

drug use; ii) negative effects in general; iii) problems with drugs and sex. Patients were offered the opportunity to see a drug worker in the clinic, who collected more information about drugs used. Questionnaires completed between July 2014 and August 2015 were analysed.

Results 335 questionnaires were completed, but 59 excluded because of lack of patient identifiers. 170 of 276 (62%) reported recreational drug use. Of these 170, 38 (22%) reported negative effects in general, 31 (18%) reported problems with drugs and sex. However, these two groups were not identical and 14 reporting problems with sex answered “no” to the question about general problems. Excluding alcohol, 66 had drug details recorded: 16 had not reported problem use. Drugs associated with Chemsex such as GBL, Mephedrone, Ketamine and Crystal Methamphetamine were frequently identified.

Discussion/conclusions A simple questionnaire can identify problem drug use in a substantial proportion of MSM attending sexual health services. Asking specifically about problems relating to sex as well as general negative effects appears to offer a complementary approach. However, not all MSM who use “chems” will self-identify as having problem use, requiring vigilance on the part of clinicians.

P205 **MANAGEMENT OF STI OUTBREAKS. WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM EACH OTHER? A QUALITATIVE STUDY IN THE UK**

¹Hannah Loftus*, ²Kelly Mackenzie, ³Ian Simms, ^{4,3}Jackie Cassell. ¹Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield, UK; ²School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK; ³Public Health England, London, UK; ⁴Division of Primary Care and Public Health, Brighton and Sussex Medical School, Brighton, UK

10.1136/sextrans-2016-052718.253

Background/introduction When outbreaks of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) are identified, effective management in a timely manner is essential for bringing the outbreak under control. Challenges to achieving this may vary, needing different approaches.

Aim(s)/objectives To review the management of outbreaks contrasting by setting and sexual orientation in order to inform responsive guidance.

Methods We interviewed clinicians and public health professionals who had recently been involved in identifying and managing STI outbreaks in the United Kingdom. Transcripts were analysed using thematic analysis.

Results Ten outbreaks were reviewed. The combination of public health teams' wider outbreak expertise and clinic staff's knowledge of the local population was essential when developing management strategies. Partner notification, mainly by health advisers, was very achievable in smaller heterosexual outbreaks but proved challenging in MSM focussed outbreaks where use of mobile apps or anonymous sex was common. Publicity campaigns via social media platforms and third sector organisations were employed although quantifying their impact was difficult. Education of local physicians resulted in syphilis referrals to sexual health services via ophthalmology, gastroenterology, oral and maxillofacial surgery and general practice. Enhanced surveillance enabled venue identification but was time consuming for clinic staff. In gonorrhoea outbreaks, the use of dual NAAT testing as part of the chlamydia screening programme enabled case finding.

Discussion/conclusion Traditional management strategies remain important but as the use of social media increases, novel

strategies for managing outbreaks are needed. Education of other professionals is essential to maximise case finding.

P206 **'DOCTOR, I THINK I'M ALLERGIC TO PENICILLIN' - PRIMARY SYPHILIS IN THE THIRD TRIMESTER**

Adele Wolujewicz*, Christine Bates. Royal Liverpool University Hospital, Liverpool, UK

10.1136/sextrans-2016-052718.254

Case Report We present a case of primary syphilis in the third trimester of pregnancy requiring penicillin desensitisation. A 34-year old woman was contacted by provider referral as a syphilis contact. She was 30 weeks pregnant. Both HIV and syphilis serology were negative at booking. She had presented to a community clinic with a sore vulva one week before and had empirical aciclovir for possible genital herpes. In our clinic, examination showed a small, non-indurated ulcer. Dark-ground microscopy was not done. A syphilis antibody screen was requested and reported positive six days later. On recall, repeat examination showed a larger, indurated ulcer. Treatment for primary syphilis was advised before confirmatory testing. However, the patient reported a possible reaction to penicillin. This was also documented by her general practitioner but the reaction was unknown. The next day she was admitted for penicillin desensitisation and the first dose of benzathine penicillin. Urgent referral to foetal medicine was made. *Treponema pallidum* was later detected by PCR on a vulval swab. Syphilis serology was reported as RPR 1:8 and TPPA 1:80. HIV serology and HSV PCR were negative. A second dose of benzathine penicillin was administered a week later, followed by 45 minutes of observation. After delivery at term, the neonate received 10 days of benzyl penicillin.

Discussion Learning points: 1. Exclude syphilis in anyone with genital ulceration, particularly in pregnancy. 2. Consult Immunology for advice on desensitisation regimen. 3. Write a syphilis birth plan as recommended by new BASHH guidelines

P207 **CHLAMYDIA AND OUR 'BEST FRIENDS FOREVER' POLICY**

Andrew de Burgh-Thomas, Angela Arthur*. Gloucestershire Care Services, Gloucester, UK

10.1136/sextrans-2016-052718.255

Background/introduction Our chlamydia screening target was challenging.

Aim(s)/Objectives To test more under 25 year olds in our area. To assess the number of new positives from the intervention and the potential impact on our target.

Methods We implemented a policy that all <25 yo's were offered kits for their friends. We developed kits with a 'site code' BFF (Best Friend Forever) enabling laboratory tracking. We developed a local code to determine if the offer was made and accepted/declined.

Results From Dec to Feb 2016 we saw 3072 <25 yo patients. We recorded that we offered BFF kits to 32% (989). They were accepted by 28% (277) who took 415 kits (average 1.5 kits each). Of these 15% (62) were returned and the chlamydia positivity in these kits was 11.2% (7). From these 7 positives via contact tracing 5 additional positives were identified. On average there are 0.6 chlamydia positives/case identified. If we extrapolate this we expect 6 additional chlamydia positives. From our intervention 7 cases, 5 chlamydia positive partners and an