priority, although the respondents felt that it was effective and important (but gave no evidence for this). The respondents felt that general practice was the best place to give this advice and that they had the necessary skills, although few had received any training. Barriers to providing the advice were, as usual, lack of time and resources as well as lack of contact with women planning to conceive. The authors suggest that research is needed into how that contraception can be provided. There seemed little appreciation of alternative views that this task might be more suited to a public education campaign that might also reach those women who do not attend general practice.

Reviewed by Gill Wakley, MD, MFPP
Visiting Professor in Primary Care Development, Staffordshire University and Freelance General Practitioner and Writer, Abergavenny, UK


This study was undertaken as there was no research evidence of the serum levels of medroxyprogesterone acetate (MPA) in the African population. A total of 97 women were recruited and 94 returned for a follow-up visit. Some 24% of the population had used the method for three or fewer injections and the remainder had been using depot medroxyprogesterone acetate (DMPA) for more than a year. The serum MPA was measured on a sample of blood taken before the next injection at the follow-up visit. The results showed no consistent level of MPA and no statistical difference when allowing for body mass index (BMI) and length of time using the method. There was only one woman recorded as being below the level of 0.1 mg/ml of MPA (the level at which ovulation is inhibited).

This study confirms that the levels of MPA at the time of the next injection are not related to BMI or length of time used and levels are very variable in any population. Almost all women will have levels of MPA that will still suppress ovulation. We should be wary of the occasional woman whose levels are low enough not to inhibit ovulation if she is late with an injection.

Reviewed by Judy Murty, DRCOG, MFPP
SCMO, Contraceptive and Sexual Health Services, Leeds, UK

NEWS ROUNDUP

Young people ignorant about STIs

The American Social Health Association (ASHA) questioned more than 1000 people aged between 18 and 35 years of age. Although 84% said that they took precautions to prevent sexually transmitted infections (STIs), the follow-up questions showed that this was not true. Although 83% of the respondents who had a partner did not have a STI, one in three had never discussed STIs with their partners – so how did they know? Of those questioned, 68% were not worried that they might contract a STI: the well-known ‘It won’t happen to me’ scenario. Nearly half used no protection during vaginal intercourse, 66% used no protection during anal intercourse and only 9% used any protection for oral sex. The survey was mainly designed to identify the level of knowledge about hepatitis A and B, both of which can be transmitted sexually. The authors of the report were concerned by the results that more than half of those surveyed didn’t know that hepatitis A and B can be sexually transmitted, the respondents were unaware that vaccines were available, and did not know if they had been immunised against either of the infections. Although hepatitis B is much more infectious than human immunodeficiency virus, young people seemed to know less about it. Further information is available at: http://www.frc.org.

Department of misinformation

A press release from the ‘Family Research Council’ quotes Kathleen M Gallagher, director of pro-life activities for the New York State Catholic Conference, commenting on a report advocating over-the-counter emergency contraception (EC). Gallagher said ‘Havest’s report promotes dangerous public policy that could result in the repeated distribution of mega doses of hormones to girls and women without physician oversight or parental supervision for children. Even the FDA has stated that the effect of repeated use of these pills is unknown. These chemicals sometimes cause abortions by destroying growing embryos and, through over-the-counter availability, women would be denied even this basic knowledge. Women deserve better.’ Perhaps this spokeswoman should gain some basic knowledge about the dose of progesterone-only EC and its actions? Readers of this journal are often aware of the dangerous myths promulgated by people with a fixed-belief system and should take every opportunity to dispel the misinformation. The Family Research Council has as its strategy ‘Defending Family, Faith and Freedom’ and its website contains some gems of biased reporting. Further information is available at: http://www.frc.org.

Good news about sex and age

A Swedish study reported on several news gathering sites reveals that nearly all 70-year-olds would be sexually active if they could. Nils Beckham from Gothenburg University polled 1658 70-year-olds. In 1971, only 0.8% of 70-year-old women said they were sexually active, now the proportion is 13%. Many more women of this age are living with a partner or are married as compared with 30 years ago. The proportion of men claiming to be sexually active has risen from 50% in 1971 to 69% today. More men tended to have partners who were younger than themselves. Unfortunately, the source for this information is in Swedish, but searching for this information on Google provoked much hilarity. (NB. The author thanks Susan Quilliam for drawing this press release to her attention.)

Topiramate and COP

The levels of interactions between topiramate and a combined oral contraceptive (COC) (containing 35 μg ethinylestradiol and norethindrone) were compared with those between carbamazepine and the COC in a recent publication.1 Hormone levels were measured over two cycles in groups of women on different doses of topiramate and in one group whose basal metabolic indexes were between 30 and 35. Small, non-significant changes occurred in the groups of women taking any of the doses of topiramate compared with a marked difference in the group taking carbamazepine. The levels of oestrone in the latter group were significantly lowered. The authors suggest that topiramate is biodegradable and do not require removal. The progestogen-only vaginal Fem-ring1 is described as is it is already in clinical use. It is hard to resist the notion that authors concluded that topiramate, at daily doses of 50–200 mg, does not interact with a COC containing norethindrone and ethinylestradiol and it seems plausible to generalise this finding to other COCs. Women taking topiramate can be reassured that no extra contraceptive precautions or increased dose of COC is required.

Reference

Condoms and HPV infection

We know that some infections with human papilloma virus (HPV) contribute to the development of cervical cancer. A commentary from the American journal reporting on control measures for cancer1 discusses what advice we should be giving to patients about the role of condoms. The commentary reviews a couple of studies from The Netherlands that suggested that condom use might be associated with the regression of cervical intra-epithelial neoplasia and in men with HPV-related penile lesions. The studies concluded that the results showed that the lesions regression in the group that used condoms compared with the carefully matched group not using condoms. HPV was more quickly cleared in the condoms users also. The researchers suggest we need the advice as condom use as a means of promoting HPV clearance and regression of lesions. However, the commentary points out some caveats. The studies showed little difference in the rates of people who had lesions of 6 months. Most HPV infections are transient and are likely to clear anyway. Many of the infections that we detect in the cervical brushing samples are present for longer than 6 months. However, using a condom is likely to prevent re-infection with HPV, infection with another type of HPV or other infections. As usual, further research is needed.

Reference

Reviewed by Gill Wakley, MD, MFPP
Visiting Professor in Primary Care Development, Staffordshire University and Freelance General Practitioner and Writer, Abergavenny, UK

BOOK REVIEWS


This slim but concise book is a highly readable introduction to obstetrics and gynaecology. Most topics are covered on one double-page spread, with good use of illustrations and text boxes. The text is generally well written and also demonstrates a positive attitude to caring for the whole patient. The authors are all hospital-based consultants in obstetrics and gynaecology. Hospital-based aspects of the specialty are accurate and up to date, however the contraception section is disappointing. The authors think that progestogen-only implants such as Implanon® are biodegradable and do not require removal. The progestogen-only vaginal Fem-ring® is described as is it is already in clinical use. It is hard to resist the notion that hospital specialists know less about contraception than they think.

This book is written from a UK context, making the book pleasantly readable to a UK audience. It would provide a good introduction to the specialty for medical students and also an excellent concise revision source for doctors preparing for DRCOG and MFPP examinations.

Reviewed by Kate Weaver, MB ChB, MFPP
Staff Grade Doctor in Reproductive Health Care, Edinburgh, UK
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