

LONDON
SCHOOL of
HYGIENE
& TROPICAL
MEDICINE



LSHTM Research Online

Baggaley, RF; Owen, BN; Silhol, R; Elmes, J; Anton, P; McGowan, I; van der Straten, A; Shacklett, B; Dang, Q; Swann, EM; +2 more... Bolton, DL; Boily, MC; (2018) Does per-act HIV-1 transmission risk through anal sex vary by gender? An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. American journal of reproductive immunology (New York, NY. e13039. ISSN 1046-7408 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/aji.13039>

Downloaded from: <http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/id/eprint/4649245/>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/aji.13039>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact researchonline@lshtm.ac.uk.

Available under license: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>

<https://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk>

Does per-act HIV-1 transmission risk through anal sex vary by gender? An updated systematic review and meta-analysis

Running title: Meta-analysis of HIV-1 risk of anal sex

Rebecca F Baggaley,^{1,2} Branwen N Owen,¹ Romain Silhol,¹ Jocelyn Elmes,^{1,2} Peter Anton,³ Ian McGowan,⁴ Ariane van der Straten,⁵ Barbara Shacklett,^{6,7} Que Dang,⁸ Edith M Swann,⁸ Diane L Bolton,⁹ Marie-Claude Boily¹

1 Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Imperial College London, London W2 1PG, United Kingdom

2 Department of Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London WC1E 7HT, United Kingdom

3 UCLA Center for HIV Prevention Research, UCLA AIDS Institute, Department of Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095-7019, United States

4 University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA

5 RTI International, Women's Global Health Imperative, San Francisco, CA 94104, United States

6 Department of Medical Microbiology and Immunology, School of Medicine, University of California Davis, Davis, CA 95616, United States

7 Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, School of Medicine, University of California Davis, Sacramento, CA 95817, United States

8 Vaccine Research Program, Division of AIDS, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD 20892, United States

9 U.S. Military HIV Research Program, The Henry M. Jackson Foundation, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Silver Spring, MD 20910, United States

Corresponding author: Rebecca Baggaley, Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, St Mary's Campus, Imperial College London, London W2 1PG, United Kingdom. Email: r.baggaley@imperial.ac.uk Tel: +44 (0)20 7594 5777

Word count: 3655

Article type: Review

Conflict of interest statement

We do not have any commercial or other association that might pose a conflict of interest.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases of the National Institutes of Health [Grant Number R01AI057020]. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health, the US Army, or the US Department of Defense. We thank the HPTN Modelling Centre, which is funded by the U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH UM1 AI068617) through HPTN, for partial funding of this work.

1 **Abstract**

2 Quantifying HIV-1 transmission risk per act of anal intercourse (AI) is important for HIV-1 prevention.

3 We updated previous reviews by searching Medline and Embase to 02/2018. We derived pooled
4 estimates of receptive AI (URAI) and insertive AI (UIAI) risk unprotected by condoms using random
5 effects models. Subgroup analyses were conducted by gender, study design, and whether
6 antiretroviral treatment (ART) had been introduced by the time of the study.

7 Two new relevant studies were identified, one of which met inclusion criteria, adding three new
8 cohorts and increasing number of individuals/partnerships included from 1869 to 14,277. Four
9 studies, all from high-income countries, were included. Pooled HIV-1 risk was higher for URAI
10 (1.25%,95%CI 0.55-2.23%,N=5,I²=87%) than UIAI (0.17%,95%CI 0.09-0.26%,N=3,I²=0%). The sole
11 heterosexual URAI estimate (3.38%,95%CI 1.85-4.91%), from a study of 72 women published in a
12 peer-reviewed journal, was significantly higher than the MSM pooled estimate (0.75%,95%CI 0.56-
13 0.98%,N=4,p<0.0001) and higher than the only other heterosexual estimate identified (0.4%,95%CI
14 0.08-2.0%, based on 59 women, excluded for being a pre-2013 abstract). Pooled per-act URAI risk
15 varied by study design (retrospective-partner studies: 2.56%,95%CI 1.20-4.42%,N=2 (one MSM, one
16 heterosexual); prospective studies: 0.71,95%CI 0.51-0.93%,N=3 MSM, p<0.0001). URAI risk was
17 lower for studies conducted in the ART era (0.75%,95%CI 0.52-1.03%) than pre-ART (1.67%,95%CI
18 0.44-3.67%) but not significantly so (p=0.537).

19 Prevention messages must emphasise that HIV-1 infectiousness through AI remains high, even in the
20 ART era. Further studies, particularly among heterosexual populations and in resource-limited
21 settings, are required to elucidate whether AI risk differs by gender, region and following
22 population-level ART scale-up.

23 **Keywords:** HIV, anal intercourse, transmission probability, infectivity, review, meta-analysis,
24 heterosexual, MSM, antiretroviral therapy

25 **Introduction**

26 Anal intercourse (AI) drives HIV-1 epidemics among men-who-have-sex-with-men (MSM), and
27 numerous studies have demonstrated that substantial proportions of heterosexual populations also
28 practise AI^{1,2}, potentially making it an important source of heterosexual HIV-1 transmission³.
29 Quantifying the role of AI in HIV-1 epidemics is important for effective targeting of safe sex
30 messages, for developing and implementing HIV-1 prevention technologies, and to inform
31 mathematical models. Two previously published systematic reviews and meta-analyses have only
32 included four studies providing estimates of the probability of HIV-1 transmission per AI act
33 unprotected by condoms^{4,5}.

34 Baggaley et al derived the first pooled receptive AI unprotected by condoms (URAI) per-act
35 estimates in 2010 (1.37%, 95% confidence interval[95%CI] 0.20-2.54%)⁵. Patel et al⁴ updated the
36 review to February 2012, and derived a similar pooled estimate to Baggaley et al despite excluding a
37 study included in Baggaley et al⁶ and incorporating one new study (1.38%, 95%CI 1.02-1.86%)^{5,7}.
38 Patel also reported a pooled estimate for insertive AI unprotected by condoms (UIAI): 0.1% (95%CI
39 0.0-0.3%). However, since their search, additional per-act estimates derived from large HIV-1 cohort
40 datasets have been published^{8,9}. Given the scarce data on per-act AI HIV risk, it is important to
41 update pooled estimates in light of new data, to reduce uncertainty and provide more reliable
42 estimates to address public health questions and for use in models.

43 Addition of further data may enable evaluation of how HIV-1 infectiousness through AI varies by
44 gender of participants, by ART use in the general population, region and other study characteristics.
45 For example, recent evidence from animal studies suggests increased susceptibility of male rhesus
46 macaques to HIV-1 acquisition following intrarectal challenge, compared to females (Diane Bolton,
47 personal communication).

48 Our aim was to revise pooled estimates of URAI and insertive AI unprotected by condoms (UIAI) per-
49 act HIV-1 transmission risk through incorporation of new data. We aimed to assess whether the

50 addition of new data leads to significantly different pooled estimates of AI per-act risk; to evaluate
51 the robustness of pooled estimates through sensitivity analysis; and to conduct subgroup analysis to
52 investigate the influence of: 1) ART use among study participants or their partners; 2) gender; 3)
53 region; and 4) study design.

54

55 **Methods**

56 The systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted in accordance with the PRISMA
57 statement¹⁰.

58 ***Search strategy***

59 We conducted literature searches to identify new studies reporting data on per-act HIV-1
60 transmission risk through anal intercourse (AI) published since searches originally performed by
61 Baggaley et al⁵ (searched to September 2008), and Patel et al⁴ (searched to February 2012). Our
62 search was harmonised to ensure inclusion of terms employed previously^{4,5}. We used the following
63 search string: (HIV OR HIV infections OR human immunodeficiency virus OR AIDS) AND (disease
64 transmission OR infectious OR infectivity OR infectiousness OR transmissibility OR contact OR
65 contacts OR per-contact OR per-act OR effectiveness) AND (sexual OR heterosexual OR homosexual
66 OR coital OR intercourse OR anal). We searched Medline (Ovid), Embase (Ovid), CINAHL (EbscoHost),
67 Web of Science, Global Health, and the Cochrane Library for studies published February 2012 to
68 February 2018 inclusive. See Supplementary Material for further search details.

69 Unlike Baggaley et al⁵, which focused on transmission risk estimates in the absence of ART, we also
70 included studies where ART was likely used by a proportion of study participant partners. This
71 change of inclusion criterion necessitated searching the exclusion lists of Baggaley et al⁵ to ensure no
72 studies were excluded based on ART use. We defined ART use to include therapeutic use by index

73 (i.e. initially infected) partners, or pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) or post-exposure prophylaxis
74 (PEP) use by their (initially uninfected) partners.

75 ***Study selection***

76 Inclusion criteria were randomised controlled trials, longitudinal studies (prospective or
77 retrospective) or other empirical observational studies that directly reported estimates of per-act
78 HIV-1 transmission risk through AI. We excluded studies that did not stratify AI risk, receptive versus
79 insertive. Abstracts pre-2013, studies using sample sizes less than 10, and estimates derived from
80 dynamic transmission modelling studies fitted to empirical HIV-1 prevalence curves, were excluded.
81 While we included studies where study populations included individuals using ART, we aimed to
82 include “real life studies” only, and so excluded studies where successful, suppressive ART of index
83 partners was an inclusion criterion. Abstracts and other unpublished data older than five years were
84 excluded because they were unlikely to result in peer-reviewed publication. There was no restriction
85 by study year, region, or language of publication. AI per-act estimates included in previous
86 systematic reviews^{4,5}, which we refer to as “original estimates”, were included if they fulfilled the
87 current inclusion criteria.

88 ***Data extraction***

89 Study review was conducted independently by two separate authors (RFB and BNO). Data were
90 extracted on the following study and participant characteristics: region, study design, study dates,
91 gender (MSM or heterosexual study population), sample size, statistical method of estimating per-
92 act risk, information on current and history of sexually transmitted infections (STIs), proportion of
93 the study partner population using therapeutic ART and stage of HIV-1 infection of infected partners,
94 condom use, intravenous drug use and ART use (PrEP or PEP). Discrepancies were resolved by
95 consensus.

96 ***Statistical methods***

97 We performed random-effects inverse-variance meta-analysis¹¹ on arcsin-transformed study
98 estimates, which were back-transformed to the original scale to produce pooled estimates for per-
99 act risk of HIV-1 transmission through URAI and UIAI. We presented available study estimates and
100 pooled URAI and UIAI estimates in forest plots.

101 Meta-regression and subgroup analysis were used to explore potential sources of heterogeneity:
102 gender; study design e.g. retrospective-partner study, prospective cohort of individuals; and ART use
103 among partners. We assessed the robustness of pooled estimates and the influence of each
104 individual study using leave-one-out sensitivity analysis (i.e., an influence analysis¹¹). We also
105 assessed the influence of relaxing our inclusion criteria to include Halperin et al (0.4%,95%CI 0.08-
106 2.0%, excluded for being unpublished data pre-2013⁶). Heterogeneity across study estimates was
107 assessed using I² statistics. Analysis was performed using R version 3.4.2¹² and the metafor package.

108 **Results**

109 ***Search results***

110 Of 5336 unique studies published from February 2012 to February 2018 that we identified in our
111 online searches, 4985 were excluded for non-relevance based on title, and 349 excluded based on
112 abstract or full text. Two new articles directly reported per-act HIV-1 transmission probability
113 estimates^{8,9}. No study had been excluded from our previous review based on ART use. Figure 1
114 illustrates the study selection procedure.

115 ***Studies included in each systematic review***

116 Table 1 summarises per-act URAI and UIAI transmission risk estimates and study characteristics for
117 estimates included in Baggaley et al 2010⁵, Patel et al⁴ and the current analysis. Detailed study
118 characteristics are shown in Table S1, Supplementary Material. Data from 14,227 and 14,000
119 individuals/partnerships reported in the included studies were used to inform URAI and UIAI pooled
120 estimates, respectively, compared to 1869 individuals/partnerships included in Baggaley et al⁵).

121 Of the two newly-identified studies^{8,9}, Scott et al⁸ was preferentially included. Smith et al⁹ used data
122 from EXPLORE¹³ and VAX 004¹⁴ studies, while Scott et al⁸ additionally included Jumpstart¹⁵ and
123 HIVNET Vaccine Preparedness Study (VPS)^{16,17} data. Furthermore, Smith et al⁹ did not account for
124 risk factors such as ethnicity and drug use, or for heterogeneity in per-act risk, as Scott did. Scott et
125 al⁸ results also superseded and improved upon Vittinghoff et al¹⁸ estimates, which were conducted
126 by the same research group and included the same Jumpstart study data. Vittinghoff et al¹⁸ data are
127 therefore excluded. Halperin et al⁶, included by Baggaley et al⁵, was excluded for being a pre-2013
128 abstract. Further details of the advantages of Scott et al methodology, together with further
129 information regarding excluded studies, are provided in Supplementary Material.

130 ***Study characteristics***

131 Five URAI per-act study estimates reported by four studies^{7,8,19,20} and three UIAI estimates reported
132 by two studies^{7,8} were included in the current analysis (Figure 1). Scott et al⁸ provided independent
133 estimates for pre-highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART, hereafter referred to as ART: study
134 data from 1992-1995) and early ART (study data from 1995-2003) eras, for both URAI and UIAI,
135 because they combined data from four cohorts¹³⁻¹⁷.

136 Data collection occurred between 1987 and 2007, although the earliest included publication did not
137 state study dates¹⁹. URAI study estimates used data from Australia (N=1⁷), the US (N=3^{8,19}) and one
138 multi-European country study²⁰ (Table 1). UIAI study estimates used data from Australia (N=1⁷) and
139 the US (N=2¹⁹). All but one included study estimate (Leynaert et al²⁰, URAI) used data from MSM
140 populations (Figure 2). Two URAI study estimates were from retrospective-partner studies^{19,20}; the
141 remaining three used data from prospective cohorts of individuals^{7,8}.

142 Three URAI study estimates used face-to-face interview (FTFI) data (^{8,20} and pre-ART¹⁹), a third used
143 FTFI combined with telephone interviewing⁷, and Scott et al's⁸ early ART study estimate combined
144 data gathered using FTFI (VAX004¹⁴ and VPS^{16,17}) and audio computer-assisted self-interview (ACASI)
145 (Explore¹³). For UIAI, all three study estimates were from prospective studies and data were

146 collected using FTFI (pre-ART¹⁹), FTFI plus telephone interview⁷ and FTFI plus ACASI combined (early
147 ART⁸).

148 No studies reported on ART use of index partners. These data were not available from cohorts of
149 individuals because they cannot be collected using this design^{7, 8}. Authors discussed plausible ART
150 coverage among infected partners but did not attempt to adjust estimates to account for ART use.
151 Jin et al cited national data that 70% of Australian MSM used ART, and 75% of those had
152 undetectable viral load⁷. For their early ART era estimates, Scott et al cited national data that only
153 around 80% of those infected were aware of their status, and only 30% were virally suppressed, and
154 that these levels were probably even lower during study periods. ART use was also not collected by
155 retrospective-partner studies^{19, 20}. Leynaert et al (retrospective-partner) reported that ART use data
156 were not collected, but the study was conducted 1987-1992 and so use was minimal²⁰. Similarly,
157 DeGruttola et al (retrospective-partner) was published in 1989¹⁹. Therefore ART use was minimal,
158 likely 0%, in 3 of 5 (^{19, 20} and pre-ART⁸) and 1 (pre-ART⁸) of 3 URAI and UIAI study estimates,
159 respectively. The remaining two studies were classed as having >0% ART use^{7, 8}. Although no
160 included studies reported any information on PEP or PrEP use by study participants, its use is
161 expected to be very low, given the dates of data collection (all before 2007).

162 Study size varied considerably. Retrospective-partner studies enrolled 155¹⁹ and 72²⁰ couples, while
163 cohorts followed between 1427⁷ and 4581 (EXPLORE¹³, included as part of Scott et al⁸) individuals.

164 Number of AI acts with a partner appeared to vary considerably between individuals in the same
165 study, with infectiousness similarly heterogeneous: Jin et al noted that 12 seroconversions in their
166 cohort occurred as a result of <10 unprotected AI acts, while six men did not seroconvert despite
167 reporting a total of 502 URAI acts with ejaculation⁷. Similarly, DeGruttola reported that 12 men
168 reported >100 URAI acts with HIV-1-infected partners without seroconverting, while five men
169 seroconverted after ≤10 such exposures to their infected partner and <3 partners outside the main
170 relationship¹⁹.

171 **Meta-analysis results**

172 The updated pooled estimate of per-act URAI HIV-1 risk of 1.25% (95%CI 0.55-2.23%,N=5, $I^2=87%$)^{7, 8,}
173 ^{19, 20}) was considerably and statistically significantly higher ($p=0.0026$) and more heterogeneous than
174 the UIAI risk (0.17%, 95%CI 0.09-0.26%, $I^2=0%$,N=3^{7, 8}). Pooled and study estimates are shown in
175 Figure 2.

176 **Subgroup analysis**

177 Table 2 shows the results of the subgroup analysis. The pooled per-act URAI HIV-1 risk was
178 significantly lower for MSM (0.75% 95%CI 0.56-0.98%,N=4) than the sole heterosexual population
179 estimate (3.38% 95%CI 1.85-4.91%,N=1) ($p<0.0001$). However, relaxing inclusion criteria to include
180 Halperin et al⁶ (0.4% 95%CI 0.08-2.0%), one of just two identified estimates from heterosexual
181 populations, excluded for being an abstract pre-2013, reduced the pooled heterosexual URAI
182 estimate to 1.57% (95%CI 0.00-5.87%,N=2, $I^2=91%$) which was no longer significantly different from
183 the MSM estimate ($p=0.370$, Figure S1). MSM per-act estimates for both URAI and UIAI showed
184 relatively little heterogeneity ($I^2<0.1%$).

185 Pooled per-act URAI risk from studies where ART was likely to have been used by >0% of sexual
186 partners was lower than half (0.75%,95%CI 0.52-1.03%,N=2) that without ART use (1.67%,95%CI
187 0.44-3.67%,N=3) but this difference was not significant ($p=0.537$). Per-act UIAI risks were similar by
188 ART use (0.14%,95%CI 0.04-0.29% for 0% use vs. 0.18%,95%CI 0.09-0.31% for >0% use, $p=0.955$).

189 When assessed in multivariate meta-regression analysis, only study design was (borderline)
190 significantly associated with magnitude of URAI transmission risk ($p=0.055$), accounting for >99% of
191 the heterogeneity across study estimates ($R^2=99.9%$). Meta-regression analysis could not be
192 undertaken for UIAI given the small number of estimates (N=3, all from MSM populations).

193 **Sensitivity analysis**

194 In the leave-one-out sensitivity analysis, only the omission of the heterosexual URAI estimate from
195 Leynaert et al²⁰ among heterosexual couples substantially reduced heterogeneity (I^2 reduced from
196 87% to 0%), producing an all-MSM pooled URAI estimate (0.75%, 95%CI 0.56-0.98%) (Figure S1).
197 Adding the Halperin et al⁶ study estimate did not substantially influence the URAI pooled estimate
198 (1.10%,95%CI 0.50-1.94%, $I^2=85%$, Figure S1). The pooled UIAI estimate was also not affected by any
199 individual study estimate because study estimates were remarkably homogeneous (Figure 2, $I^2=0$).

200

201 **Discussion**

202 Our updated review incorporates recently-published study estimates which strengthen the analysis
203 and robustness of pooled per-act risk estimates by greatly increasing the number of included
204 individuals (data from 14,227 individuals/partnerships, compared to 1869 individuals/partnerships in
205 Baggaley et al⁵). Our results highlight that risk of HIV-1 transmission through AI remains high
206 (1.25%,95%CI 0.55-2.23%, $N=5$ for URAI; 0.17%,95%CI 0.09-0.26%, $N=3$ for UIAI), and raises the
207 question of whether HIV risk during URAI is higher for women than MSM, also highlighting the lack
208 of data from resource-limited settings.

209 Our new pooled estimate is slightly lower than the previous pooled URAI estimates by Baggaley et
210 al⁵ and Patel et al⁴, and a slight, nonsignificant increase on the previous pooled UIAI estimate
211 reported by Patel et al⁴. We have explored sources of heterogeneity as far as possible, given the few
212 included study estimates. In fact, URAI and UIAI estimates from MSM study populations were
213 remarkably homogeneous ($I^2=0%$). It is unclear whether gender or study design accounted for the
214 heterogeneity across all URAI study estimates, but even after omitting the highest URAI estimate
215 (i.e., the sole heterosexual estimate²⁰, see Figure S1), the estimate of HIV-1 transmission risk through
216 URAI remained high (0.75%,95%CI 0.56-0.98%). Even considering only study estimates which were
217 conducted since the introduction of ART, risk remained nearly 10-fold riskier than unprotected

218 receptive vaginal intercourse (VI): URAI 0.75%,95%CI 0.52-1.03% vs. unprotected receptive VI:
219 0.08%,95%CI 0.06-0.11%²¹. UIAI risk in the ART era is more than four-fold riskier than insertive VI
220 (0.18%,95%CI 0.09-0.31% vs. 0.04%,95%CI 0.01-0.14%²¹).

221 It is unclear why the Leynaert et al URAI risk among females was so high (3.38%, 95%CI 1.85-
222 4.91%²⁰). All studies were conducted in industrialised countries, so difference by region is unlikely.
223 Heterosexual study participants reported monogamy and no STIs. However, a large proportion of
224 index cases (65% of the entire sample) were infected by intravenous drug use, so while their sexual
225 partners reported no such use, it is possible that they underreported HIV-1 exposure and acquired
226 HIV-1 via this route. Leynaert et al was a retrospective-partner study, and in multivariate meta-
227 regression, study design explained a larger fraction of the variation across URAI estimates than
228 gender, so the apparent difference by gender may be confounded by study design. HIV risk during
229 URAI is especially uncertain because the only other identified URAI estimate among females, which
230 was excluded for being a pre-2013 abstract, provided a markedly lower estimate than Leynaert et al
231 (0.4% 95%CI 0.08-2.0%): it is in fact lower than all the five included URAI study estimates. This clouds
232 the picture of potential differential risk by gender. The sample sizes of both Leynaert and Halperin
233 were low (n<80), and given heterogeneity in infectiousness between individuals and by stage of HIV-
234 1 infection²⁵, the widely different estimates may be due to chance (95%CI are wide and
235 overlapping: 1.85-4.91%²⁰ and 0.08-2.0%⁶). The lack of study design detail for the Halperin abstract
236 makes it difficult to postulate reasons for the low estimate. However, our main results, based on the
237 a priori exclusion of Halperin et al, mean we cannot exclude the possibility that women have an
238 intrinsically higher URAI HIV-1 acquisition risk than men. This warrants further research, given its
239 implication for HIV-1 prevention. There may exist underlying biological differences between the
240 rectal compartments of males and females, rendering women more susceptible to infection. For
241 example, there may be sex hormone differences, which alter rectal mucosal immunology and
242 enhance susceptibility²⁶. However, there has been little research conducted in this area to date, and
243 recent evidence from animal studies suggested an opposite effect (Diane Bolton, person

244 communication). Alternatively, variation in sexual practices by gender may play a role. MSM may be
245 more likely to anticipate receptive AI and therefore prepare to reduce the likelihood of trauma (such
246 as use of lubricants, cleansing the colon). Qualitative research has suggested that heterosexual AI
247 often occurs without the explicit prior consent of women^{27, 28}.

248 Our meta-regression found the pooled URAI risk among studies conducted in the ART era, when
249 there was likely to be >0% ART use among sexual partners of study participants, was less than half
250 that from pre-ART studies, but this difference failed to reach statistical significance, probably partly
251 because of the small number of estimates and also the variability across estimates in the pre-ART era
252 (from 0.60%⁸ to 3.38%²⁰). For both URAI and UIAI, Scott et al pre-ART and early ART era per-act study
253 estimates were very similar. Scott et al explained this lack of a significant association by suggesting
254 that a relatively low proportion of infected MSM were on ART and had a suppressed viral load during
255 the years in which data were collected. However, Jin et al⁷ URAI estimates were also high, and
256 similar to Baggaley et al⁵ 2010's pooled estimate (without ART use), despite the likely high ART use in
257 the Australian study population. In fact, omitting the high heterosexual URAI estimate from Leynaert
258 et al²⁰ makes pre-ART and ART era URAI estimates more comparable: 1.00% (95%CI 0.22-2.33%) and
259 0.75% (95%CI 0.52-1.03%), respectively.

260

261 However, as Jin and Scott et al followed individuals rather than couples over time, information on
262 infection status, current ART use and viral load of each sexual partner of each study participant was
263 missing: data that are required to control for ART use adequately. While evidence shows that HIV-
264 infected individuals with ART-mediated viral suppression do not transmit HIV-1²²⁻²⁴, our findings
265 demonstrate that HIV-1 infectiousness through AI remains high, indicating that many HIV-infected
266 individuals practising condomless AI are not on effective ART and remain infectious.

267 With ART coverage having continued to increase, now taken at earlier stages of HIV-1 infection and more
268 tolerable regimens increasing levels of adherence, and with the advent of PrEP, it is expected that any

269 future AI HIV-1 infectiousness studies would find further, significant reductions in infectiousness
270 estimates. However, HIV-infected MSM engaging in nondisclosing (not disclosing their HIV status to their
271 partner), condomless AI have been found to be less ART-adherent and more likely to have unsuppressed
272 HIV³¹ and so it is important to collect further data to monitor whether these population-level AI HIV-1
273 infectiousness estimates continue to decline over time.

274 There are some limitations to our findings, mainly due to scarcity of data. The few study estimates
275 prevent us exploring the sources of heterogeneity in greater depth. Only one heterosexual study
276 estimate was included, so it is difficult to know if differences in infectiousness by gender are real or
277 confounded by study design. Included estimates were from only two study types: retrospective-
278 partner and prospective studies of individuals. Both have advantages and disadvantages. For
279 example, prospective studies are less likely to experience recall bias and therefore estimating
280 numbers of sex acts may be more precise than retrospective studies. Recruiting individuals is easier
281 than recruiting couples, providing larger sample sizes. Partner studies provide more reliable data on
282 index cases, particularly regarding HIV-1 status, and in theory on their patterns of ART use. Studies of
283 individuals rely on participants' perceptions of the status of their sexual partners. However, couples
284 may be more likely to underreport sexual partners outside the main relationship because of social
285 desirability bias. Leynaert et al only reported from monogamous couples²⁰, but all other study
286 estimates included participants reporting multiple partners and multiple sexual behaviours. It can be
287 challenging to estimate transmission risks using such data, especially where the HIV-1 infection and
288 ART use status of sexual partners cannot be known with certainty: there are a lot of unknowns which
289 must be accounted for. Different studies have used different statistical techniques to attempt this.
290 All but one study used FTFI to gather sexual behaviour data, which may lead to social desirability
291 bias³². These limitations may over- or underestimate per-act risk, and together with the small
292 number of studies identified, and the variation in methods of data analysis, mean we recommend
293 further data gathering using more confidential techniques such as ACASI, and analysis using
294 standardised statistical methods, to increase comparability of studies and robustness of pooled

295 estimates. Publication bias and selective reporting are likely to be low, because these studies are not
296 assessing significance or effectiveness outcomes. This bias could be investigated using funnel plots if
297 more study estimates became available.

298 In conclusion, current evidence suggests that practising unprotected AI continues to confer a high
299 risk of HIV-1 transmission, particularly URAI, even in the ART era. More research is needed as
300 important knowledge gaps regarding HIV-1 risk during AI remain. Given the high HIV-1 transmission
301 risk associated with AI, it is remarkable that more research has not been conducted to evaluate if AI
302 transmissibility differs by gender, high- and low-income countries and following ART scale-up at the
303 population level. Standardised methods should be used to aid comparability between studies, and
304 longitudinal studies reporting HIV transmission rates should be encouraged to use these methods to
305 additionally report per-act estimates. Even today it continues to be important to design safe sex
306 messaging that promotes the use of condoms in addition to interventions such as PrEP and other
307 biotechnologies to prevent HIV-1 transmission through AI for both MSM and heterosexual
308 populations.

References

1. Owen, B.N., et al., *Prevalence and Frequency of Heterosexual Anal Intercourse Among Young People: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis*. *AIDS Behav*, 2015. **19**(7): p. 1338-60.
2. Owen, B.N., et al., *How common and frequent is heterosexual anal intercourse among South Africans? A systematic review and meta-analysis*. *J Int AIDS Soc*, 2017. **19**(1): p. 21162.
3. Maheu-Giroux, M., et al., *Anal Intercourse Among Female Sex Workers in Cote d'Ivoire: Prevalence, Determinants, and Model-Based Estimates of the Population-Level Impact on HIV Transmission*. *Am J Epidemiol*, 2018. **187**(2): p. 287-297.
4. Patel, P., et al., *Estimating per-act HIV transmission risk: a systematic review*. *AIDS*, 2014. **28**(10): p. 1509-19.
5. Baggaley, R.F., R.G. White, and M.C. Boily, *HIV transmission risk through anal intercourse: systematic review, meta-analysis and implications for HIV prevention*. *Int J Epidemiol*, 2010. **39**(4): p. 1048-63.
6. Halperin, D.T., et al., *High level of HIV-1 infection from anal intercourse: a neglected risk factor in heterosexual AIDS prevention*. Abstract ThPeC7438. *International Conference on AIDS 2002, July 7-12*. 2002.
7. Jin, F., et al., *Per-contact probability of HIV transmission in homosexual men in Sydney in the era of HAART*. *AIDS*, 2010. **24**(6): p. 907-13.
8. Scott, H.M., et al., *Age, race/ethnicity, and behavioral risk factors associated with per contact risk of HIV infection among men who have sex with men in the United States*. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*, 2014. **65**(1): p. 115-21.
9. Smith, D.K., et al., *Condom effectiveness for HIV prevention by consistency of use among men who have sex with men in the United States*. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*, 2015. **68**(3): p. 337-44.
10. Moher, D., et al., *Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement*. *Int J Surg*, 2010. **8**(5): p. 336-41.
11. Deeks, J.J., D.G. Altman, and M.J. Bradburn, *Chapter 15: Statistical methods for examining heterogeneity and combining results from several studies in meta-analysis*. In: *Systematic review in health care: Meta-analysis in context*. *BMJ Books, London, U.K.* 1995.
12. *R Core Team (2012). R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. *R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria*. ISBN 3-900051-07-0, URL <http://http://www.R-project.org/>.
13. Koblin, B., et al., *Effects of a behavioural intervention to reduce acquisition of HIV infection among men who have sex with men: the EXPLORE randomised controlled study*. *Lancet*, 2004. **364**(9428): p. 41-50.
14. Bartholow, B.N., et al., *Demographic and behavioral contextual risk groups among men who have sex with men participating in a phase 3 HIV vaccine efficacy trial: implications for HIV prevention and behavioral/biomedical intervention trials*. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*, 2006. **43**(5): p. 594-602.
15. Buchbinder, S.P., et al., *Feasibility of human immunodeficiency virus vaccine trials in homosexual men in the United States: risk behavior, seroincidence, and willingness to participate*. *J Infect Dis*, 1996. **174**(5): p. 954-61.
16. Flynn, N.M., et al., *Placebo-controlled phase 3 trial of a recombinant glycoprotein 120 vaccine to prevent HIV-1 infection*. *J Infect Dis*, 2005. **191**(5): p. 654-65.
17. Seage, G.R., 3rd, et al., *Are US populations appropriate for trials of human immunodeficiency virus vaccine? The HIVNET Vaccine Preparedness Study*. *Am J Epidemiol*, 2001. **153**(7): p. 619-27.
18. Vittinghoff, E., et al., *Per-contact risk of human immunodeficiency virus transmission between male sexual partners*. *Am J Epidemiol*, 1999. **150**(3): p. 306-11.

19. DeGruttola, V., et al., *Infectiousness of HIV between male homosexual partners*. J Clin Epidemiol, 1989. **42**(9): p. 849-56.
20. Leynaert, B., A.M. Downs, and I. de Vincenzi, *Heterosexual transmission of human immunodeficiency virus: variability of infectivity throughout the course of infection*. European Study Group on Heterosexual Transmission of HIV. Am J Epidemiol, 1998. **148**(1): p. 88-96.
21. Boily, M.C., et al., *Heterosexual risk of HIV-1 infection per sexual act: systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies*. Lancet Infect Dis, 2009. **9**(2): p. 118-29.
22. Cohen, M.S., et al., *Antiretroviral Therapy for the Prevention of HIV-1 Transmission*. N Engl J Med, 2016. **375**(9): p. 830-9.
23. Baggaley, R.F., et al., *Heterosexual HIV-1 infectiousness and antiretroviral use: systematic review of prospective studies of discordant couples*. Epidemiology, 2013. **24**(1): p. 110-21.
24. Bavinton, B.R., et al., *Viral suppression and HIV transmission in serodiscordant male couples: an international, prospective, observational, cohort study*. Lancet HIV, 2018.
25. Boily, M.C., R.F. Baggaley, and B. Masse, *The role of heterosexual anal intercourse for HIV transmission in developing countries: are we ready to draw conclusions?* Sex Transm Infect, 2009. **85**(6): p. 408-10.
26. McGowan, I., et al., *A phase 1 randomized, double blind, placebo controlled rectal safety and acceptability study of tenofovir 1% gel (MTN-007)*. PLoS One, 2013. **8**(4): p. e60147.
27. Marston, C. and R. Lewis, *Anal heterosex among young people and implications for health promotion: a qualitative study in the UK*. BMJ Open, 2014. **4**(8): p. e004996.
28. Reynolds, G.L., D.G. Fisher, and B. Rogala, *Why women engage in anal intercourse: results from a qualitative study*. Arch Sex Behav, 2015. **44**(4): p. 983-95.
29. Rodger, A.J., et al., *Sexual Activity Without Condoms and Risk of HIV Transmission in Serodifferent Couples When the HIV-Positive Partner Is Using Suppressive Antiretroviral Therapy*. JAMA, 2016. **316**(2): p. 171-81.
30. Powers, K.A., et al., *Rethinking the heterosexual infectivity of HIV-1: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. Lancet Infect Dis, 2008. **8**(9): p. 553-63.
31. Kalichman, S.C., et al., *HIV Disclosure and Transmission Risks to Sex Partners Among HIV-Positive Men*. AIDS Patient Care STDS, 2016. **30**(5): p. 221-8.
32. Langhaug, L.F., L. Sherr, and F.M. Cowan, *How to improve the validity of sexual behaviour reporting: systematic review of questionnaire delivery modes in developing countries*. Trop Med Int Health, 2010. **15**(3): p. 362-81.
33. Higgins, J.P., et al., *Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses*. BMJ, 2003. **327**(7414): p. 557-60.

Tables

Table 1 Summary of per-act anal intercourse HIV-1 transmission probability studies included in meta-analyses reported by Baggaley et al 2010⁵, Patel et al⁴, and the current analysis. Reasons for study exclusion are provided, where applicable.

Study	Population, sample size, setting	Design. Study dates	Per-act estimate, % (95%CI)	Included in:		
				Baggaley et al 2010	Patel et al 2014	Current analysis
URAI						
DeGruttola et al 1989 ¹⁹	132 MSM (some infected, some uninfected) plus 155 sexual partners, US	Retrospective-partner, study dates not stated	0.5-3.0^a	✓	✓	✓
Leynaert et al 1998 ²⁰	72 heterosexual couples (male index) practising AI, Europe	Retrospective-partner, 1987-1992	3.38 (1.85-4.91)	✓	✓	✓
Vittinghoff et al 1999 ¹⁸	1583 MSM, US	Prospective cohort of individuals, 1992-1994	0.82 (0.24-2.76)	✓	✓	✗ Superseded ^c
Halperin et al 2002 (abstract) ⁶ plus S.C. Shiboski (personal communication, 2003)	59 heterosexual couples (male index), US	Retrospective-partner, participants recruited 1985-1986	0.4 (0.08-2.0) ^b	✓	✗ Estimate interpreted as a relative risk	✗ Abstract pre-2013
Jin et al 2010 ⁷	1427 MSM, Australia	Prospective cohort of individuals, 2001-2007	0.91^d (0.41-2.07)	✗ Data not yet published	✓	✓

Study	Population, sample size, setting	Design. Study dates	Per-act estimate, % (95%CI)		Included in:		
					Baggaley et al 2010	Patel et al 2014	Current analysis
Scott et al 2014 ⁸	MSM, US Pre-ART N=1813 ^c Early ART N=10,760 ^f	Four prospective cohorts of individuals: Jumpstart 1992-1995 ¹⁵ , EXPLORE 1999-2003 ¹³ , VAX 004 1998-2002 ¹⁴ , VPS 1995- 1999 ^{16, 17}	0.60 ^e	(0.34-1.09)	x Data not yet published	x Not included ⁹	✓
Smith et al 2015 ⁹	3490 MSM, US	Two prospective cohorts of individuals: EXPLORE 1999-2003 ¹³ , VAX 004 1998-2002 ¹⁴	1.11 ⁿ	(0.75-1.62)	x Data not yet published	x Data not yet published	x Study data reported by Scott et al 2014 ⁸
UIAI							
Vittinghoff et al 1999 ¹⁸	1583 MSM, US	Prospective cohort of individuals, 1992-1994	0.06	(0.02-0.19)	x Estimate is per partner of HIV-1 positive or unknown serostatus	✓	x Estimate is per partner of HIV-1 positive or unknown serostatus; superseded ^c
Jin et al 2010 ⁷	1427 MSM, Australia	Prospective cohort of individuals, 2001-2007	0.16	(0.05-0.31)	x Data not yet published	✓	✓

Study	Population, sample size, setting	Design. Study dates	Per-act estimate, % (95%CI)		Included in:		
					Baggaley et al 2010	Patel et al 2014	Current analysis
Scott et al 2014 ⁸	MSM, US	Four prospective cohorts			x	x	✓
	Pre-ART N=1813 ^c	of individuals: Jumpstart	0.14^e	(0.04-0.29)	Data not yet published	Not included ⁹	
	Early ART N=10,760 ^f	1992-1995 ¹⁵ , EXPLORE 1999-2003 ¹³ , VAX 004 1998-2002 ¹⁴ , VPS 1995- 1999 ^{16, 17}	0.22^f	(0.05-0.39)			
Smith et al 2015 ⁹	3490 MSM, US	Two prospective cohorts	0.27^h	(0.18-0.41)	x	x	x
		of individuals: EXPLORE 1999-2003 ¹³ , VAX 004 1998-2002 ¹⁴	0.20ⁱ	(0.15-0.27)	Data not yet published	Data not yet published	Study data reported by Scott et al 2014 ⁸

NS – not stated.

^a Range rather than 95%CI reported by publication.

^b Range rather than 95%CI.

^c Estimate superseded by reanalysis of the dataset reported in Scott et al 2014⁸.

^d Jin et al⁷ published per-act risk with ejaculation taking place inside the rectum (1.43%, 95%CI 0.48-2.85%) and with withdrawal prior to ejaculation (0.65%, 95%CI 0.15-1.53%). Per-act estimate regardless of when ejaculation occurred was reported in Patel et al⁴, obtained from study authors (James Jansson, personal communication).

^e Data taken from the pre-ART era (estimates use data from the Jumpstart study¹⁵).

^f Data taken from the early ART era (estimates use data from the EXPLORE¹³, VAX 004¹⁴, and VPS^{16, 17} studies).

^g Data mentioned in text but not included in meta-analysis

^h Data taken from the EXPLORE study¹³, restricted to study participants reporting never using condoms.

ⁱ Data taken from the VAX 004 study¹⁴, restricted to study participants reporting never using condoms.

Table 2 Subgroup analysis: meta-analytic pooled per-act HIV-1 transmission probability estimates for URAI and UIAI stratified by population subgroup (heterosexual and MSM), study design (retrospective-partner and prospective cohort of individuals) and plausible extent of ART use by sexual partners (0% versus >0%).

Estimate type	Pooled estimate, % (95%CI)	P ^a	I ² , ^b (%)	N	References	p-value ^a
URAI						
Gender						
Women	3.38 (1.85-4.91)	1.000	0.0%	1	²⁰	
MSM	0.75 (0.56-0.98)	0.278	<0.1%	4	^{7, 8, 19c}	p<0.0001
Study design						
Retrospective-partner	2.56 (1.20-4.42)	0.1296	56.5%	2	^{19, 20}	
Prospective cohort of individuals	0.71 (0.51-0.93)	0.722	0.0%	3	^{7, 8c}	p<0.0001
Plausible extent of ART use by sexual partners						
0%	1.67 (0.44-3.67)	<0.0001	87.6%	3	^{8, 19, 20d}	
>0%	0.75 (0.52-1.03)	0.650	0.0%	2	^{7, 8d}	p=0.537
Pooled estimate	1.25 (0.55-2.23)	0.0002	87.3%	5	^{7, 8, 19, 20c}	
UIAI^e						
Plausible extent of ART use by sexual partners						
0%	0.14 (0.04-0.29)	1.000	0.0%	1	⁸	
>0%	0.18 (0.09-0.31)	0.604	0.0%	2	^{7, 8c}	P=0.955
Pooled estimate	0.17 (0.09-0.26)	0.7716	0.0%	3	^{7, 8c}	

ART – antiretroviral treatment; N – number of study estimates; NA – not applicable; P – P-value; Q – heterogeneity statistic; UIAI – unprotected insertive anal intercourse; URAI – unprotected receptive anal intercourse.

^a “P” is the p-value for heterogeneity of the pooled estimate; “p-value” is the metaregression p-value defining the significance of the difference in pooled estimates between the two subgroups.

^b I² is calculated as described in Higgins et al³³. I² lies between 0 and 100%; 0% indicates no observed heterogeneity and larger values show increasing heterogeneity.

^c Two URAI and UIAI estimates were provided by Scott et al⁸, using data from studies conducted in the pre-ART and early ART eras.

^d Scott et al's⁸ pre-ART estimates are classed as likely 0% ART use; its early ART estimates are classed as >0% use.

^e All UIAI study estimates used data from prospective cohorts of individuals from MSM populations and so subgroup analysis could not be conducted gender or design.

Figure legends

Figure 1 Flowchart summary of the literature search, comprising an update search from 2012 to February 2018 and a catch-up search to ensure the pre-2012 search included the same search terms as the updated search. “Original estimates” refers to studies included in either previous review^{4,5}.
ART – antiretroviral therapy; CINAHL – Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature; UIAI – unprotected insertive anal intercourse; URAI – unprotected receptive anal intercourse.

Figure 2 Forest plot of studies estimating per-act HIV-1 transmission probability through anal intercourse. “Original estimates” refers to studies included in either previous review^{4,5}.