Editor’s Note: Missed pill correspondence

Interested readers may wish to note that there has been a letter3 from the Clinical Effectiveness Unit (CEU) published in the Lancet, in response to the April Editorial2 by Diana Mansour and Ian Fraser.

The main points of this letter can be summarised as follows: The authors believe that most women know the name and type of their pill and would be able to apply the recommendations. They believe having different rules for 20 and 30 μg ethinyl estradiol pills minimises intervention and inconvenience for the maximum number of women. They state a pill has been missed only when 24 hours have elapsed after the scheduled time. They did not review UK evidence cited by Mansour and Fraser as suggesting caution about extending the pill-free interval beyond 7 days; two were published after the WHO Fraser guidelines were published. Finally, the Faculty of Family Planning and Reproductive Health Care’s philosophy is to be guided by evidence rather than by fear of litigation.

A comment in response to the letter has been placed on the Lancet’s website.3 For our readers’ convenience, we have permission to reproduce it in full below.

Comment on Lancet website: Missed pill guidelines

Dear Sir

In the same week that the Faculty of Family Planning’s Clinical Effectiveness Unit (CEU) stated that “we assume that most women know the name and type of their pill”,1 a paper in the Journal of Family Planning and Reproductive Health Care showed that 41% of a group of educated women were not even sure whether they were taking a high- or low-dose pill.2 In the same issue of the Journal, Therod, Primary Care Trust explained that they felt they could not use the new guidelines in their area because their clients “would have difficulty following the new advice”.3

There have been letters to that Journal pointing out the deficiencies of the CEU’s guidelines on missed pills, over the last 6 months, yet the widespread concerns are simply being ignored by the Faculty. Is it a valid excuse to say that papers that suggest their guidelines are unsuitable are not written by WHO Fraser and that they are not giving evidence? Why did the CEU not take those findings into account when considering important new guidelines?
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Interested readers should refer to the Lancet’s website for any further responses or comments.

DMPA and BMD

Following the Committee on Safety of Medicines (CSM) advising against the use of depot medroxyprogesterone acetate (DMPA) in November 2004, there has been continued discussion regarding its effects on bone mineral density (BMD). DMPA is known to increase the mean long term for bone health and fracture risk.

To examine women’s views and knowledge regarding this issue, a questionnaire (see http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PII/S0140-6736(05)67522-8/fulltext) was distributed anonymously to women using DMPA who attend contraception and sexual health clinics in Newcastle-upon-Tyne. It was given to all women prior to their consultation appointment at three clinics between January and June 2005.

All 64 patients to whom the questionnaire was given completed it, and their ages ranged from 17 to 46 (mean, 25.8) years. They had been using DMPA for between 3 months and 9 years (mean duration of use, 2.6 years).

Of these patients, 53 (83%) were aware of the possible effects of DMPA on BMD, and all of these women felt that their concerns had been discussed. Four of these patients (all in their twenties) were considering a change of contraception following reading about the CSM advice in the media or as a result of discussing this issue with their health professional. One woman was definitely going to change her method of contraception (i.e. 90.5% of those aware of the link with reduced BMD) prior to the start of DMPA use, which highlights the importance of ensuring patient understanding and awareness of the potential reversibility of BMD changes involving gynaecological practice, accounting for 25% of all claims notified to the Medical Defence Union.3 In order to minimise the risk of litigation, the need for adequate documentation and the use of a checklist as an important part of informed consent procedures was identified in a previous study.4

The present authors have now demonstrated that the introduction of a standardised proforma can significantly improve the level of compliance with the RCOG’s guidelines by improving the quality of documentation.1 If our ultimate goal is to improve the quality of care and thereby reduce the high level of complaints and litigation associated with female sterilisation, then the available evidence would suggest that units providing the female sterilisation service should seriously consider the use of a standardised proforma that would ensure that a consistent and adequate information as recommended by the RCOG is provided to all patients requesting sterilisation.
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Audit of documentation of female sterilisation

We read with great interest the paper by Anderson et al. on documentation of preoperative counseling for female sterilisation: a complete audit cycle1 in which the authors have provided evidence on the usefulness of a standardised proforma in the documentation of counselling women requesting sterilisation. Their documentation was fully compliant with the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RCOG)’s guidelines2 only when a standardised proforma was used during the counselling.

A recently completed re-audit of documentation of female sterilisation carried out in our department has identified areas where there is room for further improvement in our practice. It is our experience that the awareness of the standards set out in the RCOG’s guidelines was not enough on its own to facilitate changes towards improving the quality of communication and to ensure that our documentation process was fully compliant with the RCOG’s guidelines.

Sterilisation is a major cause of litigation involving gynaecological practice, accounting for 25% of all claims notified to the Medical Defence Union.3 In order to minimise the risk of litigation, the need for adequate documentation and the use of a checklist as an important part of informed consent procedures was identified in a previous study.4

The present authors have now demonstrated that the introduction of a standardised proforma can significantly improve the level of compliance with the RCOG’s guidelines by improving the quality of documentation.1 If our ultimate goal is to improve the quality of care and thereby reduce the high level of complaints and litigation associated with female sterilisation, then the available evidence would suggest that units providing the female sterilisation service should seriously consider the use of a standardised proforma that would ensure that a consistent and adequate information as recommended by the RCOG is provided to all patients requesting sterilisation.
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