

Demand for Self-Managed Online Telemedicine Abortion in Eight European Countries During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Regression Discontinuity Analysis

Abigail R. A. Aiken^{1,2,*}, Jennifer E. Starling PhD^{3,4}, Rebecca Gomperts MD, PhD⁵, James G. Scott PhD^{3,6} and Catherine E. Aiken MB BChir, PhD⁷

¹ Associate Professor, LBJ School of Public Policy, University of Texas at Austin, Texas, 78712, USA

² Faculty Associate, Population Research Center, University of Texas at Austin, Texas, 78712, USA

³ PhD Candidate, Department of Statistics and Data Sciences, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA

⁴ Statistician, Mathematica Policy Research, Cambridge, MA, 02139, USA

⁵ Founder and Director, Women on Web, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

⁶ Professor, McCombs School of Business, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, 78712, USA

⁷ Academic Clinical Lecturer, University Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of Cambridge; NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre, CB2 2SW, UK

*Corresponding author:

LBJ School of Public Affairs

University of Texas at Austin

Austin, TX, 78712

+1 512-810-9285

araa2@utexas.edu

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
ORCID: 0000-0002-1555-3025

What this paper adds

What is already known on this subject

- The COVID-19 pandemic has presented challenges to patients seeking medication abortion, including lockdown travel restrictions and infection risk during in-person clinic visits.
- Yet in most European countries, medication abortion must still be provided through in-person models of care. The sole exception is Great Britain, where a fully remote medication abortion service was introduced in response to the pandemic.
- Anecdotal reports suggest that patients are struggling to access in-person abortion services and may turn to self-managed abortion as a result. However, to date there has been no systematic assessment of this possibility.

What this study adds

- Our study provides the best evidence to date that demand for self-managed medication abortion provided using online telemedicine increased following the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- The largest increases were observed in countries where medication abortion is provided mainly in hospitals and where travel restrictions were most stringent. By contrast, in the one country that implemented fully remote services, demand for self-managed abortion declined almost to zero.
- Our findings demonstrate the urgent need for policymakers to expand access to telemedicine models of medication abortion within the formal healthcare setting.

Abstract (295)

Objectives: In most European countries, patients seeking medication abortion during the COVID-19 pandemic are still expected to attend healthcare settings in person despite lockdown measures and infection risk. We assessed whether demand for self-managed medication abortion provided by a fully remote online telemedicine service increased following the emergence of COVID-19.

Design: We used regression discontinuity to compare the number of requests to online telemedicine service Women on Web in eight European countries before and after they implemented lockdown measures to slow COVID-19 transmission. We examined the number deaths due to COVID-19, the degree of government-provided economic support, the severity of lockdown travel restrictions, and the medication abortion service provision model in countries with and without significant changes in requests.

Setting: Eight European countries served by Women on Web.

Participants: 3,915 people who made requests for self-managed abortion to Women on Web between January 1st, 2019 and June 1st, 2020.

Main Outcome Measures: Percent change in requests to Women on Web before and after the emergence of COVID-19 and associated lockdown measures.

Results: Five countries showed significant increases in requests, ranging from 28% in Northern Ireland ($p=0.001$) to 139% in Portugal ($p<0.001$). Two countries showed no significant change in requests, and one country, Great Britain, showed an 88% decrease in requests ($p<0.001$). Countries with significant increases in requests were either countries where abortion services are mainly provided in hospitals or where no abortion services are available and international travel was prohibited during lockdown. By contrast, Great Britain authorized teleconsultation for medication abortion and provision of medications by mail during the pandemic.

Conclusion: These marked changes in requests for self-managed medication abortion during COVID-19 demonstrate demand for fully remote models of abortion care and an urgent need for policymakers to expand access to medication abortion by telemedicine.

Introduction

The first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic posed challenges for the provision of abortion care in Europe. Reallocation of resources, redeployment of staff, and social distancing requirements all introduced new barriers to in-person clinic visits.^{1,2}

Countries differed in their policy responses to these new challenges. Great Britain expanded remote access to medication abortion, allowing teleconsultation with providers, and mifepristone and misoprostol to be provided by mail.³⁻⁵ France extended the ability to take abortion medications at home following an in-person visit with a healthcare professional from 7 weeks to 9 weeks of gestation.⁶ Germany allowed mandatory pre-abortion counselling to take place by phone or video teleconsult instead of in person.⁷ Most other countries, however, made few changes to medication abortion service models and continued to require fully in-person provision, despite calls from human rights groups to prioritize patient safety and expand remote access.^{7,8}

At the same time, the economic downturn and rising unemployment across Europe in the wake of the pandemic may increase demand for abortion care at a time when it is most difficult to access in the clinic setting. This situation raises the possibility of an increase in abortions taking place outside the formal healthcare setting. Marie Stopes International estimates that an additional 2.7 million unsafe abortions will take place globally as a result of health service disruptions caused by the pandemic.⁹

However, not all abortions that take place outside the formal healthcare settings are unsafe. Medication abortion provided through online telemedicine services has been shown to be a safe and effective option.^{10,11} Using data from one such service, we assessed whether demand for

online telemedicine abortion changed in eight European countries after stay-at-home restrictions to slow the spread of COVID-19 were introduced.

Methods

We obtained fully de-identified data from Women on Web (WoW), a non-profit organisation that provides telemedicine medication abortion services up to 10 weeks of gestation.¹² The service is accessed via an online form, which directly populates the database from which our data were obtained. Submitted forms are screened by a doctor, and if clinical eligibility criteria are met, mifepristone and misoprostol are sent by mail. In some countries, referrals are also made to local in-clinic services. A donation of 70-90 Euros is requested to support the service, but may be waived or reduced in cases of financial hardship. Information and support are provided via email in a variety of languages by a trained helpdesk team. People accessing the service consent to the fully anonymized use of their data for research purposes at the time of submitting the online consultation form.

Our analytic sample includes eight countries: Germany, Hungary, Italy, Malta, The Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Portugal, and Great Britain. WoW does not accept consultations from all countries in Europe, because abortion is legal and normally relatively accessible in most places. Among those countries that WoW does serve, some have only a few consultations requests over the course of a year. We excluded countries that had too few requests to reliably detect differences in request numbers between the 'before' and 'after' periods (i.e. fewer than 10 expected requests in the 'after' period). We also excluded Spain, because the Spanish Government censored the WoW website during the study period and so no requests could be made,¹³ and Poland because the number of requests made to WoW has been unstable since the beginning of 2020.

109

110 We obtained the daily number of requests made to WoW from the eight countries in our sample
111 between 1st January 2019 and 1st June 2020 (the last day that lockdown measures were lifted in a
112 country included in the analysis). We excluded duplicate requests, which were identified as >1
113 request with the same information and location made within 12 hours. The number of requests
114 from each country was analysed using a regression-discontinuity design.¹⁴ We designated a
115 ‘before’ period, which began on 1st January 2019 and ended on the date that each individual
116 country’s government issued their first ‘stay-at-home’ directive. The one exception was
117 Germany, where the ‘before’ period begins on 1st January 2020, due to the fact that WoW did
118 not accept consultations from Germany in until late 2019. The ‘after’ period began the first day
119 after the ‘stay-at-home’ directive was issued for each country, and ended on the first day that the
120 directives were eased in each country. ‘Stay-at-home’ directives were chosen as the threshold date
121 defining the “pre” and “post” periods, because the majority of European countries issued such a
122 directive, which posed definitive limitations on population movement and activities. Of the
123 countries included in our analytic sample, only Malta did not issue a population-wide directive,
124 and we instead used the date that the Maltese government issued a directive to close public
125 places as the discontinuity point.¹⁵

126

127 We fit a generalised linear model (GLM) for each country’s daily requests between 1st January
128 2019 (1st January 2020, for Germany) and the date of easing ‘stay-at-home’ restrictions. The
129 model incorporated a dummy variable for the ‘before’ v. ‘after’ period, representing a possible
130 discontinuity at the day of the ‘stay-at-home’ directive. The significance of the discontinuity for
131 each country was assessed using a likelihood ratio test to compare with a null model that did not
132 include a dummy variable for the ‘before’ v. ‘after’ period. The null model was also used to
133 generate Monte Carlo simulations for each country, which create a probability distribution of the
134 expected requests in the ‘after’ period with no discontinuity. The observed requests line would

be highly likely to lie within this probability distribution if there was no difference in requests between the ‘before’ and ‘after’ periods. We also calculated the percentage difference between observed and expected requests in the ‘after’ period. For Northern Ireland, both the null and discontinuity models also included a dummy variable indicating the period after 10th April 2020, because abortion services became available for the first time in Northern Ireland on this date.¹⁶

We also compiled information for each country included in the analysis on several metrics we hypothesised could be related to demand for online abortion: stringency of ‘stay-at-home’ requirements; deaths due to COVID-19; economic assistance provided by governments in response to the pandemic;¹⁷ and abortion service provision before and during the pandemic.^{7,18-20} We examined each of these metrics across each country included in the analysis to assess their relationship to changes in requests to WoW.

Data analyses were conducted using the R statistical package version 3.6.2.²¹ Findings were considered statistically significant at an alpha level of 0.05. The study was reviewed by the University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board and considered exempt on the basis that the study is an analysis of pre-collected, fully de-identified data.

Patient involvement

Patients were not involved in the design or conduct of the study. However, the follow-up that WoW provides is designed to address the priorities and experiences of people who access the service. Thus, although this study is an analysis of secondary, de-identified data, with no direct participant involvement, the research questions were informed by the needs of people who rely on WoW to access abortion.

Results

During the data collection period, Women on Web received 3,915 requests for abortion medications from the eight countries included in the analysis. Among these, we observed a statistically significant increase in requests during the ‘after’ period in five countries: Hungary, Italy, Malta, Portugal, and Northern Ireland (Figure 1). The magnitude of the observed increases ranged from 139% above expected in Portugal to 28% above expected in Northern Ireland (Table 1). In two countries (Germany, the Netherlands) there was no statistically significant difference in observed compared to expected numbers of requests in the ‘after’ period (Figure 1 and Table 1). In one country (Great Britain), there was a statistically significant decrease in requests in the ‘after’ period (Figure 1 and Table 1).

Countries that had higher numbers of COVID-19 related deaths or which provided less government economic support during the pandemic did not appear to have higher numbers of requests to WoW (Table 2). We did however, observe a relationship between higher numbers of requests and both the location of abortion service provision, and the severity of domestic and international travel restrictions (Table 2). In Italy, Portugal, and Hungary, all of which showed significant increases in requests to WoW, abortion is provided mostly in the hospital setting and all enacted stringent stay-at-home requirements. In Northern Ireland and Malta, where significant increases in requests were also observed, in-clinic abortion services are only available by traveling outside of the country, and international travel was restricted during the study periods. In Germany and the Netherlands, we observed no increases in requests, abortion services remained available in clinic settings, and no country-wide domestic travel restrictions were enacted. In Great Britain, abortion services were made available by fully remote telemedicine shortly after lockdown began and we observed a significant decrease in requests.

Discussion

During the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in Europe, we observed changes in requests to the WoW online telemedicine abortion service among five out of eight countries in our analysis. Among countries where abortion is legally available within the formal healthcare setting, we observed increased requests to the WoW online telemedicine service in those countries that had more stringent stay-at-home requirements—including country-wide domestic travel restrictions—and where abortion is mostly available only in the hospital setting. Among the two countries where abortion was not legally available within the formal healthcare setting during the study period, and where travel outside the country was restricted, we also observed an increase in requests. Among countries where abortion is legally available but which enacted less stringent stay-at-home policies (including no country-wide domestic travel restrictions) and where abortions are provided outside the hospital setting, we observed no increases in requests. In the sole country where abortion services were made available by fully remote telemedicine during the study period, we observed a significant decrease in requests.

Our data provide a unique window into requests for self-managed medication abortion using online telemedicine during COVID-19. Key strengths include the ability to measure changes in demand for self-managed abortion from a reliable source that does not rely on self-reporting, and the ability to compare data from before and after the emergence of COVID-19. An important limitation, however, is that there are of course other pathways to abortion outside the formal healthcare setting in Europe, including alternative sources of mifepristone and misoprostol, and non-medication methods. Thus, we cannot measure all demand for self-managed abortion during the pandemic. We also lack nuanced insight into the exact reasons underlying changes in requests to WoW for any particular country. It is important to note that in the two countries where we observed no increases in requests, people likely still encountered

challenges to accessing abortion services.²² Future qualitative work could address this important knowledge gap.

Our results may reflect two distinct phenomena. First, in some countries, more people may be seeking abortion through all channels during the pandemic. The decision to end a pregnancy could be due to the perception of risk posed by COVID-19, reduced access to pre-natal care, and limited social support during lockdowns.²³ Additionally, decision-making could be influenced by the economic downturn COVID-19 has precipitated, with many people facing unemployment or financial losses.²⁴ It has also been suggested that social distancing policies may increase rates of unintended pregnancy due to increased time spent at home with a partner or reduced access to contraception.²⁵

Second, the observed increases in requests may represent a shift in demand from in-clinic abortion to self-managed abortion using online telemedicine. In countries where abortion services are provided predominantly or solely in hospital settings, people may have feared entering a hospital due to perceived or real risk of infection. Even where limited alternatives are available in the community setting—for example in Portugal, where a few private clinics offer abortion services—accessing these services may still have been extremely challenging due to the infection risk associated with public transport, inability to escape surveillance from a controlling partner, or difficulty finding childcare while daycares and schools were closed. Moreover, in countries with no abortion services, the inability to travel outside of the country to seek abortion care due to travel restrictions may have led more people to seek an alternative in online telemedicine. Indeed, our findings from Northern Ireland show a steep increase in requests to WoW following the introduction of lockdown measures, followed by a levelling off shortly after the introduction of within-country abortion services.

These challenges to accessing medication abortion during COVID-19, coupled with the increases we observed in requests for online telemedicine are reflected in the fact that people in countries where the challenges are greatest found their own solutions outside the clinic setting. However, while medication abortion provided via online telemedicine is a safe and effective option,^{10,11} it is not without legal risks.²⁶ Its safety also depends on access to the formal healthcare system when necessary, which is not guaranteed during a pandemic. Additionally, while some people may prefer self-managed medication abortion, others may experience it as fraught and isolating due to stigma or the threat of criminalization, or may have preferred in-clinic care.²⁷ Despite the fact that the WHO recommends the use of telemedicine abortion provision models during COVID-19,²⁸ only one country in the analysis, Great Britain, responded to pandemic by purposefully changing their medication abortion service to circumvent the difficulties of in-person care. Following the introduction of a fully remote telemedicine service for medication abortion up to 10 week's gestation, where consultations with healthcare professionals are done by phone or video, and medications are mailed or made available for pick-up from a clinic front-desk, requests to WoW decreased to a single consultation. This dramatic decrease points not only to the removal of access barriers posed by COVID-19, but also of pre-existing barriers. Evidence from other settings suggests that similar telemedicine models for medication abortion are safe, effective, and acceptable to patients.²⁹

Conclusion

Our findings provide evidence in support of the need for service model changes to make medication abortion more accessible during and beyond the COVID-19 pandemic.³⁰ Fully remote provision of early medication abortion negates the need to visit a hospital or healthcare facility, thus preserving personal protective equipment, and reducing infection risks for both patients and healthcare providers. Follow-up care can be provided in the clinic if necessary, and patients have clear continuity of care in the rare instances that adverse events occur. Authorizing

and implementing telemedicine models within the formal healthcare setting in line with the WHO recommendations would help to meet the demand we observed for remote provision and would ensure truly patient-centered care.

Contributors

ARAA and CEA conceived of the original research question. ARAA, CEA, JGS, and JES contributed to the study design. RG provided the de-identified data. JES conducted the statistical analyses and prepared the tables and figures. ARAA and CEA did the initial data interpretation. ARAA wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to final data interpretation, revised first and subsequent drafts critically for intellectual content, and approved the final manuscript. All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work. ARAA is the manuscripts guarantor. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Competing Interests

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/doi_disclosure.pdf and declare: ARAA and JES have received grant support from the Society of Family Planning and infrastructure support from the National Institutes of Health. The authors declare no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years. RG is Founder and Director of Women on Web. The authors declare no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Copyright

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, a [worldwide licence](#) to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above.

Data Sharing

No additional data are available.
All authors, external and internal, had full access to all of the data (including statistical reports and tables) in the study and can take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Ethics Approval

The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board reviewed the study protocol and declared the use of pre-collected, fully de-identified data exempt from the need for approval.

Transparency

ARAA affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained

Role of the Funding Source

This study was supported in part by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development of the NIH through Center Grant P2CHD042849, awarded to the Population Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin. The funder played no role in the study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the article for publication. The authors are completely independent from the funding sources. The content of this article is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Dissemination Declaration

We plan to disseminate the results to people who have made requests to the WoW service by having a link to the published paper included in the 'Research' section of the WoW website.

References

1. Council on Foreign Relations. Women Around the World & Women and Foreign Policy Program. Abortion in the Time of COVID-19. June 25th 2020.
<https://www.cfr.org/blog/abortion-time-covid-19> (Accessed September 4th 2020).
2. European Parliamentary Forum for Sexual and Reproductive Rights & International Planned Parenthood Federation Report. April 22nd 2020. Women and girls left without care: a snapshot in time during COVID-19. https://www.epfweb.org/sites/default/files/2020-05/epf_-_ipff_en_joint_report_sexual_and_reproductive_health_during_the_covid-19_pandemic_23.04.2020.pdf (Accessed September 4th 2020).
3. Department of Health and Social Care. Temporary approval of home use for both stages of early medical abortion in England. March 30th 2020.
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/temporary-approval-of-home-use-for-both-stages-of-early-medical-abortion--2> (Accessed September 4th 2020).
4. Department of Health and Social Services. Temporary approval of home use for both stages of early medical abortion in Wales.
April 1st 2020. <https://gov.wales/temporary-approval-home-use-both-stages-early-medical-abortion>
(Accessed September 4th 2002).
5. Scottish Government Chief Medical Officer Directorate. Temporary approval of home use for both stages of early medical abortion in Scotland. March 31st 2020.
[https://www.sehd.scot.nhs.uk/cmo/CMO\(2020\)09.pdf](https://www.sehd.scot.nhs.uk/cmo/CMO(2020)09.pdf) (Accessed September 4th 2020).

- 359 6. Haute Autorité de Santé. Réponses rapides dans le cadre du COVID-19 - Interruption
360 Volontaire de Grossesse (IVG) médicamenteuse à la 8ème et à la 9ème semaine d'aménorrhée
361 (SA) hors milieu hospitalier
362 9th April 2020. [https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/2020-](https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/2020-04/reponse_rapide_ivg_09_04_2020_coiv8.pdf)
363 [04/reponse_rapide_ivg_09_04_2020_coiv8.pdf](https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/2020-04/reponse_rapide_ivg_09_04_2020_coiv8.pdf) (Accessed September 4th 2020).
364
365 7. Webber M. How coronavirus is changing access to abortion. *Politico*. May 8th 2020.
366 <https://www.politico.eu/article/how-coronavirus-is-changing-access-to-reproductive-health/>
367 (Accessed September 4th 2020).
368
369 8. Center for Reproductive Rights. European governments must ensure safe and timely access to
370 abortion care during the COVID-19 pandemic. [https://reproductiverights.org/press-](https://reproductiverights.org/press-room/european-governments-must-ensure-safe-and-timely-access-abortion-care-during-covid-19)
371 [room/european-governments-must-ensure-safe-and-timely-access-abortion-care-during-covid-19](https://reproductiverights.org/press-room/european-governments-must-ensure-safe-and-timely-access-abortion-care-during-covid-19)
372 (Accessed September 4th 2020).
373
374 9. Marie Stopes International. COVID-19 threatens women's health. April 2nd 2020.
375 <https://mariestopes-us.org/2020/covid-19-threatens-womens-health/> (Accessed September 4th
376 2020).
377
378 10. Gomperts RJ, Jelinska K, Davies S, Gemzell-Danielsson K, Kleiverda G. Using telemedicine
379 for termination of pregnancy with mifepristone and misoprostol in settings where there is no
380 access to safe services. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*. 2008
381 Aug;115(9):1171-8.
382
383

11. Aiken, A.R., Digol, I., Trussell, J. and Gomperts, R., 2017. Self reported outcomes and adverse events after medical abortion through online telemedicine: population based study in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. *BMJ*. 2017;16;357;j2011.
12. Women on Web <https://www.womenonweb.org/en/page/521/about-women-on-web> (Accessed September 4th 2020).
13. Women on Web. Spain censors information about abortion amid Covid-19 lockdown. June 17th 2020. <https://www.womenonweb.org/en/page/20230/spain-censors-information-about-abortion-amid-covid-19-lockdown>. (Accessed September 4th 2020).
14. Venkataramani AS, Bor J, Jena AB. Regression discontinuity designs in healthcare research. *BMJ*. 2016 Mar 14;352:i1216.
15. Azzopardi K. Covid-19 regulations repealed, vulnerable people no longer required to stay at home. *Malta Independent*. June 4th 2020. <https://www.independent.com.mt/articles/2020-06-04/local-news/Covid-19-regulations-repealed-vulnerable-people-no-longer-required-to-stay-at-home-6736223847> (Accessed September 4th 2020).
16. Ferguson A. Northern Ireland authorities give green light to abortion services. *Reuters*. April 9th 2020. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-britain-nireland-abortion/northern-ireland-authorities-give-green-light-to-abortion-services-idUSKCN21R2XG> (Accessed September 4th 2020).

17. University of Oxford Blavatnik School of Government. Coronavirus Government Response Tracker. <https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/coronavirus-government-response-tracker> (Accessed September 4th 2020).
18. Europe Abortion Access Project. <https://europeabortionaccessproject.org> (Accessed September 4th 2020).
19. Bellizzi S, Ronzoni AR, Pichierri G, Cegolon L, Salaris P, Panu Napodano CM, Fiamma M. Safe abortion amid the COVID-19 pandemic: The case of Italy. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*. 2020 May 21.
20. Caruana-Finkel L. Abortion in the time of COVID-19: perspectives from Malta. *Sexual and Reproductive Health Matters*. 2020 Jan 1;28(1):1780679.
21. R Core Team (2017). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>. (Accessed September 4th 2020).
22. [Stevis-Gridneff](#) M., [Haridasani Gupta](#) A., Pronczuk M. Coronavirus Created an Obstacle Course for Safe Abortions. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/14/world/europe/coronavirus-abortion-obstacles.html> (Accessed September 4th 2020).
23. Bayefsky MJ, Bartz D, Watson KL. Abortion during the Covid-19 Pandemic—Ensuring Access to an Essential Health Service. *New Engl J Med*. 2020;382(19):e47.

24. Alderman L., [Stevis-Gridneff M.](#) The Pandemic's Economic Damage Is Growing. *The New York Times*. July 7th 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/07/business/EU-OECD-coronavirus-economic-reports.html> (Accessed September 4th 2020).
25. UNFPA, with contributions from Avenir Health, Johns Hopkins University (USA) and Victoria University (Australia). Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Family Planning and Ending Gender-based Violence, Female Genital Mutilation and Child Marriage. April 22nd 2020. (<https://www.unfpa.org/resources/impact-covid-19-pandemic-family-planning-and-ending-gender-based-violence-female-genital>). (Accessed September 4th 2020).
26. Hervey, T and S Sheldon, Abortion by telemedicine in the European Union, *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics*, 2019;145: 125–128.
27. Aiken AR, Johnson DM, Broussard K, Padron E. Experiences of women in Ireland who accessed abortion by travelling abroad or by using abortion medication at home: a qualitative study. *BMJ SRH*. 2018;44(3);181-6.
28. World Health Organization (WHO). Maintaining essential health services: operational guidance for the COVID-19 context. June 1st 2020. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/332240> (Accessed September 4th 2020).
29. Kohn JE, Snow JL, Simons HR, Seymour JW, Thompson TA, Grossman D. Medication abortion provided through telemedicine in four US states. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*. 2019;134(2);343-50.

459 30. Assis MP, Larrea S. Why self-managed abortion is so much more than a provisional solution
460 for times of pandemic. *Sexual and Reproductive Health Matters*. 2020 Jan 1;28(1):1779633.
461

Table 1: Actual versus expected numbers of self-managed abortion requests in the “after” period for each country included in the study

Country	Actual Requests	Expected Requests	Percent Change Over Baseline Trend (95% CI)	P Value
Portugal	34	14.2	139.0 (54.5, 385.7)	< 0.001
Italy	53	31.6	67.9 (23.3, 152.4)	< 0.001
Hungary	113	83.2	35.8 (11.9, 71.2)	< 0.001
Malta	69	52.3	31.9 (3.0, 76.9)	< 0.001
Northern Ireland (UK)	97	75.8	28.0 (4.3, 64.4)	0.001
Germany	465	467.1	-0.5 (-9.0, 9.2)	0.798
Netherlands	47	50.9	-7.7 (-28.8, 27.0)	0.458
Great Britain	1	8.1	-87.6 (-92.9, -66.7)	< 0.001

Table 2: Financial and health parameters during the COVID-19 pandemic for all countries included in the analysis

Country	Date stay-at-home requirements began	Date stay-at-home requirements ended	Number of Deaths due to COVID-19 when stay-at-home requirement ended	Stringency of stay-at-home requirements (Country-wide domestic travel restriction)	Government economic support index	Location and scope of abortion service provision
Portugal	19/03/20	14/04/20	535	87.96 (Yes)	75	Abortion available on request through 10 weeks gestation with a 3-day waiting period and provided mostly in hospitals.
Northern Ireland	23/03/20	10/04/20	476	75.93 (Yes, including to the rest of the UK)	100	No abortion services available until new legislation brought into effect on April 10 th 2020.
Hungary	12/03/20	04/05/20	351	76.85 (Yes)	75	Abortion available in certain circumstances through 12 weeks gestation and provided in hospitals. No medication abortion available.
Malta	17/03/20 [†]	01/06/20	9	NA (No, but no travel outside the country)	NA	No abortion services available.
Italy	23/03/20	10/04/20	18,281	93.52 (Yes)	50	Abortion available on request through 90 days gestation with a 7-day waiting period, and provided mostly in hospitals.
Germany	09/03/20	04/05/20	6,692	73.15 (No, only a few specific districts)	88	Abortions provided on request through 14 weeks with a 3-day waiting period, and mostly provided in doctor's offices and clinics.
Netherlands	06/03/20	11/05/20	5,440	80 (No)	63	Abortions provided on request up until viability with a 5-day waiting period, and mostly provided in doctor's offices and clinics.
Great Britain	23/03/20	13/05/20	32,692	76 (Yes)	100	Medication abortion provision changed from in—person to fully remote service model, including phone consultation and pills provided by mail or pick-up at a clinic

[†] Malta did not issue a population-wide directive, so that date that the Maltese government issued a directive to close public places is used in lieu.


475 **Figure 1: Observed versus expected requests to Women on Web for all countries**
476 **included in the analysis**

477 Cumulative requests in the “before” versus “after” periods are in black and orange, respectively.
478 Vertical dashed lines show the dates when stay-at-home orders were announced. The blue line
479 shows the model without any discontinuities (the null model), and the green line shows the
480 model fit with a discontinuity. for the stay-at-home order. The pink lines are the 250 Monte
481 Carlo simulations from the null model, which support the likelihood ratio test’s finding that the
482 model with discontinuities is a significantly better fit than the null model.


Countries with significant increase in requests

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20195222>; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.


All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Countries without significant change in requests



Countries with significant decrease in requests



- Data (no restrictions)
- Data (restrictions)
- Fit without discontinuity
- Fit with discontinuity

Women on Web requests since 01-01-2019