Prevalence and predictors of low uptake of HIV testing among young men in Papua New Guinea: a cross-sectional analysis from a nationally representative sample

McKenzie Ken Maviso[1]*

[1] Division of Public Health, School of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Papua New Guinea, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea

*Corresponding author

Email: mckenzie.maviso@upng.ac.pg

Prevalence and predictors of low uptake of HIV testing among young men in Papua New Guinea: a cross-sectional analysis from a nationally representative sample

Abstract

Background

HIV testing is an important component of HIV prevention and serves as a gateway to other HIV-related services. However, it remains suboptimal, especially among young people in highly prevalent settings like Papua New Guinea (PNG). This study used nationally representative data to assess the prevalence and predictors of low uptake of HIV testing among young men aged 15–24 in PNG.

Methods

The 2016–2018 PNG Demographic and Health Survey (PNGDHS) data were analyzed. A total weighted sample of 1,274 young men aged 15–24 was included in the final analysis. A multivariable logistic regression analysis was used to determine predictors of uptake of HIV testing.

Results

The prevalence of HIV testing among young men was 17.2% (95% CI: 15%, 19%). Being from the Southern region [AOR 1.02 (95% CI: 0.54, 1.94)] and the Highlands region [AOR 1.16 (95% CI: 0.62, 2.16)], having paid for sex [AOR 3.02 (95% CI: 1.41, 6.46)] and not always using a condom during sex [AOR 1.65 (95% CI: 1.06, 2.58)] were associated with increased uptake of HIV testing. Predictors of low uptake of HIV testing were never married [AOR 0.55 (95% CI: 0.35, 0.87)] or divorced/separated [AOR 0.97 (95% CI: 0.29, 3.16)], residing in rural areas [AOR 0.57 (95% CI: 0.34, 1.94)], from the

Momase region [AOR 0.69 (95% CI: 0.21, 1.00)], not owning a mobile phone [AOR 0.53 (95% CI: 0.34, 0.81)], and not having any STIs [AOR 0.35 (95% CI: 0.17, 0.75)].

Conclusion

The uptake of HIV testing among young men in PNG was low. Youth-specific interventions should focus on improving HIV/STI knowledge and stimulating young men to increase access to HIV testing services through mobile and community-based testing and an "opt-out" strategy at the point of care in prioritized areas requiring urgent prevention intervention.

Introduction

Considerable progress has been made in responding to the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) under the Millennium Development Goals framework. However, young people aged 15–24 represent a growing proportion of people who disproportionately endure the burden of HIV [1]. In 2019, around 3.4 million young individuals were living with HIV globally, with approximately 460,000 newly infected, accounting for more than one-third (36%) of all new HIV infections [1]. Many new infections in the Asia-Pacific region occur among adolescents and young people [2]. In 2021, an estimated 63,000 young people were living with HIV, contributing to 26% of new HIV infections in the region [2]. Despite the region's initial success in HIV prevention interventions, 35% of young women and 65% of young men were newly infected with HIV in 2021 [3]. The challenge of HIV testing among this age group persists, as many are unaware of their status, and those who are optimistic have low adherence to antiretroviral therapy (ART) [4–6], which is off target for achieving ambitious targets by 2030 [7].

Young people comprise a heterogeneous group whose sexual behaviors and susceptibility to HIV infection differ widely by social context, including increased individual autonomy and a lack of social control [8,9]. There is growing evidence that high-risk behaviors such as early sexual debut, substance use (alcohol consumption and drug use), inconsistent condom use, and multiple and concurrent sexual relationships, as well as poor HIV knowledge, low-risk perception, and sensation-seeking behaviors, increase HIV risks and transmissions among young people [10–14]. In addition, biological factors such as low rates of male circumcision [15,16] and manifestations of other sexually transmitted infections (STIs) (chlamydia, gonorrhea, syphilis, and trichomoniasis) [11,14,17] contribute to some of the increased HIV risk and burden among this population. They continue to be an important target group for HIV prevention and STI surveillance due to their unique behavioral and social-related vulnerability.

HIV testing is a key strategic entry point to prevention, treatment, care, and support services. It confers multiple benefits for individuals who test positive and those who test negative and encourages preventive behaviors [18,19]. Despite the significant benefits, young people remain the least likely to get an HIV test and know their HIV status [6,20]. Several factors are known to influence the uptake of testing for HIV among this population, including lack of knowledge and awareness, being unaware of an HIV testing facility, fear of positive results and disclosure issues, fear of discrimination, and low perception of risk [20–23]. These barriers undermine efforts to increase HIV testing and highlight the critical need to develop appropriate HIV prevention strategies.

PNG is one of the countries in the Western Pacific region experiencing a concentrated-generalized HIV epidemic, demonstrating a significant disparity in HIV prevalence between key populations (i.e., sex workers, men who have sex with men (MSM)) and the general population [24,25]. HIV prevalence is 1% in the general adult population [26]. Among young people (aged 15–24), the prevalence of HIV is

estimated at 0.2% for males and 0.5% for females [26], indicating the high vulnerability of this priority group in the country. Although HIV testing services are widely available throughout PNG, the current testing rate among young people is suboptimal, especially among young men. Young men's engagement in HIV services and access to sexual and reproductive health remain challenging [27,28]. In addition, evidence concerning HIV knowledge and risk reduction behaviors (e.g., consistent use of condoms and having only one faithful sexual partner) among young men is limited. It has been reported that young men's knowledge of HIV and sexual relationships is established through a complex interplay of sociocultural norms, expectations, attitudes, and information gleaned from various sources [29].

Despite the established profile of risky sexual behaviors among young people, little is known about the prevalence and correlates of HIV testing in young men in PNG. There is also a lack of evidence concerning the low uptake of HIV testing in young men. This creates a critical knowledge gap that must be filled to inform national-level policy development and targeted prevention interventions. This study used nationally representative data to determine the prevalence and predictors of low uptake of HIV testing among young men aged 15–24 in PNG.

Methods and materials

Data sources

Data for the current study were derived from the 2016–2018 PNG Demographic and Health Survey (PNGDHS), which used a stratified, multistage cluster sampling method to ensure a sample representative of the population. The survey was conducted between October 2016 and December 2018 and collected data on the country's important demographic, socio-economic, and health indicators. The survey used the list of census units (CUs) from the 2011 PNG National Population and Housing Census

[30] as the sampling frame, which contains information on CU location, type of residence (urban or rural), estimated number of residential households, and population by sex. Administratively, the country is divided into four (4) regions (Southern, Highlands, Momase, and Islands) comprising 22 provinces, and each province is subdivided into urban and rural areas. The PNG National Statistical Office (NSO) conducted the survey with technical support and assistance from the Inner City Fund (ICF) through the DHS Program. The governments of PNG and Australia, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), and the Children's Fund of the United Nations (UNICEF) funded the survey [31].

Sampling procedures

The 2016–2018 PNGDHS sample stratification and selection were achieved in two strata: urban and rural areas, except for the National Capital District, which has no rural areas. In each stratum, samples of households were selected in two stages, with CU constituting the primary sampling unit and households as the secondary sampling unit. The first stage involved selecting 800 CUs using a probability proportional to the CU size. In the second stage, 24 households were selected from each cluster using probability sampling, yielding a total sample size of approximately 19,200 households. A total of 7,333 men aged 15–49 participated in the survey. This study included a total weighted sample of 1,274 young men aged 15–24 who ever had sex with variables of interest. Details about the sampling technique, survey team training, household selection, survey questionnaires, and validation procedures are available in the final report [31].

Variable measures

The primary outcome variable of this study was “ever tested for HIV?” and was dichotomized as “0” for “no” or “1” for “yes.” The explanatory variables were selected based on the literature and their relevance [18–20] and were divided into two categories:

i. Sociodemographic factors include age, marital status, educational level, employment status, wealth index, region, and place of residence. In addition, household factors measured included exposure to mass media (reading a newspaper or magazine, listening to the radio, watching television, and internet use) and mobile phone ownership.

ii. HIV-related knowledge and sexual risk behaviors include ever heard of AIDS or STIs, knowing a testing facility, age of sexual debut, number of sexual partners (including spouse), having ever paid for sex, always using a condom, and having had any STI (unspecific) in the last 12 months.

Statistical analysis

Data extraction, recoding, and analysis were performed using IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 26.0 (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.). The sample was weighted using the primary sampling unit variable, stratification variable, and weight variable to restore its representativeness and obtain a better estimate throughout the analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to explore the characteristics of the sample and were presented as weighted frequencies (n) and percentages (%). A chi-square test for independence was performed to assess the strength of the association between the dependent variable and each independent variable. Variables significant in the bivariate analysis were entered into the multivariate logistic regression model. Since the PNGDHS used a two-stage stratified sampling technique, a Complex Samples Analysis technique was employed to determine independent predictors of low uptake of HIV testing. This approach was to adjust for weight, clustering, and stratification of the sampling design to obtain realistic national estimates of the population from the sample, considering the weights for non-response and disproportionate sampling used in the survey [32,33]. Results were reports adjusted odds ratios (AOR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). A p-value of 0.05 or less was used to assess statistical significance.

Ethical Considerations

Permission to use data was obtained from the DHS program (https://dhsprogram.com) and was only used for this study. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Inner City Fund (ICF) International and the IRB committee of PNG examined and approved the 2016–2018 PNGDHS protocols. All the respondents had provided verbal informed consent prior to each interview. There were no ethical considerations on the researcher's part as the data were anonymized entirely, with no identifiable information on the survey participants when analyzed.

Results

Sociodemographic characteristics of young men

Table 1 presents the participants' characteristics. Overall, 1,274 sexually active young men aged 15–24 enrolled in the study. The median age was 21 (IQR: 15–24), while the majority (54.1%) of the participants were aged 15–19. Most participants were never married (73.7%) and lived in rural areas (82%). Nearly half had primary (44.3%) and secondary (45.4%) education, and about two-thirds (62%) were unemployed. Similarly, more than two-thirds of young men read newspapers or magazines (71.1%) and listened to the radio (71.7%), while 57.8% owned a mobile phone.

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of participants (N = 1,274)

Characteristics	**Frequency (n)**	**(%)**
Age group (years)		
15–19	379	(29.8)
20–24	895	(70.2)
Marital status		
Never married	939	(73.7)
Married	310	(24.3)
Divorced/separated	26	(2.0)

Table 1. (*Continued*)		
Educational level		
No formal education	73	(5.7)
Primary	565	(44.3)
Secondary	579	(45.4)
Tertiary	58	(4.5)
Employment status		
Not employed	790	(62.0)
Employed	485	(38.0)
Wealth Index		
Poor	373	(29.3)
Middle	241	(18.9)
Rich	660	(51.8)
Place of residence		
Urban	229	(18.0)
Rural	1,045	(82.0)
Read newspaper/magazine		
No	369	(28.9)
Yes	906	(71.1)
Listen to radio		
No	361	(28.3)
Yes	913	(71.7)
Watch television		
No	674	(52.9)
Yes	601	(47.1)
Use the Internet		
No	847	(55.4)
Yes	428	(33.6)
Owns a mobile phone		
No	537	(42.2)
Yes	737	(57.8)
Note: Weighted frequency (n) and percentage (%)		

The prevalence of ever being tested for HIV

Overall, 17.2% (95% CI: 0.15, 0.19) of the young men had been tested for HIV. There are substantial regional variations concerning the uptake of HIV testing among this population, which ranges from 13% in the Islands region to 45% in the Highlands region (Fig 1).

Fig 1. The rates of HIV testing among young men by region in PNG.

HIV-related knowledge and risky sexual behaviors

Table 2 shows the HIV-related knowledge and risky sexual behaviors of young men who ever had sex. Most of the young men had heard of AIDS (92.8%) and STIs (94.2%), and over two-thirds (70.7%) knew of an HIV testing facility. Over three-quarters (84%) of young men have initiated sex under the age of 20, and nearly one-third (27.7%) reported not always using a condom during sex.

Table 2. HIV knowledge and risky sexual behaviors of young men (N = 1,274)

Characteristics	**Frequency (n)**	**(%)**
Ever heard of AIDS		
No	92	(7.2)
Yes	1,182	(92.8)
Ever heard of STIs		
No	74	(5.8)
Yes	1,200	(94.2)
Know HIV testing facility (*n* = 1,181)		
No	346	(29.3)
Yes	836	(70.7)
Age of sexual debut (years)		
< 20	1,070	(84.0)
20 or more	204	(16.0)

Table 2. (*Continued*)		
Number of sexual partners, including spouse (last 12 months)		
0–1	1,130	(88.7)
2 or more	144	(11.3)
Ever paid for sex (*n* = 1,225)		
No	1,163	(94.9)
Yes	63	(5.1)
Always use a condom during sex (*n* = 1,180)		
No	326	(27.7)
Yes	850	(72.3)
Had any STIs (last 12 months)*		
No, or do not know	1,210	(94.9)
Yes	65	(5.1)
*The type of STI was not specified in the dataset. **Note:** Weighted frequency (n) and percentage (%)		

Predictors of HIV testing

Table 3 shows adjusted predictors of HIV testing among young men. In the bivariate analysis, age, marital status, educational level, employment status, wealth index, place of residence, reading a newspaper/magazine, listening to the radio, watching television, using the internet, mobile phone ownership, having ever paid for sex, always using a condom during sex, and having any STIs were significant predictors of HIV testing. In the multivariable analysis, being from the Southern [AOR 1.04 (95% CI: 0.55, 1.98)] and the Highlands [AOR 1.15 (95% CI: 0.61, 2.16)] regions, having paid for sex [AOR 2.78 (95% CI: 1.32, 5.86)], and not always using a condom during sex [AOR 1.63 (95% CI: 1.04, 2.54)] were associated with increased uptake of HIV testing. Predictors of low uptake of HIV testing were never married [AOR 0.53 (95% CI: 0.33, 0.84)], or divorced/separated [AOR 0.93 (95% CI: 0.28, 3.09)], residing in rural areas [AOR 0.58 (95% CI: 0.35, 0.96)], from the Momase region [AOR 0.46 (95% CI: 0.21, 1.01)], not owning a mobile phone [AOR 0.58 (95% CI: 0.37, 0.89)], and not having any STIs [AOR 0.45 (95% CI: 0.23, 0.89)].

Table 3. Multivariable analysis of predictors of HIV testing among young men (N = 1,274)

	Ever tested for HIV				
Characteristics	**No n = 1,053 (%)**	**Yes n = 222 (%)**	**COR (95% CI)**	**AOR (95% CI)**	**p-value**
Age group (years)					0.325
15–19	333 (31.6)	47 (21.2)	0.58 (0.36, 0.92)	0.77 (0.46, 1.29)	
20–24	720 (68.4)	175 (78.8)	1.00	1.00	
Marital status					**0.023**
Married	796 (75.6)	143 (64.4)	1.00	1.00	
Never married	238 (22.6)	72 (32.4)	0.59 (0.39, 0.89)	0.53 (0.33, 0.84)	
Divorced/separated	19 (1.8)	7 (3.2)	1.25 (0.47, 3.32)	0.93 (0.28, 3.09)	
Educational level					0.850
No formal education	68 (6.5)	5 (2.3)	0.25 (0.06, 1.09)	1.04 (0.21, 5.32)	
Primary	490 (46.5)	75 (33.8)	0.53 (0.18, 1.58)	1.31 (0.42, 4.07)	
Secondary	450 (42.7)	129 (58.1)	0.99 (0.32, 3.09)	1.48 (0.48, 4.57)	
Tertiary	45 94.3)	13 (5.9)	1.00	1.00	
Employment status					0.304
Not employed	671 (63.7)	119 (53.6)	0.66 (0.45, 0.97)	0.79 (0.51, 1.23)	
Employed	382 (36.3)	103 (46.4)	1.00	1.00	
Wealth Index					0.104
Poor	333 (31.6)	40 (18.1)	0.47 (0.27, 0.79)	0.57 (0.28, 1.17)	
Middle	196 (18.6)	45 (20.4)	0.89 (0.51, 1.57)	1.13 (0.54, 2.36)	
Rich	524 (49.8)	136 (61.5)	1.00	1.00	
Place of residence					**0.035**
Urban	169 (16.1)	60 (27.0)	1.00	1.00	
Rural	883 (83.9)	162 (73.0)	0.52 (0.35, 0.77)	0.58 (0.35, 0.96)	

Table 3. (*Continued*)					
Region					**0.047**
Southern	248 (23.6)	53 (23.8)	0.87 (0.52, 1.46)	1.04 (0.55, 1.98)	
Highlands	355 (33.7)	100 (44.8)	1.15 (0.71, 1.86)	1.15 (0.61, 2.16)	
Momase	332 (31.5)	41 (18.4)	0.49 (0.25, 1.02)	0.46 (0.21, 1.01)	
Islands	118 (11.2)	29 (13.0)	1.00	1.00	
Read newspaper/magazine					0.239
No	328 (31.1)	41 (18.5)	0.50 (0.33, 0.75)	0.75 (0.47, 1.21)	
Yes	725 (68.9)	181 (81.5)	1.00	1.00	
Listen to the radio					0.388
No	315 (29.9)	46 (20.8)	0.62 (0.40, 0.95)	0.80 (0.48, 1.33)	
Yes	738 (70.1)	175 (97.2)	1.00	1.00	
Watch television					0.070
No	570 (54.1)	104 (46.8)	0.75 (0.48, 1.17)	1.71 (0.96, 3.07)	
Yes	483 (45.9)	118 (53.2)	1.00	1.00	
Use the Internet					
No	730	117	0.49 (0.31, 0.79)	0.70 (0.44, 1.13)	
Yes	323	105	1.00	1.00	
Own a mobile phone					**0.015**
No	475 (45.1)	62 (28.1)	0.48 (0.31, 0.72)	0.58 (0.37, 0.89)	
Yes	578 (54.9)	159 (71.9)	1.00	1.00	
Age of sexual debut (years)					0.670
< 20	880 (83.6)	190 (85.6)	1.18 (0.69, 2.04)	1.14 (0.63, 2.07)	
20 or more	173 (16.4)	32 (14.4)	1.00	1.00	
Number of sexual partners, including spouse (last 12 months)					0.978
0–1	636 (60.4)	120 (54.3)	1.00	1.00	

Table 3. (*Continued*)					
2 or more	112 (10.6)	32 (14.5)	1.45 (0.87, 2.40)	1.01 (0.56, 1.81)	
Ever paid for sex					**0.007**
No	971 (96.3)	192 (88.1)	1.00	1.00	
Yes	37 (3.7)	26 (11.9)	3.56 (1.85, 6.83)	2.78 (1.32, 5.86)	
Always use a condom during sex					**0.034**
No	251 (26.2)	75 (33.9)	1.45 (0.96, 2.20)	1.63 (1.04, 2.54)	
Yes	707 (73.8)	146 (66.1)	1.00	1.00	
Had any STIs (last 12 months)*					**0.022**
No, or do not know	1,010 (95.9)	200 (90.1)	0.39 (0.19, 0.74)	0.45 (0.23, 0.89)	
Yes	43 (4.1)	22 (9.9)	1.00	1.00	

*The type of STI was not specified in the dataset.
1.00, reference category; COR, Crude Odds Ratio; AOR, Adjusted Odds Ratio; CI, Confidence Interval; p-value, < 0.05.
Note: Variables such as ever heard of AIDS and STIs and knowing an HIV testing facility had no responses for “ever tested for HIV” and were excluded in the final analysis.

Discussion

This study assessed the prevalence and predictors of low uptake of HIV testing among young men aged 15–24 using PNGDHS data. While the benefits of early HIV testing are widely recognized in PNG, studies investigating predictors of HIV testing among this age group are limited. The findings of this study contribute to a better understanding of the factors contributing to low HIV testing to develop appropriate prevention interventions for this population.

Findings from this study revealed that HIV testing among young men in PNG remained low (17.2%). The study also found significant geographical regional variations among young men tested for HIV, ranging from 13% in the Islands to 45% in the Highlands. The rates of HIV testing among young men were lower in the Southern, Momase, and Islands regions. Notably, the distribution of low uptake of HIV testing appears to reflect HIV prevalence by geographical region, indicating areas where prevention interventions are problematic [34,35]. There is evidence that HIV (and STI) prevention has been more focused on the prevention of parent-to-child transmission [36–38] and key populations (e.g., sex workers and MSM) [39,40]. Despite increased awareness about promoting HIV testing and the increased availability of services, the country's HIV prevention interventions for young men continue to fall short. Given the importance of timely HIV diagnosis and linkage to treatment and care, age-specific policy framework development is required in PNG to increase HIV testing uptake among this priority group. In addition, while it remains crucial to prioritize areas that require urgent HIV prevention intervention, regions of low prevalence should not be neglected.

Findings from this study revealed that young men from rural areas were less likely to be tested for HIV, consistent with previous research [41,42]. This could be due to the availability and accessibility of HIV

testing services in urban areas rather than in rural areas, where young men would have fewer opportunities to be tested for HIV. This disparity may also reflect a lack of HIV services, a lack of trained HIV-trained health workers, and inequitable outreach programs to reach young men in rural areas, as previously reported [43,44]. While prioritizing areas that require tailored and youth-specific interventions to improve HIV testing access and uptake, there is a need to expand HIV services to rural areas. Mobile and rural health outreach programs are critical for reaching young men lacking health care access and increasing HIV testing uptake.

There was a negative association between HIV testing uptake and marital status. The odds of HIV testing remained lower among unmarried young men and those who had divorced or separated than those who were married. The result corroborated recent studies in Sub-Saharan Africa [20,41,45]. A possible explanation for the higher odds of low uptake of HIV testing among unmarried young men could be service accessibility and availability issues or dissatisfaction with HIV testing services. Another plausible reason for this could be the low-risk perception of being young and active and lacking physical signs of HIV. Young men who perceive their risk of HIV as low and do not have access to HIV testing services are less likely to have received an HIV test in their lifetime [46,47]. Youth-friendly health services can help close the HIV testing gap among young men by addressing access barriers, providing a more accessible, equitable, and effective social environment, and linking to HIV treatment and care.

Regarding mobile phone ownership, this study revealed that young men who did not own a mobile phone were less likely to be tested for HIV than those who did, particularly in rural areas where the majority (82%) live. A plausible reason could be that young men are economically disadvantaged and experience technology gaps, including connectivity and accessibility issues. A systematic review found

barriers to using mobile phones in health (mHealth), including a non-conducive technology gap, costs, disengaging content, and inaccessibility [48]. However, evidence shows that mobile phone use in healthcare systems has fostered optimal health outcomes for high-risk young people [49,50]. Studies have shown that mHealth improves adherence to treatment and retention in care [49,51] and provides information on HIV services and prevention interventions, including pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) and risk reduction [50,52,53]. In addition, mHealth interventions have been shown to address barriers of provider prejudice, stigmatization, discrimination, fear of refusal, lack of privacy, and confidentiality [53,54]. Using mHealth technology provides a potentially promising implementation strategy for interventions to remedy disparities and barriers to HIV testing and the care continuum among young men. This study emphasizes the importance of preliminary, formative research on population differences in accessibility, effectiveness, willingness, and use of mobile phones in HIV prevention programs.

In this study, young men who had paid for sex and did not always use a condom during sex were more likely to be tested for HIV than their counterparts. These findings are consistent with previous studies elsewhere [55–58], which suggest that young men who engage in risky sexual behaviors such as sex work and inconsistently use condoms accurately perceive their risks of HIV acquisition and transmission and, as a result, undertake HIV testing. The fact that they engage in such risky behaviors may imply that their overall risk perception differs from that of those who do not engage in risky behaviors [59]. HIV prevention intervention for young men who transact sex should not only concentrate on HIV testing and treatment approaches but also on the social contexts in which they engage in transacting sex. In addition, there is a growing gap between the demand for condoms and their availability among young men in PNG. Findings from this study suggest that strengthening HIV testing services for young men is plausibly the most viable programmatic strategy for increasing

condom use. For instance, social marketing of condoms should be used to inform and improve the desire for and use of condoms consistently [60]. While there is evidence that condom social marketing can increase condom use [60,61], more rigorous evaluations of the impact of social marketing on condom use in PNG's context and to adequately increase condom efficacy among high-risk young people are required.

Additionally, this study indicated that young men who reported having no STIs or were unaware if they had any (i.e., chlamydia, gonorrhea, syphilis, or trichomoniasis) were less likely to be tested for HIV. It is plausible that young men were unaware of their low-risk perceptions of STIs and their negative consequences; thus, they did not seek timely STI screening, including HIV testing. Recent evidence suggests that poor knowledge about STIs is associated with delays in seeking timely treatment, increasing the risk of further transmission [62,63]. Furthermore, STIs increase the risk of acquiring and transmitting HIV, including other reproductive complications such as infertility, if not treated promptly [64,65]. Sexual and reproductive health interventions that address low levels of STI-related knowledge and increase STI screening remain critical for effective control and prevention for this priority group.

Contrary to other studies [6,20], no association between the uptake of HIV testing and age, educational level, employment status, wealth index, mass media, age of sexual debut, or number of sexual partners was found in this study. However, one of the concerns is that high-risk behaviors (i.e., having multiple sexual partners) did not increase the uptake of HIV testing among young men, which suggests that they are exposing themselves to higher risks for HIV and are more likely to infect their sexual partners unknowingly. Therefore, there is a need for a targeted and coordinated approach to HIV testing services among this priority group to prevent the transmission of the virus. Further qualitative research should explore the influence of multiple sexual partners on HIV testing uptake.

Study strengths and limitations

The study is based on nationwide population data with a nationally representative sample. Also, appropriate estimation adjustments, such as weighting, were employed. However, the study has limitations, and findings should be interpreted cautiously. Given that the data are from a cross-sectional study, it is impossible to prove the temporal relationship. Since the study's outcome depended on self-reporting, social desirability bias is highly probable, which might have led to under-reporting by the participants.

Conclusion

This study found relatively low rates of HIV testing among young men in PNG. Those who were unmarried, living in rural areas, from the Momase region, did not own a mobile phone, and were unaware of having any STIs predicted low uptake of HIV testing. The study underscored the demand for integrated youth-specific interventions to improve HIV/STI knowledge and stimulate young men to increase access to HIV preventive services. It also calls for policymakers to design strategic guidelines to expand HIV testing uptake for young people through mobile and community-based testing and an "opt-out" strategy at the point of care in prioritized areas requiring urgent prevention intervention.

Supporting information

S1 Table. STROBE Checklist.

S1 Dataset. HIV testing-young men dataset.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank the DHS program and its partners for the approval to analyze the data. Also, the author is greatly indebted to Dr Fatch Welcome Kalembo from Curtin University, who provided constructive feedback and suggestions to strengthen the quality of this manuscript.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: McKenzie K. Maviso

Data curation: McKenzie K. Maviso

Formal analysis: McKenzie K. Maviso

Methodology: McKenzie K. Maviso

Software: McKenzie K. Maviso

Validation: McKenzie K. Maviso

Writing – original draft: McKenzie K. Maviso

Writing – review & editing: McKenzie K. Maviso

References

1. UNAIDS. Young people and HIV. Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS; 2021. Available: https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/young-people-and-hiv_en.pdf

2. UNAIDS. Putting young key populations first — HIV and young people from key populations in the Asia and Pacific region 2022. Geneva, Switzerland; 2022. Available: https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2022/2022-HIV-young-people-key-populations-asia-pacific

3. UNICEF. Adolescent HIV prevention: Turning the tide against AIDS will require more concentrated focus on adolescents and young people. 2020. Available: https://data.unicef.org/topic/hivaids/adolescents-young-people/

4. Kim S-H, Gerver SM, Fidler S, Ward H. Adherence to antiretroviral therapy in adolescents living with HIV: systematic review and meta-analysis. AIDS. 2014;28: 1945–1956. doi:10.1097/QAD.0000000000000316

5. Peltzer K, Matseke G. Determinants of HIV testing among young people aged 18 - 24 years in South Africa. Afr Health Sci. 2013;13: 1012–1020. doi:10.4314/ahs.v13i4.22

6. Ajayi AI, Awopegba OE, Adeagbo OA, Ushie BA. Low coverage of HIV testing among adolescents and young adults in Nigeria: Implication for achieving the UNAIDS first 95. PLOS ONE. 2020;15: e0233368. doi:https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0233368

7. Wong VJ, Murray KR, Phelps BR, Vermund SH, McCarraher DR. Adolescents, young people, and the 90-90-90 goals: a call to improve HIV testing and linkage to treatment. AIDS. 2017;31 Suppl 3: S191–S194. doi:https://doi.org/10.1097/qad.0000000000001539

8. Caltabiano M, Castiglioni M, De-Rose A. Changes in the sexual behaviour of young people: introduction. Genus. 2020;76: 38. doi:10.1186/s41118-020-00107-1

9. Hittner JB, Owens EC, Swickert RJ. Influence of Social Settings on Risky Sexual Behavior. SAGE Open. 2016;6: 2158244016629187. doi:10.1177/2158244016629187

10. Cho H-S, Yang Y. Relationship Between Alcohol Consumption and Risky Sexual Behaviors Among Adolescents and Young Adults: A Meta-Analysis. International Journal of Public Health. 2023;68. doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/ijph.2023.1605669

11. Harris B, McCredie MN, Truong T, Regan T, Thompson CG, Leach W, et al. Relations Between Adolescent Sensation Seeking and Risky Sexual Behaviors Across Sex, Race, and Age: A Meta-Analysis. Archives of Sexual Behavior. 2023;52: 191–204. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-022-02384-7

12. Manu A, Ogum-Alangea D, Azilaku JC, Anaba EA, Torpey K. Risky sexual behaviours and HIV testing among young people in Ghana: evidence from the 2017/2018 Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey. Reproductive Health. 2022;19: 125. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-022-01439-1

13. Bolarinwa OA, Ajayi KV, Sah RK. Association between knowledge of Human Immunodeficiency Virus transmission and consistent condom use among sexually active men in Nigeria: An analysis of 2018 Nigeria Demographic Health Survey. Jilo GK, editor. PLOS Glob Public Health. 2022;2: e0000223. doi:https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0000223

14. Folayan MO, Sam-Agudu NA, Harrison A. Exploring the why: risk factors for HIV and barriers to sexual and reproductive health service access among adolescents in Nigeria. BMC Health Services Research. 2022;22: 1198. doi:10.1186/s12913-022-08551-9

15. Wilcken A, Miiro-Nakayima F, Hizaamu RN, Keil T, Balaba-Byansi D. Male circumcision for HIV prevention - a cross-sectional study on awareness among young people and adults in rural Uganda. BMC Public Health. 2010;10: 209. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-10-209

16. Bendera A, Nakamura K, Seino K, Al-Sobaihi S. Factors Associated with Low Uptake of Medical Male Circumcision Among Adolescent Boys in Tanzania: A Multinomial Logistic Regression

Modeling. HIV/AIDS - Research and Palliative Care. 2022;14: 565–575. doi:10.2147/HIV.S387380

17. Alexis Sentís, Mario Martin-Sanchez, Maider Arando, Martí Vall, María Jesus Barbera, Inma Ocaña, et al. Sexually transmitted infections in young people and factors associated with HIV coinfection: an observational study in a large city. BMJ Open. 2019;9: e027245. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027245

18. Delavande A, Kohler H-P. The Impact of HIV Testing on Subjective Expectations and Risky Behavior in Malawi. Demography. 2012;49: 1011–1036. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-012-0119-7

19. Scott-Sheldon LA, Carey MP, Carey KB, Cain D, Simbayi LC, Mehlomakhulu V, et al. HIV testing is associated with increased knowledge and reductions in sexual risk behaviours among men in Cape Town, South Africa. African Journal of AIDS Research. 2013;12: 195–201. doi:https://doi.org/10.2989/16085906.2013.863219

20. Sonko I, Chung M-H, Hou W-H, Chen W-T, Chang P-C. Predictors of HIV testing among youth aged 15–24 years in The Gambia. PLOS ONE. 2022;17: e0263720. doi:https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0263720

21. Asaolu IO, Gunn JK, Center KE, Koss MP, Iwelunmor JI, Ehiri JE. Predictors of HIV Testing among Youth in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Cross-Sectional Study. PLOS ONE. 2016;11: e0164052. doi:https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0164052

22. Diress G, Ahmed M, Adane S, Linger M, Alemnew B. Barriers and Facilitators for HIV Testing Practice Among Ethiopian Women Aged 15-24 years: Analysis of the 2016 Ethiopian Demographic and Health Survey. HIV/AIDS - Research and Palliative Care. 2020;12: 963–970. doi:https://doi.org/10.2147/HIV.S280590

23. Akatukwasa C, Getahun M, El Ayadi AM, Namanya J, Maeri I, Itiakorit H, et al. Dimensions of HIV-related stigma in rural communities in Kenya and Uganda at the start of a large HIV 'test and treat' trial. PLOS ONE. 2021;16: e0249462. doi:https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249462

24. Hakim AJ, Coy K, Badman SG, Willie B, Narokobi R, Gabuzzi J, et al. One size does not fit all: HIV prevalence and correlates of risk for men who have sex with men, transgender women in multiple cities in Papua New Guinea. BMC Public Health. 2019;19: 623. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6942-7

25. Kelly-Hanku A, Willie B, Weikum D, Boli Neo R, Kupul M, Coy K. Kauntim mi tu: Multi-site summary report from the key population integrated bio-behavioural survey, Papua New Guinea. Goroka: Papua New Guinea Institute of Medical Research and Kirby Institute, UNSW Sydney. 2018. Available: https://www.kirby.unsw.edu.au/research/reports/kauntim-mi-tu-port-moresby-2017

26. UNAIDS. Country facts - Papua New Guinea 2022. UNAIDS; 2022. Available: https://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/papuanewguinea

27. Baigry MI, Ray R, Lindsay D, Kelly-Hanku A, Redman-MacLaren M. Barriers and enablers to young people accessing sexual and reproductive health services in Pacific Island Countries and Territories: A scoping review. PLOS ONE. 2023;18: e0280667. doi:https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0280667

28. Gray N, Azzopardi P, Kennedy E, Willersdorf E, Creati M. Improving Adolescent Reproductive Health in Asia and the Pacific: Do We Have the Data? A Review of DHS and MICS Surveys in Nine Countries. Asia Pac J Public Health. 2013;25: 134–144. doi:10.1177/1010539511417423

29. Kelly A, Worth H, Akuani F, Kepa B, Kupul M, Walizopa L, et al. Gendered talk about sex, sexual relationships and HIV among young people in Papua New Guinea. Culture, Health & Sexuality. 2010;12: 221–232. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/13691050903181107

30. National Statistical Office (NSO). National Population and Housing Census 2011. Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea: National Statistical Office; 2015. Available: https://png-data.sprep.org/resource/papua-new-guinea-2011-national-report

31. National Statistical Office (NSO) [Papua New Guinea], ICF. Papua New Guinea Demographic and Health Survey 2016-18. Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, and Rockville, Maryland, USA: NSO and ICF; 2019. Available: https://www.dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR364/FR364.pdf

32. Saylor J, Friedmann E, Lee HJ. Navigating Complex Sample Analysis Using National Survey Data. Nursing Research. 2012;61. doi:10.1097/NNR.0b013e3182533403

33. Bell BA, Onwuegbuzie AJ, Ferron JM, Jiao QG, Hibbard ST, Kromrey JD. Use of Design Effects and Sample Weights in Complex Health Survey Data: A Review of Published Articles Using Data From 3 Commonly Used Adolescent Health Surveys. Am J Public Health. 2012;102: 1399–1405. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300398

34. Maviso M. Sociodemographic characteristics of people tested HIV-positive by notifying testing facilities in Papua New Guinea, 2010-2014: A descriptive analysis. Papua New Guinea Medical Journal. 2020;63: 132–143.

35. Coghlan B, Millan J, Malau C, Kaldor J, Toole M. The HIV Epidemic in Papua New Guinea. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes. 2011;58. doi:https://doi.org/10.1097/qai.0b013e3182293417

36. Carmone A, Bomai K, Bongi W, Frank TD, Dalepa H, Loifa B, et al. Partner testing, linkage to care, and HIV-free survival in a program to prevent parent-to-child transmission of HIV in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea. Global Health Action. 2014;7: 24995. doi:https://doi.org/10.3402/gha.v7.24995

37. Badman SG, Vallely LM, Toliman P, Kariwiga G, Lote B, Pomat W, et al. A novel point-of-care testing strategy for sexually transmitted infections among pregnant women in high-burden settings: results of a feasibility study in Papua New Guinea. BMC Infectious Diseases. 2016;16: 250. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-016-1573-4

38. Saweri OP, Batura N, Pulford J, Khan MM, Hou X, Pomat WS, et al. Investigating health service availability and readiness for antenatal testing and treatment for HIV and syphilis in Papua New

Guinea. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2022;22: 780. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-022-05097-w

39. Hakim AJ, Badman SG, Weikum D, Amos A, Willie B, Narokobi R, et al. Considerable distance to reach 90-90-90 targets among female sex workers, men who have sex with men and transgender women in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea: findings from a cross-sectional respondent-driven sampling survey. Sex Transm Infect. 2020;96: 143. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/sextrans-2019-053961

40. Mitchell E, Hakim A, Nosi S, Kupul M, Boli-Neo R, Aeno H, et al. A socio-ecological analysis of factors influencing HIV treatment initiation and adherence among key populations in Papua New Guinea. BMC Public Health. 2021;21: 2003. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-12077-w

41. Adugna DG, Worku MG. HIV testing and associated factors among men (15-64 years) in Eastern Africa: a multilevel analysis using the recent demographic and health survey. BMC Public Health. 2022;22: 2170. doi:10.1186/s12889-022-14588-6

42. Mabaso M, Maseko G, Sewpaul R, Naidoo I, Jooste S, Takatshana S, et al. Trends and correlates of HIV prevalence among adolescents in South Africa: evidence from the 2008, 2012 and 2017 South African National HIV Prevalence, Incidence and Behaviour surveys. AIDS Research and Therapy. 2021;18: 97. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12981-021-00422-3

43. Sanga ES, Mukumbang FC, Mushi AK, Lerebo W, Zarowsky C. Understanding factors influencing linkage to HIV care in a rural setting, Mbeya, Tanzania: qualitative findings of a mixed methods study. BMC Public Health. 2019;19: 383. doi:10.1186/s12889-019-6691-7

44. Pellowski JA. Barriers to care for rural people living with HIV: a review of domestic research and health care models. J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care. 2013;24: 422–437. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jana.2012.08.007

45. Nshimirimana C, Vuylsteke B, Smekens T, Benova L. HIV testing uptake and determinants among adolescents and young people in Burundi: a cross-sectional analysis of the Demographic and Health Survey 2016–2017. BMJ Open. 2022;12: e064052. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2022-064052

46. Jung MS, Dlamini NS, Cui X, Cha K. Prevalence of HIV testing and associated factors among young adolescents in Eswatini: a secondary data analysis. BMC Pediatrics. 2022;22: 659. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12887-022-03698-0

47. Muravha T, Hoffmann CJ, Botha C, Maruma W, Charalambous S, Chetty-Makkan CM. Exploring perceptions of low risk behaviour and drivers to test for HIV among South African youth. PLOS ONE. 2021;16: e0245542. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0245542

48. Kruse C, Betancourt J, Ortiz S, Valdes Luna SM, Bamrah IK, Segovia N. Barriers to the Use of Mobile Health in Improving Health Outcomes in Developing Countries: Systematic Review. J Med Internet Res. 2019;21: e13263. doi:https://doi.org/10.2196/13263

49. Jennings Mayo-Wilson L, Kang B-A, Mathai M, Mak'anyengo MO, Ssewamala FM. Mobile phone access, willingness, and usage for HIV-related services among young adults living in

informal urban settlements in Kenya: A cross-sectional analysis. International Journal of Medical Informatics. 2022;161: 104728. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2022.104728

50. Cordova D, Munoz-Velazquez J, Mendoza Lua F, Fessler K, Warner S, Delva J, et al. Pilot Study of a Multilevel Mobile Health App for Substance Use, Sexual Risk Behaviors, and Testing for Sexually Transmitted Infections and HIV Among Youth: Randomized Controlled Trial. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth. 2020;8: e16251. doi:https://doi.org/10.2196/16251

51. Saberi P, Lisha NE, Erguera XA, Hudes ES, Johnson MO, Ruel T, et al. A Mobile Health App (WYZ) for Engagement in Care and Antiretroviral Therapy Adherence Among Youth and Young Adults Living With HIV: Single-Arm Pilot Intervention Study. JMIR Form Res. 2021;5: e26861. doi:https://doi.org/10.2196/26861

52. Garg PR, Uppal L, Mehra S, Mehra D. Mobile Health App for Self-Learning on HIV Prevention Knowledge and Services Among a Young Indonesian Key Population: Cohort Study. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth. 2020;8: e17646–e17646. doi:https://doi.org/10.2196/17646

53. Mulawa MI, Rosengren AL, Amico KR, Hightow-Weidman LB, Muessig KE. mHealth to reduce HIV-related stigma among youth in the United States: a scoping review. Mhealth. 2021;7: 35. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/mhealth-20-68

54. Feroz AS, Ali NA, Khoja A, Asad A, Saleem S. Using mobile phones to improve young people sexual and reproductive health in low and middle-income countries: a systematic review to identify barriers, facilitators, and range of mHealth solutions. Reprod Health. 2021;18: 9–9. doi:10.1186/s12978-020-01059-7

55. Hlongwa M, Mashamba-Thompson T, Makhunga S, Muraraneza C, Hlongwana K. Men's perspectives on HIV self-testing in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-synthesis. BMC Public Health. 2020;20: 66. doi:10.1186/s12889-020-8184-0

56. Hodgins C, Stannah J, Kuchukhidze S, Zembe L, Eaton JW, Boily M-C, et al. Population sizes, HIV prevalence, and HIV prevention among men who paid for sex in sub-Saharan Africa (2000–2020): A meta-analysis of 87 population-based surveys. PLOS Medicine. 2022;19: e1003861. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003861

57. Ajayi AI, Ismail KO, Akpan W. Factors associated with consistent condom use: a cross-sectional survey of two Nigerian universities. BMC Public Health. 2019;19: 1207. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7543-1

58. Gebresilassie F, Ayele B, Hadgu T, Gebretnsae H, Negash D, Demoz Ghebremdhin K, et al. Predictors of Condom Use Among Youth of the Rural Tigray, Northern Ethiopia: Community-Based Cross-Sectional Study. HIV/AIDS - Research and Palliative Care. 2023;15: 377–385. doi:https://doi.org/10.2147/HIV.S412337

59. Dizechi S, Brody C, Tuot S, Chhea C, Saphonn V, Yung K, et al. Youth paying for sex: what are the associated factors? Findings from a cross-sectional study in Cambodia. BMC Public Health. 2018;18: 113. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4999-8

60. Olson DJ, Purdy C, Harrington R, Marun D, Garcia JE. How Social Marketing Contributed to Expanding Size of Overall Condom Markets in Ethiopia, Brazil, and Indonesia. Social Marketing Quarterly. 2022;28: 91–108. doi:10.1177/15245004221077965

61. Sweat MD, Yeh T, Kennedy C, O'Reilly K, Armstrong K, Fonner V. Condom Social Marketing Effects in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review Update, 1990 to 2019. Am J Health Promot. 2020;34: 91–95. doi:10.1177/0890117119864921

62. Kassie BA, Yenus H, Berhe R, Kassahun EA. Prevalence of sexually transmitted infections and associated factors among the University of Gondar students, Northwest Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. Reproductive Health. 2019;16: 163. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-019-0815-5

63. Al-Gburi G, Al-Shakarchi A, Al-Dabagh JD, Lami F. Assessing knowledge, attitudes, and practices toward sexually transmitted infections among Baghdad undergraduate students for research-guided sexual health education. Frontiers in Public Health. 2023;11. doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1017300

64. Ayerdi Aguirrebengoa O, Vera Garcia M, Rueda Sanchez M, D´Elia G, Chavero Méndez B, Alvargonzalez Arrancudiaga M, et al. Risk factors associated with sexually transmitted infections and HIV among adolescents in a reference clinic in Madrid. PLOS ONE. 2020;15: e0228998. doi:https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0228998

65. Henkel R. Long-term consequences of sexually transmitted infections on men's sexual function: A systematic review. Arab Journal of Urology. 2021;19: 411–418. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/2090598X.2021.1942414