reversible contraceptives is more persistent.

The results for specific methods are also somewhat unexpected. On commonsense grounds, we might anticipate that continuation rates for the intrinsically more effective modern hormonal methods and the IUD would be higher than those for traditional methods such as withdrawal and periodic abstinence. This expectation is borne out in the case of the IUD. In all six countries, users with exceptionally high motivation were much more likely to continue use than were users of each of the other methods. In Bangladesh, where it is possible to compare pill users with users of injectables, there was no appreciable difference between the two groups. In contrast to IUD users, users of highly effective hormonal methods were almost as likely to stop use as were couples who relied on periodic abstinence and withdrawal. Typically, 30–40% of users of each of these methods had discontinued within a year and 50–60% had done so within two years. Pill users in Indonesia, whose rate of discontinuation was very low, were the sole exception. In Indonesia and Thailand, where it is possible to compare pill users with users of injectables, there was no appreciable difference between the two groups in the likelihood of discontinuation.

Probabilities of discontinuation for condom use, which we could calculate for only three countries, were the least amenable to broad generalization. In Thailand, the proportion of condom users who continued to use the method declined sharply in the early months and fell to only 18% by the end of two years. In Egypt and Indonesia, however, continuation of condom use was more common (43–47% after two years). In Egypt, the continuation rate for the condom closely paralleled the rate for the pill, but in Indonesia it was considerably lower than the rate for either the pill or injectables.

### Causes of Discontinuation

Reasons given for discontinuation should provide further insights into the method-specific and country-specific results. The DHS coding of stated reasons was rather detailed and included several items of direct practical relevance to program managers. Preliminary investigation indicated that three main reasons were dominant: de-