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Intervention Evaluation

1) Two longitudinal surveys conducted with women visiting an incarcerated partner. Baseline interview conducted during partner’s incarceration, follow-up 30 days after release from prison:
   - prior to intervention (N=117 baseline, 99 follow-up)
   - during intervention (N=202 baseline, 156 follow-up)
   - outcomes measured at follow-up in the first 30 days following the partner’s release from prison:
     - Number of unprotected anal and vaginal sex acts
     - Proportion of respondents who tested for HIV
     - Number of HIV risk-related topics she wanted to discuss and did discuss with the partner
Intervention Evaluation

2) Two cross-sectional surveys conducted with women visiting incarcerated men.
   • prior to intervention (N=205)
   • immediately after intervention (N=207)
   • outcomes:
     • Stress (10-point scale ranging from 1 = no stress through 5 = a medium amount of stress to 10 = an extreme amount of stress)
     • HIV misinformation: Sum of 7 true/false items assessing beliefs about prison-related HIV risk (e.g., “Condoms are given to men in prison”; “Only gay men have sex with other men in prison”).

3) Longitudinal qualitative interviews with peer educators at 3 (N=11) and 6 months (N=9)
The HOME Intervention
February 2005-January 2006
# Pre-Intervention Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cross-sectional</th>
<th>Longitudinal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean, range)</td>
<td>40.3, 18-80</td>
<td>31.3, 18-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legally married</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyfriend/fiancé</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pre-Intervention Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cross-sectional</th>
<th>Longitudinal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/Hispanic</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Is.</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.83%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UPI in 30 days after release from prison

• **comparison sample**: increase in the mean number of unprotected sex acts from the 30 days prior to the partner’s release ($M = 19.01$) to the 30 days following the partner’s release ($M = 24.78$, $p = .006$)

• **intervention sample**: no increase in the number of unprotected sex acts from the 30 days prior to the partner’s release ($M = 23.40$) to the 30 days following the partner’s release ($M = 23.24$, $p = .99$)
HIV Testing

Thirty days after their partner’s release from prison, nearly three times more women in the intervention sample than in the comparison sample reported having recently tested for HIV (33.8% vs. 13.3%, p < .001)
Communication

Although women in the intervention and comparison samples were equally likely to want to talk to their partners about HIV risk and risk-related topics, women in the intervention sample (median = 2 topics) actually talked with their partners about more HIV risk and risk-related topics than did women in the comparison sample (median = 1 topic; p = .04)
Cross-sectional Results

- Higher than medium levels of stress among cross-sectional participants (mean = 6.3 at time 1 vs. 6.2 at time 2; p = .86).
- HIV misinformation was reduced among cross-sectional participants from a mean of 4.1 to 3.4 misinformation questions answered incorrectly (p < .001).
Peer Educator Interview Findings

• Peer educators supported feasibility and acceptability of intervention
• Peer educators endorsed being both participants and interventionists
Discussion

• Importance of flexibility, meeting participants ‘where they’re at,’ paying attention to context of risk

• There are multiple ways to reduce risk

• Peer education is feasible and acceptable for women visiting incarcerated partners
Contact information

Megan Comfort: Megan.Comfort@ucsf.edu
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