

Mini Review Open Access

Comparative Cost Study of Clinical HIV Testing Prompts at the Veterans Affairs Healthcare System

Joe Henry*

Ö^]ælc { ^}ch[~hP^æ|c@hŒ æâ;•ÊhW}âç^;•āc^h[~hTā]æ}ÊhQcæ|^

Abstract

V[Á&æ]&`|æc^Ác@^Á&[•c•Áæ}åÁ@^æ|c@Á^ ^&c•Á[-ÁæÁ}[ç^|ÁPOXÁc^•ci}*Áæ]]¦[æ&@Ác@æcÁ{æ\^eÁ`•^Á[-Á¦[či}^Éàæ•^åÁ &|ā}ā&āæ}Á¦^{ā}å^!•È

Methods: V@^Á•cæ}忦åÁ]¦^c^•cD][•cc^•cd&[ˇ]•^||ā}*Éh&[ˇ]•^||ā}*Áæ}åhæÁ}^¸,h&|ā}ä&æ|Á¦^{{ā}a^;•Á•^•c^{{Éhæ}}åhc@^Á a^&i•i[}Á{[a^|EXæ|`^•A-[!Ac@^A]æ!æ{^c^!•EA•`&@Aæ•Ac@^A|i\^|i@[[aAc@æcA]æ&^}c•A,i|]Hæ&&^]chc@^Ac^•chæ}aAc@^Aj]i&^A[-A c@^ÁPQXÁc^•cã}*Á];[&^å`;^•ÉÁ,^;^Ácæ\^}Á-;[{ Ác@^Ájāc^;æc`;^È

&æ•^A-[`}åhæ}åhi{];[ç^hc@^h^ &æ&^h[-hPQXhc^•ci}*ÉhY@^}hi{]]^{^}ci}*hæh•i{i|æ!h];[*!æ{{^hæchæh-æ&i|ic^h[`c•iā^h[-h X^c^!æ}hCE æi!•Éhc@^h-[`}åæci[}æ|hå^&&ii]h{[å^|h{i*@chà^h^{]][^^åÉ

K : AIDS; Cost analysis; Veterans A airs Healthcare System

Early HIV infection detection lowers the risk of disease transmission and bene ts those who are a ected clinically. According to estimates from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 19% of Americans are not aware of their HIV status [1]. e American College of Physicians, the US Preventive Services Task Force, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have all recommended routine, voluntary HIV testing for adults as a result of this gap.

e Veteran Health Administration (VHA), the largest healthcare institution in the country, has established a number of measures to encourage HIV testing in order to increase early detection. Over time, in reaction to modi cations in the regulatory environment (such as the elimination of the need for written informed consent) [2], Various initiatives have been implemented in VHA to increase HIV testing rates, including changes to guidelines for who should be o ered HIV testing (i.e., moving from risk-based to routine testing). Although our earlier analysis showed that these programmes were e ective, the total expenses of these programmes and the cost per detected case are not fully stated [3]. is study analysed the costs of three alternative HIV testing plans: 1) physician-based traditional HIV testing and counselling without clinical reminders; 2) nurse-based streamlined counselling with clinical reminders and telephone noti cations for negative results; and 3) clinical reminders without pretest counselling and with telephone noti cations for negative results [4]. We have assessed the cost per test and the cost for discovering a previously undetected case of HIV infection in order to support programmes that may be interested in implementing a similar method but are unsure of the nancial implications.

We did not include the long-term cost-e ectiveness of HIV

testing because this article concentrated on examining the immediate economic implications of these new tactics. ese evaluations will take the consequences of beyond the purview of this study; diagnosis and therapy on quality-adjusted life-year are not included [5].

$\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{x}}$

Nurse-initiated, simpli ed counselling was found to be coste ective in raising HIV testing rates in primary care settings when written informed permission was required for HIV testing used this tactic as a component of a multimodal intervention that also included provider education, an audit-feedback tool, and a real-time clinical reminder to remind physicians to conduct risk-based HIV testing at Southern California VHA medical care facilities [6]. Any past records of hepatitis B or C infection, use of illegal drugs, a sexually transmitted disease, homelessness, or specie behavioural risk factors were enough to set o the clinical reminder. is program's implementation tripled the screening rate and increased the number of HIV diagnoses. VHA's policy for HIV testing changed in August. e updated policy does away with the need for o cial pre- and post-test counselling.

*Corresponding author:ÁR[^ÁP^}¦^ÉÁÖ^]æ¦c{^}cÁ[-ÁP^æ|c@ÁŒ æå;•ÉÁW}åç^;•åc^Á[-Á $Ti|x\}$ ÉÁCcæ|^ÉÁÖE { æi|KÁ@^} | ^HGO * { æi|E&[{

Received: €FÉÞ[çĒG€GĠĤ Tæ} * •&ii]dÞ[þ[{ @æĒGGĒÌ€Ì Ì GlฝEditor assigned:Á€IĒ Þ[çĒG€GĠĤÚ!^ÈŨÔÁÞ[Ѩ[{ @æĒGGĒÌ€Ì Ì ßQŨÛŊĠReviewed: FÌĒÞ[çĒG€GĠĤÛÔÁÞ[Ѩ [{@æĒGGĒÌ€ÌÌGLÁ **Revised**: GGĒÞ[çĒG€GĞÉÁ Tæ}ˇ∙&¦á]ck Þ[KÁ [{@æĒGGĒÌ€ÌÌGÁÇÜDLÁ Published: H€ĒÞ[çĒG€GGÉÁÖUŒÁF€ĒĪFÏGÐGHGJĒÍÌÏJĒF€€€ĪHJ

Citation: P^}¦^ÁRÁÇG€GGDÁÔ[{]æ¦æœç^ÁÔ[•cÁÙcˇå^Á[-ÁÔ|ā}á&æ|ÁPQXÁV^•cá}*ÁÚ¦[{]c•Á æcic@^ÁX^c^\æj •ÁŒ æã;•ÁP^æjc@&æ;^ÁÙ^•c^ { ÈÁU&&]ÁT^åÁP^æjc@ÁF€KÁTHJÉ

Copyright: hî hG€GGhP^}; ^ hRÈhV@i•hi•hæ}h[]^}Ēæ&&^••hæ; ti&|^hai•ciàà *c^ah*}a^;hc@^h •[~|&^Áæ|^Á&|^åāc^åÈ

In the meanwhile, verbal consent for testing was used instead of written authorization, and testing was advised for everyone, regardless of known risk of HIV infection [7]. Following this modi cation, numerous Veterans A airs (VA) facilities updated their procedures to comply with the new VA standards and put in place a non-risk-based