

ORAL COMMUNICATION

Awareness in Sexual Health: U=U and prevention

OC 43 "U=U impossibile sbagliare" awareness campaign: impact assessment among PLWH

Authors

A. Tavelli¹, A. Cingolani², L. Cosmaro³, S. De Benedittis¹, N. Frattini⁴, G.V. Calvino⁵, F.M. Fusco⁶, A. Costantini⁷, A. Di Biagio⁸, B.M. Celesia⁹, M. Guastavigna¹⁰, M. Cernuschi^{11,4}, D. Calzavara¹¹, A. Antinori¹², F. Von Schloesser¹³, A. d'Arminio Monforte¹, on behalf of Icona Foundation Study Group

Affiliation

¹ICONA Foundation, Milan, Italy, ²Clinic of Infectious Diseases, Catholic University, Rome, Italy, ³LILA ONLUS, Milan, Italy, ⁴A.S.A. ONLUS, Milan, Italy, ⁵ANLAIDS ONLUS NAZIONALE, Rome, Italy, ⁶P.O. 'D. Cotugno', Azienda Ospedaliera dei Colli, Naples, Italy, ⁷Clinical Immunology Unit, Azienda Ospedaliero Universitaria delle Marche - Università Politecnica delle Marche, Ancona, Italy, ⁸Infectious Disease Clinic, IRCCS Ospedale Policlinico San Martino, Genoa, Italy, ⁹Unit of Infectious Diseases, ARNAS Garibaldi Hospital, University of Catania, Catania, Italy, ¹⁰S.C. Malattie Infettive e Tropicali I, ASL Città di Torino, Amedeo di Savoia Hospital, Turin, Italy, ¹¹Milano Checkpoint ETS, Milan, Italy, ¹²Clinical Infectious Diseases Department, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy, ¹³NADIR Onlus, Rome, Italy

ABSTRACT

Background: The "undetectable equals untransmittable" (U=U) message should contribute to reduce stigma affecting PWH, who can live without the fear of transmitting HIV once they have reached undetectable HIV-RNA. Nevertheless, still many PWH are unaware of this concept. To spread the U=U message in Italy, an awareness campaign designed by the community 'U=U-Impossibile sbagliare' was launched in Sept 2023. This study aims to verify its impact among PWH by measuring the awareness of U=U and its association with self-stigma. Methods: A survey was disseminated within the PWH of the ICONA network before (Jul-Sept2023) and after the launch of the campaign (Sept2023-March2024). It was accessible via web or Icona mobile app and consisted of the validated HIV Stigma Scale (12-items) and 3 questions on U=U (Do you know U=U? Do you think it is reliable? Did it change your life?). The domains of the stigma scale were 4: personalized stigma, disclosure concerns, concerns with public attitude, negative self-image. Scores varied from 3 to 12, with higher scores indicating higher stigma. The survey was anonymous and not designed to compare pre-/post results of same subject. Data on knowledge of U=U pre-and post-campaign were compared by logistic regression; association between U=U knowledge and HIV stigma was analyzed by linear regression. A logistic regression analysis was conducted to identify factors associated with lack of knowledge of U=U. Results: A total of 820 PWH responded to the survey: 362 (44.1%) pre- and 458 post- start of campaign (55.9%). 333 (40.6%) PWH responded "No" and 487 (59.4%) "Yes" to the question on knowledge of U=U with no differences according to the period: 226 (62.4%) prevs 168 (56.6%) post-campaign knew about U=U (p=0.13) (Table 1). After adjusting for age, gender at birth, MSM, center, education and nation of birth, the marginal predicted probability of knowing U=U pre-campaign was 61.3% (95%CI 56.4%-66.3%) and 57.7% (52.3%-63.0%) post-campaign (p=0.32).

The HIV stigma domain with the highest score was related to disclosure concerns. There was no evidence for an association between knowledge of U=U and the HIV-stigma scale scores; the "concerns with public attitudes" domain was even higher for those who knew U=U (Table 2). Independent factors associated to lack of U=U knowledge were age > 40, being non-MSM, education below university level and not-knowing last HIV-RNA (Table3).

Conclusions: Still 40% of PWH do not know about U=U; it is essential that medical staff dedicate due time to inform their patients. The campaign did not result in an increased knowledge of U=U. Possible reasons relate to the lack of funds to promote the concept widely. In this setting, the spot intervention suggests the need for additional campaigns targeting people still unaware of this concept (those with lower educational level, older age and not MSM). Finally, HIV stigma is a multifactorial issue of which personal awareness of U=U is one -but not the only- driver.

Table 1. Characteristics of the 820 PWH responding to the survey according to knowledge of U=U

Knowledge of U=U Yes 33 N=487 N=333 N=820 Gender at birth 79 50.3% 78 49.7% 157 100.0% 0.005 61.9% 656 Age. mean (±SD) 25-51.8 ±11.0 47.4 ±11.40 <0.001 ±11.3 49.2 10 100.0% <0.001 30.0% 7 70.0% 31.2% 278 50.1% 198 68.8% 404 49.9% 397 26-50 126 100.0% 199 100.0% Mode of HIV transmission Other 18 40.0% 27 60.0% 45 100.0% < 0.001 52.5% 96 30.0% 290 47.5% 202 100.0% MSM 124 70.0% 414 100.0% 48.3% 45 60.0% 26 40.0% 65 PWID 39 100.0% Period
Pre-U=U campaign 136 37.6% 226 62.4% 362 100.0% 0.28 During campaign After campaign 42.2% 93 43.4% 168 57.8% 161 56.6% 297 68 100.0% 129 100.0% Italian born 290 Region where you are living 290 39.5% 444 60.5% 734 100.0% 0.09 39.0% 167 49.5% 93 61.0% 274 50.5% 184 100.0% 100.0% 0.020 Northern 107 Central 91 Southern Region of the center 130 37.4% 218 62.6% 348 100.0% 89 37.9% 146 62.1% 235 Northern 100.0% 100.0% < 0.001 126 35.7% 227 64.3% 353 Southern 100.0% Education level Other 5 62.5% 3 Elementary 69.2% 4 30.8% 13 100.0% 39.3% 17 60.7% 28 11 100.0% Unknwon MiddleSchool 94 65.3% 50 34.7% 144 100.0% 155 42.5% 210 57.5% 365 100.0% High School 55 22.0% 195 78.0% 250 100.0%

Table 2. Associations between knowledge of U=U and scores of the HIV-stigma questionnaire domains by means of linear regression models

of linear regression models			Unadjusted linear regression model			Adjusted linear regression model*			
Mean(±SD)	beta	95%CI	р	beta	95%CI	р			
5.8 (±2.5) 5.8 (±2.4)	0.052	(-0.29; 0.395)	0.764	0.182	(-0.183; 0.546)	0.328			
8.9 (±2.2) 9.2 (±2.2)	0.255	(-0.052; 0.562)	0.103	0.146	(-0.18; 0.472)	0.379			
8 (±2.5) 8.7 (±2.1)	0.661	(0.348; 0.974)	<.001	0.485	(0.153; 0.816)	0.004			
6.5 (±2.4) 6.6 (±2.4)	0.080	(-0.257; 0.417)	0.641	-0.143	(-0.498; 0.211)	0.428			
	5.8 (±2.5) 5.8 (±2.4) 8.9 (±2.2) 9.2 (±2.2) 8 (±2.5) 8.7 (±2.1) 6.5 (±2.4)	Mean(±SD) beta 0.052 5.8 (±2.5) 5.8 (±2.4) 0.255 8.9 (±2.2) 9.2 (±2.2) 0.661 8 (±2.5) 8.7 (±2.1) 0.080 6.5 (±2.4)	model	Mean(±SD) beta 95%Cl p	Mean(±SD) beta 95%Cl p beta	Mean(±SD) beta 95%Cl p beta 95%Cl			

Table 3. Factors associated with NOT-knowledge of U=U using logistic regression model

	Unadjusted model				Adjusted model*				
	OR	95%CI		р	AOR	95%CI		р	
Female (vs Male)	1.64	1.16	2.33	0.005	0.94	0.61	1.44	0.78	
Age >40 yrs (vs. ≤40)	1.95	1.39	2.73	<.001	1.64	1.13	2.37	0.009	
Mode HIV Transmission									
MSM	1.00				1.00				
Other	1.56	0.83	2.93	0.169	1.27	0.64	2.52	0.487	
Heterosexual	2.58	1.83	3.65	<.001	2.28	1.50	3.45	<.001	
Unknown	2.18	1.36	3.49	0.001	1.76	1.06	2.93	0.03	
PWID	3.51	2.05	6.01	<.001	2.43	1.35	4.35	0.003	
Elementary/Middle/high school (vs. University)	3.44	2.44	4.85	<.001	2.83	1.97	4.08	<.001	
Not Knowledge of last HIV-RNA, (vs Yes)	3.37	1.79	6.33	<.001	3.92	1.99	7.70	<.001	
Nation of birth, outside Italy (vs. Italy)	1.49	0.94	2.38	0.091	1.50	0.90	2.51	0.118	