

Sexually Transmitted Infections

Editorials

Patient access to GUM clinics

The public health control of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) demands open and immediate access for individuals with symptoms or other reasons to suspect they may be infected. The paper by Foley *et al* in this issue of *STI* (p 12) suggests that almost one quarter of clinics contacted by individuals with symptoms suggestive of acute STI were not offered appointments to be seen within the next 48 hours. Yet there was virtual unanimity among consultants responsible for clinics participating in the study that there were arrangements for such patients to be seen urgently.

Moreover, a subsequent survey collaboratively organised by the Communicable Diseases Surveillance Centre, AGUM, and the MSSVD,¹ has also shown disturbing inequities in the accessibility of GUM clinic services, and suggested that such difficulties are becoming increasingly widespread throughout the United Kingdom.

The "patients" employed in the study by Foley *et al* had skills in the use of the telephone, were articulate and able to describe classic symptoms of acute STIs, and were insistent about the need to be seen urgently. It seems likely that those with lesser communication skills would have been less successful. This suggests the inequity in access is possibly increased for those with the greatest needs, such as the young, ethnic minorities, and other socially disadvantaged individuals.

GUM clinics have long attempted to counter stigma and improve both the acceptability and accessibility of their services. Their success has been demonstrated by the increasing annual new patient attendances of the past decade, the choice of a majority of HIV infected people in the United Kingdom to have their continuing care provided within GUM clinics, and the development of subspecialty interests for many chronic genitourinary conditions that are not sexually acquired. These chronic conditions often require time consuming consultations, however, the rapid consultant expansion between 1988 and 1997 has previously allowed the supply of clinician time to keep pace with increasing demand.

More recently, there appears to have been a further upsurge in demand while clinical expansion has stalled. The reasons for this increased demand are undoubtedly complex and incompletely understood. Many clinicians think that the success of HAART, and the subsequent declining incidence and mortality from AIDS, has relaxed adherence to safer sexual practices among a wide cross section of the community. Moreover, in the major cities, GUM resources have often been diverted to fund the rap-

idly escalating costs of antiretroviral treatment. Within the tight financial straitjacket imposed by trusts, the specialty has faced a growing HIV patient population and a rising tide of acute STI with static or reduced resources devoted to general GUM services.

In those clinics where Foley's patients could not access care within 48 hours, reception staff alone invariably performed triage. This is unacceptable. GUM clerical staff are often unsung heroes who provide a welcoming and supportive environment for apprehensive and frightened patients. However, they do not have the necessary clinical training to differentiate between acute and non-acute conditions and should never be expected to do so.

It is vital that the specialty reinforces its process standards. Only suitably trained, qualified clinical staff should perform triage. There should be written protocols within each clinic to provide clear guidance. Protocols should also include advice as to how patients can access appropriate health care for the treatment relief of acute symptoms when there is no immediate clinic session. This may require collaborative arrangements to be made with local accident and emergency services or other walk-in services. Adjacent clinics within a geographical locality should also consider joint arrangements to ensure that at least one GUM clinic can always provide urgent clinic access to patients within a reasonable travelling distance.

Written process standards together with collaboration and cooperation within clinical networks may help ameliorate access inequities. However, they will not address the fundamental imbalance between demands for GUM services and current resources. Concerted attempts through all of our national representative bodies must intensify and should complement local action to ensure that clinic resources are commensurate with the demands being placed upon the service. The need for urgent action will be increased by the greater involvement of primary care practitioners in sexual health screening, which will uncover more latent clinical need that is more likely to further increase GUM workload rather than to divert cases to alternative providers.

Commissioners see the maintenance of open access as a fundamental quality standard of GUM services and may see the Foley patient approach as one means to assess this. By highlighting service deficiencies at this time, Foley *et al* have stimulated the urgent need for all clinics to review patient access arrangements, challenged the specialty to

renew its longstanding commitment to maintain open access services, and provided valuable data to augment our efforts to expand consultant numbers.

G R KINGHORN

Department of Genitourinary Medicine, Royal Hallamshire Hospital,
Glossop Road, Sheffield S10 2JF, UK

Correspondence to: G.R.Kinghorn@Sheffield.ac.uk

1 Report prepared by Public Health Laboratory Service Communicable Disease Surveillance Centre, Association for Genitourinary Medicine and The Medical Society for the Study of Venereal Disease. *Survey of Patient Access to GUM Clinics in the United Kingdom*. (Submitted for publication.)

Ethnicity and STIs: more than black and white

Because of its close links to behaviour, the epidemiology of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) involves forays into social science research. One of the most vexing problems has been defining the relation between ethnicity and STI risk. Defining these associations, even when methodologically carefully performed, is problematic because of the historical context of discrimination in both the United States and Europe. However, not dealing with these issues in a forthright manner may have profound public health consequences.

Population based cross sectional studies in the United States have demonstrated increased rates of gonorrhoea, chlamydia,¹ and genital herpes² in African-Americans. The herpes studies are particularly instructive because they were based on a national sample—and the differences persist when controlled for socioeconomic status and other demographic variables. The differences are also stable over time. In the United Kingdom, studies have shown that gonorrhoea rates in Leeds,³ Birmingham,⁴ and south London⁵ and chlamydia rates in Coventry⁶ and Birmingham⁴ were substantially higher in black residents, again after controlling for socioeconomic status, and in an environment (in contrast with the United States) where there is universal access to free health care.

Commenting on the papers by Low *et al*⁵ and Lacey *et al*,³ Raj Bhopal⁷ cautioned us to be prudent in using ethnicity data because of the historical propensity to marginalise and discriminate against minorities, but reminded us not to shirk from our responsibilities in protecting public health. Ethnic classification systems invented for one purpose, such as census monitoring, may not be adequate to explain differences in health. Pfeffer developed a trenchant critique of this essentialist view of ethnicity, where culture is presented as a fixed product and all members of a defined group are assumed to share a stereotypical “true” identity and biology: “black” versus “white.” This is as problematic for the dominant group as for recognised minorities.⁸ For example, in the United Kingdom an apparently homogeneous “white” ethnic group conceals many minorities subject to discrimination and disadvantage, such as the Irish.⁹ In the United States the development of an integrated syphilis elimination programme is a model for an appropriate response. This programme is based on integrating community based organisations, religious leaders, and outreach programmes with medical providers, and creating multiple forums for the sharing of epidemiological data, community concerns, perceptions, and ideas.

With this background, we must welcome the paper by Low *et al* in this issue of *STI* (p 15), which attempts to go beyond studies on “black everybody” to the “black specific” and provide epidemiological data which highlight Bhopal and Pfeffer’s concerns. Specifically, they demon-

strate that in terms of gonorrhoea risk, black ethnicity is a complex variable. People with Caribbean ancestry have substantially higher risk than those with African ancestry—even in multivariate analyses. These are resonant themes. For example, one would argue that in terms of HIV risk, the ratios would be reversed.

Yet the issues they raise are complex and constrained by venue and history. A study by DeHovitz *et al* conducted in Brooklyn, New York, in the early 1990s¹⁰ demonstrated that African-Americans who were Caribbean immigrants (or first generation) had substantially *lower* rates of STDs, and drug using behaviour, compared with native born US African-Americans. DeHovitz’s work shows the complex interaction of ethnicity and socioeconomic status in a world of global migration spanning several centuries. For example, if Low *et al* had conducted their study in an area where the African immigrant population has been predominantly from east Africa rather than from west Africa, then lumping all people born in Africa as “black African” would have combined African born “blacks” with those of “south Asian” origin who may, or may not, have similar sexual behaviour. Moreover, you cannot classify the latter with “south Asians” of Asian origin—at least not when it comes to behaviour. A Trinidadian of Asian origin three or more generations ago may have more in common with a Trinidadian of “African” origin than an Indian in India. Finally, what has a villager from Bangladesh in common with a middle class professional from Dacca?

The diversity of results in Low *et al*’s study confirms the traditional public health approach—that we cannot look at disease in isolation from the social and cultural context of our patients’ lives. The whole issue of ethnicity is more complicated than we imagined!¹¹ Yet, having defined the problem in a number of model settings, we need to be able to expand our ability to define sociological/behavioural risk and to develop sensitive and appropriate intervention strategies. Before we can do this, however, we have to define more clearly the mechanism of the relation between social groups and STIs. In this expanded model ethnicity is one factor alongside many others determining sexual behaviour.¹²

With the possible exception of bacterial vaginosis (which actually may be a behavioural-cultural effect rather than true biological susceptibility),¹³ there is no known biological susceptibility differences between ethnic groups. Traditional scalar measures such as demographics, number of sexual partners, and socioeconomic status do not explain the difference either. Geographic residence appears to be a factor—although careful studies beyond empirical descriptive analyses have not been done.

Laumann and Youm¹ and Rothenberg *et al*,¹⁴ and Stoner *et al*¹⁵ have to date provided the most coherent explanation for these phenomena. Rothenberg *et al*, in a series of