LETTERS

EID use and normal 7-day PFIs first emerged in the 50–100 µg era! Indeed, in the Mayo Clinic-based collected series,1 16/25 women who, despite allegedly good pill-taking, conceived on emergency inducers were taking 50 µg pills; and the remaining nine were taking 100 µg pills (with mestrans)! Please, may we have our tricycle back?

John Guillebaud, FRCOG, Hon FFP
Professor of Family Planning and Reproductive Health, University College London, London, UK. E-mail: j.guillebaud@ucl.ac.net
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Reply
We welcome the opportunity to respond to these comments on our FFPHRHC Guidance on ‘Drug interactions with hormonal contraception’ published in the April issue of the Journal.1 Your correspondent draws attention to a paper by Spona et al.2 which regards the decrease in the pill-free interval in women taking concurrent liver enzyme-inducers.3 As explained in our response to your correspondent, Graham Davids, we failed to identify this paper during our systematic review for the ‘Drug interactions’ Guidance; but did identify it during development of our subsequent Guidance on ‘The use of contraception outside the terms of the product licence’.3

We acknowledge the lifestyle factors that influence contraceptive choices for young people. The new ‘missed pill rules’ do not negate or contradict the responsibility of clinicians caring for young people to promote the fundamental importance of regular, disciplined, pill-taking routines. Pragmatic measures, such as use of the alarm call facility on a mobile phone, can assist young people to promote the necessary routine. We do not believe that evidence-based missed pill rules, which minimise unnecessary interventions from the maximum number of women, condone or reinforce poor pill-taking routines. If a young woman has a lifestyle that is incompatible with regular pill-taking, then she needs a user-independent method of contraception, not ‘stricter’ missed pill rules.

We also acknowledge that the new WHO recommendations differ from the advice given in manufacturers’ leaflets. However, the problem of conflicting information from different sources is not new. Advice given in different manufacturers’ leaflets varies in some details, as does advice in the British National Formulary. Achievement of uniformity and consistency was one of the reasons given by the WHO for preparing the new advice.

We disagree that the new advice is more difficult than the old to explain verbally to an individual patient. Each woman need only be given the ‘rules’ that apply to her own pill formulation (20 µg or ≥30 µg ethinylestradiol); there are fewer circumstances in which she must adopt any specific rule (only if she has missed ‘two for twenty’ or ‘three for thirty’ pills); and there are fewer circumstances in which emergency contraception must be considered (only if pills have been missed in Week 1 of the pill-taking cycle).

Thus, the CEU stands by their endorsement of the WHO’s ‘missed pill rules’. Nevertheless, an individual clinician managing an individual patient may choose to give different advice tailored to individual circumstances, or based on his/her own interpretation of available evidence.

Gillian Penney, FRCOG, MFFP
Honorary Director, FFPHRHC Clinical Effectiveness Unit, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK. E-mail: j.fpee@abdn.ac.uk
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Preoperative counselling for female sterilisation
I read with great interest the article by Philip Owen and colleagues on the documentation of preoperative counselling for female sterilisation.1 A similar audit was conducted recently in the Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Nobles Hospital, Isle of Man and included 81 cases which were admitted for sterilisation between October 2002 and September 2004. The audits standards were obtained from the Clinical Guidelines No. 4 of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RCOG), published in January 2004) and the RCOG Consent Advice 3 (published in October 2004). Data were collected retrospectively from the case notes.

The results of the audit were as follows:
• Discussion regarding vasectomy was recorded in 60% of the case notes.
• Discussion regarding contraceptive advice1 was recorded in 60% of the case notes.
• Discussion regarding Mirena® was recorded in 54% of the case notes.
• Discussion regarding Depo-Provera® was recorded in 54% of the case notes.
• Discussion regarding the failure rate was recorded in 95% of the case notes.
• Discussion regarding risks specific to laparoscopy and risk of minilaparotomy were recorded in 85% of the case notes.
• Discussion regarding the risk of ectopic pregnancy in cases of failure was recorded in 85% of the case notes.
• Discussion regarding irreversibility was recorded in 94% of the case notes. However, discussion regarding the reversal procedure and its success rates were only recorded in 1% of the case notes.
• Advice regarding use of effective contraception until the next periods was recorded in 19% of the case notes.

It was concluded that documentation of preoperative counselling for female sterilisation needs to be improved. It was recommended that a ‘tick box’ proforma should be used, and to do a re-audit in 12 months’ time to check whether the introduction of the proforma has resulted in an improvement of documentation.

The female sterilisation procedure is very commonly performed, and all procedures should attract complaints and litigation. I have a few comments to make regarding the sample proforma that was included in the article.

The Consent Advice 3 of the RCOG recommends that the procedure should be called a laparoscopic tubal occlusion. Moreover, the risk of death (which is in 1 in 150,000 if the procedure is performed) should be mentioned. During the preprocedure discussion it is difficult to emphasize the irreversibility of the procedure whilst at the same time talking about the reversal procedures and their success rates.
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