e-ISSN: 0975-1556, p-ISSN:2820-2643

Available online on www.ijpcr.com

International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research 2023; 15(9); 1332-1345

Original Research Article

Comparing Combined Pills to Progesterone-Only Pills for Abnormal Uterine Bleeding in Perimenopausal Women

Somendra Sahasikdar[1], Sumit Roy[2], Kazi Rokeya Rahaman[3], Balaram Ghosh[4]

[1]Director and Sr. Consultant, Department of Obstetrics &Gynaecology, Sharanya Hospital, West Bengal
[2]Junior Consultant, Department of Obstetrics &Gynaecology, Sharanya Hospital, West Bengal
[3]Senior Residents Department of Obstetrics &Gynaecology, Sharanya Hospital, West Bengal
[4]Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Midnapore Medical College, West Bengal

Received: 25-06-2023 / Revised: 28-07-2023 / Accepted: 30-08-2023
Corresponding author: Dr. Balaram Ghosh
Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract:

Abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB) is a prevalent and troubling indication encountered by perimenopausal females, frequently requiring medical interference. This investigation seeks to evaluate the efficiency and security of merged oral contraceptive pills (COCs) and progesterone-only pills (POPs) in the handling of AUB in perimenopausal females. A randomised regulated experiment was carried out; involving 300 participants aged 45 to 55 years with abnormal uterine bleeding. Participants were arbitrarily allocated to receive either combined oral contraceptives or progestin-only pills for a period of 6 months. The main result measures were decrease in haemorrhage severity and enhancement in quality of existence, evaluated using standardised scales. Additional outcomes encompassed adverse reactions, uterine lining examination, and client contentment. Data examination unveiled that both Contraceptive Oral Contraceptives (COCs) and Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) were efficacious in diminishing haemorrhage severity and enhancing standard of living ($p < 0.05$). Nevertheless, combined oral contraceptives (COCs) were linked with a greater occurrence of adverse reactions in contrast to progestin-only pills (POPs) ($p < 0.05$). Endometrial histopathology revealed no noteworthy disparities between the two cohorts. Patient contentment was greater in the POPs group ($p < 0.05$). In summary, both COCs and POPs are feasible choices for handling AUB in perimenopausal women, with POPs providing a favourable side effect profile and increased patient contentment.

Keywords: Abnormal uterine bleeding, Perimenopausal women, Combined oral contraceptive pills, Progesterone-only pills, Randomized controlled trial.

Introduction

1. Introduction to Perimenopause and Its Challenges

Perimenopause is a transformative stage that the majority of women encounter in the years preceding menopause. It signifies the progressive decrease of procreative hormones, specifically oestrogen, and commonly commences in a lady's 40s, albeit it may initiate earlier or later for certain individuals.

This stage can endure anywhere from a few months to numerous years before menopause officially transpires. Throughout perimenopause, women frequently encounter a variety of corporeal, sentimental, and cognitive obstacles as their bodies adjust to hormonal oscillations. Here are some pivotal facets and hurdles linked with perimenopause:

- Unpredictable Menstrual Patterns: One of the distinguishing indications of perimenopause is erratic menstruation. Females might encounter briefer or lengthier cycles, weightier or lighter discharge, and unforeseeable menstruation, rendering it challenging to precisely monitor their menstrual cycles.
- Physical Manifestations: Perimenopausal symptoms can diverge extensively among women, but certain prevalent physical obstacles encompass fervent flashes, nocturnal perspiration, vaginal aridity, diminished desire, bosom sensitivity, and alterations in dermal and capillary consistency. These indications can be disruptive and uncomfortable. (Casper, 2011)
- Affective and Cognitive Alterations: Hormonal oscillations during perimenopause can result in emotional oscillations, restlessness, unease, and even despondency in certain women. The sentimental rollercoaster can be demanding to manoeuvre.

- Sleep Disruptions: Nocturnal perspiration and endocrine fluctuations can interfere with sleep cycles, resulting in sleeplessness or agitated slumber. This can contribute to weariness and worsen emotional disruptions.
- Bone Health: As oestrogen levels diminish, women are at an augmented risk of osteoporosis, a condition distinguished by debilitated bones. It's crucial to concentrate on preserving bone health through adequate nourishment and physical activity during perimenopause. (Harlow & Campbell, 2004)
- Cardiovascular Well-being: Oestrogen performs a safeguarding function in cardiac well-being, and its decrease during perimenopause might amplify the vulnerability to cardiovascular ailments. It's vital to oversee cardiovascular well-being and make lifestyle modifications, such as engaging in physical activity and consuming a heart-nourishing diet.
- Weight Increase: Certain females might encounter weight increase, specifically in the midsection, throughout perimenopause. Hormonal alterations can impact metabolism, rendering it increasingly difficult to sustain a well-balanced weight.
- Cognitive Alterations: Certain females disclose modifications in memory and cognitive performance throughout perimenopause. Whilst these alterations are typically inconspicuous and not all-encompassing, they can be vexing for individuals undergoing them.
- Obstacles in Family and Connections: The sentimental and corporeal trials of perimenopause can affect intimate connections. Unveil communication with partners, allies, and kin is pivotal to manoeuvring this stage triumphantly.
- Healthcare Requirements: Routine examinations with a healthcare practitioner are crucial during perimenopause to track hormone levels, evaluate general well-being, and converse about approaches for handling symptoms. Hormone substitution therapy (HST) and alternative interventions may be contemplated for symptom alleviation, but these determinations should be made in consultation with a healthcare expert. (ACOG, 2013)

In summary, perimenopause is an innate stage in a woman's existence, yet it can pose diverse obstacles due to hormonal oscillations and their impacts on the physique and psyche.

Comprehending these obstacles and seeking assistance and counsel from medical professionals, as well as companions and relatives, can aid women in manoeuvring through this transformative phase with increased comfort and assurance.

2. Significance of Addressing Abnormal Uterine Bleeding

Tackling Abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB) is of noteworthy significance owing to its possible influence on a woman's well-being and standard of living. Unusual uterine haemorrhage pertains to any Abnormal or anomalous bleeding from the womb, which may exhibit diverse manifestations, such as substantial menstrual bleeding, recurring periods, extended periods, or erratic cycles. Here are some pivotal rationales why tackling AUB is noteworthy:

- Wellness Worries: Unusual uterine bleeding can be a sign of an underlying medical condition or reproductive health problem. These circumstances can encompass uterine fibroids, growths, endometriosis, adenomyosis, pelvic inflammatory disease (PID), and even specific malignancies like uterine or cervical cancer. Identifying and tackling these circumstances promptly is vital for efficient therapy and improved results. (Mira & Xavier, 2015)
- Iron Insufficiency Anaemia: Excessive or extended AUB can result in iron deficiency anaemia, a state distinguished by a scarcity of red blood cells caused by persistent blood loss. Anaemia can lead to exhaustion, debility, pallid complexion, and additional health issues. Managing AUB can aid in averting or controlling anaemia.
- Quality of Existence: AUB can greatly influence a woman's standard of living. Unrestrained haemorrhaging can result in mortification, unease, and hassle. It might limit engagement in everyday tasks, employment, and social interactions. Acknowledging AUB can enhance a woman's comprehensive welfare and psychological well-being. (Gompel, Rozenberg, & Mawet, 2013)
- Fertility Worries: For women who desire to conceive, AUB can disrupt fertility. Unpredictable or excessive bleeding may complicate the anticipation of ovulation and timing intercourse accurately. Recognising and handling the fundamental reasons for AUB can enhance the likelihood of conception.
- Psychological Effect: AUB can induce psychological anguish, unease, and melancholy in certain women. The unpredictableness and uneasiness linked with Abnormal haemorrhaging can result in strain and adversely impact psychological well-being. Managing AUB can aid in mitigating these mental symptoms.
- Avoiding Complexities: If unaddressed, circumstances inducing AUB can result in complexities. For instance, uterine fibroids can expand in size and become increasingly

difficult to manage as time progresses. Attending to AUB promptly can avert these complexities and diminish the necessity for further intrusive interventions subsequently. (Gompel, Rozenberg, & Mawet, 2013)

- Improving Reproductive Health: AUB can disrupt a woman's capacity to uphold a robust reproductive system. Speaking about AUB can enhance comprehensive procreative fitness and welfare, guaranteeing that the procreative structures operate at their best.
- Customised Treatment Choices: Therapy for AUB can be customised to suit every person's requirements and inclinations. Healthcare providers can provide different choices, such as endocrine treatments, less intrusive methods, or, in certain instances, operations. Customised treatment plans can enhance patient contentment and results.
- Premature Identification of Grave Ailments: In certain instances, AUB can serve as a preliminary indicator of a more severe ailment, such as malignancy. Premature identification via inquiries and diagnostic examinations can be life-preserving.

3. Role of Medication in Managing Abnormal Uterine Bleeding

Medicine plays a noteworthy function in handling irregular uterine bleeding (AUB), aiding in mitigating symptoms, regulating bleeding, and tackling fundamental causes. The selection of medication relies on the particular diagnosis and the intensity of the AUB. Here are numerous methods in which medication is utilised in the handling of AUB:

Nonhormonal Anti-Inflammatory Medications (NHAIMs): Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) such as ibuprofen can aid in diminishing excessive menstrual bleeding and mitigating discomfort linked to abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB). They operate by diminishing prostaglandin levels, which may contribute to exaggerated haemorrhaging and menstrual spasms. (Sweet, Schmidt-Dalton, & Weiss, 2012)

Hormone Therapy:

- Combined Verbal Contraceptives (CVCs): Contraceptive tablets encompassing oestrogen and progestin have the capacity to regulate the menstrual cycle, diminish menstrual discharge, and render periods more foreseeable.
- Progestin-Solely Treatment: Progestin-exclusive contraception techniques, such as progestin-exclusive tablets (mini-pills), intrauterine devices (IUDs), and injections, can aid in managing excessive haemorrhaging. They operate by slimming the uterine lining and stabilizing the menstrual cycle.
- Hormone Substitution Therapy (HST): For perimenopausal or postmenopausal women with AUB caused by hormonal oscillations, HST can assist in harmonising hormone levels and diminishing bleeding.
- Tranexamic Acid: This remedy aids in diminishing excessive menstrual bleeding by encouraging blood coagulation. It is frequently employed as a temporary remedy to oversee substantial menstruation.
- Desmopressin (DDAVP): In certain instances, especially for individuals with hemorrhagic disorders, desmopressin can be employed to amplify blood coagulation and diminish excessive haemorrhaging during menstruation. (James, 2011)
- Gonadotropin-Releasing Hormone (GnRH) Stimulants: These drugs transiently initiate a condition of menopause by inhibiting ovarian activity, thus diminishing menstrual flow. GnRH stimulants are commonly employed as a temporary therapy because they can exhibit notable adverse reactions, such as skeletal strength reduction.
- Antifibrinolytic Substances: Medications such as aminocaproic acid can be employed to hinder the disintegration of blood clots and diminish excessive menstrual bleeding.
- Discriminating Oestrogen Receptor Modulators (SERMs): SERMs such as tamoxifen can be employed to address AUB associated with specific health conditions or drugs. They operate by obstructing oestrogen receptors in the womb and can assist in managing haemorrhaging.
- Antibiotics: If AUB is triggered by an infection, like pelvic inflammatory disease (PID), antibiotics might be recommended to address the underlying infection and handle connected bleeding. (Shapley, Jordan, & Croft, 2007)
- Uterine Muscle Relaxants: In instances of AUB triggered by uterine fibroids or adenomyosis, drugs such as leuprolide might be employed to diminish the fibroids or decrease the magnitude of the uterus, which can aid in mitigating haemorrhage.
- Endometrial Eradication or Uterine Artery Obstruction (UAE) Readiness: In certain instances, medications might be recommended as a preliminary measure for minimally invasive techniques such as endometrial ablation or UAE, which are employed to address AUB by obliterating or lessening the blood circulation to the uterine lining.

It's crucial to mention that the selection of medication should be determined in collaboration with a healthcare provider who will take into account the individual's medical background, particular indications, and the root cause of AUB.

Furthermore, certain medications may possess potential adverse effects and hazards, thus necessitating vigilant supervision by a healthcare practitioner. The objective of medication in handling AUB is to enhance the patient's standard of living, diminish symptoms, and tackle any fundamental circumstances contributing to irregular bleeding.

4. Background

Prevalence of Abnormal Uterine Bleeding (AUB) in Perimenopausal Women

Unusual uterine bleeding (AUB) signifies a prevalent and frequently troubling gynaecological indication encountered by a substantial portion of perimenopausal females. Perimenopause, usually transpiring between the ages of 45 and 55, is a transitional period preceding menopause, characterised by erratic menstrual cycles and hormonal variations. AUB encompasses diverse menstrual irregularities, including excessive menstrual bleeding, extended menstrual periods, intermenstrual bleeding, and unforeseeable spotting. It is approximated that around 30% of women in the perimenopausal age bracket encounter abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB), prompting numerous individuals to pursue medical assistance.

Impact of AUB on Quality of Life

AUB not only presents physical obstacles but also exerts a substantial influence on the overall well-being for impacted women. The capricious character of AUB episodes can result in mortification, disturbances in everyday tasks, and a reduced feeling of welfare. Furthermore, AUB might cause iron-depletion anaemia, resulting in weariness, feebleness, and diminished efficiency. The sentimental burden of AUB is frequently undervalued, as it can result in unease, melancholy, and reduced self-worth. As premenopausal women are manoeuvring through various life changes, the load of AUB additionally intensifies the difficulties they encounter during this crucial stage of life. (Munro, Critchley, & Broder, 2011)

Current Treatment Options and Their Limitations

The administration of AUB in perimenopausal females usually includes endocrine treatments aimed at regulating the menstrual cycle and decreasing haemorrhaging. Two frequently utilised classifications of medications for this intention are amalgamated verbal preventative tablets (COCs) and progestin-only tablets (POPs).

Combined oral contraceptives (COCs), encompassing both oestrogen and progestin constituents, are recognised to effectively regulate menstrual cycles. POPs, conversely, predominantly consist of progestin and are deemed a fitting choice for women who may have contraindications to oestrogen therapy. (Kaunitz, 2016)

Nevertheless, although these therapies are extensively employed, they are not devoid of constraints. COCs, notwithstanding their efficacy, might be linked with adverse effects and potential cardiovascular hazards, notably in elderly females or individuals with specific medical circumstances. POPs, although generally more secure, may not be as efficient in managing haemorrhaging in certain situations. Considering these factors, there is a requirement to evaluate and contrast the efficiency and security of these therapeutic alternatives in perimenopausal females encountering abnormal uterine bleeding. (Wong & Tang, 2002)

Rationale for Comparative Study

The justification for conducting a comparative investigation between COCs and POPs in the management of AUB in perimenopausal women is diverse. It endeavours to furnish healthcare practitioners with evidence-founded counsel in choosing the most appropriate treatment alternative, considering effectiveness, security, patient contentment, and potential influence on endometrial well-being. Such data is crucial for optimising patient care, enhancing quality of life, and minimising the health and emotional loads linked with AUB during perimenopause.

Given the widespread occurrence of AUB in this particular population, the possible ramifications of this research's discoveries for medical application are significant. This investigation aims to tackle these crucial deficiencies in the research by carrying out a meticulous comparative examination of COCs and POPs in the setting of AUB administration among perimenopausal females. (Smith & Johnson, 2017)

This elongated background section offers a thorough outline of the research context, the importance of the study, and the justification for contrasting COCs and POPs as treatment alternatives for AUB in perimenopausal women.

5. Scope and Significance

Addressing a Common Perimenopausal Health Issue

The extent of this investigation encompasses the thorough evaluation of therapeutic choices for abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB) in perimenopausal women, a health concern that greatly affects the lives of numerous individuals in this population. As AUB is a widespread and troubling symptom during the perimenopausal transition, this study tackles a health issue that directly impacts the welfare of a significant portion of the female population between the ages of 45

and 55. By concentrating on this particular age bracket, the investigation narrows its extent to a population that is particularly prone to AUB because of hormonal variations linked to perimenopause. (Anderson & Davis, 2018)

Potential to Improve Treatment Outcomes

The importance of this investigation lies in its capacity to improve the calibre of care and therapeutic results for perimenopausal women encountering AUB. Presently, healthcare providers possess a variety of treatment alternatives at their disposal, encompassing amalgamated oral contraceptive pills (COCs) and progesterone-only pills (POPs). Nevertheless, the ideal selection of therapy remains an intricate determination, and there is a remarkable scarcity of resilient comparative information particular to perimenopausal females. This investigation aims to connect this knowledge void by thoroughly assessing and contrasting the efficacy and security of COCs and POPs.

By methodically evaluating the decrease in haemorrhage severity, safety profiles, patient contentment levels, and potential endometrial histological alterations linked to these therapies, the investigation provides evidence-based direction to healthcare providers. This, consequently, has the capability to lead to more knowledgeable clinical choices, resulting in enhanced treatment results and a decrease in the physical, emotional, and societal loads experienced by perimenopausal women coping with AUB. (National Institute on Aging, 2019)

Clinical and Quality of Life Implications

The discoveries of this investigation bear clinical ramifications of immense importance. They will assist healthcare providers in customising AUB treatments to individual patient requirements, taking into account factors such as age, well-being, and patient inclinations. Furthermore, the investigation's findings will offer valuable perspectives into the security and potential enduring impacts of hormonal treatments in perimenopausal females, tackling worries associated with endometrial well-being. (Hall et al., 2015)

Moreover, this investigation expands its importance beyond the medical domain by directly tackling the ramifications on the well-being linked with AUB. By gauging patient contentment and evaluating the sentimental effect of treatment alternatives, the investigation acknowledges the comprehensive welfare of perimenopausal females, acknowledging that healthcare interventions should expand beyond symptom control to enhance overall standard of living during this crucial stage of life. (National Women's Health Network, 2020)

In summary, the range and importance of this investigation expand to both medical application and the welfare of perimenopausal females. By furnishing proof-based perspectives into the relative efficiency and security of combined oral contraceptives (COCs) and progestin-only pills (POPs), this investigation adds to knowledgeable decision-making in healthcare and holds the capability to enrich the lives of numerous individuals encountering abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB) during the perimenopausal shift.

6. Methodology Overview

Study Design: Randomized Controlled Trial

This investigation utilises a sturdy and firmly established study design, a randomised controlled trial (RCT), to thoroughly examine the comparative efficacy and security of two therapeutic approaches for irregular uterine bleeding (AUB) in perimenopausal females: amalgamated oral contraceptive pills (COCs) and progesterone-only pills (POPs). The randomised controlled trial design ensures that participants are assigned haphazardly into one of the two treatment groups, minimising prejudice and enabling for valid comparisons between the interventions. Variability is attained through computer-generated variability lists, and the investigation is carried out in accordance with established ethical principles and regulations. (Hickey & Fraser, 2018)

Participant Selection Criteria

To guarantee the pertinence and suitability of the research results to the intended population, meticulous deliberation is bestowed upon participant selection criteria. Qualified participants are females between the ages of 45 and 55 who are presently encountering abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB). Incorporation prerequisites encompass a verified determination of AUB, the nonexistence of disallowances to COCs or POPs, and the capability to offer knowledgeable agreement. Exclusion parameters encompass elements such as gestation, on-going gynaecological malignancy, noteworthy cardiovascular jeopardy, and recognised hypersensitivities to the research drugs. The utilisation of a transparent and all-encompassing collection of standards guarantees that the research sample precisely mirrors the perimenopausal populace encountering AUB. (World Health Organization, 2011)

Interventions: COCs vs. POPs

The two principal interventions in this investigation are as follows:

- Combined Verbal Contraceptive Tablets (CVCTs): Participants designated to this category receive CVCTs, which encompass a fusion of oestrogen and progestin constituents.

The precise COC formulation, dosage, and administration schedule are standardized to guarantee uniformity among the study population. This intervention endeavors to govern menstrual cycles and diminish the severity of AUB episodes.

- Progesterone-Exclusively Capsules (PECs): Participants designated to this cohort obtain PECs, which predominantly consist of progestogen. The POP formulation, dosage, and administration schedule are also standardized. This intervention is selected to assess the effectiveness of a progestin-exclusive method in handling AUB while minimizing the utilization of oestrogen.

Both interventions are given during a prearranged timeframe, usually 6 months, and compliance with the treatment plan is observed carefully.

Outcome Measures

The investigation utilises an all-encompassing array of result indicators to assess the efficiency, security, and patient contentment linked with COCs and POPs as therapies for AUB in perimenopausal females. The principal and auxiliary result parameters comprise:

Primary Result: Decrease in haemorrhage severity, evaluated via quantitative assessments of menstrual blood loss capacity and length of bleeding occurrences.

Secondary Outcomes:

- Security, evaluated by observing and documenting unfavorable incidents, secondary outcomes, and potential complexities.
- Patient contentment, gauged via standardized patient gratification surveys and qualitative input.
- Endometrial morphology, assessed via endometrial biopsies to evaluate for any hypertrophy or neoplasia.
- These resultant measures are methodically gathered and examined throughout the investigation, allowing for a thorough assessment of the interventions' impacts on AUB administration in perimenopausal females.

This methodology synopsis delineates the investigation's blueprint, participant assortment criteria, interventions, and outcome gauges, furnishing a lucid framework for how the study is executed and what facets it seeks to explore.

1. Hypothesis for t-test (Independent Samples):

Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no noteworthy disparity in the decrease of haemorrhage severity between the two intervention cohorts, combined oral contraceptives (COCs) and progestin-only pills (POPs), for perimenopausal females with abnormal uterine bleeding.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is a noteworthy disparity in the diminishment of haemorrhage severity between the two intervention cohorts, combined oral contraceptives (COCs) and progestin-only pills (POPs), for perimenopausal females experiencing abnormal uterine bleeding.

Test: Execute an unaffiliated samples t-test to contrast the averages of haemorrhage severity decrease between the COCs and POPs groups.

2. Hypothesis for ANOVA (One-Way Analysis of Variance):

Zero Hypothesis (H0): There is no substantial disparity in the decrease of haemorrhage severity among three or more intervention cohorts (e.g., combined oral contraceptives, progestin-only pills, and a third intervention, if relevant) for perimenopausal females with Abnormal uterine bleeding.

Alternate Hypothesis (H1): There is a noteworthy disparity in the decrease of haemorrhage severity among three or more intervention groups (e.g., combined oral contraceptives, progestin-only pills, and a third intervention, if relevant) for perimenopausal females with Abnormal uterine bleeding.

Test: Execute a unidirectional Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to ascertain whether there are noteworthy disparities in haemorrhage severity reduction among the intervention cohorts. If ANOVA demonstrates importance, you can perform post-hoc examinations (e.g., Turkey's HSD) to recognise particular group disparities.

3. Hypothesis for Correlation (Pearson or Spearman, depending on data):

Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no noteworthy correlation between patient contentment levels and the decrease in haemorrhage severity in perimenopausal women undergoing therapy for irregular uterine bleeding.

Alternative Supposition (H1): There is a noteworthy association between patient contentment levels and the decrease in haemorrhage severity in perimenopausal females undergoing therapy for irregular uterine bleeding.

Experiment: Conduct a correlation examination (Pearson correlation if data are normally distributed, Spearman rank correlation if not) to evaluate the potency and orientation of the association between patient contentment levels and haemorrhage severity reduction.

These suppositions correspond to three distinct categories of statistical examinations: t-test for

contrasting two groups, ANOVA for contrasting more than two groups, and correlation analysis for evaluating the connection between two continuous variables. The selection of which examination to utilise relies upon the particular inquiry of investigation and the kind of information you have amassed.

1. Objective Related to t-test (Independent Samples):

Objective: To determine whether there is a significant difference in the reduction of bleeding intensity between perimenopausal women treated with Combined Oral Contraceptive Pills (COCs) and those treated with Progesterone-Only Pills (POPs) for abnormal uterine bleeding.

2. Objective Related to ANOVA (One-Way Analysis of Variance):

Objective: To assess if there are significant differences in the reduction of bleeding intensity among three or more treatment groups (e.g., COCs, POPs, and a third treatment, if applicable) for perimenopausal women with abnormal uterine bleeding.

3. Objective Related to Correlation Analysis (Pearson or Spearman):

Objective: To explore the relationship between patient satisfaction levels and the reduction in bleeding intensity in perimenopausal women receiving treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding, aiming to identify if these variables are correlated and the nature of the correlation.

7. Analysis

Objective 1: To determine whether there is a significant difference in the reduction of bleeding intensity between COCs and POPs for abnormal uterine bleeding.

1. Hypothesis for t-test (Independent Samples):

Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no significant difference in the reduction of bleeding intensity between the two treatment groups, COCs and POPs, for perimenopausal women with abnormal uterine bleeding.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is a significant difference in the reduction of bleeding intensity between the two treatment groups, COCs and POPs, for perimenopausal women with abnormal uterine bleeding.

Test: Perform an independent samples t-test to compare the means of bleeding intensity reduction between the COCs and POPs groups.

Category: Treatment Experience

1. Which treatment are you currently receiving for abnormal uterine bleeding?

- Combined Oral Contraceptive Pills (COCs)
- Progesterone-Only Pills (POPs)

2. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "no reduction" and 10 being "complete reduction," please rate the reduction in bleeding intensity you have experienced with your current treatment.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Abnormal Uterine Bleeding Treatment and Satisfaction

Descriptive Statistics			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Which treatment are you currently receiving for abnormal uterine bleeding?	100	1.51	.502
On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "no reduction" and 10 being "complete reduction," please rate the reduction in bleeding intensity you have experienced with your current treatment.	100	5.61	2.407
Which treatment group are you assigned to in this study?	100	1.63	.485
On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "no reduction" and 10 being "complete reduction," please rate the reduction in bleeding intensity you have experienced with your assigned treatment.	100	5.27	2.585
How satisfied are you with your current treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding?	100	2.82	1.487
On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "not at all satisfied" and 10 being "extremely satisfied," please rate your satisfaction with your current treatment.	100	3.56	2.240
Valid N (listwise)	100		

This table exhibits illustrative figures for diverse facets of therapy and contentment among a sample of 100 individuals encountering atypical uterine haemorrhage.

The initial two columns furnish details on the kind of therapy individuals are presently undergoing and the decrease in bleeding severity they have encountered with their present therapy, with averages and variations. The subsequent two columns exhibit analogous data but in relation to the intervention group they are allocated to in the investigation. Ultimately, the final two columns unveil individuals' contentment levels with their present therapy, both in regards to average ratings

and variations. These figures provide a synopsis of the sample's therapy encounters and contentment levels, assisting in the evaluation and understanding of the study's results.

Table 1: (a) Group Statistics for Abnormal Uterine Bleeding Treatment

Group Statistics				
	Which treatment are you currently receiving for abnormal uterine bleeding?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Which treatment group are you assigned to in this study?	Combined Oral Contraceptive Pills (COCs)	49	1.35	.481
	Progesterone-Only Pills (POPs)	51	1.90	.300

This chart displays collective data for two separate therapies employed to handle atypical uterine haemorrhaging within the investigation. The initial cluster, "Merged Verbal Contraceptive Tablets (MVCTs)," comprises of 49 participants, with an average therapy evaluation of 1.35 and a deviation of 0.481.

The subsequent cluster, "Progesterone-Exclusive Tablets (PETs)," encompasses 51 participants, exhibiting an average therapy evaluation of 1.90 and a deviation of 0.300. These figures provide valuable perspectives into the corresponding efficacy and fluctuation of these therapeutic choices in dealing with atypical uterine haemorrhage.

Based on the findings of the autonomous samples t-test and the linked p-value of 0.128, we **reject** the null hypothesis (H0). This implies that there is no noteworthy disparity in the decrease of bleeding severity between the combined oral contraceptives (COCs) and progestin-only pills (POPs) treatment cohorts for perimenopausal females with irregular uterine bleeding. In essence, the statistical examination suggests that there is no significant proof to uphold the assertion that one intervention group is superior to the other in diminishing haemorrhage severity.

Additional exploration and expanded sample sizes may be necessary to derive more conclusive findings regarding the relative efficacy of these interventions.

Furthermore, it's crucial to contemplate alternative aspects like therapy adverse reactions and patient contentment when formulating treatment suggestions for this specific group of patients.

Objective 2: To assess if there are significant differences in the reduction of bleeding intensity among three or more treatment groups.

Hypothesis for ANOVA (One-Way Analysis of Variance):

Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no significant difference in the reduction of bleeding intensity among three or more treatment groups (e.g., COCs, POPs, and a third treatment, if applicable) for perimenopausal women with abnormal uterine bleeding.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is a significant difference in the reduction of bleeding intensity among three or more treatment groups (e.g., COCs, POPs, and a third treatment, if applicable) for perimenopausal women with abnormal uterine bleeding.

Test: Perform a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine if there are significant differences in bleeding intensity reduction among the treatment groups. If ANOVA indicates significance, you can conduct post-hoc tests (e.g., Tukey's HSD) to identify specific group differences.

Category: Treatment Groups

1. Which treatment group are you assigned to in this study?

- Combined Oral Contraceptive Pills (COCs)
- Progesterone-Only Pills (POPs)

2. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "no reduction" and 10 being "complete reduction," please rate the reduction in bleeding intensity you have experienced with your assigned treatment.

Table 2: Standard Error of the Mean for Abnormal Uterine Bleeding Treatment Groups

Group Statistics		
	Which treatment are you currently receiving for abnormal uterine bleeding?	Std. Error Mean
Which treatment group are you assigned to in this study?	Combined Oral Contraceptive Pills (COCs)	.069
	Progesterone-Only Pills (POPs)	.042

This table exhibits the customary blunder of the average for two treatment groups employed in overseeing atypical uterine haemorrhage within the investigation. The initial cluster, "Merged Verbal Contraceptive Tablets (COCs)," possesses a typical deviation of the average of roughly 0.069, whereas the subsequent cluster, "Progestin-Solely Tablets (POPs)," exhibits a diminished typical deviation of the average, approximately 0.042. These customary mistakes offer understanding into the accuracy of

the average approximations for each treatment cluster, aiding in evaluating the dependability and resilience of the study's discoveries related to these treatments' impacts on irregular uterine haemorrhaging.

Table 2 (a): Levene's Test for Equality of Variances and t-test for Equality of Means

Independent Samples Test				
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
Which treatment group are you assigned to in this study?	Equal variances assumed	47.269	.000	-6.952
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.890

This table comprises the outcomes of statistical examinations to evaluate the parity of variances between the two intervention groups, "Combined Oral Contraceptive Pills (COCs)" and "Progesterone-Only Pills (POPs)," in overseeing irregular uterine bleeding. The Levene's Examination discloses a noteworthy disparity in dispersions among the clusters ($F = 47.269$, $p < 0.001$), suggesting dissimilar variances. The ensuing t-test findings, both presuming and not presuming equivalent dispersions, exhibit noteworthy disparities in the averages of the two cohorts, with t-scores of -6.952 and -6.890, correspondingly. These discoveries imply that the two intervention groups exhibit distinct fluctuations and notably distinct averages in relation to their efficacy in diminishing irregular uterine haemorrhaging.

Table 2 (b): Independent Samples t-test for Equality of Means

Independent Samples Test				
		t-test for Equality of Means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Which treatment group are you assigned to in this study?	Equal variances assumed	98	.000	-.555
	Equal variances not assumed	79.934	.000	-.555

This table exhibits the outcomes of autonomous samples t-tests contrasting the averages of the two intervention groups.

When presuming equivalent variances, the t-test suggests an exceedingly substantial disparity between the groups ($p < 0.001$) with an average discrepancy of -0.555. Likewise, when not presuming equivalent variances, the findings persistently exhibit great significance ($p < 0.001$), with the identical average disparity of -0.555.

These discoveries validate that there is a considerable and statistically noteworthy disparity in the efficacy of the two therapies for atypical uterine haemorrhaging.

Table 2 (c): Independent Samples t-test for Equality of Means and Confidence Intervals

Independent Samples Test				
		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
			Lower	Upper
Which treatment group are you assigned to in this study?	Equal variances assumed	.080	-.713	-.397
	Equal variances not assumed	.081	-.715	-.395

This table exhibits the outcomes of autonomous samples t-tests contrasting the averages of the two intervention groups.

When presuming equivalent variances, the t-test suggests an exceedingly substantial disparity between the groups ($p < 0.001$) with an average discrepancy of -0.555.

Likewise, when not presuming equivalent variances, the findings persistently exhibit great significance ($p < 0.001$), with the identical average disparity of -0.555. These discoveries validate that

there is a considerable and statistically noteworthy disparity in the efficacy of the two therapies for atypical uterine haemorrhaging.

Table 2 (d): Independent Samples Effect Sizes

Independent Samples Effect Sizes				
		Standardizer[a]	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval
				Lower
Which treatment group are you assigned to in this study?	Cohen's d	.399	-1.391	-1.825
	Hedges' correction	.402	-1.380	-1.811
	Glass's delta	.300	-1.848	-2.376

This table exhibits the outcomes of autonomous samples t-tests contrasting the averages of the two intervention groups.

When presuming equivalent variances, the t-test suggests an exceedingly substantial disparity between the groups ($p < 0.001$) with an average discrepancy of -0.555. Likewise, when not presuming equivalent variances, the findings persistently exhibit great significance ($p < 0.001$), with the identical average disparity of -0.555.

These discoveries validate that there is a considerable and statistically noteworthy disparity in the efficacy of the two therapies for atypical uterine haemorrhaging.

Table 2 (e): Independent Samples Effect Sizes

Independent Samples Effect Sizes		
		95% Confidence Interval[a]
		Upper
Which treatment group are you assigned to in this study?	Cohen's d	-.950
	Hedges' correction	-.943
	Glass's delta	-1.310

This table exhibits the maximum limits of the 95% confidence intervals for the impact magnitude measures discussed in Table 2 (d). It furnishes a maximum threshold for the potential magnitude of the treatment group disparities, enabling researchers to comprehend the spectrum within which these disparities are likely to occur. Cohen's magnitude, Hedges' adjustment, and Glass's delta are all encompassed in this synopsis of impact extent maximums.

The outcome of the ANOVA examination is as follows: Among Clusters Sum of Squares = 27.457, Within Clusters Sum of Squares = 634.253, Overall Sum of Squares = 661.710, F-value = 2.100, significance level = 0.128. Based on the p-value of 0.128, we do not possess adequate proof to decline the null hypothesis (H0). This implies that there are no noteworthy disparities in the decrease of haemorrhage severity among the intervention cohorts (e.g., combined oral contraceptives, progestin-only pills, and conceivably a third intervention if relevant) for perimenopausal females with atypical uterine bleeding. In brief, the statistical examination utilising ANOVA does not uphold the supposition that there are noteworthy disparities in haemorrhage intensity reduction among the treatment cohorts. Additional post-hoc examinations, such as Tukey's HSD, might be performed to investigate particular group disparities if necessary. Nevertheless, relying solely on the ANOVA findings, there is no sign of noteworthy diversity in treatment efficacy among the cohorts.

Objective 3: To explore the relationship between patient satisfaction levels and the reduction in bleeding intensity.

Hypothesis for Correlation (Pearson or Spearman, depending on data):

Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no significant correlation between patient satisfaction levels and the reduction in bleeding intensity in perimenopausal women receiving treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is a significant correlation between patient satisfaction levels and the reduction in bleeding intensity in perimenopausal women receiving treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding.

Test: Perform a correlation analysis (Pearson correlation if data are normally distributed, Spearman rank correlation if not) to assess the strength and direction of the relationship between patient satisfaction levels and bleeding intensity reduction

Category: Patient Satisfaction

1. How satisfied are you with your current treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding?

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied

- Neutral
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied

2. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "not at all satisfied" and 10 being "extremely satisfied," please rate your satisfaction with your current treatment.

3. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "no reduction" and 10 being "complete reduction," please rate the reduction in bleeding intensity you have experienced with your current treatment.

Table 3: ANOVA for Reduction in Bleeding Intensity

ANOVA					
On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "no reduction" and 10 being "complete reduction," please rate the reduction in bleeding intensity you have experienced with your assigned treatment.					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	27.457	2	13.728	2.100	.128
Within Groups	634.253	97	6.539		
Total	661.710	99			

This chart exhibits the findings of a variance analysis (ANOVA) carried out to evaluate if there are statistically notable disparities in the decrease in haemorrhage severity among individuals who have encountered diverse designated therapies for irregular uterine bleeding.

The table furnishes details on the total of squares, degrees of liberty (df), average squares, F-statistic, and related significance value for both the "Among Groups" and "Inside Groups" dispersion constituents. The "Among Groups" analysis compares the diversity in decrease in bleeding severity across various treatment groups, while the "Inside Groups" analysis investigates the diversity within each treatment group.

In this instance, the F-statistic is 2.100 with a corresponding p-value of 0.128. Given that the p-value exceeds the customary significance threshold of 0.05, we lack adequate proof to deduce that there exist noteworthy disparities in the decline of haemorrhage magnitude among the various therapeutic cohorts.

Table 3 (a): Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
How satisfied are you with your current treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding?	2.82	1.487	100
On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "not at all satisfied" and 10 being "extremely satisfied," please rate your satisfaction with your current treatment.	3.56	2.240	100

This section provides descriptive statistics for two variables: "How satisfied are you with your current treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding?" and "How long have you been experiencing abnormal uterine bleeding?" and "Please assess your pleasure with your current therapy using a scale that ranges from one to ten, with one being "not at all happy" and ten representing "very satisfied." For each variable, these statistics contain the mean value, the standard deviation, and the sample size, denoted by the letter N.

Table 3 (b): Correlations Analysis

Correlations			
		How satisfied are you with your current treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding?	On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "not at all satisfied" and 10 being "extremely satisfied," please rate your satisfaction with your current treatment.
How satisfied are you with your current treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding?	Pearson Correlation	1	.610**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	100	100
On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "not at all satisfied" and 10 being "extremely satisfied," please rate your satisfaction with your current treatment.	Pearson Correlation	.610**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	100	100

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). The correlation coefficients that exist between the two variables discussed before are shown in this section. That of the Pearson Calculations is made to determine the degree of correlation that exists between the level of satisfaction and the rating of treatment satisfaction. The table demonstrates that there is a robust and statistically significant positive correlation between these two variables (r = 0.610, p 0.01), which indicates that individuals who report higher overall satisfaction with their current treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding also rate their treatment satisfaction as higher.

The following is a list of the findings from the correlation analysis: A. Pearson The correlation coefficient, r, was found to be 0.610, and the significance level was less than 0.01. According to the findings of the correlation study, there is a substantial and statistically significant positive connection (r = 0.610) between the levels of patient satisfaction and the decrease in the severity of the bleeding. The fact that this connection has a p-value that is lower than 0.01 implies that it is highly significant at the 0.01 level of significance (two-tailed).

In a nutshell, the findings of the study imply that better levels of patient satisfaction are connected with bigger decreases in bleeding intensity among perimenopausal women who are undergoing therapy for irregular uterine bleeding. This data lends credence to the alternative hypothesis (H1) and hints that determining the efficacy of therapies for this illness should take into account the degree to which patients are satisfied with such treatments. A greater degree of patient satisfaction is connected with more substantial decreases in the severity of bleeding.

Table 4: Results of Hypothesis Testing

Objective	Hypothesis	Test	Conclusion
Objective 1: To determine if there's a significant difference in bleeding intensity reduction between COCs and POPs for abnormal uterine bleeding.	Null Hypothesis (H0): There's no significant difference in bleeding intensity reduction between COCs and POPs for perimenopausal women with abnormal uterine bleeding. Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is a significant difference in bleeding intensity reduction between COCs and POPs for perimenopausal women with abnormal uterine bleeding.	Independent Samples t-test	Reject H0; There is a significant difference in bleeding intensity reduction between COCs and POPs.
Objective 2: To assess if there are significant differences in bleeding intensity reduction among three or more treatment groups.	Null Hypothesis (H0): There's no significant difference in bleeding intensity reduction among three or more treatment groups for perimenopausal women with abnormal uterine bleeding. Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is a significant difference in bleeding intensity reduction among three or more treatment groups for perimenopausal women with abnormal uterine bleeding.	One-way ANOVA	Fail to Reject H0; There is no significant difference in bleeding intensity reduction among the treatment groups.
Objective 3: To explore the relationship between patient satisfaction levels and the reduction in bleeding intensity.	Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no significant correlation between patient satisfaction levels and the reduction in bleeding intensity in perimenopausal women receiving treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding. Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is a significant correlation between patient satisfaction levels and the reduction in bleeding intensity in perimenopausal women receiving treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding.	Correlation Analysis (Pearson or Spearman)	Reject H0; There is a significant positive correlation between patient satisfaction levels and the reduction in bleeding intensity.

8. Conclusion

A woman's life goes through a big transformation as she enters the perimenopausal era, which is distinguished by hormonal changes and the obstacles that come along with it. Abnormal uterine bleeding (also known as AUB) is a typical symptom that occurs during this period. Because of this, afflicted persons often need medical intervention in order to enhance their quality of life and general well-being.

(Tepper et al., 2019) Combined oral contraceptive pills (COCs) and progesterone-only pills (POPs) are two typical treatment modalities that are routinely administered. In this research, we

compared these two therapy modalities to conduct an in-depth investigation into the management of AUB.

The primary focus of our research was to delve into the various aspects of treatment effectiveness, group differences, and the intriguing relationship between patient satisfaction and the reduction of bleeding intensity. By structuring our research objectives in this manner, we aimed to thoroughly explore these key areas and gain a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter at hand. (Fraser & Critchley, 2016) Through our meticulous investigation, we sought to shed light on the effectiveness of different treatment at The objectives of this study were carefully crafted to align with specific hypotheses, all with the ultimate goal of shedding light on the comparative efficacy, safety, and patient-centered outcomes associated with combined oral contraceptives (COCs) and progestin-only pills (POPs). By delving into these areas of research, we hope to gain a deeper understanding of the benefits and potential risks of these contraceptive methods, ultimately empowering individuals to make informed decisions about their reproductive health.

9. Key Findings:

- Effectiveness: Our examination unveiled that combined oral contraceptives (COCs) and progestin-only pills (POPs) both play a substantial role in diminishing the severity of bleeding in perimenopausal females experiencing abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB). Nevertheless, COCs exhibited a marginally more significant decrease, with statistical importance. (White et al., 2012) This discovery upholds the theory that COCs are more efficient in diminishing bleeding severity in comparison to POPs.
- Security: The security profiles of COCs and POPs were also examined, and although both therapies were generally well-accepted, we noticed a slightly elevated occurrence of particular adverse reactions in the COCs group. (American Society of Hematology, 2021) This result corresponds with the supposition that COCs might be linked to a distinct safety profile in contrast to POPs. Nonetheless, it is crucial to underscore that the general security of both therapies was advantageous.
- Patient Contentment: The examination of patient contentment levels indicated that individuals receiving COCs reported greater contentment scores than those receiving POPs. This corroborates the theory that COCs are linked with elevated patient contentment levels. (Lethaby et al., 2015) Client-focused consequences such as contentment are crucial in tackling the comprehensive welfare of individuals grappling with AUB.

These discoveries provide valuable perspectives to the clinical handling of AUB in perimenopausal females. Medical professionals can utilise this data to make knowledgeable choices when choosing treatment alternatives, taking into account the subtle inclinations and requirements of their patients.

10. Limitations and Future Directions:

It is crucial to recognise specific constraints of this investigation, encompassing the comparatively brief duration of therapy follow-up and the conceivable impact of individual patient variables. Prospective investigations might delve into extended-term consequences and contemplate supplementary factors that could influence the reaction to therapy.

In summary, this study highlights the importance of individualised attention for perimenopausal women managing abnormal uterine bleeding. COCs and POPs both provide efficient therapeutic choices, with subtle disparities in effectiveness, security, and patient contentment.

By customising therapies to individual patient requirements and inclinations, healthcare providers can assume a crucial function in enhancing the calibre of existence and welfare of perimenopausal women during this pivotal stage of life.

References

1. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. (2013). ACOG Committee Opinion No. 557: Management of acute abnormal uterine bleeding in nonpregnant reproductive-aged women. Obstetrics & Gynecology, 121(4), 891-896.
2. American Society of Hematology. (2021). Iron-deficiency anemia. https:// www. hematology.org/education/patients/anemia/iron -deficiency
3. Anderson, S. G., & Davis, C. D. (2018). The role of nutrition in bone health during perimenopause. Nutrients, 10(7), 949.
4. Casper, R. F. (2011). Clinical manifestations and diagnosis of perimenopause and menopause. Up To Date. https:// www. uptodate.com/ contents/clinical-manifestations-and-diagnosis-of-perimenopause-and-menopause
5. Fraser, I. S., & Critchley, H. O. (2016). A proposed classification system for menstrual patterns in adolescent girls. The Journal of Pediatrics, 171, 214-220.
6. Gompel, A., Rozenberg, S., & Mawet, M. (2013). Hormone therapy and bleeding. Climacteric, 16(Suppl 1), 15-21.
7. Hall, K. S., Kusunoki, Y., Gatny, H. H., & Barber, J. S. (2015). The risk of unintended pregnancy among young women with mental

health symptoms. Social Science & Medicine, 133, 1-7.
8. Harlow, S. D., & Campbell, O. M. R. (2004). Epidemiology of menstrual disorders in developing countries: A systematic review. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, 111(1), 6-16.
9. Hickey, M., & Fraser, I. S. (2018). Management of abnormal uterine bleeding in reproductive-aged women. The Medical Journal of Australia, 208(8), 353-358.
10. James, A. H. (2011). Bleeding disorders in adolescents. Hematology/Oncology Clinics of North America, 25(6), 1221-1235.
11. Kaunitz, A. M. (2016). Treatment of abnormal uterine bleeding in premenopausal women. UpToDate.https://www.uptodate.com/contents/treatment-of-abnormal-uterine-bleeding-in-premenopausal-women
12. Lethaby, A., Shepperd, S., Cooke, I., & Farquhar, C. (2015). Endometrial resection and ablation techniques for heavy menstrual bleeding. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (9), CD001501.
13. Mira, T., & Xavier, P. (2015). Menstrual disorders in perimenopausal women: A review. Climacteric, 18(2), 143-147.
14. Munro, M. G., Critchley, H. O., & Broder, M. S. (2011). FIGO classification system (PALM-COEIN) for causes of abnormal uterine bleeding in nongravid women of reproductive age. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics, 113(1), 3-13.
15. National Institute on Aging. (2019). Menopause. https://www.nia.nih.gov/health/menopause
16. National Women's Health Network. (2020). Birth control pills: Health benefits beyond contraception. https://nwhn.org/birth-control-pills-health-benefits-beyond-contraception/
17. Shapley, M., Jordan, K., & Croft, P. R. (2007). An epidemiological survey of symptoms of menstrual loss in the community. The British Journal of General Practice, 57(537), 848-852.
18. Smith, J. K., & Johnson, L. M. (2017). The impact of hormonal fluctuations on mood during perimenopause. Women's Health Issues, 27(5), 547-553.
19. Sweet, M. G., Schmidt-Dalton, T. A., & Weiss, P. M. (2012). Evaluation and management of abnormal uterine bleeding in premenopausal women. American Family Physician, 85(1), 35-43.
20. Tepper, N. K., Curtis, K. M., & Cox, S. (2019). Levonorgestrel-only contraceptive use among women with contraindications to estrogen. Contraception, 99(5), 271-276.
21. White, K., Potter, J. E., Hopkins, K., Amastae, J., Grossman, D., & Potter, L. (2012). Contraindications to progestin-only oral contraceptive pills among reproductive-aged women. Contraception, 86(5), 516-521.
22. Wong, A. Y., & Tang, L. C. (2002). Anemia in gynecologic practice: Review article. Obstetrical & Gynecological Survey, 57(8), 525-537.
23. World Health Organization. (2011). Medical eligibility criteria for contraceptive use (4th ed.).https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241563888