

1 **eSexualHealth: Preferences to Use Technology to Promote Sexual Health Among Men**
2 **Who Have Sex with Men and Trans and Gender Diverse People**

3
4 Esha Abraham^{1,2}, Eric PF Chow^{1,2,3}, Christopher K Fairley^{1,2}, David Lee², Fabian YS Kong³,
5 Limin Mao⁴, Jane L Goller³, Nicholas Medland⁵, Benjamin R Bavinton⁵, Budiadi Sudarto¹,
6 Stefan Joksic, Jessica Wong, Tiffany R Phillips^{1,2*}(PhD), Jason J Ong^{1,2,6*}

7
8 ¹ Central Clinical School, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

9 ² Melbourne Sexual Health Centre, Alfred Health, Melbourne, Australia

10 ³ Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health,
11 The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

12 ⁴ Centre for Social Research in Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

13 ⁵ Kirby Institute, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

14 ⁶ Department of Clinical Research, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London,
15 United Kingdom

16 * Co-senior authors

17

18 **Word Count**

19 Abstract: 266

20 Manuscript: 2044

21

22 **Abstract**

23 Objectives: Gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men (GBMSM) and trans and
24 gender diverse (TGD) people are disproportionately affected by poorer sexual health outcomes
25 compared to heterosexual populations. We aimed to explore the preferences of GBMSM and
26 TGD for using eHealth for sexual health (eSexualHealth).

27
28 Methods: We distributed an anonymous online survey among the lesbian, gay, bisexual,
29 transgender, intersex, queer and other people of diverse sexuality or gender (LGBTIQ+)
30 community in Australia. The survey collected data on sociodemographic characteristics and
31 sexual behaviours, their preferences for app/website functions and preferred HIV and sexually
32 transmitted infection (STI) testing reminders. We used descriptive statistics to summarise the
33 characteristics of the study population. Free-text responses were thematically analysed.

34
35 Results: Of 466 participants included, most identified as cisgender males (92.7%). The median
36 age was 48 (interquartile range [IQR]: 37-56). For accessing sexual health-related information,
37 160 (34.6%) would use either a website or an app, 165 (32.7%) would prefer a website, 119
38 (25.8%) would prefer an app, and 33 (7.1%) would not use either platform. There was no
39 significant difference between GBMSM and TGD people. Participants were most interested in
40 information about STI clinics, HIV/STI hotspots, and sexual health education. Participants
41 stressed the need for privacy and anonymity when using eHealth. Regarding reminders to test for
42 HIV/STIs, receiving regular SMS was most popular (112/293, 38.2%), followed by regular
43 emails (55/293 18.8%) and a reminder function on their phone (48/293, 16.4%).

44 Conclusion: Our study suggests a promising future for eHealth among GBMSM and TGD
45 people. Sexual health is still a stigmatised area, and eHealth may circumvent barriers this
46 population faces.

47

48 Keywords: GBMSM; TGD; sexual health; survey; eHealth; mHealth

49

50 **What is already known about the topic**

- 51 • Gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (GBMSM) and trans- and gender
52 diverse people (TGD) have poorer sexual health outcomes compared to heterosexuals
- 53 • eHealth (or digital interventions) to improve sexual health is a growing area

54 **What this study adds**

- 55 • Our survey among Australian GBMSM and TGD individuals document their preferences
56 for using eHealth to optimize their sexual health

57 **How this study might affect research, practice or policy**

- 58 • Being aware of preferences for eHealth can inform resource allocation and future
59 development of features wanted by target populations

60

61

62

63

64 **Introduction**

65 While HIV notification rates have decreased in Australia in recent years, gay and bisexual men
66 who have sex with men (GBMSM) continue to be disproportionately affected compared to their
67 heterosexual counterparts.¹ Furthermore, STI incidence rates are higher among GBMSM living
68 with HIV than among HIV-negative GBMSM.² A 2018 survey of trans and gender diverse
69 (TGD) people found that more than half believed they received poor sexual health education
70 during their school years. Additionally, 51.2% reported receiving insensitive sexual health care.
71 Most participants (65%) also reported inconsistent condom use with casual sexual partners.
72 Combined with their poor experiences in sexual health care, it increases their risk for HIV/STIs.³
73 As a result, greater effort needs to be put into educating and facilitating HIV/STI testing among
74 GBMSM and TGD people.

75
76 GBMSM and TGD people can face several barriers when accessing healthcare, such as:
77 experiencing stigma due to their sexuality, a lack of knowledge and culturally appropriate
78 training amongst healthcare providers; and personal concerns around disclosing their sexual
79 identity.⁴⁻⁶ Specialised sexual healthcare is scarce in Australia, and patients can face long waiting
80 times or high costs. Digital health interventions, also known as eHealth, can improve healthcare
81 access among LGBTIQ+ people.⁷ These can be delivered through mobile devices, laptops,
82 websites, or smartphone apps, and can provide private, personalised content that is easily
83 accessible.⁸ However, to be successful, input from the target audience is essential in creating an
84 intervention that addresses their needs and, in turn, results in increased uptake.^{9 10} Previous
85 studies have determined that there is a promising future for an eHealth app among GBMSM.¹¹

86 However, few studies have investigated the preferences and types of features for different
87 platforms.

88

89 This study sought to understand the features of a website or smartphone app that GBMSM and
90 TGD people prefer to access information related to sexual health. We also aimed to measure
91 whether GBMSM and TGD people currently use eHealth for reminding themselves to test for
92 HIV/STIs.

93

94 **Method**

95 Study Population

96 This was an anonymous online survey distributed among the LGBTIQ+ community in
97 Australia. We included all respondents aged 16 years and above who identified as LGBTIQ+.
98 Completion of the survey was taken as implied consent. The online survey link was disseminated
99 through the authors' professional networks, social media, and clients at Melbourne Sexual Health
100 Centre (MSHC), a public sexual health clinic in Australia. This included a short messaging
101 service (SMS) or email from MSHC (if they had previously consented to receive them), a dating
102 app (Grindr), and LGBTIQ+ community groups. These community groups included Equinox,
103 Your Community Health, Switchboard, Minus18, QLife, and Rainbow Health Victoria. The
104 survey was run from 10 April 2021 to 3 August 2021. Given that most respondents identified as
105 GBMSM or TGD, the decision was made to limit the analysis to only include these respondents.

106

107 Survey Instrument

108 The survey was accessed through an online link (hosted by Qualtrics). The survey collected data
109 on sociodemographic characteristics and sexual practices. Respondents were provided with a list
110 of app/website functions and asked to rate how useful each function would be using a five-point
111 Likert scale. Participants were also asked about current and preferred HIV/STI testing reminders
112 and were able to rank their top three answers. Participants were not required to answer all
113 questions and could rank less than three options if desired. Free text response to the questions:
114 *“If you could design an app, website, or health service for LGBTIQ+ people that would make it*
115 *easier to get tested for HIV/STIs? What would it do? Feel free to be creative--all answers and*
116 *ideas are welcome!”* this allowed participants to expand on any features they would want in an
117 eHealth intervention.

118

119 Statistical Analysis

120 We used descriptive statistics to summarise the characteristics of the study population, using
121 Stata (version 17, StataCorp, College Station, TX). Differences between GBMSM and TGD
122 were assessed using Chi-squared test. The free-text responses were thematically analysed using
123 NVivo (Release 1.6, QSR International Pty Ltd., Melbourne, Australia). Ethics approval was
124 granted by the Alfred Ethics Committee (670/20).

125

126 **Results**

127 The survey was accessed 727 times during the study period, and 704 people consented to
128 participate of whom 513 (72.9%) completed the survey. There were 47 (9.2%) participants who
129 did not identify as GBMSM or TGD and were excluded, leaving a total of 466 participants for

130 the analysis. Most were recruited through an SMS or email from MSHC (306/466, 65.7%),
131 followed by Grindr (93/466, 20.0%), then community groups (41/466, 8.8%).

132

133 Table 1 summarises the sociodemographic characteristics of the study population. Of the 466
134 participants, the majority identified as cisgender males (92.7%). The median age was 48
135 (interquartile range [IQR]: 37-56) and three-quarters were born in Australia. There were 21.2%
136 ($n=98$) of participants living with HIV and had an undetectable viral load. Among those not
137 living with HIV, 37.8% ($n=139$) reported PrEP use.

138

139 Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of the study population (N=466)

Demographic	n (%)
Current gender identity	
Cisgender Male	432 (92.7)
Transgender Male	8 (1.7)
Transgender Female	1 (0.2)
Non-binary or gender-fluid	21 (4.5)
Different identity ^A	4 (0.9)
Sexual identity	
Gay	410 (88.0)
Bisexual	36 (7.7)
Queer	14 (3.0)
Lesbian	1 (0.2)
Straight/Heterosexual ^B	1 (0.2)
Other, please specify	3 (0.6)

Prefer not to answer	1 (0.2)
Age group (years)	
≤ 25	27 (5.8)
26-35	70 (15.0)
36-45	116 (24.9)
≥ 46	253 (54.3)
Country of birth	
Australia	346 (74.3)
Outside of Australia	120 (25.8)
HIV status	
HIV negative	351 (75.3)
Positive & undetectable	98 (21.0)
I don't know my status	13 (2.8)
Prefer not to answer	4 (0.9)
Reports PrEP use^D	
Yes	139 (37.8)
No	225 (61.1)
I don't know	2 (0.5)
Prefer not to answer	2 (0.5)

140 ^A Different gender identity included (verbatim), “Genderqueer”, “Mostly male, except on Saturday
141 nights”, “Trans femme”, and “Trans (agender)”. ^B Identified as Trans or gender diverse; ^C Different
142 sexual identities included: 1. Pansexual, 2. Bisexual and queer, 3. Trixix (Non-binary person who loves
143 women) ^D Denominator excludes those who are HIV positive and undetectable (n=98) and is thus N=368.

144 *Website vs App*

145 Overall, there was no clear preference for an app or website-based sexual health platform. Of the
 146 462 participants that answered the question, 160 (34.6%) would use either a website or an app,
 147 165 (32.7%) would prefer a website, 119 (25.8%) would prefer an app, and 33 (7.1%) would not
 148 use either platform. There was no significant difference between GBMSM and TGD people
 149 (Supplementary Table 1). Figures 1 and 2 provide the preferences for functions on an app and
 150 web-based platform, respectively. Supplementary Figures 1-4 separates out preferences of
 151 GBMSM and TGD, and found that GBMSM were more likely to prioritise information about
 152 pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) and post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) (Supplementary Figures




Figure 1: Preferences for functions on an app-based platform among GBMSM and TGD

153 1-4).

154

155




Figure 2: Preferences for functions on a web-based platform among GBMSM and TGD

156 In the free-text response, there was a strong emphasis on the need for information, particularly
 157 about STI clinics, HIV/STI hotspots (geographical areas with high levels of STI diagnoses), and
 158 sexual health education. Concerning STI clinics, respondents wanted information on their
 159 location, opening hours, contact details, and the cost of the services. Other themes that emerged
 160 included the need for anonymity, accessibility, and a simple user interface. A few participants
 161 also highlighted that they would want a discreet app. Participants were interested in features such
 162 as a sexual activity tracker (i.e., an online diary that recorded sexual encounters), a daily PrEP
 163 reminder system, and an HIV/STI testing reminder system. Some participants suggested
 164 introducing an online booking system for clinics, which would allow them to book an
 165 appointment in advance.
 166

167 *HIV/STI Testing Reminder*

168 A large proportion of respondents would prefer regular SMS reminders (112/293, 38.2%),
 169 followed by regular email reminders (55/293 18.8%) and a reminder function on their phone
 170 (48/293, 16.4%). (Figure 3) Testing reminder preferences were similar between GBMSM and
 171 TGD people (Supplementary Figures 5-6).




Figure 3: Preferred HIV/STI testing reminder system on an eHealth platform, stratified by rank

172

173 **Discussion**

174 This study provided insights into how GBMSM and TGD people viewed the use of eHealth for
 175 sexual health. Specifically, we identified what features may be desirable for a new eHealth
 176 intervention, providing useful information for future implementation research to optimize the use
 177 of eHealth among GBMSM and TGD. Participants highlighted their desire for privacy and

178 sexual health information. Furthermore, we found that GBMSM were more likely to prioritise
179 wanting information about PrEP and PEP in comparison to TGD people.

180

181 The use of eHealth is a relatively new concept, and international data suggests that this has been
182 accepted elsewhere. A study among 495 GBMSM from the USA found that 91% would be
183 interested in an app with sexual health features tailored to GBMSM.¹¹ A 2015 study using
184 qualitative interviews of 35 MSM in China found that they supported the use of mobile phones
185 and websites for sexual health.¹² Most participants agreed that this provided a level of
186 convenience, and provided information about testing services. Similarly, Nguyen et al.
187 conducted five focus group discussions among MSM in Vietnam. The majority of participants
188 were agreeable to eHealth. They also requested similar content to our participants, such as
189 information about HIV/STIs and testing, and safe sex practice.¹³ The dissemination of sexual
190 health information through social media and dating apps was acceptable to GBMSM in England,
191 however, some participants felt that receiving this information on dating apps could negatively
192 impact user experience.¹⁴ These participants felt that it may dampen the mood when searching
193 for sexual partners, and create negative connotations with new partners.

194

195 Ensuring privacy when accessing the services was a prominent theme. It is unclear whether these
196 concerns were due to the stigma surrounding sexual health or whether they resulted from a
197 previous negative experience. Muessig et al. also reported concerns about privacy and
198 confidentiality when accessing eHealth for sexual health.¹² Another study found that the use of
199 eHealth would depend on the privacy policy for most participants in the study.¹⁵ As a result, they
200 may feel that they need to attend a specialist clinic to meet their healthcare needs. However, this

201 can be difficult to access, and these barriers can discourage GBMSM and TGD people from
202 seeking traditional sexual health services such as face-to-face consultations with health care
203 professionals. eHealth addresses these barriers by offering privacy and easy access to sexual
204 health services. These eHealth interventions can be delivered through computers, websites, and
205 personal devices and can deliver content tailored to an individual's needs. In turn, these address
206 barriers to health care access like cost and accessibility.¹⁶ This was a major concern for
207 respondents, and our findings suggest that future eHealth interventions should prioritise
208 anonymity to ensure uptake and continued use of the services.

209
210 SMS for HIV/STI testing reminders was the most popular choice among respondents in our
211 survey. Several studies have already evaluated the use of an SMS reminder system on HIV/STI
212 testing. A minority of participants from our study indicated that they would prefer an email
213 reminder, however, this has not been evaluated previously. A 2013 study conducted by Zou et al.
214 at MSHC found that GBMSM who received quarterly STI testing reminders by text or email
215 were more likely to return for a test (median 3 vs 1 test in 12 months) than controls.¹⁷ However,
216 this study did not stratify results by the modality used. A 2011 study looking at STI testing rates
217 among Australian GBMSM found that those who received 3 to 6-monthly SMS reminders were
218 4.4 times more likely to retest for HIV/STIs than those who did not receive a text.¹⁸ Similarly, a
219 2019 USA study reported that men who received a quarterly SMS testing reminder had a shorter
220 interval between HIV tests than men who did not receive a text.¹⁹ SMS reminders are a feasible
221 intervention that is relatively affordable and can help increase STI testing rates and has a lower
222 burden on the health system than phone calls or other in-person interventions. Second, mobile
223 technology is almost universally used and can effectively reach a wider population. A 2020

224 meta-analysis found that there were high levels of feasibility for mHealth tailored to GBMSM.
225 However, most studies reviewed were pilot trials, and it is unclear whether these mHealth
226 interventions would be successful on a larger scale.²⁰

227

228 Our study has several limitations. First, this is a cross-sectional study, and thus we cannot make
229 causal inferences. Secondly, our study only recruited through one gay dating app (Grindr) but no
230 other mainstream apps, such as Tinder, Bumble, and Hinge. This may have skewed the results,
231 and as a result, we only included GBMSM and TGD people in the analysis; thus, our findings are
232 not generalisable to other members of the LGBTIQ+ population. To make any future
233 intervention successful, it will require further collaboration between developers and a more
234 representative sample of the population. Third, our sample was mostly derived from men who
235 had recently attended a sexual health service. These individuals would therefore be biased
236 towards individuals who are comfortable attending services and so our estimates are likely to
237 underestimate preferences for eHealth services. Future studies should seek the views of
238 individuals who are at risk but not attending services although we appreciate undertaking such a
239 study is difficult. Finally, HIV/STI-related stigma, potentially influencing perceived engagement
240 with digital platforms and data security, was not measured.

241

242 **Conclusion**

243 Overall, our study suggests a promising future for eHealth among GBMSM and TGD people.
244 Sexual health is still a stigmatised area, and eHealth may circumvent barriers this population
245 faces. Further research that provides in-depth data on the themes raised in this study is required
246 to ensure the acceptability and feasibility of any future interventions. Specifically, confidentiality

247 and options to remain anonymous should be considered in future developments of eHealth for
248 sexual health.

249

250 **Acknowledgements**

251 We thank the survey participants for contributing to the research. JO conceived the idea. EC, DL,
252 FK, LM, JG, BB, BS, SJ, JW assisted with recruitment. EA and TP analysed the data. EA wrote
253 the first draft of the paper. All authors contributed to writing the manuscript and approved the
254 final version for submission. EPFC and JJO are each supported by an Australian National Health
255 and Medical Research Council Emerging Leadership Investigator Grant (GNT1172873 and
256 GNT1193955, respectively). CKF is supported by an Australian NHMRC Leadership
257 Investigator Grant (GNT1172900). All other authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

258

259 **References**

- 260 1. Kirby Institute. Nation HIV Notification Q1 2016 - Q4 2020. In: Institute K, ed. Sydney:
261 University of New South Wales, 2020.
- 262 2. Kirby Institute. National update on HIV, viral hepatitis and sexually transmissible infections in
263 Australia: 2009–2018: The Kirby Institute, UNSW Sydney Sydney, Australia, 2020.
- 264 3. Callander D, Wiggins J, Rosenberg S, et al. The 2018 Australian trans and gender diverse
265 sexual health survey: Report of findings. *Syd NSW Kirby Inst UNSW Syd* 2019
- 266 4. Brown A, Rice SM, Rickwood DJ, et al. Systematic review of barriers and facilitators to
267 accessing and engaging with mental health care among at-risk young people. *Asia-Pacific*
268 *Psychiatry* 2016;8(1):3-22. doi: 10.1111/appy.12199
- 269 5. Sanchez NF, Sanchez JP, Danoff A. Health Care Utilization, Barriers to Care, and Hormone
270 Usage Among Male-to-Female Transgender Persons in New York City. *Am J Public*
271 *Health* 2009;99(4):713-19. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2007.132035
- 272 6. Bien-Gund CH, Zhao P, Cao B, et al. Providing competent, comprehensive and inclusive
273 sexual health services for men who have sex with men in low- and middle-income
274 countries: a scoping review. *Sexual Health* 2019;16(4):320-31. doi: 10.1071/SH18191
- 275 7. Minichiello V, Rahman S, Dune T, et al. E-health: potential benefits and challenges in
276 providing and accessing sexual health services. *BMC Public Health* 2013;13(1):1-7. doi:
277 10.1186/1471-2458-13-790
- 278 8. Sun CJ, Anderson KM, Mayer L, et al. Findings from Formative Research to Develop a
279 Strength-Based HIV Prevention and Sexual Health Promotion mHealth Intervention for

- 280 Transgender Women. *Transgender Health* 2019;4(1):350-58. doi:
281 10.1089/trgh.2019.0032
- 282 9. McCurdie T, Taneva S, Casselman M, et al. mHealth consumer apps: the case for user-
283 centered design. *Biomedical instrumentation & technology* 2012;46(2):49. doi:
284 10.2345/0899-8205-46.s2.49
- 285 10. Yardley L, Spring BJ, Riper H, et al. Understanding and promoting effective engagement
286 with digital behavior change interventions. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*
287 2016;51(5):833-42. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2016.06.015
- 288 11. Ventuneac A, John SA, Whitfield TH, et al. Preferences for sexual health smartphone app
289 features among gay and bisexual men. *AIDS and Behavior* 2018;22(10):3384-94. doi:
290 10.1007/s10461-018-2171-9
- 291 12. Muessig KE, Bien CH, Wei C, et al. A mixed-methods study on the acceptability of using
292 eHealth for HIV prevention and sexual health care among men who have sex with men in
293 China. *J Med Internet Res* 2015;17(4):e100. doi: 10.2196/jmir.3370 [published Online
294 First: 20150421]
- 295 13. Nguyen LH, Nguyen HLT, Larsson M, et al. An exploratory assessment of the preference for
296 eHealth interventions to prevent HIV and sexually transmitted infections among men
297 who have sex with men in Hanoi, Vietnam. *BMC Public Health* 2020;20(1):1387. doi:
298 10.1186/s12889-020-09449-z
- 299 14. Kesten JM, Dias K, Burns F, et al. Acceptability and potential impact of delivering sexual
300 health promotion information through social media and dating apps to MSM in England:
301 a qualitative study. *BMC Public Health* 2019;19(1):1236. doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-7558-
302 7
- 303 15. Goldman J, Hudson Z. Perspective: Virtually Exposed: Privacy And E-Health. *Health Affairs*
304 2000;19(6):140-48. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.19.6.140
- 305 16. Shrestha R, Lim SH, Altice FL, et al. Use of smartphone to seek sexual health information
306 online among Malaysian men who have sex with men (MSM): implications for mHealth
307 intervention to increase HIV testing and reduce HIV risks. *Journal of community health*
308 2020;45(1):10-19. doi: 10.1007/s10900-019-00713-x
- 309 17. Zou H, Fairley CK, Guy R, et al. Automated, computer generated reminders and increased
310 detection of gonorrhoea, chlamydia and syphilis in men who have sex with men. *PloS*
311 *one* 2013;8(4):e61972-e72. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0061972
- 312 18. Bourne C, Knight V, Guy R, et al. Short message service reminder intervention doubles
313 sexually transmitted infection/HIV re-testing rates among men who have sex with men.
314 *Sex Transm Infect* 2011;87(3):229-31. doi: 10.1136/sti.2010.048397 [published Online
315 First: 20110204]
- 316 19. Ronen K, Golden MR, Dombrowski JC, et al. Uptake and Impact of Short Message Service
317 Reminders via STI Partner Services on HIV/STI Testing Frequency among Men Who
318 Have Sex with Men. *Sexually transmitted diseases* 2019 doi:
319 10.1097/OLQ.0000000000001043
- 320 20. Nelson KM, Perry NS, Horvath KJ, et al. A systematic review of mHealth interventions for
321 HIV prevention and treatment among gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with
322 men. *Translational Behavioral Medicine* 2020;10(5):1211-20. doi: 10.1093/tbm/ibaa007
323

324

325


326

327 **Supplemental Data**


328 Supplemental Table 1. Preference for eHealth intervention platform, by risk group

Preferred Platform	GBMSM (%)	TGD (%)	Total
Websites	138 (32.2)	12 (36.4)	150
Apps	114 (26.6)	5 (15.2)	119
Both website and apps	145 (33.8)	15 (45.5)	160
I wouldn't use either	32 (7.5)	1 (3.0)	33


329 GBMSM, Gay and bisexual men who have sex with men; TGD, trans and gender diverse, p=0.228




Supplementary Figure 1: Preferences for functions on a web-based platform among GBMSM




Supplementary Figure 2: Preferences for functions on a web-based platform among TGD people




Supplementary Figure 3: Preferences for functions on an app-based platform among GBMSM



Supplementary Figure 4: Preferences for functions on an app-based platform among TGD people



Supplementary Figure 5: Preferred HIV/STI testing reminder system on an eHealth platform among GBMSM



Supplementary Figure 6: Preferred HIV/STI testing reminder system on an eHealth platform, among TGD people