



LJMU Research Online

Hibbert, MP, Germain, J, Brett, CE, Van Hout, MC, Hope, V and Porcellato, LA

Service provision and barriers to care for men who have sex with men engaging in chemsex and sexualised drug use in the North and West Midlands of England.

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/14181/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Hibbert, MP, Germain, J, Brett, CE, Van Hout, MC, Hope, V and Porcellato, LA (2021) Service provision and barriers to care for men who have sex with men engaging in chemsex and sexualised drug use in the North and West Midlands of England. International Journal of Drug Policy. 92. ISSN 0955-

LJMU has developed [LJMU Research Online](#) for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

1 **Service provision and barriers to care for men who have sex with men**
2 **engaging in chemsex and sexualised drug use in England**

3 Matthew Peter Hibbert¹ (corresponding author), matthew.hibbert@phe.gov.uk, +44 (0) 151
4 231 4542

5 Jennifer S Germain¹

6 Caroline E Brett²

7 Marie-Claire Van Hout¹

8 Vivian D Hope¹

9 Lorna A Porcellato¹

10

11 ¹Public Health Institute, Liverpool John Moores University, Exchange Station, Liverpool, L2
12 2QP, UK

13 ²School of Psychology, Liverpool John Moores University, Tom Reilly Building, Byrom
14 Street, Liverpool, L3 3AF, UK

15

16 **Word count: 5490**

17

18

1 **Service provision and barriers to care for men who have sex with men**
2 **engaging in chemsex and sexualised drug use in England**

3

4 **Abstract**

5 **Background:** Chemsex and sexualised drug use (SDU) among men who have sex with men
6 (MSM) has become a public health issue because of its associated sexual risks. Some MSM
7 engaging in SDU require further help and support, but it is not clear if this need is being met.
8 This research seeks to understand MSM and service provider (SP) perspectives of the current
9 standard of service provision for MSM engaging in SDU.

10 **Method:** Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 13 MSM and 16 SPs in England
11 (January-December 2019). MSM who reported taking one of ten substances for sex in the
12 past 12 months were recruited from a mailing list or a community organisation providing
13 chemsex support. Potential SP participants were recruited via an email sent from their local
14 healthcare NHS Trust. Data for MSM and SPs were analysed separately using thematic
15 analysis.

16 **Results:** MSM participants had a median age of 34 years (range 23-66). The majority of SPs
17 recruited were genitourinary medicine (GUM) consultants. We found that the main reason for
18 engagement in SDU was because of the enhanced sexual experience. Most MSM recruited
19 were satisfied with their sexual health service provision, but barriers to care were highlighted
20 by both MSM and SPs. Four themes relating to barriers to care were identified: accessibility
21 of sexual health services, funding of services, SP's attitudes towards MSM who engage in
22 SDU, and services outside sexual healthcare.

1 **Conclusion:** SPs appeared to have adopted a harm reduction approach to MSM engaging in
2 SDU, but for MSM wanting further help and assistance in relation to their SDU additional
3 barriers to care existed. Training healthcare providers outside of sexual health services
4 regarding chemsex and SDU may reduce some of these barriers, but funding for sexual health
5 services needs to be improved to maintain and further develop services.

6

7 **Keywords:** men who have sex with men; chemsex; sexualised drug use; sexual health
8 services; harm reduction

1 **Introduction**

2 Sexualised drug use (SDU), particularly chemsex, has become an emerging public
3 health issue among men who have sex with men (MSM) due to associations with sexually
4 transmitted infections (STI) diagnoses, living with HIV, condomless anal intercourse, having
5 a higher number of sexual partners, serodiscordant anal intercourse, and injecting drug use
6 (Blomquist et al., 2020; Bourne, Reid, Hickson, Torres Rueda, & Weatherburn, 2014; Glynn
7 et al., 2018; Hegazi et al., 2017; Hibbert, Brett, Porcellato, & Hope, 2019; Ottaway, Finnerty,
8 Buckingham, & Richardson, 2017). Chemsex in a United Kingdom (UK) context is a
9 particular form of SDU, which involves the use of crystal methamphetamine, gamma
10 hydroxybutyrate/gamma butyrolactone (GHB/GBL), mephedrone, and/or ketamine taken
11 immediately before or during sex to enhance the sexual experience (Bourne et al., 2014).
12 Although there is variability in defining what drugs constitute as chemsex (Drysdale et al.,
13 2020; Stuart, 2019), the use of crystal methamphetamine, GHB/GBL, mephedrone, and/or
14 ketamine is commonly grouped as chemsex drugs in European research (Curtis et al., 2019;
15 Rosińska et al., 2018; Schmidt et al., 2016). The rise in the number of men who have sex with
16 men (MSM) engaging in chemsex has been attributed to the development of geospatial
17 networking applications and online sites used to meet sexual partners (Ahmed et al., 2016;
18 Stuart, 2013). Studies have estimated that around 1 in 5 MSM in London may have engaged
19 in chemsex during the past year, and this proportion has remained stable between 2013-16
20 (Curtis et al., 2019). Similar estimates have been reported for MSM living in other UK cities,
21 such as Manchester (15.5%) (Schmidt et al., 2016). However, a review of the literature of
22 chemsex and SDU among MSM in the UK found that prevalence estimates varied for both
23 chemsex (17%-31%) and SDU (4%-41%), due to the method of recruitment and definition of
24 the drugs used for each behaviour (Edmundson et al., 2018).

1 Whilst chemsex appears to be a relatively recent phenomenon, SDU among MSM and
2 its associated sexual risk behaviours has been researched for some time (Halkitis, Parsons, &
3 Stirratt, 2001; Mattison, Ross, Wolfson, Franklin, & HNRC Group, 2001; Stall & Purcell,
4 2000). A cross-sectional study into SDU among MSM found SDU, including other
5 substances not associated with chemsex (e.g. amyl nitrates/poppers, cannabis), was associated
6 with lower life satisfaction (Hibbert et al., 2019). Although engaging in chemsex (defined
7 here as crystal methamphetamine, GHB/GBL, ketamine and mephedrone) was associated
8 with a higher proportion of condomless anal intercourse than those engaging in other types of
9 SDU, engaging in other types of SDU was still associated with a higher proportion of
10 condomless anal intercourse than those who did not report SDU. Therefore, it is important
11 not to neglect other substances that may also be associated with sexual risk. Although MSM
12 engaging in chemsex tend to have a greater number of condomless anal intercourse partners,
13 research has found that MSM engaging in chemsex are more likely to be taking pre-exposure
14 prophylaxis (PrEP), thereby mitigating the risk of HIV acquisition (Hammoud et al., 2020;
15 Hibbert, Brett, Porcellato, & Hope, 2020).

16 Chemsex research has tended to focus on sexual health outcomes, which is important
17 to prevent onwards transmission of STIs and to understand any relationship between chemsex
18 and blood borne viruses (BBVs), but research regarding potential psychological harms has
19 been somewhat neglected. Motivations for engagement in chemsex have included the intense
20 sexual experience, HIV stigma, and internalised homophobia (Weatherburn, Hickson, Reid,
21 Torres-Rueda, & Bourne, 2017). Studies from the UK and Ireland have found that around
22 20% of MSM engaging in chemsex have reported chemsex was having a negative impact on
23 their life (Glynn et al., 2018; Hibbert et al., 2019). Similarly, a study conducted in The
24 Netherlands found that 23% of MSM wanted to receive counselling for chemsex related
25 issues (Evers et al., 2020). It is important to note that only a proportion of those engaging in

1 chemsex report problems relating to their usage, and that those that experience problems are
2 not representative of all MSM engaging in chemsex (Drysdale et al., 2020; Pienaar, Murphy,
3 Race, & Lea, 2018; Race, 2017). However, help and support should be available for those
4 who need it, and MSM have stated a preference for drug support within sexual health clinics
5 (Bourne et al., 2014; Evers et al., 2020; Tomkins, Vivancos, Ward, & Kliner, 2018).

6 Currently, local government is primarily responsible for sexual health services in
7 England which are paid for by a ring-fenced public health grant which is funded by the
8 national government (Department of Health and Social Care, 2018). It has been suggested
9 that sexual health clinics should adapt services for MSM engaging in SDU and chemsex in
10 addition to promoting existing services (Frankis & Clutterbuck, 2017; Stuart, 2014; Tomkins
11 et al., 2018). MSM in Ireland who indicated a desire and intention to cease engagement in
12 chemsex stated the need for integrated drug and sexual health services to assist them to at
13 least reduce and monitor their engagement as exit from the chemsex scene was a difficult
14 process (Van Hout, Crowley, O'Dea, & Clarke, 2019). Whether sexual health services in the
15 UK have adopted an integrated sexual health clinic varies across clinics depending on local
16 need (Frankis & Clutterbuck, 2017; Stuart, 2014), but the reduced funding for UK sexual
17 health services over the past decade may have negatively impacted any service development
18 (BASHH/BHIVA, 2018). It has also been reported that the reduced funding has limited
19 access to psychosexual service provision from sexual health clinics in the UK, as well as a
20 reduction in the use of community organisations by sexual health clinics to provide additional
21 psychosexual support (e.g. advice and peer support) (BASHH/BHIVA, 2018).

22 UK chemsex research has predominately focused on London (Stuart & Weymann,
23 2015), however, a higher prevalence of chemsex has also been observed in other regions of
24 the UK (Edmundson et al., 2018), with broader SDU likely to be more common across the
25 UK (Tomkins et al., 2018). Therefore, this research explored MSM and service provider (SP)

1 perspectives of service provision for MSM engaging in SDU and chemsex with a view to
2 understanding current service provision and highlighting any needs for service development.

3

4 **Methods**

5 Qualitative semi-structured interviews were undertaken with MSM and service
6 providers (SP) in Northern and Central England between January-December 2019. Ethical
7 approval for semi-structured interviews with MSM was obtained from a University research
8 ethics committee. MSM were recruited using a mailing list (n=210) from a previous cross-
9 sectional online survey, although this sample was not exclusive to MSM who engaged in
10 SDU and included LGBT people more generally (Hibbert et al., 2019), as well as from
11 recruitment flyers at a community organisation that provided chemsex support. Participants
12 had to be over the age of 18 years old, currently live in Northern or Central England and had
13 taken one of 10 substances in the past 12 months immediately before or during sex
14 (amphetamines, cocaine, crack cocaine, crystal methamphetamine, ecstasy, heroin, ketamine,
15 GHB/GBL, mephedrone, poppers or other inhalants). Participants did not have to be
16 engaging in sexual health services for support relating to SDU, as the aim of this research
17 was to gain perspectives on their engagement with services generally. The interview schedule
18 for MSM was informed by previous research regarding motivations and effects of SDU
19 (Glynn et al., 2018; Hibbert et al., 2019), in addition to questions designed to assess
20 engagement in sexual health services. Questions covered wellbeing and motivations in
21 relation to SDU and experiences of engaging in SDU and sexual health services. Interviews
22 were digitally recorded and conducted by one researcher at private offices, public locations
23 with the required level of privacy, over the phone, or via Skype. Participants were offered a

1 £20 Amazon voucher for their time. Written informed consent was gained from MSM prior
2 to each interview and the average length of interviews was 43 minutes (range 20-70).

3 Ethical approval for semi-structured telephone interviews with National Health
4 Service (NHS) staff was obtained from the NHS Health Research Authority. A contact in the
5 local NHS Trust suggested SPs for recruitment and emails were sent to these SPs. Sixteen
6 SPs from five NHS trusts were recruited across four regions of Northern and Central
7 England. An additional six were invited to interview but did not respond. Interviews were
8 digitally recorded and conducted by three researchers as part of a larger research project that
9 also examined service provision for PrEP (Hillis, Germain, Hibbert, Hope, & Van Hout, in
10 press). Written informed consent was gained from SPs prior to each interview and the
11 average length of interviews was 27 minutes (range 16-43).

12 Recruitment continued until data saturation was achieved. Two authors confirmed
13 data saturation for MSM interviews and three authors confirmed data saturation for SP
14 interviews as no new information was emerging. Interviews were transcribed verbatim and
15 MSM and SP interviews were analysed separately using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke,
16 2006). Initial codes were generated by two authors independently for six transcripts (3
17 MSM/SPs) to develop a coding framework for the remaining transcripts. Codes were
18 organised into relevant themes, and themes were reviewed and refined by two authors.
19 Typical quotes were identified to illustrate themes.

20

21 **Results**

22 Thirteen MSM took part in semi-structured interviews. Nine participants were
23 recruited through the mailing list, and four participants were recruited through the community
24 organisation. MSM participants had a median age of 34 years (range 23-66), with the

1 majority identifying as gay and White British (Table 1). Two participants were living with
2 HIV and three participants were taking pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP). The majority of SPs
3 recruited were genitourinary medicine (GUM) consultants (n=7, Table 1).

4

5 *******Table 1 about here*******

6 In this analysis, chemsex refers to the use of crystal methamphetamine, GHB/GBL, or
7 mephedrone (no participants reported using ketamine). First, we discuss the positive and
8 negative motivations MSM identified for engagement in SDU. We then discuss the provision
9 of sexual health care for MSM engaging in SDU, identifying positives reported by both MSM
10 and SPs. Following this are three themes related to barriers to care for MSM engaging in
11 SDU: accessibility, funding, and SP’s attitudes towards MSM who engage in SDU. Finally,
12 experiences of services outside of sexual health clinics are discussed.

13

14 **Motivations for engagement in SDU**

15 The majority of MSM reported regularly engaging in SDU in the previous 12 months. All but
16 one participant noted a sexual motivation for SDU and this was primarily to enhance the
17 sexual experience. This was a key motivation regardless of the substance used. SDU was
18 described as “intense”, “euphoric” and “enhancing”, with a number of participants noting
19 how it creates an intense focus on sexual pleasure, creating a “little bubble” that was isolating
20 in a positive way.

21

22 *“That’s the thing that I wanted, was to carry on using chems [GHB/GBL, mephedrone] and*
23 *having sex, coz of the like how much of a more intense experience it was.” – 31, Gay*

1

2 *“I think it [poppers] lends itself to a kind of subservient role, a kind of nothing else matters,*
3 *it creates almost like a single focus, single focus in terms of like eroticism and sexual*
4 *pleasure really.” – 52, Gay*

5

6 Some MSM also discussed positive psychological motivations for engagement such as
7 increasing self-esteem. One participant outlined how chemsex helped them moderate their
8 own drug use due to the confidence boost from chemsex, and therefore only took drugs when
9 in that environment. This increase in self-esteem was related to feeling more attractive after
10 being invited to more sex parties. This increase in social connections was also seen as a
11 positive impact of chemsex by the participant.

12

13 *For me it's been a really good thing [engaging in chemsex], like it's massively helped my*
14 *confidence...Like I've made loads of friends at chemsex parties and stuff, like I dunno you*
15 *just, I just feel like, you only mainly you only remember the bad stories you hear. It's just a*
16 *fun thing, do you know what I mean? I dunno it's just, I really enjoy it. – 26, Gay*

17

18 Three participants mentioned negative psychological motivations for engaging in sexualised
19 drug use, such as loneliness and mental health. All of those who mentioned a negative
20 psychological motivation had been engaging in chemsex and had stopped engaging, either
21 because of the harm it was doing to them or due to having engaged in this behaviour for only
22 a very small period of time. One participant reflected on how they were previously using
23 drugs to “*self-destruct*” by engaging in a number of risk behaviours that could have had a

1 potentially negative effect on their health. Another participant described how the breakdown
2 of a long-term relationship had left him “*grief-stricken*”. This participant discussed how the
3 use of chemsex drugs contributed to the worsening of his mental health; he was using the
4 drugs to invite other men around for sex to ease the loneliness. One participant described how
5 recently receiving a mental health diagnosis had led to a situation where they tried
6 mephedrone, because they had stopped caring about life and their wellbeing.

7
8 *Motivations [for chemsex]? Loneliness, I had been for seven years in what I considered a*
9 *totally loving relationship and unfortunately my partner met someone else ...I was grief-*
10 *stricken, totally and utterly grief-stricken.... I used to say to everyone I haven't got anything*
11 *to live for anymore, and that's that mental side that eventually I had to come to terms with*
12 *and sort out, but taking the combinations of MKAT [mephedrone] and G [GHB/GBL] and*
13 *then eventually doing a lot of Tina [crystal methamphetamine] did not help that mental state*
14 *at all, it was trying to get someone round the whole time to fill the void – 66, Bisexual*

17 **Experiences of sexual health service provision**

18 Most MSM were content with their engagement in SDU (n=9) and reported engaging
19 in sexual health services primarily for routine sexual health screening. Other reasons for
20 engagement in sexual health services included for HIV care (n=2) and to receive
21 psychosocial support (n=2). MSM reported positive experiences generally, with some
22 complimenting the staff for their friendliness, non-judgemental approach, and how
23 informative the staff were, with one participant saying he found them “*really friendly...it's*
24 *completely fine, very comfortable*” (29, Gay). Some MSM also noted how quick and easy the

1 service was to use and get referrals for further care relating to chemsex if needed. Another
2 participant described his experience of using a specific chemsex clinic and how this helped
3 him to manage his usage, as it was an opportunity to vent and receive reinforcement, which
4 helped generate ideas of how to manage his chemsex behaviour.

5

6 *It's not that I need it every week, but there's certain times where I just feel aw I'll give them a*
7 *call, and just book in an appointment and just talk to them coz I think I need it at the moment,*
8 *for both positive reinforcement and for possibly like advice really or kind of exchange of*
9 *ideas...I mean, sitting there in that space with them, sometimes I come up with the realisation*
10 *just by being there. – 41, Queer*

11

12 Two SPs were positive about the services they are currently providing. One
13 participant showed pride in running a specific service for MSM engaging in chemsex, stating
14 *“I think we provide a really good service, actually, I'm really proud of it”* (SP13).

15

16 **Barriers to care**

17 *Access to sexual health services*

18 Seven MSM complained about accessibility of sexual health clinics generally,
19 discussing the length of the waiting times and difficulty in getting an appointment, with one
20 participant referring to them as *“sausage machines”* and stating *“They're overrun. The*
21 *difficulty of getting an appointment”* (66, Bisexual). Six SPs identified accessibility as a
22 possible barrier to care, identifying clinic opening times, a limited number of specific clinics
23 for MSM, and a need to develop more accessible clinics for other patient groups such as

1 people living with learning impairments and trans people. One SP discussed whether the
2 clinic was accessible around people's work life and suggested utilising online methods to
3 reduce barriers regarding accessibility.

4

5 *"Well not everyone conforms to the nine to five or the nine to seven screening...so if people*
6 *could access things at a time that was convenient to them, so perhaps more online*
7 *engagement, so we weren't trying to get people to fit in with what we already, when we're*
8 *open"* (SP11)

9

10

11 *Funding*

12 Lack of funding and current constraints on sexual health clinics were identified by
13 some as significant barriers to service provision. Two MSM were aware of current funding
14 constraints on sexual health clinics and attributed the barriers to care that they experienced to
15 a lack of funding: *"I still don't think the government and that are taking sexual health*
16 *serious. I think they think they put out this message 'use a condom' and that's enough and*
17 *people just aren't"* (43, Gay). Another MSM referred to how austerity has impacted sexual
18 health, and how the staff are doing the best they can with the resources they have.

19

20 *"They're at a strain, austerity has hit them really hard and they're trying to run a complex*
21 *service, dealing with a very sensitive issue, on a very limited budget, with very limited staff"* -

22

41, Queer

1

2 Six SPs also identified funding issues as a barrier to providing optimum care for
3 MSM engaging in SDU. This was seen to be a national problem, across sexual health
4 generally, and whether funding for internal and external services would remain in place for
5 current services for MSM engaging in chemsex was a concern.

6

7 *“although whether that will remain as the budgets get cut further and further, who knows,*
8 *because it’s not a non-mandatory service and in many parts of the country, budgets for*
9 *counselling and support have been slashed” (SP1)*

10

11

12 *SP’s attitudes towards MSM who engage in SDU*

13 Two MSM identified the attitudes of the SP as a barrier to care. One participant
14 described an experience of receiving drug support, unrelated to SDU, from an HIV clinic.
15 The participant reported how the SP’s assumption that gay men who used drugs did so
16 because of trauma related to their sexuality made him question his validity for help as he did
17 not relate to this assumption from the SP, which then impacted his future help seeking
18 behaviour.

19

20 *“He was like really surprised that I was still in touch with my family and they were accepting*
21 *of me being gay...like he was just really shocked that I needed help. So that made me feel*
22 *like, do I actually need this help? Am I kind of valid for it or am I just being ridiculous? So*

1 *then when I get to a point that I know I need help, I'll just sit there for days and be like do I*
2 *actually, or am I just being an idiot you know?" -26, Gay*

3

4 Another MSM also rejected the narrative that people engaging in chemsex are doing so because of
5 issues relating to their sexuality and how this is true for some experiences of chemsex but not all. This
6 participant went on to discuss how they believe that this narrative is in fact counter-intuitive to
7 providing help and support for MSM engaging in chemsex, because people who do not identify as
8 having internalised homophobia but are in need of help may question their validity for help.

9

10 *"This notion that chemsex is just gay tragedy on a par with the AIDS crisis, that it's this meaningless*
11 *interaction inhabited by desperate people living at the edges of society, or fiercely addicted but*
12 *unwilling to admit it because of this innate self-loathing, they're infantile, and they don't understand*
13 *themselves so they have to deal with it by filling themselves full of meaningless sex and pumping*
14 *drugs until they crash and it's just a nightmarish, ghoulish scenario. It's a description of an extreme*
15 *end of chemsex and it's kind of like, and I'd say the majority of people who engage in chemsex for any*
16 *length of time will experience some of that stuff, whereas it's not true of every experience of*
17 *chemsex." - 41, Queer*

18

19 Whilst some SPs stated that they had seen MSM patients who were engaging in
20 chemsex because of issues regarding their sexuality, this was contextualised by SPs
21 vocalising an open-minded attitude to MSM engaging in SDU, acknowledging variation
22 exists among MSM who use drugs and conceptualising drug use as a spectrum. When
23 discussing the variation among MSM engaging in SDU, one SP referred to an occasion where
24 a woman had come seeking support for using GHB, providing further support to the need for

1 SPs to have an open-minded attitude to people engaging in SDU, so that optimum care can be
2 provided.

3

4 *“I think there is a whole complexity to drug use. That includes MSMs as well as people who*
5 *aren’t MSM...We have had a request for it [chemsex support] for non-MSM people recently,*
6 *a young lady who had a real problem with GHB, which that service isn’t commissioned to*
7 *provide.” (SP13)*

8

9 *Services outside sexual health clinics*

10 Four MSM reported wanting further help and support for chemsex. Some MSM who
11 engaged in chemsex reported negative experiences when seeking help and support for mental
12 health and drug use from NHS services outside of sexual health clinics, such as from their
13 general practice or from mental health services. Two participants were seeking help after
14 attempting suicide, which they attributed to their engagement in chemsex. Participants
15 described the lack of support available as being due to long waiting lists or referrals to
16 services which no longer existed. This suggests both a lack of knowledge and services for
17 MSM engaging in chemsex, as well as more generally for mental health support. Whilst
18 participants successfully sought alternative help from community organisations, they faced
19 barriers when attempting to access care in the NHS.

20

21

1 *if people are HIV positive...I don't know if they think to contact us if it's people that are just*
2 *using chems, but they're not HIV positive.” (SP14)*

3

4 SPs discussed signposting MSM engaging in chemsex and other forms of SDU to
5 external services, such as websites for information, or community organisations. SPs who
6 mentioned referring participants to external services would highlight services available
7 regardless of their need for support, to ensure they were informed.

8

9 *“So I would ask specifically about chems, and if they disclose any risk at all, I would discuss*
10 *[organisation] with them, I think it's, you know it's good for them to know about that service*
11 *even if they don't want to engage with it. I think it's helpful that they know it exists and then*
12 *they've got that choice really” (SP6)*

1 **Discussion**

2 The themes identified in the study provide insight into the current state of service
3 provision for MSM engaging in SDU in Northern and Central England. Most MSM had
4 positive experiences of sexual health services generally, complimenting staff and the
5 treatment they received. SPs appeared to have adopted a harm reduction approach to MSM
6 engaging in SDU (Lenton & Single, 1998), highlighting available services to all of those
7 engaging in this behaviour, thereby empowering them to make an informed choice if they
8 ever needed support. A harm reduction approach for MSM engaging in chemsex has
9 increased service uptake, community involvement, and is seen as a holistic healthcare
10 approach (Bourne et al., 2014; Ma & Perera, 2016; Stardust, Kolstee, Joksic, Gray, &
11 Hannan, 2018). Although SPs in this study were utilising a harm reduction approach,
12 numerous barriers to care were identified, which were: access to sexual health services;
13 funding; SPs attitudes towards MSM engaging in SDU; and access to services outside sexual
14 health settings.

15 The most common complaint among MSM was access in terms of waiting and
16 opening times. Accessibility as a barrier to care was noted by SPs as well. A solution
17 suggested by a SP proposed utilising online methods as a possibility to reduce accessibility
18 barriers, and research has found that MSM who have used HIV self-testing services reported
19 it reduced barriers relating to convenience (Witzel et al., 2019). Therefore, more modern
20 means of testing may help reduce this accessibility barrier, although further research is
21 needed (Wellings, Mehl, & Free, 2017). Additionally, whether online methods could be
22 utilised for MSM wanting further help and support in relation to SDU is unknown, and the
23 utilisation of online methods for testing may reduce opportunities to signpost MSM engaging
24 in SDU to further help and support.

1 Although the majority of MSM engaging in SDU were satisfied with the services
2 provided by sexual health clinics and happy with their engagement in SDU, a number of
3 MSM wanted further support. All MSM wanting further support relating to psychological
4 impact of engagement in SDU were engaging in chemsex. Due to the small sample in this
5 study, it cannot be said that those engaging in other types of SDU may be less likely to need
6 further help and support beyond sexual health screening and further research is needed to
7 investigate this. Both MSM and SPs highlighted potential barriers to care for MSM engaging
8 in SDU wanting additional support for mental health and drug use. MSM have previously
9 stated a preference for integrated drug services within sexual health clinics for chemsex
10 support due to the non-judgemental attitude held by sexual health SPs (Bourne et al., 2014;
11 Evers et al., 2020; Tomkins et al., 2018), and one participant who had engaged in this service
12 had found it useful. This service user used the sexual health service as a means to monitor
13 and reduce his engagement in chemsex when desired and previous research has found MSM
14 expressing a desire for this type of service (Van Hout et al., 2019). However, SPs questioned
15 whether funding for such services that were regarded as non-essential could be sustained
16 considering the reduction in sexual health funding across the UK (BASHH/BHIVA, 2018).
17 Both MSM and SPs noted funding constraints on sexual health services that may hinder any
18 potential service development. It was interesting that some MSM were aware of issues
19 regarding funding of sexual health services, suggesting that these funding constraints may be
20 noticeable to service users (e.g. issues regarding access and waiting times), although
21 awareness of funding constraints may have been gained through other sources (e.g. the
22 media).

23 Both MSM and SPs noted some long waiting lists for services internal to sexual
24 health clinics as well as community services (e.g. psychosexual support, sexual assault
25 services), which is a barrier to care at a time when people may be particularly vulnerable.

1 Poor access to NHS mental health services has been reported across the UK (Care Quality
2 Commission, 2019), therefore this finding is likely to be reflective of a lack of access
3 generally, rather than being specific to MSM engaging in SDU. The lack of knowledge of
4 chemsex and SDU outside of sexual health settings was raised as a barrier to care. Training
5 for healthcare providers outside of sexual health may be needed to improve quality of overall
6 care to MSM engaging in SDU.

7 Although MSM generally expressed satisfaction with service provision, one MSM
8 reported negative experiences of seeking help for drug use unrelated to SDU at a sexual
9 health clinic, where the SP's expectations that MSM with 'problematic' drug use must have
10 experienced problems relating to their sexuality was off-putting. This was enough to make
11 this participant question his validity for help in this instance, as well as possibly in the future.
12 Congruent with previous research with MSM, the SPs in this study highlighted internalised
13 homophobia as a possible motivation for engagement in chemsex for some MSM (Pollard,
14 Nadarzynski, & Llewellyn, 2018; Weatherburn et al., 2017). However, they would often
15 contextualise this statement by discussing the variability of chemsex, and how, in their
16 experience, SDU encompasses a wide-ranging spectrum of behaviours. It is important to note
17 that no MSM in this study identified internalised homophobia as a motivation for them to
18 engage in SDU, and the main motivation identified by MSM as their reason for engagement
19 was the sexual experience. Engaging in SDU usually involves multiple behaviours that may
20 be stigmatised by society (Bourne et al., 2014; Pollard et al., 2018). It is possible that the
21 stigma surrounding these behaviours, such as polygamy and non-monogamy (Frank, 2019;
22 Moors, 2019), which are in themselves linked to same-sex sexual stigma for men (Herek,
23 2004), in addition to the stigma and marginalisation of people who use drugs (Room, 2005),
24 all interact in the case of SDU resulting in the behaviour being highly stigmatised. Although
25 the Minority Stress Model suggests internalised homophobia may be a factor in influencing

1 health behaviour among MSM (Meyer, 2003), it may not be as useful when discussing
2 chemsex and SDU, as it can be off-putting to MSM who are experiencing problems relating
3 to drug use but do not see their sexuality as a contributing factor.

4 Study findings also highlighted a potential problem of defining chemsex as a
5 behaviour exclusive to MSM, as a SP recalled a heterosexual woman with problems related
6 to GHB who could not access support services because these are specific to MSM. This
7 highlights that even if chemsex is more prevalent among the MSM community, other groups
8 may engage in this behaviour and will still need access to support services. Ensuring service
9 providers understand that SDU and chemsex is a variable behaviour, with variable
10 motivations for engagement, could avoid potentially stigmatising patients resulting in
11 avoidance of future care.

12 One strength of the study was the inclusion of SPs, which added the perspective of
13 front-line workers who interact regularly with MSM engaging in SDU, and therefore helped
14 to contextualise some of the issues raised by MSM. A significant proportion of UK research
15 regarding chemsex amongst MSM has been conducted in London (Bourne et al., 2014;
16 Ottaway, Finnerty, Amlani, et al., 2017), so it is therefore a strength that this research
17 explores the experience of chemsex in other parts of the UK, given the lack of
18 generalisability in qualitative research. However, due to issues with MSM recruitment, it was
19 not possible to completely match the geographical locations of service providers and MSM.
20 A limitation of this research is that the inclusion criteria did not consist of an extensive list of
21 substances that can be used for sexual purposes among MSM, such as cannabis (Parent,
22 Ferlatte, Milloy, Fast, & Knight, 2020), and therefore these findings may not apply to all
23 sexualised substances used. It also cannot be overlooked that the findings may reflect a self-
24 selection bias. Both MSM who were currently engaging in SDU and MSM who had stopped
25 engaging were recruited in an attempt to provide multiple narratives and experiences.

1 However, it is possible that those who wanted to voice their experiences were more likely to
2 volunteer, but as with all qualitative research, the aim was to explore people's personal
3 experiences of SDU and chemsex, rather than the representativeness of these viewpoints.
4 Whilst not all barriers to care identified were specific to MSM engaging in SDU (such as
5 funding and access), these are likely to impact on MSM engaging in SDU and chemsex, and
6 are therefore still important and valid to highlight.

7

8 **Conclusion**

9 This study has highlighted that the majority of MSM who engage in SDU were
10 satisfied with their sexual health care, but support services for those wanting further help are
11 needed. There is a need to further develop service provision for SDU; however, continuation
12 of current services is uncertain due to funding constraints, and increases in funding and
13 training are needed to remove current barriers to care for MSM engaging in SDU. Services
14 outside sexual health services such as mental health services have also received funding cuts,
15 resulting in poor care for MSM engaging in SDU at a time they are particularly vulnerable,
16 and funding to these services needs to increase if MSM engaging in SDU are to receive care
17 when required.

18

19 **Acknowledgements**

20 The researchers would like to thank everyone who participated in the interviews, as
21 well LGBT Foundation who assisted with recruitment.

22 **Funding**

1 This study was funded by the Sexually Transmitted Infection Research Foundation (STIRF)
2 United Kingdom and as a PhD project from a higher education university.

3

4

5

6

1 **References**

- 2 Ahmed, A. K., Weatherburn, P., Reid, D., Hickson, F., Torres-Rueda, S., Steinberg, P., & Bourne, A.
3 (2016). Social norms related to combining drugs and sex ("chemsex") among gay men in
4 South London. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, *38*, 29-35.
5 doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2016.10.007
- 6 BASHH/BHIVA. (2018). Government funding cuts leave sexual health and HIV care at 'breaking point'.
7 Retrieved from [https://www.bashh.org/news/news/government-funding-cuts-leave-sexual-](https://www.bashh.org/news/news/government-funding-cuts-leave-sexual-health-and-hiv-care-at-breaking-point/)
8 [health-and-hiv-care-at-breaking-point/](https://www.bashh.org/news/news/government-funding-cuts-leave-sexual-health-and-hiv-care-at-breaking-point/)
- 9 Blomquist, P. B., Mohammed, H., Mikhail, A., Weatherburn, P., Reid, D., Wayal, S., . . . Mercer, C. H.
10 (2020). Characteristics and sexual health service use of MSM engaging in chemsex: results
11 from a large online survey in England. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, sextrans-2019-
12 054345. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2019-054345
- 13 Bourne, A., Reid, D., Hickson, F., Torres Rueda, S., & Weatherburn, P. (2014). *The Chemsex study:*
14 *drug use in sexual settings among gay and bisexual men in Lambeth, Southwark and*
15 *Lewisham*. Retrieved from [https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ssh-chemsex-](https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ssh-chemsex-study-final-main-report.pdf)
16 [study-final-main-report.pdf](https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ssh-chemsex-study-final-main-report.pdf):
- 17 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in*
18 *psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.
- 19 Care Quality Commission. (2019). *2019 Community mental health survey: Statistical Release*.
20 Retrieved from
21 https://www.cqc.org.uk/sites/default/files/20191126_cmh19_statisticalrelease.pdf:
- 22 Curtis, T. J., Rodger, A. J., Burns, F., Nardone, A., Copas, A., & Wayal, S. (2019). Patterns of sexualised
23 recreational drug use and its association with risk behaviours and sexual health outcomes in
24 men who have sex with men in London, UK: a comparison of cross-sectional studies
25 conducted in 2013 and 2016. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, sextrans-2019-054139.
26 doi:10.1136/sextrans-2019-054139
- 27 Department of Health and Social Care. (2018). *Integrated Sexual Health Services: A suggested*
28 *national service specification*. Retrieved from
29 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/731140/integrated-sexual-health-services-specification.pdf)
30 [data/file/731140/integrated-sexual-health-services-specification.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/731140/integrated-sexual-health-services-specification.pdf):
- 31 Drysdale, K., Bryant, J., Hopwood, M., Dowsett, G. W., Holt, M., Lea, T., . . . Treloar, C. (2020).
32 Destabilising the 'problem' of chemsex: Diversity in settings, relations and practices revealed
33 in Australian gay and bisexual men's crystal methamphetamine use. *International Journal of*
34 *Drug Policy*, *78*, 102697. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2020.102697>
- 35 Edmundson, C., Heinsbroek, E., Glass, R., Hope, V., Mohammed, H., White, M., & Desai, M. (2018).
36 Sexualised drug use in the United Kingdom (UK): A review of the literature. *The International*
37 *Journal On Drug Policy*, *55*, 131-148.
- 38 Evers, Y. J., Hoebe, C. J. P. A., Dukers-Muijers, N. H. T. M., Kampman, C. J. G., Kuizenga-Wessel, S.,
39 Shilue, D., . . . van Liere, G. A. F. S. (2020). Sexual, addiction and mental health care needs
40 among men who have sex with men practicing chemsex - a cross-sectional study in the
41 Netherlands. *Preventive Medicine Reports*, 101074.
42 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2020.101074>
- 43 Frank, K. (2019). Rethinking Risk, Culture, and Intervention in Collective Sex Environments. *Arch Sex*
44 *Behav*, *48*(1), 3-30. doi:10.1007/s10508-018-1153-3
- 45 Frankis, J., & Clutterbuck, D. (2017). What does the latest research evidence mean for practitioners
46 who work with gay and bisexual men engaging in chemsex? *Sexually Transmitted Infections*,
47 *93*(3), 153-154. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2016-052783
- 48 Glynn, R. W., Byrne, N., O'Dea, S., Shanley, A., Codd, M., Keenan, E., . . . Clarke, S. (2018). Chemsex,
49 risk behaviours and sexually transmitted infections among men who have sex with men in
50 Dublin, Ireland. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, *52*, 9-15.

- 1 Halkitis, P. N., Parsons, J. T., & Stirratt, M. J. (2001). A double epidemic: crystal methamphetamine
2 drug use in relation to HIV transmission among gay men. *Journal Of Homosexuality*, 41(2),
3 17-35.
- 4 Hammoud, M. A., Jin, F., Maher, L., Bourne, A., Haire, B., Saxton, P., . . . Prestage, G. (2020).
5 Biomedical HIV Protection Among Gay and Bisexual Men Who Use Crystal
6 Methamphetamine. *Aids and Behavior*, 24(5), 1400-1413. doi:10.1007/s10461-019-02739-7
- 7 Hegazi, A., Lee, M. J., Whittaker, W., Green, S., Simms, R., Cutts, R., . . . Pakianathan, M. R. (2017).
8 Chemsex and the city: sexualised substance use in gay bisexual and other men who have sex
9 with men attending sexual health clinics *International Journal Of STD & AIDS*, 28(4), 423-423.
10 doi:10.1177/0956462417694744
- 11 Herek, G. M. (2004). Beyond "Homophobia": Thinking about sexual prejudice and stigma in the
12 twenty-first century. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 1(2), 6-24.
13 doi:10.1525/srsp.2004.1.2.6
- 14 Hibbert, M. P., Brett, C. E., Porcellato, L. A., & Hope, V. D. (2019). Psychosocial and sexual
15 characteristics associated with sexualised drug use and chemsex among men who have sex
16 with men (MSM) in the UK. *Sex Transm Infect*, 95(5), 342-350. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2018-
17 053933
- 18 Hibbert, M. P., Brett, C. E., Porcellato, L. A., & Hope, V. D. (2020). Sexually transmitted infection
19 diagnoses, sexualised drug use and associations with pre-exposure prophylaxis use among
20 men who have sex with men in the UK. *International Journal Of STD & AIDS*, 31(3), 254-263.
21 doi:10.1177/0956462419897222
- 22 Hillis, A., Germain, J., Hibbert, M., Hope, V., & Van Hout, M. C. (in press). 'Belt and braces approach;
23 added benefit and...extra reassurance': A multi-stakeholder examination of the challenges to
24 effective provision of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) for HIV prevention among men who
25 have sex with men (MSM) in Northern and Central England. *International Journal of Health
26 Services*.
- 27 Lenton, S., & Single, E. (1998). The definition of harm reduction. *Drug Alcohol Rev*, 17(2), 213-219.
28 doi:Doi 10.1080/09595239800187011
- 29 Ma, R., & Perera, S. (2016). Safer 'chemsex': GPs' role in harm reduction for emerging forms of
30 recreational drug use. *British Journal of General Practice*, 66(642), 4-5.
31 doi:10.3399/bjgp16X683029
- 32 Mattison, A. M., Ross, M. W., Wolfson, T., Franklin, D., & HNRC Group. (2001). Circuit party
33 attendance, club drug use, and unsafe sex in gay men. *Journal of Substance Abuse*, 13(1-2),
34 119-126. doi:Doi 10.1016/S0899-3289(01)00060-8
- 35 Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual
36 populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(5), 674-
37 697.
- 38 Moors, A. C. (2019). Moving Past the Rose-Tinted Lens of Monogamy: Onward with Critical Self-
39 Examination and (Sexually) Healthy Science. *Arch Sex Behav*, 48(1), 57-61.
40 doi:10.1007/s10508-018-1215-6
- 41 Ottaway, Z., Finnerty, F., Amlani, A., Pinto-Sander, N., Szanyi, J., & Richardson, D. (2017). Men who
42 have sex with men diagnosed with a sexually transmitted infection are significantly more
43 likely to engage in sexualised drug use. *International Journal Of STD & AIDS*, 28(1), 91-93.
44 doi:10.1177/0956462416666753
- 45 Ottaway, Z., Finnerty, F., Buckingham, T., & Richardson, D. (2017). Increasing rates of reported
46 chemsex/sexualised recreational drug use in men who have sex with men attending for
47 postexposure prophylaxis for sexual exposure. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, 93(1), 31.
- 48 Parent, N., Ferlatte, O., Milloy, M. J., Fast, D., & Knight, R. (2020). The sexualised use of cannabis
49 among young sexual minority men: "I'm actually enjoying this for the first time". *Cult Health
50 Sex*, 1-16. doi:10.1080/13691058.2020.1736634

- 1 Pienaar, K., Murphy, D. A., Race, K., & Lea, T. (2018). Problematising LGBTIQ drug use, governing
2 sexuality and gender: A critical analysis of LGBTIQ health policy in Australia. *International*
3 *Journal of Drug Policy*, 55, 187-194. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2018.01.008>
- 4 Pollard, A., Nadarzynski, T., & Llewellyn, C. (2018). Syndemics of stigma, minority-stress, maladaptive
5 coping, risk environments and littoral spaces among men who have sex with men using
6 chemsex. *Cult Health Sex*, 20(4), 411-427. doi:10.1080/13691058.2017.1350751
- 7 Race, K. (2017). Thinking with pleasure: Experimenting with drugs and drug research. *International*
8 *Journal of Drug Policy*, 49, 144-149. doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2017.07.019
- 9 Room, R. (2005). Stigma, social inequality and alcohol and drug use. *Drug Alcohol Rev*, 24(2), 143-
10 155. doi:10.1080/09595230500102434
- 11 Rosińska, M., Gios, L., Nöstlinger, C., Vanden Berghe, W., Marcus, U., Schink, S., . . . Mirandola, M.
12 (2018). Prevalence of drug use during sex amongst MSM in Europe: Results from a multi-site
13 bio-behavioural survey. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 55, 231-241.
14 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2018.01.002>
- 15 Schmidt, A. J., Bourne, A., Weatherburn, P., Reid, D., Marcus, U., & Hickson, F. (2016). Illicit drug use
16 among gay and bisexual men in 44 cities: Findings from the European MSM Internet Survey
17 (EMIS). *The International Journal On Drug Policy*, 38, 4-12. doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2016.09.007
- 18 Stall, R., & Purcell, D. W. (2000). Intertwining Epidemics: A Review of Research on Substance Use
19 Among Men Who Have Sex with Men and Its Connection to the AIDS Epidemic. *Aids and*
20 *Behavior*, 4(2), 181-192. doi:10.1023/a:1009516608672
- 21 Stardust, Z., Kolstee, J., Joksic, S., Gray, J., & Hannan, S. (2018). A community-led, harm-reduction
22 approach to chemsex: case study from Australia's largest gay city. *Sexual Health (Online)*,
23 15(2), 179-181. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/SH17145>
- 24 Stuart, D. (2013). Sexualised drug use by MSM: background, current status and response. *HIV*
25 *Nursing*, 13(1), 6-10.
- 26 Stuart, D. (2014). Sexualised drug use by MSM (ChemSex): a toolkit for GUM/HIV staff. *HIV Nursing*,
27 14(2), 15-19.
- 28 Stuart, D. (2019). Chemsex: origins of the word, a history of the phenomenon and a respect to the
29 culture. *Drugs and Alcohol Today*, 19(1), 3-10. doi:10.1108/DAT-10-2018-0058
- 30 Stuart, D., & Weymann, J. (2015). ChemSex and care-planning: One year in practice. *HIV Nursing*, 15,
31 24-28.
- 32 Tomkins, A., Vivancos, R., Ward, C., & Kliner, M. (2018). How can those engaging in chemsex best be
33 supported? An online survey to gain intelligence in Greater Manchester. *International*
34 *Journal Of STD & AIDS*, 29(2), 128-134. doi:10.1177/0956462417719643
- 35 Van Hout, M. C., Crowley, D., O'Dea, S., & Clarke, S. (2019). Chasing the rainbow: pleasure, sex-based
36 sociality and consumerism in navigating and exiting the Irish Chemsex scene. *Cult Health Sex*,
37 21(9), 1074-1086. doi:10.1080/13691058.2018.1529336
- 38 Weatherburn, P., Hickson, F., Reid, D., Torres-Rueda, S., & Bourne, A. (2017). Motivations and values
39 associated with combining sex and illicit drugs ('chemsex') among gay men in South London:
40 findings from a qualitative study. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, 93(3), 203-206.
41 doi:10.1136/sextrans-2016-052695
- 42 Wellings, K., Mehl, G. L., & Free, C. J. (2017). eSexual health interventions: promising, but more
43 evidence needed. *Lancet Public Health*, 2(4), e162-e163. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(17)30051-
44 8
- 45 Witzel, T. C., Bourne, A., Burns, F. M., Rodger, A. J., McCabe, L., Gabriel, M. M., . . . Weatherburn, P.
46 (2019). HIV self-testing intervention experiences and kit usability: results from a qualitative
47 study among men who have sex with men in the SELPHI (Self-Testing Public Health
48 Intervention) randomized controlled trial in England and Wales. *HIV Med*,
49 <https://doi.org/10.1111/hiv.12818>. doi:10.1111/hiv.12818

50

1 Table 1. Demographics of MSM and service provider participants.

2

	No. of participants	%
<i>Men who have sex with men (N=13)</i>		
Sexuality		
Gay	11	85%
Bisexual	1	8%
Queer	1	8%
Ethnicity		
White British	10	77%
White non-British	2	16%
Person of colour	1	8%
Work Status		
Full-time	10	77%
Student	3	23%
Relationship status		
In a relationship	6	46%
Single	7	54%
Location		
Lancashire	1	8%
Cheshire & Merseyside	2	16%
Greater Manchester	10	77%
Sexualised drugs used		
Cocaine	3	23%
Crystal methamphetamine	4	31%
GHB/GBL	4	31%
LSD	1	8%
Mephedrone	5	38%
Poppers	5	38%
Use of a chemsex drug (crystal methamphetamine, GHB/GBL, mephedrone)	5	38%
<i>Service providers (N=16)</i>		
Job role		
Consultant	7	44%
Speciality doctor	4	25%
Health advisor/psychotherapist	2	13%
Administrator	2	13%
Nurse practitioner	1	6%
Location		
Greater Manchester	4	25%
Cheshire & Merseyside	9	56%
West Midlands	2	13%
South Yorkshire	1	6%

3

4