# The Use of Female Sex Workers Among Men in Nepal: Prevalence, STIs/HIV-Related Risk Behaviors, and Gender Ideology



Roman Shrestha<sup>1,2</sup>, Pramila Karki<sup>2,3</sup> and Michael Copenhaver<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Community Medicine and Health Care, University of Connecticut Health Center, Farmington, CT, USA. <sup>2</sup>Institute for Collaboration on Health, Intervention, and Policy, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA. <sup>3</sup>Department of Allied Health Sciences, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA.

ABSTRACT: Heterosexual sex involving female sex workers (FSWs) is widely documented for its role in facilitating the spread of sexually transmitted infections (STIs)/HIV. Critical to such studies, and increasingly considered essential to HIV prevention efforts, is the gender constructs and power dynamics within relationships. However, little efforts have been made, which focus on male clients of FSWs, particularly on the relationship between gender ideologies and men's sexual contact with FSWs, within the Nepali context. The present study aims to fill this critical gap by assessing the prevalence of use of FSWs and its association with STIs/HIV-related risk behaviors and gender ideologies among Nepali men. We used data from the nationally representative Nepal Demographic Health Survey (NDHS) 2011. For the purpose of analyses, we included a sample of 4,121 men, aged 15–49 years. During data analyses, we used multivariate logistic regression models, adjusted for the following variables: age, region, residence, religion, educational level, wealth index, employment status, and cigarette smoking status. Of the total sample, approximately 5% reported the use of FSWs in their lifetime. In regression models, men who had sex with FSWs were more likely to report a history of STIs [adjusted odds ratio (aOR): 3.03; 95% confidence interval (CI): 1.69–5.43; P < 0.001], not using condom all the time (aOR: 1.31; 95% CI: 1.05–2.12; P = 0.010), more than one sexual partner (aOR: 3.75; 95% CI: 2.18–5.23; P < 0.001), and have had early sexual debut (aOR: 2.60; 95% CI: 1.85–3.67; P < 0.001). Respondents reporting the endorsement of violence against wives (aOR: 1.65; 95% CI: 1.01–2.84; P = 0.04) and male sexual entitlement (aOR: 1.63; 95% CI: 1.21–2.32; P = 0.001) were significantly more likely to report sexual contact with FSWs. Our findings highlight the need to develop and implement specifically tailored interventions toward male clients of FSWs, with a particular emphasis on promoting equitable gender roles and beli

KEYWORDS: transactional sex, female sex workers, HIV/AIDS, sexual risk behaviors, gender ideology, Nepal

CITATION: Shrestha et al. The Use of Female Sex Workers Among Men in Nepal: Prevalence, STIs/HIV-Related Risk Behaviors, and Gender Ideology. Primary Prevention Insights 2016:6 11–17 doi:10.4137/PPRI.S39664.

TYPE: Original Research

RECEIVED: March 9, 2016. RESUBMITTED: May 12, 2016. ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION: May 15, 2016.

ACADEMIC EDITOR: Anthony Wai-leung Kwok, Editor in Chief

**PEER REVIEW:** Two peer reviewers contributed to the peer review report. Reviewers' reports totaled 742 words, excluding any confidential comments to the academic editor.

**FUNDING:** Funding to support the preparation of the article was provided by a National Institute of Health (NIH) Grant (K02DA033139) to Michael M. Copenhaver. The authors confirm that the funder had no influence over the study design, content of the article, or selection of this journal.

COMPETING INTERESTS: Authors disclose no potential conflicts of interest.

COPYRIGHT: © the authors, publisher and licensee Libertas Academica Limited. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons CC-BY-NC 3.0 License.

CORRESPONDENCE: roman.shrestha@uconn.edu

Paper subject to independent expert single-blind peer review. All editorial decisions made by independent academic editor. Upon submission manuscript was subject to anti-plagiarism scanning. Prior to publication all authors have given signed confirmation of agreement to article publication and compliance with all applicable ethical and legal requirements, including the accuracy of author and contributor information, disclosure of competing interests and funding sources, compliance with ethical requirements relating to human and animal study participants, and compliance with any copyright requirements of third parties. This journal is a member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Published by Libertas Academica. Learn more about this journal

### Introduction

Globally, heterosexual sex involving female sex workers (FSWs) and their male clients is widely documented for its role in facilitating the spread of sexually transmitted infections (STIs), including HIV.<sup>1–3</sup> Research on this issue has been primarily focused on FSWs, with findings of high sexual risk practices and high rates of STIs/HIV among these populations.<sup>4,5</sup> Efforts have been made, which focus on male clients of FSWs in terms of curtailing the spread of STI/HIV, although to a lesser extent. A growing body of research shows high rates of inconsistent condom use, multiple sex partners, substance use, and HIV/STI among male clients of FSWs.<sup>1,6–8</sup> These findings have prompted increasing recognition of male clients of FSWs as a critical *bridge population* by which STIs/HIV infection may spread from high-risk populations (eg, FSWs) to the general population (eg, wives and steady female partners).<sup>1,9,10</sup>

The HIV epidemic in Nepal is considered to be driven by the Most-at-Risk Population groups, including FSWs and

their clients.<sup>11</sup> Despite a growing body of research on FSWs and their role in HIV epidemic, 12-14 considerably little research has been devoted to their male clients in the Nepali context. Research to date has revealed that the use of FSWs in Nepal may be common among truck drivers and migrant workers, and often involves young men. 15-17 These studies were focused primarily among higher risk groups (eg, transport workers, construction workers, and returnee migrant workers).<sup>9,15,17</sup> Hence, the degree to which this issue persists in the general population remains unclear. Furthermore, no populationbased studies conducted till date have investigated either the prevalence or correlates of Nepali men's use of FSWs and its link with gender ideologies and STIs/HIV-related risk behaviors. Such exploration is particularly important in order to highlight the need for the investigation of men's patterns of use of FSWs to inform STIs/HIV preventive strategies.

Critical to such studies, and increasingly considered essential to HIV prevention efforts, is the gender constructs



and power dynamics within relationships. A growing body of research has documented the ways in which gender ideologies and/or traditional gender beliefs present challenges to STI/HIV prevention efforts within a given cultural context. 8,18,19 In particular, attitudes of men's sexual entitlement (ie, supportive of male sexual privilege) and culturally sanctioned norms of masculinity contributes to asymmetrical power balance that facilitate men's sexual contact with FSWs and risk for STIs/HIV. For example, men's use of FSWs is often viewed as a manifestation of masculinity, 20–22 and men's perceptions of sexual entitlement seem to relate to their use of FSWs and to unsafe sexual practices. 8,23,24 Yet, relatively little attention has been paid to the association between gender ideologies and men's use of FSWs within the Nepali context.

In an effort to address this gap in research and to maximize inferences of the findings to the general population, we conducted this study using population-based data. This study aimed to (1) assess the prevalence of Nepali men's use of FSWs; (2) examine the demographic correlates of men's engaging in sex with FSWs; and (3) examine the association of FSW sexual contact with STIs/HIV-related risk behaviors and major aspects of men's traditional gender ideologies (ie, endorsement of violence against wives and sexual entitlement).

### Methods

Study design. We used data from the Nepal Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS) 2011, which is a nationally representative cross-sectional survey.<sup>25</sup> The NDHS utilized a multistage cluster-sampling procedure for data collection. The first stage involved the selection of a total of 95 urban and 194 rural enumeration areas (wards in the village development committees and subwards in the municipalities). In the second stage, households within each enumeration area were selected adopting systematic sampling technique. Participants were recruited by trained research assistants and were interviewed privately. All participants provided written informed consent prior to data collection. The NDHS utilized face-to-face interview using a structured questionnaire to collect data. The questionnaires were translated from English into the three main local languages (Nepali, Maithali, and Bhojpuri) and back translated into English. Further details of sampling technique, data collection, and data management procedures are documented elsewhere. 25 This procedure identified 12,918 eligible women, of which 12,674 completed the survey, and 4,323 eligible men, of which 4,121 completed the survey, resulting in the response rate of 95.3%. For the purpose of this study, we then restricted our sample to men aged 15-49 years. This comprised a total of 4,121 men.

Ethical approval for the NDHS protocol was obtained from the Nepal Health Research Council, Nepal, and the IFC Macro Institutional Review Board, USA. The present study complied with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

**Measures.** We used basic sociodemographic variables such as age, ecological region, place of residence, religion, educational status, employment status, marital status, wealth index, and current smoking status of the participants. The dependent variable, *sex with FSW*, was assessed via a question regarding sexual contacts: *sexual contact with an FSW* (in lifetime). Men's affirmative response to this question was coded as *yes* for sex with FSW.

Variables of interest were grouped into two categories: STIs/HIV-related sexual risk behaviors and gender ideologies. Items used to measure individuals' sexual risk behaviors included the following: during the past 12 months, have you had: (i) a disease which you got through sexual contact; (ii) had a bad-smelling abnormal genital discharge; or (iii) had a genital sore/ulcer?, What is the total number of sexual partners you had in your lifetime?, Was a condom used every time you had sex in the past 12 months?, Was a condom used in the last time you had sexual intercourse?, and How old were you when you had sexual intercourse for the very first time?. As in prior study, participants who reported to have had first intercourse at or before the age of 16 were classified as having early sexual debut.<sup>26</sup>

Variables related to gender ideologies were grouped into two domains: (1) justification of violence against wife and (2) sexual entitlement. The former domain, which captured attitudes and beliefs about wife beating, was assessed using a modified version of the Battering is Justified Subscale of the Attitudes and Believes about Wife Beating Scale.<sup>27</sup> Respondents were asked if husbands were justified in hitting or beating wives across five contexts (eg, wife goes out without telling husband, wife neglects the children, wife argues with husband, wife refuses to have sex with husband, and wife burns food). Affirmative response to any of these items was coded as yes for justification of violence against wife. In addition, sexual entitlement of the sampled men was measured using the standard Nepal Demographic and Health Survey questions<sup>25</sup>: wife justified refusing sex if husband has other women and wife justified asking husband to use condom if he has STI. The missing data on the dichotomous variables (eg, sex with FSW, STIs/HIV-related risk factors, and gender ideology among participants) were treated as no.

**Analysis.** The prevalence estimates of use of FSWs were calculated for the overall sample. Univariate analyses were carried out in order to examine the frequency distribution of these data. We calculated the prevalence estimates for each item across both gender ideology scales. In order to determine the demographic correlates of use of FSWs, multivariate logistic regression models were constructed. All key assumptions of regression were checked before conducting regression analysis. The regression model was adjusted for all possible covariates: age, region, residence, religion, educational level, wealth index, employment status, and cigarette smoking status; the selection of which was guided by the results from prior studies and univariate analyses. We used SPSS software, version 20.0, to conduct data analyses with  $P < 0.05.^{28}$  As recommended



by the NDHS report, we weighted our analyses using the sample weight to account for the complex sampling design of the NDHS.

### Results

Participant characteristics. The current study included 4,121 men (age range, 15–49 years), with a mean current age of 29.1 years. More than half of the respondents were from Terai region, and 82.6% of them from rural areas. The majority of them were identified as Hindu (84.6%) and reported to have received some form of formal education (86.2%). Over 77% of the sampled men reported to be currently involved in some sort of income-generating activities and were distributed fairly evenly across the wealth quintiles. Of the total sample, almost two-thirds of them indicated to be currently married. Across the total sample, almost 5% reported to have had sexual contact with FSWs in their lifetime (Table 1).

STIs/HIV-related risk factors and gender ideology. The prevalence of self-reported STIs among this sample was found to be 2.5%. More than two-third of the respondents (69%) reported to be sexually active in the past 12 months. Just 3.8% of the respondents reported having more than one sexual partners in the past 12 months. Of those who were sexually active in the past 12 months, only a small proportion of them (10.8%) reported consistently using condom during every sexual intercourse and 16.3% reported using a condom during their last sexual encounter. One in every seven individuals reported having an early sexual debut (Table 2).

In terms of gender ideologies, only 2.8% of the respondents expressed endorsement of violence against wives (eg, husband justified in hitting or beating wife). Similarly, attitudes of sexual entitlement among sampled men varied across survey items: 73.7% of the respondents reported that the wife is justified in refusing sex if her husband has other women and only 4.3% of them reported that the wife is justified in asking her husband to use a condom if he has STI (Table 2).

Association between participant characteristics and the use of FSWs. In a multivariate logistic regression analysis, several independent factors were identified that are related to lifetime use of FSWs. Men with higher levels of formal education were 1.87 times more likely to have engaged in sexual activity with FSWs as compared to those with no formal education. Similarly, men belonging to the richest wealth index were 2.28 times more likely to have sexual relationship with FSWs as compared to those in the poorest wealth index. Further, it was identified that divorced men were 5.08 times more likely to have sexual contact with FSWs as compared to unmarried men (Table 3).

Association of the use of FSWs with STIs/HIV-related risk behaviors and gender ideology. Respondents who reported the use of FSWs were 3.03 times more likely to report a history of STIs compared to those who did not report

**Table 1.** Characteristics of participants (N = 4,121).

VARIABLES	n	%
Age (years)		
<19	978	23.7
20–29	1266	30.7
30–39	1041	25.3
40 and above	836	20.3
Mean ± SD	29.1 ± 10.1	
Region		
Mountain	245	5.9
Hill	1658	40.2
Terai <sup>a</sup>	2218	53.8
Residence		
Urban	717	17.4
Rural	3404	82.6
Religion		
Hindu	3472	84.2
Buddhist	354	8.6
Muslim	128	3.1
Others <sup>b</sup>	168	4.1
Educational level		
No education	567	13.8
Primary	814	19.7
Secondary	2108	51.1
Higher	632	15.3
Wealth index		
Poorest	610	14.8
Poorer	695	16.9
Middle	830	20.1
Richer	920	22.3
Richest	1066	25.9
Employment status		
No	929	22.5
Yes	3192	77.5
Marital status		
Never married	1433	34.8
Married <sup>c</sup>	2626	63.7
Widowed	23	0.5
Divorced <sup>d</sup>	39	0.9
Use of FSWs <sup>e</sup>		
No	3927	95.3
Yes	194	4.7

**Notes:** <sup>a</sup>Low-lying, southern plain land in Nepal. <sup>b</sup>Includes Christian, Kirat, and others. <sup>c</sup>Includes married and living with partner. <sup>d</sup>Includes divorced, no longer living together, and separated. <sup>e</sup>Female sex workers.

the use of FSWs. Among surveyed men who reported being engaged in penetrative sex in the past 12 months, those who reported having engaged in sexual activity with FSWs were 3.75 times more likely to report multiple sex partner, 1.31 times



**Table 2.** STIs/HIV-related risk factors and gender ideology among participants (N = 4,121).

VARIABLES	n	%
STIs/HIV-related risk factors <sup>a</sup>		
History of STI (last 12 months) <sup>b</sup>		
No	4017	97.5
Yes	104	2.5
No. of sex partners (last 12 months)		
0	1279	31.0
1	2686	65.2
2–4	146	3.6
≥5	9	0.2
Multiple sex partners (last 12 months)		
No	3966	96.2
Yes	155	3.8
Used condom every time (last 12 months)	n = 2842	
No	2534	89.2
Yes	308	10.8
Used condom during last sex	n = 2842	
No	2379	83.7
Yes	463	16.3
Early sexual debut <sup>c</sup>		
No	3512	85.2
Yes	609	14.8
Gender ideology		
Husband is justified in hitting or beating wifed		
No	4005	97.2
Yes	116	2.8
Wife justified refusing sex if husband has other women		
No	1085	26.3
Yes	3026	73.7
Wife justified asking husband to use condom if he has STI		
No	179	4.3
Yes	3942	95.7

Notes: annotates STIs and HIV/AIDS. bIncludes bad smelling genital discharge and genital sore/ulcer. altern dichotomized: No: age of first sex at or before 16 years; Yes: age of first sex after 16 years of age. Beating justified: if wife goes out without telling husband, neglects the children, argues with husband, refuses to have sex with husband, and burns food.

less likely to have used condom during last penetrative sex, and 2.60 times more likely to have early sexual debut.

Men reporting the endorsement of violence against wives (eg, husband justified hitting or beating wife) were 1.65 times more likely to have engaged in sexual intercourse with FSWs as compared to those reporting no use of FSWs. Similarly, Nepali men demonstrating sexual entitlement (ie, wife not justified refusing sex if husband has other women) were 1.63 times more likely to report a sexual relationship with FSWs than their counterparts (Table 4).

**Table 3.** Association between participant characteristics and the use of FSWs, listed with odds ratio (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs).

OR         95% CI         P           Age         0.99         0.97, 1.01         0.855           Region         Mountain         —         —         —           Hill         1.42         0.62, 3.27         0.405           Teraia         1.71         0.74, 3.92         0.206           Residence         —         —         —           Urban         —         —         —           Rural         1.13         0.75, 1.71         0.543           Religion         —         —         —           Hindu         —         —         —           Buddhist         1.08         0.61, 1.92         0.778           Muslim         1.02         0.42, 2.46         0.965           Othersb         1.13         0.51, 2.51         0.751           Educational level         No education         —         —         —           No education         —         —         —         —           Primary         1.03         0.59, 1.81         0.902           Secondary         1.38         0.81, 2.35         0.230           Higher         1.87         1.01, 3.50         0.050 <t< th=""><th colspan="4">VARIABLES USE OF FSWs</th></t<>	VARIABLES USE OF FSWs			
Region  Mountain		OR	95% CI	P
Mountain         -         -         -           Hill         1.42         0.62, 3.27         0.405           Teraia         1.71         0.74, 3.92         0.206           Residence           Urban         -         -         -           Rural         1.13         0.75, 1.71         0.543           Religion         -         -         -           Hindu         -         -         -           Buddhist         1.08         0.61, 1.92         0.778           Muslim         1.02         0.42, 2.46         0.965           Othersb         1.13         0.51, 2.51         0.751           Educational level         No education         -         -         -           Primary         1.03         0.59, 1.81         0.902           Secondary         1.38         0.81, 2.35         0.230           Higher         1.87         1.01, 3.50         0.050           Wealth index           Poorest         -         -         -           Poorest         -         -         -           Poorest         -         -         -           Poorest         -	Age	0.99	0.97, 1.01	0.855
Hill         1.42         0.62, 3.27         0.405           Teraia         1.71         0.74, 3.92         0.206           Residence         Urban         —         —         —           Rural         1.13         0.75, 1.71         0.543           Religion         —         —         —           Hindu         —         —         —           Buddhist         1.08         0.61, 1.92         0.778           Muslim         1.02         0.42, 2.46         0.965           Othersb         1.13         0.51, 2.51         0.751           Educational level         No education         —         —         —           Primary         1.03         0.59, 1.81         0.902           Secondary         1.38         0.81, 2.35         0.230           Higher         1.87         1.01, 3.50         0.050           Wealth index           Poorest         —         —         —           Poorest         —         —         —           Poorer         0.73         0.37, 1.47         0.389           Middle         1.60         0.88, 2.90         0.117           Richest <td< td=""><td>Region</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Region			
Teraia         1.71         0.74, 3.92         0.206           Residence         Urban         -         -         -           Rural         1.13         0.75, 1.71         0.543           Religion         -         -         -           Hindu         -         -         -           Buddhist         1.08         0.61, 1.92         0.778           Muslim         1.02         0.42, 2.46         0.965           Othersb         1.13         0.51, 2.51         0.751           Educational level         No education         -         -         -           Primary         1.03         0.59, 1.81         0.902           Secondary         1.38         0.81, 2.35         0.230           Higher         1.87         1.01, 3.50         0.050           Wealth index           Poorest         -         -         -           Poorer         0.73         0.37, 1.47         0.389           Middle         1.60         0.88, 2.90         0.117           Richer         1.46         0.78, 2.72         0.233           Richest         2.28         1.21, 4.30         0.010	Mountain	_	_	_
Residence         Urban       -       -       -       -       -         Rural       1.13       0.75, 1.71       0.543         Religion       -       -       -       -         Hindu       -       -       -       -         Buddhist       1.08       0.61, 1.92       0.778         Muslim       1.02       0.42, 2.46       0.965         Othersb       1.13       0.51, 2.51       0.751         Educational level       -       -       -         No education       -       -       -         Primary       1.03       0.59, 1.81       0.902         Secondary       1.38       0.81, 2.35       0.230         Higher       1.87       1.01, 3.50       0.050         Wealth index         Poorest       -       -       -         Poorest       -       -       -         Poorer       0.73       0.37, 1.47       0.389         Middle       1.60       0.88, 2.90       0.117         Richest       2.28       1.21, 4.30       0.010         Employment status         No       -       -	Hill	1.42	0.62, 3.27	0.405
Urban       -       -       -         Rural       1.13       0.75, 1.71       0.543         Religion       -       -       -         Hindu       -       -       -         Buddhist       1.08       0.61, 1.92       0.778         Muslim       1.02       0.42, 2.46       0.965         Others¹b       1.13       0.51, 2.51       0.751         Educational level       -       -       -         No education       -       -       -         Primary       1.03       0.59, 1.81       0.902         Secondary       1.38       0.81, 2.35       0.230         Higher       1.87       1.01, 3.50       0.050         Wealth index         Poorest       -       -       -         Poorest       -       -       -         Poorest       -       -       -         Poorer       0.73       0.37, 1.47       0.389         Middle       1.60       0.88, 2.90       0.117         Richest       2.28       1.21, 4.30       0.010         Employment status         No       -       -       -	Terai <sup>a</sup>	1.71	0.74, 3.92	0.206
Rural       1.13       0.75, 1.71       0.543         Religion       Hindu       -       -       -         Buddhist       1.08       0.61, 1.92       0.778         Muslim       1.02       0.42, 2.46       0.965         Othersb       1.13       0.51, 2.51       0.751         Educational level         No education       -       -       -         Primary       1.03       0.59, 1.81       0.902         Secondary       1.38       0.81, 2.35       0.230         Higher       1.87       1.01, 3.50       0.050         Wealth index         Poorest       -       -       -         Poorer       0.73       0.37, 1.47       0.389         Middle       1.60       0.88, 2.90       0.117         Richest       2.28       1.21, 4.30       0.010         Employment status         No       -       -       -         Yes       1.23       0.79, 1.90       0.344         Marital status         Never married       -       -       -         Marriedc       1.42       0.89, 2.26       0.132         Widowed<	Residence			
Religion         Hindu       -       -       -         Buddhist       1.08       0.61, 1.92       0.778         Muslim       1.02       0.42, 2.46       0.965         Othersb       1.13       0.51, 2.51       0.751         Educational level         No education       -       -       -         Primary       1.03       0.59, 1.81       0.902         Secondary       1.38       0.81, 2.35       0.230         Higher       1.87       1.01, 3.50       0.050         Wealth index         Poorest       -       -       -         Poorer       0.73       0.37, 1.47       0.389         Middle       1.60       0.88, 2.90       0.117         Richer       1.46       0.78, 2.72       0.233         Richest       2.28       1.21, 4.30       0.010         Employment status         No       -       -       -         Yes       1.23       0.79, 1.90       0.344         Marital status         Never married       -       -       -         Married <sup>c</sup> 1.42       0.89, 2.26       0.132      <	Urban	_	_	_
Hindu         -         -         -           Buddhist         1.08         0.61, 1.92         0.778           Muslim         1.02         0.42, 2.46         0.965           Othersb         1.13         0.51, 2.51         0.751           Educational level         No education         -         -         -           Primary         1.03         0.59, 1.81         0.902           Secondary         1.38         0.81, 2.35         0.230           Higher         1.87         1.01, 3.50         0.050           Wealth index         Poorest         -         -         -           Poorest         -         -         -         -           Poorer         0.73         0.37, 1.47         0.389           Middle         1.60         0.88, 2.90         0.117           Richer         1.46         0.78, 2.72         0.233           Richest         2.28         1.21, 4.30         0.010           Employment status           No         -         -         -           Yes         1.23         0.79, 1.90         0.344           Marital status         -         -         -	Rural	1.13	0.75, 1.71	0.543
Buddhist         1.08         0.61, 1.92         0.778           Muslim         1.02         0.42, 2.46         0.965           Othersb         1.13         0.51, 2.51         0.751           Educational level         No education         —         —         —           Primary         1.03         0.59, 1.81         0.902           Secondary         1.38         0.81, 2.35         0.230           Higher         1.87         1.01, 3.50         0.050           Wealth index         Poorest         —         —         —           Poorest         —         —         —         —           Poorer         0.73         0.37, 1.47         0.389           Middle         1.60         0.88, 2.90         0.117           Richer         1.46         0.78, 2.72         0.233           Richest         2.28         1.21, 4.30         0.010           Employment status           No         —         —         —           Yes         1.23         0.79, 1.90         0.344           Marital status         Never married         —         —         —           Midowed         1.12	Religion			
Muslim         1.02         0.42, 2.46         0.965           Othersb         1.13         0.51, 2.51         0.751           Educational level         No education         —         —         —           Primary         1.03         0.59, 1.81         0.902           Secondary         1.38         0.81, 2.35         0.230           Higher         1.87         1.01, 3.50         0.050           Wealth index         Poorest         —         —         —           Poorest         —         —         —         —           Poorer         0.73         0.37, 1.47         0.389           Middle         1.60         0.88, 2.90         0.117           Richer         1.46         0.78, 2.72         0.233           Richest         2.28         1.21, 4.30         0.010           Employment status           No         —         —         —           Yes         1.23         0.79, 1.90         0.344           Marital status         Never married         —         —         —           Marriedc         1.42         0.89, 2.26         0.132           Widowed         1.12	Hindu	_	_	_
Othersb         1.13         0.51, 2.51         0.751           Educational level         -         -         -           No education         -         -         -           Primary         1.03         0.59, 1.81         0.902           Secondary         1.38         0.81, 2.35         0.230           Higher         1.87         1.01, 3.50         0.050           Wealth index         -         -         -         -           Poorest         -         -         -         -           Poorer         0.73         0.37, 1.47         0.389           Middle         1.60         0.88, 2.90         0.117           Richer         1.46         0.78, 2.72         0.233           Richest         2.28         1.21, 4.30         0.010           Employment status         No         -         -         -           Yes         1.23         0.79, 1.90         0.344           Marital status         Never married         -         -         -           Married <sup>c</sup> 1.42         0.89, 2.26         0.132           Widowed         1.12         0.13, 9.19         0.911	Buddhist	1.08	0.61, 1.92	0.778
No education	Muslim	1.02	0.42, 2.46	0.965
No education         -         -         -           Primary         1.03         0.59, 1.81         0.902           Secondary         1.38         0.81, 2.35         0.230           Higher         1.87         1.01, 3.50         0.050           Wealth index         Poorest         -         -         -         -           Poorest         -         -         -         -         -           Poorer         0.73         0.37, 1.47         0.389         0.117           Richer         1.46         0.78, 2.72         0.233           Richest         2.28         1.21, 4.30         0.010           Employment status           No         -         -         -           Yes         1.23         0.79, 1.90         0.344           Marital status         Never married         -         -         -           Married <sup>c</sup> 1.42         0.89, 2.26         0.132           Widowed         1.12         0.13, 9.19         0.911	Others <sup>b</sup>	1.13	0.51, 2.51	0.751
Primary         1.03         0.59, 1.81         0.902           Secondary         1.38         0.81, 2.35         0.230           Higher         1.87         1.01, 3.50         0.050           Wealth index         Poorest         -         -         -         -           Poorer         0.73         0.37, 1.47         0.389           Middle         1.60         0.88, 2.90         0.117           Richer         1.46         0.78, 2.72         0.233           Richest         2.28         1.21, 4.30         0.010           Employment status           No         -         -         -           Yes         1.23         0.79, 1.90         0.344           Marital status           Never married         -         -         -           Married <sup>c</sup> 1.42         0.89, 2.26         0.132           Widowed         1.12         0.13, 9.19         0.911	Educational level			
Secondary         1.38         0.81, 2.35         0.230           Higher         1.87         1.01, 3.50         0.050           Wealth index           Poorest         -         -         -           Poorer         0.73         0.37, 1.47         0.389           Middle         1.60         0.88, 2.90         0.117           Richer         1.46         0.78, 2.72         0.233           Richest         2.28         1.21, 4.30         0.010           Employment status           No         -         -         -           Yes         1.23         0.79, 1.90         0.344           Marital status           Never married         -         -         -           Married <sup>c</sup> 1.42         0.89, 2.26         0.132           Widowed         1.12         0.13, 9.19         0.911	No education	_	_	_
Higher       1.87       1.01, 3.50       0.050         Wealth index       —       —       —         Poorest       —       —       —         Poorer       0.73       0.37, 1.47       0.389         Middle       1.60       0.88, 2.90       0.117         Richer       1.46       0.78, 2.72       0.233         Richest       2.28       1.21, 4.30       0.010         Employment status         No       —       —       —         Yes       1.23       0.79, 1.90       0.344         Marital status         Never married       —       —       —         Married°       1.42       0.89, 2.26       0.132         Widowed       1.12       0.13, 9.19       0.911	Primary	1.03	0.59, 1.81	0.902
Wealth index           Poorest         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         - <td< td=""><td>Secondary</td><td>1.38</td><td>0.81, 2.35</td><td>0.230</td></td<>	Secondary	1.38	0.81, 2.35	0.230
Poorest         -         -         -           Poorer         0.73         0.37, 1.47         0.389           Middle         1.60         0.88, 2.90         0.117           Richer         1.46         0.78, 2.72         0.233           Richest         2.28         1.21, 4.30         0.010           Employment status           No         -         -         -           Yes         1.23         0.79, 1.90         0.344           Marital status           Never married         -         -         -           Married <sup>c</sup> 1.42         0.89, 2.26         0.132           Widowed         1.12         0.13, 9.19         0.911	Higher	1.87	1.01, 3.50	0.050
Poorer         0.73         0.37, 1.47         0.389           Middle         1.60         0.88, 2.90         0.117           Richer         1.46         0.78, 2.72         0.233           Richest         2.28         1.21, 4.30         0.010           Employment status           No         -         -         -           Yes         1.23         0.79, 1.90         0.344           Marital status           Never married         -         -         -           Married <sup>c</sup> 1.42         0.89, 2.26         0.132           Widowed         1.12         0.13, 9.19         0.911	Wealth index			
Middle       1.60       0.88, 2.90       0.117         Richer       1.46       0.78, 2.72       0.233         Richest       2.28       1.21, 4.30       0.010         Employment status         No       -       -       -         Yes       1.23       0.79, 1.90       0.344         Marital status         Never married       -       -       -         Married <sup>c</sup> 1.42       0.89, 2.26       0.132         Widowed       1.12       0.13, 9.19       0.911	Poorest	_	_	_
Richer       1.46       0.78, 2.72       0.233         Richest       2.28       1.21, 4.30       0.010         Employment status         No       -       -       -         Yes       1.23       0.79, 1.90       0.344         Marital status         Never married       -       -       -         Married <sup>c</sup> 1.42       0.89, 2.26       0.132         Widowed       1.12       0.13, 9.19       0.911	Poorer	0.73	0.37, 1.47	0.389
Richest       2.28       1.21, 4.30       0.010         Employment status       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.000       0.00	Middle	1.60	0.88, 2.90	0.117
Employment status           No         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         - <th< td=""><td>Richer</td><td>1.46</td><td>0.78, 2.72</td><td>0.233</td></th<>	Richer	1.46	0.78, 2.72	0.233
No         -         -         -           Yes         1.23         0.79, 1.90         0.344           Marital status           Never married         -         -         -           Married <sup>c</sup> 1.42         0.89, 2.26         0.132           Widowed         1.12         0.13, 9.19         0.911	Richest	2.28	1.21, 4.30	0.010
Yes     1.23     0.79, 1.90     0.344       Marital status       Never married     -     -     -       Married°     1.42     0.89, 2.26     0.132       Widowed     1.12     0.13, 9.19     0.911	Employment status			
Marital status           Never married         -         -         -         -           Married°         1.42         0.89, 2.26         0.132           Widowed         1.12         0.13, 9.19         0.911	No	_	_	_
Never married         -         -         -           Marriedc         1.42         0.89, 2.26         0.132           Widowed         1.12         0.13, 9.19         0.911	Yes	1.23	0.79, 1.90	0.344
Married <sup>c</sup> 1.42         0.89, 2.26         0.132           Widowed         1.12         0.13, 9.19         0.911	Marital status			
Widowed 1.12 0.13, 9.19 0.911	Never married	_	_	_
	Married <sup>c</sup>	1.42	0.89, 2.26	0.132
Divorced <sup>d</sup> 5.08 1.94, 13.30 0.001	Widowed	1.12	0.13, 9.19	0.911
	Divorcedd	5.08	1.94, 13.30	0.001

**Notes:** <sup>a</sup>Low-lying, southern plain land in Nepal. <sup>b</sup>Includes Christian, Kirat, and others. <sup>c</sup>Includes married and living with partner. <sup>d</sup>Includes divorced, no longer living together, and separated.

## Discussion

Findings from this first national-based population survey revealed that approximately 5% of Nepali men reported a sexual relationship with FSWs in their lifetime. Notably, men reporting sexual contact with FSWs were over twice as likely to report an STI diagnosis and a range of STIs/HIV-related risk behaviors (ie, multiple sex partners and early coital debut), thus suggesting considerable risk for STIs/HIV transmission or acquisition within Nepali context. <sup>26</sup> Results also revealed that men who reported beliefs supportive of



**Table 4.** Association of use of FSWs with STIs/HIV-related risk behaviors and gender ideology, listed with odds ratio (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs).

VARIABLES	USE OF FSW	USE OF FSWs			
	OR	95% CI	aORª	95% CI	
STIs/HIV-related risk factors					
History of STI <sup>b</sup>	4.02***	2.32, 6.98	3.03***	1.69, 5.43	
Multiple sex partner	4.78***	2.20, 7.42	3.75***	2.18, 5.23	
Used condom every time	1.25	0.66, 2.34	0.94	0.46, 1.93	
Used condom during last sex	0.72**	0.48, 0.91	0.76**	0.47, 0.95	
Early sexual debut <sup>c</sup>	2.55***	1.85, 3.52	2.60***	1.85, 3.67	
Gender ideology					
Husband justified for violence against wifed	1.76*	1.08, 2.97	1.65*	1.01, 2.84	
Wife justified refusing sex if husband has other women	0.60**	0.44, 0.82	0.61**	0.43, 0.82	
Wife justified asking husband to use condom if he has STI	1.58	0.66, 3.76	1.38	0.56, 3.36	

Notes: <sup>a</sup>Adjusted for age, region, residence, religion, educational level, wealth index, employment status, and cigarette smoking status. <sup>b</sup>Includes bad smelling genital discharge and genital sore/ulcer. <sup>c</sup>Item dichotomized: No: age at first sex,  $\leq$ 16 years; Yes: age at first sex, >16 years. <sup>d</sup>Beating justified: if wife goes out without telling husband, neglects the children, argues with husband, refuses to have sex with husband, and burns food. Statistically significant: \*P < 0.05; \*\*P < 0.01; \*\*\*P < 0.001.

gender-based violence and sexual entitlement were more likely to be involved in a sexual relationship with FSWs, indicating the prominent role of socially constructed gender norms and beliefs in promoting STIs/HIV risk. 8,20,29,30 Given these findings and the role of FSWs in facilitating the spread of HIV in Nepal<sup>13,14,31,32</sup> and elsewhere, <sup>2,3,33</sup> present finding also suggest the need to address male clients of FSWs in STIs/HIV prevention and intervention efforts.

Consistent with prior reports, <sup>15,25</sup> Nepali men's use of FSWs varied considerably across educational, economic, and marital status categories: men with higher educational and better economic status, and divorced men reported higher rates of sexual contact with FSWs. Although the overall prevalence of Nepali men's use of FSWs was low, it was concentrated among these specific groups, signifying the potential effectiveness of specifically tailored interventions. The identification of high-risk population groups can be helpful in guiding STIs/HIV prevention strategies and policies to reduce sexual contact with FSWs and to promote safer sexual practices among the general public, as efforts to reduce the heterosexual spread of HIV.<sup>34</sup>

Evidence that the men reporting sexual contact with FSWs did not consistently use condoms in their last sexual encounters, had multiple sexual partners, had early sexual debut, and increased likelihood of STIs/HIV augments our concerns that male clients of FSWs may represent a critical bridge population in the HIV epidemic.<sup>1,9,10</sup> This finding is consistent with prior reports across international literature demonstrating higher rates of both sexual risk behavior and STIs/HIV based on men's reports of sex involvement with FSWs.<sup>1,6,8</sup> Thus, the present study adds to the growing body of work indicating that men who frequently seek FSWs should be considered a high-risk population, given the heightened

risk they pose for the spread of STIs/HIV to both commercial (ie, FSWs) and non-commercial sex partners (ie, wife and steady female sex partners).

New to this body of research, the current study provides the first empirical support signifying the influence of gender ideologies on men's use of FSWs in the Nepali context. Consistent with findings from prior research, the results from this study indicate a significant association between Nepali men's use of FSWs and their attitudes and beliefs about violence against wife and sexual entitlement, with controlling attitudes toward women's autonomy.<sup>8,20,29</sup> These findings indicate that men's use of FSWs is associated with individuals' gender-based attitudes and point to the critical importance of culturally based gender norms and beliefs. These results highlight the importance of community-level interventions that specifically address overall constructs of gender ideologies in changing men's behavior and thereby reducing the spread of STIs/HIV.<sup>23,35</sup>

The findings of the current study highlight the need to develop and implement specifically tailored interventions toward male clients of FSWs, with a particular emphasis on promoting more progressive and equitable gender roles and beliefs. As such, an efficacious approach is needed to capture this hard to reach and underserved group in an effort promote STIs/HIV programs, services, and products through community-based and/or school-based interventional efforts. These findings also call for HIV prevention strategies to begin incorporating gender-related social contexts to address gender norms and inequities, transforming power dynamics and promoting gender equality that are essential to address the STIs/HIV epidemic. 20,36,37 Within an international context, programmatic approaches targeting men with the goals of promoting gender equity



and addressing masculinity to reduce HIV risk have been shown to be effective in improving gender attitudes. <sup>19,38</sup> No research and intervention efforts, however, currently exist within Nepal, particularly targeting male clients of FSWs. The findings from the current study, thus, provide a basis for future work to develop STIs/HIV prevention interventions that have greater potential to reduce the transmission and spread of STIs/HIV via sexual contact with FSWs, as well as interventions aimed at reducing violence against women and girls, in Nepal and elsewhere.

The findings from the current study should be considered in light of certain study limitations. First, the use of selfreport assessment approach in the NDHS may have limited the study's ability to precisely measure certain variables; in particular, sexual contact with FSWs and associated sexual risk behaviors. Second, the current assessment of men's sexual contact with FSWs was relatively broad. Thus, future research should consider using a more in-depth assessment of sexual contact with FSWs as well as take into account additional variables (eg, context of sexual contact with FSWs, age at first contact with FSW, occupation type, and migration-related characteristics) to better inform future intervention efforts. Third, the current study included variables measured at different time duration (eg, lifetime, past 12 months, and last event), which could bias the results of association. Fourth, this study is limited in its ability to assert causal relationships of the use of FSWs with gender ideologies and STIs/HIV-related risk behaviors due to the cross-sectional nature of the data. Longitudinal and qualitative researches are needed to clarify the causal and temporal relations among the use of FSWs, STIs/ HIV risk, gender norms, and beliefs.

# **Conclusions**

The current study presents novel findings regarding the prevalence and demographic correlates of Nepali men's use of FSWs and the association of FSW sexual contact with gender ideologies and STIs/HIV-related risk behaviors. Currently, the vast majority of HIV prevention efforts targets FSWs,8 with little attention paid to their male clients. The current study helps to fill this critical gap by identifying high-risk groups for seeking sexual contact with FSWs as well as modifiable risk factors for such risk behaviors (ie, culturally linked gender attitudes relating to violence against women and male entitlement to sexual privileges). Given increasing recognition of the bridging role of male clients of FSWs in transmitting STIs/HIV from high-risk population (FSWs) to the general population, 1,9,10 the present findings indicate an urgent need to prioritize research and programmatic efforts specifically targeting this understudied highrisk group.

# Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank ICF international for providing the data used in this analysis.

### **Author Contributions**

Conceived and designed the experiments: RS, PK, and MC. Analyzed the data: RS. Wrote the first draft of the manuscript: RS and PK. Contributed to the writing of the manuscript: RS, PK, and MC. Agree with manuscript results and conclusions: RS, PK, and MC. Jointly developed the structure and arguments for the paper: RS, PK, and MC. Made critical revisions and approved final version: RS, PK, and MC. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

### REFERENCES

- Jin X, Smith K, Chen RY, et al. HIV prevalence and risk behaviors among male clients of female sex workers in Yunnan, China. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2010; 53(1):131–135.
- Braunstein SL, Ingabire CM, Kestelyn E, et al. High human immunodeficiency virus incidence in a cohort of Rwandan female sex workers. Sex Transm Dis. 2011; 38(5):385–394.
- Prüss-Ustün A, Wolf J, Driscoll T, Degenhardt L, Neira M, Calleja JMG. HIV
  due to female sex work: regional and global estimates. PLoS One. 2013;8(5):
  e63476
- Medhi GK, Mahanta J, Paranjape RS, Adhikary R, Laskar N, Ngully P. Factors associated with HIV among female sex workers in a high HIV prevalent state of India. AIDS Care. 2012;24(3):369–376.
- Znazen A, Frikha-Gargouri O, Berrajah L, et al. Sexually transmitted infections among female sex workers in Tunisia: high prevalence of *Chlamydia trachomatis*. Sex Transm Infect. 2010;86(7):500–505.
- Goldenberg SM, Cruz MG, Strathdee SA, Nguyen L, Semple SJ, Patterson TL.
  Correlates of unprotected sex with female sex workers among male clients in
  Tijuana, Mexico. Sex Transm Dis. 2010;37(5):319–324.
- Patterson TL, Goldenberg S, Gallardo M, et al. Correlates of HIV, sexually transmitted infections, and associated high-risk behaviors among male clients of female sex workers in Tijuana, Mexico. AIDS. 2009;23(13):1765–1771.
- 8. Decker MR, Miller E, Raj A, Saggurti N, Donta B, Silverman JG. Indian men's use of commercial sex workers: prevalence, condom use, and related gender attitudes. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2010;53(2):240–246.
- Shrestha R, Copenhaver M. HIV risk behaviors among returnee male migrant workers in Nepal. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2014;140:e207.
- Shrestha R. Understanding HIV-Related Risk Behaviors among Returnee Male Migrant Workers in Nepal. Connecticut, USA: University of Connecticut; 2013.
- Control NCfAaS. HIV Epidemic Update of Nepal. Kathmandu, Nepal: NCfAaS; 2014
- Ghimire L, Smith WC, van Teijlingen ER. Utilisation of sexual health services by female sex workers in Nepal. BMC Health Serv Res. 2011;11(1):79.
- Joshi SK, Swahnberg K. Trafficking of women and girls from Nepal to India for prostitution: what is known about its history, nurturing factors, health effects and prevention? *Nurtur Factors Health Eff Prevent*. 2010;XII:89–99.
- Sagtani RA, Bhattarai S, Adhikari BR, Baral D, Yadav DK, Pokharel PK. Alcohol use, HIV risk behavior and experience of sexually transmitted infections among female sex workers of Nepal. Clin Epidemiol Global Health. 2013;1(2): 73–78
- Rana MS, Nepali B, Sathian B, Aryal RP, Thapalia M, Bhatta DR. The sociodemographic characteristics of the clients of female sex workers and their perspectives, behaviours and attitude on HIV and AIDS: a questionnaire based survey from Pokhara, Nepal. J Clin Diagn Res. 2013;7(1):112–117.
- Poudel KC, Jimba M, Okumura J, Joshi AB, Wakai S. Migrants' risky sexual behaviours in India and at home in far western Nepal. Trop Med Int Health. 2004; 9(8):897–903.
- 17. New ERA. Integrated Bio-Behavioral Survey (IBBS) Among Female Sex Workers and Truckers along the Terai Highway Routes Covering 22 Districts of Nepal. Kathmandu: Family Health International/Nepal; 2004.
- Kerrigan D, Andrinopoulos K, Chung S-E, Glass B, Ellen J. Gender ideologies, socioeconomic opportunities, and HIV/STI-related vulnerability among female, African-American adolescents. J Urban Health. 2008;85(5):717–726.
- Pulerwitz J, Michaelis A, Verma R, Weiss E. Addressing gender dynamics and engaging men in HIV programs: lessons learned from horizons research. *Public Health Rep.* 2010;125(2):282–292.
- Dunkle KL, Jewkes R. Effective HIV prevention requires gender-transformative work with men. Sex Transm Infect. 2007;83(3):173–174.
- Monto MA, McRee N. A comparison of the male customers of female street prostitutes with national samples of men. Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol. 2005; 49(5):505–529.



- 22. Huda S. Sex trafficking in South Asia. Int J Gynaecol Obstet. 2006;94(3):374–381.
- Dunkle KL, Jewkes R, Nduna M, et al. Transactional sex with casual and main partners among young South African men in the rural Eastern Cape: prevalence, predictors, and associations with gender-based violence. Soc Sci Med. 2007;65(6): 1235–1248.
- Macleod J. Challenging Men's Demand for Prostitution in Scotland: A Research Report Based on Interviews with 110 Men who Bought Women in Prostitution. Glasgow: Women's Support Project; 2008.
- Ministry of Health and Population NE, ICF International Inc. Nepal Demographic and Health Survey 2011. Kathmandu, Nepal; Maryland, USA: Ministry of Health and Population NE, ICF International Inc; 2012.
- Shrestha R, Karki P, Copenhaver M. Early sexual debut: a risk factor for STIs/ HIV acquisition among a nationally representative sample of adults in Nepal. I Community Health. 2016;41(1):70–77.
- Saunders DG, Lynch AB, Grayson M, Linz D. The inventory of beliefs about wife beating: the construction and initial validation of a measure of beliefs and attitudes. Violence Vict. 1987;2(1):39–57.
- Corp IBM. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 20.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp; 2011.
- Kaufman MR, Shefer T, Crawford M, Simbayi LC, Kalichman SC. Gender attitudes, sexual power, HIV risk: a model for understanding HIV risk behavior of South African men. AIDS Care. 2008;20(4):434–441.
- Shrestha R, Copenhaver MM. Association Between Intimate Partner Violence Against Women and HIV-Risk Behaviors: Findings From the Nepal Demographic Health Survey. Violence Against Women. 2016. doi: 10.1177/1077801216628690.

- Ghimire L, Smith WCS, van Teijlingen ER, Dahal R, Luitel NP. Reasons for non-use of condoms and self-efficacy among female sex workers: a qualitative study in Nepal. BMC Womens Health. 2011;11(1):42.
- 32. New ERA. Integrated Biological and Behavioral Surveillance (IBBS) Survey among Female Sex Workers in Kathmandu Valley, Nepal Round IV-2011. Kathmandu: New ERA: 2011
- Shannon K, Strathdee SA, Goldenberg SM, et al. Global epidemiology of HIV among female sex workers: influence of structural determinants. *Lancet*. 2015; 385(9962):55–71.
- Nagelkerke NJ, Jha P, de Vlas SJ, et al. Modelling HIV/AIDS epidemics in Botswana and India: impact of interventions to prevent transmission. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2002;80(2):89–96.
- Bekker L-G, Johnson L, Cowan F, et al. Combination HIV prevention for female sex workers; what is the evidence? *Lancet*. 2015;385(9962):72–87.
- Ghanotakis E, Peacock D, Wilcher R. The importance of addressing gender inequality in efforts to end vertical transmission of HIV. J Int AIDS Soc. 2012; 15(suppl 2):17385.
- Auerbach JD, Parkhurst JO, Cáceres CF. Addressing social drivers of HIV/AIDS for the long-term response: conceptual and methodological considerations. *Glob Public Health*. 2011;6(suppl 3):S293–S309.
- Verma RK, Pulerwitz J, Mahendra V, et al. Challenging and changing gender attitudes among young men in Mumbai, India. Reprod Health Matters. 2006; 14(28):135–143.