USE EFFECTIVENESS OF COPPER—T & LIPPES LOOP

by

K. K. DESHMUKH,* M.D., D.G.O., S. B. MUJUMDAR,** M.D.

and

P. C. SANKHOLKAR,*** M.D.

Intrauterine devices have been used on a large scale all over the world as a contraceptive method for spacing. Various types of intrauterine devices have been introduced so as to reduce the complications and to increase the use effctiveness. Clinical studies have been reported that copper improves the performance of intrauterine devices. The addition of metalic copper to an intrauterine device was shown by Zipper et al (1969) to enhance significantly contraception effectiveness. Tatum (1973) in his preliminary report derived from the first twelve months' of use of the T-cu 200 in comparison with Loop-D showed that the Copper-T provides somewhat better use effectiveness than Loop-D.

The purpose of the present study was to make a comparison between the Copper-T model T-cu 200 and Lippes loop 30 m.m. size. The results of 193 insertions with a follow-up on every patient for 12 months are described.

Material and Method

Patients between 18 to 35 years of age attending Urban Family Planning Centre attached to J.J. Group of Hospitals and Grant Medical College, Bombay were given intrauterine device as a method for spacing the childbirth. All the pa ients were of proved fertility and were without demonstrable pelvic pathology. Total number of I.U.D. insertions performed during Oc'ober 1974 to February 1975 were 229. Copper-T were inserted in 95 women and Lippes loop in 134 women. were advised to come for follow-up after one week of insertion. Thereafter follow-up examination was done monthly for three mon'hs and every 3 months thereafter or any other time if she has any side effects.

At the follow up visits speculum and bimanual examinations were done in all the women. Out of 134 cases of Lippes loop, 34 cases were lost to follow up and out of 95 cases of Copper-T, only 2 cases did not come for follow up examination. The results were analysed in November 1975.

Results

By comparing the clinical trials of Lippes loop and Copper-T, the following information is obtained. Out of 134 insertions, 100 cases were followed up giving a follow up incidence of 74.6 per cent but out of 95 Copper-T insertion, only 2 cases were lost for follow-up. Complete comparative data are shown in Table I.

Clinical comparison of Lippes loop and Copper-T showed that expulsion rate in

^{*}Reader.

^{**} Associate Professor.

^{***}Professor, Department of Obstetrics (Gynaecology, Grant Medical College, Bombay-8.
Accepted for Publication on 21.5.1976.

TABLE I
Clinical Comparison of Lippes Loop and Copper-T

Address of the Control of the Contro	Lippes loop 30 mm Total No.	Percentage	Cu-T 200 Total No.	Percentage
1. Total No. of insertions	134	224 1	95	AND SHOPE
2. Lost for follow up.	34	25.4	2	2.1
Active at the end of study	100	74.6	93	97.9
3. Expulsion	3	3	5	5.37
4. Pregnancy	Nil		1	1.07
5. Removal due to side effects	12	12	6	6.4

Copper-T was very high i.e. 5.37% compared to 3% of Lippes loop. Pregnancy rate for Copper-T was 1.07% but there was no incidence of pregnancy in cases of Lippes loop.

Removal of Cu-T for medical reasons were less than Lippes loop. Details of removal due to side effects are shown in Table II. series, but there was one case of displacement of Lippes loop in the uterus. When patient came for follow up examination, nylon thread was not seen on speculum examination, but loop could be sounded with the uterine sound in the uterus. X-ray abdomen confirmed the presence of loop in the uterine cavity.

TABLE II

Details of Removal Due to Side-effects

Side effects	Lippes loop No. of cases	Cu-T No. of cases	
1. Continuous bleeding since insertion	3	2	
2. Bleeding per vaginum off and on	4 2		
. Pain in lower abdomen	3	1	
. Excessive white discharge	1	1	
5. Displacement of I.U.D.	1	Nil	
Total:	12	6	

Total removals of Lippes loop were 12 as compared to 6 removals in case of Copper-T. Removals due to pain and/or bleeding were less for Copper-T than in Lippes loop. There were only 6 removals for medical reasons out of 93 cases among T-cu users, but among the women wearing the Lippes loop, there were 12 removals for medical reasons out of 100 cases.

There were no case of perforation either in Copper-T or Lippes loop in this

Discussion

In this clinical comparison of Cu-T with Lippes loop, it is observed that Copper-T produces very few side effects compared to Lippes loop. Tatum (1972) in his clinical comparison of Copper-T, Model T-cu 200 with Lippes loop size D has shown that except termination for medical reasons other than pain and/or bleeding, the Copper-T performance is better than Lippes loop. Gulati and

Mujumdar (1975) also reported 12.5% removals in Copper-T series as against 21% removals in Loop series. Pregnancy ra'e reported by Tatum with the Copper-T was 2.2 per 100 users as compared to 3 per 100 users in Lippes loop. In this series though the number of cases studied is small there was one pregnancy in Cu-T device users but no pregnancy in Lippes loop weares. This may be the result of failure to insert the 'T' high in the fundal cavity or the small size of Cu-T. Unusual complication of Copper-T like perforation of the cervix by the transverse arm of the "T" was not observed in this series. There were 3 cases reported by Tatum (1972) in his series.

Conclusion

The data derived from the clinical comparison of the T-cu 200 with Lippes

michel venera other than rate and on

loop indicates that Copper-T provides better use effectiveness than Lippes loop.

Acknowledgement

We thank Dr. K. D. Sharma, Dean, Grant Medical College, Bombay, for allowing us to present hospital data.

References

- Gulai, B. N. and Mujumdar, U.: J. Obst. & Gynec. India. 26: 616, 1975.
- Tatum, H. J.: Am. J. Obst. & Gynec. 117: 602, 1973.
- 3. Tatum, H. J.: Am. J. Obst. & Gynec. 112: 1000, 1972.
- 4. Tatum, H. J.: "Advances in Planned Parenthood". Vol. VIII Proceedings of the tenth annual meeting of the American Association of Planned Parenthood Physician, Detroit, Michigan. April 6th July 1972, Page 127.
- Zipper, J. A., Tatum, H. J., Pasten, L., Model, M. and Rivera, M.: Am. J. Obst. & Gynec. 105: 1274, 1969.