

## nPEP IN THE PREP ERA

# ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF PRE-EXPOSURE PROPHYLAXIS ON THE USE OF NON-OCCUPATIONAL POST-EXPOSURE PROPHYLAXIS IN HIV PREVENTION

A .FERNÁNDEZ VÁZQUEZ<sup>1</sup>, P. DIOS DÍEZ<sup>2</sup>, L. ORTEGA VALÍN<sup>1</sup>, Y.M. BUITRAGO ROCHA<sup>3</sup>, D. OZCOIDI IDOATE<sup>1</sup>, R. VARELA FERNÁNDEZ<sup>1</sup>, E. GUTIÉRREZ GUTIÉRREZ<sup>1</sup>, S. LLAMAS LORENZANA<sup>1</sup>, A. VELEZ BLANCO<sup>1</sup>, J.J. ORTIZ DE URBINA GONZÁLEZ<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Hospital Pharmacy Service, <sup>2</sup>Internal Medicine Service, <sup>3</sup>Emergency Service. Complejo Asistencial Universitario de León (CAULE). León (Spain).

## BACKGROUND AND IMPORTANCE | AIM AND OBJECTIVES

Two HIV preventive intervention highly effective

- **Non-occupational Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (nPEP)**, administered **after** a potential exposure.
- **Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP)** administered **prior** to a risk exposure, designed to reduce HIV transmission.

¿Has the introduction of PrEP (since 2021 in CAULE) influenced the demand for nPEP?

### nPEP usage

(number of prescriptions per month)

- **P1** (2015-2021): **BEFORE** PrEP
- **P2** (2021-2025): **AFTER** PrEP

### Data analysis:

- Two-sample test of proportions
- Statistical significance set  $p < 0.05$
- RStudio for Windows (v4.4.1)

## MATERIAL AND METHODS



Characterize and evaluate both prevention strategies in terms of

- Demographic profiles
- Exposure types
- Clinical follow-up

## RESULTS

**nPEP increased significantly + 342.21% (p-value 0.002)**

from 0.289 prescriptions/month (P1) to 0.989 (P2), when PrEP was more available

Number (proportion %)	nPEP-P1 (n=22)	nPEP-P2 (n=51)	p-value	nPEP (P1+P2) (n=73)	PrEP users (n=47)	p-value
<b>Age, years (median (IQR))</b>	34 (27-39)	31 (27-38)	0.413	32 (27-39)	35 (29-43)	0.0619
<b>Gender</b>						
Men	20 (90.91%)	34 (66.67%)	0.078	54 (73.97%)	45 (95.74%)	0.003
Women	1 (4.55%)	14 (27.45%)		15 (20.54%)	-	
Transgender-women	1 (4.55%)	3 (5.88%)		4 (5.48%)	2 (4.26%)	
<b>Men who has sex with men (MSM)</b>	8 (36,36%)	23 (45,10%)	0.174	22 (30,13%)	47 (100%)	0.0005
<b>Risky sexual intercourse</b>	15 (68.18%)	39 (76.47%)	0.497	54 (73.97%)	-	-
<b>nPEP &lt;24 h initiation</b>	9 (40.91%)	28 (54.90%)	1	37 (50.68%)	-	-
<b>Weekend exposition</b>	8 (36.36%)	28 (54.09%)	0.2307	36 (49.32%)	-	-
<b>ITS</b>	3 (13.64%)	8 (15.69%)	1	11 (15.07%)	29 (61.70%)	0,0359
<b>Follow-up adherence</b>	9 (40.91%)	25 (49.02%)		34 (46.58%)	35 (85.71%)	

## CONCLUSIONS

The increase in nPEP use may reflect heightened awareness of HIV prevention and knowledge of available interventions, as well as exposure scenarios not preventable by PrEP alone.

Many people could benefit from PrEP; it is necessary to: minimize social barriers, strengthen the coordination of care and the integration of both strategies "PEP-to-PrEP"

