Cohort Profile: The Nepal Turnaway Study

Rachel Murro*, Sarah Raifman, W John Boscardin, Mahesh C Puri, Sunita Karki, Anupama Ale Magar, Dev Chandra Maharjan, Corinne H Rocca, M Antonia Biggs, Nadia G Diamond-Smith, Diana Greene Foster

Word count (main text): 3,065

*Corresponding author
Rachel Murro, MPH
UCSF Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics
rachel.murro@ucsf.edu

Sarah Raifman, PhD
Advancing Standards in Reproductive Health, UCSF Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology & Reproductive Sciences

W John Boscardin, PhD
UCSF Department of Medicine and UCSF Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics

Mahesh C Puri, PhD
Co-Director, Center for Research on Environment Health and Population Activities (CREHPA)

Sunita Karki, MPH
Research Associate, Center for Research on Environment Health and Population Activities (CREHPA)

Anupama Ale Magar, MPH
Research Officer, Center for Research on Environment Health and Population Activities (CREHPA)

Dev Chandra Maharjan, MSc
Senior Data Manager, Center for Research on Environment Health and Population Activities (CREHPA)

Corinne H Rocca, PhD, MPH
Advancing Standards in Reproductive Health, UCSF Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology & Reproductive Sciences

M Antonia Biggs, PhD
Advancing Standards in Reproductive Health, UCSF Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology & Reproductive Sciences

Nadia G Diamond-Smith, PhD
UCSF Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics and UCSF Institute for Global Health Sciences

Diana Greene Foster, PhD
Advancing Standards in Reproductive Health, UCSF Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology & Reproductive Sciences

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The Nepal Turnaway Study was designed to understand abortion care experiences and the longitudinal wellbeing of abortion-seekers and their families.

Participants: The Nepal Turnaway Study is a nation-wide cohort of abortion seekers recruited from public and private facilities across all seven provinces between April 2019 and December 2020. It contains 1,832 abortion seekers followed for up to five years. Repeated measures of socioeconomic status, health and wellbeing—including maternal physical and mental health and child health (under age three)—were collected every six months or annually, alongside detailed pregnancy and abortion-seeking histories.

Findings to date: Abortion seekers in this context can be recruited at health facilities (96% participation) and successfully followed for up to five years (87% retention). Nearly half (49%, n=856) of abortion seekers were initially denied their abortion, and 16% (n=275) ultimately carried the pregnancy to term and gave birth. Those who were denied were more likely to be socioeconomically disadvantaged prior to abortion seeking.

Future plans: The Nepal Turnaway Study will be used to understand the longitudinal health and socioeconomic effects of receiving a wanted abortion in this setting. Exposure-balancing weights can be applied to ensure rigorous estimation of the effects of abortion denial on longitudinal outcomes. This cohort can also be used more broadly to examine the trajectories of women and their families in the years following abortion-seeking.

Registration: This study has been registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT03930576)

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- The primary strength of the Nepal Turnaway Study is the recruitment of individuals at the time of abortion seeking, with prospective follow-up. This design ensures accurate measurement of pregnancy outcomes and establishes temporality between abortion receipt and subsequent longitudinal outcomes.
- The five-year follow-up period enables assessment of both immediate and longer-term health and wellbeing among abortion seekers. It also allows examination of outcomes for children born before and in the years following abortion seeking, capturing broader family-level implications.
- Future collaborations are welcome, and researchers may rigorously examine the effects of receiving a wanted abortion by applying exposure-balancing weights that have already been derived using propensity score methods
- Loss to follow-up and administrative censoring at study end may limit statistical power for some analyses and could introduce bias.
- Although the study seeks to emulate a target trial, participants were not randomized to pregnancy outcome groups; therefore, unmeasured or unknown confounding may affect longitudinal analyses.

INTRODUCTION

Globally, over 121 million unintended pregnancies occur each year [1]. Unwanted or mistimed births can be associated with negative physical, social and economic consequences [2,3]. The ability to avoid and terminate unintended pregnancies is thus a fundamental component of reproductive health and autonomy. However, in low-income countries, 60% of unintended pregnancies do not end in abortion [1], and over three quarters of abortions are performed in unsafe conditions [4]. Carrying an unwanted pregnancy to term may lead to poor health outcomes for both birthing people and their families [5], and the consequences of unsafe abortion can include infection, infertility, and death [6]. An estimated eight percent of maternal deaths worldwide are due to unsafe abortion [7], though this is likely an underestimate due to the difficulty of measuring abortion-related mortality and morbidity [7,8].

Abortion is permitted in Nepal with the consent of the pregnant woman up to 12 weeks' gestation and up to 28 weeks' in cases of rape, incest, if the woman is living with an incurable disease, danger to the woman's life, or fetal anomaly [9]. However, access to abortion services remains limited, particularly for women in poverty or rural areas, where over 80% of the population resides [10,11]. Only physicians and midlevel providers certified in safe abortion care by the government can provider legal abortion services, limiting service delivery [12]. Additionally, stigma and insufficient knowledge of the law prevent women from obtaining care, even if they are legally eligible for free or low cost care [13,14]. Poor availability of and access to legal abortion care may lead women to 1) seek unsafe alternatives or 2) carry an unwanted pregnancy to term. As of 2014, over half of abortions in Nepal were performed without a certified provider or in other illegal circumstances [15]. The burden of unwanted births due to lack of abortion access in Nepal remains understudied.

Given this literature gap, researchers from the University of California, San Francisco in the United States and The Center for Research on Environment Health and Population Activities (CREHPA) in Kathmandu, Nepal collaborated to adapt the cohort design of the U.S. Turnaway Study to Nepal. The U.S. Turnaway Study successfully evaluated the mental health, physical health, and socioeconomic outcomes of individuals who both received or were denied a wanted abortion.

The Nepal Turnaway Study is a prospective longitudinal study of women with unwanted pregnancies – pregnancies which they seek to abort rather than carry to term – designed chiefly to investigate the consequences for women and their families of legal abortion, abortion outside of the legal system, and delivery of an unwanted pregnancy in Nepal.

COHORT DESCRIPTION

Study overview and data collection procedures

(Figure 1 here)

From April 2019 through December 2020, women seeking abortion care were recruited at 22 facilities across Nepal (Figure 1). Initial recruitment began at 14 public and private/non-profit sites, with one of each type selected in all seven provinces. Facilities were chosen randomly, with the probability of selection proportional to client volume, from the national list of certified abortion facilities that had performed at least 60 abortions per year during 2016–2017. These sites together accounted for most legal abortion services provided nationally at that time. In late 2019, seven of the original facilities were replaced and one new site was added because of

limited numbers of eligible participants at seven locations. The same sampling approach was used to identify the new site. Recruitment was suspended twice during the study period: first between October 2019 and January 2020 to replace the seven facilities with low numbers of eligible women, and again from April to June 2020 because of travel restrictions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic.

Women aged 15 years and older who sought abortion care at participating study facilities and resided in Nepal were eligible for enrollment. In the initial recruitment phase (April 15–May 10, 2019), women at any gestational age were invited to participate. From May 11, 2019 through December 31, 2020, eligibility was limited to women presenting at or beyond ten weeks of gestation, or those uncertain of their gestational age, to ensure adequate representation of individuals more likely to be denied services. No additional exclusion criteria were applied. 100% of abortion-seekers were screened for study eligibility by a doctor, nurse, or counselor upon arrival to the facility. These point people recorded the patient's age and estimated gestation (reported by the patient based on their last menstrual period), determined the patient's eligibility for legal abortion, and recorded the reason for abortion ineligibility, if relevant. If a woman was eligible for the study, she was subsequently taken to a private clinic room to speak with a trained research staff member. The research staff member confirmed study eligibility and obtained written informed consent. A thumbprint was obtained for women unable to sign. In the case of minors under 18 years of age, participants provided assent for participation and interviewers obtained consent from one biological parent.

Participants completed a baseline survey immediately after recruitment, before receiving abortion services. Follow-up interviews were conducted six weeks after baseline and then at six-month intervals over five years, at the participant's home or another chosen location. Interviews, lasting about 40 minutes, were conducted in the participant's preferred language (Nepali, Maithali, Tharu, Bhojpuri, or Hindi) and participants received NRs 500 (approximately $4 USD) for each interview. Initially, participants consented to surveys for up to three years, but starting in March 2023, consent was obtained for continued participation for up to five years. Interviews ended in December 2024 when funding was exhausted. By December 2024, some participants had completed five years of interviews, while others were administratively censored.

Retention

Between April 2019 and December 2020, 8,849 women sought abortion care at the 22 study recruitment sites. Of these, 1,916 (22%) were eligible for the study and 1,832 (96% of eligible women) agreed to participate and complete a baseline interview at the recruitment facility.

(Table 1 here)

Of the 1,832 women who completed baseline surveys, 90 have unknown pregnancy outcomes: 86 were lost before the six-week follow-up, and four were lost after completing the six-week survey while still pregnant. For most studies of this cohort, this results in an analytical sample of 1,742 women. Compared to participants with known pregnancy outcomes, these 90 women were more likely to be younger, more likely to be unmarried, of Dalit ethnicity, and at greater than 10 weeks' gestation or uncertain gestation at baseline. They were also more likely to have no children or only boys and to report lower pregnancy wantedness for the index pregnancy.

Retention assessments are complicated by the cessation of data collection in December 2024 due to funding constraints. Only participants recruited before December 2019 were able to complete the full 60 months of interviews, while all others were administratively censored. By

study completion, 1,073 participants (62%) completed 60-month interviews, 478 (27%) were actively participating but censored after the 48- or 54-month survey, and 191 (11%) were lost to follow-up. Table 1 shows participation by survey round. Eleven percent of participants were lost to follow-up after their pregnancy outcome was determined, with no systematic differences observed between those lost early and those retained until the study's end.

Participants with a known pregnancy outcome were followed for an average of 56 months, with slightly longer follow-up for those who obtained an abortion (56.5 months) compared to those who gave birth (53.7 months). This stems from the initial recruitment phase when all abortion-seekers were eligible regardless of gestation. After the first month, recruitment shifted to women later in pregnancy or uncertain of their gestational age, who were more likely to be denied an abortion and to give birth, and also more likely to face administrative censoring by the end of data collection. Because abortion denial differed by baseline characteristics, differences were observed across administrative censoring groups for indicators such as caste, education, employment, facility type, travel distance, gestational age, empowerment, income, and abortion-seeking reasons. However, as this type of censoring was administrative and entirely explained by gestational age, missing data can be classified as "Missing at Random," meaning missingness is attributable to known variables [16]. Correctly specified analysis models using maximum-likelihood-based methods are robust to this type of informative censoring [16]. Therefore, as long as gestational age is appropriately accounted for in future regression adjustments or balancing weights, and maximum-likelihood-based models are applied, estimates from this cohort examining the effect of abortion denial remain unbiased by administrative censoring. Among participants recruited early enough to complete all 60 months (65% of respondents), retention was 86.3% for those who gave birth and 87.0% for those who obtained an abortion.

Measures and key variables

The Nepal Turnaway study collected data on a range of measures to capture the social, economic, emotional, mental, and physical wellbeing of participants and their families. Table 2 documents all measures and collection frequency.

(Table 2 here)

This cohort is unique in capturing abortion care seeking experiences and outcomes. Of the 1,746 participants with known pregnancy outcomes, 890 were classified as having received an abortion, while 856 were initially denied abortion. Among those denied, 536 subsequently obtained an abortion, 41 experienced a pregnancy loss, and 275 gave birth (figure 2). Detailed methodology for determining abortion denial status is in the Supplementary Materials.

(Figure 2 here)

For future analyses, we propose that abortion denial be defined using two indicators: (1) a three-category indicator—initially received abortion ("Abortion" group), initially denied but did not carry the pregnancy to term ("Turnaway – No Birth" group), and denied abortion and gave birth ("Turnaway – Birth group); and (2) a binary indicator—"No Birth" group vs. "Gave Birth" group. Given limited evidence on abortion-seeking in this setting, it is reasonable to justify both treating those initially denied but not carrying to term as a separate group and grouping them with those who initially received abortions.

FINDINGS TO DATE

Sample characteristics at baseline

A total of 1,742 women were retained in the study long enough to ascertain their pregnancy outcome and are described in the first column of table 3. At baseline, most participants were married and the largest proportion were under age 25, followed by 25-29 years and 30-34 years. Participants came from diverse caste backgrounds, with greatest representation from the most advantaged groups (Brahmin/Chhetri/Thakuri) but notable proportions identifying as Hill Janajati, Terai Janajati, and Dalit castes. Educational attainment varied, though the majority had completed at least secondary schooling. Most were working, reported adequate household income, and had at least one child, with more than half already having a son. A minority sought abortion due to sex selection or fetal anomaly. More than a third of participants were at or below 10 weeks at the time of abortion seeking, though an equal number were over 10 weeks and a quarter were unsure of their gestation. Most sought care at private facilities, with almost half requiring substantial travel time. Overall self-rated pre-pregnancy health was high, though many reported chronic pain, a history of anxiety or depression, or experiences of intimate partner violence. Indicators of limited household autonomy were common, including reduced decision-making power, restricted mobility, and spousal alcohol use.

(Table 3 here)

Abortion denial

Data on abortion denial from the baseline and first follow-up survey have been published in a prior publication [17]. Though nearly half of women were initially denied their abortion, most sought care again at facilities and successfully ended their pregnancies. Those initially denied were primarily told they were too far along, even though many should have been eligible under current laws. Common reasons for seeking abortion were rooted in existing family structures, including having enough children, having a very young child, and financial constraints.

Table 3 also presents baseline differences across the two abortion study groups. Compared to those who received their abortion, women who gave birth were younger, more often belonged to the disadvantaged Dalit caste, and were less likely to have secondary or higher education, be employed outside the home, or have adequate income. They were more likely to live farther from the abortion facility, be at or above 10 weeks of pregnancy, and seek abortion for sex selection rather than fetal anomaly. These women also faced greater social disadvantages, including having a husband who drank daily, and experiencing intimate partner violence, limited household decision-making power, and restricted mobility outside the home (table 3). Standardized mean differences less than 0.1 demonstrate adequate covariate balance [18].

(Table 4 here)

Table 4 shows baseline differences among the three study groups. In several cases, the two Turnaway groups resembled each other but differed from those who received an abortion upon initial care-seeking: both were more likely than the abortion group to present above 10 weeks' gestation and to have no living children. In other cases, the Turnaway–Birth group stood apart from the other two groups who did not give birth, being younger, less likely to be Brahmin/Chhetri/Thakuri, more often Dalit/other caste, less educated, and more likely to have a husband who drinks daily.

This study was modeled after the US Turnaway Study, which used a natural experiment design to compare the effects of carrying an unwanted pregnancy to term versus receiving an abortion by studying only those nearing the gestational age limit [5]. In Nepal, unlike in the US, abortion denial depended not only on gestational age but also on provider availability, biases, and sociodemographic factors, with pregnancy outcomes differing among those denied an abortion [17]. Pregnancy outcomes among those initially denied an abortion also varied by sociodemographic characteristics, as many did not carry the pregnancy to term. As a primary goal of the cohort was to identify the effects of abortion denial, balancing weights were developed to match covariate distributions across abortion exposure groups at baseline. These weights support analyses of average treatment effects for both binary exposure groups ("Gave Birth" vs. "No Birth") and three-category exposure groups ("Abortion" vs. "Turnaway – No Birth" vs. "Turnaway – Birth"). Detailed methods for weight generation and propensity score estimation are provided in the Supplementary Material.

Applying exposure balancing weights from propensity score models eliminates baseline differences between the two abortion exposure groups (table 3), as the overlap weighting method guarantees perfect covariate balance for two groups [18]. While weights for three exposure categories did not achieve perfect balance (table 4), they provided adequate covariate overlap, with further validation confirmed through additional balance diagnostics, found in the Supplementary Material.

Other publications to date

Albach and colleagues investigated prior abortion attempts in this cohort [19], finding that 14% of participants attempted to end their pregnancy before enrolling, with 83% using abortion medication and 79% obtaining it from pharmacists. Women who struggled to access abortion clinics were more likely to rely on pharmacy-dispensed medication, emphasizing the critical role of pharmacists in abortion care provision.

A COVID-19 analysis from the Nepal Turnaway Study cohort [20] revealed that 93% of participants experienced pandemic-related impacts, with economic challenges, difficulty accessing necessities, and interruptions to children's education being common. Women denied abortion and later giving birth faced greater difficulties accessing health services and financial challenges, suggesting the pandemic worsened social and health inequities, including barriers to abortion access.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

This cohort documents the trajectories of abortion seekers for the first time in a context with high maternal mortality, documented practice of abortion outside of the formal medical system, and high poverty levels. A chief strength of the cohort is the recruitment of women prior to the end of their pregnancy, allowing for accurate capture of pregnancy outcomes among women seeking to end their pregnancies. Most studies that have attempted to estimate the morbidity that results from unintended pregnancies or unwanted births rely on cross-sectional or retrospective data, which suffers from potentially severe biases [21]. Given the stigma associated with abortion, women are often unwilling to report past abortions – or they report them as miscarriages – leading to significant selection bias [22,23].

A primary goal of this cohort was to quantify the effects of abortion denial. The comparison group proposed here, those who obtained a legal, facility-based abortion, offers the appropriate

counterfactual for both illegal abortion and carrying an unwanted pregnancy to term. Causal claims about abortion denial are strengthened by prospective longitudinal data collection, ensuring outcomes studied did not precede the exposure. Additionally, recruiting participants at the point of abortion-seeking allows us to control for risk factors common to women with unwanted pregnancies seeking abortion. We used propensity score weighting based on over 15 baseline characteristics and their interactions to improve covariate balance and estimate average treatment effects. Specifically, overlap weighting was applied, a technique estimating treatment effects among individuals with sufficient representation across study groups. This method is particularly useful when certain subgroups are likely to fall into only one exposure category—for instance, participants presenting at the earliest gestation were very likely to obtain an abortion. By focusing on individuals who could plausibly fall within all exposure groups, overlap weights yield more precise estimates of average treatment effects relevant to real-world situations.

This study has several limitations. First, propensity score weighting accounts only for measured confounders. Unmeasured or unknown factors that influence both whether someone is denied an abortion and subsequent outcomes may still introduce residual confounding. To the extent that such factors are strongly correlated with included covariates, they may be partially or fully accounted for. Second, we have potential sources of selection bias. While less than five percent of individuals were lost to follow-up after baseline, these women were excluded from all longitudinal analyses and differed from those retained in several key characteristics. Third, 27% of respondents included in longitudinal analyses were administratively censored after 48-54 months of follow-up (instead of followed through 60 months), limiting the power of analyses in the last year of follow-up. However, this administrative censoring was caused by intentional changes in recruitment strategy aimed at selecting individuals with later gestation and thus is completely explained by baseline characteristics incorporated into models. In this situation, estimates derived from maximum-likelihood-based methods are relatively unbiased by the presence of censoring [16]. Lastly, 11% of respondents included in longitudinal analyses were lost to follow-up after the pregnancy resolved, although this attrition was nondifferential with respect to abortion denial.

COLLABORATION

The authors welcome reasonable proposals for collaboration, which should be directed to diana.greenefoster@ucsf.edu. Please refer to the list of survey measures published here and the publicly available dataset (see Data sharing statement) to identify potential research questions. A list of existing publications based on this cohort can be found at: [insert URL when live].

Ethics approval
Ethical review and approval was granted by The University of California, San Francisco Human Research Protection Program (18-25863) and the Ethics Committee of the Nepal Health Research Council (704/2018).

Funding
This work was supported by the National Institute of Health [R01-HD095181] and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation [32968] to Diana Greene Foster.

Acknowledgements
We thank the members of the National Technical Advisory Committee, including Chairs Dr. R. P. Bichha, Dr. Bhim Singh Tinkari, and Dr. Bibek Kumar Lal, for their guidance and support. We are grateful to seven government hospitals, MSI, the Family Planning Association of Nepal, and Sunaulo Bhabishya Nepal's clinics for permitting us to conduct this study in their facilities and assisting with eligibility form completion. We acknowledge Preeti Gautam for project management support and Sara Daniels for data infrastructure. We thank the 24 research assistants for their dedicated work in data collection and, most importantly, the study participants for generously sharing their time and information.

Contributions
Conceptualization: MCP, DGF. Study design: MCP, CHR, MAB, NDS, DGF. Data curation: SR, MCP, SK, AAM, DCM, RM. Formal analysis and interpretation: RM, WJB, DGF, CHR, MAB, NGD-S. Writing: RM, DGF. Reviewing and editing: all authors. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Competing interests
None declared

Data sharing statement
Data are publicly available for five years at a third party website: https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/HMOWCA. To gain access, data requestors will need to sign a data access agreement.

Use of Artificial intelligence (AI) tools
ChatGPT-5 was used to improve readability and grammar.

Patient and public involvement
Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

References

1 Bearak J, Popinchalk A, Ganatra B, *et al.* Unintended pregnancy and abortion by income, region, and the legal status of abortion: estimates from a comprehensive model for 1990–2019. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2020;8:e1152–61. doi: 10.1016/s2214-109x(20)30315-6

2 Yeatman S, Smith-Greenaway E. Women's health decline following (some) unintended births: a prospective study. *Demogr Res*. 2021;45:547–76. doi: 10.4054/DemRes.2021.45.17

3 Barbuscia A, Pailhé A, Solaz A. Unplanned births and their effects on maternal health: findings from the Constances Cohort. *Soc Sci Med*. 2024;361:117350. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117350

4 Ganatra B, Gerdts C, Rossier C, *et al.* Global, regional, and subregional classification of abortions by safety, 2010–14: estimates from a Bayesian hierarchical model. *Lancet*. 2017;390:2372–81. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(17)31794-4

5 Introduction to the Turnaway Study. Oakland, CA: Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health (ANSIRH) 2022.

6 Harris LH, Grossman D. Complications of unsafe and self-managed abortion. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382:1029–40. doi: 10.1056/nejmra1908412

7 Say L, Chou D, Gemmill A, *et al.* Global causes of maternal death: a WHO systematic analysis. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2014;2:e323–33. doi: 10.1016/s2214-109x(14)70227-x

8 Singh S, Maddow-Zimet I. Facility-based treatment for medical complications resulting from unsafe pregnancy termination in the developing world, 2012: a review of evidence from 26 countries. *BJOG*. 2016;123:1489–98. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.13552

9 Nepal Law Commission. The Right to Safe Motherhood and Reproductive Health Act, 2018. 2018.

10 Bell SO, Zimmerman L, Choi Y, *et al.* Legal but limited? Abortion service availability and readiness assessment in Nepal. *Health Policy Plan*. 2018;33:99–106. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czx149

11 Wu W-J, Maru S, Regmi K, *et al.* Abortion care in Nepal, 15 years after legalization: gaps in access, equity, and quality. *Health Hum Rights*. 2017;19:221–30.

12 Samandari G, Wolf M, Basnett I, *et al.* Implementation of legal abortion in Nepal: a model for rapid scale-up of high-quality care. *Reprod Health*. 2012;9. doi: 10.1186/1742-4755-9-7

13 Rocca C, Puri M, Dulal B, *et al.* Unsafe abortion after legalisation in Nepal: a cross-sectional study of women presenting to hospitals. *BJOG*. 2013;120:1075–84. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.12242

14 Puri M, Ingham R, Matthews Z. Factors affecting abortion decisions among young couples in Nepal. *J Adolesc Health*. 2007;40:535–42. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.01.010

15 Puri M, Singh S, Sundaram A, *et al.* Abortion incidence and unintended pregnancy in Nepal. *Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2016;42:197. doi: 10.1363/42e2116

16 Vittinghoff E, Glidden DV, Shiboski SC, *et al. Regression Methods in Biostatistics: Linear, Logistic, Survival, and Repeated Measures Models*. Boston, MA: Springer US 2012.

17 Puri MC, Raifman S, Daniel S, *et al.* Denial of legal abortion in Nepal. *PLoS ONE*. 2023;18:e0282886. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0282886

18 Li F, Li F. Propensity score weighting for causal inference with multiple treatments. *Ann Appl Stat*. 2019;13. doi: 10.1214/19-aoas1282

19 Ahlbach C, Puri MC, Daniel S, *et al.* Predictors of prior unsuccessful pharmacy abortion attempts among women presenting for abortion in government certified clinics in Nepal. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*. 2022;159:160–5. doi: 10.1002/ijgo.14141

20 Magar AA, Puri MC, Karki S, *et al.* Impact of COVID-19 among women seeking abortion services in Nepal: results from a longitudinal study. *Arch Public Health*. 2025;83:238. doi: 10.1186/s13690-025-01705-1

21 Nelson HD, Darney BG, Ahrens K, *et al.* Associations of unintended pregnancy with maternal and infant health outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2022;328:1714. doi: 10.1001/jama.2022.19097

22 Desai S, Lindberg LD, Maddow-Zimet I, *et al.* The impact of abortion underreporting on pregnancy data and related research. *Matern Child Health J*. 2021;25:1187–92. doi: 10.1007/s10995-021-03157-9

23 Gerdts C, Tunçalp O, Johnston H, *et al.* Measuring abortion-related mortality: challenges and opportunities. *Reprod Health*. 2015;12:87. doi: 10.1186/s12978-015-0064-1



Figure 1. Map of Nepal with study sites



Figure 2. Classification of pregnancy outcomes

Table 1. Number of interviews and retention by survey round			
	Number of interviews	**Percent retained since baseline**	
baseline	1,832	--	
6 week	1,665	91	
6 month	1,644	90	
12 month	1,631	89	
18 month	1,645	90	
24 month	1,648	90	
30 month	1,656	90	
36 month	1,642	90	
42 month	1,580	86	
48 month	1,550	85	
54 month	1,303	71	*Start of administrative censoring
60 month	1,057	58	

Table 2. List of survey measures

Category	Indicators	BL	6w	6m	12m	18m	24m	30m	36m	42m	48m	54m	60m
Respondent demographics[a]	Schooling, student status, work status/type; marriage/cohabitation status; household composition; household income adequacy; caste/ethnicity; religion; parity (lifetime history of pregnancies, births, miscarriages, abortions)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Life goals	Goals (school, work, marriage, childbearing, other) for next one year	✓			✓		✓					✓	
Life goals progress	Reflect whether 1-year goals from year prior were achieved				✓		✓		✓				
Husband demographics[b]	Husband age; husband schooling; age at cohabitation; marriage type; dowry		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Husband employment & migration	Husband work status/type; husband work abroad; current living arrangement/location		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Household infrastructure, assets, ownership	Water source; toilet type/shared; cooking fuel; household assets; bank account; floor/roof/walls; house/land/item ownership; sleeping rooms		✓			✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	
Household food security	Preferred foods unavailable; fewer meals; skipped meals		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓
Index pregnancy	Date of last menstrual period; weeks pregnant; pregnancy wantedness/intentions and partner agreement; mental health symptoms during pregnancy; perceived impacts of pregnancy; legal indications for abortion (rape/incest and provider-identified maternal/fetal risk)	✓											
History of contraceptive use	Ever used contraception; contraceptive use at time of conception; contraceptive decision-making (respondent/husband/joint)		✓										
Health seeking at enrollment facility	Travel time/mode/cost; lodging; barriers; accompaniment; decision-making; primary reason for abortion	✓											
Abortion care seeking before enrollment	Prior attempts to end pregnancy (number; method; people and providers involved; pill type/route; settings; care; reasons for no care)	✓											
Abortion at enrollment facility: care quality & outcomes	Method of abortion; counseling (use, expected symptoms, complications); regimen/dose/route; pill ID; completion of abortion; complications; post-abortion care and treatment; post-abortion physical limitations		✓										
Denied abortion at enrollment facility: Initial post-denial pathways	Reason and context for denial; details of subsequent abortion attempts (methods, sources, costs, travel, lodging, complications); current pregnancy status; details of miscarriage (if relevant)		✓										
Denied abortion at enrollment facility: Later post-denial pathways[c]	Pregnancy outcome (miscarriage/abortion/birth/still pregnant); details of subsequent abortion attempts (methods, sources, costs, travel, lodging, complications, post-abortion functional limitations); details of miscarriage (if relevant)			✓									
Subsequent pregnancies	Any new pregnancies since last interview; attempts to end subsequent pregnancies (method, people involved, pills/regimen/route, settings, care/treatment, costs, complications, post-abortion physical limitations); current pregnancy status; date of last menstrual period and weeks pregnant (if currently pregnant); subsequent pregnancy outcomes (miscarriage, live birth, stillbirth)			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Knowledge of abortion legality	General legality; specific circumstances; guardian/husband permission		✓										
Maternal perinatal health[d]	health provider and visits during pregnancy; maternal health and nutrition during pregnancy; sex determination; delivery place/attendant; delivery payments; postpartum maternal complications; post-birth physical limitations		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Infant health[d]	Live or stillbirth; infant death (cause); child sex; birth weight/size; preterm; breastfeeding practices		▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
Mother–infant bonding[e]			▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
Child preventive care & recent illness[f]	Vaccinations; vitamin A/iron/deworming; diarrhea (symptoms and care); fever/cough (symptoms and care); disability; serious injuries		▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
Age-specific child development screening[f]			▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
Women's empowerment and relationship quality	Household decision-making power; mobility/freedom, relationship happiness, husband alcohol consumption	▯			▯		▯		▯		▯		▯
Relationship commitment/trust			▯		▯		▯		▯		▯		▯
Violence[g]	Psychological, economic, physical and sexual violence from intimate partner; violence from non-partner(s)	▯			▯		▯		▯		▯		▯
Mental health screening[h]	Generalized anxiety disorder; depression; post-traumatic stress disorder; stress; life satisfaction; community abortion stigma	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
Physical health—self-rating & diagnoses[i]	Self-rated health; clinician-diagnosed conditions (anemia, hypertension, diabetes, cholesterol, asthma; chronic respiratory disease, cancer); types of chronic pain	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
Fertility intentions & contraceptive use[j]	Current pregnancy intentions/wantedness; recent contraceptive use; reasons for nonuse		▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯
Anthropometry[k]	Weight, height, and mid upper arm circumference		▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯	▯

Notes: *BL*=baseline; *w*=weeks, *m*=months.

a. Limited respondent demographics recorded at 6w if already taken at BL, time-invariant demographics asked only once (BL or 6w)
b. Husband demographics only asked after 6w if newly married since prior wave
c. Later post-denial pathways asked at 6m for those still pregnant at 6w, asked at first follow-up visit for participants that were unreachable at 6w
d. Maternal perinatal health and infant health indicators measured for index and subsequent pregnancies ending in births only
e. Maternal-infant bonding measured for all children child <18 months (index, subsequent, or prior children)
f. Child preventive care & recent illness and child development measured for all children < 3 years (index, subsequent, and prior children)
g. Sexual violence not asked at 12m or 24m
h. Abortion stigma asked only at 6w and at all follow-ups; Lifetime history of mental health conditions also recorded at BL
i. Both pre-pregnancy and current self-rated health measured at BL; Chronic respiratory disease and cancer only measured at follow-ups
j. Current fertility intentions & contraceptive use only asked if respondent reports not pregnant and not sterilized
k. Anthropometry measured for respondent and all children <3 years (index, subsequent, or prior children)

Table 3. Baseline characteristics by two-category abortion denial exposure

	Unweighted				Weighted		
	Total N=1742	**No Birth N=1467**	**Gave Birth N=275**	**Standardized mean difference**	**No Birth**	**Gave Birth**	**Standardized mean difference**
Demographic characteristics							
Age, years							
≤24	579 (33.2)	469 (32.0)	110 (40.0)	0.17	(38.6)	(38.6)	<.01
25-29	504 (28.9)	415 (28.3)	89 (32.4)	0.09	(32.6)	(32.6)	<.01
30-34	380 (21.8)	332 (22.6)	48 (17.5)	0.13	(17.8)	(17.8)	<.01
35+	279 (16.0)	251 (17.1)	28 (10.2)	0.20	(10.9)	(10.9)	<.01
Marital status							
Unmarried	48 (2.8)	42 (2.9)	6 (2.2)	--	(2.6)	(2.6)	--
Married	1694 (97.2)	1425 (97.1)	19 (97.8)	0.04	(97.4)	(97.4)	<.01
Caste							
Brahmin/Chhetri/Thakuri	683 (39.4)	594 (40.6)	89 (32.6)	0.16	(34.5)	(34.2)	<.01
Hill Janajati	415 (23.9)	346 (23.7)	69 (25.3)	0.04	(24.9)	(25.1)	<.01
Dalit/other	259 (14.9)	192 (13.1)	67 (24.5)	0.29	(21.6)	(21.7)	<.01
Terai Janajati	378 (21.8)	330 (22.6)	48 (17.6)	0.13	(19.0)	(19.1)	<.01
Education							
None/ some formal schooling	279 (16.1)	230 (15.7)	49 (17.9)	0.06	(17.4)	(17.6)	<.01
Primary	267 (15.4)	203 (13.9)	64 (23.4)	0.24	(21.1)	(21.1)	<.01
Secondary	1069 (61.6)	920 (63.0)	149 (54.6)	0.17	(56.9)	(56.6)	<.01
Higher	119 (6.9)	108 (7.4)	11 (4.0)	0.15	(4.7)	(4.7)	<.01
Employment status							
Not currently working	800 (46.1)	658 (45.0)	142 (52.0)	--	(51.1)	(50.8)	--
Currently working	935 (53.9)	804 (55.0)	131 (48.0)	0.14	(48.9)	(49.2)	<.01
No. of living children							
0	231 (13.3)	200 (13.6)	31 (11.3)	0.07	(12.1)	(12.1)	<.01
1	520 (29.9)	438 (29.9)	82 (29.8)	<.01	(30.0)	(30.0)	<.01
2	621 (35.6)	530 (36.1)	91 (33.1)	0.06	(33.8)	(33.8)	<.01
3+	370 (21.2)	299 (20.4)	71 (25.8)	0.13	(24.1)	(24.1)	<.01
Sex of living children							
No boys	726 (41.7)	608 (41.4)	118 (42.9)	--	(43.9)	(43.9)	--
1+ boys	1016 (58.3)	859 (58.6)	157 (57.1)	0.03	(56.1)	(56.1)	<.01
Income adequacy							
Not Adequate	463 (26.7)	357 (24.4)	106 (39.0)	0.31	(34.7)	(35.0)	<.01
Adequate	1228 (70.9)	1066 (73.0)	162 (59.6)	0.28	(63.7)	(63.4)	<.01
More than adequate	42 (2.4)	38 (2.6)	4 (1.5)	0.08	(1.5)	(1.5)	<.01
Pregnancy and clinic factors							

Unintended Pregnancy Score	3.7 (2.7)	3.7 (2.7)	3.8 (2.6)	0.05	3.7 (2.6)	3.7 (2.6)	<.01
Seeking for sex selection	167 (9.6)	116 (7.9)	51 (18.5)	0.32	(16.5)	(16.5)	<.01
Seeking for fetal anomaly	181 (10.4)	174 (11.9)	7 (2.5)	0.37	(3.4)	(3.4)	<.01
Gestational age							
at or below 10 weeks	648 (37.2)	613 (41.8)	35 (12.7)	0.69	(16.3)	(16.3)	<.01
above 10 weeks	635 (36.5)	486 (33.1)	149 (54.2)	0.43	(51.0)	(51.0)	<.01
don't know gestation	459 (26.3)	368 (25.1)	91 (33.1)	0.18	(32.6)	(32.6)	<.01
Seeking at private facility	1244 (71.4)	1047 (71.4)	197 (71.6)	0.01	(72.3)	(72.3)	<.01
Travel distance to facility							
Less than a 30 minutes	535 (31.2)	482 (33.3)	53 (19.6)	0.31	(21.8)	(21.6)	<.01
30 minutes to 1 hour	395 (23.0)	331 (22.9)	64 (23.7)	0.01	(24.4)	(24.8)	<.01
1 to 3 hours	413 (24.1)	333 (23.0)	80 (29.6)	0.16	(28.2)	(27.8)	<.01
3+ hours	374 (21.8)	301 (20.8)	73 (27.0)	0.14	(25.6)	(25.8)	<.01
Health and empowerment factors							
Chronic pain							
No	996 (57.4)	830 (56.8)	166 (60.6)	0.08	(59.7)	(59.6)	<.01
Yes	684 (39.4)	582 (39.8)	102 (37.2)	0.05	(37.5)	(37.6)	<.01
Don't know	56 (3.2)	50 (3.4)	6 (2.2)	0.07	(2.8)	(2.8)	<.01
Pre-pregnancy self-rated health							
Good or very good	1575 (90.7)	1333 (91.2)	242 (88.3)	--	(88.9)	(88.9)	--
Poor or very poor	161 (9.3)	129 (8.8)	32 (11.7)	0.09	(11.1)	(11.1)	<.01
History of anxiety or depression	551 (31.7)	459 (31.4)	92 (33.6)	0.05	(31.9)	(32.0)	<.01
Husband's alcohol consumption							
Never or rarely	982 (58.2)	836 (59.0)	146 (54.5)	0.10	(56.2)	(56.3)	<.01
1-2x per month	356 (21.1)	308 (21.7)	48 (17.9)	0.09	(18.5)	(18.5)	<.01
At least 1x per week	192 (11.4)	157 (11.1)	35 (13.1)	0.06	(12.0)	(12.0)	<.01
Every day	156 (9.3)	117 (8.3)	39 (14.6)	0.20	(13.3)	(13.2)	<.01
Intimate partner violence	388 (23.0)	313 (22.1)	75 (28.0)	0.14	(25.1)	(25.0)	<.01
Limited mobility	413 (23.7)	329 (22.4)	84 (30.5)	0.18	(28.2)	(28.2)	<.01
Household decision-making power							
None	866 (51.4)	707 (49.9)	159 (59.3)	0.18	(58.4)	(58.5)	<.01
Some	244 (14.5)	212 (15.0)	32 (11.9)	0.08	(12.0)	(12.0)	<.01
More	575 (34.1)	498 (35.1)	77 (28.7)	0.13	(29.6)	(29.5)	<.01

Notes: Unweighted data are presented as N(column %) for categorical measures and mean(SD) for ordinal measures. Exposure balancing weights derived from propensity scores predicting exposure (gave birth). Weighted results apply to artificially balanced sample and thus counts are not shown.

Table 4. Baseline sociodemographic characteristics by three-category abortion denial exposure

	Unweighted					Weighted			
	Total N=1742	**Abortion n=890**	**Turnaway-No Birth n=577**	**Turnaway - Birth n=275**	**Standardized mean difference**	**Abortion**	**Turnaway - No Birth**	**Turnaway-Birth**	**Standardiz mean differenc**
Demographic characteristics									
Age, years									
≤24	579 (33.2)	290 (32.6)	179 (31.0)	110 (40.0)	0.19	(35.1)	(37.8)	(36.8)	0.06
25-29	504 (28.9)	244 (27.4)	171 (29.6)	89 (32.4)	0.11	(33.0)	(31.5)	(32.5)	0.03
30-34	380 (21.8)	207 (23.3)	125 (21.7)	48 (17.5)	0.14	(19.5)	(18.2)	(18.4)	0.03
35+	279 (16.0)	149 (16.7)	102 (17.7)	28 (10.2)	0.21	(12.4)	(12.6)	(12.3)	0.01
Marital status									
Unmarried	48 (2.8)	17 (1.9)	25 (4.3)	6 (2.2)	--	(2.9)	(3.2)	(2.9)	--
Married	1694 (97.2)	873 (98.1)	552 (95.7)	269 (97.8)	0.15	(97.1)	(96.8)	(97.1)	0.02
Caste									
Brahmin/Chhetri/Thakuri	683 (39.4)	352 (39.7)	242 (42.0)	89 (32.6)	0.19	(38.1)	(36.5)	(35.4)	0.05
Hill Janajati	415 (23.9)	236 (26.6)	110 (19.1)	69 (25.3)	0.18	(24.7)	(25.8)	(24.9)	0.03
Dalit/other	259 (14.9)	116 (13.1)	76 (13.2)	67 (24.5)	0.31	(18.7)	(19.0)	(19.7)	0.02
Terai Janajati	378 (21.8)	182 (20.5)	148 (25.7)	48 (17.6)	0.20	(18.4)	(18.6)	(20.0)	0.04
Education									
None/ some formal schooling	279 (16.1)	132 (14.9)	98 (17.0)	49 (17.9)	0.08	(17.8)	(16.4)	(17.3)	0.05
Primary	267 (15.4)	130 (14.7)	73 (12.7)	64 (23.4)	0.29	(18.4)	(18.0)	(19.9)	0.05
Secondary	1069 (61.6)	563 (63.6)	357 (62.0)	149 (54.6)	0.18	(58.2)	(61.3)	(57.8)	0.07
Higher	119 (6.9)	60 (6.8)	48 (8.3)	11 (4.0)	0.18	(5.6)	(4.2)	(5.0)	0.05
Employment status									
Not currently working	800 (46.1)	390 (44.0)	268 (46.5)	142 (52.0)	--	(49.5)	(48.3)	(49.0)	--
Currently working	935 (53.9)	496 (56.0)	308 (53.5)	131 (48.0)	0.16	(50.5)	(51.7)	(51.0)	0.03
No. of living children									
0	231 (13.3)	137 (15.4)	63 (10.9)	31 (11.3)	0.14	(11.7)	(12.6)	(12.9)	0.04
1	520 (29.9)	279 (31.3)	159 (27.6)	82 (29.8)	0.08	(31.8)	(31.0)	(31.0)	0.02
2	621 (35.6)	304 (34.2)	226 (39.2)	91 (33.1)	0.13	(32.9)	(33.3)	(33.1)	0.01
3+	370 (21.2)	170 (19.1)	129 (22.4)	71 (25.8)	0.16	(23.6)	(23.1)	(22.9)	0.01
Sex of living children									
No boys	726 (41.7)	352 (39.6)	256 (44.4)	118 (42.9)	--	(39.0)	(40.4)	(42.2)	--
1+ boys	1016 (58.3)	538 (60.4)	321 (55.6)	157 (57.1)	0.10	(61.0)	(59.6)	(57.8)	0.06
Income adequacy									
Not Adequate	463 (26.7)	191 (21.6)	166 (28.9)	106 (39.0)	0.38	(31.2)	(32.5)	(32.0)	0.03
Adequate	1228 (70.9)	670 (75.6)	396 (68.9)	162 (59.6)	0.34	(67.7)	(65.4)	(66.4)	0.05
More than adequate	42 (2.4)	25 (2.8)	13 (2.3)	4 (1.5)	0.09	(1.1)	(2.1)	(1.6)	0.07
Pregnancy and clinic factors									
Unintended Pregnancy Score	3.7 (2.7)	3.6 (2.6)	3.8 (2.8)	3.8 (2.6)	0.08	3.5 (2.6)	3.5 (2.6)	3.5 (2.4)	0.02

Seeking for sex selection	167 (9.6)	27 (3.0)	89 (15.4)	51 (18.5)	0.48	(10.9)	(10.1)	(11.0)	0.03
Seeking for fetal anomaly	181 (10.4)	130 (14.6)	44 (7.6)	7 (2.5)	0.45	(4.5)	(4.9)	(5.5)	0.04
Gestational age									
at or below 10 weeks	648 (37.2)	453 (50.9)	160 (27.7)	35 (12.7)	0.88	(22.2)	(20.3)	(21.7)	0.04
above 10 weeks	635 (36.5)	193 (21.7)	293 (50.8)	149 (54.2)	0.69	(44.3)	(45.1)	(45.4)	0.02
don't know gestation	459 (26.3)	244 (27.4)	124 (21.5)	91 (33.1)	0.26	(33.5)	(34.6)	(32.9)	0.04
Seeking at private facility	1244 (71.4)	584 (65.6)	463 (80.2)	197 (71.6)	0.33	(73.5)	(71.9)	(73.1)	0.04
Travel distance to facility									
Less than a 30 minutes	535 (31.2)	318 (36.2)	164 (28.9)	53 (19.6)	0.36	(26.9)	(25.2)	(24.4)	0.04
30 minutes to 1 hour	395 (23.0)	197 (22.4)	134 (23.6)	64 (23.7)	0.03	(22.8)	(23.2)	(25.7)	0.05
1 to 3 hours	413 (24.1)	199 (22.6)	134 (23.6)	80 (29.6)	0.17	(25.6)	(26.1)	(24.8)	0.02
3+ hours	374 (21.8)	165 (18.8)	136 (23.9)	73 (27.0)	0.19	(24.7)	(25.5)	(25.2)	0.02
Health and empowerment factors									
Chronic pain									
No	996 (57.4)	489 (55.2)	341 (59.2)	166 (60.6)	0.11	(58.2)	(59.9)	(58.9)	0.03
Yes	684 (39.4)	378 (42.7)	204 (35.4)	102 (37.2)	0.15	(38.8)	(37.8)	(37.6)	0.02
Don't know	56 (3.2)	19 (2.1)	31 (5.4)	6 (2.2)	0.18	(3.0)	(2.3)	(3.5)	0.07
Pre-pregnancy self-rated health									
Good or very good	1575 (90.7)	805 (90.9)	528 (91.7)	242 (88.3)	--	(88.8)	(90.4)	(88.5)	--
Poor or very poor	161 (9.3)	81 (9.1)	48 (8.3)	32 (11.7)	0.11	(11.2)	(9.6)	(11.5)	0.06
History of anxiety or depression	551 (31.7)	269 (30.4)	190 (33.0)	92 (33.6)	0.07	(31.9)	(33.0)	(31.0)	0.05
Husband's alcohol consumption									
Never or rarely	982 (58.2)	503 (58.0)	333 (60.4)	146 (54.5)	0.13	(59.5)	(58.9)	(57.1)	0.05
1-2x per month	356 (21.1)	187 (21.6)	121 (22.0)	48 (17.9)	0.09	(18.6)	(17.7)	(19.5)	0.04
At least 1x per week	192 (11.4)	100 (11.5)	57 (10.3)	35 (13.1)	0.09	(10.7)	(12.4)	(11.0)	0.05
Every day	156 (9.3)	77 (8.9)	40 (7.3)	39 (14.6)	0.24	(11.2)	(10.9)	(12.4)	0.05
Intimate partner violence	388 (23.0)	209 (24.1)	104 (18.9)	75 (28.0)	0.22	(24.2)	(24.0)	(24.4)	0.01
Limited mobility	413 (23.7)	187 (21.0)	142 (24.6)	84 (30.5)	0.22	(28.1)	(25.5)	(26.0)	0.06
Household decision-making power									
None	866 (51.4)	410 (47.3)	297 (53.9)	159 (59.3)	0.23	(56.7)	(53.8)	(57.1)	0.06
Some	244 (14.5)	139 (16.1)	73 (13.2)	32 (11.9)	0.12	(11.7)	(13.7)	(12.3)	0.06
More	575 (34.1)	317 (36.6)	181 (32.8)	77 (28.7)	0.16	(31.6)	(32.6)	(30.6)	0.04

Notes: Unweighted data are presented as N(column %) for categorical measures and mean(SD) for ordinal measures. Exposure balancing weights derived from propensity scores predicting exposure (abortion denial/pregnancy outcome). Weighted results apply to artificially balanced sample and thus counts are not shown. Standardized mean difference for multicategory abortion denial exposure calculated using minimum and maximum means from the three study groups.