## ORIGINAL PAPER

# Prevalence and Correlates of Female Condom Use and Interest Among Injection Drug-Using Female Sex Workers in Two Mexico-US Border Cities

Jamila K. Stockman · Meghan D. Morris · Gustavo Martinez · Remedios Lozada · Thomas L. Patterson · Monica D. Ulibarri · Alicia Vera · Steffanie A. Strathdee

Published online: 19 June 2012

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2012

Abstract Little is known about female condom use among female sex workers who inject drugs (FSW-IDUs) in Northern Mexico, where HIV/STI prevalence is high. We examined the prevalence and correlates of female condom use and interest in female condom use among FSW-IDUs aged ≥18 years in Tijuana and Ciudad Juárez, Mexico enrolled in a behavioral intervention designed to reduce high-risk sexual and injection behaviors. Of 621 FSW-IDUs, 8 % reported ever using female condoms, and 67.2 % expressed interest in trying female condoms. Factors independently associated with female condom use were having had a client become angry at the suggestion of using condoms and having engaged in unprotected vaginal sex with non-regular clients. Factors independently associated

J. K. Stockman (⋈) · M. D. Morris · A. Vera Division of Global Public Health, Department of Medicine, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive,

G. Martinez SADEC-FEMAP, Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua, Mexico

MC 0849, La Jolla, CA 92093-0849, USA

e-mail: jstockman@ucsd.edu

R. Lozada Prevencasa AC, Tijuana, Baja California, Mexico

T. L. Patterson

Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0680, La Jolla, CA 92093-0680, USA

Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0849, La Jolla, CA 92093-0849, USA

# Division of Global Public Health, Department of Medicine, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0507, La Jolla, CA 92093-0507, USA

S. A. Strathdee

M. D. Ulibarri

with interest in using female condoms were lifetime physical abuse and lifetime sexual abuse. Increasing the availability of female condoms and providing education on their use in the context of drug use and violence is recommended.

Resumen Se sabe poco acerca del uso del condón femenino por parte de sexoservidoras usuarias de drogas inyectables (SS-UDIs) en el norte de México, donde la prevalencia del VIH/ITS es elevada. Analizamos la prevalencia y los factores relacionados con el interés en y el uso del condón femenino en SS-UDIs de >18 años en Tijuana y Ciudad Juárez, México inscritas en una intervención conductual diseñada para disminuir los comportamientos sexuales y del uso de jeringas de alto riesgo. De 621 SS-UDIs, el 8 % reportó alguna vez haber usado condones femeninos y el 67.2 % mostró interés en usarlos. El que el cliente se enoje al sugerir el uso de condones y el sexo vaginal sin protección con clientes no regulares fueron factores independientemente relacionados con el uso del condón femenino. El abuso físico y el abuso sexual a lo largo de su vida fueron factores independientemente relacionados con el interés en el uso de los condones femeninos. Se recomienda aumentar la disponibilidad del condón femenino y brindar educación sobre su uso en el contexto del uso de drogas y la violencia.

**Keywords** Female condom · Female sex workers · Injection drug use · HIV · Mexico

## Introduction

The female condom provides an alternative HIV prevention method ideal for women who are unable to negotiate



male condom use with their partners [1], often as a result of relationship power imbalances and physical and/or sexual violence [1-5]. In vulnerable populations at high risk for HIV such as drug-using women and female sex workers (who may overlap in their risk for HIV), results have been mixed in the acceptability of the female condom as a barrier method to prevent sexually transmitted infections (STIs). For example, facilitators of female condom use include prior use of male condoms, the perception that it is more physically resistant and thus safer than the male condom, and the fact that it can be inserted several hours prior to sexual intercourse [2, 6–8]. Other facilitators of use that have been identified include a perceived increase in negotiating power and in control over safer sex and the fact that, unlike male condoms, female condoms will not tear or be removed by a sex partner midway through sex [2, 6-11]. A history of childhood abuse has also been associated with female condom use [9, 12]. Conversely, factors identified as barriers or as negatively associated with female condom use include the risk of violent reactions from male sex partners, clients' refusal or distrust of unfamiliar methods, difficulties during application and use, and high cost [6, 7, 11, 13–15]. Despite these mixed results, the female condom has been shown to increase the number of protected sex acts and reduce STI incidence among drug-using women and female sex workers [16-21].

Female sex workers in Tijuana and Ciudad (Cd.) Juárez who inject drugs (FSW-IDUs) have been identified as a high-risk population for HIV acquisition [22]. In 2006, HIV prevalence among FSW-IDUs in these cities was 12 %, which was twice as high as that of non-injecting female sex workers (6 %) [23]. More recent data from these cities (2009) showed that the prevalence among FSW-IDUs of any STI was 72 % [24]. Both cities have "zones of tolerance" where sex work is quasi-legal. Clients come from both sides of the Mexico–US border and from other countries to solicit sex, which is often unprotected [25]. Both cities also lie on major trafficking routes for cocaine, heroin, and methamphetamine, which has led many female sex workers to engage in drug use [26].

Compared to non-IDU female sex workers in this region, FSW-IDUs are more likely to be younger, be married or in a common-law relationship, have worked longer in the sex trade, speak English, earn less for sex without condoms, and use drugs before sex [25]. FSW-IDUs face a number of vulnerabilities including entrenched poverty, mental illness, violence from clients or intimate partners, and conflict with sex partners surrounding drug use. These factors may directly or indirectly impair FSWs' ability to negotiate male condom use and thus increase their risk of STIs [27–29]. Furthermore, compared to non-IDU female sex workers, FSW-IDUs may also be more likely to acquiesce to clients' demands for unprotected sex

if they are suffering from drug-related withdrawal [24]. Therefore, the female condom may be a useful HIV prevention method.

To date, no study has documented patterns of female condom use or factors associated with such use among any group of FSW-IDUs in Mexico. Our study aimed to determine the prevalence and correlates among FSW-IDUs in Tijuana and Cd. Juárez of both female condom use and interest in trying female condoms. We hypothesized that FSW-IDUs with a history of female condom use or who were interested in trying the female condom would be more likely to report male condom use and more likely to have experienced physical or sexual abuse. Identification of such correlates is important for increasing knowledge about female condoms and their accessibility.

#### Methods

Study Population

Between 2008 and 2009, FSW-IDUs in Tijuana (n = 311) and Cd. Juárez, Mexico (n = 311) were recruited to participate in Mujer Más Segura, a randomized controlled trial of a behavioral intervention designed to reduce high-risk sexual and injection behaviors [24]. In each city, three neighborhoods with high densities of sex workers and three with medium densities were randomly assigned to one of three intervention conditions. Fifty women from each neighborhood were recruited into each condition, for a total of 100 per condition per city. Approximately 600 FSW-IDUs were screened in each city to achieve a sample size of at least 300. To be eligible, participants had to be female; aged 18 years or older; report exchanging sex for money, drugs, or material benefit in the past month; report injecting drugs and sharing injecting equipment within the past month; and report having unprotected vaginal or anal sex with a client within the past month. Eligible women provided written informed consent. The study protocol was reviewed and approved by Institutional Review Boards in the United States and Mexico.

# Data Collection

Data were collected through interviewer-administered, computer-based surveys and through testing of biological samples for HIV/STIs at baseline and at 4-, 8- and 12-month follow-up visits. The present study used data from the baseline assessment. Interviews were conducted in Spanish or English, and participants received \$25 US upon completion of their visit. The baseline interview included questions on sociodemographics; physical and sexual abuse experiences; and sexual and drug-related risk



behaviors with the following partners: spouse or steady partner, regular clients (i.e., clients who return repeatedly or those with whom the FSW has an ongoing relationship), and non-regular clients (i.e., clients whom FSWs entertained at most twice). Female condom use was assessed by a dichotomous self-report variable ("ever" vs. "never"). Participants who had never used a female condom were asked if they were interested in trying one.

The "Determine" rapid HIV antibody test (Abbott Pharmaceuticals, Boston, MA, USA) was used to detect HIV antibodies in blood samples. All reactive samples were confirmed by Western Blot and HIV-1 enzyme immunoassay. Women who tested HIV-positive were referred to local municipal health clinics for monitoring and care. The rapid plasma reagin test (Determine TM Syphilis TP; Abbott Pharmaceuticals, Boston, MA, USA) was used to detect syphilis antibodies in blood samples. All reactive samples were confirmed by the Treponema pallidum particle agglutination assay (TPPA) (Fujirebio, Wilmington, DE, USA). Women who obtained a positive result on the syphilis rapid test were treated presumptively with benzicillin injections (once per week for 3 weeks). Vaginal swabs were collected to test for chlamydia and gonorrhea. Chlamydia was detected using the BioStar® OIA® chlamydia rapid test kit. Positive rapid tests were confirmed with urine specimens using the Genprobe transcriptionmediated amplification assay (TMA; San Diego, CA, USA). During the first half of the recruitment period, gonorrhea was detected using BioStar® OIA® GC. Following guidelines from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in the second half of the recruitment period, gonorrhea was detected through urine samples using the TMA (Genprobe, San Diego, CA). Women who had positive rapid tests for either chlamydia or gonorrhea or who had symptoms were treated presumptively. Confirmatory tests for STIs were conducted at the San Diego County Health Department.

# Statistical Analysis

The current study was a secondary analysis of baseline data from the *Mujer Más Segura* study to examine preliminary correlates of female condom use and, among women who reported never having used a female condom, interest in trying one. We explored sexual and drug-related risk behaviors, abuse history, HIV/STI status, and male condom use as correlates given their possible associations with female condom use and interest among this sample of women. First, we conducted descriptive analyses of prevalence and patterns of female condom use among women who reported ever using a female condom use by comparing women who reported ever using a female condom to those who reported that they had never used one. In

a second analysis among the women who reported never having used a female condom, we compared those who expressed interest in trying one to those without such an interest. Pearson's Chi-square or Fisher's exact test was used for dichotomous variables. T-tests and Wilcoxon's Rank Sum tests were used for continuous normally and non-normally distributed variables, respectively.

Logistic regression modeling was used to identify factors associated with female condom use and interest in trying a female condom. All variables attaining significance levels of p < 0.10 in bivariate models were assessed for inclusion in multivariate regression models. Both models were reduced manually using a backward stepwise regression technique. The likelihood ratio test was used to assess model fit.

#### Results

#### Characteristics of Participants

Of 622 FSW-IDUs enrolled at baseline, 621 had complete data on female condom use and were included in the first analysis that identified factors associated with female condom use. To assess factors associated with interest in trying female condoms, we analyzed data from 561 FSW-IDUs who reported never having used female condoms and responded to the question on interest. Among 621 FSW-IDUs, the median age was 33 years (interquartile range [IQR], 27–40), and median years of education was 6 (IQR, 5–9). The median duration of sex work was 11 years (IQR, 6–17). Approximately 50 % of FSW-IDUs were single or never married; one-third had children under the age of 18 years. The majority were street-based workers (88 %).

#### Patterns of Female Condom Use

Among 621 FSW-IDUs, approximately 8 % (n=48) reported ever using female condoms. Of those 48 women, 51 % used a female condom at least sometimes with regular non-commercial partners, 47 % used them at least sometimes with regular clients, and 54 % used them at least sometimes with non-regular clients. Seven women (15 %) used the same female condom more than once; of those, five (71 %) had used the same condom three or more times in the past month. One reported using the same female condom with more than one client or partner. One woman used two female condoms at the same time on four different occasions.

Among non-users of female condoms (n = 573), 14 % were absolutely certain they would use one if the condoms were provided free of charge, 12 % were somewhat certain, and 33 % were unsure; the median amount that they



reported being willing to pay for a female condom was 8 pesos (approximately \$0.58 US) (IQR: \$0.36–\$0.73). The remaining 41 % of FSW-IDUs said they would not use female condoms even if they were provided free of charge.

#### Factors Associated with Female Condom Use

Compared to women who never used female condoms. women who ever used them reported fewer unprotected vaginal sex acts in the past month with both non-regular clients (mean: 34, standard deviation [SD]: 33 vs. mean: 61, SD: 36; t = 5.29, p < 0.0001) and regular clients (mean: 51, SD: 38 vs. mean: 68, SD: 37; t = 2.93, p = 0.005) (Table 1). Compared to women who never used female condoms, those who ever used female condoms were more likely to have been forced or coerced into sex during their lifetime (65 vs. 49 %;  $\gamma^2 = 4.09$ , p = 0.043) and were more likely to have ever experienced physical abuse by a client (31 vs. 19 %;  $\chi^2 = 4.17$ , p = 0.041). Women who ever used a female condom were more likely to have had a client use or threaten to use violence when she proposed any condom use during sex (25 vs. 13 %;  $\chi^2 = 5.02$ , p = 0.025) and to report having had a client who was angered by the suggestion that he use a condom during sex (57 vs. 44 %;  $\chi^2 = 3.08$ , p = 0.079).

Women who ever used female condoms were significantly more likely to have had an HIV test (73 vs. 51 %;  $\chi^2 = 8.89$ , p = 0.003) and were more likely to have syphilis titers  $\geq$ 1:8 at the time of interview (17 vs. 10 %;  $\chi^2 = 3.38$ , p = 0.066). The two groups did not differ significantly in type of sex work, substance use behaviors, lifetime history of physical abuse, or prevalence of HIV, chlamydia, or gonorrhea.

After we adjusted for age, number of years as a sex worker, and study site, two factors were associated with ever using female condoms (Table 1). Women who used female condoms were less likely to report unprotected vaginal sex with non-regular clients (adjusted odds ratio [AOR]: 0.98, 95 % confidence interval [95 % CI]: 0.97–0.99) and were more likely to report having had a client who became angry at the suggestion that he use a male condom (AOR: 1.71, 95 % CI: 1.17–2.52).

# Factors Associated with Interest in Trying Female Condoms

Among 561 women who reported never having used a female condom, 67 % expressed interest in trying one (Table 2). Compared to those who were not interested, women who were interested in trying female condoms were younger, had been a sex worker for fewer years, and were less likely to be from Tijuana (vs. Cd. Juárez). Women who were interested in trying female condoms also

had fewer unprotected vaginal sex acts with non-regular clients (mean: 59, SD: 35 vs. mean: 66, SD: 39; t=2.10, p=0.037) and were less likely to inject drugs with clients around the time of sex (68 vs. 82 %;  $\chi^2=11.19$ , p<0.0001). Women who were interested in trying female condoms were more likely ever to have been physically abused (56 vs. 33 %;  $\chi^2=26.43$ , p<0.0001), ever to have been forced or coerced into sex (56 vs. 39 %;  $\chi^2=13.30$ , p=0.0003), and ever to have experienced physical abuse from a client (23 vs. 12 %;  $\chi^2=9.47$ , p=0.002). No significant differences were detected between the interested vs. the non-interested groups with respect to sex work type, sex work earnings, number of IDU partners, number of IDU clients, abuse in the context of condom negotiation, HIV testing, or STI prevalence.

After we adjusted for age and study site, we found that interest in trying female condoms was independently associated with having engaged in sex work for fewer years (AOR: 0.96 per year, 95 % CI: 0.93–0.99) and with lower odds of having injected drugs with clients around the time of sex in the past month (AOR: 0.59, 95 % CI: 0.36–0.97). Women who were interested in trying female condoms were also approximately two times more likely ever to have been physically abused (AOR: 1.98, 95 % CI: 1.26–3.10) or forced or coerced into sex (AOR: 1.73, 95 % CI: 1.12–2.66) (Table 2).

#### Discussion

In our sample of high-risk FSW-IDUs, only 8 % had ever used a female condom, possibly due to the condoms' cost and poor availability. These barriers have been documented in prior studies [6, 13, 14]. In Northern Mexico, female condoms are currently available in few health clinics, and their high cost (approximately 35 pesos, equivalent to approximately \$3 US) limits purchases. In Tijuana, female condoms are available from the state HIV agency for free when the agency is able to purchase them at a discount (which limits their availability), whereas male condoms are widely and consistently available for free at community health centers [30].

Approximately 25 % of women who had never used a female condom were at least somewhat certain they would use female condoms if they were provided free of charge. An additional 33 % were unsure they would use them under that condition, and 41 % would not use them at all, which may reflect a lack of knowledge on how to use them or the fear that they would interfere with sex work transactions. In other studies, women have reported various barriers to female condom use, such as difficulties surrounding application and discomfort during use [7, 13, 14], while in our study, the fact that 15 % of those who had



 Table 1
 HIV risk factors associated with female condom use among FSW-IDUs in Tijuana and Ciudad Juárez, Mexico (N=621)

Switchemographics Median years element (1028)  Median years entered variant element, median (1028)  Median years entered years evidence element, median (1028)  Median years entered years element years when a cientificated ye	Characteristic	Ever used female condoms <sup>a</sup> $(n = 48)$	Never used female condoms <sup>a</sup> $(n = 573)$	Test statistic	p value	Unadjusted OR (95 % CI)	Adjusted OR (95 % CI)
QQR)         31 (27, 37)         33 (27, 40)         Z = 134         0.179         0.98 (0.94-1.01)           cuburation (QR)         1 (5, 10)         6 (5, 9)         Z = 0.38         1,05 (0.95-1.16)           cuburation (QR)         1 (5, 10)         6 (5, 9)         Z = 0.26         0.38         1,05 (0.95-1.16)           cuburation (QR)         18 (37.50)         199 (34.73)         7 = 0.29         0.32         0.98 (0.95-1.03)           cumor-law         23 (47.92)         212 (37.00)         7 = 2.92         0.232         -         151 (0.61-3.23)           anno-law         1 (4.38)         23 (47.92)         23 (47.93)         23 (47.93)         1,3 (0.91-3.29)           anno-law         1 (4.38)         23 (47.92)         212 (37.00)         7 = 2.92         0.232         1,3 (0.91-3.29)           anno-law         1 (4.38)         23 (48.32)         2 = 0.25         0.232         1,3 (0.91-3.29)           anno-law         1 (2.08)         2 = 0.28         2 = 0.25         0.232         1,3 (0.91-3.23)           anno-law         1 (2.08)         2 = 0.28         7 = 7.25         0.007         0.43 (0.23-0.81)           a (2.01)         2 = 0.28         2 = 0.28         2 = 0.28         0.007         0.43 (0.23-0.81) <td>Sociodemographics</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Sociodemographics						
set worker (QR) 17.5.10 6 (5.9) $Z = 0.05$ 0.398 1.05 (0.95-1.16) 1.05 (1.7) $Z = 0.76$ 0.438 0.38 (0.95-1.02) 1.05 (1.25) (1.25) 1.05 (1	Median age (IQR)	31 (27, 37)	33 (27, 40)	Z = 1.34	0.179	0.98 (0.94–1.01)	0.97 (0.91–1.03)
sex worker (IQR)  11 (5, 16)  12 (6, 17)  13 (5750)  18 (3750)  18	Median years education (IQR)	7 (5, 10)	6 (5, 9)	Z = 0.85	0.398	1.05 (0.95–1.16)	1
clls years         18 (37.50)         199 (34.73) $\chi^2 = 0.16$ 0.921         0.90 (0.75–1.00)           non-law         23 (47.92)         237 (50.09) $\chi^2 = 2.92$ 0.232         -           non-law         15 (47.50)         237 (60.09) $\chi^2 = 2.92$ 0.232         -           ce         15 (31.25)         295 (51.48) $\chi^2 = 7.25$ 0.007 <b>0.43 (0.24-0.81)</b> z         42 (87.50)         278 (48.52)         278 (48.52)         2.007 <b>0.43 (0.24-0.81)</b> z         1 (2.08)         2 (3.35)         2 (3.35)         2 (3.35)         0.007 <b>0.43 (0.24-0.81)</b> s         1 (2.08)         2 (3.35)         2 (4.20)         0.322         -         -           s         1 (2.08)         2 (4.30)         44 (7.60)         1 (2.60)         0.30 (0.07-3.8)         1.00 (0.93-0.0)           s         1 (2.08)         2 (0.35)         3 (2.05)         3 (2.05)         0.00         0.90 (0.92-0.0)           s         4 (8.33)         44 (7.60)         1 (2.60)         1 (2.60)         1 (2.60)         1 (2.00)         0.90 (0.92-0.0)           s         4 (9.167)         3 (1.30)         3 (1.30)         3 (1.30	Median years sex worker (IQR)	11 (5, 16)	12 (6, 17)	Z = 0.76	0.438	0.98 (0.95–1.02)	1.01 (0.95–1.07)
non-law arneedwidowed 23 (47.95) 212 (37.00) $\chi^2 = 2.92$ 0.222 - 1.73 (0.91-2.29) 212 (37.00) $\chi^2 = 2.92$ 0.022 - 1.73 (0.91-2.29) 212 (37.00) 225 (51.48) $\chi^2 = 7.25$ 0.007 0.43 (0.52.40.81) 2.00 (0.91-2.29)	Has children <18 years	18 (37.50)	199 (34.73)	$\chi^2 = 0.16$	0.921	0.90 (0.75–1.09)	1
mon-law         18 (37.50) $287 (50.00)$ $\chi^2 = 292$ $0.222$ $-$ anterledwidtowed         7 (14.58)         74 (12.91) $\chi^2 = 2.92$ $0.22$ $-$ ce         15 (31.25)         295 (51.48) $\chi^2 = 7.25$ $0.007$ $0.43 (0.23-0.81)$ z         2 (87.50)         33 (68.75)         295 (51.48) $\chi^2 = 7.25$ $0.007$ $0.43 (0.23-0.81)$ z         2 (87.50)         302 (87.76)         NA $0.32$ $-$ z         2 (87.50)         302 (87.76)         NA $0.32$ $-$ z         4 (83.3)         4 (47.69) $   -$	Marital status						
non-law morlaw (14.58) (14.58) (14.59) (15.00) (1.73 (0.91-3.29) (1.53 (0.61-3.75) (0.61-3	Single	18 (37.50)	287 (50.09)	Ш	0.232	1	ı
ce definitionwed T (1438) T (1291) T (1438) T (1291) T (1438) T (1291) T (1438) T (1	Married/common-law	23 (47.92)	212 (37.00)			1.73 (0.91–3.29)	ı
ce 2 33 (68.75) 295 (51.48) $\chi^2 = 7.25$ 0.007 <b>0.43 0.23-0.81</b> )  2 3 (68.75) 278 (48.22)	Divorced/separated/widowed	7 (14.58)	74 (12.91)			1.51 (0.61–3.75)	I
z         15 (31.25)         295 (51.48) $\chi^2 = 7.25$ 0.007 <b>0.43 (0.23-0.81)</b> e         42 (87.50)         202 (87.76)         NA         0.322         -           e         1 (2.08)         2 (0.35)         NA         0.322         -           s         1 (2.08)         2 (0.35)         1 (0.30)         2 (0.37)         0.007         0.43 (0.23-0.81)           use         1 (2.08)         2 (0.35)         1 (2.08)         2 (0.35)         1 (0.0037-3.18)         1.00 (0.37-3.18)           use         4 (8.33)         4 (4.20)         1 (2.08)         2 (0.34)         1 (0.0037-3.18)         1.00 (0.37-3.18)           use         4 (8.33)         4 (3.34)         6 (1.36)         1 (2.08)         1.00 (0.37-3.18)         1.00 (0.37-3.18)           use         4 (8.34)         4 (1.36)         1 (1.36)         1 (1.36)         1 (1.30) <td< td=""><td>City of residence</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	City of residence						
z         3 (8.75)         278 (48.52)         -         -           e         42 (87.50)         502 (87.76)         NA         0.322         -           e         1 (2.08)         2 (0.35)         8.99 (0.53-6741)         5.99 (0.53-6741)           e         1 (2.08)         2 (0.35)         1.09 (0.97-3.78)         1.09 (0.7-3.78)           d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners,* mean (SD)         34 (3.3)         61 (36)         1 = 0.25         0.801         0.99 (0.98-1.02)           d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners,* mean (SD)         34 (3.3)         61 (36)         1 = 5.29         0.801         0.99 (0.98-1.02)           d vaginal sex w/regular clients,* mean (SD)         34 (3.3)         61 (36)         1 = 5.29         0.801         0.99 (0.98-1.02)           d vaginal sex w/regular clients,* mean (SD)         34 (3.3)         61 (36)         1 = 5.29         0.001         0.99 (0.98-1.02)           d vaginal sex w/regular clients,* median (QR)         51 (3.4)         20 (15.30)         2 = 0.15         0.90 (0.98-1.02)           e carned for sex with a condom, median (QR)         35 (18.45)         30 (20.50)         2 = 0.15         0.75 (0.99 (0.97-1.01)           or drugs before or during sex with a client*         44 (91.67)         37 (73.06)         2 = 0.28         0.75 (0.	Tijuana	15 (31.25)	295 (51.48)	$\chi^2 = 7.25$	0.007	0.43 (0.23-0.81)	0.51 (0.25–1.05)
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Ciudad Juárez	33 (68.75)	278 (48.52)			I	I
s the condom use both the	Sex worker type						
s         1 (2.08)         2 (0.35)         5.99 (0.53-67.41)           use         4 (8.33)         4 (7.69) $1.09$ $24 (4.20)$ $1.09 (0.7-3.78)$ use         4 (8.33)         4 (7.69) $1.09 (0.7-3.78)$ $1.09 (0.7-3.78)$ d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners, mean (SD)         34 (33)         6 (20) $1.02$ $0.801$ $0.99 (0.98-1.02)$ d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners, mean (SD)         34 (33)         6 (136) $1.00 (0.03)$ $1.00 (0.98-1.02)$ d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners, mean (SD)         51 (38)         6 (37) $1.0.25$ $0.801$ $0.99 (0.98-1.02)$ e carned for sex with a condom, median (QR)         25 (10,40)         20 (15,30) $2.0.15$ $0.878$ $0.005$ $0.99 (0.98-1.01)$ e carned for sex with a condom, median (QR)         35 (18,45)         30 (20,50) $2.0.28$ $2.0.38$ $2.0.50$ $2.0.28$ $0.005$ $0.99 (0.98-1.01)$ e carned for sex with a condom, median (QR)         35 (18,45)         30 (20,50) $2.0.28$ $2.0.28$ $0.25$ $0.99 (0.98-1.01)$ or drugs before or during sex with a clients, median (QR)         2 (0.3)         2 (0.5)	Street worker	42 (87.50)	502 (87.76)	NA	0.322	I	I
use         1 (2.08)         24 (4.20) $4 (3.0)$ $6.50 (0.07-3.78)$ use         4 (8.33)         44 (7.69) $6.50 (0.07-3.78)$ $1.09 (0.37-3.18)$ d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners, mean (SD)         34 (33)         6 (30) $1 = 5.29$ $0.801$ $1.09 (0.38-1.02)$ d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners, mean (SD)         34 (33) $61 (36)$ $1 = 5.29$ $0.800$ $0.99 (0.98-1.02)$ e carned for sex w/regular clients, mean (SD)         31 (38) $68 (37)$ $1 = 5.29$ $0.000$ $0.99 (0.98-1.02)$ e carned for sex w/regular clients, median (IQR)         25 (10,40)         20 (15,30) $2 = 0.15$ $0.878$ $1.00 (0.98-1.01)$ or drugs before or during sex with a condom, median (IQR)         35 (18,45)         30 (20,50) $2 = 0.28$ $0.755$ $0.99 (0.97-1.01)$ or drugs before or during sex with a condom, median (IQR)         2 (0,3)         2 (0,5) $2 = 0.29$ $0.755$ $0.99 (0.98-1.01)$ Of unit client around time of sex beginn of clients, median (IQR)         2 (0,3)         2 (0,5)         2 $= 0.79$ $0.755$ $0.99 (0.97-1.01)$ Unon-client sex partners, median (IQR)         1 (0,1)         0 (	Dance hostess	1 (2.08)	2 (0.35)			5.99 (0.53-67.41)	I
use         4 (8.33)         44 (7.69)         1.09 (0.37–3.18)           use         d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)         95 (20)         96 (20) $t = 0.25$ 0.801         0.99 (0.98–1.02)           d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)         34 (33)         61 (36) $t = 5.29$ 0.0001         0.98 (0.97–0.99)           d vaginal sex w/regular clients <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)         51 (38)         68 (37) $t = 2.93$ 0.005         0.99 (0.98–1.02)           e armed for sex with a condom, median (QR)         25 (10, 40)         20 (15, 30) $Z = 0.15$ 0.878         1.00 (0.98–1.01)           e armed for sex with out a condom, median (QR)         35 (18, 45)         30 (20, 50) $Z = 0.28$ 0.755         0.99 (0.97–1.01)           or dnugs before or during sex with a client <sup>b</sup> 44 (91.67)         530 (92.66) $\chi^2 = 0.063$ 0.801         0.87 (0.30–2.54)           DU <sup>d</sup> male clients <sup>b</sup> , median (QR)         2 (0, 3)         2 (0, 5) $Z = 0.79$ 0.71         0.240         0.90 (0.81–1.04)           DU <sup>d</sup> male clients <sup>b</sup> , median (QR)         1 (0, 1)         0 (0, 1) $Z = 0.65$ 0.51         0.51         0.54         0.90 (0.81–1.04)           DU non-client sex partners <sup>b</sup> , median (QR)	Barmaid	1 (2.08)	24 (4.20)			0.50 (0.07–3.78)	I
use         d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)         95 (20)         96 (20) $t = 0.25$ 0.801         0.99 (0.98-1.02)           d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)         34 (33)         61 (36) $t = 5.29$ <0.0001	Other	4 (8.33)	44 (7.69)			1.09 (0.37–3.18)	I
d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)         95 (20)         96 (20) $t = 0.25$ 0.801         0.99 (0.98-1.02)           d vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)         34 (33)         61 (36) $t = 5.29$ $< 0.0001$ $< 0.99 (0.98-1.01)$ d vaginal sex w/non-regular clients <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)         51 (38)         68 (37) $t = 2.93$ $< 0.005$ $< 0.99 (0.98-0.99)$ e arned for sex with a condom, median (IQR)         25 (10, 40) $20 (15, 30)$ $2 = 0.15$ $< 0.878$ $< 0.09 (0.97-1.01)$ or drugs before or during sex with a client <sup>b</sup> 44 (91.67) $530 (92.66)$ $\chi^2 = 0.063$ $< 0.755$ $< 0.99 (0.97-1.01)$ or drugs before or during sex with a client <sup>b</sup> $< 4 (91.67)$ $< 530 (92.66)$ $< \chi^2 = 0.079$ $< 0.755$ $< 0.740 (0.98-1.01)$ or drugs before or during sex with a client <sup>b</sup> $< 4 (91.67)$ $< 530 (92.66)$ $< \chi^2 = 0.09$ $< 0.740 (0.98-1.01)$ or drugs before or during sex with a client <sup>b</sup> $< (0.31)$ $< (0.51)$ $< (0.51)$ $< (0.51)$ $< (0.51)$ $< (0.51)$ $< (0.51)$ $< (0.51)$ $< (0.51)$ $< (0.51)$ $< (0.51)$ $< (0.51)$	Male condom use						
d vaginal sex w/non-regular clients <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)         34 (33)         61 (36) $t = 5.29$ $<0.0001$ $0.98$ (0.97–0.99)           d vaginal sex w/regular clients <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)         51 (38)         68 (37) $t = 2.93$ $0.005$ $0.99$ (0.98–0.01)           e arned for sex with a condom, median (IQR)         25 (10, 40)         20 (15, 30) $Z = 0.15$ $0.87$ $1.00$ (0.98–1.01)           e arned for sex without a condom, median (IQR)         35 (18, 45)         30 (20, 50) $Z = 0.15$ $0.87$ $0.99$ (0.97–1.01)           or drugs before or during sex with a clientber of sex with client around time of sex with client around time of sex with client around time of sex because of sex because of description (IQR) $2 (0, 3)$ $2 (0, 5)$ $2 = 0.05$ $0.80$ $0.99$ (0.97–1.01)           OU non-client sex partners beginn (IQR) $1 (0, 1)$ $0 (0, 1)$	% unprotected vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)	95 (20)	96 (20)	t = 0.25	0.801	0.99 (0.98–1.02)	I
d vaginal sex w/regular clients <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD) 51 (38) 68 (37) $t = 2.93$ 0.005 <b>0.996 (0.98–0.99)</b> c earned for sex with a condom, median (IQR) 25 (10, 40) 20 (15, 30) $Z = 0.15$ 0.878 1.00 (0.98–1.01) c or drugs before or during sex with a client <sup>b</sup> 44 (91.67) 28 (66.67) 377 (73.06) $\chi^2 = 0.063$ 0.801 0.87 (0.30–2.54) s with client around time of sex <sup>b</sup> 28 (66.67) 377 (73.06) $\chi^2 = 0.079$ 0.372 0.74 (0.38–1.44) OU non-client sex partners <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR) 1 (0, 1) 0 (0, 1) $Z = 0.05$ 0.516 0.96 (0.81–1.14)  Ily abused by client 15 (31.25) 108 (18.98) $\chi^2 = 4.17$ 0.041 1.94 (10.2–3.70) sed/threatened violence when proposing condom use 12 (25.00) 106 (21.54) $\chi^2 = 0.050$ 0.077 1.29 (0.54–2.57)  Idue to suggestion of condom use b 12 (26.09) 106 (21.54) $\chi^2 = 0.050$ 0.077 1.29 (0.54–2.57)	% unprotected vaginal sex w/non-regular clients <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)	34 (33)	61 (36)	t = 5.29	< 0.0001	0.98 (0.97–0.99)	0.98 (0.97-0.99)
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	% unprotected vaginal sex w/regular clients <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)	51 (38)	68 (37)	t = 2.93	0.005	0.99 (0.98-0.99)	I
or drugs before or during sex with a client <sup>b</sup> $44 \ (91.67)$ $530 \ (92.66)$ $\chi^2 = 0.063$ $0.801$ $0.87 \ (0.30-2.54)$ s with client around time of sex <sup>b</sup> $28 \ (66.67)$ $377 \ (73.06)$ $\chi^2 = 0.063$ $0.801$ $0.87 \ (0.38-1.44)$ $0.04$ male clients <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR) $1 \ (0, 1)$ $0 \ (0, $	Median USD <sup>c</sup> earned for sex with a condom, median (IQR)	25 (10, 40)	20 (15, 30)	Z = 0.15	0.878	1.00 (0.98–1.01)	I
or drugs before or during sex with a client <sup>b</sup> $44 (91.67)$ $530 (92.66)$ $\chi^2 = 0.063$ $0.801$ $0.87 (0.30-2.54)$ $s$ with client around time of sex <sup>b</sup> $28 (66.67)$ $2 (0,3)$ $2 (0,5)$ $2 (0,5)$ $2 = 1.17$ $0.240$ $0.372$ $0.74 (0.38-1.44)$ $0.01$ on client sex partners <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR) $1 (0,1)$ $0 (0,1)$ $1 (0,1)$ $0 (0,1)$ $1 (0,$	Median USD <sup>c</sup> earned for sex without a condom, median (IQR)	35 (18, 45)	30 (20, 50)	Z = 0.28	0.755	0.99 (0.97–1.01)	I
or drugs before or during sex with a client $\frac{44}{2}$ 44 (91.67) 530 (92.66) $\chi^2 = 0.063$ 0.801 0.87 (0.30–2.54) (0.30–2.54) (0.30 client around time of sex bound time bound	Substance use						
s, with client around time of sexb       28 (66.67)       377 (73.06) $\chi^2 = 0.79$ 0.372       0.74 (0.38–1.44)         DU <sup>d</sup> male clients <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR)       1 (0, 1)       2 (0, 5) $Z = 1.17$ 0.240       0.90 (0.81–1.00)         DU non-client sex partners <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR)       1 (0, 1)       0 (0, 1) $Z = 0.65$ 0.516       0.96 (0.81–1.00)         DU non-client sex partners <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR)       1 (0, 1) $Z = 0.65$ 0.516       0.96 (0.81–1.14)         Ily abused       26 (56.52)       275 (48.50) $\chi^2 = 1.09$ 0.295       1.38 (0.75–2.53)         Ily abused by client       15 (31.25)       108 (18.98) $\chi^2 = 4.09$ 0.043       1.87 (1.01–3.45)         Ily abused by client       12 (25.00)       76 (13.26) $\chi^2 = 5.02$ 0.025       2.18 (1.09–4.37)         due to suggestion of condom useb       27 (57.45)       217 (44.11) $\chi^2 = 5.02$ 0.079       1.66 (1.18–2.3)         t due to suggestion of condom useb       12 (26.09)       106 (21.54) $\chi^2 = 0.507$ 0.477       1.29 (0.64–2.57)	Used alcohol or drugs before or during sex with a client <sup>b</sup>	44 (91.67)	530 (92.66)	$\chi^2 = 0.063$	0.801	0.87 (0.30–2.54)	I
DU <sup>d</sup> male clients <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR)         2 (0, 3)         2 (0, 5) $Z = 1.17$ 0.240         0.90 (0.81–1.00)           DU non-client sex partners <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR)         1 (0, 1)         0 (0, 1) $Z = 0.65$ 0.516         0.96 (0.81–1.04)           DU non-client sex partners <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR)         26 (56.52)         275 (48.50) $\chi^2 = 1.09$ 0.295         1.38 (0.75–2.53)           Ily abused         31 (64.58)         280 (49.38) $\chi^2 = 4.09$ 0.043 <b>1.87 (1.01–3.45)</b> Ily abused by client         15 (31.25)         108 (18.98) $\chi^2 = 4.17$ 0.041 <b>1.94 (1.02–3.70)</b> sed/threatened violence when proposing condom use         27 (57.45)         76 (13.26) $\chi^2 = 5.02$ 0.025 <b>2.18 (1.09–4.37)</b> t due to suggestion of condom use         27 (57.45)         106 (21.54) $\chi^2 = 0.507$ 0.477         1.29 (0.64–2.57)	Injected drugs with client around time of sex <sup>b</sup>	28 (66.67)	377 (73.06)	$\chi^2 = 0.79$	0.372	0.74 (0.38–1.44)	I
DU non-client sex partners <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR) $1 (0, 1)$ $0 (0, 1)$ $Z = 0.65$ $0.516$ $0.516$ $0.96 (0.81-1.14)$ Ily abused  Socreded into sex  1 (64.58) $26 (6.52)$ $275 (48.50)$ $\chi^2 = 1.09 0.295 1.38 (0.75-2.53)  Socreded into sex  11 (64.58) 280 (49.38) \chi^2 = 4.09 0.043 1.87 (1.01-3.45)  Ily abused by client  15 (31.25) 108 (18.98) \chi^2 = 4.17 0.041 1.94 (1.02-3.70)  due to suggestion of condom useb  12 (25.00) 27 (1.25) 217 (44.11) 27 (1.25) 217 (44.11) 27 (1.25) 217 (44.11) 27 (1.25) 217 (44.11) 27 (1.25) 217 (44.11) 27 (1.25) 217 (44.11) 27 (1.25) 217 $	Number of IDU <sup>d</sup> male clients <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR)	2 (0, 3)	2 (0, 5)	Z = 1.17	0.240	0.90 (0.81–1.00)	I
lly abused $26 (56.52)$ $275 (48.50)$ $\chi^2 = 1.09$ $0.295$ $1.38 (0.75-2.53)$ coerced into sex $31 (64.58)$ $280 (49.38)$ $\chi^2 = 4.09$ $0.043$ $1.87 (1.01-3.45)$ lly abused by client $15 (31.25)$ $108 (18.98)$ $\chi^2 = 4.17$ $0.041$ $1.94 (1.02-3.70)$ sed/threatened violence when proposing condom use b to suggestion of condom use b to su	Number of IDU non-client sex partners <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR)	1 (0, 1)	0 (0, 1)		0.516	0.96 (0.81–1.14)	I
26 (56.52) 275 (48.50) $\chi^2 = 1.09$ 0.295 1.38 (0.75–2.53) 31 (64.58) 280 (49.38) $\chi^2 = 4.09$ 0.043 <b>1.87 (1.01–3.45)</b> 15 (31.25) 108 (18.98) $\chi^2 = 4.17$ 0.041 <b>1.94 (1.02–3.70)</b> sing condom use 12 (25.00) 76 (13.26) $\chi^2 = 5.02$ 0.025 <b>2.18 (1.09–4.37)</b> 27 (57.45) 217 (44.11) $\chi^2 = 3.08$ 0.079 <b>1.66 (1.18–2.33)</b> 12 (26.09) 106 (21.54) $\chi^2 = 0.507$ 0.477 1.29 (0.64–2.57)	Abuse history						
31 (64.58)       280 (49.38) $\chi^2 = 4.09$ 0.043       1.87 (1.01-3.45)         15 (31.25)       108 (18.98) $\chi^2 = 4.17$ 0.041       1.94 (1.02-3.70)         sing condom use       12 (25.00)       76 (13.26) $\chi^2 = 5.02$ 0.025       2.18 (1.09-4.37)         27 (57.45)       217 (44.11) $\chi^2 = 3.08$ 0.079       1.66 (1.18-2.33)         12 (26.09)       106 (21.54) $\chi^2 = 0.507$ 0.477       1.29 (0.64-2.57)	Ever physically abused	26 (56.52)	275 (48.50)	$\chi^2 = 1.09$	0.295	1.38 (0.75–2.53)	I
sing condom use 15 (31.25) 108 (18.98) $\chi^2 = 4.17$ 0.041 1.94 (1.02-3.70) $76$ (13.26) $\chi^2 = 5.02$ 0.025 2.18 (1.09-4.37) $27$ (57.45) $217$ (44.11) $\chi^2 = 3.08$ 0.079 1.66 (1.18-2.33) $\chi^2 = 0.507$ 0.477 1.29 (0.64-2.57)	Ever forced/coerced into sex	31 (64.58)	280 (49.38)	$\chi^2 = 4.09$	0.043	1.87 (1.01–3.45)	I
sing condom use 12 (25.00) 76 (13.26) $\chi^2 = 5.02$ 0.025 <b>2.18 (1.09-4.37)</b> 27 (57.45) 217 (44.11) $\chi^2 = 3.08$ 0.079 <b>1.66 (1.18-2.33)</b> 12 (26.09) 106 (21.54) $\chi^2 = 0.507$ 0.477 1.29 (0.64-2.57)	Ever physically abused by client	15 (31.25)	108 (18.98)	$\chi^2 = 4.17$	0.041	1.94 (1.02-3.70)	I
27 (57.45) 217 (44.11) $\chi^2 = 3.08$ 0.079 <b>1.66 (1.18–2.33)</b> 12 (26.09) 106 (21.54) $\chi^2 = 0.507$ 0.477 1.29 (0.64–2.57)	Client ever used/threatened violence when proposing condom use	12 (25.00)	76 (13.26)	$\chi^2 = 5.02$	0.025	2.18 (1.09-4.37)	I
12 (26.09) 106 (21.54) $\chi^2 = 0.507$ 0.477	Client angry due to suggestion of condom use <sup>b</sup>	27 (57.45)	217 (44.11)	$\chi^2 = 3.08$	0.079	1.66 (1.18–2.33)	1.71 (1.17–2.52)
	Client violent due to suggestion of condom use <sup>b</sup>	12 (26.09)	106 (21.54)	Ш	0.477	1.29 (0.64–2.57)	I



Table 1 conunued						
Characteristic	Ever used female condoms <sup>a</sup> $(n = 48)$	Never used female condoms <sup>a</sup> $(n = 573)$		p value	Test statistic p value Unadjusted OR (95 % CI)	Adjusted OR (95 % CI)
HIV/STI status						
Ever tested for HIV	35 (72.92)	289 (50.52)	$\chi^2 = 8.89$	0.003	2.64 (1.37–5.09)	ı
HIV	4 (8.33)	29 (5.06)	$\chi^2 = 0.31$	0.855	1.70 (0.57–5.06)	ı
Chlamydia	5 (10.42)	75 (13.09)	$\chi^2 = 0.82$	0.845	0.76 (0.29–1.99)	ı
Gonorrhea	1 (2.33)	13 (2.52)	$\chi^2 = 0.51$	0.916	0.92 (0.12–7.16)	I
Syphilis titers $\geq 1:8$	8 (16.67)	55 (9.60)	$\chi^2 = 3.38$	990.0	2.16 (0.95–4.93)	I

OR (CI) values that are significant are shown in bold. Adjusted odds ratios reflect associations after controlling for all other variables that were included in the model OR odds ratio, CI confidence interval, IQR interquartile range, SD standard deviation <sup>a</sup> Data are in the format n (%) unless otherwise indicated. Some percentages may reflect denominators smaller than the n value given in the column head due to missing data

Injection drug user

used female condoms reported re-use suggests that these women may benefit from more education on how to use them appropriately.

Although our study was cross-sectional, we were able to provide informative preliminary data on factors associated with female condom use among FSW-IDUs and with FSW-IDUs' interest in trying the female condom. We found that women who reported using female condoms were less likely to have unprotected vaginal sex with non-regular clients. Prospective studies have suggested that providing women with female condoms can decrease their number of unprotected sex acts, whether through increased male condom use, increased female condom use, or more commonly, a combination of the two [17].

The low proportion of women who reported female condom use may have limited our power to detect potentially significant associations with other sexual and drugrelated risk variables in multivariate analyses. However, in bivariate analyses, additional violence-related variablesnamely, lifetime physical and sexual abuse, and violence in the context of condom use negotiation—were significantly associated with female condom use. This lends support to the idea that women with histories of violence may feel empowered to protect themselves through their own prevention methods rather than relying on their sex partner to implement safe sex strategies. Additionally, women who had a history of getting tested for HIV were more likely to report lifetime female condom use, which may reflect counseling they received on HIV prevention methods, including the female condom, in connection with their HIV testing.

Despite the low prevalence of female condom use, twothirds of non-users expressed interest in trying the female condom. Younger women were significantly more likely to be interested in trying the female condom, which may reflect more openness to unfamiliar safer-sex strategies. Although interest in trying female condoms was lower among women who reported injecting drugs with clients during sex acts, 55 % of these women reported using male condoms with male clients in the past month (data not shown). This suggests that these women are considering at least some level of protection to reduce their exposure to HIV/STIs.

Although female condom use was not more likely among women with histories of physical or sexual abuse in multivariate analyses, interest in female condom use was more likely among women with such histories. Women with lifetime histories of suffering physical or sexual violence or both may feel empowered to take the initiative to protect themselves rather than assert their power with clients or regular partners to negotiate male condom use, which could result in violence or threats of violence. Although barriers to male condom use have been noted,



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> In the past month

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup> US dollar

**Table 2** HIV risk factors associated with interest in female condom use among FSW-IDUs who never used female condoms, Tijuana and Ciudad Juárez, Mexico (N = 561)

	,					
Characteristic	Interested in using female condoms <sup>a</sup> $(n = 377)$	No interest in using female condoms <sup>a</sup> $(n = 184)$	Test statistic	p value	Unadjusted OR (95 % CI)	Adjusted OR (95 % CI)
Sociodemographics						
Median age (IQR)	32 (27, 39)	35 (29, 42)	Z = 2.66	0.008	0.97 (0.95-0.99)	1.01 (0.98–1.04)
Median yrs education (IQR)	7 (6, 9)	6 (5, 9)	Z = 1.06	0.291	1.04 (0.98–1.11)	I
Median yrs sex worker (IQR)	11 (6, 17)	12 (7, 21)	Z = 2.73	900.0	0.97 (0.95-0.99)	0.96 (0.93-0.99)
Has children < 18 years	135 (35.81)	58 (31.52)	$\chi^2 = 1.01$	0.604	0.94 (0.85–1.04)	I
Marital status						
Single	188 (49.87)	90 (48.91)	$\chi^2 = 0.07$	0.964	I	I
Married/common-law	139 (36.87)	70 (38.04)			0.95 (0.65–1.39)	I
Divorced/separated/widowed	50 (13.26)	24 (13.04)			0.98 (0.58–1.73)	I
City of residence						
Tijuana	170 (45.09)	117 (63.59)	$\chi^2 = 16.93$	<0.0001	0.47 (0.33-0.68)	0.67 (0.44–1.03)
Ciudad Juárez	207 (54.91)	67 (36.41)			I	I
Sex worker type						
Street worker	324 (86.17)	167 (90.76)	NA		I	I
Dance hostess	1 (0.27)	1 (0.54)			0.51 (0.03–8.27)	I
Barmaid	17 (4.52)	7 (3.80)			1.25 (0.51–3.07)	I
Other	34 (9.04)	9 (4.89)			1.94 (0.91–4.14)	ı
Male condom use						
% unprotected vaginal sex w/spouse/steady partners <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)	97 (17)	93 (25)	t = 1.41	0.160	1.01 (0.99–1.02)	I
% unprotected vaginal sex w/non-regular clients <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)	59 (35)	66 (39)	t = 2.10	0.037	0.99 (0.98-0.99)	I
% unprotected vaginal sex w/regular clients <sup>b</sup> , mean (SD)	67 (37)	70 (37)	t = 1.01	0.311	0.99 (0.99–1.00)	I
Median USD <sup>c</sup> earned for sex with a condom, median (IQR)	20 (15, 30)	20 (14, 30)	Z = 1.44	0.150	0.99 (0.99–1.01)	ı
Median USD <sup>c</sup> earned for sex without a condom, median (IQR)	30 (20, 45)	30 (20, 55)	Z = 0.250	0.803	0.99 (0.99–1.00)	I
Substance use						
Used alcohol or drugs before or during sex with a client <sup>b</sup>	352 (93.37)	168 (91.80)	$\chi^2 = 0.45$	0.500	1.26 (0.65–2.45)	I
Injected drugs with client around time of sex <sup>b</sup>	233 (68.33)	136 (82.42)	$\chi^2 = 11.19$	<0.0001	0.46 (0.29-0.73)	0.59 (0.36-0.97)
Number of IDU <sup>d</sup> male clients <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR)	2 (0, 5)	3 (0, 6)	Z = 2.88	9/9:0	1.00 (0.99–1.01)	I
Number of IDU <sup>d</sup> non-client sex partners <sup>b</sup> , median (IQR)	1 (0, 1)	1 (0, 1)	Z = 2.17	0.030	1.00 (0.98–1.02)	I
Abuse history						
Ever physically abused	211 (56.42)	60 (33.15)	$\chi^2 = 26.43$	<0.0001	2.61 (1.80–3.78)	1.98 (1.26–3.10)
Ever forced/coerced into sex	207 (55.50)	71 (39.01)	$\chi^2 = 13.30$	0.0003	1.95 (1.36–2.80)	1.73 (1.12–2.66)
Ever physically abused by client	86 (22.99)	22 (12.02)	$\chi^2 = 9.47$	0.002	2.19 (1.32–3.63)	I
Client ever used/threatened violence when proposing condom use	50 (13.26)	25 (13.59)	$\chi^2 = 0.01$	0.916	0.97 (0.58–1.63)	I
Client angry due to suggestion of condom use <sup>b</sup>	147 (45.23)	69 (43.40)	$\chi^2 = 0.15$	0.703	1.16 (0.89–1.52)	ı



Table 2 continued						
Characteristic	Interested in using female condoms <sup>a</sup> $(n = 377)$	No interest in using female condoms <sup>a</sup> $(n = 184)$	Test statistic p value	p value	Unadjusted OR (95 % CI)	Adjusted OR (95 % CI)
Client violent due to suggestion of condom use <sup>b</sup>	64 (19.75)	41 (25.63)	$\chi^2 = 2.17$	0.140	0.140 0.71 (0.46–1.12)	ı
HIV/STI status						
Ever tested for HIV	198 (52.52)	82 (44.57)	$\chi^2 = 3.24$	0.072	1.38 (0.97–1.97)	I
HIV	19 (5.04)	9 (4.89)	$\chi^2 = 2.25$	0.325	1.04 (0.46–2.33)	I
Chlamydia	54 (14.32)	20 (10.87)	$\chi^2 = 3.38$	0.337	1.36 (0.79–2.35)	ı
Gonorrhea	8 (2.12)	4 (2.17)	$\chi^2 = 2.19$	0.534	0.98 (0.29–2.28)	ı
Synhilis titers >1:8	33 (8.75)	20 (10.87)	$v^2 = 0.67$	0.716	0.78 (0.44–1.41)	ı

OR (CI) values that are significant are shown in bold. Adjusted odds ratios reflect associations after controlling for all other variables that were included in the model OR odds ratio, CI confidence interval, IQR interquartile range, SD standard deviation given in the column head due to missing data the n-value percentages may reflect denominators smaller than <sup>a</sup> Data are in the format n (%) unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>b</sup> In the past month

<sup>c</sup> US dollar

Us dollar Injection drug user some female sex workers identify methods to exercise agency and gain personal protection and economic advantage [31]. Prior fieldwork demonstrated female sex workers' eagerness to try the female condom because of its potential use as a bargaining strategy to charge higher prices for sex without a condom while secretly using it [32]. However, it is not clear to what extent it is actually possible to conceal the use of a female condom from a client who refuses to use a male condom [32].

Due to the cross-sectional nature of our study, it was not possible to infer causality within the relationships between female condom use and interest and male condom use, substance use, abuse history, and HIV/STI status. Behavioral risk measures and abuse history were based on selfreport and may be subject to recall bias or social desirability bias, though the high prevalence among our sample of reports of physical and sexual abuse, experiences that are known to be underreported, suggests that such biases were of minimal effect. Since the parent study was not designed to comprehensively examine female condom use experiences, we were unable to determine if our comparison group of non-users included FSW-IDUs who lacked knowledge about or access to female condoms, which may have resulted in an overestimate of observed associations. Our measures of violence and threats of violence in the context of condom use negotiation were not specific to type of condom (male or female), which limited the interpretation of this finding. Although the study sample included a large number of FSW-IDUs in Tijuana and Cd. Juárez, the findings may not be generalizable to FSW-IDUs in other cities in Mexico or other countries, since the parent study intentionally recruited high-risk women.

Despite these limitations, our study contributes to the existing literature about the prevalence of female condom use and associated factors by providing findings from an underexplored population of high-risk FSW-IDUs. FSW-IDUs are highly vulnerable to violence from clients, intimate partners, injection partners, and police, which leads to reduced self-efficacy to negotiate male condom use [25, 33, 34]. Our finding that anger from a client in the context of condom use negotiation was associated with female condom use suggests that female condoms may provide one avenue for FSW-IDUs to increase their control over their working conditions. Unique to this study are the assessment of factors associated with an interest in trying a female condom and a focus on FSW-IDUs in the Mexico-US border, where STI prevalence is increasing.

Further research is warranted to elucidate the situational context and relationship dynamics of female condom use in this population of FSW-IDUs. Given the strong association between partner violence and power differentials in sexual relationships, it is crucial to disentangle the interplay of these factors in association with female condom use and



interest. To increase protected sex acts among FSW-IDUs with both regular and non-regular clients, further research is also needed on the acceptability of, and potential barriers to, such alternate methods of STI prevention as female condoms and vaginal microbicides. In the Mexico-US border region, FSW-IDUs are at dual risk for HIV through unsafe practices of both injection and sex. To truly reduce the risk of HIV/STIs in this population, interventions are needed that increase safer injection practices while promoting female-initiated HIV prevention methods (e.g., negotiation of female condom use with clients and regular sex partners). Coupled with HIV prevention interventions, efforts by the state HIV agency and local counseling centers to increase the availability and affordability of female condoms, as well as education about their use, will assist in curtailing the HIV/STI epidemic among FSW-IDUs in the Mexico-US border region.

Acknowledgments This research was supported by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (R01 DA023877, T32 DA023356, R25 DA025571, K01 DA031593 and K01 DA026307) and the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities (L60 MD003701). The authors gratefully acknowledge the contributions of the study staff and participants of *Mujer Más Segura* and the following organizations: Patronato Pro-COMUSIDA, A.C., Prevencasa, A.C., Salud y Desarollo Comunitario de Ciudad Juárez, A.C. (SADEC), Federación Méxicana de Asociaciones Privadas (FEMAP), the Instituto de Servicios de Salud del Estado de Baja California (ISESALUD), and the University of California, San Diego. The authors thank the San Diego County Health Department for its assistance with STI and HIV testing. The authors also thank Brian R. Kelly and Serena Ruiz for their assistance on this manuscript.

#### References

- 1. Hoffman S, Mantell J, Exner T, Stein Z. The future of the female condom. Int Fam Plan Perspect. 2004;30(3):139–45.
- Lara DK, Grossman DA, Munoz JE, Rosario SR, Gomez BJ, Garcia SG. Acceptability and use of the female condom and diaphragm among sex workers in Dominican Republic: results from a prospective study. AIDS Educ Prev. 2009;21(6):538–51.
- Gollub EL. The female condom: tool for women's empowerment.
   Am J Public Health. 2000;90(9):1377–81.
- Latka M. Female-initiated barrier methods for the prevention of STI/HIV: where are we now? where should we go? J Urban Health. 2001;78(4):571–80.
- Stockman JK, Ludwig-Barron N, Hoffman MA, Ulibarri MD. Penniman Dyer TV. Prevention interventions for human immunodeficiency virus in drug-using women with a history of partner violence. Subst Abuse Rehabil. 2012;3(Suppl 1):45–57.
- Jivasak-Apimas S, Saba J, Chandeying V, et al. Acceptability of the female condom among sex workers in Thailand: results from a prospective study. Sex Transm Dis. 2001;28(11):648–54.
- Yimin C, Zhaohui L, Xianmi W, et al. Use of the female condom among sex workers in China. Int J Gynaecol Obstet. 2003; 81(2):233-9.
- 8. Ray S, van De Wijgert J, Mason P, Ndowa F, Maposhere C. Constraints faced by sex workers in use of female and male condoms for safer sex in urban Zimbabwe. J Urban Health. 2001;78(4):581–92.

- Weeks MR, Hilario H, Li J, et al. Multilevel social influences on female condom use and adoption among women in the urban United States. AIDS Patient Care STDS. 2010;24(5):297–309.
- Gollub EL. A neglected population: drug-using women and women's methods of HIV/STI prevention. AIDS Educ Prev. 2008;20(2):107–20.
- Telles Dias PR, Souto K, Page-Shafer K. Long-term female condom use among vulnerable populations in Brazil. AIDS Behav. 2006;10(4 Suppl):S67–75.
- Witte SS, Wada T, El-Bassel N, Gilbert L, Wallace J. Predictors of female condom use among women exchanging street sex in New York City. Sex Transm Dis. 2000;27(2):93–100.
- Witte SS, el-Bassel N, Wada T, Gray O, Wallace J. Acceptability of female condom use among women exchanging street sex in New York City. Int J STD AIDS. 1999;10(3):162–8.
- Mack N, Grey TG, Amsterdam A, Williamson N, Matta CI. Introducing female condoms to female sex workers in Central America. Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2010;36(3):149–55.
- El-Bassel N, Gilbert L, Rajah V, Foleno A, Frye V. Fear and violence: raising the HIV stakes. AIDS Educ Prev. 2000;12(2):154–70.
- Rotheram-Borus MJ, Swendeman D, Chovnick G. The past, present, and future of HIV prevention: integrating behavioral, biomedical, and structural intervention strategies for the next generation of HIV prevention. Annu Rev Clin Psychol. 2009;5:143–67.
- 17. Vijayakumar G, Mabude Z, Smit J, Beksinska M, Lurie M. A review of female-condom effectiveness: patterns of use and impact on protected sex acts and STI incidence. Int J STD AIDS. 2006;17(10):652–9.
- Thomsen SC, Ombidi W, Toroitich-Ruto C, et al. A prospective study assessing the effects of introducing the female condom in a sex worker population in Mombasa. Kenya. Sex Transm Infect. 2006;82(5):397–402.
- Hoke TH, Feldblum PJ, Van Damme K, et al. Temporal trends in sexually transmitted infection prevalence and condom use following introduction of the female condom to Madagascar sex workers. Int J STD AIDS. 2007;18(7):461–6.
- Campbell AN, Tross S, Hu MC, Pavlicova M, Kenney J, Nunes EV. Female condom skill and attitude: results from a NIDA Clinical Trials Network gender-specific HIV risk reduction study. AIDS Educ Prev. 2011;23(4):329–40.
- Gollub EL, Morrow KM, Mayer KH, et al. Three city feasibility study of a body empowerment and HIV prevention intervention among women with drug use histories: women FIT. J Womens Health (Larchmt). 2010;19(9):1705–13.
- Strathdee SA, Magis-Rodriguez C. Mexico's evolving HIV epidemic. JAMA. 2008;300(5):571–3.
- Strathdee SA, Philbin MM, Semple SJ, et al. Correlates of injection drug use among female sex workers in two Mexico–US border cities. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2008;92(1–3):132–40.
- 24. Strathdee SA, Lozada R, Martinez G, et al. Social and structural factors associated with HIV infection among female sex workers who inject drugs in the Mexico–US border region. PLoS One. 2011:6(4):e19048.
- Ulibarri MD, Strathdee SA, Patterson TL. Sexual and drug use behaviors associated with HIV and other sexually transmitted infections among female sex workers in the Mexico-US border region. Curr Opin Psychiatry. 2010;23(3):215-20.
- Patterson TL, Semple SJ, Staines H, et al. Prevalence and correlates of HIV infection among female sex workers in two Mexico-US border cities. J Infect Dis. 2008;197(5):728–32.
- Stockman JK, Strathdee SA. HIV among people who use drugs: a global perspective of populations at risk. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2010;55(Suppl 1):S17–22.
- Ulibarri MD, Semple SJ, Rao S, et al. History of abuse and psychological distress symptoms among female sex workers in two Mexico-US border cities. Violence Vict. 2009;24(3):399-413.



 Shannon K, Kerr T, Bright V, Gibson K, Tyndall MW. Drug sharing with clients as a risk marker for increased violence and sexual and drug-related harms among survival sex workers. AIDS Care. 2008;20(2):228–34.

- Munoz FA, Pollini RA, Zuniga ML, et al. Condom access: associations with consistent condom use among female sex workers in two northern border cities of Mexico. AIDS Educ Prev. 2010;22(5):455–65.
- 31. Choi SY, Holroyd E. The influence of power, poverty and agency in the negotiation of condom use for female sex workers in mainland China. Cult Health Sex. 2007;9(5):489–503.
- 32. Wojcicki JM, Malala J. Condom use, power and HIV/AIDS risk: sex-workers bargain for survival in Hillbrow/Joubert Park/Berea. Johannesburg. Soc Sci Med. 2001;53(1):99–121.
- 33. El-Bassel N, Terlikbaeva A, Pinkham S. HIV and women who use drugs: double neglect, double risk. Lancet. 2010;376(9738): 312–4.
- 34. Shannon K, Csete J. Violence, condom negotiation, and HIV/STI risk among sex workers. JAMA. 2010;304(5):573–4.

