Intrauterine contraception: why are so few Australian women using this effective method?
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TO THE EDITOR: The recent article by Lewis and colleagues highlights the important role of long-acting reversible contraceptives (LARCs) in reducing unintended pregnancy in Australian teenagers. LARCs are defined as contraceptives that are administered less than monthly and include hormonal implants and injections, and intrauterine devices (IUDs). The critical importance of improving access to LARC methods has been recognised in the United Kingdom by the National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence, which produced guidelines for implementing this policy in 2005. The United States has recently followed this lead. In 2009, expanding access to intrauterine devices and other LARCs, particularly for younger women, was declared a national public health priority by the US Institute of Medicine.

Our particular interest is to expand Australian women’s access to intrauterine contraception, including the copper devices and the levonorgestrel-releasing device (LNG-IUD). IUDs provide highly effective long-term contraception, and the LNG-IUD offers additional benefits for women with heavy menstrual bleeding. Although IUDs are the most widely used reversible contraceptives in the world, they are underused in Australia; the most recent available data suggest use by about 1.2% of women using contraceptives, compared with 17% in France and 21% in Sweden. The reasons for the low uptake of IUDs are undoubtedly complex, but appear to include lack of information, and misinformation in relation to infection risk and their unsuitability for younger women. There is now good evidence that modern devices present minimal risk of infection and no increased risk of subsequent infertility. There is increasing experience of their use in younger women, and nulliparity is not considered a contra-indication.

To investigate barriers to acquiring an IUD, we surveyed 334 of the 366 women who attended for IUD insertion over 3 months in 2009 at family planning clinics in New South Wales and Queensland. Excluding the 16 women (5%) for whom there were missing data, 16% of respondents (51 of 318) had not found it easy to obtain IUD-related information and almost a fifth (58; 18%) had been told it was not a suitable method for them by either a health professional or a friend or family member (or both), despite these women meeting appropriate medical eligibility criteria at the family planning clinic.

Although family planning organisations are currently engaged nationally in developing and delivering IUD-insertion training for general practitioners, we suggest that increasing appropriate use of IUDs in line with other countries will only be achieved if the misperceptions of the risks relating to modern IUDs among consumers and health professionals are addressed. This is crucial to reducing the burden of unintended pregnancy, particularly in young women.
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