Estimation of Abortions in the Province of Buenos Aires, Argentina: a Bayesian Approach

Andrea Paz [1], Sharon Josid [1], María Carla Rodríguez [1], Giselle Lamela [1], Matías Poullain [2], Lupe Marín [1] and Franco Marsico [2, 3]

[1]Ministerio de Salud de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, Argentina,[2]Universidad de Buenos Aires.[3]IDEPI-UNPAZ.

Abstract

Abortion is one of the reasons for hospital discharge among women of fertile age in Argentina. The criminalization of abortion prior to the enactment of the Voluntary Interruption of Pregnancy Act (IVE), coupled with the fragmentation of the health system, has hindered the availability of reliable records to quantify induced abortions in the country. Given the lack of information reflecting the magnitude of these practices, it is necessary to perform an accurate estimation to characterize abortion access within the healthcare system. Using a Bayesian approach and abortion records in the province of Buenos Aires in 2021, the incidence of abortions per thousand women of fertile age was estimated. This study, based on a direct case count methodology, is the first of its kind in Argentina. The method used allows for the correction of bias caused by under-reporting of practices. An incidence of 29.92 (Credibility Interval, CI95: [29.38; 30.47]) abortions per thousand women of fertile age was obtained during 2021. The results are consistent with previous national research and agree with estimates made for the region. In conclusion, the estimates of abortion incidence highlight its frequency in the lives of people with gestational capacity, underlining the importance of fully guaranteeing the right to comprehensive sexual health through a wide network of abortion access.

1 Introduction

Abortion is a frequent event in the lives of individuals with reproductive capacities; particularly in Argentina, it is one of the important reasons for hospital discharge in women of fertile age [1]. The legal framework surrounding abortion practices was recently modified in Argentina. After 17 years of the Campaign for Legal, Safe and Free Abortion, in December 2020, the National Law N° 27.610 of Voluntary Interruption of Pregnancy was sanctioned (IVE Law) [2]. Before this Law, the National Penal Code criminalized abortion, with some exceptions indicated in its article Nro 86 [3]: (i) risk to the life and health of the pregnant person or (ii) if the pregnancy was the result of a rape. Even though the interruption of pregnancy for these causes has been in effect since 1921, access was met with multiple obstacles in the health system [4, 5].

The IVE Law of 2020 opens a new normative framework, as it replaces the system of causes established in the Penal Code since 1921 by recognizing the right of pregnant people to voluntarily interrupt their pregnancy up to the fourteenth week inclusive of the gestational process [2]. Outside of this term, the pregnant person has the right to access the legal interruption of pregnancy if it was the result of a rape or if the life or health of the pregnant person was in danger/risk. The effective implementation of abortion access that the IVE Law carries special difficulties throughout Argentina, due to territorial heterogeneities and inequalities, levels of government involved, fragmentation of the health system [6], and the historical tensions and disputes of meaning that abortion practice produces.

The Argentine health system is a fragmented system in three subsectors: public, social security, and private. In turn it has different levels of government in the case of the public subsector, finding health establishments of different dependencies: municipal, provincial, or national [6]. This fragmentation in the province of Buenos Aires has special complexity since it is made up of 135 municipalities or local governments, on whom almost all primary care centers and 218 municipal hospitals depend [7]. This decentralization of primary health care to the local level [8] adds greater complexity to the system, increased by inequalities between municipalities and within them. The province has 95 hospitals under its dependence, along with 5 national hospitals, of the second and third level of care. Also, to organize the health management of the territory, it is divided into twelve sanitary regions that are distributed in management and government areas integrated at the central level, from which health policies are carried out from an intermediate position between the provincial and municipal level. Buenos Aires is the most populated province in Argentina. In 2021, the estimated population was 17,709,598 inhabitants [9], representing 38.6% of the total population of the country. The distribution is uneven, concentrating the largest amount of population in the 40 municipalities of the Buenos Aires Metropolitan Area (AMBA).

The criminalization of the abortion practice before the sanction of the IVE Law, together with the fragmentation of the health system, have made it difficult to have reliable records to quantify the events of induced abortions in the province of Buenos Aires. Atucha and Pailes [10] and Mario and Pantelides [11] made estimates for Argentina using indirect methodolo-

gies. These publications were made before the sanction of the IVE Law, so one of the main difficulties was the non-existence of records or unreliable records.

In the absence of information that indicates the magnitude of abortion in the province of Buenos Aires, it is necessary to estimate it accurately to characterize access to abortion in the health system. In 2020, Buenos Aires Ministry of Health developed the first centralized registry of abortions, making it possible to have data to make direct estimates from them, as has been done in similar studies in other countries [12, 13]. This study made an estimate of the number of abortions produced during the year 2021 in the public health subsector and throughout the province, based on direct methods. From the bibliographic search carried out, this would be the first estimate developed in the country based on the direct record of practices.

2 Methods

An exhaustive search of antecedents was carried out in the virtual libraries of scientific publications Scielo, PubMed, and Virtual Health Library (BVS) with the following steps: (i) The search was located in title and abstract using the reference terms "estimate" and "abortion". Only in the case of the BVS to specify the initial search, a new filter was applied in the main subject (induced abortion/legal abortion), since more than 7,000 publications were obtained. (ii) A reading of the abstracts was carried out. Those publications that specifically referred to induced or voluntary abortions in humans were selected. Primarily it was evaluated that they were related to the calculation of incidence. (iii) Finally, the country or region of the publications was regionalized.

As previously stated, the province is politically divided into 135 municipalities, grouped into 12 sanitary regions (Figure 1) as part of the political-administrative structure of the provincial Ministry of Health. From the last available national census [14], population information (total number and by five-year age groups) estimated for 2021 and information on the percentage of households with Unsatisfied Basic Needs (UBN) were obtained as a socioeconomic indicator for each municipalities.

The target population of this study were women of fertile age residing in the province of Buenos Aires who attend the public health subsector. By "woman of fertile age" is understood any person who identifies in the health records as female between the ages of 15 and 49 inclusive. It is estimated that in 2021 there are 4,361,010 women of fertile age residing in the province, of which 33.3% are cared for in the public subsector (1,450,700 women) [15]. However, there are significant heterogeneities in the territory, since while in some municipalities the proportion of women who have exclusive public coverage reaches 43.5%, in others it does not exceed 20.0%.

Table 1 shows the estimated number of women of fertile age by sanitary region and the unequal distribution of the number of health establishments that guarantee access to abortion.



Figure 1: Sanitary regions of the Province of Buenos Aires.

The data on the number of abortions were obtained from the Unified Registry of IVE/ILE practices and use of misoprostol developed by the Ministry of Health of the province of Buenos Aires. It has information on 34,354 abortions performed in the province within the public health subsector during the year 2021. The registry is anonymous, recording the place where the practice was performed, the methodology used (surgery, pharmaceutical, etc), the municipality of residence, and age. Also, analyzed data were aggregated at municipality level. Moreover, public information from the Non-Governmental Organization "Socorristas en Red" was available. It is responsible for accompanying abortion situations. During 2021 they accompanied a total of 2,648 cases, of which 1,778 were abortions carried out within the community health system (self-managed). This implies that part of the population, having the public health subsector, carries out practices outside it, in a self-managed way with the accompaniment of other networks. For the estimation, this implies a source of under-registration, of the same nature as was observed in similar studies [12, 13, 16, 17]. The 1,778 cases represent 5.84% of the registered abortions. It is therefore taken that this is the lower bound of the under-registration (since there are also other NGOs, and self-managed abortions that are not registered). All the proportions of patients by ages within each sanitary region or type of health institution were compared. These comparisons were made pairwise with Z tests of proportions [18] and with adjustment of the p-values with the Holm method [19]. The values "No data" were not taken into account. In order to generate estimates of the incidence of abortions in the population of women of fertile age taking into account the sources of uncertainty already mentioned, the following statistical approach was used:

Region	Health facilities	Women (15-49 years old)	Rate
I	36	161.268	0.22
II	17	62.015	0.27
III	8	58.437	0.14
IV	17	144.595	0.12
V	83	882.989	0.09
VI	95	1.057.049	0.09
VII	63	622.748	0.10
VIII	66	291.994	0.23
IX	34	72.853	0.47
X	15	77.289	0.19
XI	44	333.420	0.13
XII	15	596.353	0.03

Table 1: Descriptive statistics by sanitary region of health establishments and women of fertile age. Year 2021. Health facilities that guarantee abortion access for each region, number of womens in fertile age and the Rate of health facilities per 1000 womens.

First, the incidence of abortions per 1,000 women of fertile age was calculated for each sanitary region and for the entire province from formulas (1) and (2):

$$At = A \cdot (1 + I) \tag{1}$$

$$R = \frac{At}{M \cdot C} \cdot 1000 \tag{2}$$

Where At is the total number of abortions, A is the registered number of abortions performed in the public subsector, I is the estimated proportion of abortions performed outside the formal health field, M is the projected number of women of fertile age residents for the year 2021, and C is the proportion with exclusive public health coverage. On the other side, R is the incidence of abortions per 1,000 women of fertile age. This calculation was made for each municipality, for each sanitary region, and for the entire province.

Secondly, a *Direct* method was applied, where an interval for the incidence of abortions per 1,000 women of fertile age was estimated based on the estimated interval of the proportion of abortions performed outside the formal health field (6-10%) and formula (1). The range of the proportion of abortions performed outside the formal field is based on the data provided by local NGOs and international literature [12, 13, 20, 21].

Then, two similar Bayesian binomial regression models were performed. In both, the number of abortions was modeled based on the percentage of households with UBN [22] and the number of establishments in the public health field per 1,000 women of fertile age, taking

the municipality as the unit of analysis. The formula for the linear predictor of the models is defined below (3).

$$\text{logit}(\pi) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \text{UBN} + \beta_2 \cdot \text{NEF} \tag{3}$$

$$\text{Priors: } \beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2 \sim \text{Normal}(\mu = 0, \sigma = 10) \tag{4}$$

Where π is the probability that a woman has an abortion, and β_0, β_1 and β_2 are the regression parameters corresponding to the intercept, the percentage of households with UBN, and the NEF (Number of Establishments per 1,000 women of fertile age) respectively.

For all these parameters, the prior distributions chosen were weakly informative since it was sought that the posterior distributions obtained are primarily defined by the data, since the previous information in relation to these parameters is scarce. With that same base model, two different models were trained, one with all the municipalities of the province and another only with the municipalities that belong to the sanitary regions with reliable registering, based on experts definition. These regions were VI, VIII, X, and XI, indicated as those where the Unified Registry of IVE/ILE was extensively applied. These models were called *All Departments model* and *Reliable Registering model*. With them, two interval estimates of R were made for each each sanitary region, and for the entire province. Then, the three estimates (Direct model, All Departments model, and Reliable Registering Rate model) were compared for the sanitary regions and province. This sensitivity analysis allows a clearer picture of the influence of the sources of uncertainty on the final estimate of the incidence of abortions. The R software, version 4.2.1 was used for data manipulation, statistical analysis, and visualization. Specifically, for Bayesian modeling, the "bmrs" package [23] was used.

For this study, ethical comittee aproval from the Ministry of Health of the Province of Buenos Aires was obtained (IF-2023-10921697-GDEBA-CECMSALGP).

This study did not receive any funding.

3 Results

In the literature search, a total of 1,343 scientific publications were found related to abortion incidence estimates, with 836 found in PubMed, 56 in Scielo, and 451 in the BVS. Of all the publications, 128 were specifically related to the calculation of incidence (Supplementary Table 1). There were 32 publications referring to abortion estimates in Latin American countries: Brazil (n= 13), Chile (n= 5), Colombia (n= 5), Mexico (n= 4), Cuba (n= 2), Peru (n= 2), Costa Rica (n= 1), Guatemala (n= 1) and Dominican Republic (n= 1). Of the total articles, only two present abortion estimates in Argentina, while none present disaggregated data for the province of Buenos Aires. Figure 1 shows the number of publications found per year.



Figure 2: Number of scientific publications per year. 1972-2022.

Based on the event registry, and during the period analysed, 34,354 abortions were recorded, of which 34,073 were performed in the public health sector with a residence in a the Province of Buenos Aires (PBA) municipality, while 281 were indicated within the PBA, but without specifying a municipality. One in every two abortions were performed in Primary Health Care Centers (CAPS), that implement promotion and prevention programs, while more than eight out of every ten used pharmacological methods (Figure 2). Regarding the analysis by age groups, it was observed that 54.1% of the procedures were performed on women between 20 and 29 years old (Table 2). The age group distribution for the different sanitary regions did not show statistically significant differences (p-value > 0.05), except in the case of sanitary region VII, where the proportion of people aged 15 to 19 (13.4%) shows significant differences compared to the rest of the age groups (15.2%-19.0%, p-values<0.001) excluding the 45-49 age segment. Furthermore, in sanitary region VII, significant differences are also observed between the 20-24 age group (15.2%) in relation to the 25-29 year interval (16.9%, p-value $= 0.02$), 35-39 years (17.4%, p-value $= 0.04$) and 40-44 years (19.0%, p-value $= 0.011$).

In terms of the establishment where the procedures were performed, there are significant differences between the proportions of people aged 15 to 19 who attended the CAPS (46.9%) and provincial hospitals (30.9%) compared to the 20-24 group (50.8%, p-value $= 0.01$ and 27.3%, p-value < 0.01), 25-29 (52.0%, p-value < 0.01 and 26.3%, p-value < 0.01) and 30-34 (52.3%, p-value < 0.01 and 26.2%, p-value < 0.01). On the other hand, the 45-49 age range has a lower proportion of abortions performed in CAPS (42.7%) than the younger age groups (46.9%-52.3%) and a higher proportion of procedures performed in municipal hospitals (21.8%) compared to the rest of the younger groups (16.3%-17.1%). However, none of these differences is statistically significant.



Figure 3: Pie charts of the proportion of registered abortions according to A) the type of institution where they were performed and B) the medical procedure.

The estimates of abortions per 1,000 women of fertile age and their 95% Credibility Intervals (IC95) by sanitary region are represented in Figure 3. In this figure, it can be observed that the Direct method retains the most variation of the estimates between the sanitary regions and that the estimates of the other two methods are usually higher. In the whole province, it was estimated by the Direct model that the number of abortions performed per 1,000 women of fertile age is between 25.50 and 28.05, while by the All Departments model, the estimated mean value was 26.45 (IC95: [26.08;26.83]) and by the Reliable Registering Rate model it was 29.92 (IC95: [29.38;30.47]). Based on these results, the total number of abortions performed in the province could be estimated. Assuming that the abortion rate between the private and public sectors is homogeneous, between 108,259 abortions (considering the lower value of the interval in the Direct model) and 129,374 (considering the higher value of the IC95 Reliable Registering model) are estimated for the province.

4 Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study in Argentina to estimate the number of abortions based on a direct counting methodology, focusing specifically on abortions that occurred within the public health subsector of Buenos Aires province. Considering multiple

Region	All	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	No data
I	628	53	169	189	117	75	21	2	2
II	332	45	105	82	52	32	10	4	2
III	359	26	111	76	73	29	9	1	34
IV	579	82	177	142	91	60	23	0	4
V	5183	590	1418	1328	902	512	192	15	226
VI	9293	1064	2554	2532	1740	949	342	23	89
VII	3924	388	1065	1083	712	431	174	13	58
VIII	2610	273	736	727	469	264	129	10	2
IX	440	42	120	128	75	57	12	3	3
X	564	68	172	150	90	54	19	1	10
XI	3108	348	938	842	508	320	99	12	41
XII	3426	405	1017	973	588	319	114	9	1
Total	30446	3384	8582	8252	5417	3102	1144	93	472

Table 2: Number of registered abortions per age and sanitary region.



Figure 4: Bar chart of the estimated R value of abortions per 1,000 women of fertile age, their different estimates and their credibility intervals by sanitary region and for the province of Buenos Aires.

models, the estimations range from 25.50 (model based on direct case counting) to 30.47 (model based on municipalities with reliable records) abortions per 1,000 women of fertile age. Specifically, the model with adjustment for underreporting (Reliable Registering model)

yields a value of 29.92 (95% CI: [29.38; 30.47]).

Mario and Pantelines [11] provide different estimates for the number of induced abortions in Argentina. In the year 2000, it was estimated that the annual abortion rate ranged from 40.8 to 49.0 induced abortions per 1,000 women aged 15 to 49 years using the method of hospital discharges. On the other side, an study by Atucha and Pailles [10] indicated a rate around 50.0. It is also kwnown that the abortion rate was reduced in the last years, related in part to the reduction of unintended pregnancy and the number of births in general [21]. In a recent study, Bearak et al. [21] estimate an average of 32 per 1,000 women in fertile age (27 to 37 considering 80% and 95% uncertainty interval) in Latin America and the Caribbean. In a country-level estimation, authors indicate a rate of 33 abortions per 1,000 for Argentina. These estimations are consistent with our Realiable Registering model, that falls within the uncertainity interval predicted for Latin America and the Caribbean.

Several factors can alter the estimate and introduce biases. Although abortion is legal in Argentina, the law that regulates it is recent, thus implying a transformation process by the health system, particularly in relation to the existing information systems. Due to the methodology employed and data sources, underreporting is a major issue. To correct for this, we utilised a set of municipalities where the records were considered to be sufficiently reliable to constitute the model. The problem of underreporting is common and has been observed in similar studies [12, 13, 20, 21]. Other factors that can alter the results obtained include abortions by residents of Buenos Aires province that occurred outside the province. This is primarily expected to occur with residents of Buenos Aires province municipalities adjacent to large urban centres, such as Buenos Aires City. It is worth noting that the inverse flow (residents from other districts who had abortions in Buenos Aires province) is detected and not considered within the estimate. Therefore, this is another factor contributing to underreporting in the estimate.

The study, being the first one conducted after the application of the law [2], is also the first that is based in direct counting of the cases. This results shows the importance of setting goals in relation to expanding the network of health establishments needed, the quantity of teams, their territorial distribution, as well as for planning the purchase of necessary supplies to guarantee the right throughout the provincial territory. In this regard, future studies are pending on the heterogeneity and impact of access inequalities in the Buenos Aires territory, which could facilitate the definition of priority areas.

Lastly, it should be noted that the estimates have a sociocultural impact. They allow for the dimensioning of the event's magnitude and thereby highlight that abortion is a common event in the lives of people with the capacity to gestate, dispelling the idea that abortion is an infrequent event or one that can be easily eliminated from the lives of women, trans men, and other people with various gender identities who are able to gestate. The magnitude of the event expressed in these estimates confirms that full guarantee of the right to comprehensive sexual health requires a network for abortion access, widely spread throughout the provincial territory.

References

[1] Ministerio de Salud de la Provincia de Buenos Aires (2021). Guía de implementación de la interrupción voluntaria del embarazo en la Provincia de Buenos Aires, en el marco de la Ley Nacional Nº 27.610. Disponible en: https://ministeriodelasmujeres.gba.gob.ar/drive/archivos/guiaimplementacionive.pdf

[2] Ley Nacional N° 27.610 de Interrupción Voluntaria del Embarazo (2020). Available on: https://www.boletinoficial.gob.ar/detalleAviso/primera/239807/20210115

[3] Código Penal de la Nación (1921), artículo 86, segundo párrafo, inciso 1 y 2. https://www.argentina.gob.ar/normativa/nacional/ley-11179-16546

[4] Corte Suprema de Justicia de la Nación, "F.A.L. s/ Medida autosatisfactiva", 13/03/2012, Disponible en: http://www.saij.gob.ar/corte-suprema-justicia-nacion-federal-ciudad-autonoma-buenos-aires–medidaautosatisfactiva-fa12000021-2012-03-13/123456789-120-0002-1ots-eupmocsollaf

[5] Programa Nacional de Salud Sexual y Procreación Responsable (2015). Protocolo para la atención integral de las personas con derecho a la interrupción legal del embarazo. Ministerio de Salud de la Nación. Available on: https://www.argentina.gob.ar/sites/default/files/senaf/materiales-otros-organismos/

[6] Rovere, M. (2016). El Sistema de Salud de la Argentina como campo; Tensiones, estratagemas y opacidades. Revista Debate Público. Reflexión de Trabajo Social, 6(12), 23-41.

[7] Ministerio de Salud de la Provincia de Buenos Aires (2022). Guía de Establacimientos Públicos, Dirección Provincial de Estadística y Salud Digital. Disponible en: https://www.ms.gba.gov.ar/sitios/infoensalud/establecimientos/

[8] Chiara, M., Di Virgilio, M. M., & Moro, J. (2009). "Inequidad (es) en la atención de la salud en el gran Buenos Aires: Una mirada desde la gestión local". Postdata, vol. 14, n°1, pp. 97-128.

[9] Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censo [INDEC]. (2010) proyecciones de población para la Provincia de Buenos Aires. https://www.indec.gob.ar/.

[10] Aller Atucha, L., & Pailles, J. (1996). La práctica del aborto en Argentina: actualización de los estudios realizados. Estimación de la magnitud del problema. In La práctica del aborto en Argentina: actualización de los estudios realizados. Estimación de la magnitud del problema.

[11] Mario, S., & Pantelides, E. A. (2009). Estimación de la magnitud del aborto inducido en la Argentina. Notas de población.

[12] Singh, S., Shekhar, C., Acharya, R., Moore, A. M., Stillman, M., Pradhan, M. R., ... & Browne, A. (2018). The incidence of abortion and unintended pregnancy in India, 2015. The Lancet Global Health, 6(1), e111-e120.

[13] Singh, S., & Wulf, D. (1994). Estimated levels of induced abortion in six Latin American countries. International Family Planning Perspectives, 4-13.

[14] Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censo [INDEC]. (2010) Censo Nacional de Población, Hogares y Viviendas. https://www.indec.gob.ar/.

[15] Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censo [INDEC]. (2010) proyecciones de población para la Provincia de Buenos Aires según sexo y grupos quinquenales de edad. Disponible en : (https://www.indec.gob.ar/indec/web/Nivel4-Tema-2-24-85).

[16] Juarez, F., Singh, S., Garcia, S. G., & Olavarrieta, C. D. (2008). Estimates of induced abortion in Mexico: what's changed between 1990 and 2006?. International Family Planning Perspectives, 158-168.

[17] Jones, R. K., & Jerman, J. (2017). Abortion incidence and service availability in the United States, 2014. Perspectives on sexual and reproductive health, 49(1), 17-27.

[18] Newcombe, R. G. (1998). Interval estimation for the difference between independent proportions: comparison of eleven methods. Statistics in Medicine, 17(8), 873–890. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0258(19980430)17:8<873::AID-SIM779>3.0.CO;2-I

[19] Holm, S. (1979). A Simple Sequentially Rejective Multiple Test Procedure. Scandinavian Journal of Statistics, 6(2), 65–70. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4615733

[20] Bearak, J., Popinchalk, A., Ganatra, B., Moller, A. B., Tunçalp, Ö., Beavin, C., ... & Alkema, L. (2020). Unintended pregnancy and abortion by income, region, and the legal status of abortion: estimates from a comprehensive model for 1990–2019. The Lancet Global Health, 8(9), e1152-e1161.

[21] Bearak, J. M., Popinchalk, A., Beavin, C., Ganatra, B., Moller, A. B., Tunçalp, Ö., & Alkema, L. (2022). Country-specific estimates of unintended pregnancy and abortion incidence: a global comparative analysis of levels in 2015–2019. BMJ Global Health, 7(3), e007151.

[22] Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censo [INDEC]. (2010) Porcentaje de hogares y de población con Necesidades Básicas Insatisfechas (NBI) provincia de Buenos Aires.

[23] Bürkner, P. C. (2017). brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. Journal of statistical software, 80, 1-28.

[24] Dirección Provincial de Estadística y Salud Digital. (2021) estadísticas vitales y egresos hospitalarios. https://www.ms.gba.gov.ar/sitios/infoensalud/