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1. LFU
   Alive
   Not attending >12 months
   Not known transfer of care

2. LFU Check
   Notes pulled
   LFU proforma attached
   Sent to clinician
   Vulnerable adults identified

3. Contact
   By telephone or post
   Outcome recorded

Lost to Follow Up
n=211

TOC (n=118)

Potential return
n=93

No LFU check (n=25)

LFU 1yr check
n=68

Contact not attempted (n=15)

Attempted contact
n=53

Remain LFU
(n=33; 62%)

Return post contact
(n=18; 34%)

Returned spontaneously
(n=2; 4%)

LFU cohort demographics compared to control

A. LFU patients significantly younger

B. LFU patients significantly more immunosuppressed

C1. LFU patients significantly more likely to be of Black ethnicity

C2. LFU patients significantly more likely to be black Caribbean