

Chlamydia Screening Coverage Title X Region X FP Clinics

David Fine
Center for Health Training
Title X Region X Meeting
March 2011

Background

- “Annual screening of **all** sexually active women aged ≤ 25 years is recommended”¹
- Yet screening coverage is low
 - Nationally $\sim 50\%$ of female family planning clients age 15-24 years are tested annually²
 - Recent FPAR estimates consistently modest

¹ Source: Sexually Transmitted Diseases Treatment Guidelines 2010 CDC DSTDP

² Gunter D, Fine D, Dicker L, et al. Methods for estimating chlamydia screening coverage among women attending family planning clinics. Paper presented at: 16th Biennial meeting of the International Society for Sexually Transmitted Disease Research; 2005; Amsterdam, The Netherlands

- Regional IPPs set screening guidelines (2007)
 - Women aged <25 years
 - Selective screening of older women with risk factors

- Screening Coverage = % of clients tested annually
 - Client-level data, based on her visits within a clinic
- FPAR 2010 regional coverage: 35%
 - Coverage among those aged < 25 y: 45%

Objectives

In Region X FP clinics:

- Estimate CY2010 CT screening coverage among women aged <25 years
- Explore variation in coverage across clinics

Methods

- Used data from visits to Title X family planning clinics in Region X during CY2010
- Examined female clients age < 25 years
- Aggregated to patient-level and then to clinic summaries
- Calculated CT screening coverage for each clinic with 25 or more clients in 2010

Visit/Client Demographics

- Female **visits**, age <25 y, 2010: 223,956
- Female **users**, age <25 y, 2010: 140,277
- Average number of patient visits: 1.59
- Race/Ethnicity
 - 70% NH White
 - 21% Hispanic
 - <3%: NH Black, AI/AN, Asian, NHOPI, other

Clinic Data

- Total # of clinics: 273
- Patient volume, female clients aged < 25 y
 - Range: 1 – 6,571 users
- Study sample: clinics with >25 clients: 215
 - 79% of all clinics in Region X

Coverage: CHT and FPAR

- Coverage documented in FPAR may vary compared to coverage calculated by CHT
- Coverage differences due to:
 - When sample of user visits was generated
 - Coverage calculated at the clinic level may **not** equal coverage calculated for all users across clinics

CT Coverage—Clinic vs. Patient: A (Crude) Example

- Grantee X has 2 clinics
 - Clinic A: 10 of 100 users tested=10% coverage
 - Clinic B: 300 of 1,000 users tested=30%
 - Average clinic coverage=20.0%
- Grantee X coverage based on all users
 - $310/1,100=28.2\%$ coverage

Results

Clinic-level CT Screening Coverage, 2010
Female users age <25 y

Area	Clinics	Mean	Range
AK	6	67%	42% – 87%
ID	40	56%	24% – 77%
OR	108	33%	0% – 70%
WA	61	42%	0% – 87%
<u>Region</u>	215	41%	0% - 87%

Clinic CT Screening Coverage—Detail

Deciles of Coverage	Clinics	
	N	%
0%	17	8%
1-10%	13	6%
11-20%	2	1%
21-30%	23	11%
31-40%	38	18%
41-50%	47	22%
51-60%	32	15%
61-70%	31	14%
71-80%	8	4%
81-90%	4	2%

- Clinics with zero coverage...
 - Some CSOs (welfare offices)
 - Small health department satellite offices
 - A few school-based clinics
- Clinics with very low coverage...
 - More detailed field information needed

- Clinics with very high coverage...
 - How?
 - Models?
- Other factors
 - Program funding
 - Lab practices
 - Referrals for testing

Other Factor—Referrals

- Given some site's low coverage, we explored CVR referral information
- Women not tested for CT: were they referred elsewhere, e.g. STD program?
 - < 1% referred to STD program, 2010
 - STD referral unrelated to users having had a CT test

Key Issues

- CT screening coverage varies significantly
- Grantees have monitored and then selectively intervened with sites concerning coverage
 - Fine tune those processes?
- Given modest coverage
 - Are we screening highest risk clients?
 - Can grantees/agencies modify clinic practices?
 - Other factors—funding, partner practices (lab, STD program, etc.)

Thank You!

David Fine

Center for Health Training

(206) 447-9538

dfine@jba-cht.com