LETTERS

EID use and normal 7-day PFIs first emerged in the 50–100 µg pill era! Indeed, in the Mayo Clinic-based collected series, 16/25 women who, despite allegedly good pill-taking, conceived on emergency inductions were taking 50 µg pills; and the remaining nine were taking 100 µg pills (with mestrans!).

Please, may we have our tricyclic back?

John Guillebaud, FRCOG, Hon FFP
Professor of Family Planning and Reproductive Health, University College London, London, UK. E-mail: j.guillebaud@lineone.net
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Reply

We welcome the opportunity to respond to these comments on the FFPRHC 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 a 15% reduction in the pill-free interval in women taking concurrent liver enzyme-inducers.3 As explained in our response to your correspondent, Graham Davies, 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’. We read within the limits of our resources, the CEU always endeavours to undertake a fully comprehensive and systematic literature search in the Guidance. Nevertheless, relevant papers occasionally are missed by the search strategies used. We are always grateful to Faculty members for alerting us to evidence that we may have overlooked. Such evidence will be taken into account when Guidance is updated.

Gillian Penney, FRCOG, MFFP
Honorary Director: FFPRHC Clinical Effectiveness Unit, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK. E-mail: jfpeeuc@abdn.ac.uk
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Missed pill guidelines

We manage a family planning contraception service for the under-25s in South West Essex, and we are aware of the service’s concerns about the new missed pill guidelines. Our young service users often lead chaotic lifestyles with subsequent chaotic pill-taking. By promoting the new advice we feel that we would be giving them further leeway to miss pills, which could result in an increase in unwanted pregnancies. Some service users were taking 50 µg pills and would have difficulty following the new advice in the IFA leaflet. They have to rely on a clear explanation of pill-taking from staff, and the old advice is a lot easier to explain verbally. At present the IFA leaflet advice contradicts that given in the patient information leaflet provided by the pill manufacturers. We understand that the manufacturers advice is unlikely to change since this would involve new product licences being sought. Our current service was discussed at Thurrock PCT’s Medicine Management Committee last month and it was decided that at present all contraception providers working for the PCT should continue to adhere to the former missed pill advice. This recommendation is to be taken to the South West Essex Medicine Management Committee.

Christine Willis, RN, BA
Acting Manager, Young People’s Advisory Service, Anthony Wellness Centre for Sexual Health, Orsett Hospital, Orsett, UK. E-mail: Chris.willis@thurrock-pct.nhs.uk

Reply

We welcome the opportunity to respond to these comments on the ‘new missed pill rules’ published by the FFPRHC and endorsed in our 2005 Faculty Statement published in the April 2005 issue of the Journal.2 Your correspondents’ main points are: that young people often have chaotic lifestyles and chaotic pill-taking routines; and that the ‘new rules’ are at odds with information in the patient information leaflets provided by manufacturers.

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 in maintaining the necessary routine. We do not believe that evidence-based missed pill rules, which minimise unnecessary interventions for the individual patient. 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 producing 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 special measures (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 should he or she feel the special circumstances based on his/her own interpretation of available evidence.

Gillian Penney, FRCOG, MFFP
Honorary Director: FFPRHC Clinical Effectiveness Unit, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK. E-mail: jfpeeuc@abdn.ac.uk
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Preoperative counselling for female sterilisation

I read with great interest the article by Philip Owendung 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 auditable standards were obtained from the Clinical Guidelines No. 4 of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RCOG), (published in January 2004) and 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 Mirena® was recorded in 60% of the case notes.
Discussion regarding Mirena® was recorded in 84% of the case notes.
Discussion regarding Depo-Provera® was recorded in 54% of the case notes.
Discussion regarding the rate was recorded in 95% of the case notes.
Discussion regarding risks specific to laparoscopy and risk of minimal laparotomy were recorded in 89% 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 period 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 has the potential to 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 1 in 100 000 if performed) should be mentioned. During the preprocedure discussion it is difficult to emphasise the irreversibility of the procedure whilst at the same time talking about the reversal procedures and their success rates.
I would be grateful for the authors’ thoughts on this matter.

Shaur Kharwar Qureshi, MRCOG
Senior House Officer, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Nobles Hospital, Westmoreland Road, Douglas, Isle of Man IM7 4QA, UK
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Reply
Dr Qureshi’s interest in our article is most welcome. The results of the audit from Dr Qureshi’s unit suggest that the introduction of a standardised proforma might be expected to improve compliance with RCOG guideline recommendations.

As regards to whether the procedure is called ‘laparoscopic tubal occlusion’ or ‘laparoscopic sterilisation’, whilst the former may be more precise, the latter is likely to be more easily recognised as an identifiable procedure by most of our patients. Preoperative counselling is an exercise in communication and we should strive to use the terminology that is most easily understood by our patients.

The publication of the consent advice from the website with audit, so quoting a risk of dying from the procedure was not included, is not an audit standard. Whilst there should be no difficulty in explaining that the procedure must be considered irreversible, I agree that to then discuss the availability and results of sterilisation reversal seems contradictory. This latter dilemma is not an issue locally since our Health Board do not permit us to perform sterilisation reversal procedures.

Philip Owen, MD, MRCOG
Consultant Obstetrician and Gynaecologist, Stobhill Hospital, Glasgow, UK. E-mail: philipowen1@hotmail.com

Pelvic examination for detecting ovarian cancer

I was very disappointed to read Gill Waky’s website review in the last issue of the Journal. I have finally abandoned clinical common sense on the altar of guidelines and evidence-based practice.

Nobody with any sense would advise a pelvic examination as a means of detection of ovarian cancer. The main reason for performing a bimanual examination prior to taking a smear is to enable that examination to be easier and more comfortable for the patient. It enables the smear to be taken, the correct speculum (extra long, virgin, etc.) and hopefully to locate the cervix at the first attempt. How else would one know that the uterus was retroverted and the cervix anterior behind the pubic symphysis? Repeatedly opening and closing the speculum in an attempt to find the cervix is very uncomfortable (I have been on the receiving end!). If one can locate the cervix first time, the procedure is much easier for everybody. I have lost count of the number of women who have said: “Is that all? Last time it took much longer.”

A bad experience having a smear taken is often a reason for patients declining further screening.

Of course, all sorts of valuable information can be gained by a pelvic examination. Discomfort can prompt tactful questioning about dyspareunia, which is often not presented as a symptom. If the uterus is enlarged, direct questions about menorrhagia may elicit symptoms that have not been directly complained about. I have even seen women who retained tampons that may account for symptoms. As a hospital gynaecologist, I have on several occasions seen women referred with retained tampons that had not been detected as a speculum often pushes the tampon out of the way but does not discover it.

Then, of course, if one did find an ovarian cyst, would it not be better for the woman if it was found and acted on regardless of whether it is malignant?

I will continue to advise trainees that I think the bimanual examination is part of the taking of a smear . . . but then I don’t write the guidelines!

Beth Devonald, MRCPG, DEFFP
Family Planning Trainer and Associate Specialist in Colposcopy, The Mount, Mere Road, Waddington, Lincoln LN5 9NX, UK. E-mail: Devonald@hitrenternet.com
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Reply
There appear to be two main issues raised in this letter.

First, the website review is reporting the answer to a specific question. Dr Devonald raises another question by suggesting that the guidelines for taking a cervical smear should be altered to include a digital vaginal examination to establish the position of the cervix, before inserting the speculum. This is an excellent question for the NELM primary care question service, namely: “By how much does a prior vaginal digital examination impair the accuracy of a cervical smear sample?” If the answer is that it does not, then there are training implications for the many nurses who take cervical smears but have not been trained to carry out a digital vaginal examination.

Second, Dr Devonald goes on to suggest that although it cannot reliably detect ovarian cancer, a pelvic examination is useful. But useful for what?

An examination on a patient without symptoms is a screening test and it is quite clear from the literature that a pelvic examination fails the criteria for a screening test.1 For example, it does not identify reliably, at an early stage, conditions that can be treated to prevent progression. It may do harm by identifying conditions that are not significant and expose the patient to unnecessary further investigations. It may do harm by giving false reassurance of normality.

As a preliminary investigation of a patient with symptoms, it may be times useful, but is not accurate enough to preclude further investigation of symptoms by other means such as ultrasound or laparoscopy.2

A large number of questions and answers now appear in the women’s health section of this NELM service,1 many of which health professionals will find instructive and useful, as they are based on real clinical problems.

Gill Wakyd, MD, MFPS
Visiting Professor in Primary Care Development, Staffordshire University and Freelance GP, Writer and Lecturer, Abergavenny, UK. E-mail: Gillwakyd@aol.com
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COPYING CLINICAL LETTERS TO PATIENTS

I read with interest Anna Glasier’s contribution to Personal View in the April edition of the Journal.2

Whilst noting that she found it difficult to draw precise conclusions from her small project, I should like to add our own findings from a more general patient population to support her impressions.

We conducted an audit into the system for ‘Copying Letters to Patients’, which had been set up at Barnsley Hospital NHS Foundation Trust in response to the Department of Health Initiative first noted in the NHS Plan.3 Our findings mirrored those of Anna Glasier in that patients were enthusiastic about the initiative but that medical, nursing and administrative staff were much less so.

Eighty-five case notes were reviewed as an unselected sample of patients attending a first outpatient appointment in General Medicine, Orthopaedics, Rheumatology or General Surgery. Confirmation of a wish to receive a copy letter was present in 40 cases and all of these patients were subsequently contacted by telephone to confirm they had received it. The highly personal nature detailing a history taken that does not require such intimate detail to be recorded.

The outcomes are similar to Anna Glasier’s findings that I would conclude that the nature of the information being sent to the patient has little bearing on their satisfaction at having received it. The highly personal nature detailing a sexual health consultation appears to be no more or less inhibitory to its formal documentation than a factual account of their consultation.

Only one patient said that they had noticed a factual error in the letter and all patients rated the personal nature of the information being sent to the patient as helpful.

The personal view is that in terms of this initiative staff appear to have a common hesitancy approach but that patients are generally enthusiastic and in their wish to understand their own personal health information than their health worker carers are likely to find much more interesting.

David Hicks, MRCPG, FRCP
Medical Director, Barnsley Hospital, Gawber Road, Barnsley S75 2EP, UK. E-mail: david.hicks@bhsf.nhs.uk

Beverly McGeorge, BSc
Business Manager (General Surgery and Orthopaedics), Barnsley Hospital, Gawber Road, Barnsley S75 2EP, UK. E-mail: mcgeorge@bhsf.nhs.uk
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INVISIBLE CONTRACEPTION?

I thought others might be interested to hear a comment passed on to me in my family planning clinic today. My client noticed her friend’s implant4 rod glowing under UV lighting while they were in a nightclub. It didn’t put her off having one fitted herself, but maybe we should warn people that their ‘invisible’ contraceptive method may be seen in these circumstances.

Emily Gwinell, MRCPG, DEFFP
GP in Clinical Assessment, Family Planning, Northamptonshire, UK. E-mail: emilygwinell@doctors.org.uk