



This is a repository copy of *Understanding barriers to using long-acting reversible contraceptives (LARCs) in primary care: a qualitative evidence synthesis*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/195760/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Linton, E., Mawson, R., Hodges, V. et al. (1 more author) (2023) Understanding barriers to using long-acting reversible contraceptives (LARCs) in primary care: a qualitative evidence synthesis. *BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health*. ISSN 2515-1991

<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjsex-2022-201560>

---

This article has been accepted for publication in *BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health*, 2023 following peer review, and the Version of Record can be accessed online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjsex-2022-201560>. © Authors (or their employer(s)). Reuse of this manuscript version (excluding any databases, tables, diagrams, photographs and other images or illustrative material included where a another copyright owner is identified) is permitted strictly pursuant to the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

# BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health

## Understanding barriers to using Long-Acting Reversible Contraceptives (LARCs) in primary care: a qualitative evidence synthesis.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Sexual &amp; Reproductive Health</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjsrh-2022-201560.R2
Article Type:	Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Nov-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Linton, Emma; The University of Sheffield, AUPMC Mawson, Rebecca; The University of Sheffield, AUPMC Hodges, Brooke; The University of Sheffield, AUPMC Mitchell, Caroline; The University of Sheffield, AUPMC
Keywords:	contraception, barrier, long-acting reversible contraception, Reproductive Health, qualitative research, general practice
Abstract:	<p><b>Background</b> Long-acting reversible contraceptives (LARCs) are highly effective. LARCs are prescribed less frequently than user-dependent contraceptives despite higher efficacy rates. Unplanned pregnancies are rising in the UK, and LARCs may have a role in reducing these and redressing inequitable contraceptive access. To provide contraceptive services that offer maximal choice and patient benefit, we must understand what contraception users and healthcare providers think about LARCs and uncover barriers to their use.</p> <p><b>Methods</b> A systematic search using CINAHL, MEDLINE via Ovid, PsycINFO, Web of Science and EMBASE identified research about LARC use for pregnancy prevention in primary care. The approach adhered to the 'Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses' (PRISMA) methodology, critically appraised the literature, and used NVivo™ software to organise data and perform thematic analysis to determine key themes.</p> <p><b>Results</b> Sixteen studies met our inclusion criteria. Three themes were identified: 1) trustworthiness (where and from whom participants obtained information regarding LARCs), 2) control (whether LARCs detract from personal autonomy), 3) systems (how healthcare providers influenced LARC access). Misgivings about LARCs frequently arose from social networks and fears of surrendering control over fertility were prominent. Healthcare practitioners perceived access issues and lack of familiarity or training as the main barriers to prescribing LARCs.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b> Barriers to LARC use may be modified by addressing misconceptions and improving healthcare worker training. Barriers relating to personal autonomy are different: these need to be understood and brought into</p>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

	the personalised conversations surrounding contraceptive choice.

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 1 **Understanding barriers to using Long-Acting Reversible**  
6 2 **Contraceptives (LARCs) in primary care: a qualitative evidence**  
7 3 **synthesis.**

11 4 **Authors**

14 5 Emma Linton

16 6 Job title: GP Speciality Trainee & Academic Clinical Fellow

18 7 Rebecca L Mawson - 0000-0001-6377-6197

20 8 Job title: GP & Academic Training Fellow

22 9 Victoria Hodges - 0000-0002-4765-3848

24 10 Job title: Obstetrics and Gynaecology Speciality Trainee

26 11 Caroline Mitchell - 0000-0002-4790-0095

28 12 Job title: GP and Senior Clinical Lecturer

32 13  
34 14 Emma Linton and Rebecca Mawson contributed equally to this paper

36 15  
38 16 **Affiliations**

- 40 17 1. The Academic Unit of Primary Medical Care, The University of Sheffield, Samuel  
42 18 Fox House, Sheffield, S5 7AU, UK.

44 19  
46 20 **Corresponding author**

48 21 Rebecca Mawson – r.l.mawson@sheffield.ac.uk

50 22 Word count; 3489 (excluding tables)

52 23

54 24

## 25 **Abstract**

## 26 **Background**

27 Long-acting reversible contraceptives (LARCs) are highly effective. LARCs are  
28 prescribed less frequently than user-dependent contraceptives despite higher efficacy  
29 rates. Unplanned pregnancies are rising in the UK, and LARCs may have a role in  
30 reducing these through and redressing inequitable contraceptive access. To provide  
31 contraceptive services that offer maximal choice and patient benefit, we must  
32 understand what contraception users and healthcare professionals (HCP) think about  
33 LARCs and uncover barriers to their use.

## 34 **Methods**

35 A systematic search using CINAHL, MEDLINE via Ovid, PsycINFO, Web of Science  
36 and EMBASE identified research about LARC use for pregnancy prevention in primary  
37 care. The approach adhered to the 'Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews  
38 and Meta-Analyses' (PRISMA) methodology, critically appraised the literature, and  
39 used NVivo™ software to organise data and perform thematic analysis to determine  
40 key themes.

## 41 **Results**

42 Sixteen studies met our inclusion criteria. Three themes were identified: 1)  
43 trustworthiness (where and from whom participants obtained information regarding  
44 LARCs), 2) control (whether LARCs detract from personal autonomy), 3) systems (how  
45 HCPs influenced LARC access). Misgivings about LARCs frequently arose from social  
46 networks and fears of surrendering control over fertility were prominent. HCPs  
47 perceived access issues and lack of familiarity or training as the main barriers to  
48 prescribing LARCs.

## 49 **Conclusions**

50 Barriers to LARC use may be modified by addressing misconceptions and improving  
51 primary care training. Barriers relating to personal autonomy are different, these need  
52 to be understood and brought into the personalised conversations surrounding  
53 contraceptive choice.

## 54 **Key Points**

- 55 1. LARCs offer an effective method of pregnancy prevention, yet their provision in  
56 primary care lags behind short acting alternatives. Insight about the barriers to  
57 use of LARC in primary care not previously explored and may help develop  
58 strategies to increase uptake.
- 59 2. Misunderstanding and myth associated with LARC use which is present  
60 amongst the public and healthcare professionals alike.
- 61 3. Easy access to LARC services is necessary to increase uptake, but prompt  
62 access to removal services is also needed to enable a person's autonomy and  
63 sense of control. This helps prevent perceived reproductive coercion and  
64 empower contraceptive users.

## 65 **Take-home messages**

- 66 • LARCs were viewed by potential users as more 'mysterious' than other forms of  
67 contraception. Individuals report relying on their social networks to gather  
68 information about contraception which may lead to misconceptions and  
69 misinformation.
- 70 • Health professionals can be a barrier to LARC access and knowledge gaps can  
71 perpetuate myths. There must be a focus on training opportunities and  
72 identifying personal belief systems which prevent the offer of LARC to patients.

## 73 **Background**

74 Access to contraception is a human right and UN sustainable development goal(1,2).  
75 Unintended pregnancies cause excess maternal and neonatal morbidity. Accessible  
76 contraception can empower individuals through expanded educational and economic  
77 opportunities(3). In the United Kingdom (UK), contraceptive methods are free at the  
78 point of use, yet 45% of pregnancies in England are unplanned, and abortion rates are  
79 increasing(4,5). Contraception is least accessible to socioeconomically deprived and  
80 vulnerable groups(6).

81 Long-acting reversible contraceptives (LARCs) have been hailed as a solution to an  
82 unmet contraceptive need(7,8). LARCs are classed as 'non-user dependent' because  
83 they continue to prevent pregnancy until removed or their period of action is  
84 exceeded(9). Examples include implants, injectables such as *depo provera*, and  
85 intrauterine devices and systems (coils). The effectiveness of LARCs is similar to  
86 sterilisation(9). LARC use lags behind 'user-dependent' contraceptive methods(10)  
87 despite these advantages.

88 Approximately 80% of contraception in the UK is prescribed in primary care. However,  
89 published research in the area, particularly regarding LARC use, is lacking(11). LARC  
90 prescriptions in sexual and reproductive health services have increased, but not in  
91 primary care(5,6). Financial incentives in general practice helped to increase LARC  
92 use and reduce unintended pregnancy(12–14), when these were removed rates  
93 fell(15). There were 100,000 additional prescriptions for LARC in the 3 years after the  
94 financial incentive was introduced via Quality of Framework in primary care(15). Even  
95 though the incentive was a success, the funding was rescinded in 2014 as the sexual  
96 and reproductive health budget was reduced(16). Primary care in the UK is freely  
97 available to all and is the conduit by which most people access healthcare and  
98 contraception. Predominantly, this includes prescription of short acting contraception  
99 despite LARCs being more cost effective and reliable(11).

100 This synthesis offers a timely understanding of LARC hesitancy, which is important in  
101 the current post-covid landscape. An ongoing study by the UCL and UCLH (CAP-  
102 Covid) team has shown that the number of unplanned pregnancies in the UK almost  
103 doubled in the first COVID-19 lockdown(17). The proportion of people reporting  
104 issues getting contraception rose from 0.6% pre-lockdown to 6.5% post-  
105 lockdown(17). NHS Digital data shows that the COVID-19 pandemic has led to a fall



1  
2  
3 106 in LARC prescriptions in GP surgeries(18). The number of LARC prescriptions is  
4  
5 107 now 17% lower than in 2019.

6  
7 108 Understanding why there is low utilisation of LARCs may help to ensure that services  
8  
9 109 and contraception users' needs are aligned(6). Our aim is not to set an agenda  
10  
11 110 towards LARC use but rather to identify common concerns in patients and health care  
12  
13 111 providers that act as barriers to LARC use and offer potential to increase LARC uptake  
14  
15 112 if appropriately addressed. This qualitative evidence synthesis will draw together  
16  
17 113 studies that have asked individuals and/or providers about their views on LARC use  
18  
19 114 in primary care. The objective is to understand barriers and facilitators to LARC use  
20  
21 115 among both groups, thus addressing a research goal identified by the UK National  
22  
23 116 Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)(19).

## 24 117 **Methods**

25  
26 118 A systematic review of qualitative studies was selected to investigate contraceptive  
27  
28 119 users' and healthcare providers' (HCP) perspectives of LARC use in primary care.  
29  
30 120 Cochrane guidance was used for quality evidence synthesis and followed the Preferred  
31  
32 121 Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Metanalysis (PRISMA) checklist(20)(21).  
33  
34 122 The protocol for this review is PROSPERO registered (156610):  
35  
36 123 <https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/>

## 37 38 124 **Selection criteria**

39  
40  
41  
42 125 Included studies used qualitative or mixed research methods to assess contraception  
43  
44 126 users or HCP's attitudes toward LARCs. The review included studies in primary care  
45  
46 127 settings in countries defined by the United Nations as 'developed economies'(22). To  
47  
48 128 be included, participants within studies must have been recruited from primary care.  
49  
50 129 Studies seeking views of HCPs from any member of primary care team were  
51  
52 130 included. Studies in hospital or secondary care settings were excluded. Studies were  
53  
54 131 excluded that addressed the use of LARCs for reasons other than contraception or  
55  
56 132 that investigated early LARC removal and immediate postpartum or 'post-placental'  
57  
58 133 use of LARCs. Case reports and conference abstracts were excluded.  
59  
60

## 134 **Search strategy**

135 The following databases were searched: CINAHL, MEDLINE via Ovid, PsycINFO, Web  
136 of Science and EMBASE, including papers published between January 2009 and  
137 March 2021. The search included synonyms and MeSH terms associated with 'LARC'  
138 and 'General Practice'. The search was updated in January 2022. Results were  
139 compiled using the reference manager, Mendeley® and imported into systematic  
140 review management software, Covidence®(23). EL and RM independently screened  
141 abstracts and conducted full-text reviews according to the inclusion and exclusion  
142 criteria. Conflicts were resolved through discussion (EL, RM, VH, CM).

## 143 **Quality summary**

144 The Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) tool for qualitative studies was used  
145 to assess methodological rigour and risk of bias in the included papers(24). EL  
146 assessed each study against these criteria, assigning 'yes', 'no' or 'can't tell' to each  
147 domain. VH independently evaluated 30% of papers to reduce bias. EL and VH  
148 resolved disagreements through discussion. In keeping with Cochrane guidance for  
149 qualitative reviews, studies were not assigned an overall quality score or excluded  
150 studies based on quality assessment(21).

151 All the papers were judged to have taken steps to reduce bias, and most were  
152 assessed as being of high quality. However, some did not give sufficient detail to be  
153 considered against all CASP domains. This was particularly applicable to the  
154 'consideration of ethical issues' and 'rigour of analysis' assessment domains. Several  
155 papers did not evidence that they had considered the relationship between the  
156 researcher and participants. There was consistency of scoring between EL and VH  
157 ratings. Identified themes were not undermined by excluding the least  
158 methodologically robust papers.

## 159 **Charting the data: summary and synthesis**

160 Two approaches were used to chart the data, summary, and synthesis. Firstly, data

1  
2  
3 161 was extracted from the background and methodological information using criteria  
4 162 adapted from Cochrane guidance(25)(26). The results/findings sections of included  
5 163 papers were assessed for their suitability to be extracted as data. Secondly, EL and  
6 164 VH independently extracted representative sections of text and all verbatim quotes  
7 165 for line-by-line coding. Verbatim quotes were prioritised to reduce the potential for  
8 166 personal inference to bias our findings. Using QSR NVivo™, a computer-assisted  
9 167 qualitative analysis software, thematic data analysis(25,26) was undertaken. EL and  
10 168 VH independently assigned a code to each line of extracted data and used inductive  
11 169 coding: once all papers were coded and a 'bank' of codes collated, each was  
12 170 independently re-coded. In the second analysis stage, EL and VH discussed  
13 171 similarities and differences in the codes to produce a hierarchy and assigned  
14 172 'Umbrella' codes encompassing related themes. In the third stage of analysis EL,  
15 173 VH, CM and RM developed emergent concepts and grouped the final codes, drawing  
16 174 the themes pertaining to the research question.

## 175 **Results**

176 The database search identified 2241 results. 441 were duplicates, leaving 1800  
177 papers for screening. 1703 papers were excluded after reviewing their title and  
178 abstract, obtaining 96 studies for full-text review. Sixteen studies were suitable for  
179 inclusion and formed the basis of our synthesis. Seven included studies were  
180 conducted in the USA(27–33). The remaining studies were conducted in Australia  
181 (n=3) (34–36), New Zealand (n=2)(37,38), UK (n=2)(39,40), France (n=1)(41), and  
182 the Republic of Ireland (n=1)(42). Eight studies focussed on the views of HCPs, six  
183 on contraceptive users and two on both groups. All studies were either based in  
184 primary care or involved primary care clinicians.

185 Of the eight studies which included users or members of the public, one study  
186 purposively recruited women from African American groups(27), four papers  
187 included detailed ethnicity of participants(28,30,31,40) and three studies had no  
188 mention of ethnicity(34,41,42). The papers that did not include ethnicity did mention  
189 purposive sampling for socio-economic groups or various urban/rural  
190 locations(34,41,42). Intrauterine devices were the predominant topic of the papers

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

191 with subdermal contraceptive implants underrepresented.

Confidential: For Review Only

192 Table 1 summarises the studies include in the synthesis

Reference	Country	Setting	Aims	Study design	Study population (n)	Analysis
Blackstock, O. 2010 (27)	USA	Comprehensive Health Care Centre	Compare the contraceptive information that urban-dwelling low-income African American women acquire from their social network compared to that obtained from their primary care provider	Semi-structured interviews	Women aged 18-39 who were heterosexual and self-identified as being African-American or Black (20)	Thematic analysis
Ding, J. 2021 (36)	Australia	Primary care	Requesting early removal of long-acting reversible contraception: a qualitative study exploring the experiences of doctors working in primary care	Semi-structured interviews	Healthcare professionals working in primary care (13)	Thematic analysis
Duncan, C. 2019 (37)	New Zealand	General Practice	Seek the views of General Practitioners (GP) to gauge whether LARCs and their proactive promotion for use in adolescents may be acceptable to GPs	Semi-structured interviews	General Practitioners (9)	Thematic analysis

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Fournier, D. 2015 (41)	France	General Practice	Explore women's knowledge and representations of IUDs	Semi-structured interviews	Women aged 18-50 (14)	Thematic analysis
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46	Garrett, B. 2015 (34)	Australia	Community health centres, online advertising at women's health organisations and University. Health care professionals recruited through clinic websites and snowballing	Investigate barriers to young women's use of LARC in Australia and identify possible approaches for increasing LARC knowledge and access	Focus groups and semi-structured interviews	Health care professionals (15) and women aged 16-25 (27)	Thematic analysis

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

Hoopes, A. 2016 (31)	USA	Urban school-based primary care centres	To explore attitudes to pregnancy and contraception in female adolescents to inform the development of LARC counselling strategies in primary care	One – one interview	Women aged 14 – 18 (30)	Grounded theory
Kang, I. 2019 (33)	USA	Authors purposively recruited primary care physicians	Identify potential best practices to guide primary care physicians in providing contraception and contraceptive counselling for women with medical conditions	Semi-structured interviews	Primary Care Physicians (10)	Template coding method (Crabtree and Miller)
Lodge, G. 2017 (35)	Australia	Primary care practice-based research network	Investigate barriers faced by Australian General Practitioners in the prescription of IUCDs	Semi-structured interviews	General Practitioners (17)	Thematic analysis
Lunniss, E. 2016 (39)	UK	General Practice	Explore how General Practitioners view their role in delivering postpartum contraception at the 6	Semi-structured interviews	General Practitioners (13)	Thematic analysis

			week visit and on providing LARC at this time			
McGinn, N. 2019 (38)	New Zealand	General Practice	Determine some of the barriers faced by general practitioners in New Zealand who wish to offer LARCs to their patient's	Open question interviews	General Practitioners who have an interest in women's health and contraception (17)	Thematic analysis
Murphy, H. 2016 (32)	USA	Variety of recruitment strategies involving email and recruitment through federally qualified health centres	Identify the context specific barriers to providing adolescents with LARC that are experienced by health care professionals	Semi-structured interviews	Family physicians (5), paediatricians (5) and advanced nurse practitioners (6)	Modified grounded theory approach
Potter, O. 2014 (30)	USA	Community and School-Based Health Centres	Explore the attitudes, knowledge and beliefs of urban female adolescents towards IUDs and identify barriers to IUD use.	Semi-structured interviews	Adolescents aged 14-21 years who had heard of, but not used an IUD (21)	Line by line analysis



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

Rubin, S. 2013 (29)	USA	Primary care clinical sites	Explore primary care physicians' experiences, attitudes and beliefs about counselling and provision of LARCs to adolescents with a focus on barriers and enablers to access	Interviews using an interview guide based on an implementation science theoretical framework	Family physicians (9), Paediatricians (10), Obstetrician-Gynaecologists (9)	Thematic analysis and coding scheme development
Rubin, S. 2010 (28)	USA	Family medicine practices	Understand patient beliefs that may act as a barrier to acceptance or use of an IUD	Semi-structured interviews	Female patients aged 18-45	Iterative analysis
Sweeny, L. 2015 (42)	Ireland	University, community-based programmes, snowballing techniques for recruitment	Explore the experiences of, and attitudes towards prescription contraception amongst samples of contraception users, General Practitioners and pharmacists	Semi-structured interviews	Contraceptive users (18), General Practitioners (18) and pharmacists (9)	Thematic analysis
Walker, S. 2018 (40)	UK	General Practice	To explore, in a general practice setting, the concerns, beliefs and attitudes about intrauterine contraception reported by women who had never used the method	Mixed methods approach	Qualitative: Women aged 18-45 who had never used IUC (30). Quantitative: Women aged 18-49 (1195)	Thematic analysis

1  
2  
3 194 Following the analysis of the selected papers, the results were organised into three  
4  
5 195 overarching themes presented in table 2.

6 196  
7  
8 197 Table 2 Summary of overarching themes regarding barriers to LARC use in primary  
9  
10 198 care.

- 11 1. Trustworthiness
  - 12 a. Sources of information
  - 13 b. 'Friend of a friend' reports
  - 14 c. LARC vs contraceptive pill
  - 15 d. Understanding how LARC works
- 16 2. Control
  - 17 a. Personal autonomy
  - 18 b. Insertion/removal process
  - 19 c. Duration
  - 20 d. Periods
- 21 3. Systems
  - 22 a. Access barriers
  - 23 b. Healthcare professional factors
  - 24 c. Critical mass of LARC users/providers
  - 25 d. Attitudes towards LARC use in adolescents

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 199 **1. Trustworthiness**

41  
42 200 This theme relates to how participants rely on different sources of information to make  
43  
44 201 decisions about contraception. Familiarity was also a factor that emerged within this  
45  
46 202 theme with the ubiquity of the oral contraceptive pill making it widely preferred.

47  
48 203 Table 3 – Trustworthiness quotes  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1. Trustworthiness	
a. Sources of information	<p><i>I still feel [talking to my doctor about contraception] is good because it's confidential. Your business will never be known. So I am very happy and open and calmed about [talking to my doctor about contraception]" Female aged 18-37 (27)</i></p> <p><i>"Friends tell me [about types of birth control]. But I never really asked the doctor like what it was for because if I don't look it up and or if don't ask, you know, a parent, somebody who could tell me what it is, it's not something that I think I would ever use. Because I'm not going use something that I don't know about." Female aged 18-37 (27)</i></p> <p><i>"I ask them if they've tried anything [as a contraceptive] in the past or if they know of anything that friends, family members or relatives have used that they're particularly keen on" General Practitioner(37)</i></p>
b. Friend of a friend' reports	<p><i>"My friend who has [an IUD] ... said that it hurt a lot when they put it in, and that felt like she had been lied to." 15-year-old female (31)</i></p> <p><i>"Yeah, and she has ballooned, she has put on so much weight and stuff. So she put me off that." Female student (42)</i></p> <p><i>"I have a friend that had one for about 5 years and when she had it removed it was like ripping out her womb lining, and that sounds horrific. And also I've heard of like a friend of a friend who had really bad endometriosis and she basically contracted out her coil in the toilets of a nightclub, and I just don't want that." Female aged 18-46 (40)</i></p> <p><i>"My sister went to the doctor and [the IUD] had messed up her walls or something in her vagina... something caused her not to have kids anymore." 17-year-old female (31)</i></p>
c. LARC vs contraceptive pill	<p><i>"I think a lotta younger kids also don't know too much about the rest of the contraceptives, so they just go to the doctor and say 'I want the pill'. That's what they get." Female aged 16-25 (34)</i></p> <p><i>"As the pill is what's most widely used, people will say that I did just like everyone else, it was something normal" 25-year-old female (41)</i></p> <p><i>"If everybody were using the coil, perhaps I would try". 31-year-old female (41)</i></p>
d. Understanding how LARCs work	<p><i>"What happens if I take it and it messes up my ovaries and I can never get pregnant? Or like, my body goes through early menopause if I took it? You know what I'm saying? People think about those things." Female aged 14-21 (30)</i></p> <p><i>"It's imagining what the coil is doing, so you sort of visualise it just scraping away at your, the wall of your uterus. [Laughter] And it just makes me think of a little bottle brush in there just scraping off all your, the wall of the uterus to prevent any ovary embedding and I suppose the image in your mind is it's sort of like some little metal spring around scratching away at your uterus." Female aged 18-49 (40)</i></p> <p><i>"I know they say that it can't come out or anything.... I don't know, I find that weird. I just have a feeling it will fall out or something and then something will happen, pregnancy or something." Female aged 14-21 (30)</i></p>

### a. Sources of information

Many papers investigated where individuals obtained information about contraception(27,31,41,42). For some, this was their doctor, whom they viewed to be knowledgeable and objective. However, the proportion of interviewees expressing reliance on their healthcare practitioner to provide information about contraception was dwarfed by those describing reliance on social networks.

Some participants reported reliance on their social network for information as they found discussing contraception with healthcare professionals 'embarrassing' or worried they would be 'judged'(42). Often individuals reported using their peers to gather information and corroborate this with a healthcare professional(27). Several of the interviewed HCPs reported being aware of this and used it to frame contraceptive consultations.

### b. 'Friend of a friend' reports

The reliance on the social network for information and their unfamiliarity compared to contraceptive pills, has resulted in LARCs becoming subject of anecdotal or 'friend of friend' reports. Negative reports and 'horror stories' featured heavily in most included

1  
2  
3 221 studies(27,31,33,40–42). Interviewees appeared to be heavily influenced by these  
4  
5 222 testimonies; some reflected typical side effects of LARCs whilst others referred to rare  
6  
7 223 complications or effects seldom reported in scientific literature.  
8

### 9 224 **c. LARC vs contraceptive pill**

10  
11  
12  
13 225 Several papers described a lack of awareness about LARCs(27,28,35). This  
14  
15 226 contrasts with views expressed about the contraceptive pill, with which individuals  
16  
17 227 were much more familiar. One GP described the oral contraceptive pill as a  
18  
19 228 “*euphemism for contraception*”(42). A view supported by several interviewees. The  
20  
21 229 pill was seen as a social 'norm' for contraception, somewhat marginalising LARCs.  
22

### 23 230 **d. Understanding how LARCs work**

24  
25  
26  
27 231 Most studies found a lack of understanding about the mechanism of action of LARCs,  
28  
29 232 particularly concerning IUDs. Several participants were unsure about where IUDs are  
30  
31 233 fitted, hypothesising that they “*enter[s] the tubes*”, “*obstruct[s] the ovaries*”(41) or  
32  
33 234 “*seals the uterus*”(31). There were several instances of a lack of understanding,  
34  
35 235 leading to fear of possible complications.  
36

37  
38 236 Several papers referenced the 'T' shape of IUDs. However, other terms seemingly  
39  
40 237 associated with the word 'coil' (a colloquial term for the IUD) were also used, including  
41  
42 238 “*giant spring*” (40) and “*piece of scrap iron*”(41). Many participants reported unease at  
43  
44 239 the prospect of having a “*foreign body*” inside them. One GP referred to the “*icky*  
45  
46 240 “*factor*”(35) of IUDs and expressed concerns about internal damage, fear of expulsion  
47  
48 241 and the need for it to be “*cleaned regularly*”(40). LARC uptake appeared to be  
49  
50 242 contingent upon sources of information and what is socially acceptable (largely through  
51  
52 243 familiarity with contraceptive method).  
53

## 53 244 **2. Control**

54  
55  
56  
57 245 Themes related to control, or lack of it, were pervasive in this review.  
58  
59  
60

246 Table 4 – Control quotes

2. Control	
<b>a. Personal autonomy</b>	<p><i>"I'd probably use the pill just because I would be the one responsible for it." 15-year-old female (31)</i></p> <p><i>"I used to take the pill, and if something goes wrong, I know that I don't have to take the pill anymore. I can stop taking it" 32-year-old female (28)</i></p> <p><i>I mean I think you have to be very conscious of the power dynamic that exists between the patient and the doctor. I might personally feel that it's not in line with best practice...I think it's important that women feel that they are completely in control of that decision [of early removal] female, GP for five years (36)</i></p> <p><i>"I do find that you can usually, I wouldn't say persuade but if people have all the information and say that this is likely to pass and settle, they'll often just bear with it" female, GP for 40 years (36)</i></p>
<b>b. Insertion/removal process</b>	<p><i>"... that you have to put a contraption in your body and you can't get it out and something goes wrong, or it doesn't act right, then what? You are standing there panicking. ... You have to wait for them to take it out. You could not just take it out. I would have been screaming." 33-year-old female (28)</i></p> <p><i>"Friends had told me it really hurt. As a result, I made a big production of it. I said to myself that I was going to suffer. Finally, there were two small contractions as it was being put in, and it was all over almost before I knew it" 35-year-old female (41)</i></p>
<b>c. Duration</b>	<p><i>"I wanted something that I would have for a while and not have to worry. Because I don't want to end up accidentally getting pregnant, during my college years." 17-year-old female (31)</i></p> <p><i>"The only thing I think maybe 10 years seem a bit long.[...], Female aged 18-49 (40)</i></p>
<b>d. Periods</b>	<p><i>"The COC [combined oral contraceptive pill] is the only option for good period control: everything else is not great" General Practitioner (37)</i></p>

247

248 **a. Personal autonomy**

249 Participants frequently reported that they felt less control and autonomy with LARCs  
 250 compared to other forms of contraception. This featured heavily in decision making.  
 251 Comparisons between LARCs and pills were commonplace. Individuals felt more like  
 252 active decision-makers in their choices by taking a pill every day(28,31).

253 GPs perceived a concept of control concerning the removal of LARC and a shift in  
 254 power dynamic between the clinician and patient. With GPs reporting a need to  
 255 persuade or coerce patients into keeping LARC when they come to ask for  
 256 removal(36).

257 **b. Insertion / removal procedure**

258 Expressed feelings of lack of control extended to the procedures involved with  
 259 inserting, and where applicable, removing LARC. For some, this involved fear and

1  
2  
3 260 anxiety about the procedure. Misconception about what was entailed was common.  
4  
5 261 Some participants spoke about '*surgical procedures*'(28), '*operations*' or '*being put*  
6  
7 262 *to sleep*'(40). For others, the reliance on a health care professional to both insert  
8  
9 263 and remove their contraceptive was a cause for hesitation. Some participants  
10  
11 264 reported their anxieties not materialising, being pleasantly surprised by  
12  
13 265 insertions(41).

### 14 266 c. Duration

15  
16  
17  
18 267 Several papers referenced the length of time that LARCs are in situ(28,34,40). This  
19  
20 268 longer timeframe was appealing for some whilst representing a significant barrier  
21  
22 269 to others by increasing perceived lack of control. There were frequent  
23  
24 270 misapprehensions about the fact that LARCs, including IUDs, can be removed  
25  
26 271 'early', some feared they had to remain for their entire advertised lifespan(40).

### 27 272 d. Periods

28  
29  
30  
31  
32 273 The effect that LARCs had on menstruation was a significant factor in decision making  
33  
34 274 for many. However, similarly to the duration of action, the topic divided opinion about  
35  
36 275 whether it was a barrier or facilitator to LARC use. Some participants explained how  
37  
38 276 the potential ability of some LARCs to cease menstruation was a considerable appeal,  
39  
40 277 with one 17-year-old user of an IUD describing it as "*awesome*"(31). Others, however,  
41  
42 278 described finding the unpredictable effect that LARCs can have on bleeding patterns  
43  
44 279 as challenging. This was frequently noted by health professionals, several of whom  
45  
46 280 contrasted the effect of LARCs with the control gained by the pill(37).

47  
48 281 Some participants referenced finding having regular periods reassuring,  
49  
50 282 discussing that it was natural and "*normal*"(41) to menstruate; that regular periods  
51  
52 283 acted as a "*friendly reminder like, Hey, you're not pregnant, by the way*"(31).

## 53 54 284 3. Systems

55  
56  
57  
58  
59 285 The final theme 'systems' addresses factors associated with primary healthcare  
60

286 organisations and those working within them.

287 Table 5 – Systems quotes

3. Systems	
a. Access barriers	<i>"If your parents don't know you've gotta catch buses and stuff like that, and sometimes that can be a bit hard with appointment times." Female aged 17-25 (34)</i>
b. Healthcare professional factors	<i>"It's very frustrating —it just feels insurmountable to get some training for something that should be fairly basic and well within my scope of practice." General Practitioner (38)</i>  <i>"You know, if you're not going to get funded for something, there's no major incentive for you to start doing it, do you know what I mean. Yeah. And it's exactly like that for me. I've 10-minute consultations do you know what I mean. So if I'm not getting incentivised in payment for it, if there isn't a huge demand, if they can get it elsewhere, it's not going to happen" General Practitioner (42)</i>
c. Critical mass of LARC users/providers	<i>"I've been trained, but I haven't done it enough to actually do [an IUD insertion]. So I feel like I need to be trained again." Advanced nurse practitioner (32)</i>
d. Attitudes towards LARC use in adolescents	<i>"I don't know much about that. I don't think either of those things [implants or IUDs] would be top of the list of things to consider as first line options for adolescents. . . I don't know enough about the safety, tolerability, acceptability, effectiveness in that group." General Practitioner (37)</i>  <i>"They're protected from their worst fear, which is having a baby. I think it gives [adolescents] license to do whatever they want without protection" Family Physician (29)</i>  <i>"[I] was trained at a time when we didn't use IUDs in adolescents or nulliparous women because we were concerned about PID [pelvic inflammatory disease] and infertility.... I learned the new evidence from [Champion] and the reproductive health team. It was a jolt to my way of thinking. I was open to changing because it was a great new option.... So the barrier was knowledge.... I [asked] but what about infection? [Champion] said the evidence does not show an increased rate of infection with IUDs. ...I worked in an office with other people, [who were] using a lot of IUDs.... It was, for whatever reason, something I believed and then changed my practice...because I really believe in teenagers not getting pregnant and offering them what I can." Family Physician (29)</i>

288

### 289 a. Access barriers

290 Several studies reported access as a significant barrier to LARC usage. This  
 291 manifested in different ways, depending on the study's country. Papers concluded  
 292 that access to LARCs trailed other forms of contraception. Some studies noted the  
 293 longer time frame from contraceptive consult to contraceptive efficacy for LARCs. To  
 294 get an IUD fitted, GPs reported wait times varying from two(39) to five months(35).  
 295 Others noted geographical barriers; individuals were asked to travel to get LARCs  
 296 fitted if the service was not available locally. On top of logistical challenges, this  
 297 presented concerns regarding confidentiality for some(34).

298 Other, country-specific barriers to LARCs were discussed. Differing healthcare  
 299 systems mean that some individuals must pay for their contraception. Patients and  
 300 health care professionals alike spoke of costs being considerably higher for LARCS  
 301 than other short-acting forms of contraception(34,35,39).

1  
2  
3 302 **b. Healthcare professional factors**  
4  
5  
6

7 303 A significant number of healthcare professionals cited training, or lack of it, affecting  
8  
9 304 their ability to provide a comprehensive LARC service(38,42). Professionals spoke  
10  
11 305 of scarce opportunities to train in LARC, specifically IUD fittings. Whilst others noted  
12  
13 306 a lack of financial incentives(42).  
14

15 307 **c. Sufficient volume of LARC requests**  
16  
17  
18

19 308 Several papers stated that sufficient volume of LARC insertions and removals  
20  
21 309 are required to maintain professional competencies(32). It is hypothesised that  
22  
23 310 more LARC fittings would lead to improved confidence and training experience  
24  
25 311 for providers, further increasing the capacity to get LARCs inserted locally. One  
26  
27 312 GP felt that *“more GPs inserting them is really the only solution to the problem of*  
28  
29 313 *access”*(35).  
30

31 314 **d. Attitudes towards LARC use in adolescents**  
32  
33

34 315 Several included papers sought to understand adolescents' views about LARCs.  
35  
36 316 Whilst many were receptive to LARC use in adolescence, others expressed that they  
37  
38 317 would be more willing to consider LARCs at a different stage in their lives or *“once I*  
39  
40 318 *have had my children”*(41). For some, this was related to a lack of confidence in using  
41  
42 319 LARCs in this age group(37). Other professionals discussed perceived technical  
43  
44 320 difficulties relating to inserting IUDs in nulliparous women. Some practitioners  
45  
46 321 expressed concerns that LARCs would increase the risks of sexually transmitted  
47  
48 322 infections amongst young users(29).  
49

50 323 Health professionals' hesitancy in offering adolescents LARCs was not universally  
51  
52 324 the case. Some practitioners were advocates of LARCs in this age group(29). The  
53  
54 325 use of an advocate or 'champion' helps to address misinformation and healthcare  
55  
56 326 professional knowledge updates.  
57  
58  
59  
60



## 327 Discussion

328 This systematic review is the first to synthesise primary care related barriers to LARC  
329 use. Three themes were identified: Trustworthiness, Control and Systems. LARCs are  
330 highly effective at reducing unplanned pregnancy and abortion, making them popular  
331 with HCPs and reducing health inequalities(7,8). Yet, primary care and patients  
332 continue to favour short-acting methods. Exploring these key themes helps us to  
333 understand how to rebalance the provision of LARC.

334  
335 The theme 'Trustworthiness' relates to the sources of information and trust in a  
336 particular method. Normalisation of LARC is essential but the primary care preference  
337 for short-acting methods contradicts this. Trust in an HCP has been shown to impact  
338 contraception choices(43). Previous studies have consistently reported reliance on  
339 friends and social networks(44)(45). Reasons for turning to friends rather than HCPs  
340 included fears of judgement and embarrassment, further perpetuating  
341 misinformation(46,47). By understanding where people access contraceptive  
342 information, HCPs have an opportunity not only to address misconceptions, but also  
343 direct patients to reliable sources.

344  
345 'Control' refers to issues of personal autonomy and the impact that LARC might have  
346 on this. Concerns have been raised about HCPs selecting LARCs for individuals  
347 deemed high-risk or unfit for motherhood, leading to reproductive coercion and racial  
348 discrimination (48). A US survey of LARC users found that 5.8% of users wanting  
349 removal were unable to due to provider discouragement(49). Removal of LARC for  
350 reasons other than wanting to become pregnant can lead to unplanned pregnancy and  
351 unsafe abortion(44)(1,6). This leads to HCP hesitancy to remove LARC and instead  
352 encourage patients to persist with side effects(50–52). This alters the power dynamic  
353 within consultations and disempowers individuals in reproductive choice(52). In the  
354 UK, financial incentives in general practice dramatically increased the provision of  
355 LARC. A critique of this was that GPs were getting 'paid' to coerce people into LARC.  
356 The importance of clear and accessible removal protocols has been highlighted  
357 previously(52).

358

1  
2  
3 359 The theme 'Systems' relates to access issues and healthcare worker associated  
4 360 factors. There is repeated evidence in the literature of HCP knowledge gaps and  
5 361 insufficient training opportunities which negative impact LARC uptake(53)(52,54,55).  
6 362 LARC use among adolescents proved to be an area of uncertainty for healthcare  
7 363 workers, with fears about the practicalities of insertion coupled with concerns regarding  
8 364 consent and ethical issues (54,56)(46). Effective contraception consultations require  
9 365 adequate medical knowledge combined with communication skills to empower patient  
10 366 choice(57–59). Educational programs for general practice have had a significant  
11 367 impact on improving provision(12,53)(60)(61). Practice champions can provide  
12 368 efficient ways of dispelling myths and disseminating up to date information to  
13 369 colleagues.

14 370  
15 371 Commonly reported barriers to LARC prescribing include limited access to training and  
16 372 the opportunity to maintain skills(62). In the current NHS workforce crisis, the training  
17 373 needs of the work force can be deprioritised against service delivery. Maintaining  
18 374 LARC insertion rates to sustain professional competence can depend on practice size.  
19 375 In the UK, new Primary Care Networks might redress this by pooling LARC  
20 376 requests(63). By pooling LARC requests within a network allows for sustainable  
21 377 provision of LARC by primary care as well as equity across areas.

22 378  
23 379 LARC provision in the UK was deemed non-essential in the COVID-19 pandemic with  
24 380 many areas offering no service in primary care(64). This has not recovered post-  
25 381 pandemic and in system straining under the weight of demand, rewarding practice  
26 382 innovation is key to delivering better contraceptive care. Using practice champions to  
27 383 tailor services for their community, accounting for ethnicity, deprivation, health literacy  
28 384 and sociocultural barriers to LARC.

## 29 385 **Strengths and limitations**

30 386 A strength of this synthesis is the rigorous critical appraisal throughout; it adhered to  
31 387 PRISMA guidelines and provides an international perspective to help better understand  
32 388 LARC hesitancy. The review drew on studies from disparate high-income settings,  
33 389 encompassing countries where contraceptive services are free to the user (such as the  
34 390 UK) or subsidised privately (US). The search strategy was able to identify primary care

1  
2  
3 391 settings across different nations regardless of disparate nomenclature for example  
4  
5 392 'federal funded clinics, 'family medicine'.

6 393 Potential weaknesses and gaps in the evidence base include the predominance of  
7  
8 394 studies set in the USA, focused on intrauterine devices and on adolescents. Barriers  
9  
10 395 from one setting may not be generalisable to another. Although the overarching  
11  
12 396 themes offer transferability between countries and ages groups, the predominance of  
13  
14 397 USA based studies may have skewed our findings. It is unclear why the topic of IUDs  
15  
16 398 was more prevalent than SDIs. The authors acknowledge the positionality of the study  
17  
18 399 team, who are Caucasian cis women. Every effort was made to let the data guide our  
19  
20 400 synthesis, and emergent themes were subject to critical interpretive challenges within  
21  
22 401 the research team. However, the risk of bringing our inherent biases to the process  
23  
24 402 must be considered.

## 25 403 **Conclusions**

26  
27 404 It is essential that primary care take ownership of the barriers to LARC access to allow  
28  
29 405 equality of reproductive empowerment. Where barriers are founded on  
30  
31 406 misconceptions, education for contraception users and clinicians may play a role.  
32  
33 407 Improved understanding of what LARCs are, how they work, and their safety might  
34  
35 408 empower those who would otherwise discount them to benefit from additional  
36  
37 409 contraceptive choices. Similarly, enhanced training for healthcare workers will facilitate  
38  
39 410 a broader and more comprehensive contraceptive conversation. Contraceptive users  
40  
41 411 should be offered information about LARC in language they understand and through  
42  
43 412 social media like TikTok and Instagram, which enables them to make coercion free and  
44  
45 413 empowered decisions.

46  
47 415 Starting or stopping a LARC is achieved by engagement with a HCP. Increasing the  
48  
49 416 availability of appointments to both insert and remove LARCs may increase a woman's  
50  
51 417 reproductive autonomy. Reports of the relative inaccessibility of LARCs should be a  
52  
53 418 siren call to bodies such as NHS England and NICE (and their equivalents in other  
54  
55 419 nations), particularly if we consider rising rates of unplanned pregnancy to signal a  
56  
57 420 failure of current contraceptive service delivery. Further research to understand  
58  
59 421 contraception hesitancy, especially among those with worse reproductive outcomes is  
60  
60 422 essential.

**423 Reference**

- 424 1. World Health Organization. Ensuring human rights in the provision of contraceptive  
425 information and services - Guidance and recommendations. World Health Organization  
426 2014. 2014.
- 427 2. United Nations Population Division. SDG Indicator 3.7.1 on Contraceptive Use [Internet].  
428 2021 [cited 2022 Feb 17]. Available from:  
429 <https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/data/sdg-indicator-371-contraceptive-use>
- 430 3. World Health Organisation. Family planning/contraception methods [Internet]. 2020  
431 [cited 2022 Feb 17]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/family-planning-contraception)  
432 [sheets/detail/family-planning-contraception](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/family-planning-contraception)
- 433 4. Public Health England. Health matters: reproductive health and pregnancy planning. 26  
434 June 2018. 2018;1–18.
- 435 5. Office for Health Improvement and Disparities. Sexual and Reproductive Health Profiles  
436 - OHID. 2021.
- 437 6. APPG. Women's lives, women's rights : strengthening access to contraception beyond  
438 the pandemic. 2020;
- 439 7. Connolly A, Pietri G, Yu J, Humphreys S. Association between long-acting reversible  
440 contraceptive use, teenage pregnancy, and abortion rates in England. *Int J Womens*  
441 *Health*. 2014 Jan 21;6:961–74.
- 442 8. Ricketts S, Klingler G, Schwalberg R. Game change in Colorado: widespread use of  
443 long-acting reversible contraceptives and rapid decline in births among young, low-  
444 income women. *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2014 Sep;46(3):125–32.
- 445 9. Stoddard A, McNicholas C, Peipert JF. Efficacy and safety of long-acting reversible  
446 contraception. *Drugs*. 2011;71(8):969–80.
- 447 10. Stewart C. Contraceptive use among women in England by type and age 2018/19 |  
448 Statista [Internet]. Health and Pharmaceuticals. 2019 [cited 2022 Feb 17]. Available  
449 from: [https://www.statista.com/statistics/573210/contraceptive-use-among-women-by-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/573210/contraceptive-use-among-women-by-type-and-age-in-england/)  
450 [type-and-age-in-england/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/573210/contraceptive-use-among-women-by-type-and-age-in-england/)
- 451 11. Gould J. All-Party Parliamentary Pro-Choice and Sexual Health Group. All-party  
452 parliamentary pro-choice Sex Heal Gr. 2007;
- 453 12. Mazza D, Black K, Taft A, Lucke J, McGeechan K, Haas M, et al. Increasing the uptake  
454 of long-acting reversible contraception in general practice: The Australian Contraceptive  
455 ChOice pRoject (ACCORd) cluster randomised controlled trial protocol. *BMJ Open*.  
456 2016;
- 457 13. Arrowsmith ME, Aicken CRH, Majeed A, Saxena S. Interventions for increasing uptake  
458 of copper intrauterine devices: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Contraception*.

- 1  
2  
3 459 2012 Dec;86(6):600–5.  
4  
5 460 14. Arrowsmith ME, Majeed A, Lee JT, Saxena S. Impact of Pay for Performance on  
6 461 Prescribing of Long-Acting Reversible Contraception in Primary Care: An Interrupted  
7 462 Time Series Study. Cameron S, editor. PLoS One. 2014 Apr 2;9(4):e92205.  
8  
9 463 15. Pasvol TJ, Macgregor EA, Rait G, Horsfall L. Time trends in contraceptive prescribing  
10 464 in UK primary care 2000–2018: a repeated cross-sectional study. *BMJ Sex Reprod Heal*.  
11 465 2021 Nov 15;0.  
12  
13 466 16. PHE. HIV, Sexual and Reproductive Health: Current Issues Bulletin - Bulletin 4 -  
14 467 Tendering Sexual Health Services. 2014.  
15  
16 468 17. Balachandren N, Barrett G, Stephenson JM, Yasmin E, Mavrelou D, Davies M, et al.  
17 469 Impact of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic on access to contraception and pregnancy  
18 470 intentions: a national prospective cohort study of the UK population. *BMJ Sex Reprod*  
19 471 *Heal*. 2022 Jan;48(1):60–5.  
20  
21 472 18. NHS digital. Part 1: Contacts with Sexual and Reproductive Health Services - NHS  
22 473 Digital [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 Feb 17]. Available from: [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/sexual-and-reproductive-health-services/2020-21)  
23 474 [and-information/publications/statistical/sexual-and-reproductive-health-services/2020-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/sexual-and-reproductive-health-services/2020-21)  
24 475 21  
25  
26 476 19. National institute for health and care excellence. Overview | Long-acting reversible  
27 477 contraception | Guidance | NICE. NICE; 2019.  
28  
29 478 20. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The  
30 479 PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Syst*  
31 480 *Rev*. 2021 Dec 1;10(1):1–11.  
32  
33 481 21. Booth A. Searching for qualitative research for inclusion in systematic reviews: A  
34 482 structured methodological review. *Syst Rev*. 2016 May 4;5(1):1–23.  
35  
36 483 22. World Economic Situation and Prospects (WESP). Country classification Data sources,  
37 484 country classifications and aggregation methodology Data sources. 2014.  
38  
39 485 23. Veritas Health Innovation. Covidence systematic review software: veritas health  
40 486 innovation. 2017.  
41  
42 487 24. CASP UK (Better Value Healthcare Ltd). Critical appraisal Skills Programme (CASP).  
43 488 Qualitative checklist. [Internet]. Oxford. 2016 [cited 2019 Jan 15]. p. 1–10. Available  
44 489 from: [www.casp-uk.net](http://www.casp-uk.net)  
45  
46 490 25. Noyes J, Booth A, Cargo M, Flemming K, Harden A, Harris J, Garside R, Hannes K,  
47 491 Pantoja T TJ. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.2.  
48 492 Chapter 21: Qualitative evidence. updated Fe. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J,  
49 493 Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ WV (editors), editor. 2021.  
50  
51 494 26. Thomas J, Harden A. Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 495 systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2008;8(8).
- 4 496 27. Blackstock OJ, Mba-Jonas A, Sacajiu GM. Family planning knowledge: The role of  
5 497 social networks and primary care providers as information sources for African American  
6 498 women. *Am J Sex Educ.* 2010;5(2):128–43.
- 9 499 28. Rubin SE, Winrob I. Urban female family medicine patients' perceptions about  
10 500 intrauterine contraception. *J Women's Heal.* 2010;19(4):735–40.
- 12 501 29. Rubin SE, Davis K, McKee MD. New York City physicians' views of providing long-acting  
13 502 reversible contraception to adolescents. *Ann Fam Med.* 2013;11(2):130–6.
- 15 503 30. Potter J, Rubin SE, Sherman P. Fear of intrauterine contraception among adolescents  
16 504 in New York City. *Contraception.* 2014 May 1;89(5):446–50.
- 18 505 31. Hoopes AJ, Gilmore K, Cady J, Akers AY, Ahrens KR. A Qualitative Study of Factors  
20 506 That Influence Contraceptive Choice among Adolescent School-Based Health Center  
21 507 Patients. *J Pediatr Adolesc Gynecol.* 2016;29(3):259–64.
- 23 508 32. Murphy MK, Stoffel C, Nolan M, Haider S. Interdependent Barriers to Providing  
24 509 Adolescents with Long-Acting Reversible Contraception: Qualitative Insights from  
25 510 Providers. *J Pediatr Adolesc Gynecol.* 2016;29(5):436–42.
- 28 511 33. Kang MM, Guetterman TC, Prussack JK, Ursu A, Wu JP. Contraceptive care for women  
29 512 with medical conditions: A qualitative study to identify potential best practices for primary  
30 513 care physicians. *Fam Med.* 2019;51(7):559–66.
- 33 514 34. Garrett CC, Keogh LA, Kavanagh A, Tomnay J, Hocking JS. Understanding the low  
34 515 uptake of long-acting reversible contraception by young women in Australia: A  
35 516 qualitative study. *BMC Womens Health.* 2015;15(1):1–10.
- 37 517 35. Lodge G, Sancu L, Temple-Smith M. GPs' perspectives on prescribing intrauterine  
38 518 contraceptive devices. *Aust Fam Physician.* 2017;
- 41 519 36. Ding J, Williams H, Hocking JS, Coombe J. Requesting early removal of long-acting  
42 520 reversible contraception: A qualitative study exploring the experiences of doctors  
43 521 working in primary care. *Aust J Prim Health.* 2021 Dec 1;27(6):467–72.
- 45 522 37. Duncan R, Paterson H, Anderson L, Pickering N. "We're kidding ourselves if we say that  
47 523 contraception is accessible": A qualitative study of general practitioners' attitudes  
48 524 towards adolescents' use of long-acting reversible contraceptives (LARC). *J Prim Health  
49 525 Care.* 2019;11(2):138–45.
- 52 526 38. McGinn O, Fulcher HJ, Arroll B, McCowan L. Barriers to the prescription of LARCs in  
53 527 general practice in New Zealand—a qualitative research study. *N Z Med J.*  
54 528 2019;132(1507):63–9.
- 56 529 39. Lunniss H, Cameron S, Chen ZE. Views of general practitioners on providing  
57 530 contraceptive advice and long-acting reversible contraception at the 6-week postnatal  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 531 visit: a qualitative study. *J Fam Plan Reprod Heal care*. 2016 Apr 1;42(2):99–106.
- 4  
5 532 40. Walker S, Newton VL, Hoggart L, Parker M. “I think maybe 10 years seems a bit long.”  
6 533 Beliefs and attitudes of women who had never used intrauterine contraception. *BMJ Sex*  
7 534 *Reprod Heal*. 2018;44(2):90–6.
- 8  
9 535 41. Fournier A, Vallee J. Views on intrauterine device of women consulting for contraception  
10 536 in general practice. *Exerc Rev Francoph Med Gen*. 2015;26(121):196–204.
- 11  
12 537 42. Sweeney LA, Molloy GJ, Byrne M, Murphy AW, Morgan K, Hughes CM, et al. A  
13 538 qualitative study of prescription contraception use: The perspectives of users, general  
14 539 practitioners and pharmacists. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(12):1–13.
- 15  
16 540 43. Stacey RE, Dempsey A. The influence of trust in health care systems on postabortion  
17 541 contraceptive choice. *Contraception*. 2015 Nov 1;92(5):458–62.
- 18  
19 542 44. Claringbold L, Sanci L, Temple-Smith M. Factors influencing young women’s  
20 543 contraceptive choices. *Aust J Gen Pract*. 2019;48(6):389–94.
- 21  
22 544 45. Whittaker PG, Merkh RD, Henry-Moss D, Hock-Long L. Withdrawal attitudes and  
23 545 experiences: a qualitative perspective among young urban adults. *Perspect Sex Reprod*  
24 546 *Health*. 2010 Apr 20;42(2):102–9.
- 25  
26 547 46. Russo J, Miller E, Gold M. Myths and misconceptions about long-acting reversible  
27 548 contraception (LARC). *J Adolesc Heal*. 2013;52(4):S14–21.
- 28  
29 549 47. Buhling KJ, Hauck B, Dermout S, Ardaens K, Marions L. Understanding the barriers and  
30 550 myths limiting the use of intrauterine contraception in nulliparous women: Results of a  
31 551 survey of European/Canadian healthcare providers. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*.  
32 552 2014;183:146–54.
- 33  
34 553 48. Lowe P, Rowlands S. Long-acting reversible contraception: Targeting those judged to  
35 554 be unfit for parenthood in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Glob Public Health*.  
36 555 2022;1–12.
- 37  
38 556 49. Poleon S, Thompson EL. Reasons for Intent to Discontinue and Remove Long-Acting  
39 557 Reversible Contraceptives: National Survey of Family Growth 2017–2019.  
40 558 <https://home.liebertpub.com/jwh>. 2022 Jan 7;
- 41  
42 559 50. Foster DG, Grossman D, Turok DK, Peipert JF, Prine L, Schreiber CA, et al. Interest in  
43 560 and experience with IUD self-removal. *Contraception*. 2014;90(1):54–9.
- 44  
45 561 51. Hoggart L, Louise Newton V, Dickson J. “I think it depends on the body, with mine it  
46 562 didn’t work”: explaining young women’s contraceptive implant removal. *Contraception*.  
47 563 2013 Nov;88(5):636–40.
- 48  
49 564 52. Higgins JA, Kramer RD, Ryder KM. Provider Bias in Long-Acting Reversible  
50 565 Contraception (LARC) Promotion and Removal: Perceptions of Young Adult Women.  
51 566 *Am J Public Health*. 2016 Nov 1;106(11):1932.
- 52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 567 53. Ma R, Shah R. Are medical educators in general practice untapped potential to increase  
4 568 training capacity in sexual and reproductive healthcare? Results of a survey in London,  
5 569 UK. *London J Prim Care (Abingdon)*. 2016;8(5):85–90.  
6  
7 570 54. Middleton AJ, Naish J, Singer N. General practitioners' views on the use of the  
8 571 levonorgestrel-releasing intrauterine system in young, nulligravid women, in London,  
9 572 UK. *Eur J Contracept Reprod Health Care*. 2011 Aug;16(4):311–8.  
10  
11 573 55. Wellings K, Zhihong Z, Krentel A, Barrett G, Glasier A. Attitudes towards long-acting  
12 574 reversible methods of contraception in general practice in the UK. *Contraception*. 2007  
13 575 Sep;76(3):208–14.  
14  
15 576 56. Hoggart L, Walker S, Newton VL, Parker M. Provider-based barriers to provision of  
16 577 intrauterine contraception in general practice. *BMJ Sex Reprod Heal*. 2018 Apr  
17 578 1;44(2):82–9.  
18  
19 579 57. Shepherd HL, Barratt A, Jones A, Bateson D, Carey K, Trevena LJ, et al. Can  
20 580 consumers learn to ask three questions to improve shared decision making? A feasibility  
21 581 study of the ASK (AskShareKnow) Patient-Clinician Communication Model(®)  
22 582 intervention in a primary health-care setting. *Health Expect*. 2016 Oct 1;19(5):1160–8.  
23  
24 583 58. de Silva Joyce H, Slade D, Bateson D, Scheeres H, McGregor J, Weisberg E. Patient-  
25 584 centred discourse in sexual and reproductive health consultations. *Discourse Commun*.  
26 585 2015 Mar 9;9(3):275–92.  
27  
28 586 59. Skelton JR, Matthews PM. Teaching sexual history taking to health care professionals  
29 587 in primary care. *Med Educ*. 2001 Jun 1;35(6):603–8.  
30  
31 588 60. Kalwij S, French S, Mugezi R, Baraitser P. Using educational outreach and a financial  
32 589 incentive to increase general practices' contribution to chlamydia screening in South-  
33 590 East London 2003–2011. *BMC Public Health*. 2012 Dec 18;12(1):802.  
34  
35 591 61. Mullineux J, Firmstone V, Matthews P, Ireson R. Innovative sexual health education for  
36 592 general practice: an evaluation of the Sexual Health in Practice (SHIP) scheme. *Educ*  
37 593 *Prim Care*. 2008;19(4):397–407.  
38  
39 594 62. Turner R, Tapley A, Sweeney S, Magin P. Barriers to prescribing of long-acting  
40 595 reversible contraception (LARC) by general practitioner registrars: A cross-sectional  
41 596 questionnaire. *Aust New Zeal J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2021 Jun 1;61(3):469–73.  
42  
43 597 63. NHS England » Primary care networks [Internet]. [cited 2022 Sep 28]. Available from:  
44 598 <https://www.england.nhs.uk/primary-care/primary-care-networks/>  
45  
46 599 64. Ma R, Foley K, Saxena S, Ma R, Drph M, Foley K. BJGP OPEN Experiences of access  
47 600 and use of contraceptive care during COVID-19 lockdown in the UK: a web-based  
48 601 survey Experiences of access and use of contraceptive care during covid-19 lockdown  
49 602 in the United Kingdom: a web-based survey. 2022;



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

# 1. Trustworthiness

## a. Sources of information

*I still feel [talking to my doctor about contraception] is good because it's confidential. Your business will never be known. So I am very happy and open and calmed about [talking to my doctor about contraception]" Female aged 18-37 (27)*

*"Friends tell me [about types of birth control]. But I never really asked the doctor like what it was for because if I don't look it up and or if don't ask, you know, a parent, somebody who could tell me what it is, it's not something that I think I would ever use. Because I'm not going use something that I don't know about." Female aged 18-37 (27)*

*"I ask them if they've tried anything [as a contraceptive] in the past or if they know of anything that friends, family members or relatives have used that they're particularly keen on" General Practitioner (37)*

## b. Friend of a friend' reports

*"My friend who has [an IUD] ... said that it hurt a lot when they put it in, and that felt like she had been lied to." 15-year-old female (31)*

*"Yeah, and she has ballooned, she has put on so much weight and stuff. So she put me off that." Female student (42)*

*"I have a friend that had one for about 5 years and when she had it removed it was like ripping out her womb lining, and that sounds horrific. And also I've heard of like a friend of a friend who had really bad endometriosis and she basically contracted out her coil in the toilets of a nightclub, and I just don't want that." Female aged 18-46 (40)*

*"My sister went to the doctor and [the IUD] had messed up her walls or something in her vagina... something caused her not to have kids anymore." 17-year-old female (31)*

## c. LARC vs contraceptive pill

*"I think a lotta younger kids also don't know too much about the rest of the contraceptives, so they just go to the doctor and say 'I want the pill'. That's what they get." Female aged 16-25 (34)*

*"As the pill is what's most widely used, people will say that I did just like everyone else, it was something normal" 25-year-old female (41)  
"If everybody were using the coil, perhaps I would try". 31-year-old female (41)*

## d. Understanding how LARCs work

*"What happens if I take it and it messes up my ovaries and I can never get pregnant? Or like, my body goes through early menopause if I took it? You know what I'm saying? People think about those things." Female aged 14-21 (30)*

*"It's imagining what the coil is doing, so you sort of visualise it just scraping away at your, the wall of your uterus. [Laughter] And it just makes me think of a little bottle brush in there just scraping off all your, the wall of the uterus to prevent any ovary embedding and I suppose the image in your mind is it's sort of like some little metal spring around scratching away at your uterus." Female aged 18-49 (40)*

<https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bmjrsrh>

*"I know they say that it can't come out or anything.... I don't know, I find that weird. I just have a feeling it will fall out or something and then something will happen, pregnancy or something." Female aged 14-21 (30)*

## 2. Control

### a. Personal autonomy

*"I'd probably use the pill just because I would be the one responsible for it." 15-year-old female (31)*  
*"I used to take the pill, and if something goes wrong, I know that I don't have to take the pill anymore. I can stop taking it" 32-year-old female (28)*

*I mean I think you have to be very conscious of the power dynamic that exists between the patient and the doctor. I might personally feel that it's not in line with best practice...I think it's important that women feel that they are completely in control of that decision [of early removal] female, GP for five years (36)*

*"I do find that you can usually, I wouldn't say persuade but if people have all the information and say that this is likely to pass and settle, they'll often just bear with it" female, GP for 40 years (36)*

### b. Insertion/removal process

*"... that you have to put a contraption in your body and you can't get it out and something goes wrong, or it doesn't act right, then what? You are standing there panicking. ... You have to wait for them to take it out. You could not just take it out. I would have been screaming." 33-year-old female (28)*

*"Friends had told me it really hurt. As a result, I made a big production of it. I said to myself that I was going to suffer. Finally, there were two small contractions as it was being put in, and it was all over almost before I knew it" 35-year-old female (41)*

### c. Duration

*"I wanted something that I would have for a while and not have to worry. Because I don't want to end up accidentally getting pregnant, during my college years." 17-year-old female (31)*

*"The only thing I think maybe 10 years seem a bit long.[...], Female aged 18-49 (40)*

### d. Periods

*"The COC [combined oral contraceptive pill] is the only option for good period control: everything else is not great" General Practitioner (37)*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 3. Systems

#### a. Access barriers

*"If your parents don't know you've gotta catch buses and stuff like that, and sometimes that can be a bit hard with appointment times." Female aged 17-25 (34)*

#### b. Healthcare professional factors

*"It's very frustrating —it just feels insurmountable to get some training for something that should be fairly basic and well within my scope of practice." General Practitioner (38)*

*"You know, if you're not going to get funded for something, there's no major incentive for you to start doing it, do you know what I mean. Yeah. And it's exactly like that for me. I've 10-minute consultations do you know what I mean. So if I'm not getting incentivised in payment for it, if there isn't a huge demand, if they can get it elsewhere, it's not going to happen" General Practitioner (42)*

#### c. Critical mass of LARC users/providers

*"I've been trained, but I haven't done it enough to actually do [an IUD insertion]. So I feel like I need to be trained again." Advanced nurse practitioner (32)*

#### d. Attitudes towards LARC use in adolescents

*"I don't know much about that. I don't think either of those things [implants or IUDs] would be top of the list of things to consider as first line options for adolescents. . . I don't know enough about the safety, tolerability, acceptability, effectiveness in that group." General Practitioner (37)*

*"They're protected from their worst fear, which is having a baby. I think it gives [adolescents] license to do whatever they want without protection" Family Physician (29)*

*"[I] was trained at a time when we didn't use IUDs in adolescents or nulliparous women because we were concerned about PID [pelvic inflammatory disease] and infertility.... I learned the new evidence from [Champion] and the reproductive health team. It was a jolt to my way of thinking. I was open to changing because it was a great new option.... So the barrier was knowledge.... I [asked] but what about infection? [Champion] said the evidence does not show an increased rate of infection with IUDs. ...I worked in an office with other people, [who were] using a lot of IUDs.... It was, for whatever reason, something I believed and then changed my practice...because I really believe in teenagers not getting pregnant and offering them what I can." Family Physician (29)*