some diabetes centres are available for patients with special problems and complications.

GYÖRGY JERMENDY

Bajcsy-Zsilinszky Hospital,
Medical Department,
Maglód út 89-91,
Budapest,
Hungary H-1106

1 Howitt AJ, Cheales NA. Diabetes registers: a grassroots approach. *BMJ* 1993;307:1046-8. (23 October.)

Deregulating emergency contraception

The alternative may be unwanted pregnancies

EDITOR,—Lawrence Mascarenhas's response¹ to James Owen Drife's editorial repeats some of the many oft quoted fallacies about emergency contraception.

Firstly, there is no evidence that the "Yuzpe" regimen carries a risk of ectopic pregnancy. Only one case has been reported in the world literature; this was in a woman who had established tubal disease.² The story probably derives from people's concern when the old method of giving 5 mg ethinylloestradiol for five days was used, but it has no place with current practice in Britain.

Secondly, there is not even a theoretical risk of teratogenesis as at the very early stages of development cells are totipotent; if a few die they are replaced by others, which are still totipotent. If many are affected pregnancy cannot be established.³ The Faculty of Family Planning and Reproductive Health Care is collecting details of pregnancies that go to term despite the Yuzpe regimen being used and confirms that the rate of congenital abnormalities is not increased above the background rate. Anyone who knows of such a case should inform the faculty, care of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists.

Thirdly, there is no evidence of changes in clotting factors after use of the Yuzpe regimen,⁴ which, after all, is only six days' worth of low dose pills. In a woman in whom there is a strong suspicion of an inherited clotting abnormality I suggest, however, that an intrauterine device should be used as the first choice of emergency contraception.

Fourthly, I wish to correct a common mistake made by Drife. Although 2-3% of women are expected to become pregnant after they take oral emergency contraception this does not mean that such contraception is 98% effective as many of the women would not have become pregnant anyway. It is difficult to calculate how many pregnancies are avoided, but the best estimate is that the Yuzpe regimen is 75% effective.⁵

The most recent guidelines on emergency contraception were published in the *British Journal of Family Planning* in 1992 and are obtainable from the faculty.

Availability of emergency contraception over the counter should be in addition to, not instead of, availability from medical services. There is also a need to train pharmacists, make sure they can provide privacy for questions, and make the package inserts clear.

ANNE WEBB

Central Manchester Healthcare Trust,
Community Services,
Foot Hospital,
Manchester M14 5BY

1 Mascarenhas L. Deregulating emergency contraception. *BMJ* 1993;307:1143. (30 October.)

2 Kubba AA, Guillebaud J. Case of ectopic pregnancy after post-coital contraception with ethinylloestradiol-levonorgestrel. *BMJ* 1983;287:1343-4.

3 Austin CR. Embryo transfer and sensitivity to teratogenesis. *Nature* 1973;244:333-4.

4 Webb A, Taberner D. Clotting factors after emergency contraception. *Adv Contracept* 1993;9:75-82.

5 Trussell J, Stewart F. The effectiveness of postcoital hormonal contraception. *Fam Plann Perspect* 1992;24:262-4.

Family planning nurses have useful skills

EDITOR,—One factor that seems to have been overlooked in the discussion on deregulating emergency contraception is the skill of well trained and experienced family planning nurses.^{1,2} Such nurses can not only provide an emergency contraceptive service but take on issues relating to continuing contraceptive and sexual health needs of clients. They are experienced counsellors with excellent communication skills and are often under-used in their role as assistants in medical sessions.

In the family planning service in Liverpool recent reorganisation has resulted in nurses being used to improve access to contraceptive services. A city centre clinic has been established, which provides open access throughout the day (9 am to 7 pm). During this time a family planning nurse is available for advice, to perform pregnancy tests, and to provide emergency contraception. As medical sessions take place all day Monday and on weekday evenings and Saturday afternoon the family planning nurse can supply emergency contraception outside these sessions. She is supported by an agreed service protocol and telephone contact with a senior in the service.

Similar centralisation of family planning services was recommended recently by the chairman of the education and training committee of the Faculty of Family Planning to address training needs in the specialty.³ Surely this can be coupled with meeting the users' needs as well. This is possible only with greater flexibility in existing family planning services, which must learn to recognise and use their nurses' skills.

MEERA KISHEN

Family Planning and Women's Health Services,
North Mersey Community Trust,
ABACUS Centre for Contraception,
Liverpool L2 1TA

1 Drife JO. Deregulating emergency contraception. *BMJ* 1993;307:695-6.

2 Correspondence. Deregulating emergency contraception. *BMJ* 1993;307:1143-4. (30 October.)

3 McEwan J. The service needs of training. *Br J Family Planning* 1993;19:215.

Non-redemption of prescriptions

Linked to poor consultations

EDITOR,—P H G Beardon and colleagues assessed non-redemption of prescriptions written by general practitioners.¹ Unfortunately, as the authors note, many factors are associated with non-redemption. The associations described and the authors' vignette of the patient least likely to redeem a prescription are unlikely to help general practitioners attempting to minimise non-compliance. Research is needed that attempts to explain why patients fail to redeem prescriptions.

This question was perhaps partly answered by an observational study in which a large number of general practice consultations were observed and interviews conducted with the patients soon afterwards.² The study suggested that a patient is least likely to accept a general practitioner's treatment plan if in the consultation the general practitioner neglected to explore the patient's concepts of the causation and correct treatment of his or her illness. Open conflict was not required for a patient

to reject a general practitioner's treatment plan but merely a failure on the general practitioner's part to explain himself or herself in terms relevant to the patient's health beliefs. This link between non-compliance and dysfunctional consultations has also been noted by American writers.³

Given the complexity of both consultations and human behaviour, it is not surprising that Beardon and colleagues showed almost meaningless associations between patients' characteristics and primary non-compliance. In ignoring what occurred in the consultation before each prescription was issued they failed to examine the point at which non-compliance was probably determined.

T J COLEMAN

Department of General Practice,
Leicester General Hospital,
Leicester LE5 4PW

1 Beardon PHG, McGilchrist MM, McKendrick AD, McDevitt DG, MacDonald TM. Primary non-compliance with prescribed medication in primary care. *BMJ* 1993;307:846-8. (2 October.)

2 Tuckett D, Boulton M, Olson C, Williams A. *Meetings between experts*. London: Tavistock, 1985.

3 Meichenbaum D, Turk DC. *Facilitating treatment adherence: a practitioners' guidebook*. New York: Plenum Press, 1987.

Homeless people miss out on prescribed treatment

EDITOR,—In early 1993 I studied 49 consecutive prescriptions (of which I had written 45) issued from the King Square medical project six months previously. This project provides part time general practitioner care for homeless people in Bristol. Data were returned to me by the Prescription Pricing Authority.

Twenty eight forms had not been redeemed. I identified the notes relating to 21. These 21 contained 26 items and had been issued to 20 patients (all men). In eight cases the patient had specifically requested the item prescribed—for example, two patients had requested inhalers for asthma to replace an inhaler that had run out or been lost and one had requested an antiparkinsonian drug to counteract side effects of depot phenothiazines. Three patients had requested a psychoactive drug (temazepam, nitrazepam); these requests had been declined because of the potential for misuse, and a prescription had been given for a drug for a different medical problem presented. In these cases the patient's chief interest in the consultation had probably been to gain a prescription for a drug that could be misused.

As P H G Beardon and colleagues reported recently,¹ and as others have done previously,^{2,3} most of the prescriptions that were not redeemed were for drugs for symptomatic conditions or repeat items. In three identified cases the non-compliance could have had important consequences: one patient had been prescribed prednisone and chloramphenicol eye ointment for newly diagnosed Bell's palsy, and two had been prescribed ulcer healing drugs.

Does the high rate of non-redemption reflect lack of confidence in the health service? Did patients encounter problems in the pharmacy over exemption from charges (some people at the margins of society do not claim any social security benefit and therefore may not fall into any exemption category)? Is non-redemption an expression of chaotic living? Because many homeless people are mobile I could not interview the patients in this study to ask why they had not cashed their prescription. Anyway, they might not have been able to remember why six months after the event. A survey will be conducted among present patients to answer some of these questions.

HILARY COOLING

Bristol BS6 5JS