Title : The disadvantaged immigrants made the most use of a prenatal consultation offered to future fathers in Seine Saint-Denis, France

Authors : Pauline Penot[1,2], Gaëlle Jacob[1,3], Audrey Guerizec[1], Clotilde Trevisson[1], Valérie-Anne Letembet[1], Raya Harich[4], Thomas Phuong[5], Bruno Renevier[3], Pierre-Etienne Manuellan[4], Annabel Desgrées du Loû[2] & the Partage Study Group[*]

[1] CEGIDD (Sexual Health and Infectious Disease Clinic), Centre Hospitalier André Grégoire, 56 boulevard de la Boissière, 93100 Montreuil, France

[2] Centre Population et Développement (Ceped), Institut de recherche pour le développement (IRD) et Université de Paris, Inserm ERL 1244, 45 rue des Saints-Pères, 75006 Paris, France

[3] Maternity unit, Centre Hospitalier André Grégoire, 56 boulevard de la Boissière, 93100 Montreuil, France

[4] Medical biology laboratory, Centre hospitalier intercommunal André Grégoire, GHT Grand Paris Nord-Est, 56 boulevard de la Boissière, Montreuil, France

[5] IT support, Centre hospitalier intercommunal André Grégoire, GHT Grand Paris Nord-Est, 56 boulevard de la Boissière, Montreuil, France

[6] Health Department, Montreuil Municipality, France

[*] Membership for the PARTAGE Study Group is provided in the Aknowledgments

ABSTRACT

Background : Prenatal care provides pregnant women with repeated opportunities for prevention, screening and diagnosis that have no current extension to future fathers. Prenatal care explains why HIV-infected women are diagnosed earlier than heterosexual men wordwide and contributes to women's general better access to health. The goal of PARTAGE study was to access the level and determinants of adherence to a prenatal prevention consultation dedicated to men.

Methods : Between January 2021 and April 2022, we conducted an interventional study assessing the acceptance of a prenatal prevention consultation newly offered to every woman over 18 attending prenatal care in Montreuil's maternity ward, and extending it to the future father, when there was one.

Results : 3,038 women provided contact information that was used to reach the father ; effective contact was established with 2,516 men, of whom 1,333 (53%) came for prenatal prevention consultation. Immigrant men were more likely to come than French-born men (56% versus 49%, $p < 0.001$), and the greater the precariousness of their situation, the more likely they were to accept the offer. In a multivariate analysis, men born in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia were twice as likely to attend the consultation as those born in Europe or North America.

Conclusion : Acceptance of this new offer was high. Moreover, this consultation was perceived by economically vulnerable immigrant men as an opportunity to integrate a healthcare system they would otherwise remain deprived of.

Keywords : Prevention, migrant health, prenatal health, healthcare access, gender inequalities

1. Introduction

Gynecological care : an opportunity for prevention, screening and health improvement

Worldwide, men have less contact with the healthcare system (1) and seek primary care less offen than women (2) (3) (4). One reason is that gynecological care (contraception, pregnancy, cervical cancer prevention) makes women used to meeting healthcare professionals regularly, even in absence of any disease. (5).

Most countries recommend regular medical check-ups and biological monitoring during pregnancy. When the father's health is taken into the picture, this is to avoid genetical or infectious transmission rather than keeping the father himself in good health (6). Even then, infectious diseases are poorly screened in the second parent : HIV diagnosis is delayed in heterosexual men compared to women, because male partner uptake of HIV testing during antenatal care remains scarce (7), despite numerous initiatives to promote it (8) (9) (10) (11) (12).

Prenatal visits are also used to encourage behavioral changes in pregnant women, such as smoking and alcoholic withdrawal, promoting physical exercise and combating overweight (13) (14). To date, men do not have such opportunities. Yet, involving their partner supports behavioral changes in pregnant women (15). In addition, important health needs were identified in a cohort of future fathers (16) and fatherhood is a high-risk period for depression in men (17) (18).

Expecting a child could therefore be an opportunity to offer men a consultation designed to protect the mother and the foetus from transmissible diseases, but also to improve or preserve their own health (19).

The French context and the Seine Saint Denis specific situation

In France, seven medical visits are scheduled during a pregnancy. The prenatal HIV screening strategy is highly effective in women, with at least 97% of them tested at every pregnancy (20). Systematic HIV screening is also recommended for fathers (21), yet not performed: between 2017 and 2020, among 567 fathers surveyed, only 3% knew a man who had been tested for HIV in connection with his partner's pregnancy (22).

The French health insurance scheme mentions the possibility of a medical examination for the father. However, there are no guidelines for reimbursing this consultation or the biological tests that would be prescribed during it: paternal prenatal consultation is therefore not currently practiced.

Seine Saint-Denis (population; 1.6 million inhabitants), located in the northeastern suburbs of Paris (Ile de France region), is the department with the highest rates of immigration and poverty in mainland France (23). Seine Saint Denis' tertiary care maternity unit is located in Montreuil: it provides prenatal care for some 3,500 women every year. In 2020-2021, 4.6% of women who gave birth at Montreuil hospital were immigrants with < 12 months' residence in France (24). 52% of women who delivered their child in Montreuil hospital over

the same period were later identified as socially vulnerable, 41% of them being born in sub-Saharan Africa and 11% in Asia (25).

In this context where poverty and immigration prevail, future fathers hardly get targetted by interventions aimed at reducing social inequalities in health. We consequently built an interventional research to evaluate a prenatal prevention consultation dedicated to them.

2. Methods

PARTAGE (« Prévention, Accès aux droits, Rattrapage vaccinal, Traitement des Affections pendant la Grossesse et pour l'Enfant ») was a monocentric interventional research without control arm assesssing for 15 months (January 2021-April 2022) the acceptability of a new prenatal prevention consultation offered through the pregnant women to all future fathers in Montreuil's hospital.

Study population

Eligible women were over 18 pregnant women attending a first prenatal consultation at Montreuil hospital during the study period, reporting a male partner positively involved in the pregnancy.

Eligible men were those designated by the participating woman as the father, provided they lived in Ile-de-France region. To make it simple, « men », « partners » or « fathers » all refer to them.

Intervention

The interview was integrated into the women's maternity trajectory. Trained interviewers offered eligible women to respond to a face-to-face questionnaire that included their sociodemographic and marital characteristics (maternal questionnaire, MQ, annex 1). Women were asked to provide the future father's contact details. When the father was present, the project was presented directly to the couple and the consultation appointment could be made immediately.

An information letter was given to all eligible pregnant women. An e-mail was sent to men for whom an e-mail address was provided, with an online appointment plateform link and dedicated phone-line and e-mail address to schedule consultation. Fathers who did not reply were called by a research midwife and offered an appointment either during the day or in the evening, on weekdays or saturday, at the hospital or in the city center, within easy reach of public transportation.

Fathers received a text reminder before appointment. If they failed to attend, they were systematically called again and given the option of either refusing the consultation (their reason for refusal was then collected and they were not called again) or rescheduling and being called again in case of another missed appointment.

Fathers were seen by a doctor or midwife. Blood pressure was measured, clinical examination was carried out if needed, biological tests were adapted to individual's exposure and medical history. Vaccines were updated; fathers lacking health insurance

coverage met a social worker to obtain it. Test results were delivered face to face, by telephone or by e-mail, according to men's choice. Depending on their needs, men were referred to a health mediator, a psychologist, a general practioner or any hospital specialist.

The complete survey protocol is available on protocole_partage_anglais.pdf (ceped.org)

Ethics

The French Data Protection Authority (CNIL, registration number 921135) and the French Personnal Data Protection Comittee (registation number 21.01.19.44753) both approved the study protocol.

Statistical analysis

Women's own sociodemographic characteristics, their partners' ones as well as data on the couple (lenght of relationship, previous children, type of union, communication about sexually transmitted infections and previous screening) were collected in maternal questionnaire. In addition to the general sociodemographic data; variables exclusively or particularly related to immigrant status were collected (main reason for women's migration, lenght of stay, permit of residence, housing conditions, health insurance coverage).

Data were compared between fathers who attended the prenatal prevention consultation and those who did not, using Chi [2] or Fisher exact tests for categorical variables and Student's or Wilcoxon rank sum tests for quantitative variables, as appropriate. All tests were two-sided with p-values < 0.05 defined as statistically significant. Multivariate logistic regression models were built to identify the factors associated with men's take-up of this offer, based on their own characteristics on one hand, and on their pregnant partner's as well as the couple's characteristics on the other hand, in the general study population, and then in the sub-groups of immigrant men and women. Backward elimination procedures were used to determine the final models. Analyses were performed in Stata SE 17 (Stata Corporation, College Station, TX, USA).

3. Results

Acceptance rate and characteristics of the studied population

Among 4205 women with first hospital prenatal visit during the study period, 3808 were eligible, 3038 provided effective contact details wich enabled the research team to contact their partner. Contact was actually made (face to face, by phone or via message exchange) with 2516 men (83%), of whom 1333 (53%) eventually attended father's prenatal prevention consultation (FPPC) (Figure 1).

Figure 1 : Study flow chart, Montreuil (France) 2021-2022



Immigrants accounted for 52 % of the pregnant women who gave effective contact information for their partner (« women ») and for 59 % of actually contacted fathers (« men»). Absence of residency permitsamounted to about 11 % in both women and men;

15 % of women had no personal housing. Immigrated participants mostly came from Subasaharan (20 % of women, 25 % of men) and North (18 % of women, 19 % of men) Africa ; 7 % of men and 5 % of women had no health insurance coverage. Quite a few couples (36%) had ever talked about sexually transmitted infections and HIV screening ; 13% of women were unaware of having been tested for HIV during pregnancy, and 56% had no idea of their partner's HIV status. Women predicted a high level of acceptance in men (78%) (table 1).

Table 1: Characteristics of the study population, Montreuil (France) 2021-2022

	Women who gave effective contact information		Men who were actually contacted	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**
Sociodemographic characteristics				
Population size	3038	100%	2516	100%
Of which foreign-born	1590	52.3%	1490	59.2%
Age (years)	31	[28-35]	35	[30-40]
[18-24]	345	11.3%	116	4.6%
[25-29]	897	29.5%	391	15.5%
[30-34]	1029	33.9%	744	29.6%
[35-39]	604	19.9%	609	24.2%
40 and over	163	5.4%	656	26.1%
Region of birth				
Mainland France	1401	46.1%	986	39.2%
French overseas departments and territories	47	1.5%	40	1.6%
European Union and United Kingdom (EU-UK)	126	4.1%	95	3.8%
Subsaharan Africa	603	19.9%	633	25.1%
Asia	143	4.7%	152	6.0%
North Africa and Middle East	555	18.3%	480	19.1%
Latin America and the Caribbean	70	2.3%	60	2.4%
Non EU-UK Europe, North America, Australia	93	3.1%	70	2.8%
Length of residence in France (for foreign-born)[1]				
< 7 years	818	51.5%	413	28.7%
>=7 years	769	48.5%	1024	71.3%
Main reason for coming to France (in foreign-born)[2,3]				
Find a job, seek a better life	263	16.6%		
Join her husband	678	42.8%		
Join another member of the family	412	26.0%		
Study	129	8.1%		
Threatened in her country	92	5.8%		
Disease	11	0.7%		
Education level[4]				
None/Primary or koranic school	272	9.0%	283	11.6%
Secondary	1274	42.0%	1301	53.1%
Superior	1483	49.0%	864	35.3%

Living conditions				
Administrative status[5]				
French nationality	1713	56.4%	1350	53.7%
Regular EU status	182	6.0%	158	6.3%
10 years residence card	420	13.8%	439	17.5%
>= 1 year residence permit	314	10.3%	256	10.2%
< 1 year residence permit or receipt	103	3.4%	40	1.6%
No residence permit	306	10.1%	270	10.7%
Health insurance coverage[6]				
No	145	4.8%	161	6.5%
State Medical Assistance (SMA)	200	6.6%	124	5.0%
Basic Health Insurance	262	8.6%	278	11.1%
Complete Health Insurance	2431	80.0%	1933	77.4%
Housing conditions[2,7]				
Personal housing (owner or tenant, including social lease)	2573	84.8%		
Hosted by family	324	10.7%		
Hosted by associations	19	0.6%		
Hosted in residence for asylum seekers or migrant hostel	25	0.8%		
No housing or overnight stay in social hostel	95	3.1%		
Employment status (excluding the pregnancy period for women)[8]				
Non-precarious employment	1376	45.3%	1664	66.9%
Precarious employment	147	4.8%	433	17,4%
Education or training	90	3.0%	30	1.2%
Parental leave	39	1.3%	0	0%
Unemployment	1385	45.6%	360	14.5%
Couple's characteristics				
Marital status[9]				
No formal union	842	27.8%		
Civil, religious or traditional formal union	2190	72.2%		
Cohabitation[10]				
No or not really	271	8.9%		
Yes	2763	91.1%		
Couple duration[11]				
Not really together	27	0.9%		
< 1 year	120	4.0%		
1-3 years	622	20.6%		
4-10 years	1445	48.0%		
Over 10 years	799	26.5%		
Children already born				
Woman's first child	1016	33.4%		
The woman has children but only with other father(s)	190	6.3%		
The couple already have children	1832	60.3%		
Couple discussion about HIV and STIs[12]				
Never, or the mother doesn't remember	1933	64.2%		
Yes	1076	35.8%		
Woman's knowledge of having been screened for HIV[13]				

Never screened or doesn't know	397	13.2%
Screened before current pregnancy	2167	71.8%
First screening during this pregnancy	452	15.0%
Woman's knowledge of father's possible HIV test[14]		
Never screened or doesn't know	1686	55.9%
Already screened	1330	44.1%
Woman's prognosis of father's attendance[15]		
Thinks he won't attend FPPC	166	5.5%
Doesn't know if he will	490	16.2%
Thinks he will attend	2376	78.4%

Data are n (%) or median [interquartile range]
[1] Data missing for 3 women and 53 men
[2] Data only collected for women
[3] Data missing for 5 women
[4] Data missing for 9 women and 68 men
[5] Data missing for 3 men
[6] Data missing for 20 men
[7] Data missing for 2 women
[8] Data missing for 1 woman and 29 men
[9] Data missing for 6 couples
[10] Data missing for 4 couples
[11] Data missing for 25 couples
[12] Data missing for 29 couples
[13] 22 women did not respon
[14] 22 women did not respond
[15] 6 women did not respond

Among 2516 actually contacted fathers, acceptance rate was higher in couples waiting for a first child than in couples with children (couple's first child: 50% *versus* 38%, *p<0.001,* table 2).

Compared to men who did not take up the offer, men who did were older, more often immigrated, especially from Subsaharan Africa or Asia (61% *versus* 39% and 63% *versus* 39%, *p< 0.001),* with shorter stays in France (<7 year residence 66% *versus* 34%, *p< 0.001*), less secure administrative status (undocumented 73% *versus* 27%, < 1 year residence permit 58% versus 43% *p< 0.001*), less health insurance coverage (no coverage 66% *versus* 34, special system for undocumented immigrants: SMA 71% *versus* 29% , *p< 0.001)*. Men who attended were more likely to have low or high education level than men who did not (none or primary school: 63% *versus* 37%, university: 59% *versus* 41%, *p< 0.001).*

Except for age, same tendencies were observed in women whose partner took up the offer, compared to those whose partner did not (table 3). The rate of partner acceptance was higher among women who reported a first HIV test during the current pregnancy than among those who had been tested previously and those who were unaware of having ever been tested (50%, 42% and 46%, respectively, *p=0.004*). Men's integration in healthcare system was similar in the two groups (medical follow up 53% *versus* 47%, *p=609).*

Table 2: Men's characteristics by attendance to father prenatal prevention consultation, Montreuil (France) 2021-2022 (N=2516 men actually contacted)

	Men who attended (N = 1333)		**Men who did not attend despite effective contact (N = 1183)**		***P-value***
Age[1]					
[18-29 years]	238	46.9%	269	53.1%	0.009
[30-34 years]	402	54%	342	46%	
35 and over	693	54.8%	571	45.2%	
Region of birth					
France	500	48.7%	526	51.3%	<0.001
EU 27	42	44.2%	53	55.6%	
Non-EU 27 Europe, Canada	32	45.7%	38	54.3%	
North Africa and Middle East	245	51.0%	235	49.0%	
Subsaharan Africa	386	61.0%	247	39.0%	
Asia	96	63.2%	56	36.8%	
Latin America and the Caribbean	32	53.3%	28	46.7%	
Length of residence in France					
< 7 years	274	66.3%	139	33.7%	<0.001
>= 7 years	559	54.6%	465	45.4%	
Born in France	500	48.7%	526	51.3%	
Administrative status					
French nationality	679	50.3%	671	49.7%	<0.001
Regular EU status	75	47.5%	83	52.5%	
10-year residence card	217	49.4%	222	50.6%	
>= 1 year residence permit	143	55.9%	113	44.1%	
Residence permit < 1 year or receipt	23	57.5%	17	42.5%	
No residence permit	196	72.6%	74	27.4%	
Health insurance coverage					
No	106	65.8%	55	34.2%	<0.001
State Medical Assistance (SMA)	88	71.0%	36	29.0%	
Basic Health Insurance	118	42.5%	160	57.5%	
Complete Health Insurance	1021	52.8%	912	47.2%	
Employment status[5]					
Precarious employment, student, in training	247	53.4%	216	46.6%	0.052
Non-precarious employment	872	52.4%	792	47.6%	
Unemployment	214	59.4%	146	40.6%	
Level of education					
None, primary or koranic school	179	63.3%	104	36.7%	<0.001
Secondary	641	49.3%	660	50.7%	
Superior	512	59.3%	352	40.7%	
Other children with the same mother					
No	629	60.7%	407	39.3%	<0.001
Yes	704	47.6%	776	52.4%	

Integration into the healthcare system					
Rarely or never in contact with a physician	458	53.8%	394	46.2%	0.609
Has a primary car physician or chronic disease follow-up	875	52.7%	786	47.3%	

[1] When the sum of the category headcounts does not correspond to the total headcount, there is missing data (see table 1).

Table 3: Women's characteristics by partner's attendance to father prenatal prevention consultation, Montreuil (France) 2021-2022 (N=3038 partners called or met)

	Women whose partner came (N=1333)		**Women whose partner did not come (N = 1705)**		***P-value***
	n	%	n	%	
Age[1]					
[18-24 years]	153	44.3%	192	55.7%	0.531
[25-29 years]	376	41.9%	521	58.1%	
[30-34 years]	456	44.3%	573	55.7%	
35 and over	348	45.4 %	419	54.6%	
Region of birth					
France	557	38.5%	891	61.5%	**<0.001**
UE 27-UK	54	42.9%	72	57.1%	
Europe non-EU 27-UK, North America, Australia	39	41.9%	54	58.1%	
North Africa and Middle East	221	39.8%	334	60.2%	
Subsaharan Africa	338	56.0%	265	44.0%	
Asia	89	62.2%	54	37.8%	
Latin America and the Caribbean	35	50.0%	35	50.0%	
Length of residence in France[2]					
< 7 years	443	54.2%	374	45.8%	**<0.001**
>= 7 years	331	43.1%	437	56.9%	
Born in France	557	38.5%	891	61.5%	
Main reason for migration					
Not applicable (born in France)	557	38.5%	890	61.5%	**<0.001**
Find a job, seek a better life	150	57.0%	113	43.0%	
Join someone (family, husband) or study	553	45.3%	667	54.7%	
Disease or threated in her country	71	68.9%	32	31.1%	
Education level					
None/ Primary or koranic school	153	56.2%	119	43.8%	**<0.001**
Secondary	497	39.0%	777	61.0%	
Superior	679	45.8%	804	54.2%	
Administrative status					
French nationality	674	39.3%	1039	60.7%	**<0.001**
Regular EU status	83	45.6%	99	54.4%	
10-year residence card	185	44.0%	235	56.0%	
Residence permit 1 year or more	156	49.7%	158	30.3%	
< 1 year residence permit or receipt	52	50.5%	51	49.5%	

No residence permit	183	59.8%	123	40.2%	
Health insurance coverage					
No	79	54.5%	66	45.5%	**<0.001**
State Medical Assistance	116	58.0%	84	42.0%	
Basic Health Insurance only	96	36.6%	166	63.4%	
Complete Health Insurance	1042	42.9%	1389	57.1%	
Employment status (excluding the pregnancy period)					
Precarious employment, student, in training	123	51.2%	117	48.8%	**0.056**
Non-precarious employment	598	43.5%	778	56.5%	
Unemployment or on parental leave	612	43.1%	809	56.9%	
Housing conditions					
Personal housing	1090	42.4%	1483	57.6%	**<0.001**
Hosted (family, association)	173	47.0%	195	53.0%	
On the street or at the 115	70	73.7%	25	26.3%	
Couple duration					
Not really together	10	37.0%	17	63.0%	**<0.001**
< 1 year	67	55.8%	53	44.2%	
1-3 years	306	49.2%	316	50.8%	
4-10 years	638	44.1%	807	55.9%	
Over 10 years	312	39.0%	487	91.0%	
Children already born					
No	536	52.8%	480	47.2%	**<0.001**
Yes, including children with the same father	703	38.4%	1129	61.6%	
Yes, but only with other father(s)	94	49.5%	96	50.5%	
Have you had an HIV test?					
No or I don't think so	182	45.8%	215	54.2%	**0.004**
Yes, even before the current pregnancy	914	42.2%	1253	57.8%	
Yes, only during this pregnancy	228	50.4%	224	49.6%	
Have you ever talked about HIV/STIs with your partner?					
No or I don't know	858	44.4%	1075	55.6%	0.472
Yes	463	43.0%	613	57.0%	
Do you think he will accept FPPC?					
No	22	13.2%	144	86.8%	**<0.001**
I don't know	108	22.0%	382	78.0%	
Yes	1200	50.5%	1176	49.5%	

[1] Cohabitation with the father, marital status, women's knowledge of father's HIV status and of any HIV performed by the father were also analyzed, with no difference between groups. A complete comparison of women's characteristics is provided in annex 2.
[2] When the sum of the category headcounts does not correspond to the total headcount, there are missing data (see table 1).

Factors associated with men's adherence to the offer

After adjustment for other men's characteristics, father attendance remained strongly associated with the couple's expecting a first child (odds Ratio [OR] 2.00

95% confidence interval [95% CI] 1.67-2.40*, p<0.001*) and with the father's being born abroad (Subsaharan Africa OR 1.83 95% CI 1.45-2.31, Asia OR 1.82 95% IC 1.26-2.63, figure 2, graph a). Same trends were observed with regards to women's place of birth: partners adherence was higher in pregnant women born in Subsaharan Africa (OR 2.23 95% CI 1.79-2.78), Asia (OR 3.14 ; 95% CI 2.15-4.59) and Latin American or the Caribbean (OR 1.71 95% CI 1.04-2.82) than in pregnant women born in France (graph b).

In both women and men, low or on the contrary high education level were associated with father's attendance, in a similar U-shaped curve (graph a & b), this association remaining significant in immigrated men subgroup but not in immigrated women's one (graph c & d).

Fathers' age was associated with their compliance in the global study population, wether pregnant women's age had no impact. However, this association disappeared when focusing in immigrant fathers (graph d).

Hardship in immigration, wether experienced by men or women, was associated with father's adherence: after adjustment for place of birth, lenght of stay, residence permit, housing, health insurance and parenthood, women who came to France seeking a better life or escaping from threats had better partner's attendance than those who came to study or join someone (OR 1.5 95% CI 1.15-1.95, graph c). Homeless women's partners also attended more often than women's with stable housing ones (OR 2.26 95% CI 1.31-3.90).

Immigration from Subaharan Africa or Asia was associated with father's higher attendance than immigration from Europe, USA and Australia in both women (Subsaharan Africa OR 1.61 95%CI [1.16-2.23], Asia OR 2.35 95%CI [1.50-3.68]) and men (Subsaharan Africa OR 1.96 95%CI [1.33-2.88], Asia OR 95% CI 2.06 [1.28-3.34], graph d).

After adjustment for other precariousness criteria including country of origin, healthcare coverage, length of stay and employment, undocumented fathers remained more likely to attend than fathers with residence permit (OR 2.41, 95% CI 1.80-3.22 in the complete multivariate model and OR 1.93, 95% CI 1.34-2.77 in the final model, annex 3).

Figure 2 : Women's and men's characteristics associated with men's acceptance of Father Prenatal Paternal Consultation (FPPC), Montreuil (France), 2021-2022



graph a



graph b



graph c



graph d

Discussion

Our main findings were a high level of acceptance by men (44% of those contacted, 53% of those with whom contact had been made), though lower than the women's predictions (78% thought their partner would come). Acceptance was higher among immigrants, especially the most precarious ones.

A high participation rate, based on a proactive approach

Taking as denominator the men targeted, participation rate was 44%. This is higher than the 36% participation rate in Seine Saint Denis for the breast cancer screening campaign, which has been launched in 2004 and would thus be expected to be more easly accepted (26). An other long-running offer, colorectal cancer screening, has an even lower acceptance rate in our seeting, especially in men (global 27%, men 25%)(27).

It has been shown that cancer screening was lower in socially disadvantaged and immigrants populations (28) (29). Thus, interventions based on proactive contact by navigators to guide vulnerable patients through the health care system and address barrier that may prevent them from getting the prevention and care they need have been built in the USA (30). Navigators call patients on the phone, explain the screening, schedule appointments, assess lack of transportation, financial and insurance barriers: the effectiveness of such programs in increasing screening rates has been demonstrated for breast, cervical and colorectal cancers (31). Earlier, proactive interventions also proved their efficiency in promoting HIV testing in future fathers, in different sub-Saharan African settings: randomized controlled trials showed higher acceptance rates when fathers received an invitation letter (12), sometimes with an appointment already booked (32), and when caregivers came to the couples' home (33).

Our proactive approach of calling men, adapting to their needs by offering them different appointment times and locations and rescheduling missed consultations probably played a major role in the high level of acceptance. However, we have always sought consent from pregnant women before contacting fathers, in order not to disempower women (40).

Using the symbolic occasion of childbirth to incite fathers to care for their own health would probably not be sufficient without this active outreach, as long as the social norm on both parent's duties remains unchanged (34). However, although the gendered distribution of responsabilities makes women the guardians of children's health, prenatal care has not always been a standard: in France, pregnant women's visits were initially a condition for the granting of family benefits (35)

Immigrants were the most receptive to the offer, specially those with social vulnerabilities

Immigrant men took up the offer better than French-born men, particularly those from sub-Saharan Africa and Asia. This differential acceptance persisted after adjustment to men's

social vulnerabilities. Therefore, the most precarious immigrants are the ones who came to the FPPC the most.
Yet the reduced flexibility of working hours for fathers in precarious employment has been identified as a potential obstacle to their attendance at classic antenatal visits (36), the availability issue was less frequently raised by socially vulnerable men than by well established ones (unshown data reasons given by .

One possible explanation for immigrants' greater attendance is their need to be helped in opening up health insurance rights: 7% of men had no health insurance coverage when surveyed, although French system theoretically covers nearly everyone. Undocumented immigrants living in France for at least 3 months can apply for State Medical Assistance (SMA), a separate system that covers the entire cost of care, but they are often unaware of their entitlement to SMA or how to obtain it (37). Another explanation could be greater uncovered healthcare needs in immigrants (38).

Surprisingly, while lack of health cover was associated with the use of consultations, having a medical follow-up was not. Number of French-born men with no social vulnerabily did not have any medical follow up and did not attend FPPC. We may hypothesize that the reason why well-integrated men do not take up the offer is that they have the social skills to access the healthcare system, should a health problem occur. This hypothesis is supported by the finding of inequitable access to the healthcare system for immigrants in various European countries, including France (39).

Strenghts and limitations

While most of the research published in the field has emphasised the importance of involving men in prenatal care in order to improve the health of the mother and the development of the child, this is, to our knowledge, the first structured healthcare intervention built in the perspective of improving fathers' own health.

This survey has several limitations: research team's outreach efforts towards the fathers, free and easy access to a multidisciplinary team, may not be replicable in routine clinical practice. Moreover, monocentric design limits the generalizability of the results. Given our context, marked by social insecurity and immigration, we reached men who may not have the same needs as the general population of fathers. We can, however, project that in areas where poverty prevails, the most disadvantaged men would seize a routine prenatal consultation as a point of entry into the health system.

Conclusion

Although a prenatal consultation with biological tests is theoretically possible in France, it is not implemented. This study as show that such consultation is well accepted when, for the first time, it is actually organized and offered. The men who make most use of it are immigrants with social vulnerabilities, and those who have been in France for less time. This consultation therefore appears as an opportunity for men facing administrative obstacles, or

who do not have the social codes of the country they live in, to integrate into the healthcare system. Scaling up this intervention might thus reduce social inequalities in health. Consideration now needs to be given on how to make it available and free of charge in current practice.

Aknowledgments

The authors would like to thank all the people who participated in the study. The PARTAGE Study Group included, in addition to all the authors : Anne-Laurence Doho, Patricia Obergfell, Djamila Gherbi, Emilie Daumergue, Anne Simon, Miguel de Sousa Mendes, Naima Osmani, Sandrine Dekens, Oumar Sissoko (ARCAT), Virginie SUPERVIE, France Lert, Stéphanie Demarest, Ngone Diop.

We thank Christophe Michon, Nathalie Lydié, Joanna Orne-Gliemann, Laurent Mandelbrot, Corinne Taeron, Nicolas Derche, Gwenaelle Morvan, Bernadette Rwegera, Mélanie Jaunay, Ruth Foundje Notemi, Elisa Wardzala, Caroline Regnier, Paul Chalvin, Priscillia Ribouchon, Neima Sghiouar, Abdelkrim Imechket, Pauline Aubry, Francis Bouvier, Guy Nielsen, the Montreuil Municipality, GILEAD Sciences, the Seine Saint Denis Departmental Council.

Bibliography

1. Greig A, Kimmel M, Lang J. Men, Masculinities & Development: Broadening Our Work Towards Gender Equality [Internet]. 2000 mai [cité 21 août 2023] p. 22. (Gender in development monograph series). Report No.: 10. Disponible sur: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/246771572_Men_Masculinities_Development_Broadening_Our_Work_Towards_Gender_Equality/link/572ad85708ae057b0a0797cd/download

2. Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques, éditeur. Femmes et hommes, l'égalité en question. Éd. 2022. Montrouge: INSEE; 2022. (INSEE Références).

3. Sandman D, Simantov E, An C. Out of touch: American men and the health care system - Commonwealth Fund Men's and Women's Health Survey Findings. USA: The Commonwealth Fund; 2000 mars.

4. Bertakis KD, Azari R, Helms LJ, Callahan EJ, Robbins JA. Gender differences in the utilization of health care services. J Fam Pract. févr 2000;49(2):147□52.

5. Koechlin A. La norme gynécologique: ce que la médecine fait au corps des femmes. Paris: Éditions Amsterdam; 2022. 305 p.

6. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2016 [cité 22 août 2023]. 152 p. Disponible sur: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/250796

7. Dahl CM, Miller ES, Leziak K, Jackson J, Yee LM. Short Communication: Communication Between Pregnant Women and Male Partners About HIV Testing in the United States. AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses. sept 2021;37(9):683□6.

8. Desgrées-Du-Loû A, Brou H, Djohan G, Becquet R, Ekouevi DK, Zanou B, et al. Beneficial Effects of Offering Prenatal HIV Counselling and Testing on Developing a HIV Preventive Attitude among Couples. Abidjan, 2002–2005. AIDS Behav. avr 2009;13(2):348□55.

9. Orne-Gliemann J, Balestre E, Tchendjou P, Miric M, Darak S, Butsashvili M, et al. Increasing HIV testing among male partners. AIDS Lond Engl. 24 avr 2013;27(7):1167□77.

10. Dhairyawan R, Creighton S, Sivyour L, Anderson J. Testing the fathers: carrying out HIV and STI tests on partners of pregnant women. Sex Transm Infect. avr 2012;88(3):184□6.

11. Chanyalew H, Girma E, Birhane T, Chanie MG. Male partner involvement in HIV testing and counseling among partners of pregnant women in the Delanta District, Ethiopia. PloS One. 2021;16(3):e0248436.

12. Mohlala BKF, Boily MC, Gregson S. The forgotten half of the equation: randomized controlled trial of a male invitation to attend couple voluntary counselling and testing. AIDS Lond Engl. 31 juill 2011;25(12):1535□41.

13. McCloud MB. Health Behavior Change in Pregnant Women With Obesity. Nurs Womens Health. déc 2018;22(6):471□80.

14. Anderson AE, Hure AJ, Powers JR, Kay-Lambkin FJ, Loxton DJ. Determinants of pregnant women's compliance with alcohol guidelines: a prospective cohort study. BMC Public Health. 13 sept 2012;12:777.

15. Martin LT, McNamara MJ, Milot AS, Halle T, Hair EC. The effects of father involvement during pregnancy on receipt of prenatal care and maternal smoking. Matern Child Health J. nov 2007;11(6):595□602.

16. Kotelchuck M, Levy RA, Nadel HM. Voices of Fathers During Pregnancy: The MGH Prenatal Care Obstetrics Fatherhood Study Methods and Results. Matern Child Health J. août 2022;26(8):1603□12.

17. Gedzyk-Nieman SA. Postpartum and Paternal Postnatal Depression: Identification, Risks, and Resources. Nurs Clin North Am. sept 2021;56(3):325□43.

18. Smythe KL, Petersen I, Schartau P. Prevalence of Perinatal Depression and Anxiety in Both Parents: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open. 1 juin 2022;5(6):e2218969.

19. Grau Grau M, Las Heras Maestro M, Riley Bowles H. Engaged fatherhood for men, families and gender equality: healthcare, social policy, and work perspectives [Internet]. Springer Nature; 2022 [cité 11 juill 2023]. 325 p. Disponible sur: https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/50717

20. Tran TC, Pillonel J, Cazein F, Sommen C, Bonnet C, Blondel B, et al. Antenatal HIV screening: results from the National Perinatal Survey, France, 2016. Euro Surveill Bull Eur Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull. oct 2019;24(40).

21. Réévaluation de la stratégie de dépistage de l'infection à VIH en France [Internet]. Haute Autorité de Santé; 2017 [cité 23 août 2023] p. 305. Disponible sur: https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/2017-03/dir2/reevaluation_de_la_strategie_depistage_vih_-_recommandation.pdf

22. Penot P. [Acceptabilité et faisabilité d'une consultation prénatale masculine de Prévention, Accès aux droits, Rattrapage vaccinal, Traitement des Affections pendant la Grossesse et pour l'Enfant]. 23rd French AIDS society (SFLS) conference présenté à: Plenary session « Beyond gender boundaries »; 2022 nov 17; Paris.

23. Chevrot J, Khelladi I, Omont L, Wolber O, Bikun Bi Nkott F, Fourré C, et al. La Seine-Saint-Denis□: entre dynamisme économique et difficultés sociales persistantes [Internet]. INSEE; 2020 [cité 8 juin 2023]. Disponible sur: file:///C:/Users/PPENOT/Downloads/if_ina_114.pdf

24. Crequit S, Chatzistergiou K, Bierry G, Bouali S, La Tour AD, Sgihouar N, et al. Association between social vulnerability profiles, prenatal care use and pregnancy outcomes. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 22 juin 2023;23(1):465.

25. Crequit S, Bierry G, Maria P, Bouali S, La Tour AD, Sgihouar N, et al. Use of pregnancy personalised follow-up in case of maternal social vulnerability to reduce prematurity and neonatal morbidity. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 26 avr 2023;23(1):289.

26. Rogel A, Plaine J, Quintin C, De Maria F. Participation au programme de dépistage organisé du cancer du sein entre 2005 et 2021 en France. Bull Epidémiologique Hebd-BEH. 11 juill 2023;(14):255□65.

27. Quintin C, Plaine J, Rogel A, De Maria F. Premiers indicateurs de performance du programme de dépistage du cancer colorectal (participation, tests non analysables, tests positifs). Évolution depuis 2010 et focus sur les années Covid 2020-2021 en France. Bull Epidémiologique Hebd-BEH. 11 juill 2023;(14):266□72.

28. Hoeck S, Van Roy K, Willems S. Barriers and facilitators to participate in the colorectal cancer screening programme in Flanders (Belgium): a focus group study. Acta Clin Belg. févr 2022;77(1):37□44.

29. Rondet C, Lapostolle A, Soler M, Grillo F, Parizot I, Chauvin P. Are immigrants and nationals born to immigrants at higher risk for delayed or no lifetime breast and cervical cancer screening? The results from a population-based survey in Paris metropolitan area in 2010. PloS One. 2014;9(1):e87046.

30. Freeman HP. The history, principles, and future of patient navigation: commentary. Semin Oncol Nurs. mai 2013;29(2):72□5.

31. Mosquera I, Todd A, Balaj M, Zhang L, Benitez Majano S, Mensah K, et al. Components and effectiveness of patient navigation programmes to increase participation to breast, cervical and colorectal cancer screening: A systematic review. Cancer Med. juill 2023;12(13):14584□611.

32. Byamugisha R, Åstrøm AN, Ndeezi G, Karamagi CAS, Tylleskär T, Tumwine JK. Male partner antenatal attendance and HIV testing in eastern Uganda: a randomized facility-based intervention trial. J Int AIDS Soc. 13 sept 2011;14:43.

33. Osoti AO, John-Stewart G, Kiarie J, Richardson B, Kinuthia J, Krakowiak D, et al. Home visits during pregnancy enhance male partner HIV counselling and testing in Kenya: a randomized clinical trial. AIDS Lond Engl. 2 janv 2014;28(1):95–103.

34. Haile F, Brhan Y. Male partner involvements in PMTCT: a cross sectional study, Mekelle, Northern Ethiopia. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 12 févr 2014;14:65.

35. Cahen F. Le gouvernement des grossesses en France (1920-1970). Rev Hist Prot Soc. janv 2014;(7):34–57.

36. Gerstel N, Clawson D. Control Over Time: Employers, Workers, and Families Shaping Work Schedules. Annu Rev Sociol. 2018;44:77–97.

37. Vignier N, Desgrées du Loû A, Pannetier J, Ravalihasy A, Gosselin A, Lert F, et al. Access to health insurance coverage among sub-Saharan African migrants living in France: Results of the ANRS-PARCOURS study. PloS One. 2018;13(2):e0192916.

38. Berchet C, Jusot F. État de santé et recours aux soins des immigrés en France : une revue de la littérature. Bull Epidémiologique Hebd-BEH. 17 janv 2012;(2-3–4):17–21.

39. Lebano A, Hamed S, Bradby H, Gil-Salmerón A, Durá-Ferrandis E, Garcés-Ferrer J, et al. Migrants' and refugees' health status and healthcare in Europe: a scoping literature review. BMC Public Health. déc 2020;20(1):1039.

40. Tokhi M, Comrie-Thomson L, Davis J, Portela A, Chersich M, Luchters S. Involving men to improve maternal and newborn health: A systematic review of the effectiveness of interventions. PloS One. 2018;13(1):e0191620.