Published in final edited form as:

AIDS Behav. 2012 August ; 16(6): 1542–1548. doi:10.1007/s10461-012-0162-9.

Sexual Relationship Power and Malnutrition Among HIV-Positive Women in Rural Uganda

Mark J. Siedner,

Department of Infectious Disease, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, 55 Fruit St., GRJ-5, Boston, MA 02114, USA

Alexander C. Tsai,

Robert Wood Johnson Health and Society Scholars Program, Harvard University, Boston, MA, USA

Shari Dworkin,

University of California, San Francisco, USA

Nozmo F. B. Mukiibi,

Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Mbarara, Uganda

Nneka I. Emenyonu,

Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Mbarara, Uganda

Peter W. Hunt,

University of California, San Francisco, USA

Jessica E. Haberer,

Department of Infectious Disease, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, 55 Fruit St., GRJ-5, Boston, MA 02114, USA

Jeffrey N. Martin,

University of California, San Francisco, USA

David R. Bangsberg, and

Department of Infectious Disease, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, 55 Fruit St., GRJ-5, Boston, MA 02114, USA; The Ragon Institute of Massachusetts General Hospital, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA; Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Mbarara, Uganda

Sheri D. Weiser

University of California, San Francisco, USA

Abstract

Inequality within partner relationships is associated with HIV acquisition and gender violence, but little is known about more pervasive effects on women's health. We performed a cross-sectional analysis of associations between sexual relationship power and nutritional status among women in Uganda. Participants completed questionnaires and anthropometric measurements. We assessed sexual relationship power using the Sexual Relationship Power Scale (SRPS). We performed logistic regression to test for associations between sexual relationship power and poor nutritional status including body mass index, body fat percentage, and mid-upper arm circumference. Women

with higher sexual relationship power scores had decreased odds of low body mass index (OR 0.29, $p = 0.01$), low body fat percentage (OR 0.54, $p = 0.04$), and low midupper arm circumference (OR 0.22, $p = 0.01$). These relationships persisted in multivariable models adjusted for potential confounders. Targeted interventions to improve intimate partner relationship equality should be explored to improve health status among women living with HIV in rural Africa.

Keywords

Gender Equality; Malnutrition HIV/AIDS; Sub-Saharan Africa

Introduction

Women are disproportionately affected by the HIV epidemic, especially in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), where 60% of the 23 million people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) are female [1]. There is considerable interest in the increased risk of HIV acquisition in women [2–7], and interventions to mitigate this risk [8, 9]. Multiple studies have shown that gender inequality and relationship power imbalances are associated with risky sexual behavior, sexual violence, and HIV acquisition [10–13]. However, there is little known about how relationship power differentials affect health among women already infected with HIV in resource-limited settings (RLS).

A major contributor to poor health among PLWHA is malnutrition [14–17], which is often attributed to the effects of advanced AIDS. Gender-based disparities in nutritional status have been noted in epidemiologic studies. For example, recent ecologic studies have noted stagnant or decreasing height in women in SSA [18, 19]. Several authors hypothesize that these findings are related to gender inequality in RLS. Consistent with this hypothesis, an analysis of demographic health surveys from women in three SSA countries documented a relationship between diminished autonomy and risk of chronic energy deficiency [20]. While these preliminary data suggest that gender power disparities may contribute to increased risk of malnutrition among women in SSA, no studies to date have directly examined associations between sexual relationship power and malnutrition. Because both intimate partner violence and malnutrition are prevalent among HIV-infected women [21–24], such an association is particularly likely to affect HIV-positive women. We sought to assess the relationship between low sexual relationship power and malnutrition in a sample of HIV-positive women in rural Uganda.

Methods

We performed a cross-sectional analysis among HIV-positive women enrolled in the Uganda AIDS Rural Treatment Outcomes (UARTO) cohort, an ongoing study of HIV medication adherence that began in 2005. Subjects attend clinic quarterly for CD4 count and viral load measurements, and structured interviews to obtain data on socio-demographic characteristics. Beginning in September 2007, a sub-study of UARTO collected detailed information on food insecurity, gender empowerment, and nutritional status, as measured by anthropometric indicators including height, weight, mid-upper arm circumference, and body impedance analysis. Informed consent was obtained for all participants. The Institutional Review Boards of the Mbarara University of Science and Technology, University of California, San Francisco, and Partners Healthcare approved the study. The study was performed in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2000.

We conducted a cross-sectional analysis of associations between sexual relationship power and malnutrition at baseline of the sub-study. For our outcome variables, we defined

malnutrition based on conventional cutoffs, as low body mass index (BMI) $<18.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$, low body fat percentage (BFP) $<25\%$, and low mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) $<22 \text{ cm}$.

The primary explanatory variable of interest was sexual relationship power, which we measured using the sexual relationship power scale (SRPS). The scale was developed with focus groups to ascertain key elements of sexual empowerment [25], and has been validated and used in both resource-rich and resource-poor settings [10, 11, 26, 27]. The scale is divided into two sub-scales: relationship control (RC) and decision-making dominance (DMD), which are comprised of fourteen and eight questions respectively. The two sub-scale scores are combined with equal weighting into an overall SRPS score, which ranges from 1–4. Higher scores correspond to greater sexual relationship power. We controlled for socioeconomic and clinical characteristics that might influence nutrition and/or dynamics of intimate partner relationships including age, literacy, educational attainment, marital status, household size, household wealth, ART use at time of study, and CD4 count nearest to the survey visit. To adjust for household wealth, we created a linear index of asset ownership and household dwelling characteristics using the methodology explained by Filmer and Pritchett [28].

We fitted univariable logistic regression models to the data to determine which explanatory variables were associated with our three outcome measures of malnutrition. Variables associated with malnutrition in unadjusted analyses as determined by a p -value <0.25 were retained in adjusted models [29]. To ascertain which sub-scale of SRPS could be influencing our results, we further fitted regression models using the RC and DMD sub-scale scores as explanatory variables. Finally, to facilitate magnitude of association comparisons across covariates, we fitted explanatory variables to multivariable linear regression models of our three nutritional outcomes. We did this to compare corresponding regression coefficients to a one-point change in SRPS score.

Results

A total of 307 out of 325 (94.5%) women in the UARTO cohort completed the SRPS survey. The median age of the sample was 33 years (IQR 28–38, Table 1). At the time of the survey, median CD4 cell count was 207 cells/ml (IQR 138–303) and 53% had not yet initiated ART. Approximately 77% had a primary education or lower, 81% were literate and 38% were married.

Median BMI of the study population was 22.6 kg/m^2 (IQR 20.2–25.2). The prevalence of underweight as determined by BMI less than 18.5 kg/m^2 was 7.0%, which is similar to prior estimates among HIV + women in SSA [21]. A description of study characteristics subdivided by BMI status is shown in Table 1. Prevalence of malnutrition as measured by low BFP and low MUAC were 18.5, and 4.3% respectively.

Median BMI in the lowest, middle, and highest tertile of SRPS scores was 22.3, 22.7, and 23.8 kg/m^2 . Median BFP and MUAC among the tertiles from lowest to highest was 31.4%, 32.2%, 33.0% and 26.4, 27.0, and 27.1 cm respectively.

In unadjusted logistic regression modeling, each one-point increase in the SRPS was associated with decreased odds of low BMI (OR 0.29, $p = 0.01$), low BFP (OR 0.54, $p = 0.04$), and low MUAC (OR 0.22, $p = 0.01$), (Table 2a–c). In adjusted regression modeling including covariates that met criteria in univariable model by p -value <0.25 , increased SRPS remained significantly associated with decreased odds of low BMI (AOR 0.31, $p = 0.01$) and low MUAC (AOR 0.29, $p = 0.04$). The association for low BFP was not statistically significant (AOR 0.57, $p = 0.08$).

In multivariable linear regression modeling, each unit increase in SRPS score was associated with an increase of 1.0 kg/m² in BMI (95% CI 0.17–1.83, $p = 0.02$), a nonsignificant increase of 1.23% in BFP (95% CI –0.63–3.10, $p = 0.19$) and an increase in 1.08 cm in MUAC (95% CI 0.33–1.82, $p = 0.01$). The coefficients of association for SRPS were larger than for other predictors including CD4 count, household size, and socioeconomic status.

To ascertain which elements of the SRPS were most associated with malnutrition, we also used logistic regression to test the association between the RC and DMD sub-scales and our outcomes of interest. Increasing RC scores were significantly associated with low BMI (OR 0.26, $p < 0.01$) and low MUAC (OR 0.23, $p = 0.01$), but not low BFP (OR 0.51, $p = 0.07$). While individuals with higher DMD scores were less likely to be malnourished, associations were not statistically significant for any of the three indicators of malnutrition (OR for BMI 0.48, $p = 0.08$; OR for BFP 0.62, $p = 0.09$, OR for MUAC 0.63, $p = 0.09$). When both sub-scales were retained in the model along with predicted cofounders, the RC sub-scale remained statistically significantly associated with both low BMI (AOR 0.27, $p = 0.01$) and low MUAC (AOR 0.31, $p = 0.05$), while the estimated odds ratios for DMD were much closer to a null effect (for low BMI AOR 0.92, $p = 0.86$; for low MUAC AOR 0.72, $p = 0.79$).

Discussion

Although multiple studies have shown strong links between low sexual relationship power and both high-risk sexual behavior and HIV acquisition [10–13, 30], there is limited data describing the health effects of low sexual relationship power beyond sexual practices and condom use. Here we report a strong association between low relationship power and malnutrition in a sample of HIV-positive women in rural Uganda. The strength of the association persists across multiple measures of malnutrition including BMI, BFP, and MUAC; is only marginally diminished after adjustment for potential cofounders of malnutrition; and is greater in magnitude compared to other known and predicted correlates of malnutrition in PLWHA including SES and CD4 count respectively [21]. Given the negative effects of malnutrition [14, 16, 31, 32] and food insecurity [33] among PLWHA, efforts to determine the causal pathway of this relationship will be an important step towards improving health outcomes and quality of life for HIV-positive women in RLS.

Our finding that relationship power is associated with nutritional risk is consistent with previous findings [34, 35]. Others have shown that women in RLS are often dependent on their partners for food [36], and that HIV-infected women are at greater risk for food insecurity [37]. Women are often the last in their household to eat, are distributed less nutritious foods [38], and can be particularly susceptible to malnutrition after perturbations in household income or drought [39–41]. Women who are victims of domestic violence are also at increased risk of malnutrition [42]. Women with low sexual relationship power thus might be more susceptible to a disadvantaged status in terms of intra-household food distribution. HIV-positive women are particularly susceptible to these effects because of their increased risk of both intimate partner relationship violence and malnutrition [12, 21–24]. Though further study is needed to corroborate this hypothesis, we postulate that the baseline vulnerability of HIV-positive women in RLS is exacerbated by unequal power in intimate relationships, leading to greater risk of malnutrition.

Increased efforts to study and implement interventions that ameliorate imbalances in intimate partner relationships in RLS should be prioritized. Multiple studies have sought to assess gender empowerment interventions and their effect on HIV prevention [43–45]. However, aside from reports describing significant reductions in intimate partner violence after economic empowerment interventions [46, 47], there are few interventions specifically

designed to improve partner equality within intimate relationships of HIV-positive women, and no published reports on their efficacy. Therefore, there is a great need to further evaluate both existing and new interventions, and to expand the reach of successful programs. Given the findings described here, nutritional status indicators should be considered as outcomes of interest for such interventions.

While some previous studies found greater effects of DMD subscale scores on risky sexual behaviors [13], we found the association between malnutrition and sexual relationship power was stronger with the RC sub-scale. This difference might be explained by the distinct focus of the sub-scales. Whereas the decision making dominance sub-scale assesses issues relating to sexual risk (e.g. “Who usually has more to say about whether you have sex”), the relationship control sub-scale might be more targeted to intra-household gender inequality (e.g. “Most of the time, we do what my partner wants to do,” and “My partner does what he wants, even if I do not want him to”). Thus, in keeping with our study hypothesis, the relationship control sub-scale might be a more sensitive predictor of malnutrition risk in this population.

This study has a number of limitations. The primary limitation of this analysis is its cross-sectional design, which precludes our ability to make causal inferences about the observed associations. For example, the reverse relationship might be true: malnutrition might lead to low sexual power if malnourished women are physically less dominant or perceive themselves to be so in sexual relationships. In contrast to most resource-rich settings, larger body types remain associated with wealth and power in some African cultures [48]. Thus malnutrition, primarily stemming from HIV or other attributable causes might consequently affect female empowerment in sexual relationships. Future longitudinal studies will lend further insight into the nature of this relationship. Additionally, the study was limited to women in rural Uganda with HIV, and therefore our results might not be generalizable to other populations.

In summary, sexual relationship power is strongly associated with malnutrition among HIV-positive women in rural Uganda. Further study is needed to explore the causal nature of this relationship and to identify interventions to improve female nutritional status and gender inequality in this especially vulnerable population.

Acknowledgments

We thank the UARTO participants who made this study possible; Annet Kembabazi and Annet Kawuma for providing study coordination and support; Doreen Akello, Marcy Mutumba, Christine Ngabirano, Ruth Ssentongo, and Florence Turyashemerwa for research assistance; Dr. Jude Senkugu, Dr. Conrad Muzoora and Dr. Elias Kumbakumba for invaluable advice and oversight of study design and implementation. While these individuals are acknowledged for their assistance, no endorsement of manuscript contents or conclusions should be inferred.

Sources of Support: The study was funded by the National Institutes of Health (R01 MH054907, K23 MH079713-03S1, K24 MH087227, and P30 AI027793), the Meyer Family Foundation, and the Mark and Lisa Schwartz Family Foundation. Dr. Weiser received additional support from the Burke Family Foundation. Dr. Tsai received salary support from the Robert Wood Johnson Health and Society Scholars.

References

1. UNAIDS. Global report: UNAIDS report on the global AIDS epidemic. Joint United Nations programme on HIV/AIDS; Geneva: 2010.
2. Quinn TC, Overbaugh J. HIV/AIDS in women: an expanding epidemic. *Science*. 2005; 308:1582–3. [PubMed: 15947174]
3. Boily MC, Baggaley RF, Wang L, Masse B, White RG, Hayes RJ, et al. Heterosexual risk of HIV-1 infection per sexual act: systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2009; 9:118–29. [PubMed: 19179227]

4. Gilbert L, Walker L. Treading the path of least resistance: HIV/AIDS and social inequalities a South African case study. *Soc Sci Med.* 2002; 54:1093–110. [PubMed: 11999505]
5. Dworkin SL, Ehrhardt AA. Going beyond “ABC” to include “GEM”: critical reflections on progress in the HIV/AIDS epidemic. *Am J Public Health.* 2007; 97:13–8. [PubMed: 17138923]
6. Zierler S, Krieger N. Reframing women’s risk: social inequalities and HIV infection. *Annu Rev Public Health.* 1997; 18:401–36. [PubMed: 9143725]
7. Gupta GR. How men’s power over women fuels the HIV epidemic. *BMJ.* 2002; 324:183–4. [PubMed: 11809629]
8. McCormack S, Ramjee G, Kamali A, Rees H, Crook AM, Gafos M, et al. PRO2000 vaginal gel for prevention of HIV-1 infection (Microbicides Development Programme 301): a phase 3, randomised, double-blind, parallel-group trial. *Lancet.* 2010; 376:1329–37. [PubMed: 20851460]
9. Abdool, Karim; Q, Abdool; Karim, SS.; Frohlich, JA.; Grobler, AC.; Baxter, C.; Mansoor, LE. Effectiveness and safety of tenofovir gel, an antiretroviral microbicide, for the prevention of HIV infection in women. *Science.* 2010; 329:1168–74. [PubMed: 20643915]
10. Pulerwitz J, Amaro H, De Jong W, Gortmaker SL, Rudd R. Relationship power, condom use and HIV risk among women in the USA. *AIDS Care.* 2002; 14:789–800. [PubMed: 12511212]
11. Pettifor AE, Measham DM, Rees HV, Padian NS. Sexual power and HIV risk. South Africa. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2004; 10:1996–2004.
12. Jewkes RK, Dunkle K, Nduna M, Shai N. Intimate partner violence, relationship power inequity, and incidence of HIV infection in young women in South Africa: a cohort study. *Lancet.* 2010; 376:41–8. [PubMed: 20557928]
13. Campbell AN, Tross S, Dworkin SL, Hu MC, Manuel J, Pavlicova M, et al. Relationship power and sexual risk among women in community-based substance abuse treatment. *J Urban Health.* 2009; 86:951–64. [PubMed: 19921541]
14. van der Sande MA, van der Schim Loeff MF, Aveika AA, Sabally S, Togun T, Sarge-Njie R, et al. Body mass index at time of HIV diagnosis: a strong and independent predictor of survival. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2004; 37:1288–94. [PubMed: 15385737]
15. de Waal A, Whiteside A. New variant famine: AIDS and food crisis in southern Africa. *Lancet.* 2003; 362:1234–7. [PubMed: 14568749]
16. Wheeler DA, Gibert CL, Launer CA, Muurahainen N, Elion RA, Abrams DI, et al. Weight loss as a predictor of survival and disease progression in HIV infection. Terry Bein community programs for clinical research on AIDS. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr Hum Retrovirol.* 1998; 18:80–5. [PubMed: 9593462]
17. Tang AM, Forrester J, Spiegelman D, Knox TA, Tchetgen E, Gorbach SL. Weight loss and survival in HIV-positive patients in the era of highly active antiretroviral therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2002; 31:230–6. [PubMed: 12394802]
18. Akachi Y, Canning D. Health trends in Sub-Saharan Africa: conflicting evidence from infant mortality rates and adult heights. *Econ Hum Biol.* 2010; 8:273–88. [PubMed: 20634153]
19. Subramanian SV, Ozaltin E, Finlay JE. Height of Nations: a socioeconomic analysis of cohort differences and patterns among women in 54 Low—to middle-income countries. *PLoS One.* 2011; 6(4):e18962. [PubMed: 21533104]
20. Hindin, M. Women’s autonomy, status, and nutrition in Zimbabwe, Zambia, and Malawi. In: Kishor, S., editor. *A focus on gender: collected papers on gender using DHS data.* ORC Macro; Calverton: 2005.
21. Uthman OA. Prevalence and pattern of HIV-related malnutrition among women in sub-Saharan Africa: a meta-analysis of demographic health surveys. *BMC Public Health.* 2008; 8:226. [PubMed: 18597680]
22. Maman S, Mbwapo JK, Hogan NM, Kilonzo GP, Campbell JC, Weiss E, et al. HIV-positive women report more lifetime partner violence: findings from a voluntary counseling and testing clinic in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Am J Public Health.* 2002; 92:1331–7. [PubMed: 12144993]
23. Dunkle KL, Jewkes RK, Brown HC, Gray GE, McIntyre JA, Harlow SD. Gender-based violence, relationship power, and risk of HIV infection in women attending antenatal clinics in South Africa. *Lancet.* 2004; 363:1415–21. [PubMed: 15121402]

24. Decker MR, Seage GR III, Hemenway D, Raj A, Saggurti N, Balaiah D, et al. Intimate partner violence functions as both a risk marker and risk factor for women's HIV infection: findings from Indian husband-wife dyads. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009; 51:593–600. [PubMed: 19421070]
25. Pulerwitz J, Gortmake S, DeJong W. Measuring sexual relationship power in HIV/STD research. *Sex Roles*. 2000; 42:637–60.
26. Amaro H, Larson M, Zhang A, Acedo A, Dai J, Matsumoto A. Effects of trauma intervention on HIV sexual risk behaviors among women with co-occurring disorders in substance abuse treatment. *J Community Psychol*. 2007; 7:895–908.
27. Parrado EA, Flippen CA, McQuiston C. Migration and relationship power among Mexican women. *Demography*. 2005; 42:347–72. [PubMed: 15986990]
28. Filmer D, Pritchett LH. Estimating wealth effects without expenditure data—or tears: an application to educational enrollments in states of India. *Demography*. 2001; 38:115–32. [PubMed: 11227840]
29. Hosmer, D.; Lemeshow, S. *Applied logistic regression*. 2nd ed. Wiley & Sons; New York: 2000.
30. Hahm HC, Lee J, Rough K, Strathdee SA. Gender power control, sexual experiences, safer sex practices, and potential HIV risk behaviors among young Asian-American women. *AIDS Behav*. 2012; 16:179–88. [PubMed: 21259042]
31. Guenter P, Muurahainen N, Simons G, Kosok A, Cohan GR, Rudenstein R, et al. Relationships among nutritional status, disease progression, and survival in HIV infection. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 1993; 6:1130–8. [PubMed: 8105073]
32. Suttman U, Ockenga J, Selberg O, Hoogestraat L, Deicher H, Muller MJ. Incidence and prognostic value of malnutrition and wasting in human immunodeficiency virus-infected outpatients. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr Hum Retrovirol*. 1995; 8:239–46. [PubMed: 7859135]
33. Weiser SD, Tsai AC, Gupta R, Frongillo EA, Kawuma A, Senkungu J, et al. Food insecurity is associated with morbidity and patterns of healthcare utilization among HIV-infected individuals in a resource-poor setting. *AIDS*. 2012; 26:67–75. [PubMed: 21904186]
34. Hindin MJ. Women's power and anthropometric status in Zimbabwe. *Soc Sci Med*. 2000; 51:1517–28. [PubMed: 11077954]
35. Hindin MJ. Women's input into household decisions and their nutritional status in three resource-constrained settings. *Public Health Nutr*. 2006; 9:485–93. [PubMed: 16870021]
36. Raj A, Livramento KN, Santana MC, Gupta J, Silverman JG. Victims of intimate partner violence more likely to report abuse from in-laws. *Violence Against Women*. 2006; 12:936–49. [PubMed: 16957174]
37. Tsai AC, Bangsberg DR, Emenyonu N, Senkungu JK, Martin JN, Weiser SD. The social context of food insecurity among persons living with HIV/AIDS in rural Uganda. *Soc Sci Med*. 2011; 73:1717–24. [PubMed: 22019367]
38. Wheeler EF. Intra-household food and nutrient allocation. *Nutr Res Rev*. 1991; 4:69–81. [PubMed: 19094325]
39. Maxwell, S. UNICEF; 1990. Household food security: a conceptual review. M http://www.ifad.org/hfs/tools/hfs/hfspub/hfs_1.pdf
40. Behrman J, Deolalikar A. The intra-household demand for nutrients in rural South India. *J Human Resour*. 1990; 25:665–96.
41. Alayon Gamboa J, Gurri Garcia F. Impact of seasonal scarcity on energy balance and body composition in peasant adolescents from Calakmul, Campeche Mexico. *Am J Human Biol*. 2007; 19:751–62. [PubMed: 17691097]
42. Ackerson LK, Subramanian SV. Domestic violence and chronic malnutrition among women and children in India. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2008; 167:1188–96. [PubMed: 18367471]
43. El-Bassel N, Witte SS, Gilbert L, Wu E, Chang M, Hill J, et al. The efficacy of a relationship-based HIV/STD prevention program for heterosexual couples. *Am J Public Health*. 2003; 93:963–9. [PubMed: 12773363]
44. Ehrhardt AA, Exner TM, Hoffman S, Silberman I, Leu CS, Miller S, et al. A gender-specific HIV/STD risk reduction intervention for women in a health care setting: short- and long-term results of a randomized clinical trial. *AIDS Care*. 2002; 14:147–61. [PubMed: 11940275]

45. Dworkin SL, Kambou SD, Sutherland C, Moalla K, Kapoor A. Gendered empowerment and HIV prevention: policy and programmatic pathways to success in the MENA region. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009; 51(Suppl 3):S111–8. [PubMed: 19553778]
46. Kim JC, Watts CH, Hargreaves JR, Ndhlovu LX, Phetla G, Morison LA, et al. Understanding the impact of a microfinance-based intervention on women's empowerment and the reduction of intimate partner violence in South Africa. *Am J Public Health*. 2007; 97:1794–802. [PubMed: 17761566]
47. Pronyk PM, Hargreaves JR, Kim JC, Morison LA, Phetla G, Watts C, et al. Effect of a structural intervention for the prevention of intimate-partner violence and HIV in rural South Africa: a cluster randomised trial. *Lancet*. 2006; 368:1973–83. [PubMed: 17141704]
48. Powell AD, Kahn AS. Racial differences in women's desires to be thin. *Int J Eat Disord*. 1995; 17:191–5. [PubMed: 7757101]

Table 1

Summary indicators for cohort of HIV-positive women in rural Uganda

Variable	Total cohort (<i>n</i> = 307)	BMI 18.5 (<i>n</i> = 21)	BMI>18.5 (<i>n</i> = 268)	Test statistic	<i>p</i> value
Sexual relationship power score Median (range)	2.5 (1.2–3.9)	2.2 (1.2–3.0)	2.5 (1.2–3.9)	$Z = 2.51^a$	0.01
Age, median (IQR)	33 (19–75)	33 (20–64)	33 (28–38)	$t = 0.71^b$	0.24
CD4 Count, median (IQR)	207 (138–303)	183 (122–302)	207 (142–304)	$Z = 0.66^b$	0.51
CD4 Category (%)	12.6	19.1	12.1	$\chi^2 = 1.10^c$	0.78
<100	50.3	42.9	50.6		
100–249	31.0	33.3	30.9		
250–500	0.1	4.8	6.4		
>500					
ART use at baseline (%)	47.6	33.3	47.8	$\chi^2 = 1.63^c$	0.20
Education (%)				$\chi^2 = 0.38^c$	0.83
None	18.9	14.3	19.7		
Primary	58.0	61.9	56.8		
Secondary or greater	23.2	23.8	23.5		
Literate (%)	81.1	85.7	79.6	$\chi^2 = 0.46^c$	0.50
Married (%)	38.7	40.1	23.8	$\chi^2 = 2.18^c$	0.14
Household size, median (range)	3 (0–14)	3 (0–13)	3 (0–14)	$Z = 1.27^a$	0.20
Asset index, (range)	−0.3 (−1.5–1.3)	−0.7 (−1.3–0.5)	−0.2 (−1.5–1.3)	$t = 0.83^b$	0.40
BMI (median, IQR)	22.6 (20.2–25.2)				
<18.5 (%)	7.0				
18.5–25	61.7				
>25	31.4				
Body fat percentage (median, IQR)	18.8 (14.0–24.5)				
Low body fat percentage<25 (%)	18.5%				
Mid-upper arm circumference (median, IQR)	26.8 (24.7–29.3)				
Low mid-upper arm circumference (<22)	4.3%				

Comparisons are made for sub-set of participants underweight by body mass index versus those with normal or high BMI

^a Comparisons for non-normally distributed continuous covariates performed with rank-sum testing

^b Comparisons for categorical variables by performed with χ^2 testing

^c Comparisons for normally distributed continuous variables performed with studentized *t* testing

Table 2

Logistic regression model of association between BMI 18.5 Body Fat Percentage <25%, Low Mid-Upper Arm Circumference <22 cm and sexual relationship power among a cohort of HIV-positive women in rural Uganda

	Univariable model		Multivariable model (<i>n</i> = 284)		
	OR	<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value
a. BMI					
Sexual relationship power score	0.29	0.01	0.31	0.12–0.78	0.01
Age (per 10 years)	0.98	0.48	–	–	–
CD4 count (per 100 cells/ml)	0.93	0.63	–	–	–
ART use at baseline	0.55	0.21	0.79	0.29–2.13	0.64
Education (primary or greater)	1.47	0.55	–	–	–
Literate	1.54	0.50	–	–	–
Married	0.47	0.15	0.57	0.20–1.64	0.30
Household size	1.15	0.06	1.14	0.98–1.34	0.09
Asset index score	0.91	0.40	–	–	–
b. BFP					
Sexual relationship power score	0.54	0.04	0.57	0.31–1.06	0.08
Age	0.09	0.38	–	–	–
CD4 Count (per 100 cells)	0.96	0.77	–	–	–
ART use at baseline	1.13	0.68	–	–	–
Education (primary or greater)	1.16	0.71	–	–	–
Literate	0.90	0.79	–	–	–
Married	1.01	0.97	–	–	–
Household size	1.09	0.13	1.14	1.00–1.29	0.04
Asset index score	0.83	0.03	0.80	0.66–0.96	0.02
c. BFP					
Univariable model		Multivariable model (<i>n</i> = 288)			
OR	<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value	
Sexual relationship power score	0.54	0.04	0.57	0.31–1.06	0.08
Age	0.09	0.38	–	–	–
CD4 Count (per 100 cells)	0.96	0.77	–	–	–
ART use at baseline	1.13	0.68	–	–	–
Education (primary or greater)	1.16	0.71	–	–	–
Literate	0.90	0.79	–	–	–
Married	1.01	0.97	–	–	–
Household size	1.09	0.13	1.14	1.00–1.29	0.04
Asset index score	0.83	0.03	0.80	0.66–0.96	0.02

	Univariable model		Multivariable model (<i>n</i> = 284)		
	OR	<i>p</i> value	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value
c. MUAC					
Sexual relationship power score	0.22	0.01	0.29	0.09–0.94	0.04
Age (per 10 years)	1.41	0.29	–	–	–
CD4 Count (per 100 cells)	0.62	0.08	0.71	0.41–1.22	0.21
ART use at baseline ^a	0.31	0.08	–	–	–
Education (primary or greater)	0.50	0.26	–	–	–
Literate	0.34	0.07	0.40	0.12–1.35	0.20
Married	0.27	0.09	0.35	0.07–1.66	0.28
Household size	1.09	0.35	–	–	–
Asset index score	0.86	0.36	–	–	–

BFP body fat percentage, *MUAC* Mid-upper arm circumference

^a ART use at baseline was dropped from the multivariable model because of collinearity with CD4 count