

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

Barriers and facilitators to engagement with artificial intelligence (AI)-based chatbots for sexual and reproductive health advice: a qualitative analysis.

Nadarzynski, Tom, Puentes, Vannesa, Pawlak, Izabela, Mendes, Tania, Montgomery, Ian, Bayley, Jake and Ridge, Damien

This is an author's accepted manuscript of an article published in *Sexual Health* 18 (5), pp. 385-393, DOI:10.1071/sh21123. The final definitive version will be available online at:

<https://doi.org/10.1071/sh21123>

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

**Barriers and facilitators to engagement with artificial intelligence (AI)-based chatbots
for sexual and reproductive health advice: A qualitative analysis**

Tom Nadarzynski¹, Vannesa Puentes², Izabela Pawlak¹, Tania Mendes¹, Ian Montgomery³,
Jake Bayley⁴ & Damien Ridge¹

1. School of Social Sciences, University of Westminster, London, UK
2. Science, Engineering and Computing Faculty, Kingston University, London, UK
3. Positive East, London, UK
4. Barts NHS Trust, London, UK

Corresponding author:

Dr Tom Nadarzynski
Room 6.101, University of Westminster
115 New Cavendish Street
London W1W 6UW, UK
Email: T.Nadarzynski@westminster.ac.uk

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

Abstract

Background: The emergence of artificial intelligence and algorithmic medicine provides valuable opportunities for demand management of sexual and reproductive health services. Conversational agents or chatbots have been increasingly common, although little is known about how this technology could aid services. This study aimed to identify barriers and facilitators for engagement with sexual health chatbots to advise service developers and related health professionals.

Methods: Between January and June 2020, a series of face-to-face, semi-structured and online interviews were conducted exploring views on sexual health chatbots. As an example, participants were asked to interact with Pat chatbot, which offered advice on sexually transmitted infections and relevant services. . Participants were based in the United Kingdom and recruited via social media. Data were recorded, transcribed verbatim and analysed thematically.

Results: Forty participants (aged 18-50, 64% women, 77% heterosexual and 58% White) from Southeast England took part in the study. Many thought chatbots could aid sex education, providing useful information about STIs and signposting to sexual health services in a convenient, anonymous and non-judgemental way. Some participants compared chatbots to health professionals or internet search engines and perceived this technology as inferior offering constrained content and interactivity, limiting disclosure of personal information, trust and perceived accuracy of chatbot responses.

Conclusions: Despite mixed attitudes towards chatbots such as Pat, this technology was seen as useful for anonymous sex education, but it may not be suitable for matters that require empathy. Chatbots may increase access to clinical services, but their effectiveness and safety need to be established. Future research should identify which chatbots designs and functions lead to optimal engagement with this innovation.

51 **Introduction**

52 Sexual and reproductive health services (SRHSs) face significant challenges related to
53 the increased demand for screening, treatment, partner notification and professional advice to
54 their users. Before the COVID-19 pandemic, around 1 million people were acquiring a
55 sexually transmitted infection (STI) each day, worldwide.[1] In England, there were 468,342
56 diagnoses of STIs in 2019, with a 10% increase in Syphilis and a 26% increase in
57 Gonorrhoea, the highest since records began in 1918.[2]. Young heterosexual people, men
58 who have sex with men, and Black minority ethnic groups continue to be disproportionately at
59 risk of STIs and HIV. These groups also face multiple obstacles to accessing SRHSs such as
60 embarrassment, low levels of knowledge about STIs, stigma and fear of discrimination.[3-4]

61 The COVID-19 pandemic and related physical distancing measures disrupted SRHSs.
62 Reports demonstrated a reduction in the number of consultations, STI screening, vaccinations
63 for MSM, STI diagnoses and treatment initiation such as for hepatitis C. In England, the
64 pandemic had an impact on SRHS delivery with around 45% of all consultations in April-
65 June 2020 being conducted over the internet, compared to 26% in January-March 2020.[5] A
66 decline in service utilisation by 13% may reflect the general decrease in sexual activities in
67 some at-risk groups during the first UK-wide lockdown, but also demonstrates the reduced
68 availability of in-person services and a parallel rapid digitalisation aimed at improved
69 accessibility of SRHS.[6] However, little is known about patient acceptability, engagement
70 and utilisation of novel remote SRHSs and online platforms for professional advice.

71 Digital interventions to promote self-care behaviours are increasingly common,
72 although the research has mainly focused on adolescents and young adults. A review of 10
73 web-based interventions for adolescents showed that they had increased knowledge about
74 STIs and condoms and increased positive attitudes towards screening and self-protective
75 behaviours.[7] However, studies have failed to link the increased knowledge with biological

76 outcomes such as the rates of STIs. Similar findings were shown in a review of 19 trials
77 examining digital interventions for sexual health promotion reporting a moderate effect on
78 knowledge and self-efficacy, but no effect on safer sex intentions or biological outcomes.[8]
79 Nevertheless, a review of 51 studies on the use of social media for sexual health promotion
80 found that interventions conducted on interactive channels such as Facebook or Twitter are
81 capable of not only increasing knowledge and improving attitudes but also of having a
82 potential impact on behaviours such as the uptake of STI screening.[9] Also, two of the
83 studies found a reduction in chlamydia and gonorrhoea cases as a result of an intervention on
84 social media. These findings indicate that digital interventions that promote the exchange of
85 health information may be more effective than static interventions that offer little
86 interactivity. Although online interventions are capable of increasing knowledge and
87 influencing some one-off behaviours, there is still a need to establish which components of
88 digital services are the most engaging and effective at reducing STI rates.

89 Recent years have seen an expansion of innovative digital services that use
90 automation, such as streamlining of repetitive and instructive tasks, and complex algorithms.
91 Healthcare services that produce large amounts of data can now mine their datasets using
92 artificial intelligence (AI), e.g. machine learning or deep learning, to predict patients at risk
93 of HIV and their potential need for PrEP.[10-11] Several AI applications have aimed at
94 increasing patients' self-care behaviours using automation. Chatbots or conversational agents
95 are virtual digital systems that mimic human interaction using textual or voice input through
96 'natural language processing' and are typically delivered through websites, smartphone apps
97 and communication exchange systems.[12] A review of 47 studies showed that AI-led
98 chatbots have been applied for general health diagnostics, treatment and monitoring, health
99 services support, education and behaviour change.[13] Additionally, a separate systematic
100 review of 31 studies reported moderate evidence on the effectiveness, usability and positive

101 user perceptions of chatbots in healthcare, indicating a potential for this technology to
102 supplement current healthcare services.[14] Chatbots have also been used for sexual and
103 reproductive health providing information about HIV and AIDS via Facebook [15], educating
104 adolescents about sex, drugs and alcohol [16], promoting fertility awareness and
105 preconception health [17-18] and promoting HIV medication adherence [19]. The potential
106 benefit of incorporating chatbots within SRHSs are their convenience, accessibility, and
107 increasing users' levels of disclosure about intimate and potentially embarrassing topics that
108 may be difficult to discuss with a healthcare professional.[20] The conversational
109 presentation of sexual health information via chatbots may also be preferred by patients with
110 lower health literacy, facilitating their engagement with healthcare services.[21]

111 Our previous research on the acceptability of sexual health chatbots amongst clinic
112 attendees showed a moderate rate of 40%, correlated with access to technology and
113 technology utilisation.[22] However, motivations for such low acceptability were not
114 explored qualitatively and there is a possibility that the acceptability would be higher
115 amongst those struggling to access healthcare services. Therefore, there is a need to
116 understand user perspectives on sexual health chatbots to inform the development of this
117 technology to ensure optimal acceptability and uptake. This study aimed to explore barriers
118 and facilitators to engagement with AI-led chatbots for sexual and reproductive health advice.

119

120

Methods

Design

122 Given that little is currently known about user perspectives in the area, our
123 exploratory study used semi-structured interviews (guided by a topic guide) and thematic
124 analysis to explore views on engagement with AI-led chatbots in sexual health. This study

125 was approved by the University of Westminster Research Ethics Committee (ref:ETH1920-
126 0381)

127 **Participants and recruitment**

128 The study aimed to gather diverse opinions of individuals at higher risk of poorer
129 sexual health, i.e. young people, sexual and gender minorities as well as Black and Asian
130 minority ethnic groups. All participants needed to be at least 18 years old with no upper end
131 limit, located in the United Kingdom, willing to interact with a sexual health chatbot and
132 comprehend the English language to consent to the study and engage in interviews. No
133 specific sampling framework was used for recruitment.

134 The participants were recruited through multiple sources between January and June
135 2020. Facebook, Twitter and Instagram were used to advertise the study inviting to discuss
136 the usability of sexual health chatbots. Social media handles and hashtags were used to
137 promote the study. The advert was also circulated amongst students of the most ethnically
138 diverse university in London, to include the opinions of younger participants. Positive East, a
139 London-based HIV support and prevention charity circulated the study advert within its
140 networks, service users and social media platforms to seek views of people at risk of HIV and
141 STIs or those currently accessing medical and their psycho-social support services to manage
142 their HIV diagnosis.

143 **Procedure**

144 All those interested in the study were asked to click on a link that would direct them
145 to an online information page and consent form. They were then asked for demographic
146 questions (i.e., age, gender, sexual orientation and ethnicity), and to leave their contact details
147 to be contacted by researchers, with a choice of an online or face-to-face interview. All
148 participants that met inclusion criteria were invited to take part in the qualitative interviews.

149 Before the interview, participants provided signed consent and were requested to
150 engage with a London-based chatbot called PAT (<https://www.positiveeast.org.uk/chattopat>)
151 PAT is a sexual health chatbot developed and hosted by Positive East charity, funded through
152 Public Health England HIV Innovation Fund. PAT aims to answer and signpost for simple
153 queries regarding sexual and reproductive health and HIV/STI prevention. It was selected as
154 an example of a sexual health chatbot, as it had the capability to interpret free text, through
155 natural language processing, typical of this AI technology. The participants were asked to
156 engage with the chatbot for at least 10 minutes to provide informed and experience-based
157 views on this type of innovation. Participants were asked to consider how chatbots in general
158 could be used to aid SRHSs, with PAT being used as a demonstration to allow participants
159 better comprehension of chatbots. The study used a 13-item topic guide to explore potential
160 barriers and facilitators to engagement with sexual health chatbots broadly (i.e. “*What is your*
161 *general opinion on talking about your sexual health to chatbots?*”; *Would you consider a*
162 *chatbot, like PAT, as a way of talking about your sex life?*”, “*What would you say was a*
163 *limitation of your interaction with the chatbot?*”). The interviews lasted approximately 20
164 minutes (range: 14-45), were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim and anonymised by TM,
165 IP and VP.

166 **Data analysis**

167 Thematic analysis was used to identify patterns and varying views on the data in line
168 with the approach recommended by Braun & Clarke (2006).[23] Both deductive approaches,
169 guided by previous research on chatbots, as well as an inductive approach, grounded in
170 interview data, were used for the analysis. Authors TM, IP and VP thoroughly familiarised
171 themselves with the data by reading it through multiple times. Microsoft Excel spreadsheets
172 were used to classify all the data into themes, sub-themes and exemplar quotes. Three
173 researchers analysed the transcripts independently, coding sub-themes and themes. Next, the

174 analyses were compared in group discussions to increase reflexivity, by debating and
175 agreeing on final themes and subthemes in line with the research objectives.[24] To further
176 increase transparency and credibility of data analysis, all procedures, themes, subthemes and
177 quotes were scrutinised by an independent senior researcher (TN), who reported back to the
178 authors, all of whom subsequently contributed to multiple iterations of the manuscript before
179 it was finalised. A targeted sample size of 40 participants was set prior to data collection and
180 deemed as sufficient for thematic analysis. Saturation, in which no new or additional issues
181 were identified, was reached with the sample of 40 and no further recruitment was required.

182

183

Results

184

185

186

187

Forty participants (aged 18-50, median age=27, 64% women, 77% self-identified heterosexual and 58% White British or European) from Southeast England took part in the study. Two major themes of barriers and facilitators, with seven subthemes each, to engagement with sexual health chatbots were identified (Table 1).

188

Facilitators for sexual health chatbot use

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

The accessibility of chatbots and immediate provision of sexual health information, regardless of the location and time, were seen as advantageous (subtheme: “*Convenience*”). Participants perceived chatbots that could incorporate interaction with users in the form of reminders, self-help tips, advice about healthier lifestyles as useful, and potentially engaging. Chatbots that could reduce large volumes of text, typically seen on websites and webpages, to a single most relevant message were viewed as attractive having an impact on users’ time spent searching for relevant information. Chatbots were seen as potential hubs for links and information about STI/HIV screening, condom distribution or support groups (“*Enabling access to clinical services*”). They were viewed as a virtual place where questions about STIs

199 and treatment could be easily answered with directions to appropriate clinical services or
200 relevant organisations offering professional help and support. Some participants felt that
201 chatbots were free of moral judgement and unable to discriminate and marginalise users
202 based on their characteristics and sexual practices (“*Neutral and non-judgemental tool*”). A
203 few reported that they would be more likely to disclose highly sensitive information about
204 sexual behaviours such as condomless sex to a chatbot compared to certain health
205 professionals, such as general practitioners and those without specific training in sexual
206 health (“*Enabling disclosure of potentially embarrassing information*”). The apparent lack of
207 traceability of sexual health chatbots, where the information could be exchanged
208 anonymously, was seen as an important factor promoting engagement, especially for users
209 who did not wish to be identified (“*Anonymity*”). Here, the participants emphasised that the
210 ability to ask difficult questions about their sexual health without revealing their identity was
211 advantageous over clinical visits or telephone conversations.

212 Sexual health chatbots were thought to be helpful in tasks such as symptom checking,
213 clinic finding and as an information hub about STI risks. Chatbots’ interface, layout, design
214 and appearance were seen as essential for interaction and engagement with some highlighting
215 the importance of vibrant and exciting graphics and short videos in addition to interactive
216 messages (“*Ease and accessibility of health information*”). Chatbots capable of reaching
217 young people or specific minority groups via tailoring of information and design were seen as
218 more effective (“*Reaching the ‘seldom heard’*”). The best use of this technology was
219 attributed to sex education, where sensitive questions about sex could be asked freely and
220 openly. There were mixed views on whether chatbots should be linked with sexual health
221 services, with some believing that they could be used to support the work of clinicians, and
222 improve the communication between patients and clinics.

223 **Barriers to sexual health chatbot use**

224

225 Lack of awareness and previous experience of chatbots for sexual health were
226 identified as major limitations, all affecting attitudes towards the technology (“*Awareness*
227 *and understanding of chatbots*”). The majority of participants were unfamiliar with chatbots
228 specifically designed for sexual health advice, but most acknowledge its potential for helping
229 users find relevant information. The participants emphasised their preferences for human-to-
230 human contact when discussing their risk of STIs or contraception (“*Comparison to human*
231 *interactions*”). Here, chatbot competence was not perceived to be sufficient for meaningful
232 consultations. For most participants, the interaction with the chatbot (PAT) was described as
233 a novel and confusing experience, as the technology was perceived as still in development,
234 and thus limited. Participants familiar with chatbots used for customer service or banking had
235 especially negative attitudes due to the perception that this technology was unable to provide
236 adequate and relevant information, especially in the sexual health context, which was thought
237 to require the use of sensitive languages, such as due to the stigma associated with STIs.

238 Chatbots were seen as lacking important human traits, including empathy and the
239 ability to process and understand emotions (“*Lacking cognitive and affective empathy*”). The
240 responses given by chatbots were seen as dry and generic. Interactions were perceived as
241 limited in exploring individual issues and contexts, lacking sufficient depth to make clinical
242 judgements and appropriate recommendations (“*Limited interactivity*”). Chatbots were
243 considered restricted in offering personalised advice, as participants had doubts about the
244 effectiveness of an algorithm or computer pattern being able to provide advice on sex and the
245 complexities associated with lifestyles and activities. Participants were also sceptical that
246 chatbots were capable of helping users who felt anxious about their sexual health, specifically
247 in the context of HIV, pregnancy and other aspects of health that are perceived as highly
248 consequential, potentially severe and/or stigmatising.

249 Chatbots were also seen as lacking diverse content on a wide range of sex-related
250 topics and issues, however, were perceived most useful for signposting to various services.
251 Participants did not believe that users with specific needs, such as those concerned about
252 “polycystic ovaries syndrome”, would find relevant and in-depth information using chatbots
253 (“*Limited content*”). The technology was seen as only providing advice about mainstream,
254 easily accessible information, already available on the internet. Subsequently, some struggled
255 to understand the need for chatbots in sexual health. Instead, conversations with a computer
256 were typically cast as frustrating, due to the lack of prompts and follow-ups. The chatbot
257 language and the method of communication using simple phrases were seen as too simplistic,
258 unsophisticated and limiting by some users.

259 Participants were concerned about the trustworthiness, data handling and privacy of
260 chatbots. They worried about the lack of confidentiality when using chatbots, and that they
261 did not know who could read their responses. Most felt hesitant to answer highly sensitive
262 questions such as HIV status or about engaging in condomless sex. Participants were
263 uncertain how the data were collected, and where they were stored, being anxious that
264 someone could misuse it against them (“*Concerns about confidentiality and privacy*”).
265 Hence, face-to-face interactions with health professionals were seen as safer and reliable.
266 Chatbots’ clinical advice was seen as less accurate and relevant than that of trained
267 professionals, whose training, knowledge and experience were viewed as essential in
268 providing recommendations for STI screening, contraception and treatment (“*Limited*
269 *credibility, competence and accuracy*”). In summary, chatbots were not seen as competent or
270 capable of responding to complex sexual health issues. Participants also perceived chatbots as
271 inferior to the internet search engines or NHS websites, in comparison to their familiarity
272 with these platforms and the depth of information provided.

273

274

Discussion

275 To our knowledge, this is the first study offering insights on the barriers and facilitators
276 for the engagement with AI-led chatbots in sexual health. Despite low levels of awareness
277 about chatbots, participants had some positive views on this technology in general, following
278 their engagement with a type of chatbot used as an example. They highlighted chatbots'
279 anonymity, privacy and the lack of judgement as potential advantages. There was a preference
280 for user-chatbot interaction when enquiring about sensitive matters that were seen as difficult
281 or embarrassing to disclose during face-to-face health consultations. These findings indicate a
282 potential role of chatbots in facilitating clinic-patient communication, adopting this technology
283 for pre-consultation sexual health history taking, or preparing users for documenting
284 uncomfortable questions, which they might expect during live consultations with health
285 professionals. On the other hand, technological limitations, restricted interactions between
286 users and chatbots, as well as the lack of empathy were viewed negatively by some users.
287 Engagement with chatbots was often compared to human interactions and deemed inferior in
288 providing a whole and reliable sexual health advice. Therefore, the results indicate that this
289 technology could be of use for signposting, such as on information about where to test for
290 HIV/STIs. However, it may be especially unsuitable for matters that typically evoke high levels
291 of anxiety such as risk behaviours for and symptoms of HIV infection. Chatbots could aid
292 access and engagement with SRHSs, for example as a screening tool for patient needs [25],
293 rather than as a service replacement.

294 There was a wide range of perceived barriers and facilitators to chatbot engagement.
295 Some participants expressed low interest in sexual health chatbots due to their limited
296 technological development, algorithm simplicity, limited keywords, restricted sexual health
297 advice and constrained input options. There was a noticeable feeling of frustration and
298 hesitation to engage with chatbots due to the perceived underdevelopment of the technology,

299 and the limited ability to provide advice on a wide range of health topics. Consistent with this
300 finding, Vaira et al., (2018) reported that rule-based chatbots operating on a pre-established list
301 of questions and answers were associated with user dissatisfaction, related to limits in
302 expressing medical concerns. Perceived restricted capabilities to mimic human interactions
303 have also been associated with hesitancy to use chatbots in healthcare in general, demonstrating
304 widespread user comparison of chatbot abilities with those of trained health professionals.[26]
305 The limited capability for interaction, and the lack of flexibility to process a range of specific
306 personal questions, had a negative impact on engagement, with most users indicating
307 preferences for human-to-human interaction instead. Mierzwa et al., (2019) demonstrated low
308 engagement and modest acceptability of medial chatbots, due to their inability to understand
309 or display human emotion, highlighting the importance of cognitive and affective empathy in
310 sexual health consultations.[27] This is also reflected in the findings of Gao et al., (2020)
311 showing that the absence of the human care aspect and the immaturity of AI technology and
312 distrust of related companies were the main reasons users held negative attitudes about medical
313 chatbots.[28] As shown in previous research on AI, concerns over data protection and user
314 privacy emerged as a barrier for some: numerous participants suggested a low inclination to
315 interact with sexual health chatbots and to provide any private or personal information that
316 might lead to identification.[11]. Several participants perceived chatbot technology as not
317 secure enough and were concerned about any potential breach of confidentiality related to
318 sexual health records. On the other hand, the anonymity offered by chatbots was seen as an
319 important incentive for engagement, with the majority of participants expressed willingness to
320 disclose information about their sexual behaviours if there were no traces of their online
321 activity. As confidentiality is key to the successful provision of sexual health services [29-30],
322 the potential for anonymity offered by chatbots could be attractive, especially for individuals
323 experiencing barriers to accessing community-based services, including young people and

324 sexual/gender minority groups. Chatbots could potentially raise awareness of available services
325 and increase knowledge of STIs and screening services promoting self-care behaviours.
326 However, the potential limitations to the traceability of chatbot users while offering an
327 anonymous platform for sexual health advice needs further investigation. Such constraints to
328 data collection are important when evaluating the effectiveness of chatbots services if most
329 users disengage with them due to privacy concerns. Our findings indicate that anonymous
330 chatbot services are more acceptable, and may lead to higher engagement. However, due to the
331 lack of familiarity with this innovation, most users remained cautious about the technology and
332 information provided.

333 **Limitations**

334 The present study enhances the understanding of engagement with sexual health
335 chatbots as an emerging tool for health promotion and sex education. It offers novel knowledge
336 on the potential applicability as well as limitations of this technology, highlighting the need for
337 further research on chatbot effectiveness as a supplementary tool. Unlike acceptability studies
338 based on hypothetical chatbots, this study used an existing sexual health chatbot enabling
339 participants to discuss their experiences and provide a more experiential perspective. However,
340 the findings could be influenced by the particular characteristics of the PAT chatbot used for
341 demonstration, and different chatbot designs could evoke additional views. Future studies
342 should offer a range of chatbots for participants to experience a broader and more objective
343 perspective on this technology. It is also possible that participants with predetermined views
344 on digital SRHSs in general self-referred for this study, thus we may have missed the views of
345 those with lower levels of digital literacy or engagement with online services. Future studies
346 could explore if health chatbots make sexual health advice more accessible for individuals that
347 struggle to navigate through the Internet in search of reliable health information. This study
348 took place in the first months of the COVID-19 pandemic, thus an online data collection

349 method was implemented. As such, views on sexual health chatbots could be influenced by
350 using digital technology for interviews (e.g. selecting those more technologically savvy), and
351 social distancing measures which include restricted access to SRHSs. Finally, it was not within
352 the scope of this inquiry to measure the differences in views by any demographic
353 characteristics, hence there was no outline of views by age, gender, ethnicity or sexual
354 orientation. Future quantitative studies need to measure if any particular demographic groups,
355 such as ethnic minorities or those with limited access to the internet, are more hesitant to this
356 technology.

357 As face-to-face interactions are primarily the most preferred mode of communication
358 regarding sexual health, a combination of chatbot and human-led services could be the way
359 forward, facilitating access to professional advice and allowing contact with health
360 professionals when required. For example, chatbots could triage online users to corresponding
361 services or webpages containing reliable health information with an option to discuss concerns
362 with live health advisors via webchat or similar facilities. As chatbots services may be a
363 convenient and attractive tool for online sexual health advice, their effectiveness still needs to
364 be established. Future studies should examine the impact of chatbots on individual knowledge,
365 motivation and behaviours such as the uptake of STI and HIV testing. Also, it is important to
366 understand the impact of chatbots on the provision of SRHSs, their demand and accessibility
367 and future quantitative studies and trials should identify to what extent chatbots can be
368 incorporated into SRHS. This technology may support sex education at schools allowing young
369 people to ask often embarrassing questions about sex and sexuality. Service developers need
370 to acknowledge user concerns and preferences to increase engagement and utilisation of this
371 technology. As sexual health chatbots become more common, clear guidelines and regulations
372 on their use are needed to prevent potential harms and unintended effects.

373

374 **Declarations**

375 **Acknowledgements:** We thank the Positive East charity for help with the recruitment of
376 participants.

377 **Contributorship:** TN, TM, IP and VP contributed to design, data collection, data analysis,
378 interpretation of results and write up of the manuscript; IM, JB and DR contributed to data
379 interpretation and manuscript editing.

380 **Conflict of interest:** The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to
381 disclose.

382 **Funding:** No funding was received for conducting this study.

383 **Availability of data and material:** Data available upon request.

384 **Ethics approval:** The study received the approval of the University of Westminster Research
385 Governance and Ethics Committee (reference: ETH1920-0381).

386

387

References

388

1. World Health Organization. Global health sector strategy on sexually transmitted infections 2016-2021: toward ending STIs. World Health Organization; 2016.

389

390

2. Mitchell H, Allen H, Sonubi T, Kuyumdzhieva G, Harb A, Shah A. Sexually transmitted infections and screening for chlamydia in England, 2019. Official

391

392

Statistics of Public Health England: England PH. 2020.

393

3. Deblonde J, De Koker P, Hamers FF, Fontaine J, Luchters S, Temmerman M.

394

Barriers to HIV testing in Europe: a systematic review. *European journal of public health*. 2010 Aug 1;20(4):422-32.

395

396

4. McDonagh LK, Saunders JM, Cassell J, Curtis T, Bastaki H, Hartney T, Rait G.

397

Application of the COM-B model to barriers and facilitators to chlamydia testing in general practice for young people and primary care practitioners: a systematic review.

398

399

Implementation Science. 2018 Dec;13(1):1-9.

400

5. Public Health England. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on prevention,

401

testing, diagnosis and care for sexually transmitted infections, HIV and viral hepatitis in England; 2020.

402

403

6. Jacob L, Smith L, Butler L, Barnett Y, Grabovac I, McDermott D, Armstrong N,

404

Yakkundi A, Tully MA. Challenges in the practice of sexual medicine in the time of COVID-19 in the United Kingdom. *The journal of sexual medicine*. 2020 Jul

405

406

1;17(7):1229-36.

407

7. Guse K, Levine D, Martins S, Lira A, Gaarde J, Westmorland W, Gilliam M.

408

Interventions using new digital media to improve adolescent sexual health: a systematic review. *Journal of adolescent health*. 2012 Dec 1;51(6):535-43.

409

- 410 8. Bailey J, Mann S, Wayal S, Hunter R, Free C, Abraham C, Murray E. Sexual health
411 promotion for young people delivered via digital media: a scoping review. *Public*
412 *Health Research*. 2015;3(13):1-19.
- 413 9. Gabarron E, Wynn R. Use of social media for sexual health promotion: a scoping
414 review. *Global health action*. 2016 Dec 1;9(1):32193.
- 415 10. Marcus JL, Hurley LB, Krakower DS, Alexeeff S, Silverberg MJ, Volk JE. Use of
416 electronic health record data and machine learning to identify candidates for HIV pre-
417 exposure prophylaxis: a modelling study. *The lancet HIV*. 2019 Oct 1;6(10):e688-95.
- 418 11. Marcus JL, Sewell WC, Balzer LB, Krakower DS. Artificial intelligence and machine
419 learning for HIV prevention: Emerging approaches to ending the epidemic. *Current*
420 *HIV/AIDS Reports*. 2020 Jun;17(3):171-9.
- 421 12. Laranjo L, Dunn AG, Tong HL, Kocaballi AB, Chen J, Bashir R, Surian D, Gallego
422 B, Magrabi F, Lau AY, Coiera E. Conversational agents in healthcare: a systematic
423 review. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2018
424 Sep;25(9):1248-58.
- 425 13. Car LT, Dhinakaran DA, Kyaw BM, Kowatsch T, Rayhan JS, Theng YL, Atun R.
426 Conversational agents in health care: Scoping review and conceptual analysis. *Journal*
427 *of medical Internet research*. 2020 Aug 7;22(8):e17158.
- 428 14. Milne-Ives M, de Cock C, Lim E, Shehadeh MH, de Pennington N, Mole G,
429 Normando E, Meinert E. The Effectiveness of Artificial Intelligence Conversational
430 Agents in Health Care: Systematic Review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*.
431 2020;22(10):e20346.
- 432 15. Brixey J, Hoegen R, Lan W, Rusow J, Singla K, Yin X, Artstein R, Leuski A.
433 Shihbot: A facebook chatbot for sexual health information on hiv/aids. In *Proceedings*

- 434 of the 18th annual SIGdial meeting on discourse and dialogue 2017 Aug (pp. 370-
435 373).
- 436 16. Crutzen R, Peters GJ, Portugal SD, Fisser EM, Grolleman JJ. An artificially
437 intelligent chat agent that answers adolescents' questions related to sex, drugs, and
438 alcohol: an exploratory study. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2011 May 1;48(5):514-9.
- 439 17. Maeda E, Miyata A, Boivin J, Nomura K, Kumazawa Y, Shirasawa H, Saito H,
440 Terada Y. Promoting fertility awareness and preconception health using a chatbot: a
441 randomized controlled trial. *Reproductive BioMedicine Online*. 2020 Dec
442 1;41(6):1133-43.
- 443 18. Bickmore T, Zhang Z, Reichert M, Julce C, Jack B. Promotion of preconception care
444 among adolescents and young adults by conversational agent. *Journal of Adolescent
445 Health*. 2020 Aug 1;67(2):S45-51.
- 446 19. Dworkin MS, Lee S, Chakraborty A, Monahan C, Hightow-Weidman L, Garofalo R,
447 Qato DM, Liu L, Jimenez A. Acceptability, feasibility, and preliminary efficacy of a
448 theory-based relational embodied conversational agent mobile phone intervention to
449 promote HIV medication adherence in young HIV-positive African American MSM.
450 *AIDS Education and Prevention*. 2019 Feb;31(1):17-37.
- 451 20. Park H, Joonhwan L. Can a Conversational Agent Lower Sexual Violence Victims'
452 Burden of Self-Disclosure? In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on
453 Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 2020 April (pp. 1-8)
- 454 21. Kocielnik R, Agapie E, Argyle A, Hsieh DT, Yadav K, Taira B, Hsieh G. HarborBot:
455 A Chatbot for Social Needs Screening. In *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings
456 2019 (Vol. 2019, p. 552)*. American Medical Informatics Association.
- 457 22. Nadarzynski T, Bayley J, Llewellyn C, Kidsley S, Graham CA. Acceptability of
458 artificial intelligence (AI)-enabled chatbots, video consultations and live webchats as

- 459 online platforms for sexual health advice. *BMJ sexual & reproductive health*. 2020 Jul
460 1;46(3):210-7.
- 461 23. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in*
462 *psychology*. 2006 Jan 1;3(2):77-101.
- 463 24. Malterud K. Qualitative research: standards, challenges, and guidelines. *The lancet*.
464 2001 Aug 11;358(9280):483-8.
- 465 25. Espinoza J, Crown K, Kulkarni O. A guide to chatbots for COVID-19 screening at
466 pediatric health care facilities. *JMIR public health and surveillance*.
467 2020;6(2):e18808.
- 468 26. Nadarzynski T, Miles O, Cowie A, Ridge D. Acceptability of artificial intelligence
469 (AI)-led chatbot services in healthcare: A mixed-methods study. *Digital health*. 2019
470 Aug;5:2055207619871808.
- 471 27. Mierzwa S, Souidi S, Conroy T, Abusyed M, Watarai H, Allen T. On the potential,
472 feasibility, and effectiveness of chat bots in public health research going forward.
473 *Online journal of public health informatics*. 2019;11(2).
- 474 28. Gao S, He L, Chen Y, Li D, Lai K. Public perception of artificial intelligence in
475 medical care: Content analysis of social media. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*.
476 2020;22(7):e16649.
- 477 29. Garside R, Ayres R, Owen M, Pearson VA, Roizen J. Anonymity and confidentiality:
478 Rural teenagers' concerns when accessing sexual health services. *BMJ Sexual &*
479 *Reproductive Health*. 2002 Jan 1;28(1):23-6.
- 480 30. Wilson A, Williams R. Sexual health services: what do teenagers want?. *Ambulatory*
481 *Child Health*. 2000 Dec;6(4):253-60.

482

483