

ABSTRACT

25
26 **Background:** Sexual and gender expansive (SGE) individuals in Kazakhstan are disproportionately
27 affected by HIV yet stigma and discrimination pose ethical and practical challenges for HIV prevention
28 research involving them. Although researchers are tasked with ensuring that risks of research participation
29 are reasonable in relation to its benefits, participation-related risks and benefits—including negative and
30 positive social impacts (NSIs and PSIs respectively) on personal relationships, social status, health, and
31 other aspects of life—among SGE populations have received little attention.

32 **Methods:** We examined NSIs and PSIs of participation among SGE individuals in a three-city HIV
33 prevention study in Kazakhstan at the clinical trial's follow-up visits. We analyzed responses from 579
34 unique SGE participants who completed a total of 2648 follow-up visits over the 36-month study period
35 (2019–2022).

36 **Results:** Overall, NSIs were rare: 9 (2%) participants reported NSIs during the study; virtually no NSIs
37 ($\bar{x}=0.0037$, $SD=0.03$) were reported at each follow-up visit. These few NSIs included 'trouble with
38 friends, family, or acquaintances' and 'other'. By contrast, PSIs were extensive: 515 (89%) participants
39 reported PSIs during the study; almost an average of five PSIs ($\bar{x}=4.8$, $SD=3.4$) were reported at each
40 follow-up visit. The most endorsed PSIs were 'gained knowledge', 'improvement in HIV-related issues',
41 and 'improvement in life'.

42 **Conclusions:** Our findings demonstrate the potential for HIV prevention research to be associated with
43 PSIs for SGE individuals experiencing stigmatization and discrimination. Future research should address
44 NSIs, particularly interpersonal challenges among network members, within HIV prevention research to
45 minimize risks and burdens of participation.

46
47 **ClinicalTrials.gov:** NCT02786615

48
49 **Keywords:** HIV, clinical trials, ethics, men who have sex with men, transgender, Kazakhstan

INTRODUCTION

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75

Globally, the number of new HIV infections has steadily declined over the past decade.¹ However, this progress has not been achieved equally across countries and key populations, with the number of new infections increasing in some contexts.^{1,2} In Kazakhstan, where HIV incidence grew by 88% between 2010 and 2021,³ sexual and gender expansive (SGE) individuals at elevated risk of HIV infection, particularly gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (MSM) and transgender and nonbinary persons who have sex with men (TSM), are disproportionately affected by HIV across the HIV care continuum.⁴⁻⁶

A long line of research suggests that the enduring gaps in the HIV care continuum engagement among SGE individuals may be attributed to stigma.⁷⁻⁹ In Kazakhstan, multiple forms of stigma against SGE individuals, such as sexual and gender-based victimization in community settings, bias-based harassment in health care settings, and the absence of legal protection from discriminatory practices, have been reported.¹⁰⁻¹³ Moreover, among a sample of MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan, HIV stigma, internalized homophobia, and sexual and gender-based victimization and discrimination were associated with disruptions to HIV testing and treatment.^{14,15} Furthermore, SGE individuals contend with multiple behavioral risks associated with HIV that urge attention.¹⁶⁻¹⁸

Persistent stigma and discrimination pose ethical and practical challenges for research needed to help develop locally effective means of decreasing HIV incidence. For instance, HIV research participation may elicit and, in turn, be deterred by presumption of infection status, unwanted attention or isolation, and other negative attitudes toward participants.^{19,20} Further, confidentiality breach, despite efforts to mitigate it, may occur during research and could reinforce social vulnerability among participants.²¹ Although researchers are tasked with ensuring that human subjects' risks of research participation are reasonable in relation to benefits, the risk-benefit relationship may not always be evident.²² These risks and benefits include negative (NSIs) and positive social impacts (PSIs) pertaining to personal relationships, social status, health, and other aspects of participants' lives.²³ Evidence in other settings suggests that PSIs related to participation in HIV prevention research are prevalent, whereas NSIs

76 are uncommon.²⁴⁻²⁷ Still, scientific literature on the assessment of NSIs and PSIs of HIV prevention
77 research participation among SGE individuals, particularly those in high stigma contexts, is sparse. We
78 sought to expand on this work by examining the overall incidence and correlates of NSIs and PSIs related
79 to HIV prevention research participation among a sample of MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan.

80

81

METHODS

82 We used data from a stepped wedge clinical trial of an HIV preventive intervention for MSM and
83 TSM in Kazakhstan (NCT02786615). Briefly, the intervention involved crowdsourcing and peer-actuated
84 network approaches to increasing engagement of MSM and TSM in the HIV care continuum in
85 Kazakhstan.²⁸ After a period of collecting baseline data at participants' initial visits (July 2018 – February
86 2019), the intervention was implemented sequentially, across three Kazakhstan cities: Almaty, Shymkent,
87 and Astana. During the implementation phase, participants were invited to complete a manualized
88 intervention that was delivered over four sessions preceded by an orientation session.²⁹

89 Throughout the trial, we conducted robust community engagement including community advisory
90 board sessions and recruitment venue site visits to help ensure safety and comfort in research
91 participation. This effort engaged community stakeholders in sharing their knowledge and wisdom of best
92 practices in conducting research involving SGE individuals in Kazakhstan. For instance, we inquired each
93 participant about preferred/appropriate term(s) to describe members of SGE communities and learned that
94 the term oft-used in research, 'sexual and gender minority', likely carries negative connotations in local
95 dialect. Finally, we implemented safety plans and staff training for risk mitigation, health care and social
96 service referrals, and regularly monitored social impacts during the trial.

97

Participants

99 Eligibility criteria for the study included: being ≥ 18 years old; identifying as man or being
100 assigned male at birth; reporting consensual sex with a man in the past 12 months; reporting binge
101 drinking, drug use, or both in the past 90 days; and residing in a study city. For the purposes of the study,

102 we refer to participants as ‘MSM’, ‘TSM’, or ‘SGE individuals’, acknowledging the terms’ limitation in
103 thoroughly representing sexual and gender diversity among them.

104

105 **Procedures**

106 Participants provided informed consent at their initial study visit. A structured behavioral survey
107 was administered by trained Research Assistants at the initial visit and follow-up visits every 6 months
108 until the end of the trial. All survey items were developed in English, translated to Russian and Kazakh,
109 and back-translated to English to ensure accuracy. Due to the stepped wedge study design, while most
110 participants completed six follow-up visits, those who were enrolled earlier in the trial had more follow-
111 up visits scheduled compared to those enrolled later/closer to the end of the trial. Rapid HIV testing,
112 counseling, and confirmatory testing or treatment referral for HIV, syphilis, gonorrhea, and chlamydia
113 were offered at the initial visit; the same services for HIV were offered at the final follow-up visit. Study
114 procedures were reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Boards at Columbia University and
115 Al-Farabi Kazakh National University.

116 Between July 2018 and February 2022, 982 individuals were screened; of them, 649 (66%) were
117 determined eligible for participation in the study. Of the study-eligible individuals, 629 (97%) returned
118 for the initial visit; of them, 579 (92%) were subsequently retained for at least one follow-up visit. Social
119 impacts related to HIV prevention research participation were assessed at follow-up visits. For this study,
120 we used panel data from 579 participants who completed a total of 2,648 follow-up visits over a 36-month
121 period (February 2019 – February 2022).

122

123 **Measures**

124 **Social Impact**

125 Negative social impact (NSI) and positive social impact (PSI) items were adapted from the social
126 impact assessment questionnaire used in a multinational HIV prevention study involving people who
127 inject drugs.³⁰ For NSIs, participants were asked at each follow-up visit whether anything negative or

128 risky happened to them due to their study participation. Those reporting any negative incident were
129 probed about occurrences of specific NSIs (1=yes, 0=no). Similarly, for PSIs, participants were asked
130 whether anything positive or beneficial happened due to their study participation. Those reporting any
131 positive incident were probed about occurrences of specific PSIs (1=yes, 0=no).

132 **Alcohol and Drug Use**

133 Alcohol and drug use assessment relied on the same measures used in previous studies.^{14,16,17}
134 Briefly, participants self-reported lifetime use of alcohol, marijuana, heroin and other opioids, stimulants,
135 cocaine, hallucinogens or psychedelics, inhalants, and club drugs. Participants reporting any prior use of
136 alcohol were asked about incidents of binge drinking, operationalized as “consuming five or more alcohol
137 beverages within a two-hour period”.³¹ When appropriate, local or street names were used to describe the
138 drugs. For alcohol, binge drinking, and each of the drugs, participants reporting any prior use were probed
139 about the frequency of use in the past 90 days.

140 **Sociodemographic Characteristics**

141 Participants self-reported their city of residence, age (in years), legal marital status, education
142 completion status, employment status, gender identity, sex assigned at birth, sexual orientation, and HIV
143 status. Participants reporting ‘other’ were asked to specify their responses.

144

145 **Study Variables and Data Analysis**

146 Social impacts were analyzed in two ways (1) *per visit*, in which each follow-up visit constitutes
147 a case, and (2) *per participant*, in which each participant’s series of follow-ups constitutes a case. In other
148 words, the outcome data were structured in long format and wide format respectively, with long format
149 allowing for easy calculation of metrics using visits as the unit of analysis, and wide format involves
150 using study participants as the unit of analysis. For each set of NSI and PSI items in the long format data,
151 responses were summed to compose count variables of NSI and PSI items endorsed at each follow-up
152 visit; these variables were dichotomized to create dummy variables denoting any or no social impact.
153 Next, we transformed long format data into wide format. For each set of NSI and PSI items in the wide

154 format data, we calculated the averages of count variables across completed follow-up visits; these
155 average count variables were dichotomized to create dummy variables so that the value of zero denoted
156 no social impact, while values greater than zero denoted any social impact. Finally, for each social impact
157 item, responses across completed follow-up visits were summed and dichotomized to create a dummy
158 variable denoting any or no social impact during study participation.

159 Analysis of alcohol and drug use focused on use that was inconsistent with medical or legal
160 guidance, and thus excluded alcohol use and included binge drinking and drug use. Responses for binge
161 drinking were imputed as zero if no prior alcohol use was reported. Frequencies of binge drinking and
162 drug use in the past 90 days were dichotomized to create dummy variables denoting any or no recent use.
163 Frequencies were imputed as zero if no prior use was reported. The dichotomized responses for drug use
164 across all drugs were summed and dichotomized to create a dummy variable denoting any or no drug use.

165 Responses for age were dichotomized as ‘ages 18-24’ and ‘ages ≥ 25 ’ categories based on clinical
166 and cultural relevance.^{32,33} If feasible and appropriate, write-in responses for the ‘other’ query for the
167 sociodemographic characteristic items were inductively coded as existing response options, as determined
168 by the authors (VV, YL, EW). In this way, all descriptions for the ‘other’ sexual orientation category
169 were coded as ‘bisexual.’ At the initial visit, no participant reported being assigned ‘other’ sex at birth.

170 We conducted frequency analyses to describe the distributions of sociodemographic
171 characteristics and alcohol and drug use at the initial visit, as well as NSI and PSIs at follow-up visits.
172 Additionally, we performed linear regression analyses to test bivariate associations between
173 sociodemographic and alcohol and drug use factors at the initial visit and the average count of PSIs
174 endorsed across follow-up visits. We did not perform bivariate analyses for NSIs due to very small
175 numbers of NSIs reported (as presented in Results). All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS
176 version 28.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY).

177 **Table 1.** Sociodemographic and Substance Use Characteristics a Sample of MSM and TSM in
 178 Kazakhstan at Initial Visit of an HIV Prevention Clinical Trial (N=579)

Variable	<i>n</i> (%)
City of Residence	
Almaty	227 (39.2%)
Shymkent	184 (31.8%)
Astana	168 (29.0%)
Age groups, years (median=27; range=18-59)	
18-24	207 (35.8%)
25 or older	372 (64.2%)
Legal Marital Status	
Single, never married	455 (78.6%)
Else (e.g., married, no longer with spouse, other)	124 (21.4%)
Education Completion Status	
High school	116 (20.0%)
Vocational or college/university	463 (80.0%)
Employment Status	
Employed (full-time or part-time)	447 (77.2%)
Unemployed	63 (10.9%)
Else (e.g., retired, disability, homemaker, student, other)	69 (11.9%)
Gender Identity	
Woman	32 (5.5%)
Man	521 (90.0%)
Other	26 (4.5%)
Sex Assigned at Birth	
Female	2 (0.3%)
Male	577 (99.7%)
Sexual Orientation	
Straight	10 (1.7%)
Gay	305 (52.7%)
Bisexual	264 (45.6%)
Self-Reported HIV Status	
Positive	46 (7.9%)
Negative	387 (66.8%)
Unknown	146 (25.2%)
Drug Use, Lifetime	432 (74.6%)
Drug Use, Past 90 Days	252 (43.5%)
Binge Drinking, Lifetime	527 (91.0%)
Binge Drinking, Past 90 Days	489 (84.5%)


179

RESULTS

180
181 Descriptive statistics for the initial-visit sociodemographic characteristics and alcohol and drug
182 use of the study sample of MSM and TSM who provided follow-up data are presented in Table 1.
183 Participants were between the ages of 18 and 59 (median=27). Most participants were single (79%),
184 employed (77%), and had completed vocational or college/university-level education (80%). With respect
185 to sexual and gender identities, most identified as man (90%) and sexually expansive, i.e., gay (53%) or
186 bisexual (46%). In this sample, 489 (85%) and 252 (44%) reported recent binge drinking and drug use,
187 respectively. A quarter of the sample reported unknown HIV status.

188 A graphical summary of participant responses for NSIs and PSIs is presented in Figure 1. In this
189 raster format, each row (i.e., raster line) represents a participant and the raster line is divided into
190 columns, with each column indicating whether NSIs and PSIs (Figures 1a and 1b, respectively) were
191 reported for the corresponding follow-up visit. The greater the number of NSIs (out of 6 items) or PSIs
192 (out of 14 items) reported during each visit, the more saturated the color (red for NSIs in Figure 1a and
193 green for PSIs in Figure 1b). If a participant did not complete a particular visit due to missing a scheduled
194 appointment, the follow-up visit falling after the end of the trial, or any other reason, that is indicated with
195 a yellow element in the raster line. Overall, the plots depict a higher volume of more-saturated green
196 raster lines than saturated red lines, indicating many more PSIs than NSIs were reported by participants at
197 each follow-up visit.

198 **Figure 1.** Raster^a Plots of Negative Social Impacts and Positive Social Impacts of HIV Research
 199 Participation in a Sample of MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan (N=2648)



^a Each raster line represents the reports from a single respondent
 N/A = Data not available due to incomplete assessment and/or not applicable (due to enrollment at later points in the trial)

200

201 **Social Impacts Per Visit**

202 Metrics regarding the distributions of NSIs and PSIs using the long format are presented in Table
 203 2. Of 2648 follow-up visits, nine (0.3%) had a report of at least one NSI. Specifically, there were five
 204 (0.2%) reports of ‘trouble with friends, family, or acquaintances’ and six (0.2%) reports of ‘other NSI’
 205 involving ‘loss of privacy’ ($n=4$), ‘stigma/harassment due to study participation’ ($n=1$), and ‘trouble with
 206 HIV-related issues’ ($n=1$). By contrast, 1519 visits (57%) had respondents reporting at least one PSI.

207
 208 **Table 2.** Negative Social Impacts and Positive Social Impacts of HIV Research Participation in a
 209 Sample of MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan ($N=2648$ visits)

2a. Negative Social Impacts (NSIs)	
Variable	<i>n</i> (%)
Any NSI	9 (0.3%)
Items	
Other NSI	6 (0.2%)
Trouble with friends, family, or acquaintances	5 (0.2%)
Arrested or trouble with police or other legal problems	0
Trouble getting or keeping housing	0
Trouble getting or keeping job, income, or economic support	0
Trouble getting health care or health insurance	0
2b. Positive Social Impacts (PSIs)	
Variable	<i>n</i> (%)
Any PSI	1519 (57.4%)
Items	
Gained knowledge	1445 (54.6%)
Improvement in HIV-related issues	1428 (53.9%)
Improvement in mental health	1162 (43.9%)
Improvement in life	1151 (43.5%)
Improvement in physical health	1133 (42.8%)
Improvement in (connection to) community	1107 (41.8%)
Improvement in relationships	1060 (40.0%)
Less homophobia or improvement in handling homophobia better	940 (35.5%)
Reduction of stigma	894 (33.8%)
Improvement in financial	770 (29.1%)
Improvement in employment	667 (25.2%)
Reduction in drug use	491 (18.5%)
Other PSI	457 (17.3%)
Less transphobia or improvement in handling transphobia better	408 (15.4%)

210

211 **Table 3.** Negative Social Impacts and Positive Social Impacts of HIV Research Participation in a
 212 Sample of MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan ($N=579$ participants)

3a. Negative Social Impacts (NSIs)	
Variable	<i>n</i> (%)
Any NSI	9 (1.6%)
Items	
Other NSI	6 (1.0%)
Trouble with friends, family, or acquaintances	5 (0.9%)
Arrested or trouble with police or other legal problems	0
Trouble getting or keeping housing	0
Trouble getting or keeping job, income, or economic support	0
Trouble getting health care or health insurance	0
3b. Positive Social Impacts (PSIs)	
Variable	<i>n</i> (%)
Any PSI	515 (88.9%)
Items	
Gained knowledge	501 (86.5%)
Improvement in HIV-related issues	499 (86.2%)
Improvement in mental health	461 (79.6%)
Improvement in life	447 (77.2%)
Improvement in (connection to) community	446 (77.0%)
Improvement in physical health	435 (75.1%)
Improvement in relationships	433 (74.8%)
Less homophobia or improvement in handling homophobia better	401 (69.3%)
Reduction of stigma	387 (66.8%)
Improvement in financial	351 (60.6%)
Improvement in employment	324 (56.0%)
Reduction in drug use	275 (47.5%)
Other PSI	266 (45.9%)
Less transphobia or improvement in handling transphobia better	237 (40.9%)

213

214 **Social Impacts Per Participant**

215 Metrics regarding the distributions of NSIs and PSIs using the wide format are presented in Table

216 3. Of 579 MSM and TSM, nine individuals (2%) reported an NSI at least once across follow-up visits;

217 five (1%) reported ‘trouble with friends, family, or acquaintances’ and six (1%) reported ‘other NSI’.

218 There was no report of NSIs related to legal, housing, economic, or health care issues. By contrast, 515

219 individuals (89%) reported a PSI at least once across follow-up visits. The majority of participants

220 reported ‘gained knowledge’ (87%), ‘improvement in HIV-related issues’ (86%), and ‘improvement in

221 life’ (80%); fewer participants reported ‘less transphobia or improvement in handling it better’ (41%),

222 ‘reduction in drug use’ (48%), and ‘other PSI’ (46%), but these numbers still approached approximately
223 half of participants. Participants reported, on average, five PSIs ($\bar{x}=4.8$, $SD=3.4$) and zero NSI ($\bar{x}=0.0037$,
224 $SD=0.03$) during the trial.

225

226 **Correlates of Positive Social Impacts**

227 Partial results of the bivariate analyses illustrating statistically significant correlates of the
228 average count of PSIs—residence and recent binge drinking—are presented in Table 4. On average, living
229 in Shymkent and Astana, compared with Almaty, was associated with 2.8-point and 1.3-point higher
230 average count of PSIs, respectively. Recent binge drinking was associated with, on average, a 1.2-point
231 higher average count of PSIs.

232

233 **Table 4.** Significant Bivariate Associations Between the Average Count of Positive Social
234 Impacts Endorsed Across Follow-Up Visits and Sociodemographic and Substance Use
235 Characteristics at Initial Visit in a Sample of MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan ($N=579$)

Variable	β	SE	95% CI	p
City of Residence				
Almaty	Ref.			
Shymkent	2.8	0.3	(2.2, 3.5)	<.001
Astana	1.3	0.3	(0.7, 1.9)	<.001
Binge Drinking, Past 90 Days	1.2	0.4	(0.4, 2.0)	.002

SE: Standard Error

CI: Confidence Interval

236

237

237 **DISCUSSION**

238 Among MSM and TSM enrolled in an HIV prevention clinical trial in Kazakhstan, PSIs related to
239 study participation were endorsed at substantially higher rates than NSIs. Specifically, NSIs were very
240 infrequently reported, with an average of virtually zero NSI per follow-up visit and per participant,
241 whereas PSIs were reported extensively, with an average of five PSIs per visit. To our knowledge, this is
242 the first study to examine the social impacts of HIV prevention research participation among SGE
243 individuals in Kazakhstan.

244 In our study, the most frequently endorsed PSIs were ‘gained knowledge’, ‘improvement in HIV-
245 related issues’, and ‘improvement in mental health’. The parent study was testing the efficacy of a social
246 network-based intervention for increasing engagement of MSM and TSM in the HIV care continuum in
247 Kazakhstan. A primary objective of the intervention was supporting MSM and TSM with promoting the
248 uptake of HIV care services within their networks. Therefore, receipt of or indirect exposure to the
249 intervention could have contributed to improvement of knowledge and HIV-related issues among
250 participants.

251 Our findings are consistent with other studies demonstrating common experiences of PSIs and
252 scant reports of NSIs. A multinational HIV prevention trial involving people who inject drugs in China
253 and Thailand similarly found that 77% of participants reported PSIs, far exceeding 0.5% reporting NSIs.²⁴
254 A cross-protocol analysis of data from 413 preventive HIV vaccine trials in 13 countries showed that 81%
255 of participants reported PSIs and 8% reported NSIs.²⁵ Finally, an HIV cure-related trial involving women
256 living with HIV in the U.S. demonstrated reporting of a greater number of PSIs than NSIs by participants
257 at their exit survey.²⁶ Our study extends this line of inquiry by contributing analyses of responses from
258 SGE individuals in Kazakhstan.

259 In our study, participants reporting recent binge drinking were more likely to report a greater
260 number of PSIs. Binge drinking is associated with increased risk of developing health and psychosocial
261 problems. Since the trial intervention also focused on increasing engagement in alcohol and drug use
262 treatment, it is possible that participants reporting binge drinking perceived the intervention to be
263 beneficial and valuable more so than those reporting no binge drinking. Moreover, participants living in
264 Shymkent and Astana were more likely to report a greater number of PSIs. In previous studies,
265 geographical differences in PSI endorsement had been attributed to variability in access to resources.^{25,30}
266 Given that twice as many MSM and TSM were estimated to be living in Almaty as Shymkent or Astana,
267 it is reasonable to posit that participants in Almaty may have been benefiting from having greater
268 availability of and access to resources outside the study.⁵

269 Although relatively rare, NSIs warrant careful review and, as necessary, development of
270 mitigation strategies. In our study, the most frequently endorsed NSIs were ‘other NSI’ and ‘trouble with
271 friends, family, or acquaintances’. Other NSIs mostly entailed loss of privacy due to breach of
272 confidentiality by an entity (e.g., HIV care provider) or an individual—in at least one case, by another
273 study participant. One participant in our study recounted online criticisms about their study participation.
274 Breach of confidentiality had been reported as an NSI in a multinational preventive HIV vaccine trial.²⁵ In
275 addition, navigating unwanted attention or aggression regarding study participation through confrontation
276 or avoidance had been reported in other studies,^{22,26} and could be interpreted as trouble with personal
277 relationships. Indeed, in our study, trouble with friends, family, or acquaintances was endorsed by five out
278 of nine participants reporting any NSI. Although we confirmed with participants that NSIs had not
279 resulted due to administration of study procedures, they nonetheless stress the importance of developing
280 and implementing safety plans to mitigate potential NSIs.

281 Limitations to our study can inform future research. In this study, assessment of NSIs and PSIs
282 pertained to experiences of research study participation and did not specify a timeframe. Responses at
283 subsequent follow-up visits could reflect prior experiences and, therefore, lead us to capture individual
284 PSIs and NSIs multiple times. This limitation does not impact participant-level results; however, future
285 studies interested in time-sequencing of NSIs and PSIs can overcome this limitation by specifying a
286 timeframe, e.g., since the most recent prior study visit. Also, given that our social impact questionnaires
287 reflected categories of impacts that could be interpreted in different ways, future research should
288 cognitively test the questionnaire items (following translation) to ensure accuracy in the local context.
289 Next, endorsement of social impacts may be subject to social response bias. In other settings, it has been
290 speculated that fear of losing tangible benefits, such as medical care and compensation, could lead to
291 underreporting of NSIs.²⁵ It is possible that study participants underreported NSIs to avoid losing
292 HIV/STI testing and counseling/referral, compensation provided for their participation, or both. Training
293 of staff on data collection procedures ensuring response accuracy should be prioritized. Finally, our
294 findings may not be generalizable to all MSM and TSM in Kazakhstan. This analysis was restricted to

295 data provided by SGE individuals retained in an HIV prevention trial conducted in three Kazakhstan
296 cities over a three-year period and, thus, did not represent experiences of those who did not participate in
297 or had been excluded from the trial (e.g., those without recent drug use or binge drinking). However, we
298 recruited a large sample of MSM and TSM from multiple cities in Kazakhstan (the first study to do so to
299 our knowledge) and retention rates were high, enabling us to obtain diverse perspectives on NSI and PSI
300 from this population. Moreover, given that drug use and binge drinking are also stigmatized, participants
301 in our study likely experience more stigma compared to their peers who do not engage in these behaviors
302 —lending confidence to our conclusion that HIV prevention research overwhelmingly leads to PSIs in a
303 high-stigma context. At the same time, despite extensive retention efforts, missing data were incurred
304 through participant dropout and loss to follow-up. It is possible that attrition was related to anticipation of
305 NSI or absence of PSI. As such, future studies specifically designed to assess PSIs and NSIs among MSM
306 and TSM in high-stigma contexts is warranted to bolster assessment of ethics of conducting HIV
307 prevention research among stigmatized groups.

308

309

CONCLUSIONS

310 Our study adds to the literature on social impact assessment in HIV prevention trials and
311 highlights the ethical significance of assessing participant-centered experiences. PSIs and NSIs identified
312 in this study suggest that it is possible to ethically conduct HIV prevention research involving SGE
313 individuals at elevated risk of HIV infection in Kazakhstan despite the context of intersecting stigma. As
314 risk mitigation is an important ethical consideration in HIV prevention, the infrequent reporting of NSIs
315 in our study is encouraging. It is possible that procedures embedded in our trial to anticipate and address
316 ethical issues contributed to such an outcome. These procedures included, but were not limited to,
317 involving SGE individuals, as paid staff, or community advisory board members, in all aspects of the
318 trial, training staff on protecting the safety, privacy, and confidentiality of participants, creating an
319 affirming environment for research participation, hosting social events for building rapport and comfort,
320 and reviewing and sharing study findings with SGE communities and service providers.

321 Several recommendations are derived from this study: (1) partner with SGE communities in all
322 aspects of research; (2) develop safety plans, including risk mitigation strategies, tailored to the needs of
323 SGE communities and features of research settings/platforms,^{34,35} (3) embed systematic assessment of
324 social impacts related to study participation; (4) include PSIs in evaluating the ethics of conducting
325 research;³⁶ and (5) facilitate feedback and communication with SGE communities to ensure researcher
326 accountability. These recommendations may serve as a guide for conducting HIV prevention research in
327 settings where diverse sexual and gender characteristics are stigmatized with few NSIs and many PSIs.

328

STATEMENTS AND DECLARATIONS

329 **Acknowledgements**

330 We would like to thank the project staff of the Columbia University Global Health Research Center of
331 Central Asia—including Karina Alipova, Farruh Aripov, Olga Balabekova, Daniya Bekishev, Dilara
332 Belkesheva, Valeriya Davydova, Ferangiz Hasanova, Sultana Kali, Saltanat Kuskulova, Aitkul Nazarova,
333 Syrym Omirbek, Svyatoslov Suslov, Aizhan Toleuova, Aidar Yelkeyev, and Saida Yessenova—for their
334 commitment and care given to the execution of study activities. We would like to thank the participants
335 for their courage and time in sharing their stories.

336

337 **Declaration of competing interest**

338 Jeremy Sugarman is a member of Merck KGaA Ethics Advisory Panel and Stem Cell Research Oversight
339 Committee; a member of IQVIA’s Ethics Advisory Panel; a member of Aspen Neurosciences Clinical
340 Advisory Panel; and a consultant to Merck. None of these activities is related to the material discussed in
341 this manuscript.

342

343 The other authors have no competing financial or non-financial interest to declare.

344

345 **Funding sources**

346 This study was supported by the National Institute on Drug Abuse [grant R01DA040513 (PI: Wu)].
347 Emily Allen Paine’s time was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health [grants
348 K01MH128117 (PI: Paine) and P30MH43520 (PI: Remien)].

349

350 **Data availability**

351 Deidentified data used in this study could be made available from the corresponding author upon
352 reasonable request.

REFERENCES

353

354 1. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). *UNAIDS Data 2023*. 2023. Available at:

355 https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2023/2023_unaids_data.

356 2. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). *Miles to go - The response to HIV in*
357 *eastern Europe and central Asia*. 2018. Available at:

358 https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2018/miles-to-go_eastern-europe-and-central-asia.

359 3. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). *UNAIDS Data 2022*. 2022. Available at:

360 https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2023/2022_unaids_data.

361 4. Eurasian Coalition on Male Health (ECOM). *Brief on HIV among MSM in Kazakhstan*. 2018.

362 Available at: <https://ecom.ngo/library/brief-kazakhstan-en>.

363 5. Wu E, Terlikbayeva A, Hunt T, Primbetova S, Lee YG, Berry M. Preliminary population size

364 estimation of men who have sex with men in Kazakhstan: Implications for HIV testing and

365 surveillance. *LGBT Health*. 2016;4:164-167. doi:10.1089/lgbt.2015.0152

366 6. Wu E, Lee YG, Zhakupova G, et al. Prevalence and correlates of HIV infection and unknown HIV

367 infection among men who have sex with men (MSM) in Kazakhstan: Evidence for a brewing

368 syndemic from a multi-city study. Presented at: 23rd International AIDS Conference (AIDS 2020);

369 2020; Virtual.

370 7. Arreola S, Santos G-M, Beck J, et al. Sexual stigma, criminalization, investment, and access to HIV

371 services among men who have sex with men worldwide. *AIDS Behav*. 2015;19:227-234.

372 doi:10.1007/s10461-014-0869-x

373 8. Babel RA, Wang P, Alessi EJ, Raymond HF, Wei C. Stigma, HIV risk, and access to HIV prevention

374 and treatment services among men who have sex with men (MSM) in the United States: A scoping

375 review. *AIDS Behav*. 2021;25:3574-3604. doi:10.1007/s10461-021-03262-4

376 9. Vaites Fontanari AM, Zanella GI, Feijó M, Churchill S, Rodrigues Lobato MI, Costa AB. HIV-

377 related care for transgender people: A systematic review of studies from around the world. *Soc Sci*

378 *Med*. 2019;230:280-294. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.03.016

- 379 10. ALMA-TQ, Law CfIHRoNPSO, Rights GifH. *Violations by Kazakhstan of the Right of Transgender*
380 *Persons to Legal Recognition of Gender Identity*. 2016. Available at:
381 <https://www.kok.team/files/files/article/386/int-ccpr-css-kaz-24305-e.pdf>
- 382 11. Eurasian Coalition on Male Health (ECOM). *Legislative Analysis Related to SOGI and HIV in*
383 *Kazakhstan*. 2021. Available at: https://ecom.ngo/library/kazakhstan-legislative-analysis_2020_en
- 384 12. Levitanus M. Agency and resistance amongst queer people in Kazakhstan. *Centr Asian Surv.*
385 2022;41:498-515. doi:10.1080/02634937.2021.2008874
- 386 13. Laughney CI, Lee YG, Mergenova G, et al. Earlier sexual debut and anti-gay victimization among
387 men who have sex with men (MSM) in Kazakhstan. *J Interpers Violence*. 2023;38:10795-10813.
388 doi:10.1177/08862605231176800
- 389 14. Paine EA, Lee YG, Vinogradov V, et al. HIV Stigma, homophobia, sexual and gender minority
390 community connectedness and HIV testing among gay, bisexual, and other men and transgender
391 people who have sex with men in Kazakhstan. *AIDS Behav*. 2021;25:2568-2577.
392 doi:10.1007/s10461-021-03217-9
- 393 15. Paine EA, Lee YG, Mergenova G, et al. Compounding vulnerabilities: Victimization and
394 discrimination is associated with COVID-19 disruptions to HIV-related care among gay, bisexual,
395 and other men and transgender and nonbinary people who have sex with men in Kazakhstan. *AIDS*
396 *Care*. 2023;35:651-657. doi:10.1080/09540121.2022.2148956
- 397 16. Lee YG, Zhakupova G, Vinogradov V, et al. Polydrug use, sexual risk, and HIV testing among
398 cisgender gay, bisexual, and other men and transgender and nonbinary individuals who have sex with
399 men in Kazakhstan. *AIDS Educ Prev*. 2022;34:413-426. doi:10.1521/aeap.2022.34.5.413
- 400 17. Laughney CI, Lee YG, Mergenova G, et al. Earlier sexual debut as a risk factor for substance use
401 among men who have sex with men (MSM) in Kazakhstan. *Glob Soc Welf.*
402 2023;doi:10.1007/s40609-023-00298-3

- 403 18. Laughney CI, Lee YG, Mergenova G, et al. Earlier sexual debut and exchange sex among men who
404 have sex with men (MSM) in Kazakhstan. *J Sex Res.* 2023;60:919-924.
405 doi:10.1080/00224499.2023.2167064
- 406 19. MacQueen K, Shapiro K, Karim Q, Sugarman J. Ethical challenges in international HIV prevention
407 research. *Account Res.* 2004;11:49-61. doi:10.1080/08989620490280230
- 408 20. Bass SB, D'Avanzo P, Alhajji M, et al. Exploring the engagement of racial and ethnic minorities in
409 HIV treatment and vaccine clinical trials: A scoping review of literature and implications for future
410 research. *AIDS Patient Care STDs.* 2020;34:399-416. doi:10.1089/apc.2020.0008
- 411 21. Azhar S, Tao X, Jokhakar V, Fisher CB. Barriers and facilitators to participation in Long-acting
412 injectable PrEP research trials for MSM, transgender women, and gender-nonconforming people of
413 color. *AIDS Educ Prev.* 2021;33:465-482. doi:10.1521/aeap.2021.33.6.465
- 414 22. Gilbertson A, Kelly EP, Rennie S, Henderson G, Kuruc J, Tucker JD. Indirect benefits in HIV cure
415 clinical research: A qualitative analysis. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses.* 2018;35:100-107.
416 doi:10.1089/aid.2017.0224
- 417 23. Allen M, Lau C-Y. Social impact of preventive HIV vaccine clinical trial participation: A model of
418 prevention, assessment and intervention. *Soc Sci Med.* 2008;66:945-951.
419 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.10.019
- 420 24. Sugarman J, Stalter R, Bokoch K, Liu T-Y, Donnell D. Positive social impacts related to participation
421 in an HIV prevention trial involving people who inject drugs. *IRB.* 2015;37:17-19.
- 422 25. Andrasik MP, Sesay FA, Isaacs A, Oseso L, Allen M. Social impacts among participants in HIV
423 Vaccine Trial Network (HVTN) preventive HIV vaccine trials. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.*
424 2020;84:488-496. doi: 10.1097/QAI.0000000000002369
- 425 26. Dubé K, Hosey L, Starr K, et al. Participant perspectives in an HIV cure-related trial conducted
426 exclusively in women in the United States: Results from AIDS clinical trials group 5366. *AIDS Res*
427 *Hum Retroviruses.* 2020;36:268-282. doi:10.1089/aid.2019.0284

- 428 27. Dubé K, Shelton B, Patel H, et al. Perceived risks and benefits of enrolling people with HIV at the
429 end of life in cure research in Southern California, United States. *J Virus Erad.* 2023;9:100328.
430 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jve.2023.100328>
- 431 28. Wu E. Using social media and social networks to increase access to HIV care among MSM in three
432 cities in Kazakhstan: Project UNI. Presented at: 22nd International AIDS Conference (AIDS 2018);
433 2018; Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- 434 29. Wu E, Lee YG, Vinogradov V, et al. Intervention adaptation and implementation method for real-
435 world constraints and using new technologies. *Res Soc Work Pract.* 2022;33:562-570.
436 doi:[10.1177/10497315221120605](https://doi.org/10.1177/10497315221120605)
- 437 30. Sugarman J, Trumble I, Hamilton E, et al. Reported participation benefits in international HIV
438 prevention research with people who inject drugs. *Ethics Hum Res.* 2019;41:28-34.
439 doi:[10.1002/eahr.500030](https://doi.org/10.1002/eahr.500030)
- 440 31. National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. *Drinking Levels Defined*. Available at:
441 <https://www.niaaa.nih.gov/alcohol-health/overview-alcohol-consumption/moderate-binge-drinking>
- 442 32. Berry M, Wirtz AL, Janayeva A, et al. Risk factors for HIV and unprotected anal intercourse among
443 men who have sex with men (MSM) in Almaty, Kazakhstan. *PLoS One.* 2012;7:e43071.
444 doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0043071](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043071)
- 445 33. World Health Organization (WHO). *Adolescent and Young Adult Health*. Available at:
446 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/adolescents-health-risks-and-solutions>
- 447 34. Fisher CB, Bragard E, Bloom R. Ethical considerations in HIV eHealth intervention research:
448 Implications for informational risk in recruitment, data maintenance, and consent procedures. *Curr*
449 *HIV/AIDS Rep.* 2020;17:180-189. doi:[10.1007/s11904-020-00489-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11904-020-00489-z)
- 450 35. Sugarman J, Barnes M, Rose S, et al. Development and implementation of participant safety plans for
451 international research with stigmatised populations. *Lancet HIV.* 2018;5:e468-e472.
452 doi:[10.1016/S2352-3018\(18\)30073-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3018(18)30073-0)

- 453 36. Rennie S, Day S, Mathews A, et al. The role of inclusion benefits in ethics committee assessment of
454 research studies. *Ethics Hum Res.* 2019;41:13-22. doi:10.1002/eahr.500015