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What was the question?
Choosing between types of contraception can be challenging, so can a website help women make the right choice for them?

What did we do?
We asked women what they think about contraception. We looked at other studies and YouTube videos. We then designed the Contraception Choices website with young women [URL: www.contraceptionchoices.org (accessed January 2020)].

The website describes each type of contraception and compares them side by side. When users answer questions about what matters to them, the website suggests three types of contraception they might like. A total of 927 women helped us test the website in an online trial. We asked everyone what contraception they were using and how satisfied they were with it 6 months later.

What did we find?
Women really liked the website. Ninety-seven per cent of participants found it helpful or very helpful for ‘getting useful information about contraception’ and 87% responded that it was helpful or very helpful for ‘finding a method of contraception that is right for you’. Comments included:

  I feel very well educated thanks to the website – I wish someone had explained about all the different choices years ago.

  It’s cleared up some of my doubts and things I worried about (probably unconsciously!) about hormonal contraception.

However, seeing the website did not mean that women used a more reliable type of contraception. Women were just as satisfied with their contraception whether or not they had seen the website. We think that this is because many other factors are involved; for example, some women found it difficult to access long-acting contraception methods from health services.

What does this mean?
Young women liked the Contraception Choices website and found it useful. Women can be put off by contraception side effects and the views of partners, friends, family and others. On its own, the Contraception Choices website was not enough to help more women use the most reliable contraception methods.
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