



Newly diagnosed HIV infections: review in UK and Ireland

Ann K Sullivan, Hilary Curtis, Caroline A Sabin and Margaret A Johnson

BMJ 2005;330;1301-1302; originally published online 13 May 2005;
doi:10.1136/bmj.38398.590602.E0

Updated information and services can be found at:
<http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/330/7503/1301>

These include:

References

This article cites 4 articles, 1 of which can be accessed free at:
<http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/330/7503/1301#BIBL>

1 online articles that cite this article can be accessed at:
<http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/330/7503/1301#otherarticles>

Rapid responses

4 rapid responses have been posted to this article, which you can access for free at:
<http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/330/7503/1301#responses>

You can respond to this article at:
<http://bmj.com/cgi/eletter-submit/330/7503/1301>

Email alerting service

Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article - sign up in the box at the top right corner of the article

Topic collections

Articles on similar topics can be found in the following collections
[HIV Infection/AIDS](#) (1157 articles)

Notes

To order reprints of this article go to:
<http://www.bmjournals.com/cgi/reprintform>

To subscribe to *BMJ* go to:
<http://bmj.bmjournals.com/subscriptions/subscribe.shtml>

Newly diagnosed HIV infections: review in UK and Ireland

Ann K Sullivan, Hilary Curtis, Caroline A Sabin, Margaret A Johnson

In 2001, 59% of people in the United Kingdom with HIV who were starting treatment had CD4 lymphocyte counts of fewer than 200 cells/ μ l,¹ mostly because of late diagnosis. We investigated new HIV diagnoses in the UK and Ireland, to assess the occurrence of late diagnosis (CD4 lymphocyte count <200cells/ μ l) and associated features and to determine if patients had prior presentations that may have been related to HIV infection.

Participants, methods, and results

We did a national case review by sending structured questionnaire forms to adult HIV care providers in the United Kingdom and Ireland for patients presenting with a new diagnosis of HIV infection in January-

March 2003 (maximum of 25 per centre). We collected information on clinical and immune status and hospital admissions and symptoms or conditions in the previous 12 months that might have been HIV related.

Of 148 centres, 113 (76%) responded with data on 977 patients. Overall, 301 (33%) presented late (table), and this was more common in older patients (adjusted odds ratio per increase in age group 1.68, 95% confidence interval 1.42 to 1.98; $P=0.0001$) and in black Africans (1.66, 1.05 to 2.62, $P=0.03$), but less likely in homosexual men, independent of age and ethnicity (0.63, 0.38 to 1.05, $P=0.07$). Overall, 401 (41%) were diagnosed via routine screening; this was

This article was posted on bmj.com on 13 May 2005: <http://bmj.com/cgi/doi/10.1136/bmj.38398.590602.E0>

See also p 1303

Chelsea and Westminster Healthcare NHS Trust, London SW10 9NH
Ann K Sullivan
consultant physician

British HIV Association, London
Hilary Curtis
clinical audit coordinator

Royal Free and University College Medical School, London

Caroline A Sabin
professor of medical statistics and epidemiology

Royal Free Hampstead NHS Trust, London

Margaret A Johnson
consultant physician

Correspondence to:
A K Sullivan
Ann.Sullivan@Chelwest.nhs.uk

BMJ 2005;330:1301-2

Patients presenting with a new diagnosis of HIV infection in January-March 2003 in the United Kingdom and Ireland. Values are numbers (percentages*) unless stated otherwise

	Total	With CD4 <200 cells/ μ l at presentation	P value†
No of patients	977 (100.0)	301 (33.4)	
Sex:			
Male	540 (55.4)	147 (29.9)	0.02
Female	434 (44.6)	152 (37.4)	
Age (years):			
15-19	21 (2.2)	3 (15.0)	<0.0001
20-29	312 (32.0)	67 (22.9)	
30-39	444 (45.6)	145 (36.1)	
40-49	153 (15.7)	65 (46.1)	
50-59	32 (3.3)	14 (48.3)	
≥60	12 (1.2)	5 (41.7)	
Ethnic group:			
White	320 (33.3)	70 (23.6)	<0.0001
Black African	576 (59.9)	209 (39.3)	
Other	66 (6.9)	18 (30.5)	
Risk group:			
Heterosexual	660 (69.1)	225 (37.0)	0.0002
Homosexual	278 (29.1)	57 (22.2)	
IDU/Other	17 (1.8)	8 (47.1)	
CD4 count (cells/ μ l):			
≤50	104 (11.6)	104 (100.0)	NA
51-200	197 (21.9)	197 (100.0)	
201-350	232 (25.8)	0	
351-500	179 (19.9)	0	
>500	188 (20.9)	0	
Not known	77		
Viral load (copies/ml):			
<500	49 (5.7)	10 (21.3)	<0.0001
500-10 000	209 (24.4)	25 (12.1)	
10 000-30 000	144 (16.8)	27 (19.0)	
30 000-100 000	202 (23.6)	77 (38.3)	
≥100 000	251 (29.4)	133 (53.8)	
Not known	122		
US Centers for Disease Control stage:			
A	560 (59.1)	82 (16.1)	<0.0001
B	245 (25.8)	96 (41.9)	
C	143 (15.1)	116 (85.3)	

NA=Not applicable.

*Percentages are based on those with non-missing data (numbers with missing data for CD4 count and viral load are shown for information).

†P values are from χ^2 tests after excluding individuals with missing values.

associated with being young, female, black African, and heterosexual; 664 (68%) were diagnosed in a genitourinary, sexual health, or HIV clinic, which was associated with being young, male, and homosexual, and less commonly associated with being black African. After adjusting for demographic factors (table) in a multivariable model, diagnosis as part of a routine screen and testing at a genitourinary, sexual health, or HIV clinic were both independently associated with a lower chance of late diagnosis (testing as part of routine screen 0.40, 0.29 to 0.55, $P=0.0001$; testing at a clinic 0.60, 0.44 to 0.82, $P=0.001$).

In the year before HIV diagnosis, 168 patients (17%) had a clinical episode that was likely to be HIV related, including 58 hospital admissions (18 for tuberculosis). Data show that 35 subsequent hospital admissions may have been avoidable and that 160 patients who had experienced a clinical episode had a CD4 lymphocyte count below the threshold for initiating treatment according to British HIV Association guidelines,² indicating that treatment may have been delayed.

Comment

We found a significant number of missed opportunities for earlier diagnosis of HIV infection with a high proportion of patients (17%) who sought medical care with symptoms in the preceding 12 months but remained undiagnosed. Many patients are not being diagnosed on routine screening, which accounted for less than half of the diagnoses, most of these occurring in sexual health clinics. This study provides further evidence of late diagnosis of HIV infection, reflecting national trends reported by the Health Protection Agency (www.hpa.org.uk). There are well recognised advantages, including public health and health cost benefits in addition to personal benefit to the patient, of early diagnosis of HIV and starting appropriate treatment with highly active antiretroviral therapy.^{3,4}

To improve this situation, the proportion of people diagnosed as having HIV as part of routine screening needs to increase, with people at risk being encouraged to have an HIV test. Healthcare professionals' awareness of factors associated with late presentation of HIV infection and conditions likely to be related to HIV also need to increase. A wide range of healthcare providers are in a position to detect these HIV infections, because patients presented to a number of

What is already known on this topic

Many people with HIV in the UK are unaware of their status, possibly up to 30% of those infected

A substantial number of people are diagnosed as having HIV infection at a late stage of disease

What this study adds

Many patients are not having their HIV infection diagnosed on routine screening

Many patients present with advanced disease after initially presenting with HIV related symptoms but with their HIV infection remaining undiagnosed

different locations with a wide variety of diseases and conditions. Improving the offering and uptake of HIV testing both as part of routine screening and as indicated by associated medical conditions should reduce the number of undiagnosed HIV infections.

The British HIV Association audit subcommittee comprises Brook G, Bunting P, Curtis H, de Ruiter A, DeSilva S, Freedman A, Johnson M (chair), McDonald C, Mital D, Monteiro E, Mulcahy F, O'Mahony C, Sabin C, Sullivan A, Tang A, Tudor-Williams G, Welch J, and Wilkins E.

Contributors: The audit subcommittee had the idea and designed the study. AKS, HC, and CAS collected and analysed the data. All the authors interpreted the data and wrote the manuscript. HC is guarantor.

Funding: British HIV Association. All authors are members of the association, and HC receives remuneration from the British HIV Association for coordinating this and similar studies

Competing interests: None declared.

Ethical approval: Not needed.

- 1 Curtis H, Sabin CA, Johnson M. Findings of the first national clinical audit of treatment for people with HIV. *HIV Med* 2003;4:11-7.
- 2 Pozniak A, Gazzard B, Anderson J, Babiker A, Churchill D, Collins S, et al. British HIV Association (BHIVA) guidelines for the treatment of HIV-infected adults with antiretroviral therapy. *HIV Med* 2003;4(suppl 1):S1-41.
- 3 Palella FJ Jr, Deloria-Knoll M, Chmiel JS, Moorman AC, Wood KC, Greenberg AE, et al. Survival benefit of initiating antiretroviral therapy in HIV-infected persons in different CD4+ cell strata. *Ann Intern Med* 2003;138:620-6.
- 4 Miners AH, Sabin CA, Trueman P, Youle M, Mocroft A, Johnson M, et al. Assessing the cost-effectiveness of HAART for adults with HIV in England. *HIV Med* 2001;2:52-8.

(Accepted 15 February 2005)

doi 10.1136/bmj.38398.590602.E0

Submitting articles to the *BMJ*

We are now inviting all authors who want to submit a paper to the *BMJ* to do so via the web (<http://submit.bmj.com>).

Benchpress is a website where authors deposit their manuscripts and editors go to read them and record their decisions. Reviewers' details are also held on the system, and when asked to review a paper reviewers will be invited to access the site to see the relevant paper. The system is secure, protected by passwords, so that authors see only their own papers and reviewers see only those they are meant to.

Anyone with an internet connection and a web browser can use the system.

The system provides all our guidance and forms and allows authors to suggest reviewers for their paper. Authors get an immediate acknowledgment that their submission has been received, and they can watch the progress of their manuscript. The record of their submission, including editors' and reviewers' reports, remains on the system for future reference.

The system itself offers extensive help, and the *BMJ* Online Submission Team will help authors and reviewers if they get stuck.

Benchpress is accessed via <http://submit.bmj.com> or via a link from bmj.com