

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

4
5 Alvaro Francisco Lopes de Sousa, PhD^{1,2}, Layze Braz de Oliveira, PhD student¹, Artur Acelino
6 Francisco Luz Nunes Queiroz PhD student¹, Hérica Emilia Felix de Carvalho PhD student¹,
7 Guilherme Schneider PhD student¹, Emerson Lucas Silva Camargo PhD student¹; Telma
8 Evangelista de Araujo PhD³, Sandra Brignol PhD⁴, Isabel Amélia Costa Mendes PhD¹, Willi
9 McFarland PhD⁵, Inês Fronteira PhD².

10 **Affiliations:**

11 1. Human Exposome and Infectious Diseases Network, Escola de Enfermagem de Ribeirão
12 Preto, Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil.

13 2. Global Health and Tropical Medicine, Instituto de Higiene e Medicina Tropical, Universidade
14 Nova de Lisboa, Portugal.

15 3. Universidade Federal do Piauí, Brazil.

16 4. Department of Collective Health, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brazil.

17 5. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California at San Francisco,
18 USA.

19 **Funding:** Conselho Nacional de Pesquisa – CNPq, Brazil.

20 **Authors' contributions:**

21 Conception, planning, analysis, interpretation and writing of the work: AFLS, AAFLNQ, LBO;
22 TMEA; IF. Conception, planning, analysis and interpretation and writing: SB, TMEA, IACM;
23 HEFC; GS; ELSC; WM. All authors approved the final version.

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

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

28 **ABSTRACT**

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

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

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

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

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

51 **Background**

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

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

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

68 negative consequences, including greater risk of exposure to COVID-19, as the disease is still
69 not fully understood [6].

70 To measure the potential consequences of COVID-19 on the sexual behavior of MSM,
71 the In_PrEP Group in Brazil and Portugal implemented an online questionnaire. In particular, the
72 questionnaire sought to measure whether MSM were seeking casual partners during the period
73 when shelter in place directives were in effect and which measures they were undertaking to
74 reduce the risk of COVID-19, as well as HIV and other STIs. Brazil and Portugal were selected
75 as they share a language and a large flow of people between these countries each year (28,210)
76 [8], through immigration, professional and academic activities, and tourism [9].

77

78 **Methods**

79 **Study design, population, sampling, and recruitment**

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

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

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

101 The seeds were identified by the two most popular [10] geolocation-based dating applications
102 (Grindr and Hornet) by direct chat with online users, adapted to time location sampling (TLS)
103 technique following previous methods [11-12] (Figure 01).

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

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

113 **Measures**

114 Data were collected by Computer-Assisted Technique Interview (CASI). The data collection
115 questionnaire was hosted on the study site and, for security reasons, it only allowed one answer
116 by IP (*internet protocol*), that is, only one user answered by machine (computer, cell phone ...).
117 The research questionnaire was created and validated (face-content) by a group of three experts
118 from both countries in two versions: European Portuguese (Portugal) and Brazilian Portuguese
119 (Brazil). It was divided into four sections with 46 questions, mostly multiple choice, some of
120 which were mandatory for completion of the questionnaire. The questions addressed:

- 121 1. Sociodemographic information (age; gender identity; schooling; race/skin color; sexual
122 orientation; type of current relationship; country; state; place of dwelling);
- 123 2. Social welfare and coping in the period of social distancing;
- 124 3. Sexual practices and activities during the pandemic, namely: sexual practice with a casual
125 partner; sex with use of drugs; threesome or group sex; sex without condom use; STIs protection
126 strategies; sex frequency and protection measures against COVID-19; search for health services;
- 127 4. Sexual practices and activities in the period prior to the pandemic: Use of PrEP and PEP;
128 commonly used ways to search for partners; knowledge about STIs and HIV testing;

129 For this study, we defined sex with a casual partner or simply casual sex, such as anal sex with a
130 new or unknown partner outside the place where they were sheltered, with the question: “Since
131 the social distancing/sheltering was proposed in your country, have you had sex with a new or
132 unknown partner who is outside the place where you are sheltered, or have you left your shelter
133 to meet that partner?.”

134 **Analysis**

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

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

143 **Ethical considerations**

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

147

148 **Results**

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

158 Table 1 also describes how the COVID-19 epidemic changed the respondents' sexual behavior.
159 Over half of respondents (n:1252/ 53.0%) had casual sex, considering that 47 (3.8%) engaged in

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

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

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

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

184

185 **Discussion**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

245 In both Brazil and in Portugal, living in an urban area increased the odds of casual sex,
246 likely explained by an access to greater numbers of MSM [28]. This facilitates the location and
247 selection of partners by dating applications or other social media [12].

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

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

258 **Conclusions**

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

269

270

271 **References**


- 272 1. Ministério da Saúde (Brazil). Painel Coronavírus. 2020. Available at:
273 <https://covid.saude.gov.br/>
- 274 2. WHO. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports. Available from:
275 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports>
- 276 3. Ministério da Saúde (Portugal). SNS-24. Temas da saúde - COVID-19. Available at:
277 <https://www.sns24.gov.pt/tema/doencas-infecciosas/covid-19/>
- 278 4. Peixoto VR, Vieira A, Aguiar P, Sousa, Abrantes A. “Timing”, Adesão e Impacto das
279 Medidas de Contenção da COVID-19 em Portugal. NOVA National School of Public Health
280 report **2020**.
- 281 5. Albuquerque LP, Silva RB, Araújo RMS. COVID-19: origin, pathogenesis, transmission,
282 clinical aspects and current therapeutic strategies. *Rev Pre Infec e Saúde*. **2020**; 6:10432.
- 283 6. Brennan DJ, Card KG, Collicot D, Jollimore J, Lachowsky NJ. How Might Social Distancing
284 Impact Gay, Bisexual, Queer, Trans and Two-Spirit Men in Canada? *AIDS Behav* **2020**
285 30:1–3.
- 286 7. McDonald K. Social Support and Mental Health in LGBTQ Adolescents: A review of the
287 literature. *Issues Ment Health Nurs* **2018**; 39(1):16-29.
- 288 8. Portugal. Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras, 2018. Available at:
289 <https://sefstat.sef.pt/Docs/Rifa2018.pdf>
- 290 9. Barbosa B, Santos CM, Santos M. Tourists with migrants’ eyes: the mediating role of
291 tourism in international retirement migration. *J Tour Cult Chang* **2020**.

- 292 10. Queiroz AAFLN, Matos MCB, Araújo TME, Reis RK, Sousa AFL. Sexually transmitted
293 infections and factors associated with condom use in dating app users in Brazil. *Acta paul
294 enferm.* **2019**;32(5):546-53.
- 295 11. Queiroz AAFLN, Sousa AFL, Matos MCB, et al. Factors associated with self-reported non-
296 completion of the hepatitis B vaccine series in men who have sex with men in Brazil. *BMC
297 Infect Dis* **2019**;19(1):335.
- 298 12. Queiroz AAFLN, Sousa AFL, Brignol S, Araújo TME, Reis RK. Vulnerability to HIV
299 among older men who have sex with men users of dating apps in Brazil. *Braz J Infect Dis*
300 **2019**; 23(5): 298-306.
- 301 13. Lana RM, Coelho FC, Gomes MFC, Cruz OG, Bastos LS, Villela DAM et al. The novel
302 coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) emergency and the role of timely and effective national health
303 surveillance. *Cad Saúde Pública* **2020**; 36 (3): e00019620.
- 304 14. Freitas ARR, Napimoga M, Donalisio MR. Assessing the severity of COVID-19. *Epidemiol
305 Serv Saúde* **2020**; e2020119.
- 306 15. Peixoto VR, Vieira A, Aguiara P, Carvalho C, Thomas D, Abrantes A. Rapid assessment of
307 the impact of “lockdown” on the COVID-19 epidemic in Portugal. *MedRxiv* **2020**.
- 308 16. [https://www.pharmacytimes.com/ajax/development-of-prep-for-covid-19-could-allow-](https://www.pharmacytimes.com/ajax/development-of-prep-for-covid-19-could-allow-country-to-open-safely-before-a-vaccine-is-available)
309 [country-to-open-safely-before-a-vaccine-is-available](https://www.pharmacytimes.com/ajax/development-of-prep-for-covid-19-could-allow-country-to-open-safely-before-a-vaccine-is-available)
- 310 17. Gama AFM. HIV infection in men who have sex with men (MSM): risk-taking behaviours
311 and drivers of increased infection. Universidade Nova de Lisboa [Thesis in tropical
312 Medicine]. 2019
- 313 18. Yuen KS, Ye ZW, Fung SY, Chan CP, Jin DY. SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: The most
314 important research questions. *Cell Biosci* **2020** 16; 10:40.

- 315 19. Wong NS, Kwan TH, Lee KCK, Lau JYC, Lee SS. Delineation of chemsex patterns of men
316 who have sex with men in association with their sexual networks and linkage to HIV
317 prevention. *Int J Drug Policy*. **2020**; 75:102591.
- 318 20. Sanchez TH, Zlotorzynska M, Rai M, Baral SD. Characterizing the Impact of COVID-19 on
319 Men Who Have Sex with Men Across the United States in April, 2020. *AIDS and Behav*
320 **2020**; 1-9.
- 321 21. Menezes PL, Garner DM, Valenti VE. Brazil is projected to be the next global COVID-19
322 pandemic epicenter. *Medrxiv* **2020**.
- 323 22. Sullivan A. Love in the time of coronavirus: COVID-19 changes the game for online dating.
324 Deutsche Welle. 2020. [https://www.dw.com/en/love-in-the-time-of-coronavirus-covid-19-](https://www.dw.com/en/love-in-the-time-of-coronavirus-covid-19-changes-the-game-for-online-dating/a-52933001)
325 [changes-the-game-for-online-dating/a-52933001](https://www.dw.com/en/love-in-the-time-of-coronavirus-covid-19-changes-the-game-for-online-dating/a-52933001). Accessed 27 May 2020.
- 326 23. NYC. Sex and COVID-19 Fact Sheet. Available from:
327 [https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/doh/downloads/pdf/imm/covid-sex-](https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/doh/downloads/pdf/imm/covid-sex-guidance.pdf?utm_source=morning_brew)
328 [guidance.pdf?utm_source=morning_brew](https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/doh/downloads/pdf/imm/covid-sex-guidance.pdf?utm_source=morning_brew). Access 27 May 2020.
- 329 24. UNAIDS. Safer sex in the time of COVID-19. Available from:
330 <https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/covid-blog>, access in 27 may 2020
- 331 25. Cunha CB, Boni RBD, Guimarães MRC, Yanavich C, Veloso VG, Moreira RI, Hoagland B,
332 Grinsztejn B, Friedman RK. Unprotected sex among men who have sex with men living with
333 HIV in Brazil: a cross-sectional study in Rio de Janeiro. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;
334 14(379):1-9.
- 335 26. Poon CM, Wong NS, Kwan TH, Wong HTH, Chan KCW, Lee SS. Changes of sexual risk
336 behaviors and sexual connections among HIV-positive men who have sex with men along
337 their HIV care continuum. *PLoS One*. 2018; 13(12):1-14.

- 338 27. Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D et al. A Trial of Lopinavir-Ritonavir in Adults Hospitalized with
339 Severe Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382:1787-1799.
- 340 28. Whitfield DL, Kattari SK, Walls NE, Al-Tayyib A. Grindr, Scruff, and on the Hunt:
341 Predictors of Condomless Anal Sex, Internet Use, and Mobile Application Use Among Men
342 Who Have Sex with Men. *Am J Mens Health*. **2017**;11(3):775-784.
- 343 29. Yeo C, Sanghvi K, Yeo D: Enteric involvement of coronaviruses: is faecal-oral transmission
344 of SARS-CoV-2 possible? *Lancet Gastroenterol*. 2020, 5: P335-337. 10.1016/ S2468-
345 1253(20)30048-0
- 346
- 347
- 348
- 349
- 350
- 351
- 352
- 353

354 Figure 01 Flowchart for data collection



367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378 **Table 1.** Characteristics and sexual practices during the COVID-19 shelter in place period, men
 379 who have sex with men, Brazil and Portugal, 2020.

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

Polyamorous	28	1.7	40	5.6	68	2.9
-------------	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----

Self-reported HIV status

HIV negative	1285	77.8	488	68.7	1773	75.1
--------------	------	------	-----	------	------	------

HIV positive	163	9.9	86	12.1	249	10.5
--------------	-----	-----	----	------	-----	------

I do not know	203	12.3	136	19.2	339	14.4
---------------	-----	------	-----	------	-----	------

Tested for COVID-19	174	10.5	110	15.5	284	12
----------------------------	-----	------	-----	------	-----	----

Diagnosed with COVID-19	90	5.5	13	1.8	103	4.4
--------------------------------	----	-----	----	-----	-----	-----

Are you now sheltering in place?

No	74	4.5	26	3.7	100	4.2
----	----	-----	----	-----	-----	-----

Partially	405	24.5	154	21.7	559	23.7
-----------	-----	------	-----	------	-----	------

Yes	1172	71.0	530	74.6	1702	72.1
-----	------	------	-----	------	------	------

For how long have you been sheltering?

1 to 14 days	60	3.6	54	7.6	114	4.8
--------------	----	-----	----	-----	-----	-----

15 to 29 days	331	20.1	62	8.8	393	16.7
---------------	-----	------	----	-----	-----	------

30 to 45 days	1035	62.7	326	45.9	1361	57.6
---------------	------	------	-----	------	------	------

More than 45 days	225	13.6	268	37.7	493	20.9
-------------------	-----	------	-----	------	-----	------

How would you rate the impact that

sheltering has had on your life?

Low impact	215	13.0	70	9.9	285	12.1
Average impact	643	38.9	292	41.1	935	39.6
High impact	793	48.0	348	49.0	1141	48.3

Usual type of sex partner

Casual	1155	70.0	413	58.2	1568	66.4
Steady	291	17.6	40	5.6	331	14.0
Both casual and steady	205	12.4	257	36.2	462	19.6

Lives with sex partner

236	14.3	109	15.4	345	14.6
-----	------	-----	------	-----	------

Usual ways respondent finds sex partners before period of sheltering

Dating apps	1285	77.8	544	76.6	1829	77.5
Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram	560	33.9	286	40.3	846	35.8
Other sites	446	27.0	173	24.4	619	26.2
Bars, clubs, bathhouses, cruising areas	72	4.4	25	3.5	97	4.1
Does not search for partners	292	17.7	98	13.8	390	16.5

Decreased number of sexual partners during

1253	75.9	515	72.5	1768	74.8
------	------	-----	------	------	------

sheltering

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

Your sexual frequency

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

Your interaction with social media

Decreased	117	7.1	248	34.9	365	15.5
Did not change	357	21.6	136	19.2	493	20.9
Increased	1177	71.3	326	45.9	1503	63.6

Your alcohol consumption

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

During sheltering, the respondent

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

Had sex with 2 or more people at the same time	259	15.7	113	15.9	372	15.8
Had sex under the influence of drugs or alcohol	777	47.1	143	20.1	920	39.0
Had unprotected anal sex with a new/casual partner.	576	34.9	142	20.0	718	30.4

To protect from COVID-19, the respondent

Took general/basic protective measures (e.g., using face mask and hand sanitizer)	423	25.6	187	26.3	610	25.8
Asked if the partner was sheltering	513	31.1	212	29.9	725	30.7
Asked if the partner had symptoms	452	27.4	197	27.7	649	27.5
Avoided kissing during sex	219	13.3	164	23.1	383	16.2
Washed hands with soap and water for at least 20 seconds before and after sex	450	27.3	202	28.5	652	27.6
Cleaned the place where they had sex before and after sex	209	12.7	136	19.2	345	14.6
Used PrEP/Truvada	191	11.6	110	15.5	301	12.7
Used a condom for anal sex	403	24.4	114	16.1	517	21.9
Did not adopt any strategy	610	36.9	247	34.8	857	36.3

382 **Table 2.** Factors associated with having casual sex during the COVID-19 shelter in place period,
 383 men who have sex with men, Brazil and Portugal, 2020.

384

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

Type of sex partner(s) usually:

<i>Steady partner</i>	1			
<i>Casual and steady partner</i>	3.3	2.2 - 4.8	1,6	0.9 - 2.8
<i>Casual partner</i>	1.5	1.2 - 2.0	2,5	1.8 - 3.5

Did you use a condom during sex?

<i>No</i>	1			
<i>Yes</i>	0.4	0.3 - 0.5	0,6	0,4 – 0,9

Decrease in the number of partners during sheltering

<i>Yes</i>	1			
<i>No</i>	21.3	15.0 - 30.4	6.5	4.2 – 10.0

Portugal

Usually used Facebook to find partners

<i>No</i>	1			
<i>Yes</i>	3.0	2.2 – 4.2	4,6	3.0-7.2

Did not seek partners

<i>No</i>	1			
-----------	---	--	--	--

<i>Yes</i>	0.5	0.4 - 0.7	0.3	0.1 - 0.5
------------	-----	-----------	-----	-----------

For how long have you been in isolation?

15-29 days	1			
------------	---	--	--	--

30-45 days	0.5	0.3 - 0.8	0.2	0.1 - 0.4
------------	-----	-----------	-----	-----------

>45 days	0.8	0.4 - 1.4	0.4	0.2 - 0.8
----------	-----	-----------	-----	-----------

<i>Not in isolation</i>	0.5	0.3 - 1.1	0.2	0.1 - 0.8
-------------------------	-----	-----------	-----	-----------

Decrease in the number of partners during sheltering

<i>Yes</i>	1			
------------	---	--	--	--

<i>No</i>	1.2	0.9 - 1.6	3.8	2.9 - 5.9
-----------	-----	-----------	-----	-----------

Usually found partners at bars, clubs, bathhouses, etc

<i>No</i>	1			
-----------	---	--	--	--

<i>Yes</i>	2.3	1.6 - 3.3	5.4	3.2 - 8.9
------------	-----	-----------	-----	-----------

Impact of isolation on daily life:

<i>Low</i>	1			
------------	---	--	--	--

<i>Average</i>	0.8	0.5 - 1.4	0.7	0.3 - 1.7
----------------	-----	-----------	-----	-----------

<i>High</i>	3.1	1.9 - 5.4	3.0	1.3 - 6.7
-------------	-----	-----------	-----	-----------

Self-reported HIV status

<i>Negative</i>	1			
<i>Positive</i>	10.4	4.9 - 22.0	11.7	4.7 - 29.2
<i>Does not know</i>	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	1.4	0.7 - 2.3