Hypercube sampling, with rejection sampling to fix a decision status. Many such genital ulcers that develop from a mechanism related to circumcision are traumatic in origin. These bacteria have cytotoxic properties that may be epithelial disruptions that are traumatic in origin. The bacterium that causes M. genitalium is known to cause symptoms both in men and women; duration of untreated infection; and incidence of PID, infertility and ectopic pregnancy attributable to M. genitalium.

**Methods** We defined GUD of unknown aetiology as negative for HSV type 1 and type 2, T. pallidum, and H. ducreyi by PCR, and negative for HSV-2 and T. pallidum by serology. In 59 GUD specimens from 59 men, 23 (39%) had unknown aetiology. We identified bacterial microbiota in all 59 specimens using multitag pyrosequencing of the 16S rRNA gene, and compared results by unknown vs STI aetiology. Statistical analysis employed exact methods.

**Results** Overall, 83 distinct genera were detected. Prevotella spp. was most abundant, accounting for 18% of microbiota on average, and present in 75% of specimens. Bacterial diversity was greater in GUD of unknown aetiology than STI associated GUD (median number of genera 13 [range 7–20] vs 11 [range 3–20], P = 0.06). Fusobacterium spp., Sneathia spp. and Anaerococcus spp. were more abundant in GUD of unknown aetiology (7.7%, 7.6%, and 5.4%, respectively) than in GUD of STI aetiology (4.6%, 5.0%, and 5.4%). Fusobacteriales (Fusobacterium spp. or Sneathia spp.) [OR = 4.7, 95% CI 1.3 to 19.9] and Anaerococcus spp. [OR = 4.6, 95% CI 1.2 to 22.5] were more likely to be recovered in GUD of unknown aetiology than STI associated GUD. Fusobacteriales were more often recovered from uncircumcised men than circumcised men (62% vs 22%, P = 0.04), and Anaerococcus spp. was present in 22% of circumcised vs 70% of uncircumcised men (P = 0.010). Reported penile coital injuries were more common among men with Anaerococcus spp. (85% vs 57%, P = 0.01), and condom use was less common (50% vs 71%, P = 0.11). There was no difference in these bacteria by ulcer location.

**Conclusions** Fusobacteriales and Anaerococcus spp. may colonise genital ulcers that develop from a mechanism related to circumcision status. Many such “ulcers” may be epithelial disruptions that are traumatic in origin. These bacteria have cytotoxic properties that may ulcerate or exacerbate pre-existing mild epithelial disruptions. MMC may reduce GUD through a reduction in these anaerobic bacteria.

**Background** The WHO estimates that 170 million people worldwide are infected with Hepatitis C. In the context of HIV co-infection, rapid point-of-care tests gain importance in both the developing and developed countries. Moreover, in the light of the Food and Drug Administration’s approval of the Oraquick point-of-care test for Hepatitis C, for use in the USA, the accuracy of these tests is relevant.

**Objective** We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature examining the sensitivity and specificity of all rapid point-of-care tests used to diagnose incident or prevalent Hepatitis C, with an attention to involvement of industry in reporting of results.

**Methods** Two reviewers conducted independent searches of five databases between the years of 1995 and 2010. Bayesian meta-analysis was conducted accounting for the use of imperfect reference standards (sensitivity and specificity ranges of 90%–100%) were assumed in the assessment of index tests. The quality of all included full-text studies was assessed using the QUADAS and STARD checklists, with a focus on reporting of conflict of interest with industry.

**Results** A total of seven studies were identified from the database searches, of which five were conducted in developing settings. Eight index tests were examined including OraQuick, HCV Tri-Dot, HCV Bidot, Thera Ricerca, SM-HCV, Oncheck, Goldspot and Accurate. Sensitivity of all index tests ranged from 45% to 100%, while specificity ranged from 93% to 100%. OraQuick reportedly had the highest accuracy, with sensitivity ranging from 99% to 100% and a specificity of 100%. However, the authors of the study reported a financial relationship with Orasure Technologies Inc., the makers of OraQuick. Although pooled sensitivity of all tests was high at
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