CASUAL SEX AMONG MSM DURING THE PERIOD OF SHELTERING IN PLACE TO PREVENT THE SPREAD OF COVID-19: RESULTS OF NATIONAL ONLINE SURVEYS IN BRAZIL AND PORTUGAL

4

Alvaro Francisco Lopes de Sousa, PhD^{1,2}, Lavze Braz de Oliveira, PhD student¹, Artur Acelino 5 Francisco Luz Nunes Queiroz PhD student¹, Hérica Emilia Felix de Carvalho PhD student¹, 6 Guilherme Schneider PhD student¹, Emerson Lucas Silva Camargo PhD student¹; Telma 7 Evangelista de Araujo PhD³, Sandra Brignol PhD⁴, Isabel Amélia Costa Mendes PhD¹, Willi 8 McFarland PhD⁵, Inês Fronteira PhD². 9 Affiliations: 10 1. Human Exposome and Infectious Diseases Network, Escola de Enfermagem de Ribeirão 11 Preto, Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil. 12 2. Global Health and Tropical Medicine, Instituto de Higiene e Medicina Tropical, Universidade 13 Nova de Lisboa, Portugal. 14 3. Universidade Federal do Piaui, Brazil. 15 4. Department of Collective Health, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brazil. 16 5. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California at San Francisco, 17 USA. 18 Funding: Conselho Nacional de Pesquisa – CNPq, Brazil. 19 20 Authors' contributions: Conception, planning, analysis, interpretation and writing of the work: AFLS, AAFLNO, LBO; 21 TMEA; IF. Conception, planning, analysis and interpretation and writing: SB, TMEA, IACM; 22

HEFC; GS; ELSC; WM. All authors approved the final version.

24 **Conflict of Interest**: All authors declare no conflict of interest.

Short Summary: The pandemic of COVID-19 did not cause changes in the sexual behavior of MSM; they continued to engage in casual sex, using drugs, having multiple partners and adopting ineffective protective measures for COVID-19.

28 ABSTRACT

Background: We investigated the extent to which Brazilian and Portuguese MSM had casual sexual relations outside their homes during the period of sheltering in place for the COVID-19 pandemic.

Methods: An online survey was implemented in Brazil and Portugal in April, during the period of social isolation for COVID-19, with a sample of 2,361 MSMs. Recruitment was done through meeting apps and Facebook.

Results: Most of the sample (53.0%; considering 53.1% in Portugal and 53% in Brazil) had 35 casual sex partners during sheltering. Factors that increased the odds of engaging in casual sex in 36 Brazil were having group sex (aOR 2.1, 95% CI 1.3-3.4), living in a urban area (aOR 1.6, 95% CI 37 1.1-2.2), feeling that sheltering had high impact on daily life (aOR 3.0, 95% CI 1.1-8.3), having 38 casual instead of steady partners (aOR 2.5, 95%CI 1.8-3.5), and not decreasing the number of 39 40 partners (aOR 6.5, 95% CI 4.2-10.0). In Portugal, the odds of engaging in casual sex increased with using Facebook to find partners (aOR 4.6, 95%CI 3.0-7.2), not decreasing the number of 41 partners (aOR 3.8, 95%CI 2.9-5.9), usually finding partners in physical venues (pre-COVID-19) 42 43 (aOR 5.4, 95% CI 3.2–8.9), feeling that the isolation had high impact on daily life (aOR 3.0, 95% CI 1.3-6.7), and HIV-positive serostatus (aOR 11.7, 95% CI 4.7-29.2). Taking PrEP/Truvada 44 to prevent COVID-19 was reported by 12.7% of MSM. 45

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

3

46 Conclusions: The pandemic has not stopped most of our MSM sample from finding sexual 47 partners, with high risk sexual behaviors continuing. Public health messages for the prevention 48 of COVID-19 need to be crafted to explicitly address sexual behavior to reduce contamination in 49 the current moment.

50 **Keywords:** Casual sex; Sex partners; MSM; SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19.

51 Background

By September 01, 2020, Brazil was still one of the most affected countries by the COVID-19 pandemic. With 121,381 deaths and 3,908,272 cases of COVID-19 officially confirmed [1] and an incidence rate (per 100,000 population) of 1837.9; Brazil ranked in the second position in the world [2]. Portugal, where the infection started spreading nearly one month before Brazil, had 58,243 confirmed cases and 1,824 deaths by COVID-19 by the same date [3], and an incidence rate (per 100,000 population) of 573.5.

Without a vaccine or effective treatment, general preventive measures for respiratory infections remain the main form of containing the spread of the virus. Minimizing the gathering and movement of people, that is, "sheltering in place" to varying degrees of strictness have been adopted by many countries, including Brazil and Portugal [4,5]. There appears to be positive effects of sheltering on reducing the speed of COVID-19 infection. However, other aspects of health, including mental and sexual health, may be suffering [6].

64 Social support is a known protective factor for general health, especially for LGBT 65 communities that have historically been victims of social exclusion. Social withdrawal can 66 trigger harmful consequences for mental and physical health. In populations where this support is 67 more fragile, as in the case of LGBT populations, interruptions in social support can have severe

4

negative consequences, including greater risk of exposure to COVID-19, as the disease is stillnot fully understood [6].

To measure the potential consequences of COVID-19 on the sexual behavior of MSM, the In_PrEP Group in Brazil and Portugal implemented an online questionnaire. In particular, the questionnaire sought to measure whether MSM were seeking casual partners during the period when shelter in place directives were in effect and which measures they were undertaking to reduce the risk of COVID-19, as well as HIV and other STIs. Brazil and Portugal were selected as they share a language and a large flow of people between these countries each year (28,210) [8], through immigration, professional and academic activities, and tourism [9].

77

78 Methods

79 Study design, population, sampling, and recruitment

This project entitled "40tena" is derived from the In_PrEP cohort study, a multicenter survey started in 2020, which carries out behavioral follow up of MSM, implemented in all 26 Brazilian states and the Federal District, and in 15 of the 18 districts of Portugal. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, some questions were added to assess sexual behavior during the sheltering-in-place period. The research project and the presentation of these manuscripts were guided by the STROBE tool and The Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES).

A rapid and dynamic data collection process took place in April 2020 at a time when the two countries were under sheltering directives. In both countries, the directives of the official health agencies asked the inhabitants to "shelter in place", avoiding close contact with people outside their place of shelter as much as possible. Essential activities such as trade and some services were maintained, but with restrictions.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

5

91 In total, 2,361 MSM participated in the research, out of which 1,651 (69.9%) were from 92 Brazil and 710 (30.1%) from Portugal. The research participants were recruited by an adaptation of the Respondent Drive Sampling (RDS) method to the virtual environment, so that one 93 94 participant was responsible for recruiting other individuals of the same category as his, using their networks. To meet the requirements of the method, we selected 15 MSM with different 95 characteristics in relation to: location in the country (divided according to the regions of the two 96 countries); race/skin color (Caucasian and non-Caucasian), age (young, adult, and older adult) 97 and schooling level. These were the first participants and they were identified as seeds. Each 98 participant received the link to the research website and was instructed to invite/disseminate to 99 MSM of their social network, until obtaining a significant sample. 100 The seeds were identified by the two most popular [10] geolocation-based dating applications 101 102 (Grindr and Hornet) by direct chat with online users, adapted to time location sampling (TLS)

technique following previous methods [11-12] (Figure 01).

We also used the social network Facebook to boost the number of participants, directing to the MSM population aged between 18 and 60 years (age limit imposed by the social network), by a fixed post on the official search page (https://www.facebook.com/taafimdeque/) and it was followed by an electronic link, which provided access to the free and informed consent form and the survey questionnaire.

We included only individuals who identified themselves as men (cis or trans), aged 18 or over, and living in one of the two countries. Non-Portuguese speakers and tourists were excluded. For Facebook recruitment, the researchers used the boost feature to target MSM in both countries.

113 Measures

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

6

114 Data were collected by Computer-Assisted Technique Interview (CASI). The data collection 115 questionnaire was hosted on the study site and, for security reasons, it only allowed one answer by IP (*internet protocol*), that is, only one user answered by machine (computer, cell phone ...). 116 117 The research questionnaire was created and validated (face-content) by a group of three experts from both countries in two versions: European Portuguese (Portugal) and Brazilian Portuguese 118 (Brazil). It was divided into four sections with 46 questions, mostly multiple choice, some of 119 120 which were mandatory for completion of the questionnaire. The questions addressed: 1. Sociodemographic information (age; gender identity; schooling; race/skin color; sexual 121 orientation; type of current relationship; country; state; place of dwelling); 122 2. Social welfare and coping in the period of social distancing: 123 3. Sexual practices and activities during the pandemic, namely: sexual practice with a casual 124 125 partner; sex with use of drugs; threesome or group sex; sex without condom use; STIs protection strategies; sex frequency and protection measures against COVID-19; search for health services; 126 127 4. Sexual practices and activities in the period prior to the pandemic: Use of PrEP and PEP; 128 commonly used ways to search for partners; knowledge about STIs and HIV testing; For this study, we defined sex with a casual partner or simply casual sex, such as anal sex with a 129 new or unknown partner outside the place where they were sheltered, with the question: "Since 130 the social distancing/sheltering was proposed in your country, have you had sex with a new or 131 unknown partner who is outside the place where you are sheltered, or have you left your shelter 132 133 to meet that partner?." Analysis 134

Descriptive analysis was performed for key numerical and categorical variables. Bivariate and
 multivariable logistic regression was used to characterize associations with having casual sex.

7

We tested the multicollinearity between variables before moving on to the regression model. A final model was selected, using the forward conditional input method, based on retaining those variables with p<0.1 while using p<0.05 as the cut-off for significance. The best performance of the multivariate model with was considered for aspects of accuracy, sensitivity to specificity (Receiver Operating Characteristic - ROC) proving that the statistical performance developed was better than chance.

143 **Ethical considerations**

The research project obtained ethical approval from the Universidade Nova de Lisboa and Universidade de São Paulo. Informed consent was obtained from all users online, before proceeding with the questionnaire.

147

148 **Results**

A total of 2,361 MSM participated in the online surveys, including 1,651 (69.9%) from Brazil 149 150 and 710 (30.1%) from Portugal (Table 1). Most participants had access to the survey from the 151 indication by social networks partners or colleagues (72.7%), and Facebook was responsible 152 for® the remaining 27.3%. The median age was 29 years (ranging from 18-66). Most men in 153 both countries lived in urban areas (69.0% in Brazil, 95.4% in Portugal) and were single (69.2% 154 in Brazil, 82.3% in Portugal). One in ten (9.9%) MSM respondents in Brazil self-reported their HIV status as positive, as did 12.1% of respondents in Portugal. In Brazil, 10.5% reported testing 155 156 and 5.5% reported being diagnosed with COVID-19. In Portugal, 15.5% had tested and 1.8% were diagnosed with COVID-19. 157

Table 1 also describes how the COVID-19 epidemic changed the respondents' sexual behavior.

159 Over half of respondents (n:1252/ 53.0%) had casual sex, considering that 47 (3.8%) engaged in

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

8

paid sex, group sex (27.3%), sex under the influence of alcohol or drugs (69.8%), and
unprotected sex (47.1%).

Many MSM reported behaviors that they believed would reduce the risk of COVID-19 162 163 transmission. Apart from measures taken with respect to sex, general preventive measures (e.g., use of face mask until the meeting place and hand sanitizing with hand sanitizer) (25.8%), asking 164 if the partner was sheltering (30.7%), and asking if the partner had symptoms (27.5%) were 165 mentioned. Other measures to reduce the spread of COVID-19 included avoiding kissing during 166 sex (16.2%), washing hands before and after sex (27.6%), and cleaning the place where they had 167 sex before and after sex (14.6%). Notably, among the 652 users of PrEP / Truvada in this study 168 almost half (301; 46.1%) also referred using this medicine as a preventive measure to the 169 transmission of COVID-19. 170

171 Table 2 presents correlates of leaving the house or having someone in their house for casual sex during the sheltering period in bivariate and multivariable logistic regression models 172 173 for each country. In Brazil, the odds of engaging in casual sex increased with the variables 174 having group sex (adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 2.1, 95% CI 1.3-3.4), living in a urban area (aOR 1.6, 95% CI 1.1-2.2), feeling that sheltering had average (aOR 2.2, 95% CI 1.5-3.2) or high 175 impact on their daily life (aOR 3.0, 95% CI 1.1-8.3) compared to low impact, having casual 176 177 partners (aOR 2.5, 95% CI 1.8-3.5), and not decreasing the number of partners during the COVID-19 epidemic (aOR 6.5, 95% CI 4.2-10.0). In Portugal, the odds of engaging in casual 178 sex increased with the variables using Facebook to find partners (aOR 4.6, 95% CI 3.0-7.2), not 179 decreasing the number of partners during the COVID-19 epidemic (aOR 3.8, 95% CI 2.9-5.9), 180 usually finding partners in physical venues (pre-COVID-19) (aOR 5.4, 95% CI 3.2-8.9), feeling 181

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

9

that the isolation had high impact on their daily life (aOR 3.0, 95% CI 1.3-6.7), and reporting
HIV-positive serostatus (aOR 11.7, 95% CI 4.7-29.2).

184

185 Discussion

Our study showed that the COVID-19 pandemic and the period of sheltering in place did not stop 186 a considerable portion of Brazilian and Portuguese MSM from finding casual sexual partners. 187 Nevertheless, over 95% of respondents say they adopted at least partial sheltering in place. For 188 Brazil, this level may be higher than typically reported by local authorities for the general 189 population (between 40% and 55%) [13]. These figures may be cause for corcern regarding 190 overcrowding hospitals [14]. For Portugal, compliance in the general population appears to have 191 been high enough to avert overwhelming the hospital system [15]. Although slightly over half of 192 193 MSM still found casual partners outside their homes, 75% had fewer partners compared to before the COVID-19 epidemic. MSM reported other measures to reduce the risk for COVID-19 194 195 akin to other risk-reduction practices. For example, more than 25% asked if their partners were 196 otherwise sheltering and if they had any symptoms of COVID-19. Although close contact was inherent or implied in having casual sex, many MSM reported avoiding kissing, handwashing 197 before and after sex, and cleaning the place where they had sex before and after sex. 198

An unexpected finding was the use of PrEP/Truvada for COVID-19 prophylaxis. In the absence of evidence of efficacy for COVID-19 prevention, the assumption may lead to people on PrEP to neglect effective measures. A possible explanation for the adoption of this practice might be misunderstanding the discussion of potential of prophylaxis drugs for SARS-CoV2 in the popular media [16]. Some MSM may have mistaken Truvada, promoted for HIV

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

10

prophylaxis, as having a similar mechanism for SARS-CoV2. Specific messaging may be needed
to dispel this false connection through programs promoting PrEP for HIV.

206 Our study also found continuing behaviors that may place the studied group at high risk 207 for acquiring or transmitting HIV and other STIs during the COVID-19 epidemic, at levels similar to those reported in studies [10,17] slightly prior to the pandemic period. More than one 208 in six MSM reported group sex, implying the meeting of several people in very close contact, 209 210 thus amplifying potential COVID-9 exposure [18]. Engaging in group sex was further associated 211 with increased odds of having casual partners among the group of Brazilian MSM. Sexual encounters under the influence of drugs or alcohol, also common during the sheltering period, 212 can decrease reasoning capacity and hinder the adoption of preventive measures for HIV/STIs 213 and COVID-19 [19]. Unprotected sex with a new casual partner was reported by over one in 214 215 three Brazilian MSM and one in five Portuguese MSM during the shelter in place period. These 216 have been considered high rates of incidence[12].

The duration of the sheltering period, with accompanying feelings of isolation, may 217 218 partly explain the high-risk sexual behaviors. Most participants had been isolated for at least 30 days, and many recognized a high impact of social isolation on their lives. This in turn may have 219 led MSM to feel a greater need for social contact, to seek a "break" in isolation to seek partners 220 221 [20], with an additional break for HIV preventive measures. This hypothesis is corroborated by the findings of the multivariable analysis, in which acknowledging high impact of the sheltering 222 period was associated with seeking external casual sex partners in both in Brazil and in Portugal. 223 The effect of a prolonged isolation period is particularly worrisome as Brazil moves towards 224 225 becoming a COVID-19 epicenter in Latin America and the world [21].

11

226 Some studies imply that social isolation may lead to higher utilization of virtual networks 227 to search for sexual encounters [6, 22]. Connections via the Tinder application increased 15% in the US and 25% in Italy and Spain during the COVID-19 epidemic [22]. The duration of chat 228 229 activity also increased by 30% [22]. Notably, the use of Facebook as the preferable way to find partners before the pandemic was significantly associated with greater odds for Portuguese MSM 230 having casual sex. Another hypothesis is that partnering through Facebook can provide a false 231 232 sense of exposure control, as it enables sex with a friend, acquaintance or otherwise someone 233 belonging to the same social network Yet another possible explanation for the association of increased casual partnering during COVID-19 and use of Facebook, not yet documented in the 234 literature, may be fear of judgment (i.e., for breaking sheltering) by closer friends, which leads 235 MSM to seek out like-minded strangers. On the other hand, social media can assist with keeping 236 237 smaller social groups as well as in the adoption of practices such as virtual sex and masturbation [23, 24], which may reduce risks of transmissible infections. 238

Other significant associations with seeking casual sex during COVID-19 are notable. 239 240 Being HIV positive also increased the odds of engaging in casual sex in Portuguese MSM. Although we recognize that even before the pandemic, studies indicated that MSM living with 241 HIV already had high-risk sexual behavior [25,26], another hypothesis may be in the false sense 242 243 of protection due to antiretrovirals for HIV currently being tested in COVID-19 patients [27]. This may be consistent with assumptions or misunderstandings about PrEP, as mentioned above. 244 In both Brazil and in Portugal, living in an urban area increased the odds of casual sex, 245 likely explained by an access to greater numbers of MSM [28]. This facilitates the location and 246

selection of partners by dating applications or other social media [12].

12

This study has several limitations. First, we recognize the data derived from a convenience sample in both countries. Venue-based and peer-referral mechanisms to sample and recruit are harder to logistically accomplish during the COVID-19 epidemic. The site that hosts the form is not able to inform how many subjects were reached, only the amount of access and answers.

Secondly, we did not measure variables recognized as important in hindsight, such as exact number of days in sheltering, different sexual practices, and the organization of other events, such as parties where sex may have occurred. Lastly, we did not test for COVID-19 and therefore could not fully link behaviors directly to infection. Furthermore, most questions refer to past events that may be biased by memory.

258 **Conclusions**

259 We were able to identify a high frequency of casual sex among MSM, as well as associated 260 factors that might increase exposure to SARS-CoV-2, HIV, and other STIs during a period of 261 high COVID-19 transmission after implementation of sheltering in place. Although many 262 strategies were adopted to minimize the exposure to SARS-CoV-2, the effectiveness of those measures is threatened by high-risk practices for both COVID-19 and HIV, including 263 unprotected sexual intercourse and group sex. By analyzing two countries with different 264 scenarios for control of COVID-19, we were able to demonstrate the vulnerability of MSM 265 communities to the pandemic. Our results should be considered when making decisions about 266 public health, since if these vulnerabilities are left unaddressed, they may hamper the response to 267 the pandemic. 268

269

271 **References**

- 272 1. Ministério da Saúde (Brazil). Painel Coronavírus. 2020. Available at:
 273 https://covid.saude.gov.br/
- 274 2. WHO. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports. Available from:
 275 https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports
- 3. Ministério da Saúde (Portugal). SNS-24. Temas da saúde COVID-19. Available at:
 <u>https://www.sns24.gov.pt/tema/doencas-infecciosas/covid-19/</u>
- Peixoto VR, Vieira A, Aguiar P, Sousa, Abrantes A. "Timing", Adesão e Impacto das
 Medidas de Contenção da COVID-19 em Portugal. NOVA National School of Public Health
 report 2020.
- 5. Albuquerque LP, Silva RB, Araújo RMS. COVID-19: origin, pathogenesis, transmission,
 clinical aspects and current therapeutic strategies. Rev Pre Infec e Saúde. 2020; 6:10432.
- Brennan DJ, Card KG, Collict D, Jollimore J, Lachowsky NJ. How Might Social Distancing
 Impact Gay, Bisexual, Queer, Trans and Two-Spirit Men in Canada? AIDS Behav 2020
 30:1–3.
- 7. McDonald K. Social Support and Mental Health in LGBTQ Adolescents: A review of the
 literature. Issues Ment Health Nurs 2018; 39(1):16-29.
- 288 8. Portugal. Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras, 2018. Available at:
 289 <u>https://sefstat.sef.pt/Docs/Rifa2018.pdf</u>
- 9. Barbosa B, Santos CM, Santos M. Tourists with migrants' eyes: the mediating role of
 tourism in international retirement migration. J Tour Cult Chang 2020.

292	10. Queiroz AAAFLN, Matos MCB, Araújo TME, Reis RK, Sousa AFL. Sexually transmitted
293	infections and factors associated with condom use in dating app users in Brazil. Acta paul
294	enferm. 2019 ;32(5):546-53.
295	11. Queiroz AAFLN, Sousa ÁFL, Matos MCB, et al. Factors associated with self-reported non-
296	completion of the hepatitis B vaccine series in men who have sex with men in Brazil. BMC
297	Infect Dis 2019 ;19(1):335.
298	12. Queiroz AAFLN, Sousa AFL, Brignol S, Araújo TME, Reis RK. Vulnerability to HIV
299	among older men who have sex with men users of dating apps in Brazil. Braz J Infect Dis
300	2019 ; 23(5): 298-306.
301	13. Lana RM, Coelho FC, Gomes MFC, Cruz OG, Bastos LS, Villela DAM et al. The novel

coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) emergency and the role of timely and effective national health
 surveillance. Cad Saúde Pública 2020; 36 (3): e00019620.

- 14. Freitas ARR, Napimoga M, Donalisio MR. Assessing the severity of COVID-19. Epidemiol
 Serv Saúde 2020; e2020119.
- 15. Peixoto VR, Vieira A, Aguiara P, Carvalho C, Thomas D, Abrantes A. Rapid assessment of
 the impact of "lockdown" on the COVID-19 epidemic in Portugal. MedRxiv 2020.
- 308 16. https://www.pharmacytimes.com/ajax/development-of-prep-for-covid-19-could-allow-
- 309 country-to-open-safely-before-a-vaccine-is-available
- 17. Gama AFM. HIV infection in men who have sex with men (MSM): risk-taking behaviours
- and drivers of increased infection. Universidade Nova de Lisboa [Thesis in tropical
 Medicine]. 2019
- 18. Yuen KS, Ye ZW, Fung SY, Chan CP, Jin DY. SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: The most
- important research questions. Cell Biosci **2020** 16; 10:40.

- 19. Wong NS, Kwan TH, Lee KCK, Lau JYC, Lee SS. Delineation of chemsex patterns of men 315 316 who have sex with men in association with their sexual networks and linkage to HIV prevention. Int J Drug Policy. 2020; 75:102591. 317 318 20. Sanchez TH, Zlotorzynska M, Rai M, Baral SD. Characterizing the Impact of COVID-19 on Men Who Have Sex with Men Across the United States in April, 2020. AIDS and Behav 319 320 **2020**; 1-9. 21. Menezes PL, Garner DM, Valenti VE. Brazil is projected to be the next global COVID-19 321 pandemic epicenter. Medrxiv 2020. 322 22. Sullivan A. Love in the time of coronavirus: COVID-19 changes the game for online dating. 323 Deutsche Welle. 2020. https://www.dw.com/en/love-in-the-time-of-coronaviruscovid-19-324 changes-the-game-for-online-dating/a-52933001. Accessed 27 May 2020. 325
- 326 23. NYC. Sex and COVID-19 Fact Sheet. Available from:
 327 https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/doh/downloads/pdf/imm/covid-sex-
- 328 guidance.pdf?utm_source=morning_brew. Acess 27 May 2020.
- 329 24. UNAIDS. Safer sex in the time of COVID-19. Available from:
 330 https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/covid-blog, access in 27 may 2020
- 25. Cunha CB, Boni RBD, Guimarães MRC, Yanavich C, Veloso VG, Moreira RI, Hoagland B,

Grinsztejn B, Friedman RK. Unprotected sex among men who have sex with men living with
HIV in Brazil: a cross-sectional study in Rio de Janeiro. BMC Public Health. 2014;
14(379):1-9.

26. Poon CM, Wong NS, Kwan TH, Wong HTH, Chan KCW, Lee SS. Changes of sexual risk
behaviors and sexual connections among HIV-positive men who have sex with men along
their HIV care continuum. PLoS One. 2018; 13(12):1-14.

- 27. Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D et al. A Trial of Lopinavir-Ritonavir in Adults Hospitalized with
 Severe Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020; 382:1787-1799.
- 340 28. Whitfield DL, Kattari SK, Walls NE, Al-Tayyib A. Grindr, Scruff, and on the Hunt:
- 341 Predictors of Condomless Anal Sex, Internet Use, and Mobile Application Use Among Men
- 342 Who Have Sex with Men. Am J Mens Health. **2017**;11(3):775-784.
- 29. Yeo C, Sanghvi K, Yeo D: Enteric involvement of coronaviruses: is faecal-oral transmission
- of SARS-CoV-2 possible? Lancet Gastroenterol. 2020, 5: P335-337. 10.1016/ S2468-
- 345 1253(20)30048-0
- 346
- 347
- 348
- 349
- 350
- 351
- 352

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .





It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

18

Table 1. Characteristics and sexual practices during the COVID-19 shelter in place period, men

who have sex with men, Brazil and Portugual, 2020.

	Brazil (N=1,651)		Portugal (N=710)		Total (N=2,361)	
Characteristics	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gender identity						
Cisgender man	1637	99.2	697	98.2	2334	98.9
Transgender man or non-binary	14	0.8	13	1.8	27	1.1
Schooling						
<9 years	340	20.6	152	21.4	492	20.8
>9 years	1311	79.4	558	78.6	1869	79.2
Race/skin color						
Caucasian	375	22.7	575	80.9	950	40.2
Non-Caucasian	1276	77.3	135	19.1	1411	59.8
Lives in urban area	1140	69.0	677	95.4	1817	77.0
Relationship status						
Single	1143	69.2	584	82.3	1727	73.1
Monogamous	480	29.1	86	12.1	566	24.0

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.07.20113142; this version posted September 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license . 19 28 5.6 68 2.9 Polyamorous 1.7 40 **Self-reported HIV status** HIV negative 1285 77.8 488 68.7 1773 75.1 HIV positive 163 9.9 86 12.1 249 10.5 I do not know 203 136 19.2 339 12.3 14.4 **Tested for COVID-19** 174 10.5 110 15.5 284 12 **Diagnosed with COVID-19** 90 5.5 13 1.8 103 4.4 Are you now sheltering in place? No 74 4.5 26 3.7 100 4.2 Partially 405 24.5 154 21.7 559 23.7 Yes 1172 71.0 530 74.6 1702 72.1 For how long have you been sheltering? 1 to 14 days 60 3.6 54 7.6 114 4.8 15 to 29 days 331 62 8.8 393 20.1 16.7 30 to 45 days 1035 62.7 326 45.9 1361 57.6 More than 45 days 225 13.6 268 37.7 493 20.9

How would you rate the impact that

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

sheltering	has	had	on	your	life?	
------------	-----	-----	----	------	-------	--

Low im	pact				215	13.0	70	9.9	285	12.1
Average	e impact				643	38.9	292	41.1	935	39.6
High im	npact				793	48.0	348	49.0	1141	48.3
Usual type	e of sex partne	er								
Casual					1155	70.0	413	58.2	1568	66.4
Steady					291	17.6	40	5.6	331	14.0
Both ca	sual and stead	у			205	12.4	257	36.2	462	19.6
Lives with	sex partner				236	14.3	109	15.4	345	14.6
Usual	ways	responde	nt fi	nds	sex		partı	ners	b	efore
period of s	sheltering									
period of s	sheltering apps				1285	77.8	544	76.6	1829	77.5
period of s Dating a Faceboo	s heltering apps ok, Twitter, or	Instagram			1285 560	77.8 33.9	544 286	76.6 40.3	1829 846	77.5 35.8
period of s Dating a Faceboo Other si	sheltering apps ok, Twitter, or tes	Instagram			1285 560 446	77.833.927.0	544 286 173	76.6 40.3 24.4	1829 846 619	77.5 35.8 26.2
period of s Dating a Faceboo Other si Bars, ch	sheltering apps ok, Twitter, or tes ubs, bathhouse	Instagram es, cruising an	reas		1285 560 446 72	77.833.927.04.4	54428617325	76.640.324.43.5	1829 846 619 97	77.535.826.24.1
period of s Dating a Faceboo Other si Bars, cli Does no	sheltering apps ok, Twitter, or tes ubs, bathhouse ot search for pa	Instagram es, cruising an artners	reas		1285 560 446 72 292	 77.8 33.9 27.0 4.4 17.7 	 544 286 173 25 98 	 76.6 40.3 24.4 3.5 13.8 	1829 846 619 97 390	 77.5 35.8 26.2 4.1 16.5

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

21

sheltering

In this sheltering period, would you say that...

Your sexual frequency

Decreased	1188	72.0	615	86.6	1803	76.4
Did not change	364	22.0	66	9.3	430	18.2
Increased	99	6.0	29	4.1	128	5.4

Your interaction with social media

Decreased	117	7.1	248	34.9	365	15.5
Did not change	357	21.6	136	19.2	493	20.9

1177 71.3 326 45.9 1503 63.6

Increased

Your alcohol consumption

Decreased	705	42.7	384	54.1	1089	46.1
Did not change	608	36.8	212	29.9	820	34.7
Increased	338	20.5	114	16.0	452	19.2

During sheltering, the respondent

Had casual sex	875	53.0	377	53.1	1252	53.0
Sought to pay for sex	63	3.8	9	1.3	72	3.0

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.07.20113142; this version posted September 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license . 22 Had sex with 2 or more people at the 259 15.7 113 15.9 372 15.8 same time Had sex under the influence of drugs 777 47.1 143 20.1 920 39.0 or alcohol Had unprotected anal sex with a new/casual partner. 576 34.9 142 20.0 718 30.4 To protect from COVID-19, the respondent Took general/basic protective measures (e.g., using 423 25.6 187 26.3 610 25.8 face mask and hand sanitizer) Asked if the partner was sheltering 513 31.1 212 29.9 725 30.7 Asked if the partner had symptoms 452 27.4 197 27.7 649 27.5 Avoided kissing during sex 219 13.3 164 23.1 383 16.2 Washed hands with soap and water for at least 450 27.3 202 28.5 652 27.6 20 seconds before and after sex Cleaned the place where they had sex before and after 209 12.7 136 19.2 345 14.6 sex 191 Used PrEP/Truvada 11.6 110 15.5 301 12.7 24.4 114 16.1 517 Used a condom for anal sex 403 21.9 Did not adopt any strategy 610 36.9 247 34.8 857 36.3

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

24

Table 2. Factors associated with having casual sex during the COVID-19 shelter in place period,

men who have sex with men, Brazil and Portugal, 2020.

Factors	Categories	OR	95%CI	aOR	95%CI
	Brazil				
Sought to pay for sex					
	No	1			
	Yes	2.7	1.5-4.8	0.4	0.2 - 1.1
Sex with ≥ 2 at the same	ne time (group sex)				
	No	1			
	Yes	10.0	6.6 - 15.1	2,1	1,3 - 3,4
Live in urban area					
	No	1			
	Yes	1,4	1,1 - 1,7	1,6	1,1-2,2
Self-reported impact	of sheltering on daily life	:			
	Low	1			
	Average	1.2	0.9 -1.5	2,2	1.5 - 3.2
	High	1.1	0.8 - 1.4	3.0	1.1 - 8.3

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

25

					25
Type of sex partner (s) usually	y:				
	Steady partner	1			
	Casual and steady partner	3.3	2.2 - 4.8	1,6	0.9 - 2.8
	Casual partner	1.5	1.2 - 2.0	2,5	1.8 - 3.5
Did you use a condom during	sex?				
	No	1			
	Yes	0.4	0.3 - 0.5	0,6	0,4 - 0,9
Decrease in the number of parts	ners during sheltering				
	Yes	1			
	No	21.3	15.0 - 30.4	6.5	4.2 - 10.0
Portuga	1				
Usually used Facebook to fir	nd partners				
	No	1			
	Yes	3.0	2.2 - 4.2	4,6	3.0-7.2

Did not seek partners

No 1 medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.07.20113142; this version posted September 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license . 26 Yes 0.5 0.4 - 0.7 0.3 0.1 - 0.5 For how long have you been in isolation? 15-29 days 1 30-45 days 0.5 0.3 - 0.8 0.2 0,1 - 0.4 >45 days 0.8 0.4 - 1.4 0.4 0.2 - 0.8 Not in isolation 0.5 0.3 - 1.1 0.2 0.1 - 0.8 Decrease in the number of partners during sheltering Yes 1 No 1.2 0.9 - 1.6 3.8 2.9 - 5.9Usually found partners at bars, clubs, bathhouses, etc No 1 Yes 2.3 1.6 - 3.3 5.4 3.2 - 8.9Impact of isolation on daily life: 1 Low Average 0.8 0.5 - 1.4 0.7 0.3 - 1.7 High 3.1 1.9 - 5.4 3.0 1.3 - 6.7

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

27

Self-reported HIV status

Negative	1			
Positive	10.4	4.9 - 22.0	11.7	4.7 - 29.2
Does not know	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	1.4	0.7 – 2.3