

# Expedited Partner Therapy in the Management of Sexually Transmitted Diseases

Review and Guidance



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**  
**PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE**  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
National Center for HIV, STD, and TB Prevention

















































































Table 2  
*Randomized Controlled Trials in the United States: Persistent/Recurrent Infection*

<b>Trial</b>	<b>Setting and Study Population</b>	<b>Study Design</b>	<b>Intervention and Control</b>	<b>Persistent/Recurrent Infection Rate</b>
<p><b>CDC Project 455, B2</b></p> <p>Schillinger et al. <i>Sex Transm Dis</i> 2003;30:49-56</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multi-center (6 cities)</li> <li>• 1996- 2000</li> <li>• N=1,787, 81% followed</li> <li>• Women age 14-34</li> <li>• Primary care, FP, teen, STD, ED</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Uncomplicated CT</b> (without GC)</li> <li>• 1.0g azithromycin DOT</li> <li>• 21 days – 3 months</li> <li>• Urine PCR/LCR</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PDPT to maximum 4 partners</li> <li>• Control = patient-referral (verbal and written)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Control 108/726 (14.9%)</li> <li>• EPT 87/728 (12.0%)</li> </ul> <p><b>OR = 0.80 (0.62 – 1.05)</b>  <sup>2</sup> = 2.67, p = .102</p>
<p><b>Seattle</b></p> <p>Golden et al. <i>NEJM</i> 2005;352:676-685.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seattle-King Co., WA</li> <li>• 1998 - 2003</li> <li>• N=2,751, 68% follow-up</li> <li>• Male 23%, Female 77%, age ≥14 yr (mean 23 yr)</li> <li>• All reporting sites: STD, FP, private, ED</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Uncomplicated CT</b> (N=2162), <b>GC</b> (450), or <b>both</b> (139)</li> <li>• AZM 1.0 g ± CFX 400 mg for CT, GC</li> <li>• Follow-up 3-19 wk</li> <li>• Urine NAAT (LCR or TMA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patient or partner pick-up of drug at 1 of 12 pharmacies</li> <li>• Control = patient-referral</li> <li>• DIS assistance (both arms) if patient unable/unwilling to contact partner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Control 121/931 (13.0%)</li> <li>• EPT 92/929 (9.9%)</li> </ul> <p><b>RR = 0.76 (0.59 – 0.98)</b>  <sup>2</sup> = 4.39, p = .04</p> <p>See supplemental tables for separate CT/GC outcomes</p>
<p><b>New Orleans Urethritis Trial</b></p> <p>Kissinger et al. <i>Clin Inf Dis</i> 2005;41:623-9.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Orleans, LA</li> <li>• 2002 - 2004</li> <li>• N=629, 80% behavioral FU, 30% biological FU</li> <li>• Male age ≥16, median 24 yr</li> <li>• STD clinic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Symptomatic urethritis</b> (61% <b>GC</b>, 21% <b>CT</b>, 6% <b>both</b>)</li> <li>• AZM 1.0 g ± CFX 400mg or cipro 500 mg</li> <li>• GenProbe(enrollment) Urine PCR (follow-up)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PDPT</li> <li>• Control = patient-referral with brief counseling</li> <li>• Third arm “Booklet Referral”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Control 35/82 (43%)</li> <li>• EPT 20/87 (23%)</li> <li>• Booklet 16/112 (14%)</li> </ul> <p><b>EPT v control:</b>  <b>OR = 0.38 (0.19 – 0.74)</b>  <b>BEPR v control:</b>  <b>OR = 0.22 (0.11 – 0.44)</b></p>

<p><b>New Orleans Trichomoniasis Trial</b></p> <p>Kissinger et al. <i>Sex Transm Dis</i> In press.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Orleans, LA</li> <li>• 2001 – 2004</li> <li>• N=282, 87% behavioral FU, 80% biological</li> <li>• Women age 16-44 yr</li> <li>• STD clinic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Trichomonal vaginitis</b></li> <li>• Metronidazole 2.0 g</li> <li>• Follow-up 21-56 d</li> <li>• Wet mount at enrollment, culture (InPouch) at follow-up</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PDPT to maximum 4 partners</li> <li>• Control = patient-referral with brief counseling</li> <li>• Third arm “Booklet Referral”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Control = 7/111 = 6.3%</li> <li>• EPT = 11/114 = 9.6%</li> <li>• Booklet = 11/122 (9.0%)</li> </ul> <p><b>EPT v control: OR = 1.58 (0.61 – 4.12)</b></p> <p><b>BEPR v control: OR = 1.47 (0.57 – 3.82)</b></p>
--	--	---	--	---







Table 5

*Variations in Sex Partner Notification as a Function of EPT versus Control Condition among RCTs*

Notification Behavior	EPT	Control	RR (95% CI)	P
<hr/>				
6-city trial				
Talked to partner and delivered fact sheet (and medications in EPT)	85%	75%	1.14 (1.08 – 1.21)	.01
Seattle trial				
Notified partner of exposure or knew of negative test	77%	78%	0.92 (0.77 – 1.10)	ns
New Orleans (urethritis) <sup>1</sup>				
Talked to partner about infection	71%	48%	--	.001
Gave intervention to partner	70%	48%	--	.001
New Orleans (trichomoniasis) <sup>1</sup>				
Talked to partner about infection	90%	88%	--	ns
Gave intervention to partner	82%	88%	--	ns

<sup>1</sup>Percentages for this study are based on proportion of partnerships, not proportion of cases. Significance levels are based on GEE.

Table 6  
*Variations in Sex Partner Treatment as a Function of EPT versus Control Condition*

Treatment Behavior	EPT	Control	RR (95% CI)	P
<b>6-city trial</b>				
Reported “very likely” partner took medication <sup>1</sup>	86%	57%	1.50 (1.40 – 1.59)	.001
<b>Seattle trial</b>				
Reported all partners “very likely treated” or tested negative	61%	49%	1.25 (1.14 – 1.36)	.001
Reported partner “very likely” treated or tested negative	64%	52%	1.19 (1.12 – 1.27)	.001
<b>New Orleans (urethritis)<sup>2</sup></b>				
Reported seeing patient take medication	48%	26%	--	.001
Partner reported taking medication	56%	34%	--	.001
Checked partner was treated	64%	42%	--	.001
<b>New Orleans (trichomoniasis)<sup>2</sup></b>				
Reported seeing patient take medication	63%	18%	--	.001
Partner reported taking medication	77%	70%	--	ns
Checked partner was treated	78%	76%	--	ns

<sup>1</sup>Analysis limited to women with one partner. <sup>2</sup>Percentages for this study are based on proportion of partnerships, not proportion of cases. Significance levels are based on GEE.

Table 7  
*Variations in Sexual Behaviors as a Function of EPT versus Control Condition*

Sexual Behavior	EPT	Control	RR (95% CI)	P
<hr/>				
6-city trial				
Reported acquisition of new sex partner	23%	28%	0.83 (0.69 – 0.99)	.05
Seattle trial				
Reported sex with an untreated partner	6%	12%	0.47 (0.34 – 0.65)	.001
New Orleans (urethritis)				
Reported unprotected sex before partner took medication <sup>1</sup>	8%	13%	0.63 (0.40 – 0.99)	.05
Reported unprotected sex with any partner	29%	34%	0.85 (0.66 – 1.10)	ns
New Orleans (trichomoniasis)				
Reported unprotected sex before partner took medication <sup>1</sup>	8%	5%	1.55 (0.62 – 3.88)	ns
Reported unprotected sex with any partner	26%	13%	1.99 (1.20 – 3.34)	.01

<sup>1</sup>Percentages for this analysis are based on proportion of partnerships, not proportion of cases. Significance levels are based on GEE; the effect size is a prevalence odds ratio, not a relative risk.









