



Health inequalities: Contraception

Introduction

There are a range of contraceptive methods available to women which include long-acting reversible contraception (LARC) – implants and intra-uterine devices – and those that are user-dependent which include hormonal methods, such as the injection or pills, and non-hormonal (mainly barrier) methods.

Prevalence and risk factors

There does not appear to be any data regarding the proportion of women with learning disabilities in the UK who use contraception. For those who do use contraception, it has been noted that women with learning disabilities have markedly different patterns of contraceptive use to women in the general population with significantly greater use of non-barrier methods such as depot injection, oral contraceptive, intrauterine device or sterilisation^{1 2}.

A small-scale survey found the most widely used form of contraception was:

- contraceptive implant (46%)³
- combined (oestrogen and progesterone) contraceptive pill (24%)³
- progesterone only contraceptive pill (7%)³

In the general population, oral contraceptives are the most common form of contraception in use (47%) and the male condom second most common (18.2%)⁴.

The use of LARCs has been slowly increasing in the general population, with implants being the most common LARC (12.9%)⁴. For those with severe or profound learning disabilities contraception was prescribed at an earlier age (38% prior to age 16 compared to 7% of those with mild or moderate learning disabilities), with management of menstruation being the most common reason for the introduction of contraception (50%) compared to 13% amongst women with mild or moderate levels of learning disability³.

Impact on people with learning disabilities

Women with learning disabilities may be prescribed contraception even when they are not sexually active or are past child bearing age¹. A study of 9 UK women with learning disabilities who had been sterilised for contraceptive purposes found that none were reported to have been sexually active during a 20 year follow up period⁵.

Contraceptives may be prescribed to women with learning disabilities who are not sexually active 'just in case' or to manage menstruation³. GPs may prescribe depot medroxyprogesterone acetate (DMPA or Depo-Provera®) due to concerns that women with learning disabilities may not be reliable users of methods which rely on the user such as the pill⁶. As noted above, for those with severe or profound learning disabilities management of menstruation was the most common reason for the introduction of contraception³. No long-term strategies exist to completely suppress menstruation without the possibility of adverse consequences⁷. For example, Depo-Provera® reduces bone mineral density and causes weight gain⁸. This may be a particular concern in relation to bone mineral density when Depo-Provera® is prescribed at a young age⁶.

The intrauterine system is highly successful in terms of suppression or at least significant reduction in menstruation. However, it can be an uncomfortable procedure and for someone who is not sexually active requires insertion under a general anaesthetic. The combined pill can also be used to reduce menstrual flow over several months at a time but not entirely.

Healthcare and treatment

Evidence suggests that women with learning disabilities are not given sufficient information and are not fully involved in decisions about contraception^{1 3 9 10}, with the decision to take contraception being made for them³. Women with learning disabilities may not be given information about contraception choices in an accessible format¹.

Social determinants

Socioeconomic determinants of contraceptive use in women in the UK include area disadvantage being associated with a decreased likelihood of contraception use¹¹ and increasing area deprivation being associated with increasing LARC prescription¹². However, we are not aware of any evidence regarding how social determinants may impact on the use of contraception in women with learning disabilities.

Resources

Mencap [Sexuality and relationships resources](#)

References

¹ McCarthy M. 'I have the jab so I can't be blamed for getting pregnant': Contraception and women with learning disabilities. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 2009. 32(3): p. 198-208

² Servais L. Sexual health care in persons with intellectual disabilities. *Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Research Reviews*, 2006. 12(1): p. 48-56

³ Ledger S and others. Contraceptive decision-making and women with learning disabilities. *Sexualities*, 2016. 19(5-6): p. 698-724

⁴ NHS Digital (2014) [NHS Contraceptive Services, England - 2013-14, Community contraceptive clinics](#)

⁵ Roy M. A case note follow-up of women with intellectual disability referred for sterilization. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities*, 2010. 14(1): p. 43-52

⁶ McCarthy M. Prescribing Contraception to Women with Intellectual Disabilities: General Practitioners' Attitudes and Practices. *Sexuality and Disability*, 2011. 29(4): p. 339-349

⁷ Albanese A and Hopper NW. Suppression of menstruation in adolescents with severe learning disabilities. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 2007. 92(7): p. 629-632

⁸ Jeffery E, Kayani S, and Garden A. Management of menstrual problems in adolescents with learning and physical disabilities. *The Obstetrician & Gynaecologist*, 2013. 15(2): p. 106-112

⁹ McCarthy M. Exercising choice and control - women with learning disabilities and contraception. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 2010. 38(4): p. 293-302

¹⁰ McCarthy M. Contraception and women with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 2009. 22(4): p. 363-369

¹¹ Bentley R, Kavanagh A and Smith A. Area disadvantage, socioeconomic position and women's contraception use: a multilevel study in the UK. *J Fam Plann Reprod Health Care*, 2009. 35(4): p. 221-6

¹² Morgan CR and Liu H. The relationship between area deprivation and prescription of long-acting reversible contraception in women of reproductive age in Lothian, Scotland, UK. *Journal of Family Planning and Reproductive Health Care*, 2017. 43(4): p. 281-288