STI/HIV prevalence among Female Sex Workers(FSW's) and treatment seeking behavior for STI in Maharashtra

Introduction

The achievement of the UN 2015 Millennium Development Goal combating HIV/AIDS (MDG 6) depends on the progress in the regions of developing countries and the Sub Saharan African countries. India's HIV epidemic is heterogeneous in nature and it spreads through three horizontal routes i.e., heterosexual contact, homosexual contact and intravenous drug use. Since the nature of the HIV epidemic in India is heterogeneous, more than 90 percent of the infections were acquired through the people having multiple partners and not practicing safe sex practices. Sexual transmission of HIV is the most dominant route of infection in the country and is concentrated among high risk group, particularly Female Sex Workers, their clients/Partners, Men having sex with men, Intravenous Drug User. An estimated 75 million men in ASIA visit FSWs and 10 million women cater to them .And to these we have MSM and IDUs around 20 million people who are at high risk of getting infected and in turn can infect a large number of their partners. A conscientious estimate by the commission on AIDS in ASIA put this figures at 50 million women (Commission on AIDS in ASIA 2008). Explicit and implicit rules imposed by society, as defined by one's gender, age, economic status, ethnicity and other factors, influence an individual's sexuality (Zeidenstein and Moore 1996; Dixon Mueller 1993).In a society where we live is a patriarchal society where the culture of silence surrounds everything .i.e., the sex, access treatment seeking for sexually transmitted infections is highly stigmatized in the society for adolescent and adult women.(Weiss, Whelan, and Rao Gupta 2000; de Bruyn et al. 1995). Women's economic dependency increases their vulnerability to HIV. Research has shown that the economic vulnerability of women makes it more likely that they will exchange sex for money or favors, less likely that they will succeed in negotiating protection, and less likely that they will leave a relationship that they perceive to be risky(Heise and Elias 1995; Mane, Rao Gupta, and Weiss 1994; Weiss and Rao Gupta 1998). Individuals' knowledge of HIV transmission and accurate assessment of their own risk seem to be among the key factors in adoption of safer sexual practices(UN AIDS 2011).Policymakers must understand these factors to design effective policies in the fight against HIV and AIDS. Adolescent and young adult behavior is of special interest for several reasons. First, the number of life-years saved is greatest when infections are averted in relatively young individuals. Second, preventing HIV infection in women of

childbearing age prevents transmission from mother to child. Finally, it may be easier to change sexual attitudes, practices and risky behaviors among the young than among older people. (WHO 2006).There exists a dearth of research in the transmission of HIV through the high risk groups. Especially female sex workers (FSWs) are at the core in transmitting the disease. Very less studies have been done on this since female sex workers are 14 times more vulnerable to other high risk groups .This study attempts to see the correlates of safe sex practice with their intimate partners. Their safe sex practice with different partners, consistent condom use, exposure to number of clients. It also throws light on various other health related dimensions of sex work like Safe sex practices with different partners , condom use behavior ,client load ,sexually transmitted infection and HIV. The large number of female sex workers and their partners creates fertile grounds for HIV to spread. Although female sex workers report high level of condom use with commercial clients, but condom use is often low with non-commercial partners. There is limited understanding regarding the factors that influence condom use with non commercial partners, contextual and emotional factors plays a major role in understanding the behavior of the study population.This study tries to portray the holistic picture of behavioral determinants of female sex worker with intimate partners while following safe sex practice.

Objectives

To assess the STI/HIV prevalence and treatment seeking behavior of female sex worker for STI.

Data and methodology

Integrated Behavioral and Biological Assessment (IBBA) secondary data source were used for the study of two rounds. Round one was carried out in the year 2005-07 emerged as a nationally important source of data for the revision of persons living with HIV/AIDS (PLHIV) sample size was 3230.The second round was conducted in the year 2009-10 provided information on important indicators such as types of sexual partners, condom use patterns with these sexual partners, knowledge, awareness and prevalence of HIV and STIs among the high-risk groups including female sex workers and their clients, men who have sex with men, injecting drug users, and long distance truck drivers sample size was 3283. It was conducted in six districts of Maharashtra.

Cross tabulation displays the joint distribution of two or more variables. It is a technique for analyzing the relationship between two variables that have been organized in a table. Logistic

regression was used to analyze relationships between a dichotomous dependent variable and metric or dichotomous independent variables. It was used to observe the effect of age, education, occupation, age at which started sex work, duration in sex work, typology i.e., where female sex workers solicit their clients. The background characteristics were taken as independent variables while dependent variable was dichotomous having code 0 and 1, where 0 represented not having any symptom of STI and 1 represents having any symptom of STI.

Results

Knowledge of STI among Female Sex Workers

Table 1 shows the awareness regarding STI among the FSWs across both the rounds of data. STI knowledge was assessed based on the ability of the FSW to correctly identify at least three of the six most common symptoms, viz., lower abdominal pain, foul smelling vaginal discharge, burning on urination, genital ulcer/sore, swelling in the groin area, and genital itching. Overall 69 percent of FSWs had comprehensive knowledge about STI in round 1 , further the knowledge had increased to 74 percent in round 2. The knowledge about STI increased by the increasing age and education. Generally, the knowledge regarding STI was found to be more among FSWs in round 2 as compared to round 1. .The knowledge was highest among the FSWs who were divorced/widowed and living with partner in both the rounds of data (76 percent and 93 percent respectively). The FSWs who were not engaged in any other occupation besides sex work were more aware about the STI. The knowledge of STI increases with the increase in duration of sex work. In round 1 the knowledge was more (74 percent) among the FSWs whose place of solicitation was non brothel based, whereas, in round 2 it was highest (82 percent) among the FSWs whose place of solicitation was brothel based.

Changes in STI Prevalence and Treatment Seeking Behavior

Table 2 gives the information regarding any STI symptom during last 12 months and treatment seeking behavior was also gathered from the FSWs (Table 3.2).The prevalence of any STI problem in FSWs was 25 percent in round 1 and it increased to 37 percent in round 2 .Symptoms of STI was found more among FSWs who were less than 36 years of age in both the rounds of data. Treatment seeking for STI was more among FSWs who were less than 25 years of age (83 percent) in round 1 and among FSWs who were more than 35 years of age (88 percent) in round

2. The treatment seeking was more among FSWs who were more educated. The symptoms of STI was found more among FSWs who were divorced/widowed living alone in round 1 (32 percent), and in round 2 it was highest among FSWs who were divorced/widowed living with partner (47 percent). The treatment seeking was more among the group of FSWs who were married but not living with husband for both the rounds of data (83 percent and 92 percent respectively). More number of FSWs who were engaged in occupation other that sex work were having symptoms of STI as well as more likely to sought treatment for STI problem. In round 2 it was found that the FSWs having more client load were more exposed any STI symptoms, and their treatment seeking was also higher as compared to their counterparts. The percentage of FSWs having symptoms of STI was higher among FSWs who were home based (31 percent and 43 percent).Symptoms as well as health seeking has increased over the time.

Safe Sex Practice among FSWs after Having STI Problem.

Table 3 shows the clear picture of the FSWs having safe sex with their intimate partner. Safe sex was computed using two variables, FSWs using condom after their exposure to STI and those who stopped sex with sexual partner. In both the rounds it was found that the percentage of FSWs having safe sex increased by age. In round 2 the result was not very consistent, but the pattern was found to be almost the same. Surprisingly, the use of condom and end of sex with sexual partner (safe sex), was more in round 1 as compared to round 2. There was not much impact of education on the practice of safe sex among the FSWs. The use of condom was mostly by the FSWs who were married but not living with husband in both the rounds. More number of FSWs who were engaged in occupation besides sex work practiced safe sex (80 percent) in round 1 as compared to that in round 2 (16 percent). In round 1 the practice of safe sex was (68 percent) among FSWs whose debut at sex work was above 25 years, however in round 2 it was (52 percent) who were below 18 years of age was totally giving a divergent picture.In both the rounds it was found the FSWs who were more experienced, or who were engaged in sex work for long time, among them the practice of safe sex was more. the decrease in number of clients, increased the tendency of having safe sex among the FSWs in both the rounds of data.

Determinants of STI Prevalence among FSWs

Table 4 represents the logistic regression analysis to show the STI prevalence among female sex workers according to their socio demographic and sexual behavior for round 1 and round2.Two

models have been used to see the STI prevalence among female sex workers. In model 1 selected background characteristics were used as predictor to see the prevalence of STI among FSWs .In model 2 behavioral indicator of FSWs has been included to see the effect on STI prevalence. As compared to age group less than 25, FSWS of age 25-35 are 0.713 times less likely to have STI.The FSWs who are engaged in other occupation beside sex work are 1.49 times more likely to have STI.The FSWs who are not living with their husbands are 1.504 times more likely to have STI as compared to the FSW who are unmarried without the cohabiting partner.STI in Divorced/Widowed living alone FSWs is highly significant. In the age group 25-35 STI is 0.65 percent less likely to occur as compared to 18-24. The FSWs who are engaged in other work besides their profession were found 1.3 times significantly more likely to have STI. The FSWs who had more client load are 21 percent (OR 0.797) less likely to have STI as of who had less than or equal to three clients. The age group 25-35 were 16 percent (OR 0.84) less likely to have STI as compared to less than 25 years . The FSWs who have completed more than 5 years of education are 1.25 times more likely to have STI in contrast to their counter parts .The FSWs having other occupation beside their profession are 1.278 more likely to have STI related problem. The FSWs who are unmarried and living with cohabiting partner were significantly more likely to have STI as unmarried without cohabitant. FSWs who are married but not living with husband and those who are Widowed/Divorced living alone were 2.2 times more likely to have STI as compared to unmarried FSWs. The FSWs who are working besides their main profession were 1.2 percent more likely to have STI as compared to those who are not engaged in other profession. FSWs who were Unmarried and living with cohabiting partner were 2.1 times more likely to have STI as compared to those who are not married living without cohabitant. The FSWs of older cohort were 0.7 times less likely to have STI as compared to the reference category below 18 years.FSW whose duration in sex work is more than ten years 0.7 times less likely to have STI as compared to other groups. The FSWs of brothel and non brothel based are 0.7 times less likely to have STI with reference to FSW who are home based.

Determinants of HIV Prevalence among FSWs

Table 5 show the result from the logistic regression shows HIV prevalence among female sex workers according to their socio demographic and sexual behavior for Round 1 and round 2.Two models have been used to see the HIV prevalence among female sex workers .In model 1 only background characteristics were used to see the prevalence of HIV among FSWs .In model 2 sexual behavior of FSWs has been included to see the effect of HIV prevalence. As compared to age group of less than 25 years, those FSWs who were in the age group 25-35 are 1.711 times more likely to have HIV. Further the prevalence of HIV was 2 times more likely after age 35. As compared to illiterate group the FSWs who have completed primary and more than 5 years of education were 0.6 times less likely to have HIV. One interesting point which is emerging out is

that those FSWs who are unmarried living with cohabitant among them prevalence of HIV was 2.7 times more as compared to their counter parts. Noticeable fact which was emerging is that as the duration in sex work is high among those FSWs were 2.2 times more likely to have HIV, whereas in round 2 in contrast to round 1 those FSWs who were engaged in other work HIV was 0.2 times less likely to reign. FSWs who are brothel based and non-brothel based HIV prevalence among them was 4.1 times more likely as compared to the FSWs who were home based.

Discussions and conclusions

Comprehensive knowledge of STI was high among Non Brothel based FSWs and FSWs whose duration in sex work was more than 10 years in both the rounds. The FSWs who were not living with their husbands were more likely to have STI.FSWs of age 25-35, those whose duration in sex work was more than ten years and FSWs brothel and non brothel based were less likely to have STI.FSWs having high level of education were less likely to have HIV. FSWs who were unmarried living with cohabitant among them prevalence of HIV was more as compared to their counter parts. As duration in sex work increased those FSWs were more likely to have HIV. FSWs that were brothel based and non-brothel based HIV prevalence among them was more as compared to the FSWs who were home based.

References

- Foss AM, Watts CH, Vickerman P, HeiseL ,Condoms and prevention of HIV *BMJ*,2004;329: 185–186.
- Marais, H. Redefining AIDS in Asia Crafting an Effective Response, Report of Commission on AIDS in 2008, Asia,OxfordUniversitypress.*http://data.unaids.org/pub/Report/2008/20080326_report_commission_aids_en.pdf.*
- Rao, G. International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) panelist presentation and statements, HIV and Intimate Partner Transmission: A Call for Action, Symposium Report 2000. .
- Rao, P UNAIDS Regional Support Team for Asia and the Pacific, quoting Decker et al., Intimate partner violence is both a risk marker and a transmission mechanism for women's HIV 2009.

Asia,OxfordUniversitypress.*http://data.unaids.org/pub/Report/2008/20080326_report_commission_aids_en.pdf.*

Table 1: Percentage distribution of female sex workers having knowledge of STI according to selected background and behavioral indicators.

Background Characteristics	Knowledge of STI among FSWs Round 1				Knowledge of STI among FSWs Round 2			
Age in years	**None**	**2 or less than 2**	**3 or more**	**N***	**None**	**2 or less than 2**	**3 or more**	N*
<25	4.9	33.0	62.2	249	6.2	27.7	66.1	274
25-35	3.3	26.8	69.9	648	6.0	17.9	76.1	865
36+	2.7	25.3	72.1	152	4.6	14.4	81.1	264
Educational Status								
Illiterate	4.3	30.2	65.6	683	7.1	18.0	75.0	925
1-5	0.9	32.3	66.9	129	3.5	22.8	73.7	207
More than 5	3.0	19.0	78.0	237	6.6	21.3	72.2	271
Living Status or Marital and living status								
Unmarried without cohabitant	4.2	35.0	60.7	87	8.2	28.5	63.4	50
Unmarried with cohabitant	1.5	21.0	77.5	48	3.9	26.9	69.2	67
Married living with husband	2.9	24.3	72.8	511	8.4	21.3	70.2	804
Married but not living with husband	3.3	39.2	57.5	174	3.6	12.0	84.4	158
Married living alone	5.8	32.7	61.5	122	5.4	28.0	66.5	88
Divorced/Widowed living alone	3.7	22.0	74.2	52	7.9	18.5	73.6	57
Widowed/Divorced-living with partner	5.1	19.4	75.5	55	1.1	6.3	92.6	174
Engaged in occupation besides sex work								
No	3.8	27.2	69.0	922	4.0	18.6	77.4	926
Yes	1.7	32.5	65.8	127	11.3	20.9	67.8	477
Age at which started sex work(years)								
Below 18	2.2	22.6	75.2	120	2.4	19.5	78.1	141
18-24	3.0	28.5	68.6	430	3.7	21.3	75.0	494
More than 25	2.4	32.9	64.7	306	5.9	14.3	79.8	505
Duration in sex work (years)								
<4	4.9	31.5	63.6	329	6.6	22.5	70.9	455
4-6	4.2	26.1	69.7	270	9.1	17.1	73.9	343
7-9	2.2	31.0	66.8	104	7.1	19.2	73.8	179
10+	2.3	24.8	72.9	231	3.1	12.2	84.7	320
Client Load								
0-4	4.6	24.7	70.7	162	6.9	14.8	78.3	511
5-10	1.6	23.2	75.2	400	2.6	19.8	77.6	627
More than 10	4.6	32.5	62.9	487	14.9	26.7	58.5	261
Condom use with Occasional and Regular partner								
Occasional	2.4	28.8	68.7	826	4.9	18.4	76.7	1141
Regular Partner	3.53	27.91	68.56	1049	6.4	19.3	74.2	1403
Place of Solicitation								
Home Based	3.98	51.92	44.1	105	12.2	21.8	66.0	356
Brothel Based	2.23	31.25	66.52	366	2.4	15.9	81.8	476
Non Brothel Based	4.37	21.88	73.75	578	6.4	20.9	72.7	571
Total	3.53	27.91	68.56	1049	6.4	19.3	74.2	1403

Total figures may not add up to N because of missing cases and don't know.
*Unweighted cases.

Table 2: Percentage distribution of female sex workers seking treatment for the STI by their selected background characteristics.

Background Characteristics	Having STI symptom during 12 months	N*	Seeking for health facility after having STI	N*	Having STI symptom during 12 months	N*	Seeking for health facility after having STI	N*
	Round 1				Round 2			
Age in years								
<25	25.8	350	82.7	103	42.7	386	74.6	169
25-35	25.1	834	68.8	215	36.8	1050	79.9	402
36+	20.7	206	73.9	50	31.0	319	87.8	93
Educational Status								
Illiterate	24.6	923	69.7	232	34.5	1172	80.4	419
1-5	24.5	167	78.0	53	43.8	257	73.2	105
More than 5	25.1	300	78.8	83	41.6	326	82.9	140
Living Status or Marital and living status								
Unmarried without cohabitant	30.0	122	62.9	38	38.0	65	85.5	25
Unmarried with cohabitant	21.8	76	83.4	14	42.9	91	89.5	40
Married living with husband	22.8	655	73.8	155	34.2	1018	75.7	353
Married but not living with husband	23.7	229	83.7	64	45.0	192	91.7	88
Married living alone	26.0	165	63.6	46	34.2	122	77.6	45
Divorced/Widowed living alone	31.9	67	80.8	25	32.3	67	72.5	23
Widowed/Divorced-living with partner	25.6	75	72.1	25	46.5	192	80.5	89
Engaged in occupation besides sex work								
No	23.9	1218	71.9	315	36.0	1176	75.8	419
Yes	30.0	172	77.6	53	39.5	579	87.1	245
Age at which started sex work(years)								
Below 18	19.2	170	86.5	41	46.4	42.47	86.1	79
18-24	23.6	553	62.2	147	35.8	37.28	78.4	236
More than 25	22.1	414	66.5	98	33.2	34.91	73.6	221
Duration in sex work (years)								
<4	25.9	449	68.0	121	35.3	589	77.9	238
4-6	28.1	337	73.5	88	37.1	419	82.9	155
7-9	26.2	133	79.3	36	41.2	213	90.4	87
10+	21.1	289	77.8	69	35.7	372	85.4	123
Client Load								
0-4	27.6	222	69.4	68	35.1	678	79.2	242
5-10	21.1	506	64.2	116	36.8	770	76.3	293
More than 10	26.2	662	78.8	184	42.3	303	88.3	126
Place of Solicitation								
Home Based	30.5	139	78.1	37	43.2	408	88.3	176
Brothel Based	23.9	476	60.3	125	37.4	607	83.0	213
Non Brothel Based	24.3	775	79.7	206	33.8	740	70.7	275
Total	24.7	1390	72.8	368	37.2	1755	79.7	664

Total number of cases may not add to N because of missing cases and don't know responses.
*Unweighted cases.

Table 3: Percentage distribution of FSWs having/experiencing safe sex after the prevalence of STI

Background Characteristics	Using Condom after STI	Stopped sex with sexual partner	Safe Sex		Using Condom after STI	Stopped sex with sexual partner	Safe Sex	
	Round 1				Round 2			
Age in years	Percent	Percent	Percent	N*	Percent	Percent	Percent	N*
<25	41.4	26.0	57.9	103	18.4	15.7	33.9	167
25-35	41.8	24.9	59.1	214	19.6	10.6	30.1	399
36+	63.6	32.3	81.8	50	27.3	9.2	36.4	92
Educational Status								
Illiterate	47.0	25.4	65.7	232	24.4	12.2	36.5	414
1-5	46.2	37.2	65.4	52	8.7	8.9	17.6	104
More than 5	35.4	21.6	47.4	83	17.7	12.5	30.2	140
Living Status or Marital and living status								
Unmarried without cohabitant	34.4	17.5	49.0	38	1.2	19.5	20.6	25
Unmarried with cohabitant	47.8	18.3	50.7	14	18.1	35.1	53.2	40
Married living with husband	40.8	26.5	58.3	155	19.0	9.1	27.9	349
Married but not living with husband	65.4	24.4	77.9	63	34.8	11.6	46.1	87
Married living alone	51.1	31.9	69.2	46	5.0	4.5	9.5	44
Divorced/Widowed living alone	39.7	38.3	72.2	25	9.1	13.7	22.9	23
Widowed/Divorced-living with partner	35.6	14.3	49.9	25	27.1	13.0	40.1	89
Engaged in occupation besides sex work								
No	44.0	20.1	58.0	315	26.8	13.7	40.3	414
Yes	45.8	53.6	80.0	52	8.1	8.0	16.1	244
Age at which started sex work								
Below 18	47.1	24.9	56.9	41	30.7	20.9	51.6	79
18-24	47.1	15.4	60.7	147	25.8	15.0	40.6	233
More than 25	55.0	17.9	67.8	98	20.5	10.9	31.2	218
Years engaged in sex work								
<4	44.9	29.0	67.5	121	19.0	14.1	33.1	237
4-6	34.5	15.4	45.6	88	22.3	9.4	31.6	153
7-9	46.4	29.0	65.8	36	17.9	14.5	32.3	86
10+	53.5	35.6	73.4	68	28.0	9.7	37.7	123
Client Load								
0-4	62.4	32.4	78.9	68	23.5	17.9	41.3	239
5-10	39.0	11.6	49.4	116	26.1	9.5	35.4	290
More than 10	40.9	31.9	62.2	183	2.3	4.5	6.9	126
Place of Solicitation								
Home Based	63.6	33.3	85.5	37	7.4	1.7	9.1	176
Brothel Based	50.7	11.6	58.6	125	28.8	19.7	48.3	210
Non Brothel Based	36.8	33.8	59.1	205	21.4	11.0	32.3	272
Total	44.3	26.1	61.5	367	20.4	11.7	32.0	658

Total number of cases may not add to N because of missing cases and don't know responses.
*Unweighted Cases.

Table 4: Odds ratio showing prevalence of STI among FSWs'.

Background Characteristics	Round 1		Round 2	
	Model 1 Exp (β)	Model 2 Exp (β)	Model 1 Exp (β)	Model 2 Exp (β)
Age in years				
<25®				
25-35	0.713***	0.653***	0.844*	1.110
36+	0.524***	0.506***	0.584***	0.857
Educational Status				
Illiterate®				
1-5 years	1.197	1.138	1.090	1.002
More than 5	1.106	1.121	1.256**	1.161
Income Beside Sex work				
No ®				
Yes	1.491***	1.397***	1.278***	1.240*
Living Status or Marital and living status				
Unmarried without cohabitant®				
Unmarried with cohabitant	0.849	0.833	1.731**	2.101***
Married living with husband	1.104	1.176	1.210	1.299
Married but not living with husband	1.504**	1.499**	2.218***	2.171***
Married living alone	1.063	1.105	1.120	1.137
Divorced/Widowed living alone	1.314*	1.305	1.244	1.453
Widowed/Divorced-living with partner	1.367	1.518	2.156***	2.537***
Age at which started sex work				
Below18®				
18-24		1.358**		0.753**
More than 25		1.176		0.649***
Duration in sex work				
<4®				
4-6		0.921		0.913
7-9		0.962		0.881
10+		0.948		0.696***
Clients				
0-4				
5-10		0.797*		1.015
More than 10		0.745**		0.687
Typology (BB,SB,BG and HB etc)				
Home Based®				
Brothel Based		1.057		0.676**
Non Brothel Based		0.799		0.714**
Constant	0.342	0.373	0.358	0.596

® represents reference category, * Significance at level of 10%, ** significance at level of 5% and *** significance at level of 1%.

Table 5: Logistic regression for HIV prevalence among FSWs'.

	Round 1		Round 2	
	Model 1	**Model2**	**Model 1**	**Model2**
Background Characteristics	**Exp (β)**	**Exp (β)**	**Exp (β)**	**Exp (β)**
Age in years				
<25®				
25-35	1.711***	1.081	1.353*	0.874
36+	2.165***	1.065	1.576**	0.814
Educational Status				
Illiterate®				
1-5 years	0.639**	1.005	1.471**	1.729***
More than 5	0.662**	0.765	1.05	1.141
Income Beside Sex work				
No ®				
Yes	0.867	0.879	0.289***	0.552***
Living Status or Marital and living status				
Unmarried without cohabitant®				
Unmarried with cohabitant	2.778***	1.956	3.136**	2.357
Married living with husband	1.012	1.137	1.212	1.136
Married but not living with husband	1.478	1.119	1.506	1.216
Married living alone	1.127	1.141	1.583	1.300
Divorced/Widowed living alone	1.009	0.973	0.921	1.030
Widowed/Divorced-living with partner	1.324	1.587	1.654	1.292
Age at which started sex work (years)				
Below18®				
18-24		0.714		1.129
More than 25		1.031		1.222
Duration in sex work (years)				
<4®				
4-6		1.290		1.244
7-9		1.792*		1.583*
10+		2.218***		2.318***
Client Load				
0-4				
5-10		0.906		1.047
More than 10		1.099		0.842
Typology (BB,SB,BG and HB etc)				
Home Based®				
Brothel Based		1.374		4.131***
Non Brothel Based		0.955		3.677***
Used Condom with regular partner				
No ®				
Yes		0.856		1.437**
Constant	0.155	0.183	0.497	0.067

® represents reference category, * Significance at level of 10%, ** significance at level of 5% and *** significance at level of 1%.