

# Estimating the Prostitution Population in the Netherlands and Belgium: A Capture-Recapture Application to Online Data

Azam, Anahita and Hendrickx, Jef and Adriaenssens, Stef

Faculty of Economics and Business, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium, Research Centre for Mathematics, Education, Econometrics and Statistics (MEES), KU Leuven, Brussels, Belgium, Research Centre for Economics (ECON); Faculty of Economics and Business, KU Leuven, Brussels, Belgium

 $17 \ {\rm October} \ 2021$ 

Online at https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/110505/ MPRA Paper No. 110505, posted 07 Nov 2021 21:57 UTC

# Estimating the Prostitution Population in the Netherlands and Belgium: A Capture-Recapture Application to Online Data

Anahita Azam<sup>1</sup>, Jef Hendrickx<sup>2</sup>, Stef Adriaenssens<sup>3\*</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> Faculty of Economics and Business, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
- <sup>2</sup> Research Centre for Mathematics, Education, Econometrics and Statistics (MEES), KU Leuven, Brussels, Belgium
- <sup>3</sup> Research Centre for Economics (ECON); Faculty of Economics and Business, KU Leuven, Brussels, Belgium
- \* <u>stef.adriaenssens@kuleuven.be</u>

### Abstract

Evidence-based risk-prevention policies for people involved in prostitution require that reliable population estimates are built. This study proposes a methodological framework and novel data source for measuring their population in regions where the internet plays a predominant role in the industry. We derive single registration capture-recapture population estimates using the Zelterman approach. The resulting estimates for the Netherlands and Belgium are lower than previous rough estimates. We find that relative to the overall population of the two countries, the proportion of sex workers are roughly identical despite differing legal environments.

Keywords: Hidden population, Sex worker population, Population size estimation, Capture-recapture, Internet data

#### Author summary

*Anahita Azam* is an Economist at Statistics Canada. She received a Master of Economics from KU Leuven, where she conducted this research study. Her research focus is on applying quantitative methods to study the dynamics of prostitution markets in the Netherlands and Belgium. She recently was published in *European Societies* for documenting the effects on prostitution markets of the first Covid-19 induced lockdown. Before that, she received a Bachelor of Commerce from the University of Toronto's Rotman School of Management and worked in the Canadian financial sector.

#### Recent publication:

Azam, Anahita, Stef Adriaenssens and Jef Hendrickx. 2021. "How Covid-19 Affects Prostitution Markets in the Netherlands and Belgium: Dynamics and Vulnerabilities under a Lockdown." *European Societies* 23(sup1):S478-S94. doi: 10.1080/14616696.2020.1828978.

*Jef Hendrickx* is a Mathematician and Statistician. His teaching includes Statistics, Econometrics, Quantitative Methods and Research Methodology. His main research interests include the fields of informal and underground economies, and hard to reach populations and behaviour. Methodologically his core interests are in mixed and multilevel method modelling, and those (big) data and techniques that allow for the analysis of sensitive, hidden, informal, and underground activities.

#### Recent publications:

Adriaenssens, Stef, Jef Hendrickx and Johanna Holm. 2021. "Class Foundations of Sexual Prejudice toward Gay and Lesbian People." *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. doi: 10.1007/s13178-020-00525-y.

Adriaenssens, Stef and Jef Hendrickx. 2019. "Calculating Value Added of Prostitution with Multiple Data: A New Approach for Belgium." *Public Finance Review* 47(1):58-86. doi: 10.1177/1091142117734173.

Adriaenssens, Stef and Jef Hendrickx. 2019. "Bad Jobs': A Case Study of Toilet Attendants." *Employee Relations* 41(3):489-505. doi: 10.1108/ER-11-2017-0263.

*Stef Adriaenssens* is a sociologist teaching courses in *Economic Sociology* and *Policy* at the Faculty of Economics and Business (KU Leuven). His core research interests involve underground, informal, and poorly protected populations and their economic activities. More specifically, he published about topics such as tax evasion, black market work, and activities and groups that are often hardly recognized as work(ers), such as begging and prostitution.

#### Recent publications:

Adriaenssens, Stef, Tobias Theys, Dieter Verhaest and Nick Deschacht. 2021. "Subsidized Household Services and Informal Employment: The Belgian Service Voucher Policy." *Journal of Social Policy*:1-22. doi: 10.1017/S0047279421000428.

Torfs, Lore, Stef Adriaenssens, Susan Lagaert and Sara Willems. 2021. "The Unequal Effects of Austerity Measures between Income-Groups on the Access to Healthcare: A Quasi-Experimental Approach." *International Journal for Equity in Health* 20(1):79. doi: 10.1186/s12939-021-01412-7.

Theys, Tobias, Stef Adriaenssens, Dieter Verhaest, Nick Deschacht and Sandra Rousseau. 2020. "Disentangling Language from Ethnic Preferences in the Recruitment of Domestic Workers: A Discrete Choice Experiment." *Journal of Business Research* 117:144-51. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.006.

# Introduction

Although sex work and prostitution receive unusually frequent and emotional attention from the public, our understanding of the phenomena remain poorly documented. Aspects that are hotly debated regarding the life of female sex workers (FSW), is the disproportionate risk of being affected by sexually transmitted infections (Sabin et al., 2016) and mental health problems (Beattie, Smilenova, Krishnaratne, & Mazzuca, 2020), the alleged increased risk of human trafficking, exploitation and forced labour (Weitzer, 2015; Zhang & Vincent, 2017), and the parallel risk of being violently victimized (Deering et al., 2014). These and other factors are associated with FSW predominantly working underground, even where selling sex is not illegal. Concurrently, these problems increase the need for targeted interventions that aim to tackle them. For one thing, the use of risk-prevention services among FSW is rather low, while these interventions are feasible and effective (Viswasam et al., 2020).

The size and working conditions of FSW need to be documented so that public health interventions can be effectively targeted and evaluated. This information, among which are reliable estimates of the number of sex workers, is often lacking. In the sex worker population estimations that have been published in the past decades, the capture-recapture methodology is the dominant approach. The general approach is to estimate the sex worker population with at least two samples from the population, with an identification of the sampled cases. The overlap between the samples allows researchers to model the total population. One salient feature of existing high-quality population estimates in the literature is their strong concentration in low- and middle-income regions (Geibel et al., 2007; Karami, Khazaei, Poorolajal, Soltanian, & Sajadipoor, 2017; Karami, Mirzaei, Khazaei, & Bathaei, 2017; Khan, Bhuiya, & Uddin, 2004; Kimani et al., 2013; Kruse et al., 2003; Minh et al., 2004; Mutagoma et al., 2015; Paz-Bailey et al., 2011; Vuylsteke et al., 2010). To our knowledge, only one cutting-edge estimation from a high-income country has been published (McKeganey, Barnard, Leyland, Coote, & Follet, 1992). Two reports also provide very rough and intuitive capture-recapture-based estimates of sex worker populations in Oslo and New York (Brunovskis & Tyldum, 2004; Curtis, Terry, Dank, Dombrowski, & Khan, 2008). This scarcity is not surprising, as the data collection process of the classical capturerecapture design is costly and time-intensive. Precisely in developed economies, we propose a new approach that allows for a much easier data collections strategy with the help of internet data.

This contribution aims to illustrate how these internet-based estimates with an adapted capture-recapture approach are feasible and relevant, with a case study of FSW in two high-income European countries, the Netherlands and Belgium. Aside from adding to the existing knowledge and estimates, this study illustrates the potential of internet data with a single-source estimate. In contrast to the time-consuming and costly direct application of traditional capture-recapture designs, online data sources can be exceptionally practical for estimating prostitution supply. Self-evidently, this approach only works for regions where the internet plays a pivotal role in the organization of prostitution (Cunningham & Kendall, 2011). Since this internet data source results in a single list of counts based on one or more reviews per sex worker, it requires a different design. We make use of the relatively newer single-registration approach in the capture-recapture methodology. Here, the frequency of counts is utilized to estimate the frequency of zero counts. The sum of observed and zero counts provides a total population estimate.

To our knowledge, this is the first FSW estimate with internet data and a single-source capture-recapture approach. Also, this is the first capture-recapture estimation of FSW for these regions, although some estimates have been proposed, mostly based on existing surveys and reports. One publication estimates

that the population of female sex workers in 2000 represented 0.6% (Netherlands) and 0.4% (Belgium) of the adult female population (15–49 years) (Vandepitte et al., 2006); another adjusts this to be 0.3% for the Netherlands (2002) and 0.2% for Belgium (2008) (Prüss-Ustün et al., 2013). Most recently, an NGO (Fondation Scelles, 2016, 2019) assessed that 20-30,000 FSW were active in the Netherlands in 2013; for Belgium, an estimated 23,000 FSW were active in 2016, and between 15,000–20,000 in 2019. Recounted as proportions, this results in the highest estimates: 0.53-0.79% (Netherlands), and 0.66-0.91% (Belgium) of the adult female population.

#### Method

#### Data

The dataset for this study is crawled from *hookers.nl*, a market leader for prostitution reviews in the Low Countries. The website is open to the public of at least 18 years old. It is based on reviews by clients of their experience with sex workers and contains substantial standardized information related to the experiences. For Belgium and the Netherlands, no other website has this kind of reach and provides client reviews: our one-year sample of 24,246 reviews has been contributed by 5,446 distinct clients and provides reviews about 5,417 unique sex workers. Internet traffic is considerable: for our sample period of a year (February 2019-2020), the estimated average monthly traffic is 1,458,262 visits (analytics website <u>SEMRush.com</u>, February 22, 2021). Data from this website have been utilized in previous studies to calculate premiums for risky behaviour in sex work (Adriaenssens & Hendrickx, 2012), the value-added of prostitution for Belgium (Adriaenssens & Hendrickx, 2019), and the effects of the first Covid-19 lockdown (Azam, Adriaenssens, & Hendrickx, 2021). The features of *hookers.nl* offer many advantages for researchers, including the purposes of the present study.

The anonymity of reviewing customers (with a pseudonym) and the limited interference by moderators allow us to have a fairly clear view of the market. Customers posting a review are guided through standardized forms to provide information about the sex worker and outline their experience, such as the day, time, duration, and price of the visit. Next, customers can list and rate the services received, and enter any free-form comments. All reviews for a particular sex worker are centralized in a thread under her name with some identifying features. Moderators check each review and decide on the features of the sex worker based on the agreement between reviews. They also monitor and remove reviews that are posted in the incorrect discussion board, that are misinformed, or posted for slandering the sex worker. In this study, a review is defined as an entry that provides both a price and the duration of the encounter. Article 3 of the so-called 'DSM Directive' [26] allows for the mining of publicly available data to which one has lawful access, provided it is done for scientific purposes by research organizations. We took several precautions to protect the anonymity of those in the dataset. The clients contributing to the reviews are only known under a pseudonym, whereas sex workers are identifiable by their selected name. Anonymity in the dataset is ensured by entirely removing the clients' pseudonyms after recording the number of unique observations and sex workers' names are replaced by a unique random number.

As illustrated in Figure 1, the cities from which these reviews are generated are spread out across the Netherlands, with a higher density of reviews being written about encounters in The Hague and Amsterdam. In Belgium, the greatest number of reviews are located around Antwerp and the reviews are almost exclusively written in Flanders - the Dutch-speaking northern part of Belgium - and Brussels. Since French is the vehicular language in Wallonia, this region may be better covered by French websites

such as *quartier-rouge.com*. Therefore, the reviews on *hookers.nl* and any conclusions drawn from this study only apply to the northern part of Belgium.



Figure 1. Review density by cities in the Netherlands (left) and Belgium (right)

Table 1 outlines descriptive statistics of relevant variables for this study. The frequencies listed refer to the number of sex workers and the proportions are for specific covariate categories relative to the total 5,417 sex workers in the dataset. The covariates listed are constant over the period since they either refer to intrinsic characteristics of the sex worker or because they are determined based on consensus from all reviews listed for that worker. Specifically, we determine the appearance and hygiene ratings based on the agreement of all ratings provided in the reviews for a particular sex worker. If there is not an agreement between all the reviews, we assign a missing category for that covariate. Although this leads to some data loss, constant categories are necessary for data modelling. Also, since the period is only one year long, this reduces the possibility of significant variation in the clients' reviews, which is indicated by the relatively small missing categories for many covariates. To further encompass heterogeneity, the missing categories are also included in the model.

#### Table 1. Descriptive statistics of sex worker covariates

Freq.      Prop. (%)      Necellent      1,807      33.36        N      5,417      100      Nice and fresh      1,530      28.24        Age      Could better      609      1,471      27.16      606      31.31        40-50      4.89      9.03      English      1,471      27.16        50+      129      2.38      French      84      1,55        missing      51      0.94      German      66      1,22        Appearance rating      Spanish      170      31.46      1,699      31.36        Above expectations      921      17      missing (other      1,699      31.36        Body type      missing      2,931      54.11      No      3,061      56.51        Mormal      1,856      34.26      South Holland      566      10.65.51        Mising      1,739      32.1      North Holland      562      11.56        Normal      1,856      34.26      South Holland      563      10.22        Courty      Gelderland      252				Hygiene rating		
N      5.417      100      No.      5.417      100      Locenent      1.530      28.34        Age      Could be better      609      11.24        Under 25      1.471      27.16      Could be better      609      11.24        30-40      1.572      29.02      Dutch      1.696      31.31        40-50      489      9.03      English      1.704      31.42        50+      129      2.38      French      84      1.55        missing      51      0.94      German      66      1.22        Appearance rating      No      3.061      56.51      1.57        Body type      1.43      26.64      1.56      1.56        missing      2.931      54.11      No      3.061      56.51        Silim      1.739      32.1      North Holland      566      11.56        Normai      1.856      34.26      South Holland      566      11.56        Normai      1.857      Region      22.37      4.38        Country <th></th> <th>Eroa</th> <th>Prop (%)</th> <th>Excellent</th> <th>1 907</th> <th>22.26</th>		Eroa	Prop (%)	Excellent	1 907	22.26
Ar      5,417      100      Nice and mesh      1,300      Nice and mesh        Age      Could be better      609      11.24        Age      missing      1,719      31.73      Language      31.31        40-50      489      9.03      English      1,774      31.42        50+      129      2.38      French      84      1.55        missing      51      0.94      German      66      1.22        Appearance rating      Spanish      170      31.42        Above expectations      921      17      missing/other      1,699      31.36        Above expectations      921      170      31.40      Noth Holland      52	N	Г 417	100	- Nice and freeh	1,807	20.24
Age      Could be better      609      11.24        Under 25      1,457      26.30      1,719      31.73      Language      727.16        30-40      1,572      29.02      Dutch      1,696      31.31        40-50      489      9.03      English      1,704      31.42        50+      129      2.38      French      84      1.55        missing      51      0.94      German      66      1.22        Appearance rating      Spanish      17.0      31.4      Above expectations      921      17        As expected      1,208      22.3      Piercing      1.43      26.66        Missing      2,931      54.11      No      3,061      56.51        Body type	N	5,417	100	Nice and Iresh	1,530	28.24
Under 2s      1,457      26.39      missing      1,471      2.173      Language        30-40      1,572      29.02      Dutch      1,666      31.31        40-50      489      9.03      English      1,704      31.42        50+      129      2.38      French      84      1.55        Appearance rating      Sapparish      1.70      3.14      missing/other      1,699      31.36        Above expectations      921      17      missing/other      1,699      31.36        As expected      1,208      2.23      Piercing	Age			Could be better	609	11.24
25-30      1,719      31.73      Language        30-40      1,572      29.02      Dutch      1,696      31.31        40-50      489      9.03      English      1,704      31.42        50+      129      2.38      French      84      1.55        missing      51      0.94      German      66      1.22        Appearance rating      521      0.94      Spanish      1.70      3.14        Above expectations      921      1      Spanish      1.703      3.14        Above expectations      921      1      Normal      1.685      3.061      56.51        Body type	Under 25	1,457	26.9		1,471	27.16
3U-40      1,572      29,02      Dutch      1,696      31.342        40-50      129      2.38      French      84      1.55        missing      51      0.94      German      66      1.22        Appearance rating      17      Bising/other      1,699      31.36        Above expectations      921      17      Prercing      5        Disappointing      357      6.59      Yes      913      16.85        Body type      -      missing/other      1,443      26.64      11.56        Normal      1,856      34.26      South Holland      626      11.56        Normal      1,856      34.26      South Holland      626      11.56        Country      -      Gelderland      252      4.65        Netherlands      3,750      69.04      Utrecht      2.37      4.38        D      868      16.02      Flevoland      100      1.85        D      868      16.02      Flevoland      100      1.85        D	25-30	1,719	31.73	Language	1 000	24.24
40-50      489      9.03      English      1,704      3.1.4        50+      129      2.38      French      84      1.55        missing      51      0.94      German      66      1.22        Appearance rating      Spanish      170      3.14        Above expectations      921      17      missing/other      1,699      31.36        Body type      Terring      1443      26.64      4.41      55.6        More appointing      2.931      54.11      No      3.061      56.51        Body type      missing      1.473      26.64      11.56      1.56        Normal      1.856      34.26      South Holland      586      10.82        Slim      1.767      30.96      Amsterdam      252      4.67        Country      Gelderland      255      4.71      Belgium      1,677      30.96      Amsterdam      252      4.65        D      3.750      69.04      Utrecht      237      4.38        D      3.68      16.02	30-40	1,572	29.02	Dutch	1,696	31.31
SU-H      129      2.36      French      64      1.32        Appearance rating      Spanish      170      3.14        Above expectations      921      17      missing/other      1,699      31.36        As expected      1,208      22.3      Piercing      missing/other      1,699      31.36        Body type	40-50	489	9.03	English	1,704	31.42
Initisting      51      0.54      German      600      1.22        Appearance rating      Spanish      170      3.14        Above expectations      921      17      missing/other      1,699      3.13        As expected      1,208      2.23      Piercing      1      1,699      3.13        Disappointing      2,931      54.11      No      3,061      56.51        Body type      I.443      26.64      North Holland      626      10.82        Slim      1,739      32.1      North Holland      626      10.82        Slim      1,677      30.96      Amsterdam      252      4.65        Nothy      253      4.67      The Hague      447      8.25        Country      Gelderland      257      4.65      3.05      C      1,512      2.38        A      526      9.71      Overlissel      170      3.14        B      1,441      27.34      Groningen      165      3.05        C      1,532      28.28      Friesland	50+	129	2.38	French	84	1.55
Appendice failing      170      5.14        Above expectations      921      17      missing/other      1.69      3.14        Above expectations      921      17      missing/other      1.69      3.14        Disappointing      357      6.59      Yes      913      16.85        missing      2.931      54.11      No      3.061      56.51        missing      1.485      34.26      South Holland      626      11.56        Normal      1.856      34.26      South Holland      626      10.82        Silm      1.739      32.1      North Brabant      449      8.29        missing      253      4.67      The Hague      447      8.25        Country      Gelderland      255      4.71      Overijssel      170      3.14        B      1.481      27.34      Groingen      165      3.05        C      1.532      2.8.28      Friesland      129      2.38        D      868      16.02      Flevoland      100      1.85		51	0.94	German	170	1.22
Abst expected      1,208      21.3      1      1,009	Appearance rating	021	17	Spanisn missing other	1 600	3.14 21.26
Disappointing      12.06      22.3      Fielding        Disappointing      357      6.59      Yes      913      16.85        missing      2.931      54.11      No      3,061      56.51        Body type	As expected	1 200	17	Diorcing	1,099	51.50
Disploiting      2.931      54.11      No      3.61      56.53        missing      2.931      54.11      No      3.061      56.51        Body type	Disappointing	1,200	6 59	Voc	913	16 85
missing      5,001      30,001<	missing	2 931	5/ 11	No	3 061	56 51
Jobs y Pric      Tensing      1,453      1,575        Athletic      853      15.75      Region      -        Normal      1,856      34.26      South Holland      586      10.82        Slim      1,739      32.1      North Brabant      449      8.29        missing      253      4.67      The Hague      447      8.25        Country      6elderland      255      4.71      8.25      4.71        Belgium      1,677      30.96      Amsterdam      252      4.65        Netherlands      3,750      69.04      Utrecht      237      4.38        Cup size       Limburg      191      3.53        A      526      9.71      Overijssel      170      3.14        B      1,481      27.34      Groningen      165      3.05        C      1,532      28.28      Friesland      100      1.85        DD      219      4.04      Drenthe      39      0.72        Ethicity      Zeeland      35 <td< td=""><td>Body type</td><td>2,551</td><td>54.11</td><td>missing</td><td>1 //3</td><td>26.64</td></td<>	Body type	2,551	54.11	missing	1 //3	26.64
Nucleu      0.03      13.23      North Holland      626      11.56        Normal      1,856      34.26      South Holland      586      10.82        Slim      1,739      32.1      North Brabant      449      8.29        missing      253      4.67      The Hague      447      8.25        Country	Athletic	853	15 75	Region	1,445	20.04
Normal      1,856      34.26      South Holland      586      10.82        Slim      1,739      32.1      North Brabant      449      8.29        Country      Gelderland      253      4.67      The Hague      447      8.25        Country      Gelderland      253      4.67      Amsterdam      252      4.57        Belgium      1,677      30.96      Amsterdam      252      4.67        Cup size      Limburg      191      3.53      4.38        Cup size      Limburg      191      3.53        D      868      16.02      Flevoland      100      1.85        DD      219      4.04      Drenthe      39      0.72      2.38        Ethnicity      Zeeland      35      0.65      missing/other      543      10.02      Antwerp      664      12.26        Ethnicity      East and West Flanders      2.77      5.11      Asian      399      7.37      Brabant and Brussels      207      3.82        East European      1,492      27.54	Chubby / fat	716	13.22	North Holland	626	11.56
Slim      1,739      32.1      North Brabant      449      8.29        missing      253      4.67      The Hague      447      8.25        Country      Gelderland      255      4.71        Belgium      1,677      30.96      Amsterdam      252      4.65        Netherlands      3,750      69.04      Utrecht      237      4.38        Cup size      Limburg      191      3.53      A      526      9.71      Overijssel      170      3.14        B      1,481      27.34      Groningen      165      3.05        C      1,532      28.28      Friesland      129      2.38        D      868      16.02      Flevoland      100      1.85        DD      219      4.04      Drenthe      39      0.72        E+      248      4.58      Zeeland      35      0.65        missing/other      543      1.02      Antwerp      664      12.26        Ethnicity      Friesland Wallonia      224      4.14      <	Normal	1.856	34.26	South Holland	586	10.82
missing      253      4.67      The Hague      447      8.25        Country      Gelderland      255      4.71        Belgium      1,677      30.96      Amsterdam      252      4.65        Netherlands      3,750      69.04      Utrecht      237      4.38        Cup size      Limburg      191      3.53      A      526      9.71      Overijssel      170      3.14        B      1,481      27.34      Groningen      165      3.05      C      1,532      28.28      Friesland      129      2.38        D      868      16.02      Flevoland      100      1.85      0.72      E+      248      4.58      Zeeland      35      0.65        missing/other      543      10.02      Antwerp      664      12.26        Ethnicity      Arica and Arabic      245      4.52      Limburg and Wallonia      224      4.14        Asian      399      7.37      Brabant and Brussels      96      1.77        South American      974      17.98	Slim	1,739	32.1	North Brabant	449	8.29
Country Belgium      1.677      30.96      Amsterdam      255      4.71        Belgium      1,677      30.96      Amsterdam      252      4.65        Netherlands      3,750      69.04      Utrecht      237      4.38        Cup size      Limburg      191      3.53      4.38        A      526      9.71      Overijssel      170      3.14        B      1,481      27.34      Groningen      165      3.05        C      1,532      28.28      Friesland      129      2.38        D      868      16.02      Flevoland      100      1.85        DD      219      4.04      Drenthe      39      0.72        E+      248      4.58      Zeeland      35      0.65        missing/other      543      10.02      Antwerp      664      12.26        Ethnicity       Segment      121      2.23      135        South American      974      17.98      missing/other      147      2.71        Sed	missina	253	4.67	The Hague	447	8.25
Belgium      1,677      30.96      Amsterdam      252      4.65        Netherlands      3,750      69.04      Utrecht      237      4.38        Cup size      -      1      Utrecht      237      4.38        A      526      9.71      Overijssel      170      3.14        B      1,481      27.34      Groningen      165      3.05        C      1,532      28.28      Friesland      129      2.38        D      868      16.02      Flevoland      100      1.85        DD      219      4.04      Drenthe      39      0.72        E+      248      4.58      Zeeland      35      0.65        missing/other      543      10.02      Antwerp      664      12.26        Ethnicity      East and West Flanders      277      5.11      African and Arabic      245      4.52        South American      974      17.98      Brussels      207      3.82        Female      5,080      93.78      Erotic massage salons	Country			Gelderland	255	4.71
Netherlands      3,750      69.04      Utrecht      237      4.38        Cup size      1      1      3.53      A      526      9.71      Overijssel      170      3.14        B      1,481      27.34      Groningen      165      3.05        C      1,532      28.28      Friesland      129      2.38        D      868      16.02      Flevoland      100      1.85        DD      219      4.04      Drenthe      39      0.72        E+      248      4.58      Zeeland      35      0.65        missing/other      543      10.02      Antwerp      664      12.26        Ethnicity      East and Wallonia      224      4.14        Asian      399      7.37      Brabant and Brussels      207      3.82        East European      1,717      31.7      Ghent and Ostend      121      2.23        South European      1,492      27.54      Segment      1.47      2.71        missing/other      297      5.48	Belgium	1.677	30.96	Amsterdam	252	4.65
Cup size      Limburg      191      3.53        A      526      9.71      Overijssel      170      3.14        B      1,481      27.34      Groningen      165      3.05        C      1,532      28.8      Friesland      129      2.38        D      868      16.02      Flevoland      100      1.85        DD      219      4.04      Drenthe      39      0.72        E+      248      4.58      Zeeland      35      0.65        Eisting/other      543      10.02      Antwerp      664      12.26        East and Vest Flanders      277      5.11      African and Arabic      245      4.52      Limburg and Wallonia      224      4.14        Asian      399      7.37      Brabant and Brussels      207      3.82        South American      974      17.98      Brussels      96      1.77        South European      1,492      27.54      Segment      Private reception and escorts      1,931      35.65        Gender      1	Netherlands	3,750	69.04	Utrecht	237	4.38
A      526      9.71      Overijssel      170      3.14        B      1,481      27.34      Groningen      165      3.05        C      1,532      28.28      Friesland      129      2.38        D      868      16.02      Flevoland      100      1.85        DD      219      4.04      Drenthe      39      0.72        E+      248      4.58      Zeeland      35      0.65        missing/other      543      10.02      Antwerp      664      12.26        Ethnicity      East and West Flanders      277      5.11        African and Arabic      245      4.52      Limburg and Wallonia      224      4.14        Asian      399      7.37      Brabant and Brussels      207      3.82        East European      1,717      31.7      Ghent and Ostend      121      2.23        South American      974      1.78      Brussels      96      1.77        South European      1,492      27.54      Segment      931      35.65 <td>Cup size</td> <td>-,</td> <td></td> <td>Limburg</td> <td>191</td> <td>3.53</td>	Cup size	-,		Limburg	191	3.53
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	A	526	9.71	Overijssel	170	3.14
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	В	1,481	27.34	Groningen	165	3.05
D      868      16.02      Flevoland      100      1.85        DD      219      4.04      Drenthe      39      0.72        E+      248      4.58      Zeeland      35      0.65        missing/other      543      10.02      Antwerp      664      12.26        Ethnicity      East and West Flanders      277      5.11        African and Arabic      245      4.52      Limburg and Wallonia      224      4.14        Asian      399      7.37      Brabant and Brussels      207      3.82        East European      1,717      31.7      Ghent and Ostend      121      2.23        South American      974      17.98      Brussels      96      1.77        South European      1,492      27.54      Segment      147      2.71        West European      1,492      27.54      Segment      1.461      26.97        Transgender      301      5.56      Clubs and private houses      1,909      2.922        missing      36      0.66      Specialties	С	1,532	28.28	Friesland	129	2.38
DD      219      4.04      Drenthe      39      0.72        E+      248      4.58      Zeeland      35      0.65        missing/other      543      10.02      Antwerp      664      12.26        Ethnicity      East and West Flanders      277      5.11        African and Arabic      245      4.52      Limburg and Wallonia      224      4.14        Asian      399      7.37      Brabant and Brussels      207      3.82        East European      1,717      31.7      Ghent and Ostend      121      2.23        South American      974      17.98      Brussels      96      1.77        South European      297      5.48      missing/other      147      2.71        West European      1,492      27.54      Segment      -      1.931      35.65        Gender      297      5.48      Private reception and escorts      1,931      35.65        Female      5,080      93.78      Erotic massage salons      532      9.82        missing      36      0.66	D	868	16.02	Flevoland	100	1.85
E+      248      4.58      Zeeland      35      0.65        missing/other      543      10.02      Antwerp      664      12.26        Ethnicity      East and West Flanders      277      5.11        African and Arabic      245      4.52      Limburg and Wallonia      224      4.14        Asian      399      7.37      Brabant and Brussels      207      3.82        East European      1,717      31.7      Ghent and Ostend      121      2.23        South American      974      17.98      Brussels      96      1.77        South European      297      5.48      missing/other      147      2.71        West European      1,492      27.54      Segment        96      1.77        South European      1,492      27.54      Segment        96      2.012        Female      5,080      93.78      Erotic massage salons      532      9.82        missing      36      0.66      Specialties      403      7.44        Hair	DD	219	4.04	Drenthe	39	0.72
missing/other54310.02Antwerp66412.26EthnicityEast and West Flanders2775.11African and Arabic2454.52Limburg and Wallonia2244.14Asian3997.37Brabant and Brussels2073.82East European1,71731.7Ghent and Ostend1212.23South American97417.98Brussels961.77South European2975.48missing/other1472.71West European1,49227.54Segment1.46126.97Transgender3015.56Clubs and private houses1,09135.65GenderWindows1,46126.977.48Female5,08093.78Erotic massage salons5329.82missing360.66Specialties4037.44Hair colourSiliconeSilicone17.2617.26Blond1,49227.54No3,65367.44Brown1,03419.09missing93517.26Dark Blonde2544.69Smoker71.831.40 - 1.651,53628.36missing2,26841.871.65 - 1.752,88853.31Tattoo1.76832.641.75 - 1.8058110.73Yes2,04337.711.75 - 1.8058110.73Yes2,04337.711.75 - 1.8058110.73Yes2,04	E+	248	4.58	Zeeland	35	0.65
Ethnicity      East and West Flanders      277      5.11        African and Arabic      245      4.52      Limburg and Wallonia      224      4.14        Asian      399      7.37      Brabant and Brussels      207      3.82        East European      1,717      31.7      Ghent and Ostend      121      2.23        South American      974      17.98      Brussels      96      1.77        South European      1,492      27.54      Segment      147      2.71        West European      1,492      27.54      Segment      1.931      35.65        Gender      297      5.48      Private reception and escorts      1,931      35.65        Gender      Windows      1,461      26.97        Transgender      301      5.56      Clubs and private houses      1,090      20.12        Female      5,080      93.78      Erotic massage salons      532      9.82        missing      36      0.66      Specialties      403      7.44        Hair colour      Silicone      Segment      1	missing/other	543	10.02	Antwerp	664	12.26
African and Arabic2454.52Limburg and Wallonia2244.14Asian3997.37Brabant and Brussels2073.82East European1,71731.7Ghent and Ostend1212.23South American97417.98Brussels961.77South European2975.48 <i>missing/other</i> 1472.71West European1,49227.54Segment1472.71West European1,49227.54Segment1,46126.97Transgender2015.56Clubs and private reception and escorts1,93135.65GenderWindows1,46126.9720.129.82missing360.66Specialties4037.44Hair colourSilicone3015.561.5382915.3Blond1,49227.54No3,65367.44Brown1,03419.09 <i>missing</i> 93517.26Blond1,49227.54No3,65367.44Brown1,03419.09 <i>missing</i> 93517.26Blond1,49227.54No3,65367.44Brown1,03419.09 <i>missing</i> 93517.26Mark Blonde2544.69Smoker16.316.3HeightNo2,22641.831.40 - 1.651,53628.36 <i>missing</i> 2,26841.871.65 - 1.752,88853.31Tattoo <t< td=""><td>Ethnicity</td><td></td><td></td><td>East and West Flanders</td><td>277</td><td>5.11</td></t<>	Ethnicity			East and West Flanders	277	5.11
Asian      399      7.37      Brabant and Brussels      207      3.82        East European      1,717      31.7      Ghent and Ostend      121      2.23        South American      974      17.98      Brussels      96      1.77        South European      297      5.48      missing/other      147      2.71        West European      1,492      27.54      Segment      147      2.71        West European      1,492      27.54      Segment      1,461      26.97        Transgender      301      5.56      Clubs and private houses      1,090      20.12        Female      5,080      93.78      Erotic massage salons      532      9.82        missing      36      0.66      Specialties      403      7.44        Hair colour      Silicone      Silicone      Silicone      Silicone      15.3        Blond      1,492      27.54      No      3,653      67.44        Brown      1,034      19.09      missing      935      17.26        Dark Blonde      2	African and Arabic	245	4.52	Limburg and Wallonia	224	4.14
East European1,71731.7Ghent and Ostend1212.23South American97417.98Brussels961.77South European2975.48 <i>missing/other</i> 1472.71West European1,49227.54Segment <i>missing/other</i> 2975.48Private reception and escorts1,93135.65GenderWindows1,46126.97Transgender3015.56Clubs and private houses1,09020.12Female5,08093.78Erotic massage salons5329.82 <i>missing</i> 360.66Specialties4037.44Hair colourSiliconeSilicone17.26Black2,16840.02Yes82915.315.36Blond1,49227.54No3,65367.44Brown1,03419.09 <i>missing</i> 93517.26Dark Blonde2544.69Smoker16.3HeightNo2,22641.8316.31.40 - 1.651,53628.36 <i>missing</i> 2,26841.871.65 - 1.752,88853.31Tattoo17.7632.641.75 - 1.8058110.73Yes2,04337.71 <i>missing/other</i> 4127.61No1,76832.64 <i>missing/other</i> 4127.61No1,76832.64	Asian	399	7.37	Brabant and Brussels	207	3.82
South American97417.98Brussels961.77South European2975.48 $missing/other$ 1472.71West European1,49227.54Segment1.93135.65Gender2975.48Private reception and escorts1,93135.65Gender3015.56Clubs and private houses1,09020.12Female5,08093.78Erotic massage salons5329.82missing360.66Specialties4037.44Hair colourSilicone11.49227.54No3,65367.44Black2,16840.02Yes82915.315.3Blond1,49227.54No3,65367.44Brown1,03419.09 <i>missing</i> 93517.26Dark Blonde2544.69Smoker16.316.3HeightNo2,22641.8316.31.40 - 1.651,53628.36 <i>missing</i> 2,26841.871.65 - 1.752,88853.31Tattoo37.71 <i>missing/other</i> 4127.61No1,76832.64	East European	1,717	31.7	Ghent and Ostend	121	2.23
South European      297      5.48      missing/other      147      2.71        West European      1,492      27.54      Segment	South American	974	17.98	Brussels	96	1.77
West European missing/other      1,492      27.54      Segment        Gender      297      5.48      Private reception and escorts      1,931      35.65        Gender      301      5.56      Clubs and private houses      1,090      20.12        Female      5,080      93.78      Erotic massage salons      532      9.82        missing      36      0.66      Specialties      403      7.44        Hair colour      Silicone      Silicone      532      9.53      67.44        Blond      1,492      27.54      No      3,653      67.44        Brown      1,034      19.09      missing      935      17.26        Dark Blonde      254      4.69      Smoker      883      16.3        Height      No      2,226      41.83      16.3        1.40 - 1.65      1,536      28.36      missing      2,268      41.87        1.65 - 1.75      2,888      53.31      Tattoo      1,768      32.64        1.75 - 1.80      581      10.73      Yes      2,043	South European	297	5.48	missing/other	147	2.71
missing/other      297      5.48      Private reception and escorts      1,931      35.65        Gender      Windows      1,461      26.97        Transgender      301      5.56      Clubs and private houses      1,090      20.12        Female      5,080      93.78      Erotic massage salons      532      9.82        missing      36      0.66      Specialties      403      7.44        Hair colour      Silicone      silicone      silicone      state      1,633      67.44        Blond      1,492      27.54      No      3,653      67.44        Brown      1,034      19.09      missing      935      17.26        Dark Blonde      254      4.69      Smoker      state      1.63      16.3        Height      No      2,226      41.83      16.3      16.3      16.3        1.40 - 1.65      1,536      28.36      missing      2,268      41.87        1.65 - 1.75      2,888      53.31      Tattoo      2,043      37.71        1.75 - 1.80	West European	1,492	27.54	Segment		
Gender      Windows      1,461      26.97        Transgender      301      5.56      Clubs and private houses      1,090      20.12        Female      5,080      93.78      Erotic massage salons      532      9.82        missing      36      0.66      Specialties      403      7.44        Hair colour      Silicone      829      15.3        Block      2,168      40.02      Yes      829      15.3        Blond      1,492      27.54      No      3,653      67.44        Brown      1,034      19.09      missing      935      17.26        Dark Blonde      254      4.69      Smoker        16.3      16.3        Height      No      2,226      41.83       16.3	missing/other	297	5.48	Private reception and escorts	1,931	35.65
Transgender      301      5.56      Clubs and private houses      1,090      20.12        Female      5,080      93.78      Erotic massage salons      532      9.82        missing      36      0.66      Specialties      403      7.44        Hair colour      Silicone      829      15.3        Black      2,168      40.02      Yes      829      15.3        Blond      1,492      27.54      No      3,653      67.44        Brown      1,034      19.09      missing      935      17.26        Dark Blonde      254      4.69      Smoker      7      7        missing      469      8.66      Yes      883      16.3        Height      No      2,226      41.83      1.40 - 1.65      1,536      28.36      missing      2,268      41.87        1.65 - 1.75      2,888      53.31      Tattoo      7.11      37.71      37.71        missing/other      412      7.61      No      1,768      32.64	Gender			Windows	1,461	26.97
Female      5,080      93.78      Erotic massage salons      532      9.82        missing      36      0.66      Specialties      403      7.44        Hair colour      Silicone      829      15.3        Black      2,168      40.02      Yes      829      15.3        Blond      1,492      27.54      No      3,653      67.44        Brown      1,034      19.09      missing      935      17.26        Dark Blonde      254      4.69      Smoker      7      7      7        missing      469      8.66      Yes      883      16.3        Height      No      2,226      41.83        1.40 - 1.65      1,536      28.36      missing      2,268      41.87        1.65 - 1.75      2,888      53.31      Tattoo      7      7        1.75 - 1.80      581      10.73      Yes      2,043      37.71        missing/other      412      7.61      No      1,768      32.64	Transgender	301	5.56	Clubs and private houses	1,090	20.12
missing      36      0.66      Specialties      403      7.44        Hair colour      Silicone      Silicone      5 <t< td=""><td>Female</td><td>5,080</td><td>93.78</td><td>Erotic massage salons</td><td>532</td><td>9.82</td></t<>	Female	5,080	93.78	Erotic massage salons	532	9.82
Hair colour      Silicone        Black      2,168      40.02      Yes      829      15.3        Blond      1,492      27.54      No      3,653      67.44        Brown      1,034      19.09      missing      935      17.26        Dark Blonde      254      4.69      Smoker          16.3      16.5      16.5      16.5      16.5      16.5 <t< td=""><td>missing</td><td>36</td><td>0.66</td><td>Specialties</td><td>403</td><td>7.44</td></t<>	missing	36	0.66	Specialties	403	7.44
Black      2,168      40.02      Yes      829      15.3        Blond      1,492      27.54      No      3,653      67.44        Brown      1,034      19.09      missing      935      17.26        Dark Blonde      254      4.69      Smoker           missing      469      8.66      Yes      883      16.3        Height      No      2,226      41.83        1.40 - 1.65      1,536      28.36      missing      2,268      41.87        1.65 - 1.75      2,888      53.31      Tattoo          1.75 - 1.80      581      10.73      Yes      2,043      37.71        missing/other      412      7.61      No      1,768      32.64	Hair colour			Silicone		
Biona      1,492      27.54      No      3,653      67.44        Brown      1,034      19.09      missing      935      17.26        Dark Blonde      254      4.69      Smoker           missing      469      8.66      Yes      883      16.3        Height      No      2,226      41.83        1.40 - 1.65      1,536      28.36      missing      2,268      41.87        1.65 - 1.75      2,888      53.31      Tattoo        37.71        1.75 - 1.80      581      10.73      Yes      2,043      37.71        missing/other      412      7.61      No      1,768      32.64	Black	2,168	40.02	Yes	829	15.3
Brown      1,034      19.09      missing      935      17.26        Dark Blonde      254      4.69      Smoker           17.26        Dark Blonde      254      4.69      Smoker            16.3	Blond	1,492	27.54	No	3,653	67.44
Dark Bionde      254      4.69      Smoker        missing      469      8.66      Yes      883      16.3        Height      No      2,226      41.83        1.40 - 1.65      1,536      28.36      missing      2,268      41.87        1.65 - 1.75      2,888      53.31      Tattoo      71        1.75 - 1.80      581      10.73      Yes      2,043      37.71        missing/other      412      7.61      No      1,666      29.65	Brown	1,034	19.09	missing	935	17.26
missing      469      8.66      Yes      883      16.3        Height      No      2,226      41.83        1.40 - 1.65      1,536      28.36      missing      2,268      41.87        1.65 - 1.75      2,888      53.31      Tattoo      74100      7412      7.61      No      1,768      32.64        missing/other      412      7.61      No      1,606      29.65	Dark Blonde	254	4.69	Smoker	002	10.0
Height      No      2,226      41.83        1.40 - 1.65      1,536      28.36      missing      2,268      41.87        1.65 - 1.75      2,888      53.31      Tattoo      7      7      7      881      10.73      Yes      2,043      37.71        missing/other      412      7.61      No      1,768      32.64	missing	469	8.66	Yes	2 2 2 2 2	10.3
1.40 - 1.05    1,530    28.30    missing    2,268    41.87      1.65 - 1.75    2,888    53.31    Tattoo    37.71      1.75 - 1.80    581    10.73    Yes    2,043    37.71      missing/other    412    7.61    No    1,768    32.64	Height	1 536	20.20	NO	2,226	41.83
1.05 - 1.75    2,888    53.31    Tattoo      1.75 - 1.80    581    10.73    Yes    2,043    37.71      missing/other    412    7.61    No    1,768    32.64      missing    1606    29.65	1.40 - 1.65	1,530	28.30	Tattaa	2,268	41.8/
<u>missing/other</u> 412 7.61 No 1,768 32.64	1.05 - 1./5	2,888 501	53.31		2042	27 71
NO	1.13 - 1.80 missing/other	79T 712	10.73 7 61	res No	2,043	37.71
	inissing/Utilei	412	7.01	missing	1 606	20 65

In terms of the segments, the specialities group encompasses various sub-segments. It includes categories such as BDSM, gangbangs, streetwalkers, and transgender workers that are classified as a separate category. Some of these categories such as streetwalkers and transgender workers are

represented in other segments too. Similarly, it is necessary to attribute a few other covariate groups to the other category due to the minimal observations for these categories. These include red and grey hair colours and those that are very tall. Note that our sample includes both sex workers that identify as women, and as transgender women. This is supported by the clear distinction in the market between men having sex with women and men having sex with men (Gallárraga & Sosa-Rubí, 2016).

There are of course various niches in the commercial sex industry, some of which are not represented at all, while others may be underrepresented on *hookers.nl*. However, the setup of the website and its dominant role in the market attracts numerous clients and interactions. This implies that it provides data of sufficient quantity and quality to be representative of the mainstream heterosexual prostitution markets in the Low Countries.

### Model specification

The single registration approach in capture-recapture methodology was developed partially to address hidden human populations that are only visible during their involvement with some administrative or criminal justice body. A single list of all sex workers on the website alongside the number of times they are reviewed by a client provides the frequency of observed counts of these events. This frequency can then be modelled to estimate the frequency of zero counts. The sum of observed sex workers and zero-counts provides an estimate for the total population of interest.

Applications of the single-registration capture-recapture approach often assume each individual count to be a realization of the same zero-truncated Poisson distribution. However, significant heterogeneity exists among real human populations reflected in an unequal probability of being observed in the sample. To model this heterogeneity, a common approach is to include characteristics (covariates) that allow for differentiation between subpopulations. The main assumption for a Poisson model with covariate adjustment is that all existing heterogeneity is observed and modelled by an individual's observed covariates. This is reflected by the Poisson parameter ( $\lambda$ ) becoming a linear function of the covariates. However, for human populations, it is difficult to justify that all heterogeneity is observed and subsequently modelled. Thus, there is often some level of overdispersion present in the model. Overdispersion results in a downward bias in the population estimate derived from the truncated Poisson regression. Despite this bias, the Poisson approach is useful if treated as a lower bound test for the population estimate (van der Heijden, Cruyff, & Van Houwelingen, 2003). Thus, we employ the Poisson approach to test for the downward bias as described in the Annex.

Alternatively, our main model is based on the Zelterman approach (Böhning, van der Heijden, & Bunge, 2018), which uses only the ones and twos from the zero-truncated count distribution to minimize unobserved heterogeneity bias without completely relying on the covariates. The intuition is that if the Poisson parameter is not impacted by the changes in counts above two, then the core assumption only needs to be satisfied for counts one and two and there is less potential for bias overall. Moreover, the zero-counts – unobserved individuals –that we want to estimate are more similar to those rarely observed relative to those observed many times, justifying placing greater weight on the former (Zelterman, 1988). The inclusion of covariates in this model via a logistic link function further limits potential bias resulting in a more reliable population estimate.

The starting point for modelling the population with the truncated Poisson distribution is finding the probability of not being observed for each individual:  $p_0 = exp(-\lambda_i)$ ,  $i = 1, ..., N_{obs}$ , where  $\lambda_i$  is the Poisson parameter for individual *i*. The probability of being present in the sample is then:  $p_i = 1 - p_0 = 1 - exp(-\lambda_i)$ . Since our Poisson parameter is a linear function of an individual's observed covariates, it is modelled as follows in equation (1) by a Poisson regression model:

$$\lambda_i = exp(\beta \mathbf{x}_i), (1)$$

where  $\beta$  is a vector of covariate effects and  $x_i$  is a vector of covariates that are categorically defined for all categories listed in Table 1.

As the Zelterman estimator only utilizes the first and second counts, an estimation for the parameter  $\lambda$  is  $2\frac{f_2}{f_1}$  where  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are the observed frequencies for counts one and two. Since we know  $p_0 = exp(-\lambda)$  from the Poisson distribution, the estimated probability of not being observed in the Zelterman case is:  $p_0 = exp\left(-2\frac{f_2}{f_1}\right)$ . The previous formulas hold if there is no heterogeneity. To incorporate heterogeneity in the cases with counts one and two (with probability  $1 - p_i$  and  $p_i$  respectively), we use the logistic regression to model this binary probability as  $p_i = \frac{exp(\beta x_i)}{(1 + exp(\beta x_i))}$ .

The parameter  $\lambda_i$  is subsequently estimated as outlined in equation (2) with  $p_i$  as a function of  $\beta x_i$ :  $\hat{\lambda}_i = 2 \frac{\hat{p}_i (\beta x_i)}{(1 - \hat{p}_i (\beta x_i))} = 2 \exp(\beta x_i). \quad (2)$ 

Then, using the Horvitz-Thompson estimator, the population estimates are derived as follows for the Zelterman model in equation (3) (Böhning & van der Heijden, 2009):

$$\widehat{N}_{Z} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{l_{i}}{1 - \exp\left(-2\exp\left(\widehat{\beta} \mathbf{x}_{i}\right)\right)}, \quad (3)$$

where  $I_i = 1$  if the individual is present in the sample and  $I_i = 0$  otherwise. The  $\hat{\beta}$  refers to the estimated coefficient of the logistic regression. The corresponding variance for the Zelterman point estimate and the base code from which we derive our models are provided by Böhning and Van der Heijden (2009).

Finally, we utilize another method to further reduce bias: divide the population into homogenous subgroups, separately estimate the population in these subgroups and combine them to get the overall population estimate. This procedure also results in a greater overall estimate, which is likely closer to the true population parameter (Sekar & Deming, 2004). A sufficiently large sample size within each covariate category is necessary for convergence in the segmented approach, which is only available to us between the two *country* distinctions - the Netherlands and Belgium. Thus, we use the two country covariates to test whether the sum of the segmented estimates is greater than the aggregated estimate, and if so, use the segmented analysis to further reduce the downward bias due to unobserved heterogeneity.

## Results

This study employs the Zelterman approach with covariate adjustment to derive a range of population estimates provided in Table 2. The *null* model does not incorporate any covariates. The next section in the table lists the estimates yielded from various single covariate models to test the impact each covariate has on the population estimate. Then, a *full* model which incorporates all covariates is listed, followed by a segmented estimation by country. Comparisons between the models are done via a range of test statistics: log-likelihood (LL), Akaike information criterion (AIC), and log-likelihood ratio chi-squared (LR<sup>2</sup>) for overall significance. We finally present the population estimates ( $\hat{N}$  and CI).

Models	LL	AIC	df	$LR^2$	Ñ	CI	
Null	-1694	3390	1	0	7652	(7323-7982)	
Single covariate							
Piercing	-1694	3394	3	0.03	7651	(7321-7981)	
Gender	-1694	3393	3	0.34	7650	(7320-7980)	
Appearance	-1693	3395	4	1.05	7651	(7321-7980)	
Hair colour	-1693	3397	5	0.9	7657	(7326-7989)	
Cup size	-1693	3401	7	0.97	7662	(7330-7994)	
Country	-1693	3390	2	1.62	7671	(7337-8005)	
Silicone	-1693	3392	3	1.89	7658	(7327-7989)	
Smoker	-1693	3391	3	2.22	7658	(7327-7989)	
Tattoo	-1693	3391	3	2.68	7660	(7329-7991)	
Age	-1692	3395	6	4.24	7669	(7336-8001)	
Body Type	-1690	3390	5	7.41	7661	(7329-7991)	
Height	-1689	3386	4	10.08**	7676	(7342-8010)	
Language	-1689	3389	6	10.38*	7686	(7349-8023)	
Segment	-1689	3388	5	10.08**	7683	(7346-8021)	
Ethnicity	-1688	3390	7	11.55*	7686	(7349-8023)	
Hygiene	-1683	3373	4	22.37***	7711	(7368-8054)	
Region	-1679	3401	21	29.18*	7771	(7406-8135)	
Full	-1637	3423	75	114**	8098	(7654-8541)	
Netherlands	-1166	2464	66	98.72**	5499	(5156-5841)	
Belgium †	-443	989	50	69.83**	3046	(2496-3596)	

Table 2. Prostitution population estimates from the Zelterman approach

\* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05,\*\*\* p < 0.01

† Covariates appearance, gender, silicone, tattoo were excluded due to non-significance.

The best model fit and the highest population estimates are derived from the full model with all covariates included, which is in line with the expectations from Van Der Heijden et al (2003). Moreover,

the covariates with a higher number of categories tend to have the greatest impact on the population estimate.

The segmented analysis by country was expected to account for some bias and result in a higher population estimate when the segmented estimates are summed, relative to the aggregate models (Sekar & Deming, 2004). This is indeed reflected in the results. Thus, we select the sum of the full models for each country to derive a population estimate of 8,545 for mainstream prostitution markets in the Netherlands and the northern half of Belgium.

# Discussion

In discussions about prostitution policy, the lack of reliable knowledge often precludes evidence-based policies. This problem lies partially in the difficulty of acquiring reliable and valid data about this hidden population. This study proposes a new estimate of sex workers in mainstream prostitution in the Netherlands and Belgium, based on a novel online data source and cutting-edge capture-recapture techniques that fit the single-list data source. To do so, we first inventory existing population estimates for these regions and conduct a thorough analysis of appropriate methodologies available for the task.

We adopt a cost- and time-efficient adaptation of the capture-recapture methodology using a logistic regression as per the Zelterman approach to estimate the population supply. For the Netherlands and the northern part of Belgium (Brussels and Flanders, that is), we find that an estimated 8,545 sex workers were active in mainstream prostitution markets between February 2019-2020. When broken down by country, an estimate of the supply in the Netherlands is 5,499, and 3,046 for Brussels and Flanders.

This study makes an important methodological contribution. We test the role of covariates in determining population size by introducing observed heterogeneity into the model. Covariates with a greater number of categories tend to reduce overdispersion in traditional Poisson models, but in the Zelterman case, weaker covariates with few observations per group could increase variance and lower the predictive power of the model without providing any useful insights about the population. Thus, a careful analysis should be conducted to identify which relevant covariates can best model heterogeneity in the population.

The estimate we derived is approximately 0.15% for the Netherlands and 0.18% for the northern part of Belgium of the adult female population  $(15-49 \text{ years old})^1$ . This is interesting from a policy perspective as, despite the differences in the legal approaches taken by the two national governments, the estimated size of mainstream prostitution markets is approximately the same. In comparison with the previously discussed estimates from various sources -0.3% to 0.8% of the adult female population for The Netherlands and 0.2% to 0.9% for Belgium (Fondation Scelles, 2016, 2019; Prüss-Ustün et al., 2013; Vandepitte et al., 2006) - our estimates are considerably lower.

There may be several reasons why previous estimates are much higher. First, we should repeat who we aim to measure. We only attempt to cover explicit commercial physical sexual services covered under the definition of prostitution. Some phenomena that are in a grey area between personal sexual practices

1

Sources are <u>https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/en/dataset/37325eng/table?ts=1610654980930</u> for the Netherlands and <u>https://bestat.statbel.fgov.be/bestat/crosstable.xhtml?datasource=65ee413b-3859-4c6f-a847-09b631766fa7 for Belgium.</u>

and selling physical sex such as compensated dating, for instance in so-called 'sugar daddy' relationships, are not included in the estimation. Second, our estimates only capture the visible segments and types of prostitution markets (such as private reception, escorts, window, clubs, massage salons, or streetwalkers). This mostly excludes strictly illegal (for example underage or trafficked) and niche markets. Also, we argue that the estimation only covers those people that explicitly work as commercial sex workers. These hidden segments may partially make up for the gap between our estimates and the previous ones.

Thirdly, there are undoubtedly clients that do not write reviews after their encounters. This absence may in theory lead to an underestimation, but that is unlikely as it requires that non-reviewed encounters cover a prostitution market that is entirely absent in our sample, which is also unlikely. Fourthly and most importantly, given the lack of consistent methodological soundness in the cited estimates, it is likely that that the latter are exaggerated. This complaint has been formulated before, particularly about the NGO-provided estimates (Adair & Nezhyvenko, 2016; Cusick, Kinnell, Brooks-Gordon, & Campbell, 2009). That being said, a combination of these factors may lead to a moderate downward bias in our estimates. Concurrently it seems likely that the existing estimates are upward biased.

In conclusion, the methodological analysis of this study provides motivation for utilizing the cost- and time-efficient procedures outlined above to obtain measures of hidden populations for a pragmatic and empirical approach to policy debates that have far-reaching implications.

# Declarations

## Funding

The authors received no specific funding for this work.

#### Conflicts of interest

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare for this study.

#### Ethical approval

As the study was based on existing internet data, the appropriate ethics committee of the university formally acknowledged that no ethics approval is required for the research.

#### Data availability

The data will be published on the DANS website (<u>https://dans.knaw.nl</u>). The files have been anonymized so that it is impossible to identify the persons included in the dataset. The provided dataset allows for a full replication of the estimations as per instructions in the author's note.

## References

- Adair, Philippe, & Nezhyvenko, Oksana. (2016). Sex work vs. sexual exploitation in the European Union: What are the likely guesstimates for prostitution? Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 6th International Academic Conference, OECD, Paris, September.
- Adriaenssens, Stef, & Hendrickx, Jef. (2012). Sex, price and preferences: accounting for unsafe sexual practices in prostitution markets. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 34*(5), 665–680. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9566.2011.01400.x
- Adriaenssens, Stef, & Hendrickx, Jef. (2019). Calculating value added of prostitution with multiple data: A new approach for Belgium. *Public Finance Review*, *47*(1), 58-86. doi:10.1177/1091142117734173
- Azam, Anahita, Adriaenssens, Stef, & Hendrickx, Jef. (2021). How Covid-19 affects prostitution markets in the Netherlands and Belgium: dynamics and vulnerabilities under a lockdown. *European Societies, 23*(sup1), S478-S494. doi:10.1080/14616696.2020.1828978
- Beattie, Tara S., Smilenova, Boryana, Krishnaratne, Shari, & Mazzuca, April. (2020). Mental health problems among female sex workers in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS medicine*, *17*(9), 1. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003297
- Böhning, Dankmar, & van der Heijden, Peter G. M. (2009). A covariate adjustment for zero-truncated approaches to estimating the size of hidden and elusive populations. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, *3*(2), 595-610.
- Böhning, Dankmar, van der Heijden, Peter G.M., & Bunge, John. (2018). Basic concepts of capturerecapture. In Dankmar Böhning, Peter G.M. van der Heijden, & John Bunge (Eds.), *Capturerecapture methods for the social and medical sciences* (pp. 1-17). Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- Brunovskis, Anette, & Tyldum, Guri. (2004). *Crossing borders: an empirical study of transnational prostiution and trafficking in human beings* (Vol. 426). Oslo: Fafo.
- Cunningham, Scott, & Kendall, Todd D. (2011). Prostitution 2.0: The changing face of sex work. *Journal of Urban Economics, 69*, 273-287. doi:10.1016/j.jue.2010.12.001
- Curtis, Ric, Terry, Karen, Dank, Meredith, Dombrowski, Kirk , & Khan, Bilal. (2008). *Commercial sexual* exploitation of children in New York City. Volume one: The CSEC population in New York City: size, characteristics, and needs. Retrieved from New York:
- Cusick, Linda, Kinnell, Hilary, Brooks-Gordon, Belinda, & Campbell, Rosie. (2009). Wild guesses and conflated meanings? Estimating the size of the sex worker population in Britain. *Critical Social Policy*, *29*(4), 703-719. doi:10.1177/0261018309341906

- Deering, Kathleen N., Amin, Avni, Shoveller, Jean, Nesbitt, Ariel, Garcia-Moreno, Claudia, Duff, Putu, . . . Shannon, Kate. (2014). A systematic review of the correlates of violence against sex workers. *American journal of public health, 104*(5), e42-e54. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2014.301909
- Fondation Scelles. (2016). *Prostitutions: Exploitations, persécutions, répressions. 4e rapport mondial.* Paris: Economica.
- Fondation Scelles. (2019). *5e rapport mondial: système prostitutionnel. Nouveaux défis, nouvelles réponses*. Paris: Fondation Scelles.
- Gallárraga, Omar, & Sosa-Rubí, Sandra G. (2016). Male sex workers: HIV risk and behavioural economics. In Scott Cunningham & Manisha Shah (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Economics of Prostitution* (pp. 282-307). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Geibel, Scott, van der Elst, Elisabeth M., King'ola, Nzioki, Luchters, Stanley, Davies, Alun, Getambu, Esther M., . . . Sanders, Eduard. (2007). 'Are you on the market?': a capture–recapture enumeration of men who sell sex to men in and around Mombasa, Kenya. *AIDS (London, England), 21*(10), 1349–1354. doi:10.1097/QAD.0b013e328017f843
- Karami, Manoochehr, Khazaei, Salman, Poorolajal, Jalal, Soltanian, Alireza, & Sajadipoor, Mansour. (2017). Estimating the population size of female sex worker population in Tehran, Iran: Application of direct capture–recapture method. *AIDS and behavior*, *21*(8), 2394-2400. doi:10.1007/s10461-017-1803-9
- Karami, Manoochehr, Mirzaei, Mohammad, Khazaei, Salman, & Bathaei, Seyyed Jalal. (2017). Estimating the population of female sex workers in Hamadan, Western Iran, 2014. International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction, 6(4), 4-8. doi:10.5812/ijhrba.63195
- Khan, Sharful Islam, Bhuiya, Abbas, & Uddin, A. S. (2004). Application of the capture-recapture method for estimating number of mobile male sex workers in a port city of Bangladesh. *Journal of health, population, and nutrition, 22*(1), 19-26.
- Kimani, Joshua, McKinnon, Lyle R., Wachihi, Charles, Kusimba, Judith, Gakii, Gloria, Birir, Sarah, . . . Gelmon, Lawrence. (2013). Enumeration of sex workers in the Central Business District of Nairobi, Kenya. *PLOS ONE*, 8(1), e54354. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054354
- Kruse, Natalie, Behets, Frieda M. T. F., Vaovola, Georgine, Burkhardt, Gillian, Barivelo, Texina, Amida, X., & Dallabetta, Gina. (2003). Participatory mapping of sex trade and enumeration of sex workers using capture-recapture methodology in Diego-Suarez, Madagascar. Sexually Transmitted Diseases, 30(8), 664-670.
- McKeganey, Neil, Barnard, Marina, Leyland, Alastair, Coote, Isobel, & Follet, Edward. (1992). Female streetworking prostitution and HIV infection in Glasgow. *British Medical Journal, 305*(6857), 801. doi:10.1136/bmj.305.6857.801
- Minh, Truong Tan, Nhan, Do Thi, West, Gary R., Durant, Tonji M., Jenkins, Richard A., Huong, Pham Thi, & Valdiserri, Ronald O. (2004). Sex workers in Vietnam: how many, how risky? *AIDS Education and Prevention*, *16*(5), 389-404.
- Mutagoma, Mwumvaneza, Kayitesi, Catherine, Gwiza, Aimé, Ruton, Hinda, Koleros, Andrew, Gupta, Neil, . . . Nsanzimana, Sabin. (2015). Estimation of the size of the female sex worker

population in Rwanda using three different methods. *International Journal of STD & AIDS, 26*(11), 810-814. doi:10.1177/0956462414555931

- Paz-Bailey, G., Jacobson, J. O., Guardado, M. E., Hernandez, F. M., Nieto, A. I., Estrada, M., & Creswell, J. (2011). How many men who have sex with men and female sex workers live in El Salvador? Using respondent-driven sampling and capture-recapture to estimate population sizes. Sexually transmitted infections, 87(4), 279-282. doi:10.1136/sti.2010.045633
- Prüss-Ustün, Annette, Wolf, Jennyfer, Driscoll, Tim, Degenhardt, Louisa, Neira, Maria, & Calleja, Jesus Maria Garcia. (2013). HIV due to female sex work: regional and global estimates. *PLOS ONE*, 8(5), e63476. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0063476
- Sabin, Keith, Zhao, Jinkou, Garcia Calleja, Jesus Maria, Sheng, Yaou, Arias Garcia, Sonia, Reinisch, Annette, & Komatsu, Ryuichi. (2016). Availability and quality of size estimations of female sex workers, men who have sex with men, people who inject drugs and transgender women in low- and middle-income countries. *PLOS ONE*, *11*(5), e0155150. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0155150
- Sekar, C. Chandra, & Deming, W. Edwards. (2004). On a method of estimating birth and death rates and the extent of registration (excerpt). *The American Statistician, 58*(1), 13-15. doi:10.1198/0003130042935
- van der Heijden, Peter G.M., Bustami, Rami, Cruyff, Maarten JLF, Engbersen, Godfried, & van Houwelingen, Hans C. (2003). Point and interval estimation of the population size using the truncated Poisson regression model. *Statistical Modelling*, *3*(4), 305-322. doi:10.1191/1471082X03st057oa
- van der Heijden, Peter G.M., Cruyff, Maarten, & Van Houwelingen, Hans C. (2003). Estimating the size of a criminal population from police records using the truncated Poisson regression model. *Statistica Neerlandica*, *57*(3), 289-304. doi:10.1111/1467-9574.00232
- Vandepitte, J., Lyerla, R., Dallabetta, G., Crabbé, F., Alary, M., & Buvé, A. (2006). Estimates of the number of female sex workers in different regions of the world. *Sexually transmitted infections, 82*, iii18-iii25. doi:10.1136/sti.2006.020081
- Viswasam, Nikita, Lyons, Carrie E., MacAllister, Jack, Millett, Greg, Sherwood, Jennifer, Rao, Amrita, . .
  Group, on behalf of the Global H. I. V. Research. (2020). The uptake of population size estimation studies for key populations in guiding HIV responses on the African continent.
  *PLOS ONE*, *15*(2), e0228634. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0228634
- Vuylsteke, Bea, Vandenhoudt, Hilde, Langat, Lilian, Semde, Gisèle, Menten, Joris, Odongo, Fredrick, . .
  Laga, Marie. (2010). Capture–recapture for estimating the size of the female sex worker population in three cities in Côte d'Ivoire and in Kisumu, western Kenya. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*, *15*(12), 1537-1543. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3156.2010.02654.x
- Weitzer, Ronald. (2015). Human trafficking and contemporary slavery. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(1), 223-242. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112506
- Zelterman, Daniel. (1988). Robust estimation in truncated discrete distributions with application to capture-recapture experiments. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference, 18*(2), 225-237. doi:10.1016/0378-3758(88)90007-9

Zhang, Sheldon X., & Vincent, Kyle. (2017). Strategies to estimate global prevalence of trafficking for sexual exploitation. *CHANCE*, *30*(3), 13-20. doi:10.1080/09332480.2017.1383107

# ANNEX. Truncated Poisson model with covariate adjustment

The main limitation of the Poisson model with covariate adjustment is the assumption that all existing heterogeneity is observed and modelled by the observed covariates. As this is difficult to justify for human populations, there is often overdispersion present in the model resulting in an underestimation of the population size. We test the truncated Poisson model on our dataset to note this overdispersion and subsequently test if the Zelterman model can correct for some unobserved heterogeneity.

Using the Horvitz-Thompson estimator, the population estimates are derived as follows for the truncated Poisson in equation (A1)

$$\widehat{N}_{P} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{l_{i}}{1 - exp\left(-exp\left(\widehat{\beta} \ge_{i}\right)\right)},$$
(A1)

where  $I_i = 1$  if the individual is present in the sample and  $I_i = 0$  otherwise. The  $\hat{\beta}$  refers to the estimated coefficient of the Poisson. The corresponding variance for the truncated Poisson point estimate is defined by Van der Heijden et al (2003).

The resulting Poisson estimates are documented in Table A2. In addition to the test statistics derived for the Zelterman models, a Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test statistic for overdispersion is derived for each Poisson model.

The Poisson approach yields a total population estimate of 5,599 for the Netherlands and the northern part of Belgium. For the Netherlands, the population estimate is 3,873, whereas it is 1,726 for Brussels and Flanders.

Covariates with a greater number of categories tend to reduce overdispersion in the truncated Poisson model, have a better model fit, and provide a larger population point estimate. For the Poisson case, it is thus advisable to include all available covariates as this provides an estimate with the lowest level of overdispersion. Similar to the Zelterman model, the segmented analysis by country also accounts for some bias and provides a higher estimate when the segmented models are summed relative to the aggregate models.

It is important to note the striking difference between the Poisson and Zelterman point estimates. Insights for this difference can be derived from the LM test statistics, indicating a clear presence of overdispersion in the truncated Poisson model. As discussed, this violation of a core assumption for the model implies that the Poisson point estimate can only be interpreted as a lower bound for the population. Subsequently, other models that better account for unobserved heterogeneity, such as the Zelterman approach, should be utilized for an accurate picture of the population (van der Heijden, Bustami, et al., 2003).

Models	LL	AIC	df	LR <sup>2</sup>	$X_{LM}^2$	Ñ	CI
Null	-19206	38416	1	3.36	83315***	5483	(5466-5499)
Single covariate							
Tattoo	-19204	38413	3	9.43**	83264***	5483	(5467-5499)
Country	-19197	38398	2	23.15***	83147*	5483	(5466-5499)
Piercing	-19189	38384	3	38.83***	83010***	5484	(5467-5500)
Silicone	-19189	38384	3	39.18**	83010***	5484	(5467-5500)
Gender	-19171	38349	3	74.36***	82566***	5484	(5467-5500)
Age	-19157	38327	6	102***	82419***	5485	(5469-5502)
Smoker	-19156	38319	3	104***	82447*	5486	(5487-5502)
Height	-19137	38282	4	143***	82056***	5486	(5469-5503)
Cup size	-19132	38277	7	154***	82019***	5487	(5470-5504)
Appearance	-19131	38271	4	154***	82073***	5488	(5470-5505)
Segment	-19103	38216	5	212***	81620***	5490	(5472-5507)
Language	-19101	38215	6	214***	81647***	5491	(5473-5508)
Hair colour	-19097	38203	5	223***	81393***	5489	(5471-5506)
Ethnicity	-19052	38118	7	313***	80615***	5491	(5474-5509)
Hygiene	-19011	38031	4	394***	80208***	5497	(5478-5515)
Body type	-18953	37917	5	510***	78943***	5497	(5479-5515)
Region	-18652	37347	21	1112***	73889***	5517	(5496-5538)
Full	-17771	35691	75	2876***	58880***	5588	(5559-5618)
Netherlands	-12134	24400	66	2158***	41407***	3873	(3846-3899)
Belgium	-5506	11130	59	959***	15565*	1726	(1710-1742)

Table A1. Prostitution population estimates from the Poisson approach

\* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01