behaviour. In order to challenge the stigma surrounding genital herpes, further research is required.

P116 HOW COMMON IS RECTAL *CHLAMYDIA TRACHOMATIS* INFECTION IN WOMEN? A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW, 1997 TO 2015

[2]L Nastassya*. Chandra[1], Kate Folkard[1], Claire Broad, [1,2]Emma M. Harding-Esch, [1]Sarah C. Woodhall, [2,3]S. Tariq Sadiq, [1]John Saunders, [1]Kevin Dunbar. [1]*Public Health England, Colindale, London, UK*; [2]*St George's University of London, London, UK*; [3]*St George's Healthcare NHS Trust, London, UK*

10.1136/sextrans-2016-052718.170

Background *Chlamydia trachomatis* is the most commonly diagnosed STI in the UK. While men-who-have-sex-with-men are known to be at-risk of rectal chlamydia infection (ReCT), the prevalence and risk-factors in women are incompletely-understood. This may have important implications for testing and treatment approaches since azithromycin and doxycycline are considered first-line regimens for uncomplicated urogenital infections, whereas doxycycline is the preferred treatment for ReCT.
Objectives Undertake a systematic review to: 1) calculate ReCT positivity (number ReCT positive/number tested) among women in different testing settings; 2) determine the proportion of women diagnosed with ReCT with: a) concurrent urogenital infections and; b) a history of anal-intercourse.
Methods Medline, Embase, CINAHL, PsychINFO and the Cochrane Database were searched for articles published January 1997-September 2015. Studies reporting ReCT positivity in women aged ≥15 years in high-income countries were included and relevant data extracted.
Results Fifteen studies were included (14 among women attending sexual health services). Populations tested varied e.g. 4/15 studies included only women with a history of anal-intercourse. Among all studies, ReCT positivity ranged from 0.5%–77% (median 13%). Among women with ReCT, 7%–100% had a concurrent urogenital infection; 16%–100% reported anal-intercourse (where data were available; Table 1)

Abstract P116 Table 1 Key findings from studies (n = 15) reporting rectal chlamydia test positivity among women.

	Number of studies where data reported	Range (%)		Median (%)
		Minimum	Maximum	
Percentage testing positive for Rectal chlamydia (positivity)	15	0.5	77	13
Site of infection among women testing positive for chlamydia:	12			
Rectal only		0	31	7
Rectal and urogenital		7	100	68
Urogenital only		0	86	18
Percentage reporting history of anal-intercourse among women testing positive for rectal chlamydia	9	16	100	44

Conclusion ReCT infections have been found in a substantial proportion of women in the populations tested. In these studies, urogenital testing alone would have missed up to 31% of chlamydia infections. Further work to establish need, criteria and feasibility for routine ReCT testing in women is needed to ensure chlamydia infections are not missed or inadequately treated.

P117 ARE WOMEN PRESCRIBED LARC LESS LIKELY TO HAVE AN ABORTION?

[1]Natasha Ratna*, [1]Martina Furegato, [2]Paul O'Brien, [2]Alyson Elliman, [1]Kate Guthrie. [1]*Public Health England, Colindale, UK*; [2]*The Faculty of Sexual and Reproductive Health, London, UK*

10.1136/sextrans-2016-052718.171

Background/introduction Almost half of pregnancies in England were estimated to be unplanned or ambivalent, and a fifth resulted in abortions. Uptake of non-injectable long-acting reversible contraception (NI-LARC) methods is recommended to reduce the risk of unplanned pregnancies and abortions.
Aim(s)/objectives To determine if NI-LARC usage reduces the risk of abortion.
Methods Attendances at Sexual and Reproductive Health (SRH) services which provided more than 10 abortions during 1/1/2013–31/12/2014, recorded in the SRH Activity Dataset, were considered. The risk of abortion by contraceptive method (NI-LARC, other methods) used at least once or no method during the study period, was estimated using the Kaplan-Meier method. Cox Proportional Hazards Models were used to estimate hazard ratios for risk of abortion by contraceptive method used, adjusted for age, ethnicity, area-level deprivation and rural/urban residence.
Results 42,210 women used NI-LARC (26.2%), 79,380 women used other contraceptive methods (49.3%), 39,403 women had no method (24.5%); 2,339 women had an abortion (1.5%). The highest proportion of women who had an abortion was reached within first month of exposure: 0.08% of women using NI-LARC, 1.34% of those using other contraceptive methods and 2.63% of those not on contraception. The adjusted hazard ratios for risk of abortions were 17.5 (CI 13.1–23.4) times higher in women who were not on contraception and 12.6 (9.5–16.9) times higher in women using other contraceptive methods, compared to those who used NI- LARC.
Discussion/conclusion NI-LARC use is strongly associated with reduced risk of abortion in women attending SRH services because it is independent of compliance.

P118 "LARCING ABOUT" WITH INTEGRATED SERVICES: OUR GENITOURINARY MEDICINE (GUM) SERVICE USERS' VIEWS ON THE PROVISION OF SHORT & LONG ACTING REVERSIBLE CONTRACEPTION (LARC)

Rachel McIntosh*, Kerry Burnett, Elisha Peter, Sam Walsh, Kimberley Forbes, Donna Nicholas, Divya Gupta, Gillian Avery, Charlotte E Cohen, Nneka Nwokolo, Sara Day. *Chelsea and Westminster Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK*

10.1136/sextrans-2016-052718.172

Background Integrated models are promoted as the ideal way for women to receive sexual health and contraception. Commissioners advocate shifting contraceptive provision away from GUM to general practice and community settings. Given our boroughs have the lowest GP LARC prescribing rates in

England, we are concerned about compromised access to contraception and a consequent rise in unplanned pregnancy/abortion rates.
Aim To explore our service users' preferences and experiences of accessing contraception.
Methods Between January and February 2016, an anonymised questionnaire was offered to all patients requesting contraception from four integrated GUM clinics.
Results 329 patients (median age 20–30 years) returned their questionnaire. 52%, 19% and 28% of users attended short-acting contraception, sub-dermal implant or intrauterine device (IUD) appointments respectively. 83% respondents found our service easy/very easy to access. Median LARC waiting time was 1–2 weeks. 33/86 (38%) of non-LARC and 29/109 (27%) of LARC (34% IUD, 21% implant) users experienced problems obtaining contraception elsewhere with 88% citing their GP had no suitable appointment or didn't offer their chosen method. 77% (126/164) of respondents prefer to have their sexual health and contraceptive needs met together, whilst 6% prefer separate settings. Patients prefer obtaining contraception from: GUM (46%); GP(19%); community clinics(16%); private establishments/online(6%); no clear preference(13%). 34% of users would consider accessing LARC privately.
Conclusion Two fifths of patients had difficulty accessing any form of contraception outside of GUM, most appreciate a one-stop shop approach and half prefer GUM to be their contraceptive provider. This survey demonstrates the need to preserve GUM as a contraceptive provider.

P119 THEORY OF CHANGE MODEL FOR CLINIC-BASED PREP PROGRAMME EVALUATION

[1]Mags Portman*, [2]Nigel Field, [1,2]Maryam Shahmanesh, [2]Carina King, [2]Nataliya Brima, [1,2]John Saunders. [1]*Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK*; [2]*UCL Research Department of Infection and Population Health, London, UK*

10.1136/sextrans-2016-052718.173

Background A national programme to provide Truvada HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) is currently being considered in England. Some men already access PrEP and some sexual health clinics already offer PrEP monitoring.
Aim(s)/objectives We created a Theory of Change (ToC) to define the key components of a clinic-based PrEP programme to reduce HIV incidence. We identified indicators, outputs and outcomes to aid programme evaluation for a large London sexual health clinic.
Methods We used a ToC approach to define necessary pre-conditions, indicators, outputs and outcomes for our PrEP delivery programme.
Results The aim of our PrEP programme is to prevent HIV seroconversion in those at greatest risk. There are three broad areas: 1) identifying those eligible; 2) engaging eligibles to initiate PrEP and other HIV prevention activities; 3) maintaining effective adherence in those at continuing risk while advising therapy cessation for those no longer at risk. We estimate that approximately 1,200 men attending our service annually could be eligible for PrEP. Assuming a high level of uptake, these men would require 1,000 follow-up appointments annually in order to fulfil quality measures of three monthly HIV and STI testing in those on PrEP.
Discussion Using a ToC approach we have defined what a clinic-based PrEP programme might look like against our current service specification to enable us to collect meaningful evaluation data. This ToC might be used by other clinics to evaluate PrEP programmes, and allow comparison across programmes to build understanding of PrEP delivery and enhance new national PrEP surveillance systems.

P120 SELF TAKEN EXTRAGENITAL SAMPLING – WHAT DO WOMEN AND MSM THINK? FEEDBACK FROM A SELF-SWAB AND CLINICIAN SWAB TRIAL

Harriet Wallace*, Jayne Fisher, Michelle Loftus-Keeling, Rachel Harrison, Sharon Daley, Janet Wilson. *Leeds Sexual Health, Leeds Teaching Hospitals Trust, Leeds, UK*

10.1136/sextrans-2016-052718.174

Background/introduction Extragenital sampling for chlamydia and gonorrhoea is standard practice in MSM and is increasingly important in women. Some UK clinics offer self-swabbing from these sites, but little has been published about its acceptability, particularly in women. We explored this as part of a clinician versus self-swab study.
Methods Women and MSM attending a sexual health clinic were invited to take part in a 'swab yourself' study. Clinician and self-swab samples for chlamydia and gonorrhoea NAATs were taken from the rectum and pharynx. Participants then completed a questionnaire.
Results See table. Response rates were >99% in both women (958/968) and MSM (197/210). MSM were not significantly more likely to feel confident taking their own swabs (83% vs 77%, p = 0.53). Of those who agreed/strongly agreed they 'felt uncomfortable taking their own swabs', sexual naivety of the site was not a common factor (53% of women agreeing stated they had never had anal sex; 70% of men agreeing reported receptive anal sex in the preceding 3 months). Free comments included 'more confidence if had clinician samples taken before', 'concerns if self-swabbing would give accurate results' and concerns about being not able to speak to a healthcare professional with home sampling. 10 women commented specifically on discomfort but only 1/10 disagreed with the statement 'I would feel happy to take my own swabs in a non-clinic environment'.

Abstract P120 Table 1 Extra genital sampling in MSM and women

Survey responses	Women (n = 958)	MSM (n = 197)
Strongly agree/agree "I felt confident taking my own swabs"	77%	83%
Strongly agree/agree "I felt uncomfortable taking my own swabs"	25%	23%
Strongly agree/agree "I would prefer to take my own samples	40%	48%
Strongly agree/agree 'I would prefer a clinician to take my samples"	33%	35%
Strongly agree/agree "I would be happy to take my own swabs in a non-clinic environment"	64%	61%

Discussion/conclusion Extragenital self-swabbing was highly acceptable in both groups, with high levels of confidence and low reports of discomfort. This has positive implications for expanding future use.