ABSTRACT


INTRODUCTION
African, Caribbean and Black (ACB) men and HIV in Canada

1. Low HIV prevalence rates in Canada tends to mask the realities of infections among sub-population in the country (Antabe et al., 2021)
2. ACB people constitute less that $5 \%$ of Canada's population, but they make up more than a quarter ( $25.3 \%$ ) of HIV cases in the country (Haddad et al., 2018; StatisticsCanada, 2019).
3. Specifically in Ontario, $22.5 \%$ of those living with HIV identify as ACB (Nelson et al., 2019).
4. Heterosexual ACB men emerge as particularly vulnerable because:

- their health needs are not prioritized
- they do not use HIV-related services
- increasing heterosexual infections impacts them

5. HIV testing is emphasized in reducing new infections among high-risk groups.
6. Despite this, there is dearth of studies examining the predictors of the uptake of HIV testing among heterosexual ACB men in the context of Toronto with the largest ACB community in Ontario and Canada live.

METHODS
$\%$ Data

1. Data were obtained through the quantitative phase of a larger Ontario-based study called weSpeak.
2. Data collection followed a community- and venue-based sampling approaches in recruiting respondents which is recommended for hard-to-reach populations.
3. Self-identified heterosexual ACB men $(n=325)$.

* Measures:
- Dependent Variable: Ever Tested for HIV
- Binary variable coded as " 0 " = never tested and " 1 " = ever tested
- Explanatory Variables (Andersen's framework of health care utilization:
- Predisposing factors
- Enabling factors
- Need factors

RESULTS

| Table 1. Univariate analysis of the dependent and independent variables |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Percentage |
| Ever tested for HIV |  |
| No | 36 |
| Yes | 64 |
| Age of respondents |  |
| $\geq 50$ | 15 |
| 40-49 | 16 |
| 30-39 | 25 |
| 20-29 | 31 |
| 16-19 | 13 |
| Education |  |
| University or higher | 30 |
| Some postsecondary | 38 |
| Secondary or lower | 32 |
| Immigrant status |  |
| Native-born | 32 |
| Immigrants | 68 |
| Religion |  |
| Christian | 72 |
| Muslim | 11 |
| Other | 17 |
| Marital status |  |
| Never married | 50 |
| Currently/ever married | 36 |
| In relationship | 14 |
| Employment status |  |
| Full-time | 52 |
| Part-time | 15 |
| Unemployed | 33 |
| Family income |  |
| No income | 22 |
| $\leq \mathbf{2 0 , 0 0 0}$ | 27 |
| \$20,000-39,999 | 13 |
| \$40,000-59,999 | 13 |
| \$60,000-79,999 | 8 |
| $\geq$ \$80,000 | 17 |
| Multiple partners |  |
| No | 74 |
| Yes | 26 |
| Condom use |  |
| No | 53 |
| Yes | 47 |
| Total | 325 |

Table 2. Negative log-log models predicting 'ever tested for HIV'

|  | Bivariate <br> Model 1 |  | Multivariate |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Model 2 |  | Model 3 |  | Model 4 |  |
|  | OR | SE | OR | SE | OR | SE | OR | SE |
| Age of respondents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\geq 50$ | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| 40-49 | 4.03*** | 1.75 | 5.57*** | 2.59 | 5.63*** | 2.65 | 6.05*** | 2.88 |
| 30-39 | 2.83*** | 0.93 | 3.49*** | 1.17 | 3.94*** | 1.38 | 4.71*** | 1.74 |
| 20-29 | 0.96 | 0.26 | 1.51 | 0.51 | 1.67 | 0.60 | 1.74 | 0.65 |
| 16-19 | 0.38*** | 0.12 | 0.69 | 0.28 | 0.58 | 0.26 | 0.57 | 0.26 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University or higher | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Some postsecondary | 0.58* | 0.17 | 0.60 | 0.20 | 0.59 | 0.20 | 0.59 | 0.20 |
| Secondary or lower | 0.36*** | 0.10 | 0.49** | 0.15 | 0.47** | 0.16 | 0.57* | 0.19 |
| Immigrant status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native-born | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Immigrants | 2.57*** | 0.51 | 2.48*** | 0.59 | 2.57*** | 0.66 | 3.14*** | 0.86 |
| Religion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Christian | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Muslim | 0.62* | 0.17 | 0.55* | 0.18 | 0.54* | 0.18 | 0.60 | 0.22 |
| Other | 1.03 | 0.28 | 1.16 | 0.33 | 1.27 | 0.35 | 1.27 | 0.35 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Currently/ever married | 1.64** | 0.36 | 0.87 | 0.24 | 0.91 | 0.25 | 0.82 | 0.22 |
| In relationship | 1.30 | 0.37 | 1.26 | 0.39 | 1.23 | 0.39 | 1.05 | 0.34 |
| Employment status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Part-time | 1.02 | 0.31 |  |  | 2.22** | 0.75 | 2.15** | 0.72 |
| Unemployed | 0.99 | 0.21 |  |  | 1.80** | 0.50 | 2.34*** | 0.68 |
| Family income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No income | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| $\leq \mathbf{2 0 , 0 0 0}$ | 0.90 | 0.24 |  |  | 0.92 | 0.25 | 0.93 | 0.26 |
| \$20,000-39,999 | 0.93 | 0.34 |  |  | 1.19 | 0.42 | 1.15 | 0.42 |
| \$40,000-59,999 | 0.97 | 0.32 |  |  | 1.29 | 0.50 | 1.23 | 0.46 |
| \$60,000-79,999 | 1.52 | 0.75 |  |  | 1.63 | 0.90 | 1.43 | 0.81 |
| $\geq \$ 80,000$ | 1.18 | 0.39 |  |  | 1.37 | 0.49 | 1.26 | 0.46 |
| Multiple partners |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Yes | 1.95*** | 0.38 |  |  |  |  | 2.76*** | 1.07 |
| Condom use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Yes | 0.57*** | 0.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.10 | 0.40 |
| NOTE: ***p<0.001, * <br> Model 4: Need | $0.05 ; \mathrm{Mo}$ | del 2: pr | disposing | factors | Model 3 | enabli | ng factor |  |

SUMMARY

1. Low level of educational attainment was associated with a lower likelihood of ever testing.
2. Mid-age ACB men were more likely to have ever tested for HIV compared to older age counterparts.
3. Immigrants were more likely to have ever tested relative to native-born
4. Part-time and unemployed ACB men were more likely to have ever tested
5. ACB men with multiple sexual partners were more likely to have ever tested
6. Marital status and family income were not significant predictors of ever testing

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

| 1. This research demonstrates that ever testing for HIV is influenced by |
| :--- |
| several factors, ranging from predisposing, enabling to need factors. |
| 2. Higher educational attainment is important in getting ACB men to test |
| for HIV. |
| 3. Mid-age ACB men may be more conscious about their health which |
| may explain their higher likelihood of testing. |
| 4. Mandatory medical screening for immigrants explains their higher |
| likelihood of ever testing for HIV. |
| 5. ACB men who are fully employed may not be having enough time to |
| test for their HIV serostatus. |
| 6. ACB men with multiple sexual partners may have a heightened sense |
| of HIV risk and therefore more likely to ever test. |
| 7. Family income not as a significant predictor of HIV testing may imply |
| Canada has made progress in removing financial barriers to accessing |
| HIV testing. |
| 8. Need to understand the barriers to HIV testing and the design of a |
| more nuanced population-based approach to HIV testing that |
| incorporates case-management or various incentives. |
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