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INTRODUCTION

Human papillomavirus (HPV) is the most common sexually transmitted infection (STI) in the USA.1 Almost every American who is sexually active will get HPV at some point in their life if they do not receive the HPV vaccine.1 Men who have sex with men (MSM) are at especially high risk for developing cancers from HPV; incidence of anal cancer in particular in this population is significantly higher than in the general population.23 An underlying human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection compounds the already heightened risk for HPV-related cancer, and the increased risk of HIV in this population increases the risk for HPV and related cancers.4 Furthermore, out of any population, HIV-positive MSM have the highest risk of anal cancer, as well as significantly higher risk of HPV-related oropharyngeal cancers.5 Despite these findings, little research exists on cancer prevention in the form of HPV vaccination for this specific population.
In 2009, 3 years after the HPV vaccine was recommended for the prevention of cervical cancer in adolescent females, the Advisory Committee on Immunisation Practices issued a recommendation that the HPV vaccine also be administered to adolescent males. Further research found the vaccine to be effective in some instances at preventing precancerous lesions and new HPV infection in adults, even those already exposed to HPV. In 2018, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved the HPV vaccine for adults up to age 45. This does not equate to universal recommendation for everyone age 27 and older, but it does support vaccination efforts for certain populations who had previously ‘aged out’ of the vaccine. Although a large number of people have already been infected with HPV by age 27, the HPV vaccine is still beneficial to many people aged 27 and older as it can protect against new HPV infections. The HPV vaccine is immunogenic in both women and men aged 27–45, and numerous benefits outweigh the costs of vaccination, especially in high-risk populations. Although HPV vaccination is efficacious for prevention of anal and oropharyngeal cancer, males (particularly adults) have problematic low vaccination rates. As of 2016, less than three percent of males 30 years and older had received at least one dose of the HPV vaccine. Barriers to HPV vaccination for MSM include: minimal awareness of health consequences to men from HPV, little to no awareness of HPV vaccination availability for adults, and lack of insurance or access to healthcare. Particularly troubling is the fact that young MSM have low perceived risk from HPV. This underscores the need to further educate both providers and patients about HPV vaccination and how to access it. Widespread use of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) among MSM in certain demographic groups suggests an existing culture of prevention in that MSM are motivated to accept and use pharmaceutical technologies to prevent disease. However, the high prevalence of preventable HPV-related cancers reflects the failure of healthcare thus far to leverage this culture of prevention and expand immunisation. As of 2017, 32.8% of MSM respondents to the National HIV Behavioural Surveillance System reported receiving one or more doses of the HPV vaccine. Given the risks for HPV-related cancers among MSM, coupled with elevated risks for contracting HIV, linking preventative strategies represents an important avenue of study. Primary care clinics have an incredible opportunity to increase HPV vaccination rates and affect HPV-related complications in their communities. Previous studies have shown that clinic initiatives to improve HPV vaccination rates by strongly recommending the vaccine to eligible patients have been successful. This is likely to be especially true when HPV vaccination recommendation is paired with PrEP prescribing. There are many parallels between access issues to PrEP and HPV vaccination among MSM, including lack of provider awareness about current guidelines and lack of insurance coverage. Addressing these barriers, as well as the gap in the literature surrounding co-administration of HPV vaccination with PrEP treatment, is vital. This study aims to add to the literature by assessing PrEP patients’ HPV vaccine perceptions and determining any potential barriers to linkage and, ultimately, reducing the incidence of HPV-related cancers in high-risk populations.

**METHODS**

This study aimed to determine the attitudes, beliefs and barriers of primary care patients on PrEP towards the HPV vaccine. Sixteen interviews were completed (n=16). Inclusion criteria was status as a PrEP patient in the two family medicine clinics where recruitment occurred. Primary care clinics were chosen for recruitment, given the potential of future intervention in that setting. There were no exclusion criteria. Participants were selected through convenience sampling due to the physicians’ roles as coinvestigators in the study and because of the relationship and trust they had already built with their patients. Medical and graduate public health students collected data and were able to refer to their relationship with the academic medical centre, as well as with the primary care physicians.

Six students were trained in qualitative research, including how to perform a semi-structured interview. The interviewers read a script, but were also trained in interview techniques: rapport building, probing, note-taking, etc. The same script was used by all six interviewers. The interview guide may be found in **table 1**. Interviews were not audio-recorded; interviewers took notes instead in order to maintain confidentiality and rapport. Data were entered in REDCap, a secure research platform. Data were then downloaded into Microsoft Excel for thematic analysis. Questions covered three domains: (1) demographics (age, education level, ethnicity/race, gender, sexual orientation and health insurance); (2) HPV vaccination status and (3) patients’ attitudes, beliefs and perceived barriers towards HPV vaccination. The questions were modelled after previous studies about HIV-positive MSM’s knowledge and perceptions of HPV, as well as incarcerated women’s engagement with cervical cancer prevention. The interviews also included a cue to action in the form of contacting either of the primary care physicians on the team if a patient was interested in receiving the HPV vaccine after the interview.

Participants were recruited through (1) cold calls made by the research team using a secure phone app, (2) flyers distributed at in-person visits or (3) messages sent by clinic nurses through patient charts. These recruitment strategies were selected because of the COVID-19 pandemic, which meant the team could not recruit in person. If participants were called directly, a scripted voicemail was left on the first call if it was not answered. If a potential participant was given a flyer or sent a chart message, they emailed the research team, who then called the participant to conduct the interview.
participants who were contacted (n=23), 69.6% participated (n=16).

The data underwent thematic analysis in the form of inductive coding and subsequent development of themes. Inductive coding was used and theme development aligned with established thematic analysis protocols. The primary exposure was PrEP user status. The primary outcome was attitudes, beliefs, and perceived barriers toward HPV vaccination. The research team reviewed and coded the first 11 interviews individually and determined potential codes, subsequently collectively deciding on 16 codes. Codes were reviewed by the team prior to extracting overall themes. Agreement and disagreement over codes were resolved through discussion by the team. Next, the team collectively reviewed code occurrence in the data and determined three overarching themes. The five subsequent interviews were analysed in relation to the 16 codes to look for thematic saturation. The themes were determined to be the same across all 16 interviews. The research team then pulled quotes to support the themes. The goal was to complete as many interviews as possible in order to perform an exploratory study, rather than to reach thematic saturation. However, thematic saturation was reached.

### RESULTS

All participants were between ages 23 and 55 years old, with a mean age of 36 years old. All participants were male, with one participant identifying as transgender male. Fifteen participants (93.75%) identified as gay, and one participant identified as bisexual (6.25%). All participants had at least some college education, with the majority (n=11, 87.5%) completing at least a 4-year college degree. All participants were insured, with the majority (n=11, 68.75%) covered by Blue Cross Blue Shield. The majority of the participants identified as white/Caucasian (n=14, 87.5%), with 12.5% (n=2) identifying as Black/African American. The same number of participants were vaccinated as were unvaccinated (n=7, 43.75%), with 12.5% (n=2) participants unsure of their vaccination status. Further demographic information for the participants is listed in table 2.
Of those patients who were vaccinated (n=7), 86% (n=6) were vaccinated 5 or more years ago. As no vaccinated participant was over age 30 at the time of their interview, M=27 years old), no participants were vaccinated under the new guidelines extending vaccination to age 45. Rather, vaccinated participants received the HPV vaccine when they were younger than the initial guideline age of 26. Of the seven participants who were vaccinated, 71% (n=5) stated that they did so because of a doctor’s recommendation. One did so because he felt he should as a gay man at higher risk for HPV. Another did so at as a teenager because his parents wanted him to.

Sixteen codes were determined and used: female/women; why not/no reason not to; cancer; warts; recommended; sexual activity; STI; preventative; vaccine; HPV is dangerous; I don’t know/not sure; insurance; research; doctor; important; age. These codes led to creation of three major themes in the three domains of attitudes, beliefs, and barriers. The themes were: (1) there is a commitment to preventative health, (2) there are gaps in knowledge about HPV risks and immunisation options, and (3) other barriers include age, lack of doctor recommendation, and lack of insurance coverage. Supporting quotes for each theme are listed in table 3. Quotes were notated during each interview and are presented as directly as possible. However, these quotes are not fully verbatim and may be slightly paraphrased.

The first theme revealed a commitment to preventative health. Participants viewed the HPV vaccine very favourably. They saw HPV vaccination as part of a preventative health package, and consistently rated it as highly important to overall health. Participants found peace of mind in the knowledge that they could further protect themselves from disease, especially disease from such a common act as sex.

The second theme revealed gaps in knowledge about HPV risks and immunisation options. Participants held a variety of beliefs about HPV and its consequences. The majority of participants had inaccurate ideas about infection with HPV, particularly for males. Participants generally believed that males had little to no consequences from HPV infection. The main concern regarded transmitting HPV to females.

The third theme was that the largest potential barriers are age/lack of knowledge around new age guidelines, lack of doctor recommendation and lack of insurance coverage. Participants were unaware that age guidelines had been adjusted to recommend HPV vaccination up to age 45 for certain individuals. Some participants aged out without receiving the HPV vaccine. This is concerning for other high-risk patients who may be nearing age 45 but are unaware they may still be eligible for vaccination. Participants stated receiving the HPV vaccine was contingent on insurance coverage. They also stated that they may not get vaccinated if a doctor did not recommend it. This shows the weight of provider recommendation, as well as the importance of knowledge about insurance coverage options.

Six patients were contacted to schedule appointments for HPV vaccination. This was 37.5% of the study population and 85.7% of the unvaccinated study population. The only participant who declined to be contacted for HPV vaccination was over age 45 and ineligible for vaccination. Therefore, 100% of eligible unvaccinated participants elected to be contacted to schedule HPV vaccination.

**DISCUSSION**

The results from our study further support the acceptability of HPV vaccination administration to high-risk patients.
populations. Although participants lacked knowledge about the severity of HPV infection in males, they still felt that the HPV vaccine was highly important. Once participants learnt that the guidelines had been extended for HPV vaccination, they overwhelmingly wanted to receive the vaccine if they had not already. This is a promising sign for generalising to other populations who may have gaps in knowledge about HPV and its long-term adverse effects. Even with limited knowledge about HPV, participants still saw the HPV vaccine as an important part of a healthy lifestyle. Our results were consistent with other qualitative studies that have misconceptions about HPV: belief that HPV primarily affects women, belief that HPV is not a concern for men, and belief that the HPV vaccine is not available to anyone over 26.4 19

The results of this study augment the sparse, although promising, literature about combination of HPV vaccination and PrEP therapy for at-risk populations. A cross-sectional survey was administered to MSM seen for PrEP consultations throughout Orléans, France.24 The mean age in this study was 36 years old, identical to that of our study. The study prevalence of HPV was 93.4%, with prevalence of high cancer risk HPV subtypes being 81.9%.24 Authors recommended including HPV vaccination as primary prevention among HIV-negative MSM using PrEP.24 In another study, a global systematic review examined HPV type distribution in anal cancer and anal intraepithelial lesions.25 The results suggest that prophylactic administration of the HPV vaccine could prevent up to two-thirds of anal cancer and lesions in both women and men.25

It is important to educate MSM about the risk of HPV infection in males. Participants overwhelmingly saw HPV as a primarily ‘female’ problem. This belief about HPV is especially concerning for MSM. If they are not engaging in sexual relations with females, they may see no harm in infection with HPV due to the lack of risk of passing it to females. The study population was more highly educated than the general population and they still had large gaps in HPV knowledge. Increasing knowledge of HPV infection, its effects in men, and extended eligibility of the vaccine are all tantamount to increasing vaccination rates. It is also important that providers stay up to date on insurance eligibility so that patients get the vaccine covered, whether through a commercial insurance company, Medicaid, or a patient assistance programme.

Although lack of knowledge about severity of HPV in males and the extended age guidelines for the vaccine
CONCLUSION

The results of this study support the idea that providers should offer the HPV vaccine to all eligible PrEP patients, even those over the age of 26. PrEP users are already invested in preventative health via their PrEP use and are excited by the opportunity for further prevention via the HPV vaccine. The PrEP patients in this study have a high acceptability of the HPV vaccine, appreciation for disease prevention, and low vaccine hesitancy. However, we also found that many PrEP patients are unaware that the HPV vaccine is available up to age 45. It is important that providers actively educate their patients, especially those who are at high-risk, about the risks of HPV vaccine and offer the vaccine if a patient is eligible and a good candidate.
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