'Taking the strain' from chlamydia screening

Madam

The editorial and interesting papers about chlamydia screening in the April 2004 issue of the Journal raise many positive aspects but highlight the need for appropriate funding and staffing in order to ensure consistent and effective management of screened-positive people and their partners.1,3

I think that our 1990 paper entitled 'Chlamydia screening – should it be offered as a routine?' was the first in the UK to suggest that chlamydia screening could be carried out in family planning clinics (FPCs). Offered at the time of cervical smear in four Wirral clinics, even with the suboptimal enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) test, we found a prevalence of 9.1% in women aged under 30 years.

Our continuing work in Liverpool clinics identified the difficulty and time involved in tracing results and notified and referring people who tested positive. At that time we referred all those testing positive to the department of genitourinary medicine (GUM) and found that many did not attend or delayed attendance (range, 10–210 days after sample collection).3

These issues were further highlighted by our work in a hospital setting, where we identified that people testing positive were often not given their results, many were not treated appropriately, and rarely was information given about the risk of transmission.4 Similarly, we demonstrated the time and commitment required in a termination of pregnancy service in carrying out chlamydia testing.5 It is not enough simply to find chlamydia; timely treatment of the index patient and partner are important issues. There are settled claims already where services were not achieved this, with resultant infertility.

So, when asked by the Department of Health to set up a pilot screening programme on Wirral, involving general practice, FPCs, gynaecology, walk-in services, and so on, we devised a central office with overall responsibility, not only for administration of the programme but also for all screened-positive people. All results are sent to this chlamydia office, in addition to the test initiator, whose printed positive reports clearly state that they will be managed by the office. From these results are sent by letter to the client/patient and those testing positive are asked to contact the office to arrange treatment for themselves and partner(s). After discussion, some clients opt to attend a GUM department rather than have the test repeated in the office or by arrangement at another venue, e.g. their family planning service. Non-attenders are sent further reminders. For patients given treatment at the time, the sample was collected, e.g. if their symptoms are suggestive of pelvic inflammatory disease, the system acts as a failsafe and enables partners to be dealt with.

The office has a part-time doctor, health advisors, an administrator and clerical support. There is close collaboration with the local GUM departments and all other services. The office provides continuity and enables monitoring of standards. It is a resource for information and training.

So – yes I endorse wholeheartedly screening in FPCs for both men and women. This takes little time if done against a backdrop of publicity and well-informed clients. We can discuss risk taking, use of condoms, the availability of examination and tests for other conditions if appropriate. With TMA (one of the nucleic acid amplification tests (NAATs)) we can offer gonorrhoea testing on the same sample.

This chlamydia office model is an accessible, effective, evidence-based service that can readily be adopted in any area. Please continue testing, but in the interests of good public health and effectiveness let someone else ‘take the strain’.

Jenny Hopwood, MDFP
Director of Chlamydia Screening on Wirral, Chlamydia Office, St Catherine’s Hospital, Church Road, Birkenhead CH4 2OL, UK

References

Laboratory diagnosis of HSV

Madam

We wish to share the experience of using polymerase chain reaction (PCR) to routinely diagnose and type herpes simplex virus (HSV) in the West of Scotland.

As Chan et al.,2 report, for many the current standard diagnostic test for HSV is viral culture. This is used by the majority of the family planning and reproductive health care and genitourinary medicine clinics in the UK. However, viral culture is a slow and labour-intensive technique. Using the PCR offers a rapid and highly sensitive test with favourable cost effectiveness.2 It also allows the identification of the type of HSV involved. The use of PCR can increase the overall detection rate of HSV by 24% and yet it is currently under-utilised as a diagnostic test.

The West of Scotland Regional Virus Laboratory based at Garnavol General Hospital in Glasgow was one of the first to use the LightCycler™ (biogene) (Roche Diagnostics, Lewes, UK) technique. Its real-time PCR protocols employ the incorporation of dyes and the binding of probes during each cycle of the PCR so that the accumulation of product can be measured.

The transport medium does not require refrigeration and should not be allowed at any time to have contact with the skin (so moistening the swab with transport medium is not applicable)2 and is not applicable as suggested by Chan et al.1 for culture media.

In the West of Scotland we routinely have access to HSV typing. This allows improved patient care as the natural history of genital herpess is different for type 1 and type 2. The clinical course of HSV-1 (this has become an important cause of genital herpes) is more favourable than that of HSV-2. Those individuals with HSV-2 are more likely to have recurrences, which are more frequent and more painful than type 1. They are also likely to have a higher frequency of asymptomatic viral shedding. This aids with counselling as regards to their chances of recurrences and how likely they are to pass on the virus to partners in the future.

Cathy Johnman, MB CHB, DFFP
Cancer Grade Trainee in Family Planning and Reproductive Health Care, The Sandford Initiative, 2–6 Sandford Place, Sauchiehall Street, Glasgow G3 7NB, UK
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Chlamydia testing

Madam

May I congratulate Lesley Bacon on the thought-provoking editorial,1 which explained how we – the medical profession – can cooperate together in tackling a major public health issue such as the chlamydia epidemic.

I wish to add one further point. One of the highest prevalence rates of Chlamydia trachomatis is among women attending for termination of pregnancy (i.e. 12.7%). If untreated, C. trachomatis leads to irreversible pelvic pain and ectopic pregnancy, with an estimated cost to the National Health Service of at least £100 million in 2003.2

The Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists recommended that abortion care should encompass strategies for minimising the risk of post-abortion infective morbidity. These strategies should include prophylactic antibiotic or screening for lower genital tract organisms with treatment of positive women.3

After leaving the abortion clinic, many of the women will be difficult to contact with their results or may not want to be contacted. This led many of the abortion clinics to adopt a policy of prophylactic antibiotics.4

However, the policy of prophylactic antibiotic dose not address the problem of partners, so for those with the infection re-infection is likely; and from the public health aspect, the prevalence of C. trachomatis is not likely to be effectively reduced in the community.

The majority of these women are seen and referred by primary care, primarily general practitioners and family planning doctors. If screened for C. trachomatis at the time of referral, the results of the screening will be available at the post-abortion assessment appointment so proper antibiotic treatment and genitourinary medicine referral can be arranged at another venue, e.g. their family planning clinic.

We believe that patients who test positive should be given the pair testing option to arrange treatment for themselves and partner(s). After discussion, some clients opt to attend a GUM department rather than have the test repeated in the office or by arrangement at another venue, e.g. their family planning service.

For patients given treatment at the time, the sample was collected, e.g. if their symptoms are suggestive of pelvic inflammatory disease, the system acts as a failsafe and enables partners to be dealt with.

The office has a part-time doctor, health advisors, an administrator and clerical support. There is close collaboration with the local GUM departments and all other services. The office provides continuity and enables monitoring of standards. It is a resource for information and training.

So – yes I endorse wholeheartedly screening in FPCs for both men and women. This takes little time if done against a backdrop of publicity and well-informed clients. We can discuss risk taking, use of condoms, the availability of examination and tests for other conditions if appropriate. With TMA (one of the nucleic acid amplification tests) (NAATs) we can offer gonorrhoea testing on the same sample.

This chlamydia office model is an accessible, effective, evidence-based service that can readily be adopted in any area. Please continue testing, but in the interests of good public health and effectiveness let someone else ‘take the strain’.

Jenny Hopwood, MDFP
Director of Chlamydia Screening on Wirral, Chlamydia Office, St Catherine’s Hospital, Church Road, Birkenhead CH4 2OL, UK
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