Table 1: Clinician Demographics

| ID Fellowship |
|---------------|
| Currently in ID fellowship | 7 (10%) |
| Completed ID fellowship | 50 (75%) |

Post Graduate Year

| PGY | % |
|-----|---|
| PGY1-5 | 10 (15%) |
| PGY 6-10 | 16 (24%) |
| PGY ≥ 11 | 36 (54%) |

Number of patients living with HIV seen per month

| Number of patients | % |
|-------------------|---|
| 0 | 2 (3%) |
| 1-10 | 16 (24%) |
| 11-20 | 12 (18%) |
| >20 | 37 (55%) |

Practice Type

| Type | % |
|------|---|
| Academic | 49 (73%) |
| Private Practice | 6 (9%) |
| Federally Qualified Health Center | 6 (9%) |
| Other | 8 (12%) |

Practice Location

| Location | % |
|----------|---|
| California | 23 (34%) |
| New York | 6 (9%) |
| Maryland | 4 (6%) |
| Other | 34 (51%) |

Table 2: HBV Vaccination Practices of Physicians Caring for People Living with HIV

| Preferred timing of HBV vaccination in a patient newly diagnosed with HIV starting ART |
|----------------------------------|
| Vaccine immediately | 53 (79%) |
| Postpone vaccination until HIV VL is suppressed | 12 (18%) |
| Delay vaccination since the patient is on ART | 1 (1%) |
| Other | 1 (1%) |

Preferred initial HBV vaccination series for susceptible individuals living with HIV

| Details | % |
|---------|---|
| Energis-B or Recombivax HB | 18 (27%) |
| Hophilus-B | 29 (44%) |
| Any of the above | 19 (29%) |

Preferred dose & schedule if using Engerix-B or Recombivax HB for initial vaccine series

| Schedule | % |
|----------|---|
| Standard dose at 0, 1, and 0, 6 months | 56 (80%) |
| Double dose at 0, 1, and 6 months | 6 (10%) |
| Standard or double dose at 0, 2, 6, and 6 months | 0 (0%) |

Preferred intervention if patient does not seroconvert after first vaccination series

| Details | % |
|---------|---|
| No further intervention | 3 (5%) |
| Repeat with Engerix-B or Recombivax-HB at standard dose at 0, 1, and 6 months | 14 (23%) |
| Repeat with Engerix-B or Recombivax-HB at double dose at 0, 1, and 6 months | 15 (24%) |
| Repeat with Engerix-B or Recombivax-HB at standard dose at 0, 2, 6, and 6 months | 2 (3%) |
| Repeat with Engerix-B or Recombivax-HB at double dose at 0, 2, 6, and 6 months | 0 (0%) |
| Repeat with Hophilus-B | 28 (45%) |

Preferred hepatitis B immunity monitoring after successful vaccination with seroconversion

| Details | % |
|---------|---|
| No further monitoring | 52 (84%) |
| Check HBsAb status to confirm immunity | 16 (16%) |

Preferred management of boosted positive hepatitis B core antibody

| Details | % |
|---------|---|
| No further intervention | 16 (24%) |
| Initiate hepatitis B vaccination series | 17 (25%) |
| Give a single dose of Engerix-B or Recombivax HB with HBVAb titer check 1 month later | 6 (9%) |
| Check HBV DNA level | 28 (42%) |

Conclusion: This study provides insights into current HBV vaccination and monitoring practices of physicians who care for patients with HIV. The results revealed varied practices and revealed opportunities for improvement. Additional research is needed to elucidate the impact these various practices have on patient outcomes and healthcare expenditure.
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Session: P-2. Adult Vaccines

Background: Community pharmacies have become vital access points to provide a range of vaccines to adults, including pneumococcal; however, despite growth in vaccines given at these sites, the most recent rates of adults being immunized against pneumococcal disease remain below goals set by Health People 2020. A lack of patient awareness is a leading reason for low vaccination rates, suggesting that a need exists to improve provider communication in recommending pneumococcal vaccination in high-risk adults.

Methods: A multi-phase, pharmacy-based intervention was launched in west and middle Tennessee locations of a nationwide community pharmacy chain focusing on improving evidence-based, presumptive recommendations related to pneumococcal vaccination. All locations were randomized to one of three arms based on training intensity: 1) no training; 2) online training only; and 3) online and live simulation training. The program focused on providing assertive recommendations and managing potential hesitancy guided by multiple health communication theories and community-based hesitancy data provided to each pharmacy by the study team. Primary endpoints included changes in pneumococcal vaccinations (counts over 6-month periods [July-December in 2018 and 2019]) and provider vaccine-related self-efficacy and were evaluated by generalized linear models.

Results: A total of 100 pharmacies were enrolled and 50 pharmacists completed their assigned training element. Completing the full training program (i.e., online and live) led to improvements in pharmacist self-efficacy related to being influential in vaccine-related decisions and not being helpless in managing resistance (both p<0.05). Overall counts of all pneumococcal vaccines were lower (-11.3%) across all stores in the period following training; however, a small increase (2.1%, P=0.084) was observed through an evidence-based communication training program but substantial improvement was seen when compared with online-only training comparisons, respectively.

Conclusion: Results suggest that provider vaccine self-efficacy can be improved through an evidence-based communication training program but substantial improvement in specific vaccinations may need to leverage a more holistic focus on all recommended adult vaccines.
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Background: Influenza in pregnancy is associated with elevated morbidity and mortality. Influenza vaccines are both safe and effective in pregnancy, supporting routine use in this population. Even though influenza vaccination in Mexico is recommended for pregnant women, there are no publications of influenza vaccine coverage in this population.

This is the first Latin American survey done only in physicians aiming to assess the knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes that Mexican Obstetricians-Gynecologists (OBG) and Family Physicians (FP) have towards influenza and influenza immunization during pregnancy.

Methods: A cross-sectional survey was conducted, both paper-based and online. The questionnaire was composed of 35 questions, which addressed general knowledge of influenza, recommendations for vaccination during pregnancy, and beliefs and attitudes concerning the acceptability of the vaccine in pregnant women.

Results: A total of 206 completed surveys were available, 98 (47.6%) from OBG, 108 (52.4%) from FP. Regarding current practicing medical institutions, 76 (37%), 69 (34%), 31 (14.5%), 30 (14.5%) reported working for the Mexican Institute of Social Security, Private Sector, Secretariat of Health, or a combination of all respectively, representing an estimated 2,472 daily pregnancy consultations.

Conclusion: Repotted not having a notion that influenza is more severe among pregnant women. More than half (51.5%) ignored the potential side effects of influenza infection on the fetus. The majority (56.8%) did not know when vaccination during pregnancy should occur.
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FIGURE 1

SUMMARY OF SURVEY’S RESULTS (% DONE IN 206 MEXICAN OBG’S AND FP’S)

| Percentage | PWH | HIV- | PWH*HIV- |
|------------|-----|------|---------|
| Race       |     |      |         |
| Age        |     |      |         |
| Sex        |     |      |         |
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Background: People with HIV (PWH) may be more likely than people without HIV (HIV-) to receive influenza vaccinations. However, it is unknown if there are demographic differences in vaccination rates and whether this varies by HIV status.

Methods: We identified all adult PWH (21 years) and 20-1 race-, age- and sex-matched HIV- adults enrolled in Kaiser Permanente Northern California between 2011-2017. We evaluated prevalence of influenza vaccinations during the 2013-2016 flu seasons (September 1 to March 31). We used Poisson regression models with repeated measures (subjects contributed to multiple flu seasons) to estimate the relative risk [RR] of influenza vaccinations by race, age, and sex within HIV status strata. Multivariable models included terms for HIV status, race, age, sex, unhealthy alcohol use, smoking status, calendar year, alcohol use disorder, census-based education/ income, depression, insurance type, and outpatient visits, and interaction terms for HIV*race, HIV*age group, and HIV*sex.

Results: The study sample included 7,422 PWH and 152,305 HIV-. 90% of PWH and 91% of HIV- were men; mean age at baseline was 49.4 (PWH) and 50.6 (HIV-) years; and 45% of PWH and 44% of HIV- were non-White. In adjusted models, PWH were more likely to receive the influenza vaccine compared with HIV- (RR 1.51; 95% CI 1.50–1.54). Among HIV-, Blacks were less likely to receive the vaccine compared with Whites (RR 0.77; 0.76–0.78); this effect was attenuated in PWH (RR 0.88; 0.84–0.92) (Figure, panel a). Among HIV-, older age groups were more likely to receive the vaccine compared with the 18 to 29 age group, with attenuated RR’s among PWH (Figure, panel b). Among HIV-, females were more likely to receive the vaccine compared to males (RR 1.11; 1.09–1.13) while among PWH, females were less likely compared to males (RR 0.94; 0.89–1.00; p=0.04) (Figure, panel c).

Conclusion: Based on this survey, current knowledge of OBG and FP for influenza morbidity and mortality during pregnancy, and the importance of influenza vaccination in pregnant women, is poor.

Mandatory recommendations to educate medical providers regarding influenza vaccination during pregnancy in Mexico are necessary, even as imperative for CME credits.
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