Background Rapid HIV testing is well established in many countries, yet few studies have evaluated the acceptability of rapid testing among clinical staff over time. We assessed staff acceptability of rapid HIV testing before and after its implementation in Australian sexual health clinics.

Methods From September 2011 onwards, men who have sex with men (MSM) attending four Sydney sexual health clinics were offered rapid HIV testing using the Alere Determine HIV Combo assay. Staff were trained in rapid HIV testing using this assay, with staff acceptability assessed via two anonymous questionnaires completed after training and at least six months later. Five-point Likert scales were used, with ‘1’ indicating strong agreement and ‘5’ strong disagreement to a range of acceptability statements. T-tests were used to assess differences in mean Likert scores between rounds, with stratification by staff profession and testing experience.

Results Of 68 trained staff, 67 completed the first questionnaire and 53 the second. Mean scores improved for confidence in conducting rapid testing (1.87 vs 1.44; p < 0.01), confidence in delivery of negative results (1.52 vs 1.25; p < 0.01) and in disagreement that rapid testing was disruptive (3.27 vs 3.58; p < 0.01). Comfort with your own role in rapid testing increased between rounds, particularly for nurses (1.71 vs 1.41; p = 0.04). In round two, doctors had a stronger preference for faster rapid tests than nurses (1.75 vs 2.50; p = 0.02) and stronger agreement that rapid testing interferes with consultations (2.63 vs 3.39; p = 0.01). Belief that patients were satisfied with rapid testing was stronger in staff who had performed >10 tests vs ≤10 tests (1.55 vs 2.07; p < 0.01). Acceptability did not vary with experience of false results.

Conclusions Acceptability of staff to rapid HIV testing for MSM increased with time and experience of rapid testing. Differences between professions may indicate variations in staff training and support needs and capacity to adapt to change.

Identifying screening venues that reach underserved women may be an important step in reducing cervical cancer. STD clinics often serve women who may not have ready access to other healthcare services. An urban US STD clinic was selected to test suitability of the STD clinic setting for cervical cancer screening.

Methods Women 30 years of age and older were recruited from clinic waiting rooms and compensated $20 for study participation. Women were offered cervical cancer screening and were asked to be available for follow up by a method of their choosing. Liquid based cytology and HPV DNA (Roche, Indianapolis, IN) testing were both performed. HPV DNA assays were performed comparing results of vaginal self-swab specimens to cervical swab results. Up to 3 attempts were made to contact patients with results using the patient-preferred contact method. Outcomes of interest included reasons for not accepting screening and proportion of results delivered to this classically hard-to-reach population.

Findings At the time of this abstract, 52 participants have completed follow up (age range 30–48, median age of 37 years; 30 African American women, 19 White, 1 Native American and 2 of multiple races). Only 2 eligible clinic patients refused study participation, 47 were available for follow up contact, and 35 reported having no regular doctor. Sixteen were high risk HPV positive and 4 of this group had an accompanying pap result of LSIL or greater.

Conclusion The findings suggest that cervical cancer screening can be successfully done in this urban STD clinic setting. Despite concerns regarding the willingness of this population to provide reliable contact information, our experience suggests that women are eager to receive cervical cancer screening results. Future studies will evaluate staff provision of follow up and navigation services in a variety of STD clinic settings.