is to be controlled in this high risk population.
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Same day testing for HIV: 1 year's experience in a district general hospital and at an alternative site

In the Department of Health's white paper, the Health of the Nation, sexual health, including HIV and AIDS, is identified as one of the key areas of health targeting. Counselling and screening for HIV forms an important part of this health service and the service should be widely available. Experience suggests, as stated in HIV/AIDS and Sexual Health,1 that where available many would prefer to attend a clinic separate from current services. In response to the executive letter from the Department of Health,1 a same day HIV counselling and testing service was developed at Bolton General Hospital, and at an alternative site in the town centre. We present the results of this service over a 12 month period.

In May 1994, a same day testing service was introduced in addition to the routine clinic testing, available 1 day a week by appointment only, both in the hospital department and also at an alternative (town centre) site. The same day service was advertised locally. All patients attending for HIV testing were given pre-and post-test counselling and sexual health advice at both sites.

Over the 12 month period, 218 patients made appointments for same day HIV antibody testing. The default rate for the same day testing service was 22.5% (n = 49). The same day holding site had a higher attendance rate than the alternative site (table). There was one positive HIV antibody result in a homosexual man who was asymptomatic. Six patients requested testing because of a possible risk of HIV infection from overseasomedical treatment. All of these opted to be tested at the clinic site, their choice perhaps reflecting concerns which they felt might be better addressed in a hospital setting. Same day testing accounted for 41.8% of the total number of HIV tests within the department.

The current arrangement for HIV antibody testing in genitourinary medicine clinics within the hospital setting has the advantage that the service is widely available and testing is performed in an anonymous and confidential manner. This testing service may have its drawbacks for certain patients who attend a genitourinary medicine clinic a daunting prospect, especially if the department is based inside a large hospital which is not readily accessible from the local town centre. Other authors have reported successful same day testing services within city centres2; however, this is the first paper to report results from a district general hospital setting together with the use of an alternative site. Our results show that a significant proportion of patients opted for the same day testing service and when given the choice of site, patients were more likely to attend the same day hospital service than the alternative site. Further work is required to ascertain reasons behind the high default rate of patients requesting same day HIV testing, as little is known about the socio-demographic traits and risk factors among this group. Future evaluation should include qualitative feedback from patients on the issues surrounding testing within the optimal testing procedure and site.
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Survival and treatment of AIDS patients 1984-1993

Hillman et al seem somewhat confused with their contribution to the debate regarding the place and value of prophylactic provision, and whether this should be through larger or smaller centres.1 Assessing survival from AIDS is not a measure of quality of service. Indeed, survival from AIDS may decrease but quality of life and overall survival from HIV infection may be improved.2 We have shown previously in a study involving a large number of patients that survival from AIDS may be influenced by the time of presentation—that is, that survival may increase if the AIDS defining illness occurs coincident with the first positive HIV antibody test.3 This does not mean, as Hillman et al assert, that we are questioning the benefit of medical intervention—quite the reverse. We propose that the development of AIDS has been delayed by medical intervention. Indeed, in their paper Hillman et al support the assertion that effective intervention may reduce survival in AIDS, by reducing the median survival time in their patients.

Furthermore, the authors suggest that in our study we both failed to acknowledge improvements in survival made before the study period from St Mary's Hospital and did not adjust for case mix in the two arms. In fact, earlier data were acknowledged and referenced and the case mix of the two arms was described in detail.

Hillman et al conclude in their paper that small numbers make it now a more informal and intimate setting for patients to be treated. This, however, is not supported by their data and is, therefore, only an unsubstantiated opinion. Others, we are sure, would argue against it.
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MATTERS ARISING

Who goes to sexually transmitted disease clinics? Results from a national population survey (Genitourin Med 1996;72:197-202)

We read with great interest Dr A M Johnson and colleagues' sexual behaviour survey of GUM clinic attenders, published in Genitourin Med. The findings of the study may now make available good population based data on the characteristics of genitourinary medicine clinic attenders, which will be applicable to many aspects of further research and service planning.

However, we wish to comment on one point made by the authors; they saw a reduction in HIV from GUM clinics being recorded on diagnostic cases rather than on individuals. It may not be widely known that, since April