resuming pill taking and/or starting the next pack without a break) and to avoid risk of pregnancy (by advising condoms/abstinence for 7 days). EC is not indicated when this advice is followed.

Susan Brechin, MBChB, MFFP and Gillian Penney, FRCOG, MFFP
Co-ordinator and Director, respectively, of the FFPRHC Clinical Effectiveness Unit, Aberdeen Maternity Hospital, Aberdeen, UK. E-mail: s.brechin@abdn.ac.uk
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When is a pill missed?
The latest WHO and CEU guidance for the action to be taken when oral contraceptive pills are missed is2 3 much more forgiving than the recommendations we have been using to follow in the UK for many years. In particular, the guidance states that women have to miss three or more 30 µg pills before needing to take additional contraceptive precautions. Much depends on how we interpret these words. If a pill is only considered to be ‘missed’ after 24 hours when it is time for the next pill to be taken, then a woman would be following the guidance correctly if she started a new packet of pills after very nearly a 10-day pill-free interval and took no additional precautions at all. Although this may be sufficient for the majority of women, there will undoubtedly be some who ovulate on such a regimen, particularly if they forget more pills later in the packet or during the next month. It seems more sensible to interpret the WHO guidance in the context that if a pill is taken only 1 hour late it has been missed. At least this is more consistent with what we have told our patients in the past, even if the words are different.

Stephen R Killick, FRCPG, MFFP
Professor of Reproductive Medicine and Surgery, University of Hull and Hull York Medical School, Hull, UK. E-mail: S.R.Killick@hull.ac.uk
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Editor’s Note
This debate on missed pills has also found its way into The Lancet. Interested readers should refer to: Mansour D, Fraser IS. Missed contraceptive pills and the critical pill-free interval, Lancet 2005; 365:1670-1671.

Emergency contraception for women aged over 40 years
The Faculty Guidance document from the CEU on ‘Contraception for women aged over 40 years’1 does provide a wealth of evidence-based practical guidelines on the subject.

I am surprised that in such a voluminous publication, except for a passing comment merely citing two references, no mention is made about emergency contraception (EC), which may provide an additional effective contraceptive option.

The Guidance document spells out that barrier methods are currently used by one-third of women using barrier methods should be adequately informed and counselled about the methods of EC in case of inability to use or failure during use of barrier contraception.

Rutva R. Thathena, MD, FRCOG
Consultant, Petit Parc Private General and Macina Hospitals, B. Petit Road, Camballa Hill, Bombay 36, India. E-mail: rkhathena@hotmail.com
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Reply
The new recommendations on missed pills published in April 2005 are based on findings of a WHO Expert Working Group with UK representation.2 These new recommendations are not very different from previous recommendations from the CEU the FFPRHC2 and the WHO (where missed pill rules were applied to the combination pill packet two or more days late or if any of two to four pills were missed in Week 1). There was inconsistency, however, in how missed pill recommendations were being used in the UK. It is hoped that with the publication of new recommendations and the WHO information leaflets that guidance and advice given to women will be harmonised throughout the UK.

The CEU does not now use the term ‘late’ pills as it has done in previous guidance. The CEU considers a pill to be ‘missed’ when one is completely omitted (more than 48 hours elapsed since taking the last pill). The CEU recommend that action need only be taken when three pills are missed (or two if using a 20 µg pill) in any week of pill taking. Seven pills are omitted every month in the pill-free interval (PFI) without concerns about loss of efficacy. Pills missed in Week 1 may extend the PFI to 10 days. The CEU acknowledge there may be individual variation in risk of ovulation by extending the PFI but available data is reassuring even with a 10-day PFI.

Susan Brechin, MBChB, MFFP
Co-ordinator of the FFPRHC Clinical Effectiveness Unit, Aberdeen Maternity Hospital, Aberdeen, UK. E-mail: s.brechin@abdn.ac.uk
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Chlamydia screening in general practice: a missed opportunity?
The second phase of the National Chlamydia Screening Programme (NCSP) is currently underway in a quarter of primary care trusts in England, covering settings such as family planning, antenatal, colposcopy and termination of pregnancy services as well as general practice.2 There is not much literature that relates to implementing chlamydia screening in general practice, so the paper by Harris in the April 2005 issue of the Journal is very timely. However, I feel he hasn’t considered the full potential of ‘opportunistic’ screening to make the screening more effective.

Harris observed there are opportunities to discuss chlamydia screening in primary care consultations. Chlamydia screening was offered to women aged between 16 and 25 years attending for smears or consulting about contraception, and men aged between 16 and 34 years at a new patient health check appointment. I have several concerns with this approach.

First, the cervical cytology screening schedule in the UK no longer invites women under the age of 25 years. In the paper, three out of the five positive cases were screened during cervical cytology; hence relying on this consultation would potentially miss the group of young women in whom the infection is most prevalent.

Second, although it was good practice to offer chlamydia screening as part of sexual health promotion, offering screening to those who attend only for cytology and contraception would worsen health inequalities by denying screening to those who are least educated and informed to use preventative services and consequently increasing the risk of infection.

The third concern is the men. The author rightly pointed out that men have responsibility for their sexual health but the only opportunity to screen men aged over 40 years appeared to be at the antenatal check. If men are traditionally perceived to be lower users of health services, then every opportunity must be taken to offer them screening.

In addition, I fail to see why only clinicians should recruit the target groups opportunistically.

Rutva R. Thathena, MD, FRCOG
Consultant, Petit Parc Private General and Macina Hospitals, B. Petit Road, Camballa Hill, Bombay 36, India. E-mail: rkhathena@hotmail.com

References
Emergency contraception for women aged over 40 years

Ruzva K Bhatena

*J Fam Plann Reprod Health Care* 2005 31: 254
doi: 10.1783/1471189054483762

Updated information and services can be found at:
http://jfprhc.bmj.com/content/31/3/254.3.citation

**Email alerting service**

Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up in the box at the top right corner of the online article.

Notes

To request permissions go to:
http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions

To order reprints go to:
http://journals.bmj.com/cgi/reprintform

To subscribe to BMJ go to:
http://group.bmj.com/subscribe/