

STD Tests Are Changing With New Technology

BY MELINDA TANZOLA
Contributing Writer

ATLANTA — Many tests now are available for screening and diagnosing sexually transmitted diseases. However, screening without a clear indication may do more harm than good, Dr. Michael Policar said at a conference on contraceptive technology sponsored by Contemporary Forums.

"We're clearly overscreening women older than age 26 for chlamydia," he explained, as data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention suggest that fewer than 2% of sexually active women in this age group are infected with chlamydia.

On the other hand, Dr. Policar recommended routine screening for chlamydia in women through age 25. The prevalence of chlamydia among sexually active teenagers is 5%-10%, and most of these patients are asymptomatic.

Clinicians now have multiple choices for screening STDs. Several molecular-based tests are now available for chlamydia and gonorrhea.

Annual screening could lead to a 56% reduction in pelvic inflammatory disease in teenagers, according to a study done in Seattle (N. Engl. J. Med. 1996; 334:1362-6).

Screening for cervical gonorrhea is appropriate in settings

where the prevalence is at least 1%, particularly in urban settings. Routine testing in lower-prevalence areas can lead to a low positive predictive value, resulting in a larger proportion of false positives.

Patients who have had a high-risk sexual exposure should be screened for gonorrhea, chlamydia, syphilis, HIV, and, possibly, herpes simplex virus-2, said Dr. Policar, of the University of California, San Francisco.

Clinicians now have multiple choices for screening sexually transmitted diseases. Dr. Policar said that multiple pathogen tests performed with a single sample are preferred when clinicians would like to screen for all the pathogens included in a test. However, he cautioned against using multiple pathogen test panels that "include pathogens that do not need to be found," both to reduce the likelihood of false positives and to avoid using resources for unnecessary tests.

Several molecular-based tests are now available for chlamydia and gonorrhea. The nucleic acid amplification tests (NAATs) can detect a small number of organisms and allow the use of urine rather than endocervical swabs. In fact, the new CDC guidelines suggest using urine unless a speculum already is being inserted for another reason.

Urine sampling for the NAATs has slightly different requirements than do other urine tests, to ensure that any organisms are present in sufficient quantity. Patients cannot have urinated in the past hour, they should not cleanse the perineum before sampling, they should collect the first part of the urinary stream,

and they should collect only as much urine as the test requires.

Dr. Policar noted that nucleic acid probe tests are not as accurate as the NAATs, and clinicians using these tests should consider switching to a NAAT system. One caveat of the NAAT is that it cannot be used for a test of cure for at least 3 weeks, because it will detect the presence of dead pathogens. Only a culture test can be performed accurately within that time frame.

According to the 2006 CDC guidelines,

a retest for chlamydia or gonorrhea should be performed in 3 months, as these infections are associated with a high likelihood of repeat infection and the retesting strategy focuses on higher-risk patients.

Tests for human papillomavirus (HPV) also are overperformed, said Dr. Policar, especially in regard to the low-risk HPV types for which there is no clinical relevance or treatment strategy. He therefore recommends using the high-risk HPV DNA test only in the context of cervical

cancer screening and the management of abnormal Pap smear results, but not as a screening or diagnostic test for sexually transmitted infection.

The combined HPV/Pap test is growing in popularity as a cervical cancer screening tool. It is indicated for women at least 30 years of age who are immunocompetent with their cervix in place. Clinicians using this test should tell women in advance that they will be screened for HPV so they can expect the result. ■

In the treatment of postmenopausal women with osteoporosis

She needs to know
Only FOSAMAX[®] (alendronate sodium)
is proven and indicated to
reduce the risk of both
spine and hip fractures.
Boniva is not.*,†,‡,1,2

Pivotal fracture clinical studies show that

| Indicated to Reduce the Risk of Fracture | Characteristics of Patients Prospectively Studied (to Gain Fracture Indication) | FOSAMAX | Actonel | Boniva |
|--|---|---------|---------|--------|
| Spine | Patients without prior spine fracture | ✓ | | |
| Hip | | ✓ | | |
| Spine | Patients with prior spine fracture | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Hip | | ✓ | † | |

FOSAMAX, Actonel, and Boniva have all been studied in pivotal fracture clinical studies and are indicated to reduce the risk of vertebral fractures in women with prior vertebral fracture.¹⁻⁴

FOSAMAX PLUS D provides

Confidence in knowing that your patients are offered at least the minimum vitamin D intake recommended by guidelines.

FOSAMAX and FOSAMAX PLUS D are contraindicated in patients with esophageal abnormalities which delay esophageal emptying (eg, stricture or achalasia) and in patients unable to stand or sit upright for at least 30 minutes. Patients at increased risk of aspiration should not receive FOSAMAX oral solution. FOSAMAX and FOSAMAX PLUS D are contraindicated in patients with hypersensitivity to any component of these products and in patients with hypocalcemia (see PRECAUTIONS). FOSAMAX and FOSAMAX PLUS D, like other bisphosphonates, may cause local irritation of the upper gastrointestinal mucosa.

* The Fracture Intervention Trial (FIT) consisted of 6,459 women in 2 arms, the Vertebral Fracture Arm (VFA) (3 years), and the Clinical Fracture Arm (CFA) (4 years). In both arms of the study, women were randomized to either placebo or FOSAMAX 5 mg Once Daily for the first 2 years and FOSAMAX 10 mg Once Daily for the remainder of the trial. In the FIT VFA, 2,027 women (mean age = 71 years) with preexisting vertebral fractures were studied for 3 years. In the FIT CFA, 4,432 women (mean age = 68 years) with no preexisting vertebral fracture and femoral neck bone mineral density T-score ≤ -1.6 (after National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey [NHANES] adjustment) at baseline were studied for a duration of 4.25 years. The primary end point of the FIT VFA was vertebral fracture, and the primary end point of the FIT CFA was any clinical (symptomatic) fracture. A relative risk reduction of 47% (7.1% absolute risk reduction) was seen in the primary end point in the FIT VFA.^{3,4}

† The Vertebral Efficacy With Risedronate Therapy (VERT) trials prospectively studied risedronate vs placebo in patients with osteoporosis who had at least 1 prior vertebral fracture at entry. Based on these trials, Actonel is also indicated to reduce the incidence of a composite end point of nonvertebral osteoporosis-related fractures.¹

‡ The Oral Ibandronate Osteoporosis Vertebral Fracture Trial in North America and Europe (BONE) prospectively studied oral ibandronate administered either daily or intermittently vs placebo in patients with osteoporosis who had between 1 and 4 prevalent vertebral fractures at entry.²

References: 1. Actonel [package insert]. Cincinnati, Ohio: Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals; 2006. 2. Boniva [package insert]. Nutley, NJ: Roche Laboratories Inc; 2006. 3. Black DM, Cummings SR, Karpf D, et al, for the Fracture Intervention Trial Research Group. Randomised trial of effect of alendronate on risk of fracture in women with existing vertebral fractures. *Lancet*. 1996;348:1535-1541. 4. Data available on request from Merck & Co., Inc., Professional Services-DAP, WP1-27, PO Box 4, West Point, PA 19486-0004. Please specify information package DA-FOS73(4).

Please read the Brief Summary of Prescribing Information on the adjacent page. For product information about FOSAMAX and FOSAMAX PLUS D, please visit fosamaxplusd.com. For services and resources on Merck products, log on to MerckServices.com.

FOSAMAX is a registered trademark of Merck & Co., Inc. FOSAMAX PLUS D is a trademark of Merck & Co., Inc. Other brands listed are the trademarks of their respective owners and are not trademarks of Merck & Co., Inc.

MERCK Copyright © 2007 Merck & Co., Inc. All rights reserved. 20701358(1)(602)-FOS

