

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

1 **A National Study of Expedited Partner Therapy Use in Emergency Departments: A**
2 **Survey of Medical Director Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices**

3

4 **Author List:** Rachel E Solnick, MD MSc,^{1,2} Rafael Cortes,³ Ethan Chang,³ Paul Dudas,^{3,4}
5 Daxuan Deng, MS, PhD-Candidate,⁵ Cornelius Jamison, MD MSc,^{6,7} Okeoma Mmeje, MD
6 MPH,^{7,8,9} Keith E. Kocher, MD MPH^{7,10}

7 **Author Affiliations:**

8 ¹ U-M National Clinical Scholars Program, Institute for Healthcare Policy and Innovation,
9 and Department of Emergency Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann
10 Arbor, MI

11 ² Now at Mount Sinai Hospital Icahn School of Medicine, Department of Emergency
12 Medicine, New York, NY (corresponding author)

13 ³ University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

14 ⁴ Now at Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI,

15 ⁵ Penn State University, Hershey, PA

16 ⁶ Department of Family Medicine University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, MI

17 ⁷ Institute for Healthcare Policy and Innovation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

18 ⁸ Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Michigan Medical School, Ann
19 Arbor, MI

20 ⁹ Adjunct Faculty, Department of Health Behavior and Health Education, University of
21 Michigan School of Public Health, Ann Arbor, MI

22 ¹⁰ Department of Learning Health Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Michigan;
23 Ann Arbor, MI,

24

25 **Prior Presentations:** SAEM 2021 Virtual Conference

26 **Financial Support:** Dr. Solnick was supported by the U-M National Clinician Scholars
27 Program at the Institute for Healthcare Policy and Innovation during this project. This work
28 was also supported by the University of Michigan Resident and Fellow Research
29 Development Grant award (RDG).

30 **Author contributions:**

31 *Concept and design: Solnick, Kocher, Jamison, Mmeje,*

32 *Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Solnick, Cortes, Dudas*

33 *Drafting of the manuscript: Solnick, Chang, Cortes*

34 *Critical revision of the manuscript: Solnick, Kocher, Jamison, Mmeje,*

35

36 *Statistical analysis: Solnick, Deng*

37 *Supervision: Solnick, Kocher*

38 **Conflict of Interest Disclosure:** Authors report no conflict of interest

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

39 **Running Title:** Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

40 **Keywords:** Sexually Transmitted Diseases, Sexually Transmitted Infection, Partner therapy,

41 expedited partner therapy

42

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

43

44 **Abstract**

45

46 **Background:**

47 Emergency departments (EDs) are the primary source of healthcare for many patients
48 diagnosed with sexually transmitted infections (STIs). Expedited partner therapy (EPT),
49 treating the partner of patients with STIs without an exam of the partner, is an evidence-based
50 practice for patients who might not otherwise seek care. Little is known about EPT use in the
51 ED. In a national survey, we describe ED medical directors' knowledge, attitudes, and
52 practices of EPT.

53

54 **Methods:**

55 A cross-sectional internet survey of medical directors from academic EDs using the Academy
56 of Academic Administrators of Emergency Medicine (AAAEM) Benchmarking Group from
57 July through September 2020. Primary outcomes were EPT awareness, support, and use. The
58 survey also examined barriers and facilitators. Multivariable regressions explored predictors
59 of EPT support.

60

61 **Results:**

62 Forty-eight of 70 (69%) medical directors responded, representing EDs with a median
63 volume of 67,840 patients/year. Awareness of EPT was high (73%), but fewer knew how to
64 prescribe it (38%), and only 19% of EDs had implemented EPT. Most (79%) supported EPT
65 and were more likely to if they were aware of EPT (89% vs. 54%) $p=0.01$. Of non-
66 implementers, 41% thought EPT was feasible, and 56% thought departmental support would
67 be likely. Of potential barriers, ED directors were most concerned about legal liability (25%
68 moderately to extremely). Benefits of EPT were rated with similar importance, with
69 preventing sequelae of untreated STIs most frequently rated as "extremely important" (44%).
70 Linear regression showed increased years in practice, and ED's proportion of Medicaid
71 patients was significantly positively associated with support for EPT.

72

73 **Conclusion:**

74 ED medical directors expressed strong support for EPT and reasonable levels of feasibility
75 for implementation but low utilization. Our findings highlight the need to identify
76 mechanisms for EPT implementation and develop ED-tailored implementation tools to
77 bolster this practice.

78

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

79 INTRODUCTION

80 Rates of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) in the United States have increased
81 considerably in the past decade.¹ Although cases of chlamydia infection dropped slightly
82 during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic, cases of gonorrhea and syphilis continue to
83 rise, contributing to a total of 2.4 million cases of STIs in 2020.² As funding for sexual health
84 clinics has decreased,³ emergency departments (EDs) have increasingly become a site of STI
85 care, outpacing general ED visits.⁴ Patients at highest risk for STIs are more likely to rely on
86 the ED for care,⁵⁻⁸ and are disproportionately from historically marginalized groups – those
87 who are non-White, have Medicaid, or are uninsured.⁹⁻¹²

88 For the most common STIs, chlamydia, and most cases of gonorrhea infections,
89 patients usually have no public health or health system assistance in ensuring their partner
90 receives treatment.^{13,14} However, under this current approach of patient referral – relying on
91 the patients alone to notify their sex partner– partners are often not notified or treated,^{14,15}
92 exposing the patient to reinfection or recurring infection.

93 A strategy to prevent a patient’s reinfection from STIs is expedited partner therapy
94 (EPT). EPT is the practice of treating the sex partners of patients with STIs – chlamydia,
95 gonorrhea, and trichomoniasis–without an exam of the partner.¹⁶ It is recommended by the
96 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) when the partner is unlikely to receive
97 timely care as a harm-reduction approach.¹⁶ Meta-analysis and systematic review of
98 randomized control trials have shown EPT to be effective in reducing chlamydia reinfection
99 and increasing partner treatment compared to unassisted patient referrals.^{17,18} Despite the
100 potential for EPT to aid in the STI epidemic via the ED – a care setting of especially high
101 patient need– little is known about current EPT use in adult EDs at the national level. Thus,
102 we conduct a national survey of academic ED medical directors evaluating the knowledge,
103 attitudes, and practices regarding EPT use, as well as an examination of barriers and

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

104 facilitators to its practice. Our primary outcomes were medical directors' awareness and
105 support of EPT and whether EPT is used in their department. We further examine how ED
106 medical director support for EPT varies by their level of EPT awareness, hypothesizing that
107 increasing awareness is linked with increased support. We also investigate how ED medical
108 director EPT awareness varies by state and ED characteristics, hypothesizing that factors
109 suggestive of an increased patient need for EPT—higher state chlamydia rates, earlier year of
110 the state adopting EPT laws, higher ED Medicaid payer population, and patient volume—
111 would be associated with increased EPT awareness. As an exploratory aim, we assessed
112 whether ED medical director demographics or ED characteristics were associated with
113 support for EPT.

114

115 **METHODS**

116 This cross-sectional online survey was emailed to ED medical directors or emergency
117 physicians in similar operational leadership positions using the Academy of Academic
118 Administrators of Emergency Medicine (AAEM)/ Association of Academic Chairs of
119 Emergency Medicine (AACEM) distribution list. Where multiple sites were listed per
120 academic department, we used the site, the primary teaching ED for the emergency medicine
121 (EM) residency. The AAEM/ AACEM group maintains a Benchmarking survey collecting
122 departmental characteristics such as ED volume and proportion of patients using Medicaid
123 insurance. We linked these benchmarking survey departmental variables to the individual
124 responses by the ED site reported.

125

126 **SURVEY DISTRIBUTION**

127 The survey invitation was emailed three times between July 17, 2020, to September
128 27, 2020. Respondents were randomized to one of two incentive levels on the first invitation
129 round: one Amazon gift card worth \$20 or a raffle to win one Amazon gift card worth \$100.

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

130 Randomization was conducted to assess a response rate difference between groups, for which
131 the later wave invitations would be invited using the higher response rate incentive. Since
132 there was no considerable difference between response rates after the first wave of
133 distribution, the incentive was changed to a \$100 gift card raffle for the remaining two email
134 invitations. Email subject lines were descriptive as follows: “[Time – Sensitive] the
135 <<Blinded for Review>> EPT Research Study” and “<<Blinded-for-review>> Research
136 Study: Interview for Expedited Partner Therapy.” Non-responders were followed up by
137 emailing and calling department administrators and research faculty at the institution using
138 publicly available email addresses, requesting that the administrator or faculty aid in
139 requesting a medical director's response. Survey responses were anonymous. The <<Blinded
140 for Review>> institutional review board reviewed and approved the study. This study is
141 reported following the Strengthening of the Reporting of Observational Studies in
142 Epidemiology (STROBE) statement¹⁹ and previously established guidelines for EM survey
143 research.²⁰

144

145 SURVEY DEVELOPMENT

146 We developed a 21-item survey instrument (**Appendix X**) including the following
147 sections: demographics, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors, followed by barriers and
148 facilitators of EPT implementation. The survey instrument was created following a published
149 framework for developing questionnaires²¹ and began with discussions with EPT content
150 experts alongside a literature review of published manuscripts on EPT implementation in
151 other practice settings,^{22–25} after which new questions were developed as necessary. We
152 refined the design and content in an iterative process—editing survey versions as needed after
153 each step—through the following steps: (1) a discussion with a survey methodologist expert;
154 (2) a cognitive interview with one ED medical director assessing for clarity and

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

155 comprehension using the ‘think-aloud’²¹ approach, in which the interviewee verbalized his
156 interpretations of the questions; and (3) pilot testing with one other ED medical director who
157 provided written feedback to correct any technical issues and ensure questions were
158 appropriate, and question options were complete. The survey was designed to take under 5
159 minutes.

160

161 SURVEY CONTENT

162 The primary outcomes were EPT awareness, support, and practices. Awareness was
163 assessed by knowledge of EPT's definition, departmental to state-level guidelines, and STI-
164 specific indications. Medical directors’ support, as well as their perception of support from
165 other ED stakeholders—other clinician prescribers, nurses, and the ED as a department— were
166 rated by the medical director on a 5-point Likert scale (1= “Strongly Oppose”; 5= “Strongly
167 Support”; “Unsure”). Perception of departmental support was asked on a scale assessing
168 likelihood (1= “Extremely unlikely”; 5= “Extremely likely.”) Perceived feasibility for
169 instituting EPT was assessed on a 4-point Likert scale (1=“Somewhat Feasible,” 4= “Very
170 Feasible”; “Unsure”). For past practices, respondents were asked if they had personally
171 prescribed EPT and if it was implemented at their ED.

172 We further analyzed whether EPT awareness varied by pre-determined state-level
173 variables (chlamydia rates, year of adopting EPT laws) and departmental-level variables
174 (proportion of Medicaid-insured patients, ED annual volume). For state variables, based on
175 prior literature,²⁵ we examined early versus late adopters of EPT permissible laws as well as
176 state-level chlamydia rates. EPT law adoption status was determined based on a combination
177 of state data pre-classified from previous research²⁵ and updated according to the CDC.²⁶
178 Early adopters were classified as states with EPT laws from 2001-2014, and late adopters
179 were states with EPT laws from 2015-2019. Chlamydia rates were based on data from the

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

180 CDC²⁷ and states were categorized based on if their rate was above or below the 2015 median
181 case rate of 447 cases per 100,000 people. For departmental variables, we examined data
182 from the AAEM/ AACEM Benchmarking survey of ED volume and the proportion of
183 Medicaid insurance patients. Survey invitation links were associated with an institution-
184 specific code to allow linkage of known state and departmental variables.

185 To assess barriers and facilitators of EPT, respondents first rated their level of
186 concern for potential barriers on a 5-point Likert scale (1= “Not at all concerned”; 2=
187 “Slightly”; 3= “Concerned”; 4= “Moderately concerned”; 5= “Extremely concerned”;
188 “Unsure”) for the following topics: adverse reaction, missed diagnoses, concern for intimate
189 partner violence, legal liabilities, affordability of EPT medications, and the ability for the
190 pharmacy to fill prescriptions. Respondents then rated the importance of potential benefits on
191 a 5-point Likert similar to above, instead using the keyword “important” in place of
192 “concerned” for the following topics: preventing STI reinfection, increasing access to
193 treatment among vulnerable populations, addressing untreated STIs, and preventing sequela
194 of STIs.

195

196 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

197 Descriptive statistics included proportions with 95% confidence intervals to report
198 demographic characteristics and main outcome variables. We conducted a bivariate analysis
199 using the Fisher exact test to assess whether awareness of EPT (“Yes” vs. “No”) was
200 associated with EPT attitudes and practice or departmental and state characteristics. The top-
201 box approach was used for the analysis of barriers and facilitators. The "top-box" score
202 indicates the proportion of respondents who selected the highest response category and is
203 commonly used by hospital patient experience surveys.^{28,29}

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

204 As an exploratory analysis, we used multivariable linear regression tests to evaluate
205 predictors of EPT support. We used a theory-driven approach to select covariates: state-
206 level²⁵ (chlamydia prevalence and onset of EPT laws), ED-level (ED volume and proportion
207 of patients using Medicaid insurance), and respondent-level (gender and years in practice).
208 For the outcome of the medical director's perception of departmental support, we added the
209 following covariates: perceived support from prescribers and RN, feasibility, and awareness
210 of hospital policies.

211 The response rate was calculated via American Association for Public Opinion
212 Research (AAPOR) response rate 1 definition, which considers surveys at least 80%
213 complete divided by the total contacted.³⁰ As a non-response bias analysis,³¹ respondents
214 were compared to nonrespondents by available ED sites and respondent characteristics. The
215 survey was administered via Qualtrics (Provo, Utah) and data was analyzed via R statistical
216 computing (Vienna, Austria) for analysis. A p-value ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically
217 significant.

218 **RESULTS**

219 Of 70 potential respondents, 48 submitted complete surveys (AAPOR response rate of
220 69%, 100% completion rate, no incomplete or break-offs); demographics, ED, and state
221 characteristics are described in **Table 1**. Respondents were 31% female, and more than half
222 (52%) had over five years in their leadership roles. Surveyed EDs were geographically
223 distributed across the country, with most from the Northeast (33%). Most (79%) EDs were in
224 states that were early adopters of EPT laws (between 2001-2014). Under half (42%) were in
225 states with high chlamydial incidence. Comparing non-responders to responders, we observed
226 no significant differences across key characteristics for which data were available: medical

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

227 director gender, ED region, volume, percentage Medicaid, EPT adoption year, and chlamydia

228 incidence (**eTable 1**).

229

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

Table 1 Demographic and ED Characteristics of Respondents

Med Director Characteristic	Total No (n=48)	Response (%)
Female	15	31
Year in practice		
0-5 years	1	2
6-10 years	12	25
11-20 years	24	50
21+ years	11	23
Year in role		
0-5 years	23	48
6-10 years	14	29
11-15 years	7	15
16+ years	4	8
ED characteristic*		
Region		
Midwest	8	17
Northeast	16	33
South	14	29
West	10	21
Medicaid		
Mean		28
Median		26
IQR		20
ED Volume		
Mean		74,699
Median		67,840
IQR		25,183
State characteristic**		
Timing of EPT laws		
Early adopter	38	79
Later adopter	10	21
Chlamydia incidence		
Low incidence	28	58
High incidence	20	42

Note: States law timing is classified as follows: earlier adopters (2001-2014) or late (2015-2019). Chlamydia incidence is classified as follows: low (233-445/100K population) or high(455-768/100K population)

230

231

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

232 EPT AWARENESS

233 Most medical directors (73%) knew of EPT (**Table 2**). Of those reportedly aware of

234 EPT, most (66%) could correctly identify that EPT was used for chlamydia in their state.

235 Less than half of medical directors were aware of the existence of guidelines from the CDC

236 (48%), and fewer were aware of more local-level guidance: State law (31%), local health

237 department (21%), and local hospital (15%). A little over a third of medical directors reported

238 that they knew how to write a prescription (38%), and fewer had previously prescribed

239 (31%). Only 19% reported that their ED had implemented EPT at the departmental level.

240

241

Table 2. Emergency Department Medical Director Knowledge and Implementation of Expedited Partner Therapy			
	Total(n)	%	(95% CI)
EPT Knowledge			
Awareness of EPT	35	73%	(60, 85)
Correctly Identify that EPT is used for Chlamydia*	23	66%	(50, 81)
Knowledge of EPT written guidance			
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	23	48%	(34, 62)
State law	15	31%	(18, 44)
Local health dept	10	21%	(9, 32)
Local hospital	7	15%	(5, 25)
EPT Practices			
Knowledge of how to Prescribe	18	38%	(24, 51)
Previously Prescribed**	15	31%	(18, 44)
ED has Implemented	9	19%	(8, 30)
Notes: *Correctly identify EPT used for Chlamydia was asked of those aware of EPT n=35			
**Previously Prescribed was asked of those that knew how to prescribe n=18			

242

243

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

244 EPT SUPPORT

245 **Table 3** shows medical director support and perceived institutional support of EPT
246 stratified by awareness level of EPT. There were high support from medical directors towards
247 EPT (79%) and a perception of similarly high support from other prescribers (71%).
248 Conversely, respondents felt nurses would have lower support for EPT (50%). Support was
249 significantly higher when respondents were aware of EPT both for medical director self-
250 reported support ($P<0.001$) and their perception of nurse support ($P<0.04$). Regarding
251 departmental factors, 41% of participants expected the implementation of EPT at their site to
252 be “very feasible”(18%) or “feasible”(23%). Only 5% reported it was “not at all feasible.”
253 Over half (56%) of medical directors anticipated that their ED would be supportive of EPT at
254 either “Somewhat likely” (49%) or “Extremely likely” (8%) levels. Approximately two-thirds
255 (67%) of medical directors felt they would be impacted in their perception of EPT if peer
256 institutions were already implementing it.

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

Table 3. Medical Director Attitudes and Perceptions of Expedited Partner Therapy								
	total (n)	%	EPT Awareness Status				Fisher	
			95%CI	Yes (n=)	%	No (n=)		%
Medical Director Perceived Support (n=48) *								
Medical Director								
Oppose (1)	2	4%	(0,31.9)	1	3%	1	8%	<0.001
Neutral (2)	4	8%	(0,35.4)	3	9%	1	8%	
Support (3)	38	79%	(66.3,92.1)	31	89%	7	54%	
Unknown/Unsure	4	8%	(0,35.4)	0	0%	4	31%	
Average	2.82			2.86		2.67		
Prescribers								
Oppose (1)	2	4%	(0,31.9)	2	6%	0	0%	0.01
Neutral (2)	4	8%	(0,35.4)	3	9%	1	8%	
Support (3)	34	71%	(55.6,86.1)	28	80%	6	46%	
Unknown/Unsure	8	17%	(0,42.5)	2	6%	6	46%	
Average	2.80			2.79		2.86		
Nurses								
Oppose (1)	3	6%	(0,33.6)	1	3%	2	15%	0.04
Neutral (2)	9	19%	(0,44.3)	7	20%	2	15%	
Support (3)	24	50%	(30,70)	21	60%	3	23%	
Unknown/Unsure	12	25%	(0.5,49.5)	6	17%	6	46%	
Average	2.58			2.69		2.14		
Departmental Factors (n=39)**								
Feasible								
Not at all feasible (1)	2	5%	(0,35.7)	2	8%	0	0%	0.11
Somewhat feasible (2)	20	51%	(29.4,73.2)	11	42%	9	69%	
Feasible (3)	16	41%	(16.9,65.1)	13	50%	3	23%	
Unknown/Unsure	1	3%	(0,33.54)	0	0%	1	8%	
Average	2.37			2.42		2.25		
Department support								
Unlikely (1)	12	31%	(4.7,56.9)	8	31%	4	31%	0.07
Neither likely nor unlikely (2)	5	13%	(0,42.1)	1	4%	4	31%	
Likely (3)	22	56%	(35.7,77.1)	17	65%	5	38%	
Average	2.26			2.35		2.08		
Peer influence								
Impact (1)	26	67%	(48.6,84.8)	17	65%	9	69%	0.7
Neutral (2)	6	15%	(0,44.3)	5	19%	1	8%	
Probably wouldn't impact (3)	7	18%	(0,46.4)	4	15%	3	23%	
Average	1.51			1.50		1.54		

*Average Medical Director Perceived Support score calculated from collapsed Likert scales from 1-5 (Strongly Opposed-Strongy Support) to 1-3 (Oppose-Support), Unknowns not included in Average; **Departmental factors asked if department responded they were not EPT implementers, denominators n=39

257

258

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

259 VARIATION WITH STATE AND ED CHARACTERISTICS

260 We examined whether medical director awareness of EPT varied by state or
261 departmental characteristics (**eTable 2**). Respondent awareness of EPT varied significantly
262 by state chlamydia incidence level (Fisher exact test $p < 0.05$), such that in states with higher
263 chlamydia incidence, most respondents (90%, 18/20) were aware of EPT and most
264 respondents (85%, 11/13) unaware of EPT were from lower chlamydia incidence states.
265 Other potential characteristics had no associated difference in EPT awareness status: ED
266 volume, the proportion of Medicaid patients, and the year when state adopted laws supporting
267 EPT.

268 BARRIERS AND FACILITATORS TO EPT

269 The EPT barriers and facilitators showed only slight variation in their ranking. The
270 perceived barriers to EPT are presented ranked in order of highest percentage of most
271 concerned (**eFigure 1, tabular form in eTable 3**): (1) legal liability (25%), (2) intimate
272 partner violence (21%), (2) affordability of EPT medication (21%), (3) potential missed
273 medical diagnoses (19%), (4) ability for the pharmacy to fill prescriptions (17%), (5) adverse
274 reactions to the antibiotics (13%). The highest ranked benefits to patients were: (1) increasing
275 access to treatment among vulnerable populations (81%), (1) addressing untreated STIs
276 (81%), (1) preventing sequela of STIs (81%), and (2) preventing STI reinfection (79%).
277 There were minimal differences in the mean scores between barriers and facilitators. Overall,
278 many more respondents rated facilitators at the highest level of importance compared to the
279 proportion that rated barriers with the highest level of concern: 81% rated the top three
280 facilitators as the highest importance compared to 25% for the top barrier.

281

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

282 PREDICTORS OF EPT SUPPORT

283 Exploratory regression analysis in variables associated with increasing support for
284 EPT found the following were significantly related: years in practice, the proportion of
285 patients using Medicaid, and the feasibility level of EPT. For the outcome of medical director
286 support (Strongly Opposed (1)- Strongly Support (5)), every unit increase in years practicing
287 emergency medicine (0-5 years; 6-10 years; 11-20 years; over 21 years), corresponded to a
288 1.02 point (95%CI 0.6, 1.44) $p < 0.0001$ increase in the level of EPT support. Conversely,
289 every unit increase in years in the medical director role (0-5 years; 6-10 years; 11-15 years;
290 over 16 years) corresponded to a -0.7 point (95%CI -1.06, -0.34) $P < 0.001$ decrease in
291 support. For every 10% increase in the proportion of Medicaid patients, there was a 0.24
292 point (95%CI 0.04, 2.37) $p = 0.04$ increase in support. For the outcome of departmental EPT
293 support, for every increase in perceived feasibility of EPT (Not at all feasible (1)- Very
294 feasible (4)) there was a 0.7 (95%CI 0.24-1.13) $p = 0.01$ increase in support.

295

296 DISCUSSION

297 This study represents the first national evaluation of knowledge and support for EPT
298 among ED medical directors. While most medical directors were aware of EPT, only some
299 knew how to prescribe it, and even fewer had written prescriptions. Together with their high
300 ranking of the benefits of EPT, this gap between interest and practice highlights the role that
301 more macro-level factors, such as institutional or cultural, may play in the low use of EPT.
302 Moreover, compared to their stated high support levels, medical directors' perception of
303 comparatively lower support from their ED, other healthcare providers, and nurses suggests a
304 tension between personal perspectives on patient care and organizational realities.

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

305 Potential explanations for this implementation gap may be due to medical directors'
306 perceptions of barriers regarding legal liability, the potential for misdiagnosis, affordability of
307 medication, and intimate partner violence. Despite concern for these barriers, medical
308 directors still espoused the importance of EPT benefits, including increasing access to
309 treatment among vulnerable populations, preventing STI reinfection, preventing sequela of
310 STIs, and addressing untreated STIs.

311 Legal concerns remain of high importance to medical directors. Despite EPT²⁶ being
312 permissible or potentially allowable in all U.S. states, 25% of ED directors stated that legal
313 concerns were an “extreme concern.” This concern may be partly due to the unfamiliarity of
314 EPTs’ prescribing practice to an unseen individual and lack of familiarity with institutional
315 policies to support ETP’s use- only 15% knew of hospital-level policies. There has been little
316 to no national research on this topic in adult EDs. This unfamiliarity with EPT in practice and
317 policy likely contributes to decreased comfort with EPT as a practice option. This may
318 change in coming years as ED organizations have adopted policies supporting the use of
319 EPT, such as the American College of Emergency Physicians’ policy supporting the
320 development of EPT protocols and model state legislation to remove legal obstacles to EPT.³²
321 Importantly, in many states, there are already explicit liability protections for the provider to
322 use EPT, and there have been no reported medical malpractice cases involving EPT.³³
323 Additionally, the safety of EPT has been well established: No adverse reactions were
324 recorded in patients included in randomized control trials,¹⁷ nor the fifteen years during
325 which a hotline to report adverse events was open in California.³⁴ Increased awareness of
326 supportive policies, legal protections, and patient preferences may help alleviate some of the
327 medical director's concerns.

328 Past work has similarly identified low levels of EPT use among healthcare providers,
329 particularly in EM. A survey of physician members of the American Academy of Pediatrics

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

330 Section of Emergency Medicine found that only 30% of physicians were aware of state EPT
331 laws,³⁵ similar to our finding that 31% stated awareness of their state laws. A study that
332 analyzed data on gonorrhea cases from 12 sites in the CDC's STD Surveillance Network
333 found that only 10% of patients with gonorrhea reported receiving EPT for their partners.³⁶
334 Previous surveys comparing EPT across specialties found that EPT uptake in the ED was
335 lower than in other specialties- most (56%) of ED physicians had never used partner therapy,
336 and only 13% used partner therapy "half or more" of the time.³⁷ One study of 492 patients
337 within the Indian Health Service found lower rates of EPT use in urgent care or EDs
338 compared to outpatient settings.³⁸ In a survey of a convenience sample of healthcare
339 providers in Pittsburg, PA, from diverse disciplines who treat young women at risk for
340 chlamydia, only 11% of providers were using EPT consistently.²² In contrast to our finding
341 of 19% of EDs reporting EPT use, a study of an urban, multicenter safety net institution in
342 Georgia found that while ED providers were willing to consider EPT, none were actually
343 practicing it. This study also identified unique barriers to antibiotic overuse in presumptive or
344 symptomatic treatment without laboratory confirmation, as well as concern for increasing
345 traffic to the ED for STI patients.^{23,24}

346 LIMITATIONS

347 Our study has limitations. This study had a relatively small sample size, and we only
348 surveyed medical directors in academic EDs. These results may not be generalizable to a
349 broader spectrum of emergency departments, especially those in a community setting. While
350 we use state-level chlamydia infection rates as a potential predictor of EPT support and
351 awareness, state-level rates of STI infections may not reflect local prevalence or community
352 resources, which are more likely to influence ED practices. Moreover, we only included
353 medical directors due to the administrative and operations focus of instituting new
354 departmental workflows and policies. But medical directors may have incomplete knowledge

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

355 of EPT feasibility due to unfamiliarity with specific legal liability protections. Their support
356 for EPT may be less valuable for the implementation of the process than a departmental
357 physician champion who could take ownership of the process. Also, the director's
358 perceptions of the support of other providers, such as nurses, is a perception and not the
359 actual perspective of other providers. Like survey work generally, the group of directors
360 responding to the survey invitation is susceptible to response bias, where ED directors more
361 interested in reproductive health may be more likely to respond, resulting in an
362 overrepresentation of EPT awareness, practice, and support.

363 Additionally, survey collection occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic, which
364 caused significant administrative stressors on EDs, especially medical directors. This would
365 have limited their ability to respond to a voluntary survey, further impacting the selection of
366 respondents. Survey questions may have been susceptible to social desirability bias since the
367 target EPT population has lower healthcare access. Thus, supporting practices to assist this
368 population may be perceived as more socially acceptable.

369 Strengths of the study included a high overall response rate (69%) and the inclusion of
370 EDs from a range of US geographical areas and areas with varying STI prevalence. We
371 analyzed EPT across important metrics such as the proportion of Medicaid patients and ED
372 volume using SAEM Benchmarking survey group data. To investigate response bias, we
373 compared these ED metrics and geographical variables of STI prevalence and recency of EPT
374 state law adoption. We observed no statistically significant differences between respondents
375 to non-respondents.

376 The use of EPT in the high-need setting of the ED is increasingly crucial as STI cases
377 increase and health disparities in STIs remain a problem of health equity. Social determinants
378 of health impact STI epidemiology, and there is an extensive history of STI disparities
379 associated with gender, sexual orientation, age, income, and race/ ethnicity.^{6,9,12,39-43}

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

380 According to the CDC, in 2019, gonorrhea rates were 42 times higher among men who have
381 sex with men and bisexual men compared to heterosexual men.⁴⁴ Young women account for
382 43% of reported cases of chlamydia and risk severe consequences such as pelvic
383 inflammatory disease and infertility.⁴⁵ Moreover, undiagnosed STIs may contribute to
384 infertility in over 20,000 women annually.⁴⁴ The ED's awareness of these disparities and
385 increased use of strategies such as EPT could help combat worse sexual and reproductive
386 health outcomes among historically socially disadvantaged populations. Future research
387 should further characterize barriers and facilitators to ED-EPT implementation in the ED in
388 greater detail. A qualitative analysis of best practices where EPT is conducted will lead to a
389 better understanding of how interested EDs can implement EPT.

390 **CONCLUSION**

391 A national study of academic EDs found that 79% of medical directors supported
392 EPT; however, only 19% reported that their department had implemented EPT, indicating a
393 significant opportunity to increase the adoption of this evidence-based practice. The ED can
394 play a critical public health role in stemming the spread of curable STIs, disproportionately
395 affecting historically marginalized populations.

396

397 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:**

398 The study team thanks <<<Blinded >> survey expert who helped review the survey
399 instrument and provided valuable feedback.

400

401 **CITATIONS**

402

403 1. Reported STDs Reach All-time High for 6th Consecutive Year [Internet]. CDC. 2021
404 [cited 2023 Feb 22]; Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2021/p0413-stds.html>
405

406 2. Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance, 2020 [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Nov

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

- 407 6];Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/std/statistics/2020/default.htm>
- 408 3. Ollstein AM. STDs are surging. The funding to fight them is not [Internet]. POLITICO.
409 [cited 2022 Nov 6];Available from: <https://www.politico.com/news/2022/04/12/stds->
410 [funding-00024678](https://www.politico.com/news/2022/04/12/stds-funding-00024678)
- 411 4. Pearson WS, Peterman TA, Gift TL. An increase in sexually transmitted infections seen
412 in US emergency departments. *Prev Med* 2017;100:143–4.
- 413 5. Cuffe KM, Coor A, Hogben M, Pearson WS. Health Care Access and Service Use
414 Among Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Respondents Engaging in High-
415 Risk Sexual Behaviors, 2016. *Sex Transm Dis* 2020;47(1):62–6.
- 416 6. Hogben M, Leichter JS. Social determinants and sexually transmitted disease
417 disparities. *Sex Transm Dis* 2008;35(12 Suppl):S13-8.
- 418 7. Mehta SD. Gonorrhea and Chlamydia in emergency departments: screening, diagnosis,
419 and treatment. *Curr Infect Dis Rep* 2007;9(2):134–42.
- 420 8. Jamison CD, Greenwood-Ericksen M, Richardson CR, Choi H, Chang T. Association
421 between Chlamydia and routine place for healthcare in the United States: NHANES
422 1999-2016. *PLoS One* 2021;16(5):e0251113.
- 423 9. Harling G, Subramanian S, Bärnighausen T, Kawachi I. Socioeconomic disparities in
424 sexually transmitted infections among young adults in the United States: examining the
425 interaction between income and race/ethnicity. *Sex Transm Dis* 2013;40(7):575–81.
- 426 10. Ware CE, Ajabnoor Y, Mullins PM, Mazer-Amirshahi M, Pines JM, May L. A
427 retrospective cross-sectional study of patients treated in US EDs and ambulatory care
428 clinics with sexually transmitted infections from 2001 to 2010. *Am J Emerg Med*
429 2016;34(9):1808–11.
- 430 11. Pearson WS, Tromble E, Jenkins WD, Solnick R, Gift TL. Choosing the Emergency
431 Department as an Alternative for STD Care: Potential Disparities in Access. *J Health*
432 *Care Poor Underserved* 2022;33(3):1163–8.
- 433 12. Solnick RE, Rothenber C, Merchant RC, Kocher KE. 273 Racial and Gender Disparities
434 in the Diagnosis and Empiric Treatment of Sexually Transmitted Infections. *Acad*
435 *Emerg Med* [Internet] 2022;29(S1). Available from:
436 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/acem.14511>
- 437 13. St. Lawrence JS, Montañó DE, Kasprzyk D, Phillips WR, Armstrong K, Leichter JS.
438 STD Screening, Testing, Case Reporting, and Clinical and Partner Notification
439 Practices: A National Survey of US Physicians. *Am J Public Health* 2002;92(11):1784–
440 8.
- 441 14. Golden MR, Hogben M, Handsfield HH, St Lawrence JS, Potterat JJ, Holmes KK.
442 Partner notification for HIV and STD in the United States: low coverage for gonorrhea,
443 chlamydial infection, and HIV. *Sex Transm Dis* 2003;30(6):490–6.
- 444 15. Mathews C, Coetzee N, Zwarenstein M, et al. A systematic review of strategies for

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

- 445 partner notification for sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV/AIDS. *Int J STD*
446 *AIDS* 2002;13(5):285–300.
- 447 16. CDC. STI Treatment Guidelines [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
448 2022 [cited 2022 Oct 18];Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/std/treatment-](https://www.cdc.gov/std/treatment-guidelines/default.htm)
449 [guidelines/default.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/std/treatment-guidelines/default.htm)
- 450 17. Ferreira A, Young T, Mathews C, Zunza M, Low N. Strategies for partner notification
451 for sexually transmitted infections, including HIV. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*
452 2013;(10):CD002843.
- 453 18. Trelle S, Shang A, Nartey L, Cassell JA, Low N. Improved effectiveness of partner
454 notification for patients with sexually transmitted infections: systematic review. *BMJ*
455 2007;334(7589):354.
- 456 19. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of
457 Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting
458 observational studies. *PLoS Med* 2007;4(10):e296.
- 459 20. Mello MJ, Merchant RC, Clark MA. Surveying emergency medicine. *Acad Emerg Med*
460 2013;20(4):409–12.
- 461 21. Artino AR Jr, La Rochelle JS, Dezee KJ, Gehlbach H. Developing questionnaires for
462 educational research: AMEE Guide No. 87. *Med Teach* 2014;36(6):463–74.
- 463 22. Rosenfeld EA, Marx J, Terry MA, et al. Perspectives on expedited partner therapy for
464 chlamydia: a survey of health care providers. *Int J STD AIDS* 2016;27(13):1180–6.
- 465 23. Gamarel KE, Mouzoon R, Rivas A, Stephenson R, Mmeje O. Healthcare providers and
466 community perspectives on expedited partner therapy (EPT) for use with gay, bisexual
467 and other men who have sex with men. *Sex Transm Infect* [Internet] 2019;Available
468 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/sextrans-2019-054156>
- 469 24. McCool-Myers M, Wickham PG, Henn MC, Sheth AN, Kottke MJ. Who’s practicing
470 expedited partner therapy and why? Insights from providers working in high STI-
471 volume specialties. *Sex Transm Dis* [Internet] 2020;Available from:
472 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/OLQ.0000000000001337>
- 473 25. Mmeje OO, Qin JZ, Wetmore MK, Kolenic GE, Diniz CP, Coleman JS. Breakdown in
474 the expedited partner therapy treatment cascade: from reproductive healthcare provider
475 to the pharmacist. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2020;223(3):417.e1-417.e8.
- 476 26. Legal Status of Expedited Partner Therapy (EPT) [Internet]. Center for Disease Control
477 and Prevention. 2020 [cited 2021 Jan 10];Available from:
478 <https://www.cdc.gov/std/ept/legal/default.htm>
- 479 27. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. NCHHSTP AtlasPlus [Internet]. [cited May
480 08. 2020];Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/nchhstp/atlas/index.htm>
- 481 28. Press Ganey Improvement Portal [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 8];Available from:
482 <https://docplayer.net/52970962-Press-ganey-improvement-portal.html>

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

- 483 29. Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems. HCAHPS Star
484 Ratings Technical Notes [Internet]. CAHPS Hospital Survey. 2022 [cited 2020 Nov
485 8]; Available from: <https://www.hcahpsonline.org/en/summary-analyses/>
- 486 30. American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR). Response Rates - An
487 Overview [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb 1]; Available from:
488 [https://www.aapor.org/Education-Resources/For-Researchers/Poll-Survey-
489 FAQ/Response-Rates-An-Overview.aspx](https://www.aapor.org/Education-Resources/For-Researchers/Poll-Survey-FAQ/Response-Rates-An-Overview.aspx)
- 490 31. Halbesleben JRB, Whitman MV. Evaluating survey quality in health services research: a
491 decision framework for assessing nonresponse bias. *Health Serv Res* 2013;48(3):913–
492 30.
- 493 32. American College of Emergency Physicians (ACEP). Expedited Partner Therapy for
494 Selected Sexually Transmitted Infections [Internet]. Policy Statements. 2022 [cited 2023
495 Jan 12]; Available from: [https://www.acep.org/patient-care/policy-statements/expedited-
496 partner-therapy-for-selected-sexually-transmitted-infections/](https://www.acep.org/patient-care/policy-statements/expedited-partner-therapy-for-selected-sexually-transmitted-infections/)
- 497 33. Arizona State University, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Legal/Policy
498 Toolkit for Adoption and Implementation of Expedited Partner Therapy [Internet]. 2011.
499 Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/std/ept/legal/ept-toolkit-complete.pdf>
- 500 34. California Department of Public Health. Patient-Delivered Partner Therapy (PDPT) for
501 Chlamydia, Gonorrhea, and Trichomoniasis: Guidance for Medical Providers in
502 California [Internet]. 2016. Available from:
503 [https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/CDPH%20Document%20Library/Clini-
504 calGuidelines_CA-STD-PDPT-Guidelines.pdf](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/CDPH%20Document%20Library/ClinicalGuidelines_CA-STD-PDPT-Guidelines.pdf)
- 505 35. Pickett ML, Melzer-Lange MD, Miller MK, Menon S, Vistocky AM, Drendel AL.
506 Physician adherence to Centers for Disease Control and Prevention guidelines for
507 sexually active adolescents in the pediatric emergency setting. *Pediatr Emerg Care*
508 [Internet] 2016; Available from: <https://europepmc.org/articles/pmc5378669>
- 509 36. Cramer R, Leichter JS, Stenger MR, et al. The legal aspects of expedited partner
510 therapy practice: do state laws and policies really matter? *Sex Transm Dis*
511 2013;40(8):657.
- 512 37. Hogben M, McCree DH, Golden MR. Patient-Delivered Partner Therapy for Sexually
513 Transmitted Diseases as Practiced by U.S. Physicians. *Sex Transm Dis* 2005;32(2):101.
- 514 38. Taylor MM, Reilley B, Yellowman M, Anderson L, de Ravello L, Tulloch S. Use of
515 expedited partner therapy among chlamydia cases diagnosed at an urban Indian health
516 centre, Arizona. *Int J STD AIDS* 2013;24(5):371–4.
- 517 39. Abara WE, Hess KL, Neblett Fanfair R, Bernstein KT, Paz-Bailey G. Syphilis Trends
518 among Men Who Have Sex with Men in the United States and Western Europe: A
519 Systematic Review of Trend Studies Published between 2004 and 2015. *PLoS One*
520 2016;11(7):e0159309.
- 521 40. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Gay and Bisexual Men’s Health: Sexually
522 Transmitted Diseases [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Feb 22]; Available from:

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

- 523 <https://www.cdc.gov/msmhealth/STD.htm>
- 524 41. Shover CL, DeVost MA, Beymer MR, Gorbach PM, Flynn RP, Bolan RK. Using Sexual
525 Orientation and Gender Identity to Monitor Disparities in HIV, Sexually Transmitted
526 Infections, and Viral Hepatitis. *Am J Public Health* 2018;108(S4):S277–83.
- 527 42. Dehlin JM, Stillwagon R, Pickett J, Keene L, Schneider JA. #PrEP4Love: An
528 Evaluation of a Sex-Positive HIV Prevention Campaign. *JMIR Public Health Surveill*
529 2019;5(2):e12822.
- 530 43. STD Health Equity [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Feb 22];Available from:
531 <https://www.cdc.gov/std/health-disparities/default.htm>
- 532 44. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC Fact Sheet: Reported STDs in the
533 United States, 2019 [Internet]. 2019. Available from:
534 <https://www.cdc.gov/nchhstp/newsroom/docs/factsheets/std-trends-508.pdf>
- 535 45. Haggerty CL, Gottlieb SL, Taylor BD, Low N, Xu F, Ness RB. Risk of sequelae after
536 Chlamydia trachomatis genital infection in women. *J Infect Dis* 2010;201 Suppl 2:S134-
537 55.

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

538 SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

eTable Characteristics of non responders versus responders				
	All participants	Non responders	Responders	p value
Med Director Characteristics				
Male	50	16	34	0.87
Female	20	6	14	
ED Characteristic				
Regions, %				
Northeast	20	4	16	0.61
Midwest	13	5	8	
South	21	7	14	
West	16	6	10	
ED Volume, mean (SD)	73747 (26622)	71671 (24903)	74699 (27576)	0.65
Medicaid %, mean (SD)	28 (14)	29 (16)	28 (13.15)	0.75
State Characteristic				
Year LPI adopted				
Early	54	16	38	0.39
Late	15	5	10	
Prohibited (SC only)	1	1	0	
Chlamydia incidence				
High	33	13	20	0.18
Low	37	9	28	

539

540 eTable 1 Characteristics of non-responders versus responders

541

eTable 2. Expedited Partner Therapy Awareness by Emergency Department and State Characteristics							
	Total (n)	%	EPT Awareness Status				Fisher p-value
			Yes (n)	%	No (n)	%	
ED Characteristics							
ED volume							
High	26	54%	20	57%	6	46%	0.53
Low	22	46%	15	43%	7	54%	
Proportion medicaid							
Low	22	50%	16	48%	6	55%	1
High	22	50%	17	52%	5	45%	
State characteristic							
EPT adoption							
Early	38	79%	29	83%	9	69%	0.43
Late	10	26%	6	17%	4	31%	
Chlamydia incidence							
High	20	42%	18	51%	2	15%	<0.05
Low	28	58%	17	49%	11	85%	
Note: Dichotimization of ED Volume threshold is 64,875 (median value); Medicaid threshold is 26% (4 had missing values), States classified as early adopters if EPT laws were between 2001-2014 vs late if between 2015-2019; Chlamydia incidence classified as low for rates at threshold of 445 per 100K population							

542

543

eTable 2. Expedited Partner Therapy Awareness by Emergency Department and

544

State Characteristics


545

546

547

548

eFigure 1. Medical Director Perceived Barriers to Expedited Partner Therapy



549

eTable 3. Percentage of medical directors reporting highest rating of concern or importance for barriers and facilitators of expedited partner therapy

type	number	total	mean	SD	95%CI Lower	95%CI upper
Facilitator Importance						
Reinfection	38	48	79.2%	5.9%	67.7%	90.7%
Access	39	48	81.3%	5.6%	70.2%	92.3%
Untreated	39	48	81.3%	5.6%	70.2%	92.3%
Sequela	39	48	81.3%	5.6%	70.2%	92.3%
Barrier concern						
Legal liability	12	48	25.0%	6.3%	12.8%	37.2%
Affordability	10	48	20.8%	5.9%	9.3%	32.3%
Pharmacy	8	48	16.7%	5.4%	6.1%	27.2%
Adverse reactions	6	48	12.5%	4.8%	3.1%	21.9%
Missed dx	9	48	18.8%	5.6%	7.7%	29.8%
IPV	10	48	20.8%	5.9%	9.3%	32.3%

550

551

552

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

553 **SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

554

555 consent Expedited Partner Therapy Survey This survey is intended for the Medical
556 Director of Emergency Departments (ED) or physicians in similar operational leadership
557 roles. We are a team of emergency physicians and researchers from <<blinded for review>>
558 studying how EDs treat patients and their patients' sexual partners for STIs. We also are
559 studying Medical Directors' knowledge and perspectives on treating patients' sexual partners
560 and the clinical practice of Expedited Partner Therapy (EPT). If you are unfamiliar with EPT
561 we will explain it later in the survey. The survey should take 5 minutes. Answering this
562 survey is voluntary. You can skip any questions that you don't want to answer. Answering
563 our survey won't benefit you directly. What we learn will help us in guiding the
564 implementation of policies that increase access to STI care. To keep your information
565 confidential, your survey responses will be anonymous. For questions, please contact
566 <<blinded for review>> MD and the research team at <<blinded for review>>. As a thank
567 you for participation, you will have the option to receive a \$20 Amazon gift card or to
568 contribute the money back to EPT research at the survey's completion. If you would like to
569 enter the drawing, you can anonymously enter your email after the survey is completed. Your
570 email will not be stored with your survey responses. To participate, check the "I agree to
571 participate" box below, then click the blue button to begin.

572 Yes, I agree to participate (1)

573 No, I do not agree to participate (0)

574

575 End of Block: Consent

576

577 Start of Block: Demographics / Who are you

578 role Which primary operational leadership role best describes your position in the emergency
579 department?

580 Medical Director of the Emergency Department (1)

581 Division Chief of Emergency Medicine (2)

582 Service Chief of Emergency Medicine (3)

583 Chief of Staff (4)

584 (Vice) Chair/ Director of (Clinical) Operations (5)

585 (Vice) Chair/ Director of Quality and Safety (6)

586 (Vice) Chair/ Director of Clinical and Faculty Affairs (7)

587 Clinical Director (8)

588 Other (9) _____

589

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

590 years_EM How many years have you been practicing emergency medicine?

591 0-5 years (1)

592 6-10 years (2)

593 11-20 years (3)

594 21+ years (4)

595 years_role How many years have you been in an operational leadership role in the ED?

596 0-5 years (1)

597 6-10 years (2)

598 11-15 years (3)

599 16+ years (4)

600 End of Block: Demographics / Who are you

601

602 Start of Block: Knowledge

603

604 EPTaware Expedited Partner Therapy (EPT) is the clinical practice of treating the sexual
 605 partners of patients diagnosed with chlamydia or gonorrhea (and/ or trichomonas) by
 606 providing prescriptions or medications to the patient to take to his/ her partner(s) *without the*
 607 *health care provider first examining the partner*. This practice is also sometimes alternatively
 608 called Patient-Delivered (Partner) Therapy. Have you ever heard about Expedited Partner
 609 Therapy (EPT) before?

610 Yes (1)

611 No (0)

612

613 *Skip To: guide If EPTaware = No*

614

615 STI To the best of your knowledge, which STIs do you think can be treated with EPT in your
 616 state?

	Yes (1)	No (0)	(Unsure) (2)
Chlamydia (STI_chlam)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gonorrhea (STI_gono)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

	Yes (1)	No (0)	(Unsure/ Don't know) (2)
Trichomoniasis (STI_trich)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
617			
618			
619	guide To the best of your knowledge, which of the following groups have written guidance		
620	regarding EPT?		
CDC guidelines (guide_CDC)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State laws (guide_law)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Local health department (guide_local)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Local hospital guidelines (guide_hospital)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

621

622

623 End of Block: Knowledge

624

625 Start of Block: Interest and Feasibility

626 support In your opinion, rate the level of support or expected level of support of the following
627 ED clinicians for EPT being offered at your facility?

	Strongly Oppose (1)	Somewhat Oppose (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Support (4)	Strongly Support (5)	(Unsure) (6)
Your personal interest (support_meddir)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

Physicians/ Physician Assistants (PA) / Nurse Practitioners (NP) (support_prescriber)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Nurses (RN) (support_RN)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

628

629

630

631 implementer Has your emergency department already implemented EPT? (i.e. Are
632 physicians/ PAs/ NPs already writing prescriptions for the sexual partners of patients
633 diagnosed with STIs without an exam of the partner?)

634 Yes (1)

635 No (0)

636 (Unsure) (2)

637

638 *Skip To: End of Block If implementer = Yes*

639

640

641 feasible How feasible do you think it would be to implement EPT at your ED?

642 Not at all feasible (1)

643 Somewhat feasible (2)

644 Feasible (3)

645 Very feasible (4)

646 (Unsure) (5)

647

648

649 departsupport Do you think your department would support implementing EPT, including
650 clinical staff time for patient follow-up and counseling?

651 Extremely unlikely (1)

652 Somewhat unlikely (2)

653 Neither likely nor unlikely (3)

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

654 Somewhat likely (4)

655 Extremely likely (5)

656

657 peers Would EPT being practiced at peer institutions have an impact on your decision to
658 implement EPT at your ED?

659 Definitely would impact (1)

660 Probably would impact (2)

661 Neutral (3)

662 Probably would not impact (4)

663 Definitely would not impact (5)

664

665 End of Block: Interest and Feasibility

666

667 Start of Block: Prior Experience

668 writerx Do you know how to write a prescription for EPT?

669 Yes (1)

670 No (0)

671

672 *Skip To: End of Block If writerx = No*

673

674 prescribed

675 Have you prescribed medications through EPT?

676 Yes (1)

677 No (0)

678

679 End of Block: Prior Experience

680

681 Start of Block: Risks and Benefits

682

683 concernLOG Rate your level of concern regarding the following potential logistical
684 challenges with EPT.

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

	Not at all concerned (1)	Slightly concerned (2)	Concerned (3)	Moderately concerned (4)	Extremely concerned (5)	(Unsure) (6)
Legal liability concerns (concernLOG_legal)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Affordability of EPT medication (concernLOG_afford)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability for pharmacy to fill Rx (concernLOG_pharm)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

685

686 concernPT Rate your level of concern regarding the following potential patient outcome
687 issues with EPT.

	Not at all concerned (1)	Slightly concerned (2)	Concerned (3)	Moderately concerned (4)	Extremely concerned (5)	(Unsure) (6)
Adverse reactions to antibiotics (concernPT_abx)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Missed medical diagnoses (concernPT_miss)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Concern for intimate partner violence (concernPT_IPV)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

688

689

690 concern_freetext Do you have additional concerns about potential risks with EPT?

Running Title: Expedited Partner Therapy in Academic Emergency Departments

691

692

693 benefit In your opinion, rate the importance of the following potential benefits with EPT:

	Not important (1)	Slightly important (2)	Moderately important (3)	Very important (4)	Extremely important (5)	(Unsure) (6)
Preventing STI reinfection (benefit_reinfx)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increasing access to treatment among vulnerable populations (benefit_access)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Addressing untreated STIs (benefit_STI)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Preventing sequela of STIs (i.e pelvic inflammatory disease) (benefit_prevent)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

694

695 benefit_freetext Do you see any additional benefits with EPT?

696 End of Block: Risks and Benefits

697

698