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Contemporary research on sex work


Contemporary research on sex work is an edited collection of 11 chapters, all of which have been published in the Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, being copublished simultaneously in England and the US. The preface focuses on social and psychological aspects of sex work, and introduces the themes of the book.

Certain strategies to combat sex work are presented in the book, such as a strong focus on acknowledging sex workers' rights and human rights, and the importance of assessing the risks of sex work and thus uncovering data to support sex workers' rights. Joanna Busza's article is on how sex work is researched and what further research needs to be conducted.

The book has 11 chapters, and most of the chapters focus on the variety of sex workers' experiences, to be found by comparing some sex worker categories. Only physical contact sex work is covered. There is nothing on pornographers, dancers, storytellers or other erotic artists.

Nevertheless, several of the articles are well researched and have something to add to the field. Joanna Busza’s article is on how Vietnamese sex workers in Cambodia perceive risk. She applies up to date sociological theories and up to date sociological theories and applies them to the field. The identity of all isolates was further confirmed definitively using the anti-galactocerebroside monoclonal antibodies specific to N gonorrhoeae and by the national reference center.

There were more Pip negative strains in the Gijon STI unit (70% of 10 strains) than in the Oviedo unit (20% of 2 of 10). Eighty percent of Pip negative strains were isolated from men and at least 50% of these men have sex with other men. One of the strains isolated in a man was also found in his female partner. All of the isolates were serovar Ib, and one isolate was B4 and B4y.

Up until recently relatively only Pip-negative strains have not been widely reported, with 0.5% in 1991, but in 2001 17 strains were found in Bristol, UK. Blackmore et al. found that between 2002 and 2004 2% of the isolates were Pip negative. Alexander et al. recorded a prevalence of 4.3%, while in 2005 4 of 10 strains were Pip negative. The overall prevalence of N gonorrhoeae negative for Pip was found to be 6.9% (10 of 143) with 0.5% in 1991, but in 2001 17 strains were found in Bristol, UK.

The increased prevalence of Pip-negative strains in the Oviedo unit may indicate a selective advantage or be an artefact, but the latter is not the case in our report because we used the same methodology during the period of study. The fact that 40% of our subtypes show the same serovar could suggest that they were from the same strain; however, our study period was 4 years and the isolates were identified throughout that time, so we cannot attribute to one specific serovar outbreak.

We believe that it is preferable to use two methods of identification, and alterations to the diagnostic strategies may need to be considered.
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CORRECTIONS

DOI: 10.1136/sti.2006.019950.cor1

In the December issue of the journal there was an error in an author’s name (Truong H-H M, Kellogg T, Klauser N, Infect J. 2006;82:546–61). The correct name of the first author should be Truong HM.

DOI: 10.1136/sti.2006.017954.cor1

In the December issue of the journal there was a mistake in the last sentence on the first page of the article by Dean GL. Near-patient testing will not improve the control of sexually transmitted infections. Sex Transm Infect 2006;82:509–12. The sentence should read “What must not be forgotten is that most laboratories will only report a specimen as truly positive, if on re-testing using a different platform the second result is also positive.”
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