

## Comparing men who have sex with men and inject drugs and people who inject drugs who are men and have sex with men in San Francisco: Implications for HIV and hepatitis C virus prevention

Adelina Artenie<sup>1</sup>, Shelley N. Facente<sup>2,3</sup>, Sheena Patel<sup>4</sup>, Jack Stone<sup>1</sup>, Jennifer Hecht<sup>5,6</sup>, Perry Rhodes III<sup>3,7</sup>, Willi McFarland<sup>8</sup>, Erin Wilson<sup>8</sup>, Peter Vickerman<sup>1\*</sup>, Meghan D. Morris<sup>4\*</sup>

*\*contributed equally*

<sup>1</sup> Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

<sup>2</sup> School of Public Health, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

<sup>3</sup> Facente Consulting, Richmond, CA, USA

<sup>4</sup> Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

<sup>5</sup> San Francisco AIDS Foundation, San Francisco, CA, USA

<sup>6</sup> Springboard HealthLab, Berkeley, CA, USA

<sup>7</sup> University of California San Francisco Alliance Health Project, San Francisco, CA, USA

<sup>8</sup> San Francisco Department of Public Health, San Francisco, CA, USA

Corresponding Author: Adelina Artenie

Oakfield House

Oakfield Grove

Bristol

BS8 2BN

UK

E-mail: [adelina.artenie@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:adelina.artenie@bristol.ac.uk)

**Running head:** COMPARING MSM-IDU and PWID-MSM

**Word count:** 2034

**Source of Funding:** AA is supported through postdoctoral fellowships through the Canadian Institute of Health Research, Fonds de recherche du Québec – Santé and Canadian Network on Hepatitis C. PV acknowledges support from the National Institute of Health Research Health Protection Research Unit in Behavioural Science and Evaluation at University of Bristol and the National Institute for Drug Abuse (NIDA; R01DA033679, R21 DA047902). The

parent study, National HIV Behavioral Surveillance (NHBS), is funded by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 5U1BPS003247). The funding sources had no role in the design and conduct of this study, the collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data, or the preparation or approval of the manuscript.

**Conflicts of interest:** PV received an unrestricted research grant from Gilead that is not related to this study. SNF acknowledges consulting support from Gilead Pharmaceuticals and from End Hep C SF; neither are related to this study. All other authors have no competing interests to report.

1 ABSTRACT (250 words)

2 **Background:** Men who have sex with men (MSM) and people who inject drugs (PWID) carry  
3 a disproportionate burden of HIV and hepatitis C virus (HCV) infections. We compared the  
4 demographic and risk profiles of MSM who inject drugs (MSM-IDU, i.e., men reached  
5 through affiliation with MSM) and PWID who are men and have sex with men (PWID-MSM,  
6 i.e., men reached through affiliation with PWID).

7  
8 **Methods:** We used data from the most recent waves of the National HIV Behavioural  
9 Surveillance among MSM (2017) and PWID (2018) in San Francisco. Participants were  
10 recruited through venue-based (MSM) and peer-referral (PWID) sampling and completed  
11 standardised questionnaires. We compared the characteristics of MSM-IDU and PWID-MSM  
12 using bivariate tests.

13  
14 **Results:** Of 504 participants completing the MSM survey, 6.2% reported past-year injection  
15 drug use (MSM-IDU). Among 311 male participants completing the PWID survey, 19.0%  
16 reported past-year sex with a male (PWID-MSM). Relative to MSM-IDU, more PWID-MSM  
17 were older, identified as bisexual, had lower income, a history of incarceration and were  
18 homeless. MSM-IDU had more male sexual partners (median: 10 vs 3) and fewer injected  
19 daily (29.0% vs 64.4%) than PWID-MSM. While more PWID-MSM sought sterile equipment  
20 from a syringe program (86.4% vs 35.5%), fewer reported using PrEP (15.0% vs 42.9%).

21  
22 **Conclusion:** The sociodemographic, risk behaviour, and prevention access profiles of MSM-  
23 IDU and PWID-MSM in San Francisco suggest that they represent distinct populations who  
24 may require tailored HIV and HCV prevention strategies. MSM- and PWID-focused  
25 prevention programs should provide combined sexual health and harm reduction messages  
26 and services.

27  
28 **Key words:** men who have sex with men; MSM; MSM-IDU; people who inject drugs; PWID;

29 PWID-MSM; HIV; hepatitis C; HCV

30 INTRODUCTION

31

32 Men who have sex with men (MSM) and people who inject drugs (PWID) are two of the  
33 populations at highest risk of HIV and hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection<sup>[1, 2]</sup>. These  
34 populations have traditionally been viewed distinctly, with research and interventions  
35 generally focusing on either the sexual behaviours of MSM or the injecting behaviours of  
36 PWID, despite evidence that that some MSM inject drugs (MSM-IDU) and some male PWID  
37 engage in sex with other men (PWID-MSM)<sup>[3-7]</sup>. Studies among MSM have indicated that  
38 MSM-IDU have a greater prevalence of HIV and HCV infection, experience more  
39 socioeconomic disadvantage and have higher levels of sexual risk behaviours, in addition to  
40 also having injection-specific risks compared to MSM who do not inject drugs (MSM non-  
41 IDU)<sup>[3-5]</sup>. Conversely, studies among PWID who are men found that, relative to those who do  
42 not report sex with other men (PWID non-MSM), PWID-MSM have lower socio-economic  
43 stability, are more likely to engage in high-risk injection practices and to be living with HIV<sup>[6,</sup>  
44 <sup>7]</sup>.

45

46 While previous studies have highlighted the distinct characteristics of people with dual risk  
47 behaviours relative to other MSM or PWID populations, it remains unclear how MSM-IDU  
48 and PWID-MSM compare to each other in their demographic groupings, their drug use and  
49 sexual patterns, their primary mode of HIV and HCV infection and how they may be  
50 reached. These similarities and differences are important in informing the planning and  
51 delivery of HIV and HCV prevention services and the ongoing US national and global  
52 campaigns to eliminate these viral infections as public health problems by 2030<sup>[1, 2, 8, 9]</sup>. In  
53 the US, the third largest HIV transmission group among men is a joint risk category referred

54 to as "male-to-male sexual contact and injection drug use"<sup>[10]</sup>. Yet, if MSM-IDU and PWID-  
55 MSM present distinct risk behaviours, different strategies may be needed to reach each  
56 group.

57

58 Our primary aim was to characterise similarities and differences between MSM-IDU and  
59 PWID-MSM by comparing socio-demographic, injection drug use and sexual patterns, and  
60 access to services. As a secondary aim, we also compared the characteristics of MSM-IDU to  
61 MSM non-IDU and PWID-MSM to male PWID non-MSM, respectively, to gain a broader  
62 understanding of the characteristics of these groups. Our case example is San Francisco,  
63 where the burden of HIV and HCV infections is high for MSM and PWID<sup>[11, 12]</sup>, campaigns to  
64 eliminate these infections are ongoing<sup>[13, 14]</sup>, and surveys with comparable measures for  
65 these populations are available.

66

## 67 METHODS

68

69 We used data collected through US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)  
70 National HIV Behavioural Surveillance (NHBS) surveys<sup>[15]</sup>, which conducts behavioural  
71 surveillance among key populations at risk of HIV infection. We used the most recent data  
72 from San Francisco's MSM (2017) and PWID (2018) surveys. MSM were recruited using  
73 time-location sampling and participants were eligible for enrolment if they were  $\geq 18$  years,  
74 resided in the San Francisco Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), and either identified as  
75 MSM or had any sex with another man in the previous year<sup>[15]</sup>. The time-location sampling  
76 method entailed intercepting MSM at venues where gay and other MSM congregate. PWID  
77 were recruited through peer referral and were eligible if  $\geq 18$  years, resided in the San

78 Francisco MSA and reported past-year injection drug use<sup>[15]</sup>. The peer-referral method  
79 entailed participants referring persons from their social networks who they knew to be  
80 PWID.

81

82 In both surveys, participants completed an interviewer-administered electronic  
83 questionnaire and were tested for HIV. Testing for HCV antibody status was only conducted  
84 among PWID. HIV and HCV infection were assessed using standardized testing methods<sup>[15]</sup>.  
85 The same core questionnaire was used across both surveys, which collected information  
86 about socio-demographic factors, injection drug use, sexual risk behaviours and access to  
87 HIV and HCV services. Participants were reimbursed \$50 for their time. Both studies were  
88 approved by the institutional review boards of the University of California, San Francisco  
89 and the CDC.

90

91 For this study, we restricted the PWID study sample to participants with self-reported  
92 gender as men. Those who reported sex with a man in the past year were categorised as  
93 PWID-MSM. Among the MSM study sample, we categorized those who reported injecting  
94 drugs in the past year as MSM-IDU. We categorised the remaining groups as PWID non-  
95 MSM and MSM non-IDU, respectively.

96

97 We used medians and interquartile ranges, and frequency distributions to summarise  
98 continuous and categorical variables, respectively. We used Pearson's chi-square or,  
99 alternatively, Fisher's Exact tests when expected cell counts were  $\leq 5$  for categorical  
100 variables, and Mann-Whitney U tests for continuous variables to explore differences  
101 between groups. All analyses were performed using SAS version 9.4.

102

103 RESULTS

104

105 Of the 504 participants completing the MSM survey, 31 (6.2%) were classified as MSM-IDU.

106 Conversely, of 464 participants completing the PWID survey, 311 (67.0%) identified as men

107 and of these, 59 PWID (19.0%) were classified as PWID-MSM. Their characteristics and those

108 of MSM non-IDU and PWID non-MSM are presented in Table 1.

109

110 *Comparing MSM-IDU and PWID-MSM*

111

112 We noted differences between MSM-IDU and PWID-MSM across most socio-demographic

113 measures. PWID-MSM were older than MSM-IDU (57.6% vs 35.5% were  $\geq 40$  years), more

114 racially/ethnically diverse (61.0% vs 35.5% identified as non-white) and more identified as

115 bisexual (45.8% vs 16.1%). PWID-MSM were also less educated and fewer were currently

116 employed relative to MSM-IDU, with a majority reporting a household annual income of less

117 than \$25,000, experiencing homelessness and having a history of detention.

118

119 Injection drug use and sexual behaviours also differed between the two groups. Relative to

120 MSM-IDU, PWID-MSM began to inject drugs earlier (median age: 22 vs 30 years), more

121 injected  $\geq 2$  different drugs (59.3% vs 25.8%) and injected daily (64.4% vs 29.0%). Conversely,

122 PWID-MSM reported fewer male sexual partners compared to MSM-IDU (median: 3 vs 10),

123 fewer reported condomless anal sex (62.7% vs 93.6%) and more indicated having a female

124 sex partner (50.9% vs 22.6%). One exception to these differences was the type of drug most

125 often injected, with 64.5% and 54.2% of MSM-IDU and PWID-MSM indicating  
126 methamphetamine, respectively.

127

128 Some markers of service use differed between the two groups. A greater proportion of  
129 PWID-MSM sought sterile syringes from a syringe service program relative to MSM-IDU  
130 (86.4% vs 35.5%). Conversely, more MSM-IDU reported using PrEP (42.9% vs 15.0%) and  
131 having been tested for HCV (90.3% vs 61.0%) compared to PWID-MSM. The two groups  
132 were comparable with respect to HIV testing and opioid agonist treatment. HIV prevalence  
133 did not differ between the groups and was high for both MSM-IDU (32.3%) and PWID-MSM  
134 (39.0%).

135

#### 136 *Comparing MSM-IDU and MSM non-IDU*

137

138 While most MSM-IDU and MSM non-IDU identified as gay (71% and 91%), a larger  
139 proportion of MSM-IDU identified as heterosexual (13% vs 1%) or bisexual (16% vs 8%)  
140 compared to the MSM non-IDU group. Key socio-economic characteristics differed between  
141 the two groups, with a larger proportion of MSM-IDU reporting having completed only high  
142 school education or less (35.5% vs 11.2%), a household annual income of less than \$25,000  
143 (38.7% vs 16.5%), current homelessness (25.8% vs 2.3%) and a history of incarceration  
144 (45.2% vs 15.4%) compared to MSM non-IDU. We also noted differences for some sexual  
145 behaviours. More MSM-IDU received money or drugs in exchange for sex with a man (35.5%  
146 vs 5.5%) and having a female sex partner (22.6% vs 6.6%). A larger proportion of MSM-IDU  
147 reported prior HCV testing compared to MSM non-IDU (90.3% vs 54.6%). HIV prevalence  
148 was also higher among MSM-IDU compared to MSM non-IDU (32.3% vs 18.4%).

149

150 *Comparing PWID-MSM and PWID non-MSM*

151

152 PWID-MSM and PWID non-MSM were comparable on several socio-demographic measures,  
153 including age, education, employment and income. A large majority of PWID non-MSM  
154 identified as being heterosexual (93.7%), while only 15.3% of PWID-MSM did so. A smaller  
155 proportion of PWID-MSM reported current homelessness (66.1% vs 81.7%) compared to  
156 PWID non-MSM. Several injection drug use behaviours differed between the two groups. A  
157 larger proportion of PWID-MSM reported methamphetamine as their primary drug injected  
158 (54.2% vs 18.3%) and a smaller proportion reported injecting  $\geq 2$  different drugs (59.3% vs.  
159 80.6%) and injecting daily (64.4% vs. 81.0%) compared to PWID non-MSM. With respect to  
160 testing and use of services, we found a larger proportion of PWID-MSM were aware (72.5%  
161 vs 48.3%) and had used PrEP (15.0% vs 0.4%) than PWID non-MSM. HIV prevalence was  
162 higher among PWID-MSM compared to PWID non-MSM (39.0% vs. 5.9%); no difference was  
163 found for HCV prevalence (71.2% vs 79.4%).

164

165 DISCUSSION

166

167 Overall, compared to MSM-IDU, PWID-MSM presented greater socio-economic  
168 disadvantage on nearly all demographic measures considered, were more likely to be  
169 racially/ethnically diverse, and to indicate being bisexual rather than gay. Relative to MSM-  
170 IDU, PWID-MSM appeared to have a heavier injection drug use profile but lower sexual risk  
171 practices. While MSM-IDU appeared to be more engaged in MSM-oriented prevention  
172 programs like PrEP, PWID-MSM were more engaged with syringe service programs, which

173 have been primarily targeted towards PWID. Together, the differences observed in the  
174 socio-demographic, risk behaviour and healthcare access profiles of MSM-IDU and PWID-  
175 MSM suggest that they represent distinct populations that are present in different social  
176 spaces and may require targeted HIV/HCV prevention strategies. More broadly, these  
177 findings suggest that harm reduction and healthcare settings catering to MSM and PWID  
178 need to reflect the complexity of risk that these groups face, providing a wider range of  
179 HIV/HCV prevention messages and services than is suggested by their primary risk  
180 behaviour or the label that is ascribed to them.

181

182 The extent to which people who engage in both injecting- and sexual-risk behaviours were  
183 included in the PWID- or MSM-focused studies could reflect the primary behaviour they  
184 associated with and which takes precedence in their day-to-day life or the social and sexual  
185 networks they interact with. In a qualitative research study conducted in Denver, some  
186 participants reported engaging in male-to-male sex work to sustain their injection drug use  
187 patterns, whereas others indicated that injection drug use was only used to enhance male-  
188 to-male sex<sup>[16]</sup>. Varying motivations and levels of priority assigned to injecting and sexual  
189 practices have also been reported in other studies<sup>[17, 18]</sup> and explain why some individuals  
190 who engage in both behaviours may not identify as MSM or PWID<sup>[16]</sup>. A better  
191 understanding of the reasons motivating these practices is needed, as it could increase the  
192 extent to which HCV and HIV prevention programs engage with these populations and,  
193 ultimately, their impact on minimising risk.

194

195 We also noted important differences between MSM-IDU and MSM non-IDU and PWID-MSM  
196 and PWID non-MSM, respectively, in line with prior studies conducted among MSM<sup>[3-5]</sup> and

197 PWID<sup>[6, 7]</sup>. For example, one-third of MSM-IDU indicated receiving money or drugs from a  
198 man to have sex, whereas only a minority of MSM non-IDU indicated this practice. In  
199 addition, the level of HCV testing was greater in the former group. Conversely, while few  
200 PWID-MSM indicated heroin as the most commonly injected drug, more than half of PWID  
201 non-MSM did so. Across both MSM and PWID, HIV prevalence was higher among the dual  
202 risk groups. Collectively, these findings highlight complex behavioural, service access and  
203 HIV infection burden distinctions within both MSM and PWID populations, adding to the  
204 importance of providing access to combined sexual health and harm reduction messages  
205 rather than targeting specific risk behaviours.

206

207 The primary limitation of this study is the small sample size of MSM-IDU and PWID-MSM,  
208 which limited the statistical power to detect significant differences between them. It is also  
209 possible that we might have incorrectly detected significant differences due to having  
210 performed multiple tests. Even so, taken together, the numerous differences observed  
211 between MSM-IDU and PWID-MSM across distinct characteristics and measures support the  
212 broader finding that these two groups are distinct and should not be conflated with one  
213 another. Additionally, aside from HIV and HCV infection status, all other variables were  
214 assessed through self-report, which are liable to misclassification errors. However, studies  
215 have suggested that self-reported data in these populations are generally valid<sup>[19, 20]</sup>. Finally,  
216 the extent to which our findings are generalisable to MSM and PWID populations in other  
217 settings is unknown and should be explored in future studies.

218

219 In conclusion, our study suggests that MSM-IDU and PWID-MSM represent different  
220 populations, with distinct demographic, risk behaviour and healthcare access profiles. In

221 light of ongoing calls to broaden access to HCV and HIV prevention and treatment programs  
222 among PWID and MSM to reach 2030 elimination goals, findings indicate a need to provide  
223 access to a range of services and prevention messages to both of these populations.  
224

## REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Interim guidance for country validation of viral hepatitis elimination. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 2021. Available at: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240028395>. Accessed June 2021.
2. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). Global HIV statistics. Fact sheet 2021. Geneva, Switzerland, 2021. Available at: [https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media\\_asset/UNAIDS\\_FactSheet\\_en.pdf](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/UNAIDS_FactSheet_en.pdf). Accessed August 2021.
3. Gorbach PM, Javanbakht M, Ragsdale A, et al. Methamphetamine Injection Among Young Men Who Have Sex With Men: Risk for Human Immunodeficiency Virus Transmission in a Los Angeles Cohort. *J Infect Dis* **2020**; 222(Suppl 5): S471-s6.
4. O'Connell JM, Lampinen TM, Weber AE, et al. Sexual Risk Profile of Young Men in Vancouver, British Columbia, Who Have Sex with Men and Inject Drugs. *AIDS and Behavior* **2004**; 8(1): 17-23.
5. Raymond HF, Chu P, Nieves-Rivera I, Louie B, McFarland W, Pandori M. Hepatitis C infection among men who have sex with men, San Francisco, 2011. *Sex Transm Dis* **2012**; 39(12): 985-6.
6. Scheim A, Knight R, Shulha H, et al. Characterizing Men Who Have Sex with Men and Use Injection Drugs in Vancouver, Canada. *AIDS Behav* **2019**; 23(12): 3324-30.
7. Ferreira AD, Caiaffa WT, Bastos FI, Mingoti SA, Projeto Aj UDEB, II. Profile of male Brazilian injecting drug users who have sex with men. *Cad Saude Publica* **2006**; 22(4): 849-60.
8. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Viral Hepatitis National Strategic Plan for the United States: A Roadmap to Elimination (2021–2025). Washington, DC, 2020. Available at: <https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/Viral-Hepatitis-National-Strategic-Plan-2021-2025.pdf>. Accessed October 2021.
9. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. HIV National Strategic Plan for the United States: A Roadmap to End the Epidemic 2021–2025. Washington, DC, 2021. Available at: <https://hivgov-prod-v3.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/HIV-National-Strategic-Plan-2021-2025.pdf>. Accessed October 2021.
10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. HIV Surveillance Report, 2019. 2021. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/library/reports/surveillance/cdc-hiv-surveillance-report-2018-updated-vol-32.pdf>. Accessed October 2021.
11. San Francisco Department of Public Health Population Health Division. HIV Epidemiology Annual Report 2020. San Francisco, CA, 2021. Available at: [https://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/reports/RptsHIVAIDS/AnnualReport2020-Purple\\_20210817Web.pdf](https://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/reports/RptsHIVAIDS/AnnualReport2020-Purple_20210817Web.pdf). Accessed October 2021.
12. Facente SN, Grebe E, Burk K, et al. Estimated hepatitis C prevalence and key population sizes in San Francisco: A foundation for elimination. *PLoS One* **2018**; 13(4): e0195575.
13. End Hep C SF. End Hep C SF Strategic Plan 2020-2022. Available at: [https://secureservercdn.net/198.71.233.185/4z4.c77.myftpupload.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/EndHepC\\_2020StrategicPlan\\_FINAL.pdf](https://secureservercdn.net/198.71.233.185/4z4.c77.myftpupload.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/EndHepC_2020StrategicPlan_FINAL.pdf). Accessed October 2021.

14. Buchbinder SP, Havlir DV. Getting to Zero San Francisco: A Collective Impact Approach. *Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes (1999)* **2019**; 82 Suppl 3(Suppl 3): S176-S82.
15. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National HIV Behavioral Surveillance (NHBS). Atlanta, GA, 2021. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/statistics/systems/nhbs/reports.html>. Accessed October 2021.
16. Bull SS, Piper P, Rietmeijer C. Men who have sex with men and also inject drugs- profiles of risk related to the synergy of sex and drug injection behaviors. *J Homosex* **2002**; 42(3): 31-51.
17. Bourne A, Reid D, Hickson F, Torres-Rueda S, Weatherburn P. Illicit drug use in sexual settings ('chemsex') and HIV/STI transmission risk behaviour among gay men in South London: findings from a qualitative study. *Sex Transm Infect* **2015**; 91(8): 564-8.
18. Harawa NT, Williams JK, Ramamurthi HC, Manago C, Avina S, Jones M. Sexual behavior, sexual identity, and substance abuse among low-income bisexual and non-gay-identifying African American men who have sex with men. *Arch Sex Behav* **2008**; 37(5): 748-62.
19. Darke S. Self-report among injecting drug users: a review. *Drug Alcohol Depen* **1998**; 51(3): 253-63.
20. Fendrich M, Mackesy-Amiti ME, Johnson TP. Validity of self-reported substance use in men who have sex with men: comparisons with a general population sample. *Ann Epidemiol* **2008**; 18(10): 752-9.

**Table 1:** Socio-demographic, injection drug use and sexual behaviours, and access to services among men who have sex with men and inject drugs (MSM-IDU) or who do not inject drugs (MSM non-IDU) and men who inject drugs and have sex with other men (PWID-MSM) or who do not have sex with other men (PWID non-MSM)

| Characteristic                            | MSM-IDU<br>(n= 31) | PWID-MSM<br>(N= 59) | p-<br>value† | MSM non-IDU<br>(n= 473) | p-<br>value†† | PWID non-MSM<br>(n= 252) | p-<br>value††† |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Socio-demographic factors</b>          |                    |                     |              |                         |               |                          |                |
| Age                                       |                    |                     | 0.05         |                         | 0.17          |                          | 0.14           |
| 18-39                                     | 20 (64.5%)         | 25 (42.4%)          |              | 245 (51.8%)             |               | 81 (32.1%)               |                |
| 40+                                       | 11 (35.5%)         | 34 (57.6%)          |              | 228 (48.2%)             |               | 171 (67.9%)              |                |
| Race/ethnicity                            |                    |                     | <0.01        |                         | 0.58          |                          | 0.34           |
| White                                     | 20 (64.5%)         | 23 (39.0%)          |              | 238 (50.3%)             |               | 122 (48.4%)              |                |
| Black/African American                    | 1 (3.2%)           | 12 (20.3%)          |              | 26 (5.5%)               |               | 52 (20.6%)               |                |
| Hispanic or Latino/a/x                    | 6 (19.4%)          | 5 (8.5%)            |              | 98 (20.7%)              |               | 26 (10.3%)               |                |
| Multiple                                  | 3 (9.7%)           | 17 (28.8%)          |              | 56 (11.8%)              |               | 43 (17.1%)               |                |
| Other                                     | 1 (3.3%)           | 2 (3.4%)            |              | 55 (11.6%)              |               | 9 (3.6%)                 |                |
| Sexual identity                           |                    |                     | <0.01        |                         | <0.01         |                          | <0.01          |
| Heterosexual                              | 4 (12.9%)          | 9 (15.3%)           |              | 5 (1.1%)                |               | 236 (93.7%)              |                |
| Gay                                       | 22 (71.0%)         | 23 (39.0%)          |              | 429 (90.7%)             |               | 2 (0.8%)                 |                |
| Bisexual                                  | 5 (16.1%)          | 27 (45.8%)          |              | 39 (8.3%)               |               | 14 (5.6%)                |                |
| Highest level of education completed      |                    |                     | 0.09         |                         | <0.01         |                          | 0.21           |
| High school or less                       | 11 (35.5%)         | 32 (54.2%)          |              | 53 (11.2%)              |               | 159 (63.1%)              |                |
| Some college, Bachelor's degree and above | 20 (64.5%)         | 27 (45.8%)          |              | 420 (88.8%)             |               | 93 (36.9%)               |                |
| Current employment status                 |                    |                     | <0.01        |                         | 0.06          |                          | 0.97           |
| Employed                                  | 17 (54.8%)         | 5 (8.5%)            |              | 341 (72.1%)             |               | 19 (7.5%)                |                |
| Unable to work for health reasons         | 3 (9.7%)           | 21 (35.6%)          |              | 16 (3.4%)               |               | 89 (35.3%)               |                |
| Not employed                              | 11 (35.5%)         | 33 (55.9%)          |              | 116 (24.5%)             |               | 144 (57.1%)              |                |

|                                                                          |            |            |       |             |       |             |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|-------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| Household income                                                         |            |            | <0.01 |             | <0.01 |             | 0.83  |
| US\$ 0 - 24,999                                                          | 12 (38.7%) | 49 (83.1%) |       | 78 (16.5%)  |       | 217 (86.1%) |       |
| US\$ 25,000 - 49,999                                                     | 5 (16.1%)  | 7 (11.9%)  |       | 92 (19.5%)  |       | 24 (9.5%)   |       |
| ≥US\$ 50,000                                                             | 14 (45.2%) | 3 (5.1%)   |       | 303 (64.1%) |       | 11 (4.4%)   |       |
| Currently homeless                                                       | 8 (25.8%)  | 39 (66.1%) | <0.01 | 11 (2.3%)   | <0.01 | 206 (81.7%) | <0.01 |
| Ever held in detention, jail or prison >24h, past 12 months              | 14 (45.2%) | 53 (89.8%) | <0.01 | 73 (15.4%)  | <0.01 | 244 (96.8%) | 0.03  |
| <b>Injection drug use behaviours</b>                                     |            |            |       |             |       |             |       |
| Age at first injection (Median, IQR)                                     | 30 (23-39) | 22 (16-30) | <0.01 | n/a         | n/a   | 20 (16-26)  | 0.30  |
| Drug most often injected, past 12 months                                 |            |            | 0.53  |             |       |             | <0.01 |
| Meth/amphetamine                                                         | 20 (64.5%) | 32 (54.2%) |       | n/a         | n/a   | 46 (18.3%)  |       |
| Heroin                                                                   | 4 (12.9%)  | 13 (22.0%) |       | n/a         | n/a   | 148 (58.7%) |       |
| Other                                                                    | 7 (22.6%)  | 14 (23.7%) |       | n/a         | n/a   | 58 (23.0%)  |       |
| Injected ≥2 different drug types, past 12 months                         | 8 (25.8%)  | 35 (59.3%) | <0.01 | n/a         | n/a   | 203 (80.6%) | <0.01 |
| Daily injection, past 12 months                                          | 9 (29.0%)  | 38 (64.4%) | <0.01 | n/a         | n/a   | 204 (81.0%) | <0.01 |
| Used injection equipment previously used by someone else, past 12 months | 8 (25.8%)  | 24 (40.7%) | 0.16  | n/a         | n/a   | 102 (40.5%) | 0.98  |
| Overdose, past 12 months *                                               | 1 (9.1%)   | 11 (30.6%) | 0.15  | 0           | 0.30  | 64 (28.1%)  | 0.76  |
| <b>Sexual behaviours</b>                                                 |            |            |       |             |       |             |       |
| Number of male sexual partners, past 12 months (Median, IQR)             | 10 (6-20)  | 3 (1-10)   | <0.01 | 7 (2-20)    | 0.38  | n/a         | n/a   |
| Condomless anal intercourse, past 12 months                              | 29 (93.6%) | 37 (62.7%) | <0.01 | 381 (80.6%) | 0.07  | n/a         | n/a   |
| Received money or drugs from a man to have sex, past 12                  | 11 (35.5%) | 30 (50.9%) | 0.16  | 26 (5.5%)   | <0.01 | n/a         | n/a   |

|                                                           |               |               |       |                 |       |                 |       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| months                                                    |               |               |       |                 |       |                 |       |
| Had a female sex partner, past 12 months                  | 7 (22.6%)     | 30 (50.9%)    | <0.01 | 31 (6.6%)       | <0.01 | 183 (72.6%)     | <0.01 |
| <b>Testing and use of services</b>                        |               |               |       |                 |       |                 |       |
| Drug treatment, past 12 months                            | 6 (19.4%)     | 18 (30.5%)    | 0.26  | 22 (4.7%)       | <0.01 | 70 (27.8%)      | 0.68  |
| OAT, past 12 months*                                      | 3 (27.3%)     | 16 (44.4%)    | 0.31  | 0               | 0.02  | 142 (62.3%)     | 0.04  |
| Obtained sterile needles from a SSP, past 12 months       | 11 (35.5%)    | 51 (86.4%)    | <0.01 | n/a             | n/a   | 239 (94.8%)     | 0.04  |
| Obtained sterile syringes from a pharmacy, past 12 months | 17 (54.8%)    | 29 (49.2%)    | 0.61  | n/a             | n/a   | 92 (36.5%)      | 0.07  |
| Tested for HIV, past 12 months**                          | 19/21 (90.5%) | 30/40 (75.0%) | 0.19  | 304/385 (79.0%) | 0.21  | 159/238 (66.8%) | 0.30  |
| Tested for HCV, past 12 months                            | 28 (90.3%)    | 36 (61.0%)    | <0.01 | 258 (54.6%)     | <0.01 | 187 (74.2%)     | 0.04  |
| PreP awareness**                                          | 18/21 (85.7%) | 29/40 (72.5%) | 0.24  | 373/385 (96.9%) | 0.04  | 115/238 (48.3%) | <0.01 |
| PreP use, past 12 months**                                | 9/21 (42.9%)  | 6/40 (15.0%)  | 0.02  | 171/385 (44.4%) | 0.89  | 1/238 (0.4%)    | <0.01 |
| HIV positive                                              | 10 (32.3%)    | 23 (39.0%)    | 0.53  | 87 (18.4%)      | 0.06  | 15 (5.9%)       | <0.01 |
| HCV antibody positive                                     | n/a           | 42 (71.2%)    |       | n/a             |       | 200 (79.4%)     | 0.17  |

Abbreviations: HCV=hepatitis C virus; IQR=interquartile range; SSP= syringe service program; OAT=opioid agonist treatment;

†p-value comparing MSM-IDU to PWID-MSM

†† p-value comparing MSM-IDU to MSM non-IDU

††† p-value comparing PWID-MSM to PWID non-MSM

\*Data available among participants who used opioids in the previous year only

\*\*Data presented among participants who report being HIV-negative

Note: p-values were derived based on Pearson's chi-square test or, alternatively, Fisher's Exact test when expected cell counts were ≤5 for categorical variables, and Mann-Whitney U test for continuous variables