

Supplementary Materials

‘The horror stories put me off!’: exploring women’s acceptability of the Levonorgestrel IntraUterine System (LNG-IUS) for endometrial protection

Claire Henry, BSc(Hons), PhD;^{1,4} Alec Ekeroma, ONZM, MBBS, DipObs, FRANZCOG, FRCOG, MBA, PhD, MInsD;² Anthony Dowell, MBChB, MRCP, FRCGP;³ Sara Filoche, BSc(Hons), MSc, PhD, PgDip Gen Med (Distn)¹

¹Department of Obstetrics, Gynaecology and Women’s Health, University of Otago, Wellington, New Zealand

²School of Medicine, National University of Samoa, Apia, Samoa

³Department of Primary Health Care, University of Otago, Wellington, New Zealand

⁴Corresponding author. Email: Claire.henry@otago.ac.nz

Supplementary Tables

Table S1: Perceptions of participants on the Mirena and Endometrial Cancer

Demographics	Friend or Family had Mirena			Friend or family with EC		
	Yes n=40 (46%)	No n=21 (23%)	Don't know n=29 (32%)	Yes n=13 (14%)	No =64 (70%)	Don't know =15 (16%)
Age						
40-49	30 (45)	15 (23)	21 (32)	10(15)	48(73)	8(12)
50-59	8 (47)	4 (24)	5 (29)	2(12)	10(59)	5(29)
60-70	2 (33)	1 (17)	3 (50)	1(17)	4(67)	1(17)
Ethnicity						
NZ European	29 (45)	16 (25)	23 (35)	7 (11)	51 (78)	10 (15)
NZ Maori	2 (50)	0 (0)	2 (50)	1 (25)	1 (25)	2 (50)
Pasifika	4 (80)	1 (20)	0 (0)	1 (20)	3 (60)	1 (20)
European	4 (40)	4 (40)	2 (20)	2 (20)	7 (70)	1 (10)
Other	3 (60)	0 (0)	2 (40)	2 (40)	2 (40)	1 (20)

Data are presented as *n* (%).

Table S2: Content analysis of participant's views on the Mirena

Content analysis	Frequency (total, %)
Views on Mirena – Negative	
Previous experience	19
Risk outweigh benefit	14
Cost	3
foreign object	6
TOTAL	42 (62%)
Views on Mirena – Positive	
Previous experience	11
Convenience	4
Potential health benefit	11
TOTAL	26 (38%)

Data are presented as *n* (%).