

ICPSR 22140

**HIV Transmission Network
Metastudy Project: An Archive of
Data From Eight Network Studies,
1988--2001**

Martina Morris

*University of Washington. Center for AIDS
Research*

Richard Rothenberg

*Emory University. Rollins School of Public
Health*

Documentation

Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
www.icpsr.umich.edu

Terms of Use

The terms of use for this study can be found at:
<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/22140/terms>

Information about Copyrighted Content

Some instruments administered as part of this study may contain in whole or substantially in part contents from copyrighted instruments. Reproductions of the instruments are provided as documentation for the analysis of the data associated with this collection. Restrictions on "fair use" apply to all copyrighted content. More information about the reproduction of copyrighted works by educators and librarians is available from the United States Copyright Office.

NOTICE

WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

Summary of Data Sets: Network Metastudy Project

Contents

1. CDC Project 90 (Colorado Springs, Hetero high-risk networks)	2
2. PPNG (Colorado Springs, crack-cocaine gangs)	3
3. Chlamydia (Colorado Springs, general population)	3
4. GC 1981 (Colorado Springs, 1981 gonorrhea)	4
5. HIV (Colorado Springs, HIV network)	4
6. Manitoba (Manitoba chlamydia network) – provisional version.....	5
7. Flagstaff (Rural Arizona risk networks)	5
8. Urban (Urban Atlanta risk networks)	6
9. Antiviral (Atlanta antiretroviral adherence).....	6
10. Matrix (Atlanta urban network matrix).....	7
11. Rockdale (Atlanta adolescent syphilis network).....	7
12. Syph318 (Atlanta syphilis network in 30318 zip code).....	8
13. Bushwick (Brooklyn network of high-risk heterosexuals)	8
14. Houston (Houston network of high-risk heterosexuals)	9
15. Baltimore (Baltimore SHIELD study)	9

Note: The sample sizes (N) given represent the entire sample. The N size for sex questions vary considerably for each data set and each question.

1. CDC Project 90 (Colorado Springs, Hetero high-risk networks)

- 1988-1992
- N = 595 respondent individuals, 1091 interviews
- Age = 15 and older
- Name generator
 - Sex contact, last 6 months
 - Needle contact, last 6 months
 - other (illicit) drug contact, last 6 months
 - sharing rooms/meals contact, last 6 months
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions (initial interview)
 - *Had sexual contact (defined as Oral/Anal/Vaginal) at any time in the past*
 - *Had Oral/Anal/Vaginal contact, last 6 months (each route captured)*
 - *Frequency of Oral/Anal/Vaginal contact, last 6 months*
 - *1 time*
 - *few times*
 - *many times / steady partner*
 - *Used condoms most of the time with Oral/Anal/Vaginal contact, last 6 months (each route captured)*
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions (follow-up interviews)
 - *Had sexual contact (defined as Oral/Anal/Vaginal) since last interview*
 - *Had Oral/Anal/Vaginal contact, last 6 months (each route captured)*
 - *Frequency of Oral/Anal/Vaginal contact, last 6 months*
 - *1 time*
 - *few times*
 - *many times / steady partner*
 - *Used condoms most of the time with Oral/Anal/Vaginal contact, last 6 months (each route captured)*
- Sampling strategy
 - Targeted outreach provided seeds
 - Prostitutes
 - IDU
 - Sex partners to above
 - Social contacts to above
 - “Modified” chain-link strategy
 - recruited “cross-links”

2. PPNG (Colorado Springs, crack-cocaine gangs)

- Late 1989 – early 1991
- N = 279 respondents, 321 interviews
- Age = 14 and older
- Name generator
 - Sexual contact in 6 month critical period, or last two contacts named
 - Sex contact to a sex contact
 - Other person in same social milieu
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions
 - *Had sexual contact in last 6 months*
 - *First exposure and last exposure dates*
 - *Frequency of sexual contact, last 6 months*
 - *1 time*
 - *few times*
 - *many times / steady partner*
- Sampling strategy
 - Derived from contact-tracing strategy:
 - Infected person (gonorrhea, chlamydia, syphilis)
 - Either named a “gang-related” person or was named by a gang-related person
 - Gang-related = member, wannabe, “gang-chick”, business associate

3. Chlamydia (Colorado Springs, general population)

- June 1996-June 1997
- N = 1082 respondents, 1131 interviews
- Age = 12 and older
- Name generator
 - Sexual contact in 6 month critical period, or last two contacts named
 - Other person in same social milieu
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions
 - *Had sexual contact in last 6 months*
 - *First exposure and last exposure dates*
 - *Frequency of sexual contact, last 6 months*
 - *1 time*
 - *few times*
 - *many times / steady partner*
- Sampling strategy
 - Derived from contact-tracing operations:
 - Infected person (chlamydia), all sectors (public, private, military)

4. GC 1981 (Colorado Springs, 1981 gonorrhea)

- Jan – Sept 1981
- N = 749 respondents, 807 interviews
- Age = 14 and older
- Name generator
 - Sexual contact in 6 month critical period
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions
 - *Had sexual contact in last 6 months*
 - *First exposure and last exposure dates*
 - *Frequency of sexual contact, last 6 months*
 - *1 time*
 - *few times*
 - *many times / steady partner*
- Sampling strategy
 - Derived from contact-tracing strategy:
 - Infected person (gonorrhea), all sectors (public, private, military)

5. HIV (Colorado Springs, HIV network)

- 1982 - 2000
- N = 602 respondents
- Age = 13 and older
- Name generators
 - Sexual or needle contact since respondent infected (rarely based on solid seroconversion data, mostly based on conservative estimates)
 - In social milieu of infecteds (has sex/needle contact with infected person)
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions
 - *Had sexual (and/or needle) contact while respondent infectious*
 - *First exposure and last exposure dates*
 - *Frequency of sexual contact*
 - *1 time*
 - *few times*
 - *many times / steady partner*
- Sampling strategy
 - Derived from contact-tracing strategy:
 - Infected person (HIV), all sectors (public, private, military)

6. Manitoba (Manitoba chlamydia network) – provisional version

- Nov 1997 – May 1998
- N = 2120 respondents/cases (current version does not allow distinction)
- Age = 10 and older
- Name generators
 - Sexual contact within critical period (taken to be 6 months)
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions
 - *Had sexual contact*
- Sampling strategy
 - Derived from contact-tracing strategy (chain-link)
 - Infected person (chlamydia)

7. Flagstaff (Rural Arizona risk networks)

- May 1996 – Jan 1998
- N = 95 respondents, interviewed up to 5 times each at 6-month intervals
- Age = 18 and older
- Name generator
 - Sex, needle, other (illicit) drug contact, social contact in last 6 months
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions (initial interview)
 - *Had sexual contact at any time in the past*
 - *Had sexual contact at any time in the past 6 months*
 - *Had sexual contact at any time in the past 30 days*
 - *Generally, uses condoms with the sexual contact*
 - *For oral sex*
 - *For vaginal sex*
 - *For anal sex*
- Sampling strategy
 - Random walk
 - Six seeds chosen at random within same geographic area (Flagstaff) from persons presumed to be at elevated risk for HIV acquisition (through sex and/or drug behaviors)
 - Less emphasis placed on non-needle drug contacts and social contacts than in Atlanta Urban study (sister project)

8. Urban (Urban Atlanta risk networks)

- June 1996 – Apr 1999
- N = 228 respondents, interviewed up to 5 times each at 6-month intervals
- Age = 19 and older
- Name generator
 - Sex, needle, other (illicit) drug contact, social contact in last 6 months
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions (initial interview)
 - *Had sexual contact at any time in the past*
 - *Had sexual contact at any time in the past 6 months*
 - *Had sexual contact at any time in the past 30 days*
 - *Generally, uses condoms with the sexual contact*
 - *For oral sex*
 - *For vaginal sex*
 - *For anal sex*
- Sampling strategy
 - Random walk
 - Six seeds chosen to originate from 3 distinct regions (two individuals chosen from each of 3 regions) -- from persons presumed to be at elevated risk for HIV acquisition (through sex and/or drug behaviors)

9. Antiviral (Atlanta antiretroviral adherence)

- Apr 1998 – Aug 2001
- N = 358 respondents, 821 interviews
- Age = 22 and older
- Name generator
 - Sex, needle, other (illicit) drug contact, in last 6 months
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions (initial interview)
 - *Had sexual contact at any time in the past 6 months*
 - *Had sexual contact at any time in the past 30 days*
 - *Generally, uses condoms with the sexual contact*
 - *For oral sex*
 - *For vaginal sex*
 - *For anal sex*
- Sampling strategy
 - Targeted outreach of HIV patients being followed for antiretroviral therapy
 - I do not have a description of methods, so am partly guessing here... Rich may have to fill in the gaps in my knowledge
 - For this reason, sexual partnership information captured may be incomplete

10. Matrix (Atlanta urban network matrix)

- 1998
- N = 112 respondents, 112 interviews
- Age = 21 and older
- Name generator
 - Sex, needle, other (illicit) drug contact, social contact in last 30 days
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions (initial interview)
 - *Had sexual contact at any time in the past 30 days*
 - *Frequency of each of oral, vaginal, anal sex*
 - *Generally, uses condoms with the sexual contact*
 - *For oral sex*
 - *For vaginal sex*
 - *For anal sex*
- Sampling strategy
 - I do not have a description of methods – unsure which paper(s) has this
 - For this reason, sexual partnership information captured may be incomplete

11. Rockdale (Atlanta adolescent syphilis network)

- Jan-Feb 1996
- N = 34 respondents
- Age = 14-29
- Name generator
 - Sex contact, or cluster suspect in syphilis investigations (based on respondent's critical period)
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions
 - *Had sexual contact in critical period*
 - *First exposure date*
 - *Last exposure date*
- Sampling strategy
 - Chain-link sampling (routine syphilis contact investigation)

12. Syph318 (Atlanta syphilis network in 30318 zip code)

- Jan-Oct 1998
- N = 98 respondents
- Age = 16 and older
- Name generator
 - Sex contact, or cluster suspect in syphilis investigations (based on respondent's critical period)
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions
 - *Had sexual contact in critical period*
 - *First exposure date*
 - *Last exposure date*
 - *Frequency of exposure, captured verbatim*
- Sampling strategy
 - Chain-link sampling (routine syphilis contact investigation)

13. Bushwick (Brooklyn network of high-risk heterosexuals)

- Jul 1991- Jan 1993
- N = 804 respondents, 871 interviews
- Age = 18 and older
- Name generator
 - "More than casual" contact in the last 30 days (sex, needles, **am unsure if "more than casual" is self-defined, and thus may include other drugs...**)
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions
 - *Had sexual contact, ever*
 - *First sex date*
 - *Last sex date*
 - *Frequency of sex (detailed scale), last 30 days*
 - *Frequency of condom use (0, <1/2, 1/2, >1/2, Always) , last 30 days*
 - *If specific partner had sex with "another" man*
- Sampling strategy
 - Purposive snowball sampling – **Martina, I'm not sure this is true, as I do not have any methods files– I'm guessing you know what happened here much better than I do. Am basing this on David Bell's description)**
 - Tended to recruit loners

14. Houston (Houston network of high-risk heterosexuals)

- 1997-1998
- N = 126 respondents
- Age = 18 and older
- Name generators
 - Had sex, shared needles, used crack/cocaine with, received drugs, other otherwise felt “close to” in the last 30 days
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions
 - *Had sexual contact, 30 days*
 - *Frequency of sex, last 6 months*
 - *Number of times had sex, last 30 days*
 - *Frequency of / Condom use frequency of*
 - *Oral (both ways)*
 - *Vaginal*
 - *Anal (both ways, if both partners male)*
 - *Frequency of “any other” type of sex (if both partners male)*
 - *Concerning the “last” sexual encounter*
 - *Where*
 - *Numbers of other people present*
 - *Numbers of other people participating*
 - *Was a condom used*
- Sampling strategy, three-pronged
 - Two-step random walk
 - Peer-driven recruitment
 - Matched recruitment

15. Baltimore (Baltimore SHIELD study)

- Aug 1997 Mar 1999
- N = 768 respondents, (741 with complete data)
- Age = 18 and older
- Name generators
 - Might discuss private matters, offer physical assistance or material aid
 - Financial trust
 - Give health advice
 - Ate meals with, last 6 months
 - Shared rooms with, last 6 months
 - Had sex with last 6 months
- Sexual Behavior/Activity Questions
 - *Had sexual contact, 6 months*
 - *Frequency of condom use, last 6 months (0, <1/2, 1/2, >1/2, Always)*
 - *Talked with about condom use, 6 months*
 - *Gave condoms to, 6 months*
- Sampling strategy, targeted outreach
 - IV drug user
 - Daily or weekly contact with drug users
 - Not currently enrolled in other studies

Table 1. Data sources available to this proposal

Data Source	Target Population	Type of Sample	Approximate size	Design
CSprings Project90	High risk persons: IDUs, prostitutes and their clients	Mixed mode: Targeted egocentric sampling and “cross-link” tracing of persons named more than once Egocentric sampling of edge units	595 respondents 6767 contacts	Longitudinal open cohort, up to 4 interviews at 12 month intervals over 5 years
Bushwick SFHR	Injection Drug Users and their risk partners	Adaptive: Respondent driven Seeds are a targeted street-based sample Egocentric sampling of edge units	767 respondents 2498 contacts	Cross sectional
Atlanta Urban		Adaptive: 10 wave link trace with 2 strategies: RW, CL Seeds (n=6) ethnographic selection from 3 communities Egocentric sampling of edge units.	228 respondents 2069 contacts (64 isolates missing)	Longitudinal open cohort, up to 4 interviews at 6 month intervals over 4 years
Flagstaff Rural		Adaptive: Modified Atlanta Urban design	88 respondents 508 contacts	Longitudinal, up to X interviews at Y month intervals over 3 years.
Atlanta Antiviral		Egocentric: Clinic-based random sample of persons with HIV, Community-based targeted sample of persons (w/ and w/o HIV)	260 clinic; 120 community 3994 contacts	Longitudinal, up to 4 interviews at 6 month intervals over 3 years
Houston RNS	Chronic drug users and a demographically matched sample of non-users, and their sex/drug risk partners	Adaptive: 1 wave link trace with 2 strategies: RW, RDS Seeds (n=168) selected by key informants, not enrolled, but used to identify the first wave of participants. Sample stratified w/ control group of matched non-users recruitment. Egocentric sampling of edge units	295 respondents 1865 contacts (267 and 1271)	Longitudinal, 2 interviews over 4 years.
Baltimore SHIELD		Adaptive: 2 wave link trace Seeds (n=?) selected through targeted community outreach	1,667 respondents 23,060 contacts	Longitudinal, up to 5 interviews at 12 month intervals. Network data collected at waves 1, 2 and 4
Manitoba		Subjects identified through routine public health contact tracing	1,912 cases 2,430 contacts	Assembled from routinely collected STD program data

numbers in blue indicate discrepant values in Reference paper

Time frame for 8 network studies

Study	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
1 CoSprings Project90													
2 Bushwick SFHR													
3 Atlanta Urban													
4 Flagstaff Rural													
5 Atlanta Antiviral													
6 Houston													
7 Baltimore Shield													
8 Manitoba													

Place of production (city/state) of data collection, date of production, and organizational name of data producer:

	Place of production	Date of production	Organization name of data producer	Abbreviated name
1	Colorado Springs, Colorado USA	1988-1992	El Paso County Department of Health and Environment	Project90
2	Bushwick neighborhood, Brooklyn, New York, New York USA	Jul 1991 – Jan 1993	National Development Research Institute	Bushwick SFHR
3	Atlanta, Georgia USA	Jun 1996 – Apr 1999	Emory University	Atlanta Urban
4	Flagstaff, Arizona USA	May 1996 – Jan 1998	Emory University	Flagstaff Rural
5	Atlanta, Georgia USA	Apr 1998 – Aug 2001	Emory University	Antiviral
6	Houston, Texas USA	1997-1998	Affiliated Systems Corporation	Manitoba
7	Baltimore, Maryland USA	Aug 1997 – Mar 1999	Johns Hopkins University	Baltimore SHIELD
8	Manitoba Canada	Nov 1997 – May 1998	Manitoba Communicable Disease Control (MCDC) Unit of Manitoba Health	Manitoba

Person/organization responsible for collecting data:

Study (Data Source)	Principal Investigator	Original Funding Source	Data Collection Organization
1 Social network structure, drug and sex behavior, and HIV	John Potterat	CDC U64/CCU802975, NIDA R01-DA09928	El Paso County Department of Health and Environment
2 Social Factors in HIV Risk (SFHR)	Samuel Friedman	NIDA R01-DA06723	NDRI (National Development and Research Institutes)
3 Atlanta Urban Network Study of IDUs	Richard Rothenberg	NIDA R01-DA09966	Emory University
4 Flagstaff Rural Network Study of IDUs	Robert Trotter	NIDA R01-DA09965	Northern Arizona University
5 Clinical, network and psychosocial aspects of adherence to antiretroviral therapy	Richard Rothenberg	NIMH R01-MH58077	Emory University
6 Risk Networks Study I	David Bell	NIDA R01-DA08989	Affiliated Systems Corporation
7 Self-Help in Eliminating Life-Threatening Diseases (SHIELD)	Carl Latkin	NIDA R01-DA010446	Johns Hopkins University
8 Manitoba sexual network	John Wylie	Manitoba Health Research Council	Cadham Provincial Laboratory