

PostScript

LETTER

Prevention of sexually transmitted infections and under 18 conceptions

We would like to correct the inaccurate comments made in the commentary in *STI*.¹

The paper states that the draft guidance misses out under 25 year olds as reflected in the paper's title and in further references within the text in relation to chlamydia screening. This view is not correct—the draft and final NICE guidance identified that those who have “early onset of sexually activity” and who have “unprotected sex and frequent change of and/or multiple sexual partners are at risk”—under 25 year olds fall into these two categories. These are key risk behaviours for chlamydia infection. The guidance recommendations for vulnerable young people under 18 also relate to this group.

A second comment “the guidelines appeared to focus exclusively on consultations in which patients are seeking care for an issue related to sexual health” does not represent the guidance. The guidance actually states that risk assessment can be “during routine care and or travel immunisation.” The final NICE guidance also states that the recommendations should be implanted alongside the National Chlamydia Screening Programme.

The full NICE guidance “Prevention of sexually transmitted infections and under 18 conceptions” is available at <http://guidance.nice.org.uk/phi003>.

Catherine Law

Public Health Interventions Advisory Committee at NICE

Mike Kelly

Centre for Public Health Excellence, NICE

Correspondence to: Mike Kelly, Centre for Public Health Excellence, NICE, MidCity Place, 71 High Holborn, London WC1V 6NA, UK; mike.kelly@nice.org.uk

doi: 10.1136/sti.2007.026807

Accepted 11 June 2007

Reference

- 1 Simms I, Battison T, Macintosh M, *et al*. The National Chlamydia Screening Programme and the NICE guidance on one-to-one interventions: remember the under-25s. *Sex Transm Infect* 2007;83:171.

CORRECTION

An error occurred in the June 2007 Brief encounters. The ophthalmic examination of the right eye showed normal visual acuity but a swollen optic disc, rather than reduced visual acuity and a swollen optic disc, as was stated in Brief encounters. The article itself was correct, stating that the visual acuity in the affected eye remained unimpaired.