, Abreu de Paulo KJI, Gültzow T, Zimmermann HML, Jonas KJ.  
428 Monkeypox self-diagnosis abilities, determinants of vaccination and self-isolation intention  
429 after diagnosis among MSM, the Netherlands, July 2022. Eurosurveillance.  
430 2022;27(33):2200603.
- 431 17. Downing MJ, Jr. Perceived likelihood of HIV and sexually transmitted infection  
432 acquisition among men who have sex with men. J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care. 2014;25(1):98-  
433 102.
- 434 18. Balán IC, Lopez-Rios J, Dolezal C, Rael CT, Lentz C. Low sexually transmissible  
435 infection knowledge, risk perception and concern about infection among men who have sex  
436 with men and transgender women at high risk of infection. Sex Health. 2019;16(6):580-6.

- 437 19. Wang H, d'Abreu de Paulo KJI, Gültzow T, Zimmermann HML, Jonas KJ. Brief report:  
438 Determinants of potential sexual activity reduction in the face of the Monkeypox epidemic.  
439 medRxiv. 2022:2022.08.01.22278287.
- 440 20. WHO. Perceptions of monkeypox from those most at risk: men who have sex with  
441 men having multiple sexual partners 2022 [Available from:  
442 [https://www.who.int/europe/news/item/26-08-2022-perceptions-of-monkeypox-from-](https://www.who.int/europe/news/item/26-08-2022-perceptions-of-monkeypox-from-those-most-at-risk--men-who-have-sex-with-men-having-multiple-sexual-partners)  
443 [those-most-at-risk--men-who-have-sex-with-men-having-multiple-sexual-partners](https://www.who.int/europe/news/item/26-08-2022-perceptions-of-monkeypox-from-those-most-at-risk--men-who-have-sex-with-men-having-multiple-sexual-partners).  
444 21. van Dijk M dWJ, Guadamuz T, Martinez JE, Jonas K. Quality of sex life and perceived  
445 sexual pleasure of PrEP users in the Netherlands 2020. 2020.
- 446 22. Wang H, Shobowale O, den Daas C, Op de Coul E, Bakker B, Radyowijati A, et al.  
447 Determinants of PrEP Uptake, Intention and Awareness in the Netherlands: A Socio-Spatial  
448 Analysis. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2022;19(14).
- 449 23. Davido B, D'Anglejan E, Baudoin R, Dahmane L, Chaud A, Cortier M, et al. Monkeypox  
450 outbreak 2022: an unusual case of peritonsillar abscess in a person previously vaccinated  
451 against smallpox. Journal of Travel Medicine. 2022;29(6):taac082.
- 452 24. Bragazzi NL, Kong JD, Mahroum N, Tsigalou C, Khamisy-Farah R, Converti M, et al.  
453 Epidemiological trends and clinical features of the ongoing monkeypox epidemic: A  
454 preliminary pooled data analysis and literature review. J Med Virol. 2022.
- 455 25. CDC. Clinical Considerations for Treatment and Prophylaxis of Monkeypox Virus  
456 Infection in People with HIV 2022 [Available from:  
457 <https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/monkeypox/clinicians/people-with-HIV.html>.  
458 26. Ferrer R, Klein WM. Risk perceptions and health behavior. Curr Opin Psychol.  
459 2015;5:85-9.
- 460 27. Hoornenborg E. PrEP in the Netherlands The introduction of HIV pre-exposure  
461 prophylaxis. 2020.
- 462 28. Kalichman SC, Cherry C, Kalichman MO, Washington C, Grebler T, Hoyt G, et al.  
463 Sexual Behaviors and Transmission Risks Among People Living with HIV: Beliefs, Perceptions,  
464 and Challenges to Using Treatments as Prevention. Archives of Sexual Behavior.  
465 2016;45(6):1421-30.
- 466 29. Bourne A, Reid D, Hickson F, Torres-Rueda S, Weatherburn P. Illicit drug use in sexual  
467 settings ('chemsex') and HIV/STI transmission risk behaviour among gay men in South  
468 London: findings from a qualitative study. Sex Transm Infect. 2015;91(8):564-8.  
469



470

471

**Figure 1. Distribution of a) monkeypox perceived concern by PrEP use status, b)**

472

**monkeypox perceived risk among MSM by PrEP use status, c) monkeypox perceived**

473

**concern by HIV status and d) monkeypox perceived risk among MSM by HIV status**

474

Note: two endpoints were measured on a 1-5 Likert scale (with 1 = "Very low" and 5 "Very high")

475 **Table 1. Study characteristics**

Variables	Total sample (n=394)		
		N	%
Socio-demographic determinants	Age		
	<45 years	171	43.4
	>45 years	223	56.6
	Relationship		
	Single	79	20.05
	Single but dating	91	23.1
	Monogamous relationship	35	8.88
	Open/Polyamorous relationship	189	47.97
	Education		
	Lower than Bachelor	89	22.65
	Bachelor	131	33.33
	Master	142	36.13
	PhD or higher	31	7.89
	Employment		
	Employed	335	85.03
	Unemployed or receiving social welfare	22	5.58
	Retired	20	5.08
	Student	17	4.31
	Migration status		
	No migration status	325	82.91
First-generation migrant	51	13.01	
Second-generation migrant	16	4.08	
Residence			
The rest of the country	154	39.10	
Randstad (main urban area)	240	60.90	
Behavioural/Health determinants	Number of sex partners in the previous 6 months		
	None	8	2.03
	1	46	11.68
	2 to 6	82	20.81
	7 to 15	159	40.36
	More than 15	99	25.13
	HIV status		
	HIV-negative	363	92.13
	HIV-positive	22	5.58
	HIV status unknown or not disclosed	9	2.28
PrEP use status			
Current PrEP users	241	66.39	



It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

PrEP naïve or PrEP discontinued	122	30.96
<hr/>		
Any type of substance use in the previous 6 months		
Never	349	11.42
Ever	45	11.42
<hr/>		
Recreational drugs use in the previous 6 months		
Never	250	63.45
Ever	144	36.55
<hr/>		
Chemsex in the previous 6 months		
Never	293	74.37
Ever	101	25.63
<hr/>		
Poppers use in the previous 6 months		
Never	183	46.45
Ever	211	53.55
<hr/>		
Erectile dysfunction medication use in the previous 6 months		
Never	228	57.87
Ever	166	42.13
<hr/>		
Alcohol use in the previous 6 months		
Never	93	23.6
Ever	301	76.4
<hr/>		
Visited a gay sauna in the previous 6 months		
Never	251	63.71
Ever	143	36.29
<hr/>		
Visited a darkroom in the previous 6 months		
Never	238	60.41
Ever	156	39.59
<hr/>		
Visited a circuit party in the previous 6 months		
Never	283	71.83
Ever	111	28.17
<hr/>		
Visited a pride event in the previous 6 months		
Never	203	51.52
Ever	191	48.48
<hr/>		
Visited a gay dance club in the previous 6 months		
Never	137	34.77
Ever	257	65.23
<hr/>		
Attended private sex parties in the previous 6 months		
Never	277	70.3
Ever	117	29.7
<hr/>		
Visited fetish events/fairs in the previous 6 months		

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

	Never	308	78.17
	Ever	86	21.83
<hr/>			
	Knowing anybody who has/had monkeypox		
Psycho-social determinants	No	326	82.74
	Yes	68	17.26
<hr/>			
	Perceived problematic consequences of monkeypox*		4 [3-4]

476  
477  
478  
479

Notes: 1 I use substances recreationally (for example THC, MDMA, ecstasy, etc). 2 I use substances in the context of sex (for example crystal meth/tina, GHB, ketamine etc.). 3 I use erectile dysfunction medication (for example Viagra, Kamagra). \* Indicates variable with a 1–5 Likert scale, with 1 = extremely unlikely and 5 = extremely likely), results were reported in median [interquartile range]. NA = not applicable.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

480 **Table 2 Prevalence and standardised prevalence ratio of perceived concern and risk of**  
 481 **monkeypox among MSM in the Netherlands, July 2022**

Sub-population	Perceived concern of monkeypox (High/very high vs. rest of scale) *					Perceived risk of monkeypox (High/very high vs. rest of scale) *				
	n	Prevalence (%)	95% CI	SPR	95% CI	n	Prevalence (%)	95% CI	SPR	95% CI
<b>Total sample (N=394)</b>	205	52.03	47.10;56.92	NA	NA	120	30.46	26.12;35.17	NA	NA
<b>PrEP users (N=241)</b>	113	46.89	40.69;53.19	0.83	0.68;0.99	74	30.71	25.22;36.79	1.09	0.86;1.36
<b>Non-PrEP users (N=122)</b>	72	59.02	50.14;67.34	1.05	0.82;1.30	28	22.95	16.38;21.16	0.82	0.54;1.15
<b>HIV positive (N=22)</b>	15	68.18	47.31;83.63	1.31	0.73;2.05	14	63.64	42.95;80.27	2.09	1.14;3.32
<b>HIV negative (N=363)</b>	185	50.96	45.84;56.07	0.98	0.84;1.13	102	28.10	23.72;32.93	0.92	0.75;1.11
<b>HIV status unknown/undisclosed (N=9)</b>	5	55.56	26.67;81.12	1.06	0.34;2.21	4	44.44	18.88;73.33	1.45	0.38;3.23

Note: CI: confidence interval; NA: not applicable; PrEP: pre-exposure prophylaxis; SPR: standardised prevalence ratio. \* 1 □ – □ 5 Likert scale, with 1 □ = □ extremely unlikely and 5 □ = □ extremely likely)

482  
 483  
 484

**Table 2. Determinants of perceived concern and perceived risk of getting monkeypox among MSM in the Netherlands, July 2022**

Variables	Perceived concern of being infected by monkeypox (High and very high vs. rest of scale) **						Perceived risk of being infected by monkeypox (High and very high vs. rest of scale) **					
	Univariable model			Multivariable model			Univariable model			Multivariable model		
	OR	95%CI	p-value	aOR	95%CI	p-value	OR	95%CI	p-value	aOR	95%CI	p-value
Age												
<45 years	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-			
>45 years	0.53	0.36;0.79	0.002	0.93	0.54;1.62	0.806	0.91	0.59;1.40	0.672			
Relationship												
Single	ref.	-	-				ref.	-	-			
Single but dating	1.25	0.68;2.29	0.486				0.99	0.50;1.96	0.975			
Monogamous relationship	0.86	0.39;1.92	0.719				0.69	0.26;1.81	0.453			
Open/Polyamorous relationship	1.15	0.68;1.95	0.597				1.55	0.87;2.77	0.138			
Education												
Lower than Bachelor	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-			
Bachelor	1.41	0.82;2.42	0.219	1.37	0.67;2.78	0.387	0.88	0.49;1.57	0.658			
Master	1.68	0.99;2.87	0.056	1.81	0.89;3.68	0.103	0.81	0.46;1.44	0.476			
PhD or higher	2.44	1.05;5.69	0.039	1.73	0.60;4.98	0.309	1.31	0.56;3.05	0.536			
Employment												
Employed	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-			
Unemployed or receiving social welfare	0.61	0.23;1.64	0.328	0.83	0.23;3.03	0.775	0.46	0.13;1.64	0.234			
Retired	0.26	0.09;0.71	0.009	0.23	0.06;0.82	0.002	0.64	0.23;1.77	0.385			
Student	2.04	0.76;5.41	0.156	1.73	0.54;5.49	0.351	0.93	0.35;2.48	0.878			
Migration status												
No migration status	ref.	-	-				ref.	-	-			
First generation migrant	1.14	0.63;2.05	0.670				0.94	0.49;1.79	0.845			

**Socio-demographic determinants**

	Second generation migrant	0.73	0.26;2.00	0.536				0.75	0.24;2.38	0.626			
	Place of residence												
	The rest of the Country	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-
	Randstad (main urban area)	1.92	1.27;2.89	0.002	1.47	0.87;2.49	0.155	1.67	1.06;2.64	0.027	1.30	0.74;2.29	0.360
	Number of sex partners in the previous 6 months												
	None	ref.	-	-				ref.	-	-			
	1	1.40	0.30;2.51	0.669				0.30	0.06;1.55	0.150			
	2 to 6	1.77	0.41;7.67	0.443				0.60	0.14;2.61	0.495			
	7 to 15	2.00	0.45;8.83	0.360				0.83	0.19;3.70	0.811			
	More than 15	2.03	0.45;9.05	0.355				1.24	0.27;5.54	0.777			
	HIV status												
	HIV negative	ref.	-	-				ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-
	HIV positive	2.06	0.82;5.18	0.123				4.48	1.82;11.00	0.001	4.29	1.44;12.82	0.009
	HIV status unknown or not disclosed	1.20	0.31;4.55	0.786				2.04	0.53;7.78	0.292	6.07	1.24;29.79	0.026
	PrEP use status												
	Current PrEP users	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-			
	PrEP naïve or PrEP discontinued	1.63	1.04;2.53	0.030	2.55	1.39;4.67	0.002	0.67	0.41;1.11	0.122			
	Any type of substance use in the previous 6 months												
	Never	ref.	-	-				ref.	-	-			
	Ever	1.60	0.85;3.02	0.149				1.16	0.60;2.25	0.565			
	Recreational drugs use in the previous 6 months <sup>1</sup>												
	Never	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-			
	Ever	1.56	1.03;2.36	0.035	1.50	0.86;2.62	0.156	1.44	0.92;2.33	0.105			
	Chemsex in the previous 6 months <sup>2</sup>												
	Never	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-

Ever	0.63	0.40;0.99	0.0491	0.44	0.22;0.88	0.021	1.55	0.96;2.50	0.071	1.23	0.60;2.71	0.605
Poppers in the previous 6 months												
Never	ref.	-	-				ref.	-	-			
Ever	1.01	0.68;1.50	0.965				1.39	0.90;2.14	0.140			
Erectile dysfunction medication use in the previous 6 months <sup>3</sup>												
Never	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-
Ever	0.70	0.47;1.05	0.088	1.16	0.63;2.15	0.625	0.98 ; 2.32	0.47;1.05	0.062	1.25	0.67;2.34	0.479
Alcohol use in the previous 6 months												
Never	ref.	-	-				ref.	-	-			
Ever	0.97	0.61;1.54	0.885				0.79	0.48;0.79	0.344			
Visited a gay sauna in the previous 6 months												
Never	ref.	-	-				ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-
Ever	1.28	0.84;1.93	0.241				1.28	0.68;2.41	0.439	1.28	0.68;2.41	0.439
Visited a darkroom in the previous 6 months												
Never	ref.	-	-				ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-
Ever	1.08	0.72;1.62	0.706				1.43	0.74;2.76	0.294	1.43	0.74;2.76	0.294
Visited a circuit party in the previous 6 months												
Never	ref.	-	-				ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-
Ever	1.06	0.69;1.65	0.780				0.89	0.44;0.81	0.749	0.89	0.44;0.81	0.749
Visited a pride event in the previous 6 months												
Never	ref.	-	-									
Ever	1.11	0.75;1.65	0.597									
Visited a gay dance club in the previous 6 months												
Never	ref.	-	-									

	Ever	1.16	0.76;1.75	0.487									
<hr/>													
	Attended private sex parties in the previous 6 months												
	Never	ref.	-	-			ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	
	Ever	0.87	0.56;1.34	0.526			2.10	1.04;4.24	0.037	2.10	1.04;4.24	0.037	
<hr/>													
	Visited fetish events/fairs in the previous 6 months												
	Never	ref.	-	-			ref.	-	-				
	Ever	1.08	0.67;1.74	0.760			1.39	0.84;2.29	0.204				
<hr/>													
	Knowing anybody who has/had monkeypox												
	No	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-	ref.	-	-
	Yes	2.81	1.59;4.98	<0.001	1.58	0.76;3.27	0.218	3.77	2.20;6.47	<0.001	2.60	1.33;5.07	0.005
<hr/>													
<b>Psycho-social determinants</b>	Perceived problematic consequences of monkeypox*	1.18	0.96;1.45	0.101				1.07	0.86;1.33	0.560			
	Perceived concern of monkeypox infection*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.13	2.36;4.13	<0.001	3.24	2.40;4.38	<0.001
	Perceived risk of monkeypox infection*	2.97	2.31;3.82	<0.001	3.26	0.81;1.36	<0.001	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

486 Notes: <sup>1</sup> I use substances recreationally (for example THC, MDMA, ecstasy, etc). <sup>2</sup> I use substances in the context of sex (for example crystal  
487 meth/tina, GHB, ketamine etc.). <sup>3</sup> I use erectile dysfunction medication (for example Viagra, Kamagra). \* indicates a variable with a 1–5 Likert  
488 scale, with 1 = extremely unlikely and 5 = extremely likely). \*\* indicates a variable with a 1-5 Likert scale, with 1 = very low and 5 = very high).  
489 NA=not applicable.