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INTRODUCTION

Prevention of new infections is the most important tool to control the HIV epidemic, given that HIV is a chronic disease with no cure despite increased patient survival with the new antiretroviral treatments.

Adequate development of prevention activities requires information on the distribution and evolution of HIV infection in the population, as well as the circumstances in which new infections are produced. Although the entire population may be susceptible to HIV infection, the prevalence is much higher in certain groups with more frequent risk exposures. Prevention should be adapted to the characteristics of each population, and this requires the availability of specific information on the main groups affected.

The EPI-VIH study group is a network of front-line centres for HIV/STI counselling and diagnosis in populations highly vulnerable to the infection. They are a valuable source of information to quantify and analyse annually the profile of persons who seek testing in participating centres, as well as those who are newly diagnosed of HIV. This report presents information on new HIV diagnoses for the period 2003-2008.

OBJECTIVES

To describe the frequency and characteristics of new HIV diagnoses in the centres participating in the EPI-VIH study during the period 2003-2008.
METHODS

- **Design:** Descriptive study.

- **Period:** 2003-2008.

- **Setting:** Twenty specialized centres for HIV/STI diagnosis located in 19 Spanish cities.

  The Health Promotion and Support Unit (Spanish acronym, UPAS) of Malaga joined the study in 2004, and the Sexually Transmitted Infection (STI) unit of the Drassanes Primary Care Centre in Barcelona participated during the period 2003-2007.

- **Subjects:** Patients who were voluntarily tested for HIV during the study period in any of the participating centres, either at their request or recommended by their attending health professional, with confirmed presence of anti-HIV antibodies.

- **Study variables and data collection:** A specially designed questionnaire was used to collect information on sociodemographic variables, existence of previous tests, history of intravenous drug use, sexual risk exposures, circumstances to which the infection was attributed, and clinical and laboratory data.

- **Data analysis:** The qualitative variables are described by the frequency and percentage, and the quantitative variables by the mean and standard deviation (SD) or the median and 25th and 75th percentiles (P25, P75). Student’s t-test was used for the comparison of means and the $\chi^2$ test for the comparison of proportions.

In interpreting these results, the profile of the population attending these centres during the study period must be considered. For this purpose, readers should consult the report “HIV prevalence in clients of a network of HIV/STI centres, 2000-2008” which is available at [http://www.isciii.es/htdocs/centros/epidemiologia/epi_VIH.jsp](http://www.isciii.es/htdocs/centros/epidemiologia/epi_VIH.jsp)
RESULTS

During the study period 2,617 new HIV diagnoses were identified. The distribution of diagnoses by participating centre and year of diagnosis is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of new diagnoses by centre and year of diagnosis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centres</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALICANTE</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARCELONA*</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILBAO</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTAGENA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTELLON</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIJON</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANADA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA RIOJA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAGA**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADRID-MONTESA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADRID-SANDBERO</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURCIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVIEDO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAMPLONA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN SEBASTIAN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTANDER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVILLA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENERIFE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALENCIA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITORIA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>2,617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Participated during the period 2003-2007
** Joined the study in 2004

a) Sociodemographic characteristics of new HIV diagnoses

Most of the new HIV diagnoses were men (83.1%), between age 25 and 34 years (47.8%) and with secondary or higher level of education (64.7%). With respect to region of birth, 1,101 patients (42.1%) came from countries other than Spain, primarily from Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa (Table 2, Figure 1).
Table 2. Sociodemographic characteristics of new HIV diagnoses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Year of diagnosis</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N°</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25 years</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>386</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>691</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=45 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>561</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>943</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Distribution of patients from other countries by region of birth
b) Distribution by transmission route

Patients were classified into mutually exclusive categories by the most probable route of HIV transmission. Unprotected sexual relations were responsible for transmission in 2,457 cases (93.9%); in 118 patients (4.5%) transmission was attributed to shared injection material, and in 42 (1.6%) transmission was either produced by other mechanisms (in one case, due to an occupational accident) or could not be determined (information was not available in 41 cases).

Of the total number of patients, 1,919 (73.3%) attributed the transmission to male sexual contacts (MSM) and 538 (20.6%) attributed it to heterosexual contacts. An increasing proportion of HIV diagnoses reporting male sexual relations as the probable transmission mechanism was observed during the period, together with a decreasing proportion of those reporting heterosexual relations (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route of transmission</th>
<th>Year of diagnosis</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nº</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared injection material</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected homosexual relations among males (MSM)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected heterosexual relations</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences were found in the mode of transmission according to patients’ origin. Homosexual relations between men were more frequent in Spaniards (79.5% versus 64.9%) and heterosexual relations were more frequent in foreigners (30.6% versus 13.3%) (Figure 2).
For the 2,457 cases in which transmission was attributed to unprotected sexual relations, data were collected on the most probable situation in which it occurred. Bearing in mind that the same patient could report more than one risk situation, the most frequent were relations with a casual partner (67.7%), followed by relations with the steady partner (39.6%) (Table 4).

**Table 4. Risk situations in new diagnoses attributed to sexual transmission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk situation*</th>
<th>Year of diagnosis</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N°</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual relations with steady partner</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual relations with casual partner</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual relations with someone known to have HIV infection</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual relations in exchange for money or drugs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual relations with a person from a high prevalence area</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A patient may have more than one risk situation.*
Sexual relations with casual partners (74.7%) and with the steady partner (36.9%) were more frequent in MSM, whereas the most frequent sexual relations in heterosexuals were with the steady partner (49.4%) followed by those with an casual partner (42.6%) (Figure 3).

**Figure 3. Distribution of new diagnoses attributed to sexual transmission, by type of partner***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male homosexual relations</th>
<th>Heterosexual relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 1,919)</td>
<td>(n = 538)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>13,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>17,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>13,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18,7</td>
<td>40,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A patient may have more than one risk situation.

Some cases reported certain special situations as the most probable exposure: condom breakage or slippage in 110 cases and unprotected oral sex in 81.

**c) Clinical characteristics**

A sexually transmitted infection (STI) together with HIV was diagnosed in 764 (29.2%) of all patients. This percentage rose to 30.4% in those for whom HIV
transmission was attributed to unprotected sexual relations (Table 5); in the latter group the most frequently diagnosed infections were: syphilis (302 cases, 40.5%), anogenital warts (154 cases, 20.6%), gonorrhoea (103 cases, 13.8%) and chlamydia (55 cases, 7.4%), either alone or in conjunction with other STIs. Some 33.0% of MSM had another STI at the time of HIV diagnosis versus 21.0% of heterosexuals (p=0.00).

Of newly diagnosed patients for whom HIV was attributed to sexual transmission, 43.8% reported having had a previous STI (Table 5). By route of HIV transmission, 50.1% of MSM reported a history of STI versus 21.6% of homosexuals, a statistically significant difference. Differences in the proportion of cases with a history of STI were also detected between Spanish (45.7%) and foreign (41.4%) patients.

Table 5. Other sexually transmitted infections in new HIV diagnoses attributed to sexual transmission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexually transmitted infections (STI)</th>
<th>Year of diagnosis</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nº</td>
<td>Nº</td>
<td>Nº</td>
<td>Nº</td>
<td>Nº</td>
<td>Nº</td>
<td>Nº</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrence with another STI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Yes                                | 87    | 95    | 101   | 131   | 147   | 185   | 746 | 30.4
| No/Unknown                         | 229   | 249   | 285   | 273   | 344   | 331   | 1,711 | 69.6 |
| History of STI                      |       |       |       |       |       |       |     |    |
| Yes                                | 126   | 151   | 155   | 179   | 228   | 238   | 1,077 | 43.8
| No/Unknown                         | 190   | 193   | 231   | 225   | 263   | 278   | 1,380 | 56.2 |
| TOTAL                              | 316   | 344   | 386   | 404   | 491   | 516   | 2,457 | 100  |

With respect to clinical stage of HIV infection, most cases were asymptomatic at the time of diagnosis (stage A) (1,875 cases, 71.6%), 6.2% (162) had primary infection, 3.8% (99) were in stage B (symptomatic not AIDS), and in 33 patients (1.3%) HIV was diagnosed in stage C (AIDS). This information was unknown for 448 patients (17.1%).

Information on hepatitis C serology was available in 1,951 cases (74.5%), 192 of whom (9.8%) had anti-HCV antibodies. Some 55.2% of persons with hepatitis C were or had been intravenous drug users (IDU) and 74.0% were Spaniards.
CD4 level at diagnosis was available for 1,770 patients (67.6%); of these, 510 (28.8%) had less than 350 CD4 cells/µl (Table 6).

Table 6. CD4 level at diagnosis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD4 level</th>
<th>Year of diagnosis</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;200</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-350</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;350</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of cases with less than 200 CD4 was higher in patients with lower educational level (16.6% in those with only primary/no education versus 9.0% in those with secondary/higher education), and was higher in IDUs (21.2%) than in heterosexuals (16.6%) and MSM (8.6%). The mean age of cases with less than 200 CD4 was 36.4 years (SD: 9.1) versus 32.4 years (SD: 7.9) in those who had >200 CD4.

A total of 1,756 new HIV diagnoses (67.1%) had previously been tested. The test date was known in 1,730 cases (98.5%), and the median time between the date of the last test and the date of HIV diagnosis was 1 year (P_{25-P_{75}} = 0.3). The existence of the previous test was reported by the patients themselves in 978 cases (56.5%), was documented in the centre participating in the study in 544 cases (31.4%), was documented in another health centre in 130 cases (7.5%), and in 78 cases (4.5%) the source of the information was unknown. Patients with a previous test were mostly men (90.8%), with a mean age of 32.6 years (SD: 7.6) and Spaniards (59.5%). About 74.5% of MSM reported having had a previous test versus 66.9% of IDUs and 42.0% of heterosexuals.
CONCLUSIONS

- During the study period, most new HIV diagnoses occurred in men, between 25 and 34 years of age, Spaniards, and with secondary or higher educational level. Some 42% of cases occurred in persons from other countries, primarily from Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa.

- Most new HIV diagnoses were attributed to unprotected sexual relations, especially among men. Unprotected homosexual relations were more frequent in Spaniards, and unprotected heterosexual relations were more frequent in persons born in other countries.

- In cases of transmission due to unprotected sexual relations, the most frequent risk situations were relations with casual partners among MSM and relations with steady partners in persons with heterosexual exposures.

- Almost one-third of new HIV diagnoses had another STI at the same time. About 44% of cases had experienced a previous STI.

- Of the HIV diagnoses with information on hepatitis C serology, one of every ten had anti-HCV antibodies. HCV infection was more frequent in Spaniards and IDUs.

- The CD4 level at HIV diagnosis was less than 350 cells/µl in 29% of cases. These are late presenters in which treatment effectiveness and quality of life are reduced.

- About 67% of newly diagnosed persons had previously been tested for HIV. The median time between date of the last negative test and date of diagnosis was 1 year (P25-P75 = 0-3).

- The results obtained in this study reflect the epidemiological situation of persons who attend HIV/STI diagnostic centres, thus they can not be considered representative of the situation in other segments of the population.
EPI-VIH Study Group

Centro de ETS y Orientación Sexual de Granada
José Manuel Ureña Escribano
Esperanza Castro López
Vicenta Benavides García
Marisa Gómez Acedo

Centro de ETS "Costa del Sol" de Málaga
Mª Victoria Aguaneill Marfil
Francisco Montiel Alcántara
Antonio Manuel Burgos del Pino

Unidad de Promoción y Apoyo a la Salud (UPAS), Málaga
Blanca Martínez Sierra
Miguel Ángel García Raso
Laura Godoy Romero

Centro de ETS de Sevilla
Isabel Pueyo Rodríguez
Enrique Ruiz Fernández
Cinta Redondo Veral
Concepción Martínez Díaz de Argandoña
Dolores Sánchez Molina

Unidad de ETS, Hospital Monte Naranco, Oviedo
Mª Luisa Junquera Llaneza
Mar Cuesta Rodríguez
Fernando Vázquez Valdés
Francisco Carreño Alonso

Unidad de ETS de Gijón
José Antonio Varela Uria
Carmen López Sánchez
Luis Otero Guerra

Centro Dermatológico de Tenerife
Carlos de Armas González
Eduardo García-Ramos Alonso
Jesús Rodríguez-Franco Castro
Mª Adelaida Gutiérrez León
Lourdes Capote Pestano
Domingo Núñez Gallo

Sección Vigilancia Epidemiológica. Servicio Salud Pública. Santander
Luis Javier Vitoria Raymundo
Luz Gómez Lastra
Carmen Fernández-Oruña

C.O.F. “La Cagiga” Santander
Mª Concepción Fernández Patallo
María de Vierna Pita
Ana Estébanez Ortega
Domingo Álvarez González
Francisco del Río Cayón

Unidad de ITS, CAP Drassanes. Barcelona
Martí Vall Mayans
Encarnación Arellano Muñoz
Pilar Saladié Martí
Benicio Sanz Colomo
Pere Armengol Egea
M. José Alcalde Calatayud
Eva Loureiro

Centro Sanitario Sandoval, Servicio Madrileño de Salud, Comunidad de Madrid
Jorge del Romero Guerrero
Carmen Rodríguez Martín
Teresa Puerta López
Petunia Clavo Escribano
Soledad García Pérez
Sonsoles del Corral del Campo
Blanca Menéndez Prieto
Mª Ángeles Neila Paredes
Natividad Jerez Zamora
Montserrat Raposo
Mar Vera García
Juan Ballesteros Martín

Programa de Prevención del SIDA y ETS, Ayuntamiento de Madrid:
Francisco Javier Bru Gorraiz
Concepción Colomo Gómez
Alicia Comunión Artieda
Raquel Martín Pozas
Silvia Marinero Escudero

Unidad de Prevención y Educación Sanitaria sobre SIDA de Murcia
Juan Ramón Ordoñana Martín
José Joaquín Gutiérrez García
Josefa Ballester Blasco
Francisco Pérez Riquelme

Unidad ETS-SIDA. Centro de Salud Área II. Cartagena
Jordi Balaguer
Ana Isabel Villafane

COFES-Pamplona
Mª Cruz Landa
Hortensia Yagüe Moreno
Pablo Sánchez Valverde
Ana Gaztambide Rubio
Isabel Huarte Salas
Elisa Sesma Sánchez
Juncal Benito Galavía

Centro ETS Vitoria. Comarca Araba- Osakidetza
Marian Azpiri

Servicio de ETS-Enfermedades Infecciosas, Hospital de Basurto. Bilbao
Mª del Mar Cámara Pérez
Josefa López de Munain López
Mª Natividad Aparicio Basauri
Mª Antonia Aizpuru de Llanos

Plan del SIDA del País Vasco. San Sebastián
Isabel Sanz Berceiartu
Arantxa Arrilaga Arrizabalaga
Xabier Camino Ortiz de Barrón

Servicio de Epidemiología y Promoción de la Salud, La Rioja.
Eva Martínez Ochoa
Mª Eugenia Lezaun Larrumbe
Luis Metola Sacristán
Carmen Quihones Rubio
Enrique Ramalle Gómar
Milagros Perucha González
Valvanera Ibarra Cuclán
José Antonio Oteo Revuelta

CIPS de Castellón
Josep Trullén Gas
Angelina Fenosa Salillas
Carmen Altava Padilla
Alicia Polo Esteve

CIPS de Alicante
Josefina Belda Ibáñez
Elisa Fernández García
Trinidad Zafra Espinosa
Sonia Colomina Monzó
Enrique Galián Rubio

CIPS de Valencia
J. Ignacio Alastrué Loscos
Concha Santos Rubio
Teresa Tasa Zapatero
Amparo Juan Corrons

Centro Nacional de Epidemiología (Instituto de Salud Carlos III) y Secretaría del Plan Nacional sobre Sida
Mercedes Diez Ruiz-Navarro
Asunción Díaz Franco
César Garriga Fuentes