

1 **Why women choose abortion through telemedicine outside the formal health sector in**  
2 **Germany? A mixed-methods study.**

3 Kristina Killinger M.D., MPH<sup>1</sup>, Sophie Günther Med Stud.<sup>2</sup>, Hazal Atay M.A. PhD Cand.<sup>2,3</sup>,  
4 Rebecca Gomperts M.D. PhD<sup>2</sup>, Margit Endler M.D PhD<sup>4,5</sup>

5 1. Department of Global Public Health, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

6 2. Women on Web, Toronto, Canada

7 3. Marie Sklodowska-Curie Fellow, Centre of Political Research, Sciences Po (CEVIPOF), Paris,  
8 France

9 4. Department of Women and Children's Health, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

10 5. Women's Health Research Unit, University of Cape Town, South Africa

11

12 **Corresponding author**

13 Margit Endler

14 Department of Women's and Children's Health, Division of Obstetrics and Gynecology,

15 Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden.

16 Tomtebodavägen 18b 171 77 Stockholm, Sverige

17 [margit.endler@ki.se](mailto:margit.endler@ki.se)

18 Tel +46 70 674 72 27 / +27 64 617 64 77

19

20 **Why are women choosing telemedicine over formal abortion services in Germany? A**  
21 **mixed-methods study.**

22 **Abstract**

23 **Introduction:** In April 2019 the abortion telemedicine service Women on Web (WoW)  
24 opened their helpdesk to Germany and saw a progressive rise in consultations. Our aim was to  
25 understand the motivations, and perceived barriers to access, for women who choose  
26 telemedicine abortion outside the formal health sector in Germany.

27 **Methods:** We conducted a parallel convergent mixed-methods study among 1090 women in  
28 Germany, who requested medical abortion through WoW between January 1<sup>st</sup> and December  
29 31<sup>st</sup>, 2019. We performed a cross-sectional study of data contained in online consultations and  
30 a content analysis of 108 email texts. Analysis was done until saturation; results were merged,  
31 and triangulation was used to validate results.

32 **Results:** Frequent reported reasons for choosing telemedicine abortion in the consultation  
33 forms were “*I need to keep the abortion a secret from my partner or family*” (48%) and “*I*  
34 *would rather keep my abortion private*” (48%). The content analysis developed two main  
35 themes and seven subsidiary categories: 1) internal motivations for seeking telemedicine  
36 abortion encompassing i) autonomy, ii) perception of external threat, iii) shame and stigma,  
37 and 2) external barriers to formal abortion care, encompassing : (iv) financial stress, v)  
38 logistic barriers to access vi) provider attitudes, and vii) vulnerability of foreigners). The  
39 findings in the quantitative and qualitative analysis were consistent.

40 **Conclusion:** Women in Germany who choose telemedicine abortion outside the formal health  
41 sector do so both from a place of empowerment and a place of disempowerment. Numerous  
42 barriers to abortion access exist in the formal sector which are of special relevance to  
43 vulnerable groups such as adolescents and undocumented immigrants.

44 **Key words:** medical abortion, telemedicine, Germany, barriers, access, stigma

45 **Key message points**

46 • When Women on Web, an abortion telemedicine service operating outside the formal  
47 health care sector, opened in Germany in April 2019, 1205 women consulted the  
48 service in the first nine months.

49 • Women who choose telemedicine abortion do so both from a position of  
50 empowerment, for reasons of autonomy, and from a position of disempowerment and  
51 lack of autonomy.

52 • Numerous barriers to abortion access, as permitted by German law exist in the formal  
53 health sector, which may most impact vulnerable groups such as adolescents, women  
54 with low financial means, and undocumented immigrants.

55

## 56 **Introduction**

57 In April 2019 Women on Web (WoW), an abortion telemedicine service that usually serves  
58 women in countries where abortion is legally restricted, opened their helpdesk to women in  
59 Germany. Between April and December 2019, consultations increased from 44 to 193 per  
60 month, suggesting that there existed a demand for abortion services that was not being met in  
61 the formal health sector. The abortion consultation process through WoW has been described  
62 previously (1, 2). Based on available data, abortion by telemedicine has similar clinical  
63 outcomes to in-person abortion, and women chose telemedicine abortion for a multitude of  
64 reasons (3) (4).

65 In Germany elective abortion is technically illegal but formally allowed through a broad legal  
66 clause that permits abortion without prosecution up to 12 weeks' gestation when it is done  
67 through a "consultation process" entailing an appointment with a state-approved agency, three  
68 days of reflection, and a physician-administered abortion (5). The advertisement of abortion  
69 services however can technically be penalised with imprisonment, and conscientious  
70 objection to abortion, the possibility of by law refusing to provide abortion care for personal  
71 beliefs, is permitted (5). Abortion providers are asked to register with the General Medical  
72 Council but information about who and where these doctors are is not accessible to the public  
73 (6) (7) In 2018, 100 986 abortions were performed in Germany, of which 96.2% occurred  
74 through the consultation process (8).

75 To our knowledge, there are no published studies on why women in Germany opt for abortion  
76 outside the formal health sector. Our aim was to understand the motivations, and perceived  
77 barriers to access, for women in Germany choosing telemedicine abortion over formal  
78 services.

79 **Methods**

80 We performed a convergent parallel mixed methods study consisting of a cross-sectional  
81 study and a content analysis. This methodology means that both data components were  
82 collected simultaneously, analysed independently but accorded equal weight, and merged for  
83 interpretation. We triangulated the quantitative and qualitative data to validate results.

84 **Cross-sectional analysis**

85 We retrieved anonymized data from consultations sent from Germany, in German or English,  
86 to WoW between January 1<sup>st</sup> and December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2019.

87 We excluded consultations that were duplicate, not in English or German, from US military  
88 bases, or which had been filled out by an intermediary for women not residing in Germany.

89 We summarized participants background characteristics and evaluated associations between  
90 age categories (with adolescents defined as women aged  $\leq 18$  years), population size of town  
91 of residence, immigration status, and categorical reasons for choosing abortion through WoW.

92 Continuous data were summarized as means and standard deviation or median and  
93 interquartile range according to the data's distribution. Categorical data were summarized as  
94 frequencies. Associations between socio-demographic characteristics and reasons for  
95 choosing online abortion were tested using Pearson's Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test.  
96 Effect size was expressed as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). Data  
97 analysis was performed using Stata version 16.0 (StataCorp. 2016).

98 **Content analysis**

99 After submitting an online consultation to WoW, women in Germany receive an email telling  
100 them that abortion is available in the formal health care sector followed by this question:

101 *“If you feel you are unable to access abortion services in Germany, can you please tell us a*  
102 *bit more about why. The doctor will review your request for help, and we will let you know as*  
103 *soon as possible if we can help you in any way (2).”*

104 We performed a content analysis of the emails sent in response to this question. Two  
105 researchers (KK; SG) simultaneously identified the main themes and recurring categories in  
106 the text starting from January and December 2019 respectively and working consecutively  
107 until saturation after which a further 28 emails were analysed from mid-year 2019 to confirm  
108 saturation.

109 The complete text was then reread and discussed with a third researcher (ME) for consistency  
110 and accuracy. We used systematic coding to categorize and derive subcategories. We  
111 analysed the text at the manifest level meaning that the we used the apparent meaning, as  
112 opposed to the “latent” or underlying meaning, of the text. Units of information were analysed  
113 separately and then case-based to evaluate women’s primary and secondary motivations. We  
114 quantified recurring categories to contextualise the findings with the quantitative results.

#### 115 **Data validation**

116 We used methodological and researcher triangulation to mitigate researcher bias and increase  
117 reliability. The quantitative and qualitative outcomes were interpreted jointly and contrasted  
118 to nuance findings and identify contradictions.

119 Public-patient involvement was not engaged in the study design. The research was approved  
120 by the Ethics Committee at Karolinska Institutet, Sweden (Dnr 2009/2072-31/2).

## 121 **RESULTS**

### 122 **Cross-sectional study**

123 Between January 1<sup>st</sup> and December 31<sup>st</sup> 2019, WoW received 1208 consultations from  
124 Germany of which 1090 were included after exclusions (Figure 1).

125 The median age among participants was 29 years (+/- 9 years). Median gestational age was 5  
126 weeks (w) 6 days (d), ranging from 3w0d to 18w1d. Background characteristics of participants,  
127 categorical reasons for requesting telemedicine abortion, and associations to background  
128 variables are shown in Tables 1, 2 and Supplementary Table 1 respectively.

### 129 **Content analysis**

130 WoW received 255 emails following online consultations from Germany during 2019. We  
131 assessed that saturation was achieved after the analysis of 80 emails, we included a further 28  
132 emails to validate this. In total we analysed 108 emails which varied in length from 10 to 400  
133 words.

134 We developed two main themes and seven categories subsidiary to these themes: 1) internal  
135 motivations for seeking telemedicine abortion encompassing i) autonomy, ii) perception of  
136 external threat, and iii) shame/fear of stigma, and 2) external barriers to formal abortion care  
137 encompassing: iv) financial stress, v) logistic barriers to access, vi) provider attitudes, and  
138 vii) the vulnerability of foreigners. A scheme of themes, categories and subcategories is  
139 shown in figure 2.

### 140 **Integrated results**

#### 141 **Autonomy**

142 In the cross-sectional data two frequent categorical reasons for requesting telemedicine  
143 abortion were the preference to keep the abortion private (48%) and being more comfortable

144 at home (44%). In the content analysis the wish for autonomy was a main internal motivation  
145 to choose telemedicine abortion. Women described privacy as a positive choice, the desire to  
146 choose where, when and with whom the abortion was to be performed, and the wish to choose  
147 medical over surgical abortion. One woman described this as follows.

148 *“I do not want to go the 'normally' way because my family will notice. I have extensively*  
149 *informed in the Internet about the pros and cons. I'm sure it's the right decision for me. I do*  
150 *not want to have to discuss within the family about something that mainly concerns me.”*

### 151 **Perception of external threat**

152 The need to keep the abortion a secret from a family or partner was a frequent reason for  
153 requesting a telemedicine abortion in the cross-sectional study (48%) and 5% of women  
154 reported living in an abusive relationship. Adolescents were almost three times more likely to  
155 report the need to keep the abortion a secret (OR 2.78, 95% CI 1.59-4.87).

156 The need to keep the pregnancy and abortion a secret because of a perceived threat from the  
157 family or community was also an internal motivation in the content analysis. Over a third of  
158 women described living in a controlling environment as exemplified below,:

159 *“The problem is my partner. We live and work together, which means that I do not have the*  
160 *opportunity to go to the consultation let alone to the doctor's practice without being noticed.*  
161 *(...) I am afraid he might hit me or push me against the furniture again. I would do it (the*  
162 *abortion) differently, but I am not able to do anything without him noticing. (transl.)”*

163 In the consultation form, 6% of women reported having been raped. Rape was reported with  
164 similar frequency in the email texts where it was sometimes, as exemplified below, described  
165 as exacerbating the shame associated with the abortion:

166 *“I was raped. I live in Germany but cannot officially have an abortion. My gynaecologist is*  
167 *my mother's best friend's daughter. If somebody sees me in a different part of town it would*

168 *be a catastrophe. (...) If I disclose the rape and communicate with my family, then everything*  
169 *will be worse. They would not believe me. (transl.)”*

### 170 **Shame and fear of stigma**

171 37% of women in the cross-sectional study reported fear of stigma. Fear of stigma was further  
172 associated with living in a small town (OR=1.47, 95% CI=1.12-1.94) and being an adolescent  
173 (OR 1.81, 95% CI 1.08-3.01). In the content analysis, we found that self-recrimination and  
174 shame for the unwanted pregnancy were sometimes internal motivations to request  
175 telemedicine abortion. One woman described her situation as follows:

176 *“(...) I feel very ashamed at the thought of discussing or rather sharing my decision to abort*  
177 *with so many people, that I do not know. I have the feeling that one will indirectly judge me*  
178 *and this, in combination with the thought of having the abortion carried out by the same*  
179 *people, feels unbelievably difficult and wrong to me.”*

### 180 **Financial stress**

181 Financial hardship was a major barrier to abortion access represented with similar frequency  
182 in the cross-sectional study (40%) and the content analysis (30%). Adolescents were more  
183 likely to name cost as barrier (OR 2.61, 95% CI 1.51-4.5).

184 In their emails women described not being able to afford the out-of-pocket expenditure, not  
185 being able to afford to take days off work, and/or not meeting the criteria for the  
186 reimbursement of the abortion through the social welfare system. As one woman described:

187 *“I cannot file for reimbursement, because my income is 15 Euros above the income threshold*  
188 *and I have so much debt, that I can barely make ends meet each month. (transl.)”*

### 189 **Logistic barriers**

190 Distance as barrier to abortion care was similarly represented in the cross-sectional study  
191 (11%) and in the content analysis (10%). In their emails women often described multiple  
192 logistic barriers such as long waiting times, travel distances, work and childcare commitments  
193 and complicated bureaucracy. One woman described the complexity of the barriers facing her  
194 as follows:

195 *“I cannot get a doctor’s appointment. I cannot drive hundreds of kilometres, wait for weeks. I*  
196 *need to take care of my children, go to work. The next hospital, which does abortions, is two*  
197 *hours away. How am I supposed to do that? How will I get there? Where shall I leave my*  
198 *children during that time? (transl.)”*

#### 199 **Provider attitudes**

200 Women described concrete prior or current negative experiences seeking abortion as their  
201 reason for choosing telemedicine abortion. These experiences included negative persuasion  
202 efforts, judgemental comments, delaying approval for abortion, or a pointed lack of assistance  
203 with the formal requirements.

204 One woman recounted:

205 *“Since I already had an abortion three years ago I know what kind of gauntlet I would have*  
206 *to expect. I cannot cope with this one more time.”*

#### 207 **Vulnerability of foreigners**

208 In the emails 9% self-identified as undocumented immigrants and 21% reported difficulties  
209 related to being a foreigner. Adolescents, without specified immigration status, were more  
210 likely to report legal restrictions to access (OR 2.82, 95% CI 1.63-4.9). Self-identified  
211 undocumented residents were also highly represented among women describing financial  
212 hardship related to the abortion and controlling or threatening environments. In the content  
213 analysis the vulnerability associated to being a foreigner was a specific barrier to abortion

214 care. These women described being denied access to services because of being undocumented  
215 or uninsured, language barriers, lack of knowledge about a complex and highly regulated  
216 system, and fear of having their immigration status revealed.

217 One woman stated:

218 *“I don't have the proper documents, I don't have insurance, I am an alien. Hospital won't*  
219 *accept me to have a check up.”*”

## 220 **DISCUSSION**

221 This study suggests that there is a demand for alternatives to formal abortion services in  
222 Germany. Women who choose telemedicine abortion do so both from a place of  
223 empowerment, expressed as a desire for autonomy, and from a place of disempowerment,  
224 expressed as perceived barriers and fear of repercussions if the abortion were known.

225 The concept of access with respect to abortion is multifaceted and depends not only on legal  
226 prerequisites but on women's attitudes, knowledge and confidence in obtaining services as  
227 well as the service delivery itself (10).

### 228 **Attitudes, knowledge, and confidence**

229 The agency to make an informed choice is fundamental to empowerment in sexual and  
230 reproductive health and rights (SRHR) (11) (12). Women in the study who described a  
231 personal preference for telemedicine abortion had often researched their options and knew  
232 why this was a good choice for them. A previous study has shown that women who opt for an  
233 abortion in the informal sector, also in countries where abortion would be available through  
234 formal channels, often do so based on the active choice of privacy and self-management (3).

235 In contrast, over a third of women in this study lived in environments that limited their ability  
236 to make choices about their sexual and reproductive health (SRH) which forced them to keep  
237 the abortion a secret. Many of these women were in abusive relationships. Concealing a

238 pregnancy or abortion from a partner is known to be associated with inter-partner violence  
239 (13).

240 Many women in the study also directed feeling of shame and blame about the abortion  
241 towards themselves. The systematic blaming of women in cases of sexual- or gender-based  
242 violence, or negative outcomes of pregnancy is termed “gendered blame” and is applicable  
243 also to unwanted pregnancy and abortion (9).

#### 244 **Service delivery**

245 Cost of services was a significant barrier to access in the study, consistent with a previous  
246 study from the US (17). Compared to the US, Germany has a strong public insurance system  
247 and extensive social welfare programs but abortions without medical indication are not  
248 routinely covered (18). The exemption of abortion from publicly financed health reflects a  
249 low prioritization of abortion rights.

250 In our results it was often the compounded effect of multiple logistic barriers that made  
251 abortion inaccessible. In a study from Great Britain barriers to abortion were suggested to  
252 result from underfunding of health services in general, impacting also abortion services (19).

253 In Germany however waiting times to clinical appointments other than abortion are shorter  
254 than other high-income countries (20). This raises the question of specific underfunding of  
255 SRHR in Germany.

256 A proportion of women in the study also described negative experiences that reflect on  
257 abortion service delivery. A study in Hungary found that negative experiences with providers  
258 and fear of stigma were the main reasons women sought alternative abortion care options  
259 (21). Research supports that legalized access to abortion is difficult to enact successfully in  
260 the context of stigmatized services (22).

261 Undocumented immigrants in the study described formal difficulties accessing abortion, that  
262 were often exacerbated by financial hardship and lack of autonomy. Undocumented  
263 immigrants within their first 15 months of stay receive only care for acute, pregnancy- or  
264 child related health issues, excluding abortion, which makes elective interventions like  
265 abortion and family planning routinely impossible (14). Germany's SRHR policy for  
266 immigrants resembles Switzerland's, where undocumented immigrants show significantly  
267 higher rates of unintended pregnancies than women with documented status (15). The need  
268 for universal access to SRH has been recognized in the WHO-European Action Plan for  
269 Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights for 2017–2021 which intends to provide a  
270 common framework for country-specific policy throughout Europe (16).

271

## 272 **Policy implications**

273 This study indicates that existing services fail to provide universal access to abortion in  
274 Germany. The 1090 consultations to WoW represent over 1% of abortions performed in 2019.  
275 Abortion-related stigma persists in laws and policies and abortion care provision suffers from  
276 complicated bureaucracy and lack of information on where to access services (4, 5). The  
277 allowance of conscientious objection is known to increase the risk of judgmental treatment  
278 (18, 23). Half of Germany's people disapprove of abortion on demand and the number of  
279 doctors who perform abortions is decreasing (24, 25).

280 Our results indicate that groups at particular risk of missing out on access are women with  
281 low financial means, undocumented immigrant women, and adolescents, where a particularly  
282 vulnerable group may be undocumented adolescent immigrants. Being young per se was not  
283 identified as a barrier to access in either the quantitative or qualitative data but adolescents  
284 were more likely to report lack of finances, need of secrecy, and legal restrictions compared to  
285 older women. German law requires parental consent for girls below the age of 16, which is in

286 practice often applied to girls under 18, something which must be recognized as a barrier to  
287 access (4).

288

289 Abortion care reform in Germany requires a simplified care process, targeted interventions for  
290 vulnerable groups and sensitization of health care providers towards non-judgmental care.  
291 Even countries that formally provide elective abortion, must recognize that barriers to access  
292 in the form of scarce service delivery, stigma, prohibitive cost, or requirements of multiple  
293 appointments are enough to seriously affect women's health and rights (26, 27).

#### 294 **Strengths and limitations of the study**

295 Motivations for women who seek abortion care outside the formal sector in Germany has not  
296 been researched. The data represented a large sample, used mixed methods which enabled  
297 triangulation, and reached information saturation.

298 The content analysis, based on the response to a single question, would have been nuanced by  
299 in-depth interviews. Our findings can also not make an overall assessment of abortion service  
300 delivery in Germany. A broader survey among women and providers in Germany is required  
301 to quantify the gaps in the current service delivery.

#### 302 **Conclusion**

303 Our study indicates that women in Germany who choose telemedicine abortion outside of the  
304 formal health sector do so both from a place of empowerment and a place of disempowerment.  
305 Numerous barriers exist to abortion access in the formal health sector and these may most  
306 impact vulnerable groups such as adolescents, women with low financial means, and  
307 undocumented immigrants.

#### 308 **Funding**

309 This study was funded by the Swedish Society of Medicine.

310 **Conflicts of interest**

311 Co-authors RG, SG and HA work or are affiliated at Women on Web. The authors otherwise

312 have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

313

314 **Table 1: Background and pregnancy-related characteristics of 109 women in Germany**  
 315 **requesting an abortion through Women on Web between January 1<sup>st</sup> and December 31<sup>st</sup> 2019**

<i>Continuous variables</i>	<i>Median (IQR, range)</i>
<b>Gestational age in days<sup>a</sup></b> (missing=189)	36 (11, 21-127)
<b>Age in years</b>	29 (9; 12-53)
<i>Categorical variables</i>	<i>% (n)</i>
<b>Age in years</b>	
≤18	6.4 (70)
19-29	49.3 (537)
30-40	40 (436)
≥41	4.3 (47)
<b>Population size of town of residence<sup>b</sup></b>	
Population ≥100.000	35.8 (390)
Population <100.000	64.2 (700)
<b>Undocumented immigrant</b>	5.0 (54)
<b>Gravidity<sup>b</sup></b> (missing=48)	
0	17.9 (186)
1	26.1 (272)
2	20.7 (216)
3	18.4 (192)
>3	16.9 (176)
<b>Parity</b> (missing=55)	
0	45.3 (469)
1	23.2 (240)
2	20.2 (209)
>2	11.3 (117)
<b>Previous abortions</b> (missing=88)	
<b>0</b>	75.3 (754)
<b>1</b>	19.1 (191)
<b>&gt;1</b>	5.7 (57)
<b>Previous caesarean section</b> (missing=1)	21.5 (234)
<b>Reasons for unwanted pregnancy</b> (missing=6)	
No use of contraceptives	29.7 (322)
Contraceptives failed	64.3 (697)
Rape	5.7 (62)
<b>Reasons for abortion<sup>c</sup></b> (missing=9)	
Cannot have child at this point of life	58.9 (637)
Financial situation	46.6 (504)
Family is complete	26.5 (286)
Age (too young/old)	26.1 (282)
Want to finish school	24.5 (265)
Illness	1.9 (21)

316 *a Values for days since last menstrual period (LMP) <21 days re-coded as missing data since as a*  
 317 *pregnancy test rarely detects U-HCG before this time.*

318 *b Questions not regarding medical eligibility are optional which explains missing data..*

319 *c Multiple responses allowed, total response percentages exceed 100%.*

320

321 **Table 2 Categorical reasons for choosing online abortion over formal abortion services among**  
322 **women in Germany requesting abortion from Women on Web January 1<sup>st</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup>**  
323 **2019**

<b>Reasons for choosing online abortion (n=1048, missing=42)</b>	<b>% (n)</b>
Need to keep my abortion a secret from partner/family	48.0 (502)
Would rather keep my abortion private	47.7 (500)
Would be more comfortable at home	44.0 (461)
Hard to access because of cost	40.2 (421)
Would rather take care of my own abortion	39.6 (415)
Hard to access because of stigma	37.4 (392)
Hard to access because of work or school commitments	30.9 (324)
Prefer to have my partner/friend with me during the process	24.4 (256)
Hard to access because of childcare commitments	23.8 (249)
Hard to access because of legal restrictions	17.2 (180)
Do not want to deal with protestors	13.4 (140)
Hard to access because of distance	10.9 (114)
I find it empowering	10.8 (113)
Hard to access because my partner is abusive	5.4 (57)
Abortion pills are not available in my country	5.2 (54)
Hard to access because I am an undocumented immigrant	5.0 (52)
Other reason	3.1 (32)

324 \*IQR= interquartile range, n= number

325

## 326 REFERENCES

- 327 1. Endler M, Beets L, Gemzell Danielsson K, Gomperts R. Safety and acceptability of medical  
328 abortion through telemedicine after 9 weeks of gestation: a population-based cohort study. *BJOG*.  
329 2019;126(5):609-18.
- 330 2. Gomperts R, van der Vleuten K, Jelinska K, da Costa CV, Gemzell-Danielsson K, Kleiverda  
331 G. Provision of medical abortion using telemedicine in Brazil. *Contraception*. 2014;89(2):129-33.
- 332 3. Chemlal S, Russo, G. Why do they take the risk? A systematic review of the qualitative  
333 literature on informal sector abortions in settings where abortion is legal. . *BMC Women's Health*  
334 2019;19, 55
- 335 4. Endler M, Lavelanet A, Cleeve A, Ganatra B, Gomperts R, Gemzell-Danielsson K.  
336 Telemedicine for medical abortion: a systematic review. *BJOG*. 2019.
- 337 5. German Criminal Code 19 §218a, 1995. Available at: [https://www.gesetze-im-](https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/stgb/_218a.html)  
338 [internet.de/stgb/ 218a.html](https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/stgb/_218a.html).
- 339 6. Zeit.online. Less doctors perform abortions (transl.). 2018. Available from  
340 URL:[https://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/zeitgeschehen/2018-08/schwangerschaftsabbrueche-](https://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/zeitgeschehen/2018-08/schwangerschaftsabbrueche-statistisches-bundesamt-arztpraxen-kliniken)  
341 [statistisches-bundesamt-arztpraxen-kliniken](https://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/zeitgeschehen/2018-08/schwangerschaftsabbrueche-statistisches-bundesamt-arztpraxen-kliniken).
- 342 7. German Medical Association. List of doctors, hospitals and medical institutions after §13 part  
343 of the pregnancy conflict law (transl.). Available from:  
344 URL:<https://www.bundesaerztekammer.de/aerzte/versorgung/schwangerschaftsabbruch/>.
- 345 8. Federal Agency for Statistics. Health: Abortions (transl.). 2018. 12 3. Available from: URL:  
346 [https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Gesundheit/Schwangerschaftsabbrueche_inhalt.html;jsessionid=9999F551AB24CBE0F3C36573FCBEDFBA.internet721#sprg234234)  
347 [Umwelt/Gesundheit/Schwangerschaftsabbrueche/ inhalt.html;jsessionid=9999F551AB24CBE0F3C36](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Gesundheit/Schwangerschaftsabbrueche_inhalt.html;jsessionid=9999F551AB24CBE0F3C36573FCBEDFBA.internet721#sprg234234)  
348 [573FCBEDFBA.internet721#sprg234234](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Gesundheit/Schwangerschaftsabbrueche_inhalt.html;jsessionid=9999F551AB24CBE0F3C36573FCBEDFBA.internet721#sprg234234).
- 349 9. N. B. Degendering the problem and gendering the blame: political discourse on women and  
350 violence. *Gend Soc*. 2001;15 pp. 262-81.
- 351 10. Benson J. Evaluating abortion-care programs: old challenges, new directions. *Stud Fam Plann*.  
352 2005;36(3):189-202.
- 353 11. Engender Health. Realizing rights in sexual and reproductive health services. Choices in  
354 family planning: Informed and voluntary decision making. USA 2003. Available at  
355 <https://www.engenderhealth.org/files/pubs/counseling-informed-choice/choices.pdf>.
- 356 12. UNFPA. Ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights.  
357 MEASURING SDG TARGET 5.6. February 2020. Available at:  
358 <https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/UNFPA-SDG561562Combined-v4.15.pdf>.
- 359 13. Hall M, Chappell LC, Parnell BL, Seed PT, Bewley S. Associations between intimate partner  
360 violence and termination of pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med*.  
361 2014;11(1):e1001581.
- 362 14. European Commission. Germany Country Profile. Available from: URL:  
363 [https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/state/docs/chp\\_de\\_english.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/state/docs/chp_de_english.pdf).
- 364 15. Casillas A, Bodenmann P, Epiney M, Gétaz L, Irion O, Gaspoz JM, et al. The border of  
365 reproductive control: undocumented immigration as a risk factor for unintended pregnancy in  
366 Switzerland. *J Immigr Minor Health*. 2015;17(2):527-34.
- 367 16. Keygnaert I IO, Guieu A, van Parys A-S, Leye E, Roelens K. . Health Evidence Network  
368 synthesis report 45 - what is the evidence on the reduction of inequalities in accessibility and quality  
369 of maternal health care delivery for migrants? A review of the existing evidence in the WHO  
370 European RegionCopenhagen: GartneriRådgivningen; 2016.
- 371 17. Aiken ARA, Starling JE, van der Wal A, van der Vliet S, Broussard K, Johnson DM, et al.  
372 Demand for Self-Managed Medication Abortion Through an Online Telemedicine Service in the  
373 United States. *Am J Public Health*. 2020;110(1):90-7.
- 374 18. German Civil Code. Pregnancy Conflict Law (transl.). §5 BGBI. I. Available at:  
375 <https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/beratungsg/BJNR113980992.html>.
- 376 19. Aiken ARA, Guthrie KA, Schellekens M, Trussell J, Gomperts R. Barriers to accessing  
377 abortion services and perspectives on using mifepristone and misoprostol at home in Great Britain.  
378 *Contraception*. 2017.


- 379 20. Siciliani L, Hurst J. Tackling excessive waiting times for elective surgery: a comparative  
380 analysis of policies in 12 OECD countries. *Health Policy*. 2005;72(2):201-15.
- 381 21. Les K, Gomperts R, Gemzell-Danielsson K. Experiences of women living in Hungary seeking  
382 a medical abortion online. *Eur J Contracept Reprod Health Care*. 2017;22(5):360-2.
- 383 22. Favier M, Greenberg JMS, Stevens M. Safe abortion in South Africa: "We have wonderful  
384 laws but we don't have people to implement those laws". *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*. 2018;143 Suppl 4:38-  
385 44.
- 386 23. Diniz D, Madeiro A, Rosas C. Conscientious objection, barriers, and abortion in the case of  
387 rape: a study among physicians in Brazil. *Reprod Health Matters*. 2014;22(43):141-8.
- 388 24. GESIS - Leibniz-Institut for Social Science. General Population Survey of Social Science  
389 ALLBUS compact-cumulation 1980-2014 (transl.). 2016. GESIS Datenarchiv, Köln. ZA4583  
390 Datenfile Version 1.0.0, <https://doi.org/10.4232/1.12440>.
- 391 25. Grimm R SL. Attitudes and options on abortion in Europe. A comparative study (transl.).  
392 2016. IPSOS. Available from: URL: [https://www.ipsos.com/de-de/einstellungen-und-meinungen-zum-](https://www.ipsos.com/de-de/einstellungen-und-meinungen-zum-schwangerschaftsabbruch-europa-eine-vergleichende-studie)  
393 [schwangerschaftsabbruch-europa-eine-vergleichende-studie](https://www.ipsos.com/de-de/einstellungen-und-meinungen-zum-schwangerschaftsabbruch-europa-eine-vergleichende-studie).
- 394 26. World Health Organization. Safe Abortion: Technical and Policy Guidance for Health  
395 Systems. 2nd ed, 2012; WHO: Geneva. .
- 396 27. World Health Organization. Health worker roles in providing safe abortion care and post-  
397 abortion contraception. 2015.

398

399

**Figure 1**

**Number of consultations for medical abortion received by Women on Web per month from Germany in 2019 (n=1090)**



\*1208 consultations were received in 2019. Consultations that were duplicate, not in English/German, from US military bases, or from intermediaries for women not residing in Germany were excluded, final inclusion n=1090.

**Figure 2: Schematic presentation of derived themes, categories and subcategories with corresponding frequencies from 108 emails sent to Women on Web between January 1<sup>st</sup> and December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2019 explaining their need of an online abortion.**

