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1. Introduction

As part of the 2013 Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections (CROI 2013), the International AIDS Society (IAS), through its Industry Liaison Forum (ILF), held an affiliated event, entitled Sex and gender differences in ARV-based prevention research (see agenda in Appendix A). There were five presentations and a moderated debate. The meeting report and all presentations are available on the ILF website (http://www.iasociety.org/ilf.aspx).

2. Attendance

Participation in the event was by invitation only. In total, 194 persons were invited, of whom 43 confirmed their attendance at the meeting. Finally, 35 participated, with an even distribution of males and females, mainly from academia (50%) and non-governmental organisations (25%).

3. Feedback from participants

Evaluation forms (see Appendix B) were distributed along with the participants’ material, and 10 participants completed the evaluation form (i.e., about 30% response rate). Seventy percent of respondents were male, while 30% were female (none were transgender); most (80%) were more than 40 years old. The majority of respondents reported mainly working in the USA (50%) and the African continent (40%), mostly in academia (67%) and hospitals or clinics (22%) as researchers in clinical research, treatment and care (50%), biomedical prevention science (30%), and social science (10%). Participants declared that they were from the following fields: antiretroviral therapy resistance (one person), antiretroviral (ARV) pharmacology (one person), biomedical HIV prevention (two persons), clinical pharmacology (one person), oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) (one person), paediatrics (one person), post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)/PrEP (one person), and prevention of mother to child transmission (two persons).

The majority of participants pointed to their general interests in ARV-based prevention research (70%) and in sex and gender differences in HIV research (70%) as drivers of their participation to the event. For 90%, sex and gender differences in HIV research have direct implications in their
field of work. Accordingly, most (70%) respondents recognised that they had gained new insights during the event about ARV-based prevention research, as well as about sex and gender differences in HIV research. A majority (60%) also recognised the event as being an opportunity to share ideas with others interested in sex and gender differences in HIV research, as well as to network and explore opportunities to collaborate with other professionals in their field (including following up on new contacts “for continued information sharing and networking” and for “collaborating on upcoming trials”). The relevance of the event for the respondents was further emphasized as they declared that they would use the information presented at this session in their work in the future (70%), motivated by the “need for focusing our interventions from a position of intellectual honesty” and being able to “critically analyse data/information about gender-based differences in ARV-based prevention research”.

Globally, the majority of participants (90%) rated the content elements (presentations and debate) as good and excellent, with respondents giving the best rating to the presentations by Kate MacQueen, and the debate, on Social science and the importance of gender on acceptability, impact of risk behavior or compensation for TasP and PrEP. The meeting organization was also appreciated, being rated as good or excellent by all respondents, who also thought that allowing more time for the panel discussion (60%) and interactive discussion with the audience (60%) would allow further improvement of the event, as well as soliciting “broader attendance”.

More than 90% of participants voted against the debate resolution before and after the debate: this resolution was “that with respect to antiretroviral-based prevention of sexual transmission, treatment is enough for women”.
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### Appendix A: Agenda

#### SEX AND GENDER DIFFERENCES IN ARV-BASED PREVENTION RESEARCH

Organized by the Industry Liaison Forum of the International AIDS Society

**SUNDAY, 3 MARCH 2013 / 09:00 – 12:00**  
Omni Hotel, CNN Center International Ballroom D  
Atlanta, Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 9:00</td>
<td>Registration and Breakfast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00 – 9:10| Welcome and introduction  
*Co-chairs: Sandra Lehrman (Merck) and Joep Lange (Amsterdam Institute For Global Health and Development)* |
| 9:10 – 9:20| Overview of PrEP trials  
*Catherine Hankins (Amsterdam Institute For Global Health and Development)* |
| 9:20 – 9:40| Sex & gender differences in ARV-based prevention - The *in vitro* and preclinical evidence  
*José Gerardo García-Lerma (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention)* |
| 9:40 – 10:00| Sex and gender in clinical trials of PrEP and TasP  
*Patrick Ndase (University of Washington)* |
| 10:00 – 10:20| Social science and the importance of gender on acceptability, impact of risk behavior or compensation for TasP and PrEP  
*Kate MacQueen (FHI 360)* |
| 10:20 – 11:30| Moderated debate followed by an open-floor discussion  
*Moderated by Catherine Hankins (Amsterdam Institute For Global Health and Development)*  
Debate with Linda-Gail Bekker (Desmond Tutu HIV Foundation), Dázon Dixon Diallo (SisterLove), Robert Grant (University of California, San Francisco), and Anna Zakowicz (GNP+, EATG, and HIV / AIDS Civil Society Forum at EU) |
| 11:30 – 11:50| Products in the pipeline  
*Industry* |
| 11:50 – 12:00| Closing  
*Co-chairs: Sandra Lehrman (Merck) and Joep Lange (Amsterdam Institute For Global Health and Development)* |
| 12:00 – 13:00| Lunch |
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EVALUATION FORM

SEX AND GENDER DIFFERENCES IN ARV-BASED PREVENTION RESEARCH

March 3rd, 2013
Atlanta, Georgia

CROI 2013 Affiliated Event organized by the Industry Liaison Forum (IAS)

Please take a few minutes to complete this anonymous survey. The meeting organizers will use the results to assess the impact of the meeting and improve future similar initiatives. By returning your completed survey you consent to the information collected being used for reporting purposes.

1. What were your main reasons for attending this meeting? (Please select all that apply.)

   a. I have a general interest in ARV-based prevention research.
   b. I have a general interest in sex and gender differences in HIV research.
   c. I have a general interest in issues related to women.
   d. Sex and gender differences in HIV research have direct implications for my field of work.
   e. Sex and gender differences in HIV prevention and treatment research may have direct implications for me personally.
   f. Other (please specify): __________________________

2. What did you gain from attending the session? (Please select all that apply.)

   a. New insights / data about ARV-based prevention research.
   b. New insights / data about sex and gender differences in HIV research.
   c. New insights / data about issues related to women.
   d. An opportunity to share ideas with others interested in ARV-based prevention research.
   e. An opportunity to share ideas with others interested in sex and gender differences in HIV research.
   f. An opportunity to share ideas with others interested in issues related to women.
   g. An opportunity to advocate for gender-sensitive HIV research.
   h. An opportunity to advocate for attention to research related to women's needs.
   i. Networking opportunities for collaboration with other professionals in my field.
   j. Networking opportunities for collaboration with other professionals in different fields from mine.
   k. I gained nothing.
   l. Other (please specify): __________________________

_________________________________________________________
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3. Will you use the information presented at this session in your work?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unsure

   If yes, please explain how. If no / unsure, please explain why.

   

4. Will you follow-up on new contacts made at the meeting?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unsure

   If yes, for what purpose? If no / unsure, please explain why.

   

5. How would you rate the following content elements?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Description</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Overview of PrEP trials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sex and gender differences in ARV-based prevention - The in vitro and preclinical evidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Sex and gender in clinical trials of PrEP and TasP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Social science and the importance of gender on acceptability, impact of risk behavior or compensation for TasP and PrEP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Moderated debate followed by an open-floor discussion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Products in the pipeline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. How would you rate the meeting’s organization?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a. Proposed agenda (topics) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   b. Proposed agenda (invited contributors) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   c. Format of the session (talks + moderated debate) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   d. Size of the event (number of participants) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   e. Duration of the event (3 hours) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   f. Time management by co-chairs and debate moderator | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   g. Overall organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   If poor, what / why?

7. How would you rate the panel discussion?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a. Composition of panel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   b. Possibilities of interaction for audience | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   c. Moderator’s handling of questions and comments from audience | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   d. Level of preparedness of panel participants | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   If poor, what / why?

8. How could future sessions be improved? (Please select all that apply)
   a. Improve general organization of the meeting
   b. Provide more information about the meeting in advance.
   c. Narrow the focus on the topics covered in the meeting.
   d. Broaden the topics and issues covered in the meeting.
   e. Allow more time for presentations.
   f. Reduce the number of presentations.
   g. Allow more time for panel discussion.
   h. Reduce time for discussion.
   i. Allow more time for an interactive discussion with the audience.
   j. Other (please specify):  ________________________________________________
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9. Do you have comments about the meeting and / or suggestions to improve similar meetings?

[Blank space for comments]

10. What is your main occupation / area of expertise in HIV / AIDS?

☐ Researcher – HIV basic science
☐ Researcher – clinical research, treatment and care
☐ Researcher – biomedical prevention science
☐ Researcher – social science
☐ Physician / clinician
☐ Other health care worker
☐ Policy / Administrator
☐ Advocate / activist
☐ Pharmaceutical / diagnostic
☐ Educator / trainer
☐ Media representative
☐ Student
☐ Other (please specify): __________

11. What is your main affiliation / organization in HIV / AIDS?

☐ Hospital / clinic
☐ Academia (university, research institute, etc.)
☐ Non-governmental
☐ Governmental
☐ Intergovernmental (e.g. UN, WHO)
☐ Grassroots community-based organization
☐ People living with HIV / AIDS group / network
☐ Media organization
☐ Pharmaceutical company
☐ Other (please specify) __________

12. What is your sex?

☐ Female
☐ Male
☐ Transgender
☐ Other

13. What is your age?

☐ Below 26
☐ Between 26 and 40
☐ Over 40

14. In which country do you mainly work? (If multiple, please order and indicate proportion.)

[Blank space for country details]

15. If applicable, what is your current field of research?

[Blank space for field details]

Would you have additional comments after the session, please contact the ILF: ilf@issociety.org.
Thank you for completing the survey.