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Background

• 35% of ever-married women in Nairobi experienced physical and/or sexual IPV in the past year (KDHS 2014)

• IPV is associated with significantly lower ART use, lower ART adherence, and lower odds of viral load suppression among women (Hatcher et al 2015)

• WHO guidelines for IPV discourage universal screening, but note routine inquiry is warranted in ANC settings and, though further research is needed, may also be warranted in HIV testing services (HTS) (WHO 2013)

• Researchers have recommended doing more than screening and referral (Christofides & Jewkes 2010; O’Doherty et al 2015; Undie et al 2016)
Aim and Setting

• Rigorously test a simple pilot intervention that aims to take a step beyond IPV screening to discuss violence and power with all women receiving HTS

• Kenyatta National Hospital’s (KNH’s) ANC clinic
Methods

• Randomized controlled trial assessing intermediate outcomes.

• First-visit ANC clients randomly assigned to either intervention (IPV-HTS) or control (standard HTS).

• Participants interviewed twice: immediately after receiving their HTS services, and at subsequent ANC visit (~one month later). Review of clients’ clinical records for HIV status.

• Sample:
  – 688 women at first visit;
  – 535 women at second visit (78% retention)

• Data analyzed using intent-to-treat approach.

• No significant differences in demographic, HIV or IPV indicators between intervention and control group participants; or with those lost to follow-up.
Intervention: HTS that addresses IPV and power in relationships

- 4 components:
  - Provider training
  - Counseling aids
  - IPV counselor from KNH’s GBV Centre posted in the ANC clinic
  - All HTS providers involved in project attended support group sessions

Resources
You are not alone. There are people and services here and elsewhere in Nairobi that provide free and confidential help.

- Gender Based Violence Recovery Centre, Kenyatta National Hospital (Old Hospital Building)
  Call: 0733 606 400 or 0722 829 501 Ext. 44101 or 43136
- Women’s Rights Awareness Programme*
  Mvuli Lane, off Thika Superhighway (next to Mathan Hospital)
  Call: 0721367677 or 0722 252 939
  * Provides safe shelter
- Nairobi Women’s Hospital, Gender Violence Recovery Centre
  (Hurlingham Centre, Adams Arcade and Ongata Rongai)
  Call: 0202 716 651
- Centre for Rights Education and Awareness
  Chalbi Drive House No. 55, Lavington (off Issac Gathanjui Road)
  Call: +254 20 237 8271 or +254 720 357 664
Participant Characteristics

- On average, 29 years old
- Half (49.6%) had completed some tertiary education
- 82% currently married, 2% unmarried but living with a man, 9% had a regular partner but not living together, 6% single
- 5.7% of women were living with HIV
- 38% reported ever experiencing IPV, most in past year
## Participant Characteristics:
### Experience of IPV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of IPV</th>
<th>Total N=688 (%)</th>
<th>Intervention N=377 (%)</th>
<th>Control N=351 (%)</th>
<th>P-value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPV in past 12 months (any type)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional IPV in past 12 months</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical IPV in past 12 months</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual IPV in past 12 months</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and/or sexual IPV in past 12 months</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chi-square tests for association. Significance at p<0.05.
HIV infection, disclosure, and couples testing among women experiencing physical or sexual violence in past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total N=688</th>
<th>IPV-negative N=543</th>
<th>IPV-positive N=145</th>
<th>P-value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disclosed HIV status to partner (positive or negative result)</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know partner’s HIV status (positive or negative result)</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have ever been to couples HCT</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV-positive</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chi-square tests for association. Significance at p<0.05.
## Intervention effects - process

Among women experiencing any IPV (physical, sexual, or emotional) in past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total N=241 (%)</th>
<th>Control N=134 (%)</th>
<th>Intervention N=107 (%)</th>
<th>P-value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider screened for IPV (1st ANC visit)</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant disclosed IPV to provider (1st ANC visit)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant followed-up on referral/ intend to today (2nd ANC visit)(^a)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chi-square tests for association. Significance at p<0.05.
\(^a\) Total response on variable N=191 (103 control, 88 intervention) due to attrition at second follow-up and one case of missing data.
## Intervention effects - perceived support

Logistic Regression Analysis, by Study Arm at Second ANC Visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unadjusted Intervention (vs. Control)</th>
<th>Adjusted Intervention ( a ) (vs. Control)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking with provider made positive difference</td>
<td>2.95***</td>
<td>2.89***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned new things about a woman’s rights in her relationship</td>
<td>3.79***</td>
<td>3.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel better able to take care of health than before visit</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel more confident in how deserve to be treated</td>
<td>2.81***</td>
<td>2.72***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a \) Adjusts for sexual relationship power and experiences of IPV in past 12 months

\*p<0.05; \**p<0.01; \***p<0.001
Among women experiencing physical or sexual violence in the past year, the proportion of women taking any action to address IPV was higher in the intervention vs. control group (46% vs. 31%, p=0.07).
Conclusion

- Results demonstrate **significant positive intermediate outcomes** of a short intervention integrating IPV/power and HTS.
- Added only 6.5 minutes to HTS counseling time making it possible to scale up
- The strategy can contribute to reaching and supporting women who are experiencing violence, and should be further tested for behavioral, health and mental health outcomes through a larger evaluation.
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