



# VCU

Virginia Commonwealth University  
VCU Scholars Compass

---

AUCTUS: The Journal of Undergraduate Research and Creative Scholarship

---

2024

## Solutions to Period Poverty in the United States

Sanya Surya  
*Virginia Commonwealth University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/auctus>



Part of the [Public Health Commons](#)

© The Author(s)

---

Downloaded from

<https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/auctus/100>

This Social Sciences is brought to you for free and open access by VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in AUCTUS: The Journal of Undergraduate Research and Creative Scholarship by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact [libcompass@vcu.edu](mailto:libcompass@vcu.edu).

# Solutions to Period Poverty in the United States

Social Sciences

By Sanya Surya  
Virginia Commonwealth University

## ABSTRACT

Many women around the world lack access to menstrual hygiene products and hygienic, private sanitation facilities: an issue commonly known as “period poverty”. Women who experience this phenomenon often resort to unhealthy alternatives, putting them at higher risk for infections. Period poverty also causes many women to miss significant amounts of school and/or work, resulting in school drop-outs and adverse career outcomes. Menstrual inequities have recently come under greater study in low- to middle-income countries, but evidence suggests that women in the United States are adversely affected by period poverty as well. With this in mind, I set out to assess the currently-available solutions to period poverty, propose modifications to these existing solutions, and offer new solutions. I notably propose the elimination of taxes applied to menstruation products, pressure to be placed on the private sector to fund women’s health research, and prioritization of menstrual education.

## KEYWORDS

Menstruation • Menstrual Inequity • Period Poverty • Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM)  
• Women’s Health

## Introduction

Globally, an estimated 500 million women experience inadequate access to menstrual products like pads, tampons, and menstrual cups, a term referred to as “period poverty”. Period poverty negatively affects women’s quality of life drastically, from their educational journeys to careers. Isingo (2016) cites evidence that shows that due to a lack of period products and/or proper sanitation facilities, one in every ten girls in Africa must miss school due to their period, and many end up dropping out of school. Davies et. al (2021) cite similar data from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) that also states one out of ten menstruators miss school during their period. Even though most discussions about period poverty revolve around other low- and middle-income countries, the United States is no stranger to this issue as well (Geng, 2021). In the United States, approximately one out of every five girls’ education suffers from period poverty, with them missing partial or complete days of school (Smith, 2019). The negative effects of period poverty on girls and women in terms of academic achievement and career outlook is evident, and often results in lower quality of life.

In this research analysis, menstruators will be referred to commonly as cisgender “women” and “girls”, but it’s important to recognize the lack of exposure and research done on other menstruating groups, specifically transgender men and nonbinary people, and the possible public health issues that arise from these intersectional identities. Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM), is a widely-used term to describe access for women and girls to sanitation facilities (like clean bathrooms, soap, and water)

and menstrual products (for instance, clean pads, tampons, or menstrual cups). Women hailing from socioeconomically-disadvantaged backgrounds and marginalized populations frequently encounter pronounced obstacles in effectively managing menstrual hygiene, a concept frequently denoted as menstrual inequity within scholarly discourse. Lack of access to MHM affects more than simply menstrual health. Isingo (2016) asserts that women experiencing period poverty are at higher risk for reproductive tract infections and using unsanitary hygiene management techniques like sand and sawdust. Geng (2021) agrees with this notion of unhealthy outcomes of period poverty, citing higher rates of depression for women lacking access to MHM. These are just a few examples of how period poverty affects many women’s health negatively beyond purely menstrual health.

A few solutions have been made to combat period poverty, most being at the market level. Additionally, in recent years, government interventions have attempted to alleviate the economic burden that women face. However, especially considering women’s health is severely under-researched, an analysis of the existing solutions to period poverty at the market and policy level is important to conduct in order to best identify a sustainable set of solutions. Therefore, the goal of this literature review is to assess the current solutions to period poverty and propose modifications to these solutions as well as possible new solutions.

Many sectors – for example the education sector and government sector – actively contribute to the magnitude of period poverty, as Rossouw and Ross (2021) claim. Sommer et al. (2016) agree, and highlight that specifically, the

education sector has not been very involved in combating issues of period inequities – there is not a focus on teaching about menstrual health in school curriculums. Additionally, while the education sector must take some responsibility for this issue, governments and institutions must also provide funding for solutions to period poverty (Sommer et al., 2016). Since the issue of period poverty is created and worsened by multiple sectors, it is best tackled with a combination of interventions, mainly policy-level changes including removing the taxation on menstrual products (commonly known as the “tampon tax” or “pink tax”) and providing free menstrual products for low-income women and in public settings. Additionally, the private sector should actively combat period poverty by devoting resources to menstrual health research, donation of menstrual products to those in need, and more charitable causes for the betterment of women’s health and quality of life. Finally, more research about menstrual health and menstrual inequities must be done, and education about periods must be implemented in our education system as a requirement for every student in the United States. Enhanced educational initiatives and destigmatization efforts regarding menstrual health, inclusive of all community constituents irrespective of gender, are poised to catalyze advancements in research and policy development in this field. This research analysis will analyze the effectiveness and limitations of commonly proposed and existing solutions including the removal of taxation on menstrual products, government-provided free menstrual products, and market-based interventions to period poverty, and provide a holistic proposed solution to combat period poverty in the United States.

## The “Tampon Tax”

In recent years, the “tampon tax” has been the focus of many women’s rights activist groups and movements and bills passed in state legislatures and in other countries. The “tampon tax” refers to the taxation of menstrual products, not limited to only tampons but also including pads and menstrual cups. While some states have lifted this taxation, currently, 30 states continue to tax menstrual hygiene products, resulting in women spending \$150 million extra per year on period products (Epstein, 2021). Moreover, even out of the 20 states that don’t implement a “tampon tax”, some of those states don’t have any sales tax to begin with, so it’s unclear whether or not those state governments made an *active* decision to lift the economic burden off of women or not.

The basis for the existence of this taxation is most often that menstrual products aren’t considered necessary, medically speaking, in the way that food is considered essential. One example of this is in the state of Florida where menstrual products, as of 2017, were taxed 6%, with possible extra taxation by county as well (Crawford & Spivack, 2017). In Florida, tax-exempt items must fall under categories of medical products, medicinal drugs, and anything used for prevention or treatment of illness, not including toilet items or cosmetics. Since menstruation is a natural function of the body, it is not an illness that needs treatment or cure – therefore products to manage menstruation do not fall under the medicinal categories of the tax-exemptions. However, menstrual products do not fit Florida’s definitions of cosmetics or toilet articles either, which are explicitly taxable. Crawford & Spivack (2017)

explain that in the state of Florida, menstrual products are taxed seemingly because they don't explicitly fall into the categories for tax exemptions *or* clearly taxable products. However, other taxations upon menstrual products have not always been as ambiguous as Florida's. New York, for instance, taxed menstrual products until 2016 specifically because they were used to ensure the cleanliness of natural bodily functions, a deliberate decision by the New York state government (Crawford & Spivack, 2017). It seems to be that in states where menstrual products are taxed, the reason is either that they are never explicitly analyzed as a priority discussion or that they are purposely subject to tax despite the fact that women require them to function properly during their menstrual cycles.

Within the scope of period poverty, women experience unwarranted economic hardships stemming from the imposition of sales taxes on menstrual products essential for menstrual health and hygiene management. Numerous advocates and researchers in the domain of women's health and menstrual equity propose the abolition of taxes on period products, offering theoretical frameworks elucidating its potential to mitigate the supplementary economic strain endured by women. Casola et al. (2022), who are researchers in favor of removing the tampon tax in the United States, argue that we should follow the lead of other countries such as Scotland, New Zealand, and Britain in removing the tax. Crays (2020) agrees that the tampon tax must be removed as a first step to tackle period poverty. These researchers often rely on theoretical explanations as there isn't an abundance of research about "tampon tax" removal effectiveness.

One notable study, however, shows the empirical benefits of removing taxation on menstrual products. Cotropia (2018) studies the empirical data of New Jersey's removal of the "tampon tax" in 2005 compared to other control states on the East Coast. In this study, the results showed that following the removal of the 6.9% tax, "consumer prices in New Jersey decreased by 7.3 percent", indicating that "the tax break was fully enjoyed by consumers" (Cotropia, 2018). The tax removal also seemed to benefit lower-income women more than high-income women. Consumers of menstrual products in the higher income bracket ended up sharing the tax burden with producers, while low-income consumers' prices decreased by *more* than the tax amount that was removed – with the removal of 6.9% tax, consumer prices for lower-income women lowered by 12.4% in comparison to control states. This is extremely important data in understanding whether or not removing taxation on menstrual products can be beneficial to removing the economic burden on the women who are most affected by period poverty – low-income women and women living in poverty. Additionally, there was still a slight benefit to the higher-income bracket of consumers, suggesting that overall, this solution has positive effects.

However, Doris (2021) cites a working paper by University of Texas PhD student Ziyue Xu titled "Does 'Tampon Tax' Repeal Help in Redistribution?" and argues that the tampon tax removal may not solve the issue at hand as well as people hope and claim it would. Xu's research compared data from Illinois, a state where a 6.25% "tampon tax" was in place until 2016 when it was removed, to states where the tampon tax still existed. She hypothesized that the decrease in tax

would increase sales of menstrual products since they'd be cheaper to buy. However, what her results showed was that sales decreased after the tax was removed while companies increased prices by about 1%. She concluded that removing the tampon tax has other "economic repercussions" that don't benefit low-income women and other groups affected most by the economic burden of MHM (Doris, 2021). This study presents compelling findings suggesting that the anticipated efficacy of abolishing the tampon tax may not be fully realized. However, the assertion made by Xu regarding the potential ineffectiveness of abolishing the tampon tax lacks substantiation through empirical evidence distinguishing the differential impact on low-income versus high-income demographics. Within the issue of period poverty, the first and foremost problem that is aimed to be solved is to make period products affordable specifically for those that currently can't afford them and end up with negative health and economic outcomes. Therefore, the results from the study conducted about New Jersey's tax reduction, outlined by Cotropia (2018), is likely more relevant to this issue and should be explored further, as it shows a benefit to low-income women. In general, there is evidence to show both the positive and negative economic repercussions of removing the "tampon tax", and both should be explored more with further research.

## **Government- Provided Menstrual Hygiene Aids**

Following the lead of taxation removal interventions comes the idea that period products should be completely free for women – no cost involved. Similar to the previous solution of tax removal, the

question is how effective providing free products is. The basis for the United States implementing this solution is that it seems to have worked well in other countries. For instance, Isingo (2016) cites evidence that shows how in Kenya, providing sanitary products for free improved school attendance. In the context of the United States, the same logic should follow, especially for low-income women and considering the rates that girls miss school due to their periods. In 2020, Scotland became the first country in the world to provide period products for free to its citizens. Sommer & Mason (2021), experts in global health and health policy, agree that the challenges low-income and homeless women face in the United States call for action like Scotland has taken.

However, while this concept is popular among many menstrual health researchers and activists, there is a relevant counterclaim. Selby (2019), an associate editor at Global Citizen, believes that the best and sole solution to period poverty is providing free period products perpetuates the idea that periods are something that must be "fixed" and "cleaned up". Essentially, although Selby acknowledges the financial benefit that complimentary provision of period products would confer upon women, she cautions against the sole reliance on this intervention, emphasizing the potential peril in exacerbating societal stigma surrounding menstruation. There are also other considerations to be made regarding this proposed solution. For instance, the negative effects of government-provided free products, economically at the government level in terms of feasibility to properly serve everyone in need, must be studied further. It's quite possible that for the government to find the money to provide free period products, they may end up raising taxes somewhere else

because they lose out on some public revenue collection. For example, in New York, an estimated \$14 million in tax revenue is lost from removing the “tampon tax”, and in California, an estimated \$55 million is lost from removing taxation on tampons and diapers (Rodriguez, 2021). If state governments end up making period products free, they lose out on this tax revenue and may start increasing taxes elsewhere. This could possibly defeat the purpose of relieving the economic burden on women who can't afford period products.

Another possible issue with being able to cater to all women in need is that the products may become too standardized, not accounting for differences in cycle lengths, heaviness of flow, preference regarding type of menstrual hygiene product, and more. These considerations hold significant importance, as variations in the quantity of pads, tampons, or menstrual cups required may arise among women, possibly exceeding or falling short of the standard usage patterns. Additionally, factors such as medical conditions or cultural and religious practices may influence the preference for or avoidance of tampons and menstrual cups among certain women. In these cases, a morally gray area is created where women who happen to have different needs for their cycles, due to no fault of their own, may have to spend more money than others or have less access to government-provided resources.

All of these arguments considered, it is still important to note that theoretically the best way to relieve economic burdens on women who don't have access to period products is to provide them for free. In the United States if it is not currently as feasible to provide free products for every woman, it would

be a promising start if they were provided in public spaces like public schools, public libraries, and other public buildings, and provided for free to women living in a specific low-income bracket, similar to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, formerly known as “food stamps”.

## Private Sector Involvement

The possible positive and negative repercussions and outcomes of removal of menstrual product taxation has now been reviewed, from an economic perspective. It is now important to briefly discuss ways that negative outcomes can be mitigated while taxations are removed. Taxations upon menstrual products should be removed – they are inherently unjust and place an *extra* economic burden on women for a natural process. Some may disagree with removing the “tampon tax”, citing that in a free market, “the producers hold the ultimate pricing power”, and therefore, even if taxation is removed, the price of the product may stay relatively the same for consumers with companies making more revenue than before (Yang, 2021). A similar outcome was found by Ziyue Xu's research, discussed earlier, where companies increased prices by 1% of menstrual products after the 6.25% tax was removed by Illinois (Doris, 2021). Yang (2021) argues that it might be beneficial to in fact keep the taxation on menstrual products intact and then put pressure on the government to use the extra tax money towards causes for women's health, like funding research or devoting it to other ways to support women. There is one big issue with this argument though – it can be hard to track where the government uses tax funds and

hold the government accountable for how they use the money.

However, inspiration *can* be drawn from this theory. Instead of putting pressure on the government to fund research and causes for women's benefit using tax money, pressure can be placed on the private sector to use the extra revenue towards these causes if they raise prices when the taxation on products is removed. A term known as Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Investing is becoming increasingly popular and important nowadays, where investors decide where to invest their money based on how much of a "good citizen" a company is. ESG is assumed to predict how well a company will perform and analyzes how much the company contributes to environmental betterment, social betterment (which menstrual equity would fall into), and the way their leadership works (Napoletano & Curry, 2022). For reasons that align with the self-interest of companies, it is economically advantageous and beneficial for them to contribute to the betterment of society. Therefore, a good solution to help combat period poverty is to have the government remove taxation on period products and then for the public to add pressure to the private sector to incentivize companies that make and sell period products to use their extra revenue towards women's health research, donating period products, and more causes like these. Additionally, while there is some research that showed the more negative economic repercussions of removing the "tampon tax", other research in New Jersey has shown that lifting taxation on menstrual products had incredibly good economic benefits to low-income women, and even benefitted higher-income women even if it was at a lower rate (Cotropia, 2018). It seems that overall, there are a couple ways

to create positive effects from removing the taxation on menstrual products through the help of the private sector and the natural economic outcomes that may occur.

## Market-Level Solutions

There are a number of market-level solutions that already exist to combat period poverty. Some are outlined by Daniel (2020), who writes for the Borgen Magazine. Examples of these solutions are: Flo, Noble Cup by Every Queen Bleeds, and Thinx.

One solution he mentions is Flo, an invention designed by Mariko Higaki Iwai, which Rhodes (2021) describes as an "inexpensive, reusable menstrual kit" that allows girls and women in poverty to "wash, dry, and carry reusable sanitary pads". Iwai (n.d.) writes that her project focuses on bettering school attendance by girls living in poverty during their periods, destigmatizing the topic of menstruation, giving girls privacy, and improving hygiene. This innovation can be implemented in the United States for girls and women living in poverty as well.

Another existing solution mentioned by Daniel (2020) is Thinx, a company that creates period underwear. Tschinkel et al. (2018) explains that Thinx period underwear can be worn by someone while menstruating all day and simply washed like any other clothes at the end of the day. Thinx also actively focuses on donating to charitable organizations and donating products to women in need through organizations as well, having donated over 5,000 products since its founding (Tschinkel et al., 2018). Thinx, in association with Period, an organization that works on menstrual equity, also began the "State of the Period" research study which focuses on



menstrual inequities and issues for students in the United States specifically ("State of the Period", 2021). As the only publicly available study focusing on students in the US and the impact of period poverty on them, this study fills some very important gaps in current research we have on period poverty in our country. Thinx, as a company, pioneers efforts in addressing period poverty and promoting menstrual comfort for all women. Their period underwear offers a cost-effective alternative for low-income and homeless women compared to pads or tampons due to its longer lifespan. Additionally, the extended wear time of period underwear reduces the need for frequent access to private hygiene facilities, distinguishing it from pads, tampons, and menstrual cups.

To put these options into perspective, according to "Your first period" (2019), it's recommended for pads and tampons to be changed every 4-6 hours and menstrual cups to be changed every 8-12 hours to be safe and hygienic. This means women need to find a space that is safe, clean, and private to change their period products multiple times each day, which may be especially difficult for houseless women.

While helpful for low-income and homeless women, these market-level interventions are bound to have limitations, the biggest being that companies and specifically smaller, community-based organizations such as Thinx don't have the funding or access to scale their interventions to everyone in need in the United States. There needs to be another source of funding for companies and organizations and it most likely must come from the government. Despite this limitation, there is much to learn from many of these already-existing solutions to period poverty in terms of finding products that are affordable and

accessible to low-income women who lack access to MHM and in how to conduct necessary research and education about menstrual health.

## Period Poverty Research

Casola et al. (2022) assert that to combat period poverty issues, research and policy changes must constantly happen. Collaborative community-based participatory research, which is research that involves both an organization and the community, is especially important. An example of this is the State of the Period study conducted by Thinx ("State of the Period", 2021). As previously mentioned, Thinx aims to fill a notable gap in period poverty research - the lack of research done in the United States compared to focused around lower-income countries - but is not nearly enough. Without research being done about the female population in the United States, period poverty feels like a foreign concept to policymakers and one that holds low urgency.

Additionally, almost all research done in this field revolves around cisgender women solely, leaving out other communities of menstruators like transgender men and nonbinary people (Crays, 2020). For instance, studying the intersections of gender dysphoria *and* stigma around menstruation on the mental health of members of the transgender community may provide insight into how to better their health in a different way than is needed for cisgender women. In the context of health and equity, it's extremely important to specifically prioritize groups of people often left out of research and the conversation around period poverty. Period inequity cannot be properly addressed with solutions only made available to cisgender women.

It's quite clear that government intervention is at least partially necessary to combat menstrual inequities in the United States. Regrettably, policymakers persist in insufficiently prioritizing this issue, reminiscent of the causality dilemma likened to the "chicken and the egg" scenario. Since the government doesn't prioritize making MHM affordable and accessible for all women, they do not provide enough funding for research on period poverty to be done or enough funding for solutions to be made. However, Sommer et al. (2016) assert that the reason why government bodies are less likely to give issues of period poverty their attention and funding is because they want more evidence regarding the extent of the issues. For instance, they want to see school attendance or drop-out rates as a result of lack of menstrual health management techniques, laboratory results of infections, and more. This causes a vicious cycle where period poverty is not actively being combatted because the government is waiting on research to analyze that they don't actively prioritize needing to be done.

One possible solution to this problem is for data to be collected that the government might care *most* about – the economic productivity of the United States. Logically, if a significant number of young girls and women drop out of school or work due to a lack of access to period products or inadequate access to hygiene facilities, our country loses out on productivity from the current and future female workforce. The federal government doesn't always pay much attention to issues that are simply social – bringing to policymakers' attention that period poverty affects *everyone* in the country, not only women, may incentivize them to start funding research and necessary

interventions to menstrual inequities in our country.

## **Stigma and Lack of Education about Menstruation in the U.S.**

Most sources agree that a step in the right direction to combatting period poverty is to destigmatize menstruation. According to the "State of the Period" (2021), in a study of menstruating students in the United States aged 13-19, 65% believe that "society teaches people to be ashamed of their periods and 85% of them "hide their period products when they walk out of class to go to the bathroom." Despite being deemed a developed nation, the United States still harbors pervasive menstrual stigma, affecting individuals who menstruate. And despite menstruation being a natural bodily function, women and girls are frequently told to conceal and refrain from discussing their periods.

Rossouw & Ross (2021) believe that destigmatizing the topic is the best solution to menstrual inequities, especially since as Sommer & Mason (2021) point out, the stigma surrounding menstrual health has caused it to be under-researched and not prioritized at the policy level. In general, the stigma surrounding menstruation is a major root cause of period poverty – since menstruation is rarely talked about openly, it's not prioritized for research. And since women are taught not to discuss their periods, they often resort to simply missing school and work to deal with menstrual issues on their own. Menstrual health must be destigmatized to trigger the possibility of new interventions to period poverty and the implementation of existing solutions.

In educational institutions, menstruation is not a priority to teach about, leading to shame and confusion regarding menstruation. 76% of students are “taught more about the biology of frogs than the human female body in school” (“State of the Period”, 2021). Over 73% of students in this study believed that learning in-depth about menstruation should be as included in core curriculum as math is, and not just for people who experience a period, but for everyone (“State of the Period”, 2021). Selby (2019) asserts that education not only for girls, but also for boys and other community members, will normalize conversations about menstrual equity at the policy level, in the way that laws around medical treatments and food access are discussed.

It's possible to pull inspiration from global efforts to destigmatize menstruation to create plans specific to the United States. UNICEF Indonesia, for instance, created Comic Books for young girls *and* boys in Indonesia to educate girls about the facts about periods and dispel common myths about menstruation, as well as teach boys about menstruation to improve their understanding and sensitivity about the topic (Artha, 2017). After UNICEF Indonesia distributed about 4,500 copies of these comic books, results showed that “the percentage of boys who understand that menstrual cycle is normal and natural jumped from 61 percent to 89 percent, while boys who feel it is wrong to bully a girl on her period increased from 61 percent to 95 percent”. Additionally, girls were less likely to believe they needed to hide their period (Artha, 2017). Using simple, age-appropriate techniques such as this in schools in the United States from a young age can be very helpful in combating the stigma around menstruation before it even begins.

## Conclusion

In more ways than one, the United States' government, educational systems, and medical community has long overlooked challenges faced by women. Crawford (2017) asserts that “for the most part, overt discrimination has been eliminated from the law in the United States and other western democracies” – for instance, women can vote in our country, women can serve on juries, women can receive an education, women can own their own credit cards, and more. However, there are some aspects of our laws that continue to have a negative impact on only one sex over the other, which indicates more hidden aspects of gender bias still prevalent in our government and culture. Highlighted in this analysis were the gender biased “tampon tax” and a lack of education about the female body. The economic burden faced by women was worsened by the Covid-19 pandemic as women were more likely to lose their jobs during the pandemic (Sommer et. al, 2022). Additionally, the lack of menstrual health and menstrual inequity research conducted echoes a broader cultural issue, echoed by historic clinical research disparities such as cardiovascular disease research (Rosenfeld, 2006).

Because period poverty is an extremely complex, multifaceted issue, the most ideal solution should incorporate aspects of each contributing area – the government, the private sector, the medical community, and the education system. Firstly, the economic burden women face just to have access to MHM must be lifted by the government, with an extra focus on low-income women who already struggle to afford many other necessities in life and suffer the most from period poverty. A proper proposed

solution will, at the minimum, allow low-income women to have access to period products completely for free and for period products to be free in all public settings such as public schools, public restrooms, and more, just as basic necessities like toilet paper are provided for free. All restrooms must also have proper disposal facilities for used period products to promote hygiene in these sanitary facilities. To determine the income bracket eligible for free menstrual products, a design can be implemented similar to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (previously called “food stamps”), where people living under a certain income level can use SNAP to buy food, considered essential. Since menstruation is a natural function of the body and without proper management, women can suffer health consequences, menstrual products should be considered just as essential as something like food is.

The next step for the government to implement is to remove the taxation on menstrual products in every state, and as discussed previously, for the public to add pressure to companies in the private sector that may likely raise prices for menstrual products to use extra revenue towards a good cause for the betterment of women's quality of life in America. Places where these funds could go are to research being done in women's health and menstrual health, charitable organizations that do community-level work with girls and women, and more. Using the concept of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Investing, companies can be incentivized better than the government would be to spend money and time on programs that contribute to a better society, such as to solving issues of period poverty.

The final two steps to a proper solution to period poverty are ones that

have been advocated for many times and should continue to be of focus – there must be more research done on menstrual health and menstrual inequities by the medical and public health communities and there must be a larger focus on menstrual health education in our country's school system to break down the stigma. Either from more funding from the government or from funding from the private sector, money must be allocated towards doing this necessary research to understand the extent of period poverty in the United States, just as other countries around the world are doing. Our education system should implement age-appropriate progression ways to teach kids about menstruation in a medically-accurate, judgment-free way. It's important that kids are educated about their bodies from an early age so that stigma about menstruation can be broken down before it can even begin and girls can receive truthful guidelines about managing their periods safely and hygienically.

Nevertheless, it is widely acknowledged that addressing numerous social justice issues often necessitates incentivizing government attention, which can be challenging to enforce accountability. Hence, it is imperative for the private sector to participate in alleviating the cycle of period poverty in our nation by financing research and educational endeavors. Hopefully, in our country's future, women won't have to worry about extra financial burdens and shameful feelings about the natural and necessary process of menstruation.

## References

- Artha, C. (2017). *UNICEF's comic book educates school boys and girls on menstruation*. Magdalene. <https://magdalene.co/story/unicefs->

- [comic-book-educates-school-boys-and-girls-on-menstruation](#)
- Casola, A. R., Luber, K., Riley, A. H., & Medley, L. (2022). Menstrual Health: Taking Action Against Period Poverty. *American Journal of Public Health*, 112(3), 374–377. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2021.306622>
- Cotropia, C. A. (2018). Who Benefits from Repealing Tampon Taxes? Empirical Evidence from New Jersey. *University of Richmond School of Law*. <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/law-faculty-publications/1503/>
- Crawford, B. J., & Spivack, C. (2017). Tampon Taxes, Discrimination, and Human Rights. *Pace University*. <https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/lawfaculty/1070/>
- Crays, Allison. (2020). Menstrual equity and justice in the United States. *Sexuality, Gender, and Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sgp2.12023>
- Daniel, Hannah. (2020). Five Innovative Period Poverty Solutions. *Borgen Magazine*. <https://www.borgenmagazine.com/period-poverty-solutions/>
- Davies, S., Clarke, G., & Lewis, N. (2021). Period Poverty: The Public Health Crisis We Don't Talk About. *Children's Hospital of Philadelphia PolicyLab*. <https://policylab.chop.edu/blog/period-poverty-public-health-crisis-we-dont-talk-about>
- Doris, A. (2021). *What happened when a US state scrapped the 'Tampon tax'*. The University of Chicago Booth School of Business. <https://www.chicagobooth.edu/review/what-happened-when-us-state-scrapped-tampon-tax>
- Epstein, R. (2021). Does your state have a tampon tax? This map will show you. *Marie Claire*. <https://www.marieclaire.com/politics/a29490059/tampon-tax-state-guide/>
- Geng, C. (2021). What to know about period poverty. *Medical News Today*. <https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/period-poverty#statistics>
- Isingo, A. (2021). Free sanitary towels could help keep Tanzanian girls in school. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/free-sanitary-towels-could-help-keep-tanzanian-girls-in-school-60126>
- Iwai, M. H. (n.d.). Flo - Tool kit for adolescent girls living in poverty. *Mariko Higaki Iwai Product Designer*. <https://marikoproduct.com/Flo>
- Napoletano, E., & Curry, B. (2022). *Environmental, social and governance: What is ESG investing?* Forbes Advisor. <https://www.forbes.com/advisor/investing/esg-investing/>
- Rhodes, M. (2021). Empowering Inventions to Help Impoverished Women. *The Borgen Project*. <https://borgenproject.org/tag/flo/>
- Rodriguez, L. (2021). The tampon tax: Everything you need to know. *Global Citizen*. <https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/content/tampon-tax-explained-definition-facts-statistics/>
- Rosenfeld, A. G. (2006). State of the heart: Building science to improve women's cardiovascular health. *American Journal of Critical Care*, 15(6), 556-566. <https://doi.org/10.4037/ajcc2006.15.6.556>
- Rossouw, L., & Ross, H. (2021). Understanding Period Poverty: Socio-Economic Inequalities in Menstrual Hygiene Management in Eight Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(5), 2571. MDPI AG. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18052571>
- Smith, A. (2019). The state of period poverty in the U.S. *Penn Nursing*. <https://www.nursing.upenn.edu/details/news.php?id=1545>
- Sommer, M., & Mason, D. (2021). Period Poverty and Promoting Menstrual Equity. *JAMA Health Forum* 2(8). <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamahealthforum.2021.3089>
- Sommer, M., Phillips-Howard, P. A., Gruer, C., Schmitt, M. L., Nguyen, A., Berry, A., Kochhar, S., Gorrell Kulkarni, S., Nash, D., & Maroko, A. R. (2022). Menstrual product insecurity resulting from COVID-19–related income loss, United States, 2020. *American Journal of Public Health*, 112(4), 675-684. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2021.306674>
- State of the period 2021. (2021). *ThinX*. <https://www.shethinx.com/blogs/thinx-piece/state-of-the-period-2021>

- Tschinkel, N., Martz, K., Coleman, J., & Mortara, J. (2018). Disrupting feminine hygiene, one panty at a time. *AIM2Flourish*.  
<https://aim2flourish.com/innovations/disrupting-feminine-hygiene-one-panty-at-a-time>
- Yang, B. (2021). Opinion: The 'Tampon tax' can benefit women. *Pepperdine Graphic*.  
<https://pepperdine-graphic.com/opinion-the-tampon-tax-can-benefit-women/>
- Your first period. (2019). *American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists*.  
<https://www.acog.org/womens-health/faqs/your-first-period>