

The Provision of HIV Post-Exposure Prophylaxis in the Context of Child Sex Trafficking

CHRISTINE E. BARRON, MD; JESSICA MOORE, BA; GRAYSON BAIRD, PHD; ERICA HARDY, MD; AMY GOLDBERG, MD

ABSTRACT

Child sex trafficking (CST) victims are at risk for HIV infection due to a convergence of both social and biological factors. However, sparse recommendations and guidelines exist for providers on the provision of HIV non-occupational post-exposure prophylaxis (nPEP) for CST patients. We evaluated whether pediatricians would provide HIV nPEP in a clinical vignette where a patient disclosed ongoing involvement in CST. Participants were relatively divided regarding whether they would provide HIV nPEP; 58.8% responded yes and 41.2% responded no. This highlights the need for medical guidelines to address the complex and case specific considerations of providing nPEP to these victims.

KEYWORDS: child sex trafficking, human immunodeficiency virus, non-occupational post-exposure prophylaxis

INTRODUCTION

Commercial sex work is widely recognized as a high-risk behavior for the transmission of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection. Those entering sex work via trafficking are thought to face elevated HIV vulnerability due to increased violence and sexual risk exposures.¹ Sex trafficking is the force, fraud, coercion, or deceitful entry into sex work, or entry into such work under age 18.¹ Child sex trafficking (CST) is a subset of child sexual abuse that involves “crimes of a sexual nature committed against juvenile victims for financial or other economic reasons.”¹ Multiple studies demonstrate that up to 40% of female sex workers entered as minors, with the average age of entry being 12 to 14 years old.²

Due to the convergence of both social and biological factors, youth involved in CST appear to be at significant risk for HIV infection and subsequent transmission.²⁻⁷ Adolescent victims of CST commonly have multiple high-risk sexual partners and experience violence, unprotected sex, and injection drug use (IDU). Further, these youth engage in risky sexual behaviors (e.g. anal sex, violently abusive sex), creating susceptibility to sexually transmitted infections.²⁻⁶ Prior studies have found that when compared to non-trafficked

adult sex workers, CST victims experience greater levels of HIV risk due to compromised ability to refuse sex or negotiate condom use, limited knowledge of HIV transmission, higher numbers of sexual clients, and violent sexual initiation.⁶ In addition, there is greater sex-buyer demand for younger children due to the false belief that there is less risk of HIV transmission with a younger partner.² As a result, child victims are being recruited into sex trafficking earlier, which provides a longer period during which they have increased potential exposure and infection.^{3,4}

Biological factors may also heighten vulnerability to children involved in sex trafficking; larger areas of cervical ectopy pose increased opportunity for infection.⁶ Additionally, repeated trauma to the immature genital tract during sexual intercourse increases the likelihood of microabrasions and microtears, consequentially increasing the potential for infection.^{4,5}

While involvement in CST concurs with risk of HIV infection, no clinical guidelines exist for medical providers in addressing the provision of HIV non-occupational post-exposure prophylaxis (nPEP) specifically for CST youth. Given the paucity of guidelines available, our hypothesis was that pediatric attending physicians would be relatively divided in regard to whether they should either provide HIV nPEP or not when a patient disclosed ongoing involvement in CST.

METHODS

We constructed a survey that assessed knowledge, comfort, barriers, and medical decision making of physicians when caring for a CST population.⁷ Pediatric attending physicians practicing in community/hospital-based clinics, the pediatric emergency department, and hospital inpatient units were asked to participate from November 2014 through January 2015. Participation in the study was both voluntary and anonymous. The final sampling frame was 267 physicians who were listed in the Rhode Island Hospital staff services and/or the Department of Pediatrics at Rhode Island Hospital. All research procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board.

This study focused on one clinical vignette within the survey listed below:

A 17-year-old female patient presents to the emergency department. She reports an acute sexual assault by an unknown person

the day before. During your interview she discloses that she was not really assaulted, but is an “escort” and wants to be tested for sexually transmitted infections and pregnancy. She plans to continue as an “escort”. You complete the STI and pregnancy testing. What else should be done for this patient?

Response options included yes or no to the following: “Provide STI prophylaxis”, “Provide HIV prophylaxis”, “Provide Plan B”, and “Wait to determine any treatment until test results return”. We focused on whether pediatric physicians chose to provide HIV nPEP to the patient described. All analyses were conducted utilizing SAS Software 9.4 (SAS Inc., Cary, NC). Differences between those who would and would not provide HIV nPEP were examined, including the respondent’s gender, medical specialty, clinical settings, and training on sex trafficking using a Chi Square test with PROC FREQ.

RESULTS

The survey was sent to 267 pediatric attending physicians in Rhode Island and a total of 109 responded, a response rate of 41% (109/267). In total, over half of the participants (58.8%, 57/97) responded that they would provide HIV nPEP and 41.2% (40/97) responded they would not, (p=.8116).

As indicated in **Table 1**, participants who would provide HIV nPEP had more hours of training than those who would not provide nPEP (p=0.0218); no other significant differences were identified. Physicians with greater knowledge of CST, and particularly their susceptibility to HIV infection, may be more inclined to prescribe prophylaxis for these patients.

DISCUSSION

Pediatric attending physicians were relatively divided in regard to the provision of HIV nPEP for a sex trafficking patient (59% vs. 41%). Consistent with our hypothesis, there is no evidence-based clinical decision to providing HIV nPEP to these high-risk youth; therefore our findings in which physicians are divided reflect the need for greater education, training, and specific medical guidelines. Overall, pediatric attending physicians reported not encountering a sex trafficking patient in their practice or screening patients for sex trafficking in the last twelve months. Asking the question about HIV in the context of CST is an important preliminary step in raising awareness of the clinician’s responsibility to consider the provision, or not, of HIV nPEP. There are several important considerations based on

Table 1. Respondent Demographics and Response to Clinical Vignette

Variables	Provide HIV Prophylaxis		P value	Missing
	Yes	No		
Total	58.8 (57/97)	41.2 (40/97)	.8116	12
Gender			0.2032	14
Female	65.5 (36/55)	52.5 (21/40)		
Male	34.6 (19/55)	47.5 (19/40)		
Medical specialty			0.1927	12
General Pediatrics	73.7 (42/57)	82.5 (33/40)		
Pediatric Subspecialists	17.5 (10/57)	17.5 (7/40)		
Internal Medicine Pediatrics	8.8 (5/57)	0 (0/40)		
Clinical setting			0.3844	14
Private/Community	32.7 (18/55)	47.5 (19/40)		
Hospital-based clinic	27.3 (15/55)	25.0 (10/40)		
Emergency Department	16.4 (9/55)	17.54 (7/40)		
Hospital Inpatient	18.2 (10/55)	10 (4/40)		
Other	5.5 (3/55)	0 (0/40)		
Training on sex trafficking				
With training	58.8 (8/57)	22.5 (9/40)	0.2804	12
Without training	86.0 (49/57)	77.5 (31/40)		
If training, how many hours: Mean, median, mode, [min-max]	3.5, 1.5, 1.0, [1-10]	1.1, 1.0, 1.0, [1-2]	0.0218a	
Years as an attending, Mean, [95% CI], median	13.2 [10.8, 15.6], 13.5	16.8 [13.3, 20.3], 16	0.1258	11
Past 12 months, how many patients concerned for sex trafficking? Median, mode, [min,max]	0, 0, [0-15]	0, 0 [0-10]	0.79	11
Past 12 months, how many patients screened for sex trafficking? Median, mode, [min,max]	0, 0, [0-20]	0, 0, [0-25]	0.9656	11
You don't feel you have sufficient training			.9742	12
Yes	87.7 (50/57)	87.5 (35/40)		
No	12.3 (7/57)	12.5 (5/40)		
You are uncertain about the medical treatment necessary for patients who have a positive screen			0.8836	13
Yes	66.1 (37/56)	67.5 (27/40)		
No	33.9 (19/56)	32.5 (13/40)		

a. Statistically significant (p < .05)

the 2015 STD Treatment Guidelines and the 2016 Updated Guidelines for Antiretroviral Post-Exposure Prophylaxis for sexual assault/sexual abuse.^{9, 10}

General recommendations include providing HIV nPEP within an acute time frame of a sexual exposure (≤ 72 hours). Decisions should be based on potential risk of transmission, the assessed potential compliance of patients with the 28-day course of medication(s) and appropriate follow-up.⁹ In the clinical vignette, the patient presented within 72 hours of sexual contact. However, the patient disclosed multiple and continued sexual contact. Victims of CST have ongoing vulnerability to infections and pregnancy as opposed to an acute sexual assault victim with risk limited to one incident.¹ Compliance to the course of medication and necessary follow-up must be evaluated due to the concern of introducing resistance to these medications. Youth victims involved in sex trafficking may be homeless, transient, or on the run^{1,2}; this makes follow-up and adherence to medications more unlikely. Further, these patients are commonly associated with additional high-risk behaviors (e.g. substance abuse) and dysfunctional environments^{1,2}, thus decreasing the likelihood of adherence to the medication. The issue of adherence should be assessed through a discussion with the patient, along with the development of a feasible plan for taking the medications, and completing necessary follow-up.

The 2015 CDC guidelines recommend that in the special case of children with evidence of sexual abuse who present to a health care provider ≤ 72 hours after their most recent exposure, nPEP can be considered on a case-by-case basis.¹⁰ Providers should ask CST patients what type of sexual contact occurred (e.g. penile-oral, penile-anal), their history of genital bleeding (trauma), and whether there was ejaculation and condom use to clarify the level of potential risk.^{9,10} A genital exam should be completed in order to determine the presence of genital mucosal trauma or genital ulcer disease, other STIs, or an oral mucosa that is compromised (e.g., oral lesions, gingivitis, wounds); all of which increase risk exposure.⁴ Health care providers should weigh the risks and benefits of the medications (i.e. effectiveness, introducing resistance and side effects) based on the information acquired during medical encounters.¹⁰ Due to the specific nuances of each CST case, it is appropriate to consult an infectious disease specialist to help make the determination of providing HIV nPEP and to collaborate with child protection pediatricians, who often have expert information on local CST populations.

The results of this study should be considered within the context of limitations. Our sample was collected from a single medical institution, and therefore responses may not be representative of providers in other geographic locations. In addition, we did not ask participants to provide their reasoning behind why they would or would not provide HIV nPEP in this clinical vignette. Prospective studies examining the

provision of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) for CST patients would be a valuable contribution to research on potential harm reduction strategies in high risk and repeated exposure populations.

Critical to investigations concerning the medical management of sex-trafficked youth is the consideration of a broad range of negative health risks, appropriate interventions and preventative harm-reduction strategies. CST victims are at high risk of HIV infection, and general recommendations on the provision of HIV nPEP do not adequately educate providers on the unique considerations necessary for this population; some do not present acutely, have ongoing exposure risk, and are associated with features that may decrease compliance with medications. Therefore, pediatricians of various specialties and levels of training and experience on CST are understandably divided in regard to providing nPEP. Medical guidance, along with education and training, is integral for a greater conceptualization of the interventions necessary to address HIV risk in a CST patient population to generate a more uniform response.

References

1. IOM (Institute of Medicine) and NRC (National Research Council). 2013. *Confronting Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Sex Trafficking of Minors in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.
2. Silverman JG. Adolescent female sex workers: invisibility, violence and HIV. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. 2011;96(5):478-481.
3. Blanchard JF, O'Neil J, Ramesh BM, et al. Understanding the social and cultural contexts of female sex workers in Karnataka India: implications for prevention of HIV infection. *J Infect Dis* 2005;191(Suppl 1):139-46.
4. Sarkar K, Bal B, Mukherjee R, et al. Sex-trafficking, violence, negotiating skill, and HIV infection in brothel-based sex workers of eastern India, adjoining Nepal, Bhutan, and Bangladesh. *J Health Popul Nutr* 2008;26:223-31.
5. Decker MR, McCauley HL, Phuengsamran D, et al. Sex trafficking, sexual risk, sexually transmitted infection and reproductive health among female sex workers in Thailand. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2010.
6. Silverman JG, Decker MR, Gupta J, et al. HIV prevalence and predictors of infection in sex-trafficked Nepalese girls and women. *JAMA* 2007;298:536-42. 26.
7. Barron CE, Moore JL, Baird G, Goldberg AP. Sex Trafficking Assessment and Resources (STAR) for Pediatric Attendings in Rhode Island. *RI Med J*. 2016, 99(9); 27-30.
8. Paul A. Harris, Robert Taylor, Robert Thielke, Jonathon Payne, Nathaniel Gonzalez, Jose G. Conde, Research electronic data capture (REDCap) – A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support, *J Biomed Inform*. 2009 Apr;42(2):377-81.
9. Sexual Assault and Abuse and STDs. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/std/tg2015/sexual-assault.htm#pep>. Published April 2015. Accessed June 5, 2016.
10. Updated Guidelines for Antiretroviral Postexposure Prophylaxis After Sexual, Injection Drug Use, or Other Nonoccupational Exposure to HIV—United States, 2016. <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/programresources/cdc-hiv-npep-guidelines.pdf>. Published 2016. Accessed June 5, 2016.

Acknowledgments

Funding: All phases of this study were supported by the Fleet Scholarship Grant, 101-6345. The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Ethical approval: The Rhode Island Hospital Institutional Review Board approved all research procedures.

Competing interests: No authors have any conflicts of interest or financial relationships relevant to this article to disclose.

Authorship roles

Dr. Barron conceptualized and designed the study, drafted the article, and approved the final version to be submitted.

Ms. Moore helped conceptualize and design the study, drafted the article, and approved the final version to be submitted.

Dr. Baird contributed to the analysis and interpretation of data, critically reviewed the manuscript, and approved the final version to be submitted.

Dr. Hardy revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content and approved the final version to be submitted.

Dr. Goldberg revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content and approved the final version to be submitted.

Authors

Christine E. Barron, MD, Division Director, The Lawrence A. Aubin Sr. Child Protection Center and Fellowship Director, Child Abuse Pediatrics at Hasbro Children's Hospital; Associate Professor of Pediatrics, Clinician Educator, The Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence, RI.

Jessica Moore, BA, Department of Pediatrics, Hasbro Children's Hospital, Providence, RI.

Grayson Baird, PhD, Assistant Professor of Diagnostic Imaging (Research), The Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence, RI.

Erica Hardy, MD, Assistant Professor of Medicine, Divisions of Obstetric Medicine and Infectious Disease, The Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence, RI.

Amy Goldberg, MD, Associate Professor of Pediatrics, Clinician Educator, The Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University; Department of Pediatrics, Hasbro Children's Hospital, Providence, RI.

Correspondence

Christine Barron, MD, FAAP
Lawrence A. Aubin, Sr. Child Protection Center
Potter Building 005
593 Eddy Street
Providence, RI 02903
401-444-3996
Cbarron1@lifespan.org