proceedings included a fine exposition by David Baird of the considerable debt that we owe to the contribution of many Scots to the humanities and natural sciences.

The theme of this Congress was holism as applied to family planning and sexual health. We discovered that holism cannot easily be translated into several European languages and indeed is a new concept to many. Part of the definition provided for delegates was: ’Holism, philosophically, is the concept that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The idea that human well-being, physical and mental, is inextricably linked and requires a holistic approach is nowhere more obvious than in sexual health’.

Presentations ranged from keynote speeches to distinguished speakers to short free communications and posters. More than 800 authors contributed to the Congress. An important component of these Congresses is the ‘meet the experts’ sessions in which discussion takes place in small groups. These proved to be so popular that some had to be repeated. The Congress also featured a commercial exhibition at which the Journal of Family Planning and Reproductive Health Care was represented (Figure 3).

It is impossible to adequately review so many contributions, especially as it is not possible to attend more than a few of the presentations in person. However, I will mention Professor Jim Drife who reminded us of the late Professor Sir Dugald Baird’s very relevant addition to the now-classic four freedoms of President Roosevelt: freedom of speech and worship and freedom from fear and want – the addition being freedom from the tyranny of excessive fertility.

The social programme included a cycling tour for those who could manage the hills of Edinburgh and a pub tour for those who couldn’t! No doubt many visitors new to Edinburgh had a chance to admire this fine city, its superlative castle and other historic buildings – not forgetting the shops. The Royal Yacht at Leith was also an attraction.

A splendid conclusion to the Congress was the Scottish Evening held at the very impressive Royal Museum. The lavish buffet included haggis (not compulsory!). This was followed by a traditional Scottish ceilidh with demonstrations by expert Scottish dancers to help the inexperienced.

Opinions which I heard included “the best Congress ever” from an English doctor and “it’s too expensive” from an East European doctor. Both statements are true. Could the ESC manage to sponsor a certain number of East Europeans to future Congresses perhaps?

Michael Cox, FRCPG, MFFP
Consultant Obstetrician and Gynaecologist (Retired), Nuneaton, UK

Editor’s Note
Abstracts of the keynote speeches, sponsored symposia, free communications and poster presentations delivered at the 2004 Congress can be viewed on the ESC website at http://www.contraception-esc.com.

LETTERS

Condom use

Madam

I read with interest the article on ‘Condom use amongst men and women attending a genitourinary clinic’ published recently in your journal.1 While the majority of the respondents to the author’s questionnaire were aware of condoms, using them was erratic and only sometimes. This is similar to the findings in a study in 2002 from our institution.2 We found that men and women who reported condom use had also more sexual partners than those who did not report condom use. The incidence of bacterial sexually transmitted infections (STIs) (gonorrhoea and chlamydia) was higher in women who did not use condoms but the incidence of genital warts was higher in those who reported condom use.

During the annual Condom Week (May) and AIDS Day (December) there are concerted campaigns to encourage people to practise safer sex, and condom use is one of the components of this practice. The use of condoms is an acquired practice and a skill that needs to be learnt. I have the opinion that many people, whether they attend the genitourinary medicine (GUM) clinic or not, have heard of condoms. It is not from lack of knowledge, but attitude and practice do not synchronise. I wish to suggest that condom manufacturers make more readily available video demonstrations of ‘How to Use a Condom’.

These videos can then be used at family planning clinics, GUM clinics and young people clinics, and so on, for teaching purposes. The incidence of STIs is high among teenagers and condom use is low within this group. Health care workers involved in the care of young people should continue to explore ways of encouraging young people to use condoms properly.

Finally, it should be realised that condom use is one facet of the ‘ABC Approach: abstinence, be faithful and condoms’. If young people need sex education, then it is not too soon to teach them about commitment.

Abayomi Opaneye, FRCPG, MFFP
Consultant Physician, Genitourinary/HIV Medicine, James Cook University Hospital, Middlesbrough TS4 3BW, UK
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Emergency contraception: latest changes

Madam

At first glance, this commentary1 appears to carefully appraise the UK’s 2004 approach to emergency contraception (EC). On closer inspection, however, there are a few practice issues that require further clarification. Although there are several reports confirming the continued efficacy of hormonal methods of EC up to 120 hours and the IUD up to 7 days, there are good data to show that the effectiveness of EC decreases over time.2 The Task Force on Postovulatory Methods of Fertility Regulation showed decreasing effectiveness of EC beyond 72 hours after intercourse.3 This was particularly noticeable within the progestogen-only group. As well, the safety and efficacy of a single-dose regimen of levonorgestrel (1.5 mg) compared to a two-dose regimen (0.75 mg taken 12 or 24 hours apart) and of single-dose mifepristone (10 mg) for EC, cannot be overemphasised. Earlier treatment is preferable, although these methods can be used effectively for up to 5 days after intercourse. Thus, EC should ideally be taken as soon as possible. As mentioned in your editorial, the IUD still remains a highly effective method of EC up to 7 days after unprotected intercourse. Unfortunately, persisting myths about IUDs continue to limit their prescription for young, nulliparous women, despite the fact that this population group comprises a large proportion of those who seek EC.

If the overall effectiveness of EC is related to elapsed time after unprotected intercourse, it would make sense to provide it to patients in a timely fashion. This would include access to an EC provider (with or without prescription) at an affordable cost. Your editorial discussed the success of walk-in clinics with over 3000 people receiving EC. While the absolute cost was not mentioned, it was noted that several clinics provided EC free of charge without an age limit.

About 10% of the adolescent population become pregnant in North America each year and 95% of these pregnancies are unwanted.4 A

Figure 3 The Journal of Family Planning and Reproductive Health Care exhibition stand at the Congress (photograph courtesy of Michael Cox)

Canadian study reviewed the success of a pilot programme for providing EC via pharmacy without a prescription.4 Almost 7000 prescriptions were obtained and 21% of women stated that if they had not obtained EC in this manner, they would not have obtained it elsewhere. The Canadian health minister recently issued a bill to remove EC from its current ‘prescription-requiring status’ making it available ‘over the counter’, thereby further removing barriers to access by women of all ages. According to the UK guidelines, the cost of licensed EC products available at pharmacies range from £5.99 with a prescription to £24.00 for an over-the-counter (OTC) product. To make matters worse, OTC products are limited to patients over 16 years of age. Imposing these restrictions on EC severely limits access to the products in the population least likely to see a physician and most likely to benefit from their use.

The medical eligibility criteria for EC are quite broad. According to the WHO guidelines,5 there are no absolute contraindications to EC use, which supports the safety of providing EC as an OTC product. If a prescription is required, advanced issue of a prescription for EC does not cause an increase in the use of EC (i.e. patients do not abuse EC as a form of regular contraception). Indeed, they are more likely to use EC when needed because they are also more likely to use standard contraception properly.6 Hormonal EC needs to be made accessible to all women, especially to adolescents. This is most likely to occur in an environment where they can access EC at a convenient time, in a convenient location, at a convenient price (preferably free of charge). Only then might we start to see the financial and social benefits of primary prevention of unwanted pregnancies in this age group.

Melissa Mirosh, MD
Chief Resident in Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Saskatchewan

Olufemi Olatunbosun, FRCOG, FACOG
Professor and Chair, Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology & Reproductive Sciences, University of Saskatchewan, Royal University Hospital, 103 Hospital Drive, Saskatoon SK S7N 0W8, Canada
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Reply
Madam

As mentioned in my original article there is only one paper7 that shows a direct correlation between intercourse treatment interval and effectiveness of emergency hormonal contraception (EHC). Neither the subsequent World Health Organization (WHO) paper in 2002 nor another large study8 have shown this correlation. The 1998 WHO paper quoted by the correspondent was carried out in women within 72 hours of intercourse and only four women used EHC-72 hours. In the 2002 paper the authors clearly state “There was no evidence of an interaction between regimen and timing of treatment within 72 hours or after 72 hours. For the three regimens combined, women treated after 72 hours had a higher pregnancy rate than those treated within 72 hours but the difference was not significant”. Another study looking at the Yuzpe regimen between 72 and 120 hours9 also had small numbers and, therefore, wide confidence intervals so it is difficult to know the true efficacy.

The 2002 paper shows that the 1.5 mg levonorgestrel strat dose regimen is as safe and effective as a split dose, so it therefore seems logical that the simpler the dosage should be the one of choice. I agree that EHC should be ideally used as soon as possible and that this may be best achieved by ensuring that any woman who may, at sometime in her life, be at risk, has some easily available. After all, not everyone has simple painkillers at home and sometimes in their handbags in case they should get a headache! This is despite both aspirin and paracetamol (acetaminophen in North America) having a considerably greater list of contraindications and side effects than levonorgestrel.

My mention of the intravaginal device (IUD) was precisely to remind clinicians that they should not be constrained by myths. Fitting an IUD in a nulliparous woman is a common occurrence in our service and acceptance, as with all methods, is related more to the adequacy of counselling and practical expertise of the fitter than with the parity or age of the woman.

Contraception in the UK is free when on a National Health Service prescription. When bought from the pharmacy without prescription, the cost of EHC is indeed high. I agree that the age restriction has no medical basis. I was delighted to hear that Canadians now have access to EHC without prescription. I hope it is at an affordable price. It was very disappointing that the USA Food and Drug Administration (FDA) did not feel able to make an equally enlightened decision despite the advice they received.

EC is safe and should be broadly and affordably available to all who need it. However it is not the answer to unwanted pregnancies and must be part of a much wider effort to increase knowledge, accessibility, affordability and usability of all methods of contraception and prevention against sexually transmitted infections.

Anne Webb, MRCOG, MFFP
Consultant in Family Planning and Reproductive Health Care, Acacan Clinics for Contraception and Reproductive Health, 40-46 Dale Street, Liverpool L2 5SF, UK. E-mail: anne.webb@pct.northliverpool.nhs.uk
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Service standards: chaperones and record keeping

Madam

We are grateful for the responses from McVicker, Murray and Robinson10 but without wishing to over-prolong this debate we would like to clarify the problems a little more clearly.

(1) If the offer of a chaperon is essential for doctors, guidance is also needed for nurses. The Association for Genito-Urinary Medicine (AGUM) guidelines for intimate examinations in gynaecological clinics11 point out that there is a problem with the shortage of health care assistants, and other general practice12 this is a real issue. Will we all have to be routing two nurses to do every smear test, and will they not be seen as supporting each other rather than the patient?

(2) We have both noticed an increasing reluctance among general practitioners (GPs) to perform intimate examinations, and a tendency to send patients to the hospital service. GPs lose very little under the new contract if they give up cytology and contraception13 but the burden will fall on community clinics. If extra nurses therefore have to be employed as chaperones they must be specifically funded, otherwise our service will increasingly have to limit the number of clients they can see per session so that nurses are freed up to do this very onerous task. This may ensure that we are protected against false accusations of improper conduct during a routine intrauterine device check, but that the distraught teenager needing urgent advice who turns up at the last minute is turned away. Is this what we really want?

E Stephen Searle, MBBCh, MRCGP
Clinical Director/Consultant in Contraception and Sexual Health, High Peak and Dales PCT, Newhollme Hospital, Baslow Road, Bakewell, North Derbyshire SK14 5XU, UK.

Lesley Bacon, MBBCh, MRCGP
Consultant in Sexual and Reproductive Health, Lewisham PCT, Honor Oak Health Centre, Turnham Road, London SE4 2LA, UK. E-mail: lesley.bacon@lewishampct.nhs.uk
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Editor’s Note
This letter has been forwarded to the Chair of the Clinical Standards Committee.