Research on emergency contraception (EC) is bedevilled by ethical objections to conducted placebo-controlled trials, problems of indirect estimates of efficacy and the difficulty that EC pill trials include only single exposure to unprotected sex whereas in real life this is often not the case. We are urged to offer the option of a copper intrauterine device (IUD, which is known to have extremely high efficacy – considerably greater than levonorgestrel (LNG) EC – but which may not be immediately available, nor be as acceptable to clients as a pill. Although there is still some uncertainty about the efficacy of LNG EC, studies show it is definitely much better than doing nothing and this applies when even women present between 72 and 120 hours after the event. Research on mode of action has shown the only convincing mechanism to be delaying or arresting follicular development and blocking or delaying/blunting the luteinising hormone (LH) surge (or work if ovulation has already happened. Effects at the endometrial level that might prevent implantation have been shown in some studies for the Yuzpe regimen (PCs) but not for LNG.

Analysis of Yuzpe regimen studies has shown that EC is more effective when given earlier in the follicular phase. Until recently there were no data on effectiveness of LNG EC according to day of the cycle. This small Australian pilot study seeks to remedy this situation. Ninety-nine women had their serum progesterone, estradiol and LH measured at the time of pill ingestion. EC was measured at the time of pill ingestion. EC was found to be effective. Women were followed up 4–6 weeks later by pill trials to measure their serum progesterone, estradiol and LH according to day of the cycle.

The polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS) is the most common endocrine disorder affecting women. Many of the patients we encounter in everyday women’s health care practice will therefore have manifestations of this condition and will need objective and up-to-date advice. The topics discussed in Mr Bhathena’s recent review include the recently agreed definition of PCOS, its clinical features and the therapeutic options available for the management of its presenting problems such as hirsutism and other androgenic effects, menstrual disturbance, obesity and anovulatory infertility.

Mr Bhathena draws attention to the fact that women with PCOS, particularly those who are obese, need long-term advice and support in order to reduce the risks of hypertension, lipid disorders, impaired glucose tolerance and cardiovascular disease in later life, all of which are associated with the fundamental problem of insulin resistance that is probably the main causative factor of the syndrome. The author deals with various approaches to achieving weight reduction, including the potential for the use of metformin, but I was disappointed that there was no assessment of the energy fashion of advising low glycaemic index (low GI) diets, for which evidence of efficacy and safety has yet to be confirmed.

The review is helpful in mentioning some of the benefits of hormonal contraception for women with PCOS. Those with hirsutism or acne will be helped by oestrogenic low-dose combined oral contraceptives (COC) containing desogestrel (Yasmin®) or drosperinone (Marvelon® or Merclon®), although initial treatment with a contraceptive dermatological preparation containing cyproterone acetate (Diane®, Clairette®) is conventional. Women with menstrual disturbance will be helped either by a COC or by the levonorgestrel IUS (Mirena®), which may also be of value in reducing the long-term risk of endometrial carcinoma due to the unopposed action of oestradiol.

This concise yet comprehensive review provides a very helpful introduction to the many issues involved in the management of this common but complex condition.

Reviewed by David H Horwell, FRCP, FFPRHC, Consultant Gynaecologist and Obstetrician, Luton & Dunstable Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Luton, UK


This was a retrospective review of 8678 cases of women who had medical abortion (<8 weeks) with either a regimen of (a) misoprostol (75 μg) over 24 hours or (b) a combination of methotrexate and misoprostol (different routes of administration). Initial treatment doses were given in the clinics, but subsequent misoprostol (self-administered) and abortion occurred at home. Patients attended the clinics 2 weeks later. The study was conducted in a Latin American country where abortion is highly restrictive/illegal so the clinics were anonymised (for security reasons). The aim was to compare the efficacy of the combined methotrexate and misoprostol only regimens. Abortion rates were significantly better with the combined regimen than misoprostol alone (83% vs 77%, respectively). It is possible that this reflects the two medications acting on uterine activity and the antimitotic effect of methotrexate upon conceptus. The authors concluded that the use of methotrexate was important in maximising success in countries where abortion is highly restrictive and mifepristone is unavailable. Methotrexate has adverse effects on bowel, liver and hair (loss). In contrast, mifepristone is well tolerated, allows reduced doses of misoprostol (fewer side effects) with a complete abortion rate of 97%. Unfortunately, women in these countries needlessly suffer greater morbidity and complications because they continue to be denied this safer more effective treatment.

Reviewed by Sharon Cameron, MD, MRCP Obstetric Gynaecologist, Dean Terrace Centre, Edinburgh, UK
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