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**Background.** While Germany has a long tradition in HIV research with many well-established regional cohorts, there was a lack of collaborative efforts toward harmonized data collection and biobanking, both key strategies for efficient translational research projects. Key challenges are heterogeneity of data systems and privacy concepts, of existing study and data collection protocols, and sample collection, storage, and sharing.

**Methods.** In 2013, we established the Translational Platform HIV (TP-HIV) with support of the German Centre for Infection Research (DZIF) as a collaboration between university hospitals and specialized HIV care centers throughout Germany. After assessing the individual needs of all partner sites, we have taken comprehensive action to create a common platform for collaboration in all research stages. We developed protocols, rules of operation, biobanking strategies, and privacy concepts for all collaborating partner sites. Patients infected with HIV (PLWH) who sign the informed consent for the TP-HIV are pro- and retrospectively included in the cohort.

**Results.** To date, the TP-HIV infrastructure is implemented at 27 member sites from 11 cities, potentially extending to more than 20,000 patients currently treated for HIV across Germany. Facing the special needs in the German research environment, the TP-HIV established a unique data- and biomaterial collection allowing expedited translational research and reduce project overheads, regulatory burden, and data security regulations for investigators. By active surveillance, rapid access to individual patient groups such as patients with acute HIV infection, TP-HIV is an ideal platform for early phase clinical trials with new drug candidates. Researchers with clinical, biological, epidemiological, and statistical expertise have been brought together within the TP-HIV, which enables an effective translational chain from bench to bedside and back. New collaborations have been established with currently 23 active study protocols.

**Conclusion.** The TP-HIV has demonstrated to be a powerful tool for generating and testing research hypotheses in PLWH. In the future, we will work to further expand our network and address the pressing needs in the German research environment.
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**Background.** PrEP is an important HIV prevention modality. Population-based metrics of PrEP uptake and access are critical to the evaluation of public health efforts to increase PrEP use.

**Methods.** Using the Oregon All Payors All Claims administrative dataset, we determined the number of unique individuals at least 16 years of age starting PrEP, defined as at least one prescription of >30 days of Truvada, each year from 2012–2016. People with HIV or hepatitis B were excluded. We created two metrics of PrEP access in 2016: the number of individuals starting PrEP per 100K population and the number of individuals with a PrEP prescription in each of the four quarters of 2016 per 100K population (i.e., prevalent users). Using public health surveillance data, we created three metrics of PrEP need in 2016: the number of HIV diagnoses per 100K population; the number early syphilis and gonorrhea diagnoses per 100K population; and the number of acute or chronic hepatitis C diagnoses among patients aged 16–30 years per 100K population. We calculated six metrics of PrEP access-to-need by dividing each of the access measures by the need measures.

**Results.** The number of individuals with a new PrEP prescription increased from 0 in 2012 to 571 in 2016. Most new PrEP users were men, aged 25–34 years, identified as white, lived in an urban area, had commercial insurance, and had an internal medicine PrEP prescriber. In 2016, there were 17.2 PrEP starts and 9.9 individuals with a PrEP prescription in each of the four quarters of 2016 per 100K population (i.e., prevalent users). Using public health surveillance data, we created three metrics of PrEP need in 2016: the number of HIV diagnoses per 100K population; the number early syphilis and gonorrhea diagnoses per 100K population; and the number of acute or chronic hepatitis C diagnoses among patients aged 16–30 years per 100K population. We calculated six metrics of PrEP access-to-need by dividing each of the access measures by the need measures.

**Conclusion.** Access metrics based on prevalent users (a measure of longer-term adherence to PrEP), STI diagnoses (a measure of HIV acquisition risk), and HCV diagnoses among those 30 years of age (a measure of need among people who inject drugs) may provide a more complete assessment of PrEP access-to-need than those based on PrEP starts and HIV diagnoses.
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**Background.** Men who have sex with men are disproportionately impacted by HIV in the United States and may benefit most from pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP). However, differences may exist between men who only have sex with men (MSM) and men who have sex with both men and women (MSMW). MSMW may experience more barriers to accessing PrEP and may act as a potential bridge population for transmitting HIV to female sex partners. Differences in PrEP awareness and use between MSM and MSMW are unknown.

**Methods.** We evaluated all MSM and MSMW presenting to the Rhode Island Sexually Transmitted Disease (STD) clinic and PrEP clinic from 2013–2017. Demographics and behavioral information were reviewed. Bivariate analyses were performed to present distributions of demographic and behavioral characteristics by sexual behavior. Logistic regression was conducted to explore associations between PrEP awareness/use and sexual behavior. Confounding variables were identified using the directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) and a priori.

**Results.** Of 1,795 male individuals, 84% (1,504) were MSM, and 16% (291) were MSMW. The median age of our study population was 29 (interquartile range [IQR]: 23–42). When compared with MSM, MSMW were more likely to be non-White (33% vs. 28%), uninsured (54% vs.46%), self-report more sexual partners in the past 12 months (median 6 [IQR: 3–9] vs. 4 [IQR:2–10]), engage in intravenous (21% vs. 12%), and engage in selling (6% vs. 2%) or buying sex (12% vs. 4%, all P < 0.05). MSMW were no less likely to test HIV negative (48% vs. 50%); however, MSMW were significantly less likely to be aware of PrEP and 17% (aOR: 0.83, 95% CI: 0.41–1.66) less likely to report ever using PrEP after adjusting for age, race/ethnicity, and self-reported HIV risk.

**Conclusion.** Despite engaging in higher risk behaviors, MSMW were significantly less likely to be aware of or use PrEP compared with MSM. Future PrEP interventions are needed to target this potentially high-risk bridge population.
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