

1 **Title Page:**

2 Title: Most users of a prenatal consultation dedicated to future fathers are immigrants facing  
3 hardship

4 Authors: Pauline Penot<sup>1,2</sup>, MD, Gaëlle Jacob<sup>1,3</sup>, Audrey Guerizec<sup>1</sup>, Clotilde Trevisson<sup>1</sup>, MD,  
5 Valérie-Anne Letembet<sup>1</sup>, MD, Raya Harich<sup>4</sup>, PharmD, Thomas Phuong<sup>5</sup>, Bruno Renevier<sup>3</sup>, MD,  
6 Pierre-Etienne Manuellan<sup>4</sup>, MD, Annabel Desgrées du Loû<sup>2</sup>, PhD & the Partage Study Group\*

7 <sup>1</sup>CeGIDD (Sexual Health and Infectious Disease Clinic), Centre Hospitalier André Grégoire, 56  
8 boulevard de la Boissière, 93100 Montreuil, France

9 <sup>2</sup> Centre Population et Développement (Ceped), Institut de recherche pour le  
10 développement (IRD) et Université de Paris, Inserm ERL 1244, 45 rue des Saints-Pères, 75006  
11 Paris, France

12 <sup>3</sup> Maternity unit, Centre Hospitalier André Grégoire, 56 boulevard de la Boissière, 93100  
13 Montreuil, France

14 <sup>4</sup> Medical biology laboratory, Centre hospitalier intercommunal André Grégoire, GHT Grand  
15 Paris Nord-Est, 56 boulevard de la Boissière, Montreuil, France

16 <sup>5</sup> IT support, Centre hospitalier intercommunal André Grégoire, GHT Grand Paris Nord-Est,  
17 56 boulevard de la Boissière, Montreuil, France

18 <sup>6</sup> Health Department, Montreuil Municipality, France

19 \* Membership for the PARTAGE Study Group is provided in the Acknowledgments section

20 Corresponding author: Pauline Penot, 56 bd de la Boissière 93100 Montreuil, France ;

21 pauline.penot@ght-gpne.fr; tel: +33-1-49203438

## 22 **Abstract**

23 **Background:** Prenatal care provides pregnant women with repeated opportunities for  
24 prevention, screening and diagnosis that have no current extension to future fathers. It also  
25 contributes to women's general better access to health. The goal of PARTAGE study was to  
26 evaluate the level and determinants of adherence to a prenatal prevention consultation  
27 dedicated to men.

28 **Methods:** Between January 2021 and April 2022, we conducted a monocentric  
29 interventional study in Montreuil hospital. We assessed the acceptance of a prenatal  
30 prevention consultation newly offered to every future father, through their pregnant  
31 partner's prior consent to provide their contact details.

32 **Results:** 3,038 women provided contact information used to reach the fathers; effective  
33 contact was established with 2,516 men, of whom 1,333 (53%) came for prenatal prevention  
34 consultation. Immigrant men were more likely to come than French-born men (56% versus  
35 49%,  $p < 0.001$ ), and the more they faced social hardship, the more likely they were to  
36 accept the offer. In multivariate analysis, men born in Subsaharan Africa and Asia were twice  
37 as likely to attend the consultation as those born in Europe or North America.

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

41 **Trial Registration:** <https://classic.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05085717>

42 **Key words:** Social inequalities in health; migrants health; prenatal health, gender  
43 inequalities; HIV; Sexually Transmitted Infections; Vaccination; Health insurance coverage

44 **List of abbreviations:**

45 MQ: Maternal Questionnaire

46 SMA: State Medical Assistance (Aide Médicale de l'Etat in French)

47 FPPC: Father's Prenatal Prevention Consultation

48 CI: Confidence Interval

49 OR: Odd Ratio

50

51 **Introduction**

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

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

57 Most countries recommend regular medical check-ups and biological monitoring during  
58 pregnancy. When the father's health is taken into the picture, this is to avoid genetical or  
59 infectious transmission rather than keeping the father himself in good health (6). Even then,  
60 infectious diseases are poorly screened in the second parent : HIV diagnosis is delayed in  
61 heterosexual men compared to women, because male partner uptake of HIV testing during  
62 antenatal care remains scarce (7), despite numerous initiatives to promote it (8) (9) (10) (11)  
63 (12).

64 Prenatal visits are also used to encourage behavioral changes in pregnant women, such as  
65 smoking and alcoholic withdrawal, promoting physical exercise and combating overweight  
66 (13) (14). To date, men do not have such opportunities. Yet, involving their partner supports  
67 behavioral changes in pregnant women (15). In addition, important health needs were  
68 identified in a cohort of future fathers (16) and fatherhood is a high-risk period for  
69 depression in men (17) (18).

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

### 73 *The French context and the Seine Saint Denis specific situation*

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

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

83 Seine Saint-Denis (population; 1.6 million inhabitants), located in the northeastern suburbs  
84 of Paris (Ile de France region), is the department with the highest rates of immigration and  
85 poverty in mainland France (23). Seine Saint Denis' tertiary care maternity unit is located in  
86 Montreuil: it provides prenatal care for some 3,500 women every year. In 2020-2021, 4-6%

87 of women who gave birth at Montreuil hospital were immigrants with < 12 months'  
88 residence in France (24). 52% of women who delivered their child in Montreuil hospital over  
89 the same period were later identified as socially vulnerable, 41% of them being born in  
90 Subsaharan Africa and 11% in Asia (25).

91 In this context where poverty and immigration prevail, future fathers hardly get targetted by  
92 interventions aimed at reducing social inequalities in health. We consequently built an  
93 interventional research to assess the take-up rate and the factors associated with  
94 acceptance of a prenatal consultation dedicated to them.

## 951. **Methods**

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

### 101 *Study population*

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

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

### 108 *Intervention*

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

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

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

125 Fathers were seen by a doctor or midwife. Blood pressure was measured, clinical  
126 examination was carried out if needed, biological tests were adapted to individual's  
127 exposure and medical history. Vaccines were updated; fathers lacking health insurance  
128 coverage met a social worker to obtain it. Test results were delivered face to face, by  
129 telephone or by e-mail, according to men's choice. Depending on their needs, men were  
130 referred to a health mediator, a psychologist, a general practioner or any hospital specialist.

131 The full protocol is available on ClinicalTrials.gov:  
132 <https://classic.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05085717>.

### 133 *Ethics*

134 The French Data Protection Authority (CNIL, registration number 921135) and the French  
135 Personal Data Protection Committee (Comite de Protection des Personnes, registration  
136 number 21.01.19.44753 amended by 21.05022.944753 decision, allowing and increased  
137 number of inclusions and additional data collection) gave full ethical approval.

### 138 *Statistical analysis*

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

145 Data were compared between fathers who attended the prenatal prevention consultation  
146 and those who did not, using Chi [2] or Fisher exact tests for categorical variables and  
147 Student's or Wilcoxon rank sum tests for quantitative variables, as appropriate. All tests  
148 were two-sided with p-values < 0.05 defined as statistically significant. Multivariate logistic  
149 regression models were built to identify the factors associated with men's take-up of this  
150 offer, based on their own characteristics on one hand, and on their pregnant partner's as  
151 well as the couple's characteristics on the other hand, in the general study population, and  
152 then in the sub-groups of immigrant men and women. Backward elimination procedures  
153 were used to determine the final models. Given the limited number of missing data, no

154 imputation was performed, in order to avoid introducing bias: incomplete observations were  
155 removed from the multivariate models. Analyses were performed in Stata SE 17 (Stata  
156 Corporation, College Station, TX, USA).




## 1572. Results

### 158        1. Acceptance rate and characteristics of the studied population

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

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



164

165 **Regarding women:** their median age was 31 years, interquartile range [ ] 28-35 years. One  
 166 third was expecting a first child; 49% had a university degree, whereas 46% were  
 167 unemployed prior to current pregnancy; 13% believed they had never been tested for HIV,  
 168 while 15% identified their ongoing pregnancy serology as their first. Only 36% recalled a  
 169 couple's discussion about HIV or sexually transmitted infections (STIs), and 56% didn't know

170 if their partner had ever been tested for HIV. 78% predicted that the future father would  
171 attend the prenatal consultation he would be offered.

172 Fifty-two percent were immigrants, most often from Subsaharan Africa (20%), North Africa  
173 or the Middle East (18%). Among the immigrant women (N = 1590): 51% had been in France  
174 for less than 7 years; 19% had no residence permit and 9% no health insurance coverage.

175 Two-thirds had come to France to join either their husbands (43%) or a family member  
176 (26%), while 17% had come to seek a better life, 8% to study, 6% to escape threats or  
177 violence, and only 0.7% for health reasons (table 1).

178 **Regarding men:** Their median age was 35 [30-40]; 35% had superior education, 14% were  
179 unemployed. Fifty-nine percent of those with whom contact had been established were  
180 immigrants (N= 1490): 25% came from Subsaharan Africa, 19% from North Africa or the  
181 Middle East. Only 29% had been in France for less than 7 years; 18% had no residence  
182 permit, and 11% had no health insurance coverage.

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

	Women who gave effective contact information		Men who were actually contacted	
	N	%	N	%
<b>Sociodemographic characteristics</b>				
<b>Population size</b>	3038	100%	2516	100%
Of which foreign-born	1590	52.3%	1490	59.2%
<b>Age (years)</b>	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%
<b>Region of birth</b>				
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%
<b>Length of residence in France (for foreign-born)<sup>1</sup></b>				
< 7 years	818	51.5%	413	28.7%
>=7 years	769	48.5%	1024	71.3%
<b>Main reason for coming to France (in foreign-born)<sup>2,3</sup></b>				
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%		
<b>Education level<sup>4</sup></b>				
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%
<b>Living conditions</b>				
<b>Administrative status<sup>5</sup></b>				
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%
<b>Health insurance coverage<sup>6</sup></b>				
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%
<b>Housing conditions<sup>2,7</sup></b>				
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%		
<b>Employment status (excluding the pregnancy period for women)<sup>8</sup></b>				
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%
<b>Couple's characteristics</b>				
<b>Marital status<sup>9</sup></b>				

No formal union	842	27.8%
Civil, religious or traditional formal union	2190	72.2%
<b>Cohabitation<sup>10</sup></b>		
No or not really	271	8.9%
Yes	2763	91.1%
<b>Couple duration<sup>11</sup></b>		
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%
<b>Children already born</b>		
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%
<b>Couple discussion about HIV and STIs<sup>12</sup></b>		
Never, or the mother doesn't remember	1933	64.2%
Yes	1076	35.8%
<b>Woman's knowledge of having been screened for HIV<sup>13</sup></b>		
Never screened or doesn't know	397	13.2%
Screened before current pregnancy	2167	71.8%
First screening during this pregnancy	452	15.0%
<b>Woman's knowledge of father's possible HIV test<sup>14</sup></b>		
Never screened or doesn't know	1686	55.9%
Already screened	1330	44.1%
<b>Woman's prognosis of father's attendance<sup>15</sup></b>		
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]

<sup>1</sup> Data missing for 3 women and 53 men

<sup>2</sup> Data only collected for women

<sup>3</sup> Data missing for 5 women

<sup>4</sup> Data missing for 9 women and 68 men

<sup>5</sup> Data missing for 3 men

<sup>6</sup> Data missing for 20 men

<sup>7</sup> Data missing for 2 women

<sup>8</sup> Data missing for 1 woman and 29 men

<sup>9</sup> Data missing for 6 couples

<sup>10</sup> Data missing for 4 couples

<sup>11</sup> Data missing for 25 couples

<sup>12</sup> Data missing for 29 couples

<sup>13</sup> 22 women did not respond

<sup>14</sup> 22 women did not respond

<sup>15</sup> 6 women did not respond

184 *Comparison of women whose partner came to the consultation with women whose partner*  
 185 *did not*

186 Partners of primipara were more likely to come than those of women who were already  
 187 mothers, especially if the couple already had children together (53% versus 38%).

188 Partners of women born in Subsaharan Africa, Asia and Latin America-Haiti took up the offer  
 189 better than those born in France (56%, 62% and 50%, respectively, versus 38%).

190 Partners of women in precarious situations (homeless, with SMA or no health insurance  
 191 coverage) came more often than those of women living in their own homes or registered  
 192 with the general health insurance scheme.

193 Partners of women declaring a first HIV serology during the current pregnancy were more  
 194 likely to take up the offer than those of women who were unaware of having been tested,  
 195 and those who had been tested prior to the current pregnancy (50% versus 46% and 42%,  
 196 respectively).

197 Half of men whose partners predicted they would take up the offer actually came, versus  
 198 22% of those whose partners were uncertain, and 13% of those whose partners predicted  
 199 that refusal ( $p < 0.001$ , table 2).

Table 2: 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	%	
<b>Age<sup>1</sup></b>					0.531
[18-24 years]	153	44.3%	192	55.7%	
[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%	

<b>Region of birth</b>					
France	557	38.5%	891	61.5%	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
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%	
<b>Length of residence in France<sup>2</sup></b>					
< 7 years	443	54.2%	374	45.8%	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
>= 7 years	331	43.1%	437	56.9%	
Born in France	557	38.5%	891	61.5%	
<b>Main reason for migration</b>					
Not applicable (born in France)	557	38.5%	890	61.5%	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
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 threatened in her country	71	68.9%	32	31.1%	
<b>Education level</b>					
None/ Primary or koranic school	153	56.2%	119	43.8%	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Secondary	497	39.0%	777	61.0%	
Superior	679	45.8%	804	54.2%	
<b>Administrative status</b>					
French nationality	674	39.3%	1039	60.7%	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
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%	
<b>Health insurance coverage</b>					
No	79	54.5%	66	45.5%	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
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%	
<b>Employment status (excluding the pregnancy period)</b>					
Precarious employment, student, in training	123	51.2%	117	48.8%	<b>0.056</b>
Non-precarious employment	598	43.5%	778	56.5%	
Unemployment or on parental leave	612	43.1%	809	56.9%	
<b>Housing conditions</b>					
Personal housing	1090	42.4%	1483	57.6%	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Hosted (family, association)	173	47.0%	195	53.0%	
On the street or at the 115	70	73.7%	25	26.3%	
<b>Couple duration</b>					
Not really together	10	37.0%	17	63.0%	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
< 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%	
<b>Children already born</b>					

No	536	52.8%	480	47.2%	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
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%	
<b>Have you had an HIV test?</b>					
No or I don't think so	182	45.8%	215	54.2%	<b>0.004</b>
Yes, even before the current pregnancy	914	42.2%	1253	57.8%	
Yes, only during this pregnancy	228	50.4%	224	49.6%	
<b>Have you ever talked about HIV/STIs with your partner?</b>					
No or I don't know	858	44.4%	1075	55.6%	0.472
Yes	463	43.0%	613	57.0%	
<b>Do you think he will accept FPPC?</b>					
No	22	13.2%	144	86.8%	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
I don't know	108	22.0%	382	78.0%	
Yes	1200	50.5%	1176	49.5%	

<sup>1</sup> 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 as additional file 2.

<sup>2</sup> When the sum of the category headcounts does not correspond to the total headcount, there are missing data (see table 1).

## 200 *Women's characteristics associated with their partners' attendance*

201 After adjusting for other women's characteristics, those born in Sub-Saharan Africa (OR 2.23  
202 [1.79-2.78]), Asia (OR 3.14 [2.15-4.59]) or Latin America-Haiti (OR 1.71 [1.04-2.82]) were  
203 more likely to have their partners attending than those born in France. Women's level of  
204 education remained associated with their partners' attendance: partners of women with a  
205 low level of formal education (no or only elementary school) or, on the contrary, a high level  
206 of formal education (university degree) came more often than those of women with a high  
207 school level (figure 2, graph a).

## 208 *Characteristics of the immigrant women sub-population associated with their partner's* 209 *attendance*

210 In multivariate analysis, partners of women born Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia made greater  
211 use of this new consultation than those of women from Europe, USA or Australia, even after  
212 adjustment for length of stay, reason for migration, housing, administrative status and  
213 parenthood (OR 1.61 [1.16-2.23] and OR 2.35 [1.50-3.68], respectively). Homelessness,



214 migration for their own safety or to seek a better life, and a residence period of less than  
215 seven years were independently associated with the partner's attendance (figure 2, graph c).

### 216 3. Characteristics of men who took up the offer

#### 217 *Comparison of men who came to the consultation versus those who did not*

218 Participation was higher among men aged 30 and over than among younger ones, and  
219 among Subsaharan African, Asian and Latin American-Haitian immigrants than among  
220 French-born men (49% versus 61%, 63% and 53% respectively). Immigrants present for less  
221 than 7 years came more often than those who had been in France for longer (66% versus  
222 55%,  $p < 0.001$ ). As for women, men with social vulnerabilities (no residence permit, no  
223 affiliation to the general health insurance scheme) made greater use of consultations than  
224 less precarious ones. The take-up rate was lower among men with a secondary level of  
225 education than among men with a lower or higher level of education (49% versus 63% and  
226 59%, respectively,  $p < 0.001$ ), and a similar trend was observed with regard to women's level  
227 of education. Finally, the proportion of adherence was similar whether or not men had any  
228 medical follow-up (53% versus 47%,  $p = 609$ , table 3).

Table 3: 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
<b>Age<sup>1</sup></b>					
[18-29 years]	238	46.9%	269	53.1%	0.009
[30-34 years]	402	54.0%	342	46.0%	
35 and over	693	54.8%	571	45.2%	
<b>Region of birth</b>					
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%	
<b>Length of residence in France</b>					
< 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%	
<b>Administrative status</b>					
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%	
<b>Health insurance coverage</b>					
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%	
<b>Employment status<sup>5</sup></b>					
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%	
<b>Level of education</b>					
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%	
<b>Other children with the same mother</b>					
No	629	60.7%	407	39.3%	<0.001
Yes	704	47.6%	776	52.4%	
<b>Integration into the healthcare system</b>					
Rarely or never in contact with a physician	458	53.8%	394	46.2%	0.609
Has a primary care physician or chronic disease follow-up	875	52.7%	786	47.3%	

<sup>1</sup> When the sum of the category headcounts does not correspond to the total headcount, there is missing data (see table 1).

229 *Men's characteristics associated with their attendance*

230 After adjustment for other men's characteristics, father attendance remained strongly

231 associated with the couple's expecting a first child (odds Ratio [OR] 2.00 95% confidence

232 interval [95% CI] 1.67-2.40,  $p < 0.001$ ) and with the father's being born abroad (Subsaharan

233 Africa OR 1.83 95% CI 1.45-2.31, Asia OR 1.82 95% IC 1.26-2.63, figure 2, graph a).


234 Men aged 30 and over remained more receptive to the offer than younger men. The same U-  
235 shaped curve was observed for educational level: men with little or no schooling and men  
236 with higher education were more likely to seek advice than men who had studied up to  
237 secondary school. Fathers' age was associated with their compliance in the global study  
238 population (figure 2, graph b).

239 *Immigrated men's characteristics associated with their attendance*


240 In multivariate analysis, immigrants from Subsaharan Africa and Asia attended more than  
241 those from Europe or North America (OR 1.96 [1.33-2.88] and OR 2.06 [1.28-3.34],  
242 respectively), while paternal age was no longer associated with the acceptance rate.  
243 Immigrant men involved in a recent relationship came more often than those in a longer  
244 relationship (figure 2, graph d).

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


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




graph a



graph b



graph c



graph d

249 **Discussion**

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

254

255 *A high participation rate, based on a proactive approach*

256 Taking as denominator the men targeted, participation rate was 44%. This is higher than the  
257 36% participation rate in Seine Saint Denis for the breast cancer screening campaign, which  
258 has been launched in 2004 and would thus be expected to be more easily accepted (26). An  
259 other long-running offer, colorectal cancer screening, has an even lower acceptance rate in  
260 our setting, especially in men (global 27%, men 25%)(27).

261 It has been shown that cancer screening was lower in socially disadvantaged and immigrants  
262 populations (28) (29). Thus, interventions based on proactive contact by navigators to guide  
263 vulnerable patients through the health care system and address barrier that may prevent  
264 them from getting the prevention and care they need have been built in the USA (30).

265 Navigators call patients on the phone, explain the screening, schedule appointments, assess  
266 lack of transportation, financial and insurance barriers: the effectiveness of such programs in  
267 increasing screening rates has been demonstrated for breast, cervical and colorectal cancers  
268 (31). Earlier, proactive interventions also proved their efficiency in promoting HIV testing in  
269 future fathers, in different Sub-Saharan African settings: randomized controlled trials showed  
270 higher acceptance rates when fathers received an invitation letter (12), sometimes with an  
271 appointment already booked (32), and when caregivers came to the couples' home (33).

272

273 Our proactive approach of calling men, adapting to their needs by offering them different  
274 appointment times and locations and rescheduling missed consultations probably played a  
275 major role in the high level of acceptance. However, we have always sought consent from  
276 pregnant women before contacting fathers, in order not to disempower women (34).

277 Although the association did not remain significant after adjustment, the partners of women  
278 who reported a first HIV test during the current pregnancy were more likely to come than  
279 those of women who were unaware of having been tested, and than those of women who  
280 had been tested previously. This finding supports the promotion of couple-oriented  
281 screening. However, using the symbolic occasion of childbirth to incite fathers to care for  
282 their own health would probably not be sufficient without this active outreach, as long as  
283 the social norm on both parent's duties remains unchanged (35). Even if the gendered  
284 distribution of responsibilities makes women the guardians of children's health, prenatal  
285 care has not always been a standard: in France, pregnant women's visits were initially a  
286 condition for the granting of family benefits (36).

287

288 *Immigrants were the most receptive to the offer, especially those with social vulnerabilities*

289 Immigrant men took up the offer better than French-born men, particularly those from  
290 Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia. This differential acceptance persisted after adjustment to men's  
291 social vulnerabilities. Therefore, the most precarious immigrants are the ones who came to  
292 the FPPC the most.

293 Yet the reduced flexibility of working hours for fathers in precarious employment has been  
294 identified as a potential obstacle to their attendance at classic antenatal visits (37), the  
295 availability issue was less frequently raised by socially vulnerable men than by well  
296 established ones (unshown data: reasons given by eligible fathers when refusing the offer) .

297

298 One possible explanation for immigrants' greater attendance is their need to be helped in  
299 opening up health insurance rights: 7% of men had no health insurance coverage when  
300 surveyed, although French system theoretically covers nearly everyone. Undocumented  
301 immigrants living in France for at least 3 months can apply for State Medical Assistance  
302 (SMA), a separate system that covers the entire cost of care, but they are often unaware of  
303 their entitlement to SMA or how to obtain it (38). Another explanation could be greater  
304 uncovered healthcare needs in immigrants (39).

305

306 Surprisingly, while lack of health insurance coverage was associated with the use of  
307 consultations, having a medical follow-up was not. Number of French-born men with no  
308 social vulnerability did not have any medical follow up and did not attend FPPC. We may  
309 hypothesize that the reason why well-integrated men do not take up the offer is that they  
310 have the social skills to access the healthcare system, should a health problem occur. This  
311 hypothesis is supported by the finding of inequitable access to the healthcare system for  
312 immigrants in various European countries, including France (40).

313

#### 314 *Strengths and limitations*

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

319 This survey has several limitations: research team's outreach efforts towards the fathers,  
320 free and easy access to a multidisciplinary team, may not be replicable in routine clinical

321 practice. Moreover, monocentric design limits the generalizability of the results. Given our  
322 context, marked by social insecurity and immigration, we reached men who may not have  
323 the same needs as the general population of fathers. We can, however, project that in areas  
324 where poverty prevails, the most disadvantaged men would seize a routine prenatal  
325 consultation as a point of entry into the health system.

## 326 **Conclusion**

327 Although a prenatal consultation with biological tests is theoretically possible in France, it is  
328 not yet implemented. This study has shown that such consultation is well accepted when, for  
329 the first time, it is actually organized and offered. The men who make most use of it are  
330 immigrants with social vulnerabilities, and those who have been in France for less time. This  
331 consultation therefore appears as an opportunity for men facing administrative obstacles, or  
332 who do not have the social codes of the country they live in, to integrate into the healthcare  
333 system. Scaling up this intervention might thus reduce social inequalities in health.  
334 Consideration now needs to be given on how to make it available and free of charge in  
335 current practice.

## 336 **Declarations**

### 337 Ethics approval and consent to participate

338 The French Data Protection Authority (CNIL, registration number 921135) and the French  
339 Personal Data Protection Committee (Comite de Protection des Personnes, registration  
340 number 21.01.19.44753 amended by 21.05022.944753 decision, allowing and increased  
341 number of inclusions and additional data collection) gave full ethical approval. Pregnant  
342 women and fathers-to-be included in the study gave their consent after being fully informed



343 Consent for publication

344 Participants' consent to publication is not required, as no identifying information is provided.

345 All co-authors have reviewed and approved the submitted manuscript.

346 Availability of data and materials

347 The datasets generated during PARTAGE study are not publicly available, but are available

348 from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

349 Competing interests

350 The authors have no competing interests.

351 Funding

352 PARTAGE study was financed by the French Agency for research on AIDS, viral hepatitis,

353 tuberculosis and emerging infectious diseases (ANRS-MIE) (research team's salaries) and by

354 the French Society against AIDS (SFLS), to implement and evaluate a Saturday consultation

355 outside hospital walls. Montreuil's hospital also received a donation from GILEAD to develop

356 PARTAGE's communication and IT tools.

357 Authors' contributions

358 Conceptualization: PP, ADL, GJ, AG, TP

359 Data curation: PP, TP, RH, AG, GJ, CT

360 Formal analysis: PP, ADL

361 Funding Acquisition: PP, PEM

362 Investigation: VAM, CT, GJ, AG

363 Methodology: PP, ADL

364 Project administration: PP, GJ, AG, PEM, BR

365 Software: TP

366 Supervision: ADL

367 Writing-original draft: PP, ADL

368 Aknowledgments

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

374 We thank Christophe Michon, Nathalie Lydié, Joanna Orne-Gliemann, Laurent Mandelbrot,  
375 Corinne Taeron, Nicolas Derche, Gwenaëlle Morvan, Bernadette Rwegera, Mélanie Jaunay,  
376 Ruth Foundje Notemi, Elisa Wardzala, Caroline Regnier, Paul Chalvin, Priscillia Ribouchon,  
377 Neima Sghiouar, Abdelkrim Imechket, Pauline Aubry, Francis Bouvier, David Benhammou,  
378 Andrainolo Ravalihasy, Karna Coulibaly, Guy Nielsen, the Montreuil Municipality, the Seine  
379 Saint Denis Departmental Council.

380 References

381 1. Greig A, Kimmel M, Lang J. Men, Masculinities & Development: Broadening Our Work  
382 Towards Gender Equality [Internet]. 2000 mai [cité 21 août 2023] p. 22. (Gender in  
383 development monograph series). Report No.: 10. Disponible sur:  
384 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/246771572\\_Men\\_Masculinities\\_Development\\_B](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/246771572_Men_Masculinities_Development_B)

- 385 roadening\_Our\_Work\_Towards\_Gender\_Equality/link/572ad85708ae057b0a0797cd/down  
386 load
- 387 2. Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques, éditeur. Femmes et hommes,  
388 l'égalité en question. Éd. 2022. Montrouge: INSEE; 2022. (INSEE Références).
- 389 3. Sandman D, Simantov E, An C. Out of touch: American men and the health care system -  
390 Commonwealth Fund Men's and Women's Health Survey Findings. USA: The  
391 Commonwealth Fund; 2000 mars.
- 392 4. Bertakis KD, Azari R, Helms LJ, Callahan EJ, Robbins JA. Gender differences in the  
393 utilization of health care services. *J Fam Pract.* févr 2000;49(2):147-52.
- 394 5. Koechlin A. La norme gynécologique: ce que la médecine fait au corps des femmes. Paris:  
395 Éditions Amsterdam; 2022. 305 p.
- 396 6. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive  
397 pregnancy experience [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2016 [cité 22 août  
398 2023]. 152 p. Disponible sur: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/250796>
- 399 7. Dahl CM, Miller ES, Leziak K, Jackson J, Yee LM. Short Communication:  
400 Communication Between Pregnant Women and Male Partners About HIV Testing in the  
401 United States. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses.* sept 2021;37(9):683-6.
- 402 8. Desgrées-Du-Loû A, Brou H, Djohan G, Becquet R, Ekouevi DK, Zanou B, et al.  
403 Beneficial Effects of Offering Prenatal HIV Counselling and Testing on Developing a HIV  
404 Preventive Attitude among Couples. Abidjan, 2002–2005. *AIDS Behav.* avr  
405 2009;13(2):348-55.

- 406 9. Orne-Gliemann J, Balestre E, Tchendjou P, Miric M, Darak S, Butsashvili M, et al.  
407 Increasing HIV testing among male partners. *AIDS Lond Engl.* 24 avr  
408 2013;27(7):1167-77.
- 409 10. Dhairyawan R, Creighton S, Sivyour L, Anderson J. Testing the fathers: carrying out  
410 HIV and STI tests on partners of pregnant women. *Sex Transm Infect.* avr  
411 2012;88(3):184-6.
- 412 11. Chanyalew H, Girma E, Birhane T, Chanie MG. Male partner involvement in HIV  
413 testing and counseling among partners of pregnant women in the Delanta District, Ethiopia.  
414 *PloS One.* 2021;16(3):e0248436.
- 415 12. Mohlala BKF, Boily MC, Gregson S. The forgotten half of the equation: randomized  
416 controlled trial of a male invitation to attend couple voluntary counselling and testing.  
417 *AIDS Lond Engl.* 31 juill 2011;25(12):1535-41.
- 418 13. McCloud MB. Health Behavior Change in Pregnant Women With Obesity. *Nurs*  
419 *Womens Health.* déc 2018;22(6):471-80.
- 420 14. Anderson AE, Hure AJ, Powers JR, Kay-Lambkin FJ, Loxton DJ. Determinants of  
421 pregnant women's compliance with alcohol guidelines: a prospective cohort study. *BMC*  
422 *Public Health.* 13 sept 2012;12:777.
- 423 15. Martin LT, McNamara MJ, Milot AS, Halle T, Hair EC. The effects of father  
424 involvement during pregnancy on receipt of prenatal care and maternal smoking. *Matern*  
425 *Child Health J.* nov 2007;11(6):595-602.

- 426 16. Kotelchuck M, Levy RA, Nadel HM. Voices of Fathers During Pregnancy: The MGH  
427 Prenatal Care Obstetrics Fatherhood Study Methods and Results. *Matern Child Health J.*  
428 août 2022;26(8):1603–12.
- 429 17. Gedzyk-Nieman SA. Postpartum and Paternal Postnatal Depression: Identification,  
430 Risks, and Resources. *Nurs Clin North Am.* sept 2021;56(3):325–43.
- 431 18. Smythe KL, Petersen I, Schartau P. Prevalence of Perinatal Depression and Anxiety in  
432 Both Parents: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open.* 1 juin  
433 2022;5(6):e2218969.
- 434 19. Grau Grau M, Las Heras Maestro M, Riley Bowles H. Engaged fatherhood for men,  
435 families and gender equality: healthcare, social policy, and work perspectives [Internet].  
436 Springer Nature; 2022 [cité 11 juill 2023]. 325 p. Disponible sur:  
437 <https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/50717>
- 438 20. Tran TC, Pillonel J, Cazein F, Sommen C, Bonnet C, Blondel B, et al. Antenatal HIV  
439 screening: results from the National Perinatal Survey, France, 2016. *Euro Surveill Bull Eur*  
440 *Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull.* oct 2019;24(40).
- 441 21. Réévaluation de la stratégie de dépistage de l'infection à VIH en France [Internet].  
442 Haute Autorité de Santé; 2017 [cité 23 août 2023] p. 305. Disponible sur: [https://www.has-](https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/2017-03/dir2/reevaluation_de_la_strategie_depistage_vih_-_recommandation.pdf)  
443 [sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/2017-](https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/2017-03/dir2/reevaluation_de_la_strategie_depistage_vih_-_recommandation.pdf)  
444 [03/dir2/reevaluation\\_de\\_la\\_strategie\\_depistage\\_vih\\_-\\_recommandation.pdf](https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/2017-03/dir2/reevaluation_de_la_strategie_depistage_vih_-_recommandation.pdf)
- 445 22. Penot P. [Acceptabilité et faisabilité d'une consultation prénatale masculine de  
446 Prévention, Accès aux droits, Rattrapage vaccinal, Traitement des Affections pendant la  
447 Grossesse et pour l'Enfant]. 23rd French AIDS society (SFLS) conference présenté à:  
448 Plenary session « Beyond gender boundaries »; 2022 nov 17; Paris.

- 449 23. Chevrot J, Khelladi I, Omont L, Wolber O, Bikun Bi Nkott F, Fourré C, et al. La  
450 Seine-Saint-Denis : entre dynamisme économique et difficultés sociales persistantes  
451 [Internet]. INSEE; 2020 [cité 8 juin 2023]. Disponible sur:  
452 file:///C:/Users/PPENOT/Downloads/if\_ina\_114.pdf
- 453 24. Crequit S, Chatzistergiou K, Bierry G, Bouali S, La Tour AD, Sgihouar N, et al.  
454 Association between social vulnerability profiles, prenatal care use and pregnancy  
455 outcomes. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 22 juin 2023;23(1):465.
- 456 25. Crequit S, Bierry G, Maria P, Bouali S, La Tour AD, Sgihouar N, et al. Use of  
457 pregnancy personalised follow-up in case of maternal social vulnerability to reduce  
458 prematurity and neonatal morbidity. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 26 avr 2023;23(1):289.
- 459 26. Rogel A, Plaine J, Quintin C, De Maria F. Participation au programme de dépistage  
460 organisé du cancer du sein entre 2005 et 2021 en France. *Bull Epidémiologique Hebd-*  
461 *BEH*. 11 juill 2023;(14):255-65.
- 462 27. Quintin C, Plaine J, Rogel A, De Maria F. Premiers indicateurs de performance du  
463 programme de dépistage du cancer colorectal (participation, tests non analysables, tests  
464 positifs). Évolution depuis 2010 et focus sur les années Covid 2020-2021 en France. *Bull*  
465 *Epidémiologique Hebd-BEH*. 11 juill 2023;(14):266-72.
- 466 28. Hoeck S, Van Roy K, Willems S. Barriers and facilitators to participate in the  
467 colorectal cancer screening programme in Flanders (Belgium): a focus group study. *Acta*  
468 *Clin Belg*. févr 2022;77(1):37-44.
- 469 29. Rondet C, Lapostolle A, Soler M, Grillo F, Parizot I, Chauvin P. Are immigrants and  
470 nationals born to immigrants at higher risk for delayed or no lifetime breast and cervical

- 471 cancer screening? The results from a population-based survey in Paris metropolitan area in  
472 2010. *PloS One*. 2014;9(1):e87046.
- 473 30. Freeman HP. The history, principles, and future of patient navigation: commentary.  
474 *Semin Oncol Nurs*. mai 2013;29(2):72-5.
- 475 31. Mosquera I, Todd A, Balaj M, Zhang L, Benitez Majano S, Mensah K, et al.  
476 Components and effectiveness of patient navigation programmes to increase participation  
477 to breast, cervical and colorectal cancer screening: A systematic review. *Cancer Med*. juill  
478 2023;12(13):14584-611.
- 479 32. Byamugisha R, Åstrøm AN, Ndeezi G, Karamagi CAS, Tylleskär T, Tumwine JK.  
480 Male partner antenatal attendance and HIV testing in eastern Uganda: a randomized  
481 facility-based intervention trial. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 13 sept 2011;14:43.
- 482 33. Osoi AO, John-Stewart G, Kiarie J, Richardson B, Kinuthia J, Krakowiak D, et al.  
483 Home visits during pregnancy enhance male partner HIV counselling and testing in Kenya:  
484 a randomized clinical trial. *AIDS Lond Engl*. 2 janv 2014;28(1):95-103.
- 485 34. Tokhi M, Comrie-Thomson L, Davis J, Portela A, Chersich M, Luchters S. Involving  
486 men to improve maternal and newborn health: A systematic review of the effectiveness of  
487 interventions. *PloS One*. 2018;13(1):e0191620.
- 488 35. Haile F, Brhan Y. Male partner involvements in PMTCT: a cross sectional study,  
489 Mekelle, Northern Ethiopia. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 12 févr 2014;14:65.
- 490 36. Cahen F. Le gouvernement des grossesses en France (1920-1970). *Rev Hist Prot Soc*.  
491 janv 2014;(7):34-57.

- 492 37. Gerstel N, Clawson D. Control Over Time: Employers, Workers, and Families  
493 Shaping Work Schedules. *Annu Rev Sociol.* 2018;44:77-97.
- 494 38. Vignier N, Desgrées du Loû A, Pannetier J, Ravalihasy A, Gosselin A, Lert F, et al.  
495 Access to health insurance coverage among Subsaharan African migrants living in France:  
496 Results of the ANRS-PARCOURS study. *PloS One.* 2018;13(2):e0192916.
- 497 39. Berchet C, Jusot F. État de santé et recours aux soins des immigrés en France : une  
498 revue de la littérature. *Bull Epidémiologique Hebd-BEH.* 17 janv 2012;(2-3-4):17-21.
- 499 40. Lebano A, Hamed S, Bradby H, Gil-Salmerón A, Durá-Ferrandis E, Garcés-Ferrer J,  
500 et al. Migrants' and refugees' health status and healthcare in Europe: a scoping literature  
501 review. *BMC Public Health.* déc 2020;20(1):1039.
- 502