

Methods All individuals newly diagnosed with HIV in the Alberta Health Services- Edmonton zone were interviewed by a partner notification nurse (PNN) for sexual and needle sharing partners, and perinatal contacts under Alberta's Public Health Act. PNNs attempted to locate named contacts to ensure timely counselling, testing, and follow-up care. The number of contacts in the year preceding the diagnosis and information required to locate each contact was recorded for each case. Additional information included whether they were located, tested, and their test results; all information was entered into a Notifiable Disease Reporting database. A descriptive analysis was performed on the characteristics and outcomes of data collected between 5 April and 31 December 2010.

Results There were 50 newly diagnosed HIV cases during this time period. The majority (n=33; 66%) of the cases were male and the overall median age was 39 years (IQR 32–48). Male cases were more likely to be Caucasian (n=21; 63.6%) while female cases were more likely to be Aboriginal (n=8; 47.1%, p=0.001). The primary mode of transmission among male cases was MSM (n=18; 54.5%) and among female cases was heterosexual transmission (n=10; 58.8%). A total of 92 contacts were provided by 36 (72%) of the HIV cases, with an average of 2.6 (range 1–14) contacts per case. The majority (97.8%; n=90) of contacts were exposed through sex with an additional 5 (5.4%) contacts being exposed through needle sharing during drug use. Of the 92 named contacts, 17.4% (n=16) were found to be previously positive for HIV, 16.3% (n=15) resided outside of Edmonton, and the remaining 66.3% (n=61) were followed up by local PNNs. At the time of analysis, 75.4% (n=45) of the contacts were located and of those located, 82.6% (n=38) were tested resulting in four new cases of HIV.

Conclusions HIV partner notification efforts resulted in the majority of contacts being located and tested for HIV, with four new cases of HIV identified. Nearly one-quarter (n=20; 21.7%) of the total contacts were HIV positive, suggesting a need for ongoing prevention and risk reduction strategies for individuals living with HIV and their partners.

P5-S5.03 PARTNER NOTIFICATION AND TREATMENT FOR MATERNAL SYPHILIS IN LIMA, PERU: KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDES, AND PRACTICES OF HEALTH PROVIDERS AND PATIENTS

doi:10.1136/sextrans-2011-050108.552

¹B Williams, ²P Garcia, ²C Carcamo, ²M Chiappe Guiterrez, ²S De la Rosa Roca, ²M V Calderon, ³R Peeling. ¹Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, New York, USA; ²Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Peru; ³London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

We sought to identify factors that affect partner notification and treatment for maternal syphilis as part of an implementation research study on the feasibility of using rapid syphilis testing (RST) in reproductive health services in Lima, Peru. Congenital syphilis remains a significant problem in many regions of the world. Prevention depends on successful treatment of syphilis-positive pregnant women. Treatment of sexual partners is essential to prevent re-infection. We conducted exploratory research to identify factors that contributed to poor rates of partner treatment after month 3 of RST implementation. Quantitative data collected from 127 RST-positive pregnant women was used to identify patient factors associated with partner treatment. A subset of 18 women participated in qualitative interviews. Fifty-eight health providers completed a survey of knowledge, attitudes, and practices related to counselling and treatment of syphilis-positive women and partners. National guidelines for follow-up and treatment of syphilis were also reviewed. Providers reported lack of human resources and coordination as reasons for failure to perform follow-up of partners. 33 (56.9%) providers said they were not well prepared for

counselling and would like additional training. Providers relayed strategies they used to treat partners, and reported paying greater attention to follow-up of partners and documentation of partner treatment since RST introduction. Fear of blame, violence, and abandonment were cited as reasons why women were less likely to notify a partner, while distrust in test results, "machismo", and lack of knowledge were said to make partners less likely to seek treatment. Women interviewed who had notified partners of their diagnosis reported that notification was easier when a health provider was present. No women reported violent responses from their partners after notifying. Reasons women said that partners had not received treatment included difficulty seeking care during regular clinic hours and lack of knowledge. In bivariate analysis only marital status was found to predict whether or not partners received treatment (p=0.004) see Abstract P5-S5.03 table 1. Data collected from patients and providers showed that women were aware of the importance of partner notification, but male partners often did not seek treatment due to systemic barriers. Health systems should prioritise partner-friendly treatment strategies. National guidelines need to clearly define procedures for partner follow-up.

Abstract P5-S5.03 Table 1 RST-Positive Pregnant Women (1 February–15 November 2010) and first dose of partner treatment: logistic regression

Variable	Partner treated, n (%)	Partner not treated, n (%)	p Value	OR (95% CI)
Age (n=127)			0.245	
Health establishment (n=127)			0.56	
INMP (n=90)	46 (51.1)	44 (48.9)		1.0
Ventanilla-Callao (n=37)	21 (56.8)	16 (43.2)		1.26 (0.58 to 2.71)
Marital Status (n=127)			0.004	
Single or separated (n=22)	5 (22.7)	17 (77.3)		1.0
Married or living together (n=105)	69 (65.7)	36 (34.3)		4.9 (1.68 to 14.30)
Education (n=126)			0.81	
No education/primary school (n=22)	11 (50.0)	11 (50.0)		1.0
Secondary school /university degree (n=104)	55 (52.9)	49 (47.1)		1.12 (0.45 to 2.82)
Antenatal visit prior to syphilis diagnosis? (n=127)			0.45	
Yes (n=51)	29 (56.9)	22 (43.1)		1.0
No (n=76)	38 (50.0)	38 (50.0)		1.32 (0.65 to 2.70)
No. of antenatal visits prior to diagnosis (n=127)			0.84	1.04 (0.73 to 1.48)
No. of sexual partners ever (n=125)			0.56	0.93 (0.72 to 1.20)

P5-S5.04 PROVIDER AND CONTRACT REFERRAL FOR BACTERIAL STIS: TWO SIDES OF THE SAME COIN?

doi:10.1136/sextrans-2011-050108.553

¹J Cassell, ²C Estcourt, ²M Symonds, ³J Richens, ³G Rait, ¹S Lanza, ⁴J Dodds, ¹H Smith. ¹Brighton and Sussex Medical School, Brighton, UK; ²Queen Mary, University of London, UK; ³University College London, UK; ⁴MRC General Practice Research Framework, UK

Background During the pilot of an RCT of provider, contract and patient referral, for a 66 practice RCT of partner notification in UK primary care, it emerged that there is uncertainty about real life clinical practice. Our objectives are to describe how health advisers negotiate provider, contract and patient partner notification in clinical practice. To determine the feasibility of