Cohort profile: The Nepal Turnaway Study

Rachel Murro[1]*, Sarah Raifman[2], W John Boscardin[1,3], Mahesh C Puri[4], Sunita Karki[4], Anupama Ale Magar[4], Dev Chandra Maharjan[4], Corinne H Rocca[2], M Antonia Biggs[2], Nadia G Diamond-Smith[1,6], Diana Greene Foster[2]

[1] Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California, United States of America

[2] Advancing Standards in Reproductive Health, Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences, University of California, San Francisco, Oakland CA, United States of America

[3] Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, California, United States of America

[4] Center for Research on Environment Health and Population Activities (CREHPA), Kathmandu, Nepal

[6] Institute for Global Health Sciences, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California, United States of America

* Corresponding author
E-mail: rachel.murro@ucsf.edu (RM)

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 (85% 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)

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]

The Government of Nepal has taken steps to protect options for fertility planning as part of women's reproductive health services. In 2002, abortion was legalized under certain circumstances by amending the country's Penal Code (Mulki Ain)[9] and in 2018, parliament passed a separate measure, The Safe Motherhood and Reproductive Health Rights (SMRHR) Act, which guaranteed women's rights to legal and safe abortion care on wider grounds.[10] Under the SMRHR Act, abortion is permitted with the consent of the pregnant woman up to 12 weeks' gestation and up to 28 weeks' in cases of rape, incest or the following situations: if the pregnant woman is living with HIV or some other incurable disease; if the pregnancy poses a danger to the woman's life, physical health or mental health; or if there is a fetal anomaly. These national efforts are reflective of a significant shift in women rights and health. Prior to 2002, many women were imprisoned for having abortions.[11] Between 2004 and 2014, national laws and policies have enabled an estimated 850,000 women in Nepal to obtain safe, legal services.[12]

Despite national efforts to expand access to legal and safe abortion services over the past 25 years, many Nepali women, especially those living in poverty and who are geographically isolated from healthcare systems, remain unable to get care.[13,14] Notably, women who live in rural areas (over 80% of the country's population) report substantial challenges in accessing services.[14] Under current law, only physicians and midlevel providers certified in safe abortion care by the government are eligible to provide induced abortion services, limiting service delivery.[15] Further, stigma and insufficient knowledge of the law prevent women from obtaining care, even if they are eligible for abortion under the law and it is theoretically affordable.[16,17] Poor availability of and access to legal services 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.[18] The burden of unwanted births due to lack of abortion access in Nepal remains understudied.

Study aims

A team of researchers from the University of California, San Francisco in the United States and CREHPA in Kathmandu, Nepal collaborated to adapt the successful, prospective cohort design of the Turnaway Study in the U.S. to Nepal. The U.S. Turnaway Study evaluated the mental health, physical health, and socioeconomic outcomes of receiving an abortion compared to carrying an unwanted pregnancy to term.

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. The objective of this

paper is to describe the Nepal Turnaway Study and invite collaboration from those interested in using the underlying data for novel research questions.

METHODS

Recruitment and enrollment

From April 2019 through December 2020, women seeking abortion care were recruited at 22 facilities across Nepal (Fig 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.

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).

Data collection procedures

After obtaining informed consent and confirming eligibility, the research staff member then conducted the baseline survey, which included collection of sociodemographic characteristics. All participants completed the baseline survey prior to obtaining abortion services. Subsequent interviews took place six weeks after the initial visit and then at six-month intervals over the next five years at the participant's home or another chosen place, covering all health and economic outcomes measurement. Interviews were conducted in Nepali, Maithali, Tharu, Bhojpuri, or Hindi, according to the participant's preference and took about 40 minutes. Participants received financial compensation of NRs 500 (approximately $4 USD) for the baseline and each subsequent interview. Research staff members conducted each interview using a tablet and uploaded survey answers to a secure web-based storage platform. Participants initially consented to participate for up to three years. In an effort to maximize the period of

observations, we put resources toward gathering longer term data, beginning in March 2023. At that point, consent was obtained for all willing participants to continue surveys each six months for up to five years. We ceased interviews when funding was exhausted in December 2024, at which point some participants had completed five years of interviews and others were administratively censored.

Measures

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 1 documents all measures and collection frequency.

Definition of study groups

This cohort is unique in capturing abortion care seeking experiences and outcomes. All participants had one of four possible experiences with their index pregnancy: (1) received abortion at initial care seeking; (2) denied abortion initially but obtained one later; (3) denied abortion but later reported being no longer pregnant; or (4) denied abortion and subsequently gave birth. Initial abortion receipt or denial was determined via “yes” or “no” answers to the six-week survey question: “Did you have an abortion at [recruitment facility] on or around [baseline date]?” Those who did not complete the six-week survey because they were unavailable for interview were asked the same question at their first follow-up survey. Initially denied individuals were then asked about subsequent abortion attempts and their current pregnancy status, at all follow-up surveys until they reported being no longer pregnant or giving birth.

For future analyses, we propose that abortion denial be defined using two possible indicators: (1) a three-arm 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 the dearth of evidence on abortion seeking in this setting, there are reasonable justifications for both including those who were initially denied but did not carry the pregnancy to term as a separate exposure group and for grouping them in with those who initially received their abortions.

Balancing weights

This study was modeled after the US Turnaway Study, in which abortion seekers nearing the gestational limit (and therefore left without other termination options if denied) were similar in most characteristics and only differed by whether they received an abortion, allowing for a natural experiment design to assess the effect of carrying an unwanted pregnancy to term versus receiving an abortion over time. In the Nepal setting however, we observed that abortion denial was dependent on factors in addition to gestational age, including provider availability, beliefs and bias, and individual sociodemographic characteristics.[19] Further differentiation in who was able to end their pregnancy occurred because many of those who were initially denied an abortion did not carry the pregnancy to term and give birth and, among those denied, pregnancy outcomes differed by sociodemographic characteristics.

Given the systematic differences by abortion denial and pregnancy outcome, we created balancing weights to match covariate distributions across the exposure groups. Exposure-based weighting is preferred over standard regression adjustment (another option to strengthen causal inferences) given the study's focus on multiple health and economic effects of abortion denial and the large number of potential confounders for these analyses, which would each require correct specification in all models. To ensure consistency across planned outcome analyses and facilitate use of this data by potential collaborators, we constructed two sets of balancing

weights to allow for analyses using either the binary exposure (“Gave Birth” vs. “No Birth”) or the three-arm exposure (“Abortion” vs. “Turnaway – No Birth” vs. “Turnaway – Birth”).

Propensity scores were estimated using multivariable regression models predicting pregnancy outcome. To support analyses using a binary pregnancy outcome exposure, multivariable logistic regression was used, while multinomial logistic regression was applied for weights that could be used in three-arm exposure analyses. Predictors in propensity score models included the following variables measured at baseline: sociodemographic characteristics (age, marital status, education, employment, parity, income), pregnancy characteristics (gestational age, abortion seeking due to fetal anomaly or sex selection, pregnancy intendedness), clinic characteristics (distance from participant home, public/private), medical history (anxiety/depression, chronic pain, overall health, intimate partner violence), and measures of empowerment and husband drinking behaviors. These predictors of pregnancy outcome were determined based on subject-matter expertise from the study team. Propensity scores were then used to generate overlap weights, which are calculated using an approach similar to inverse probability of treatment weighting. These weights, when applied to the full sample, create a pseudo-population in which baseline characteristics are balanced between exposure groups, facilitating estimation of causal effects.[20] We compared baseline demographic characteristics across pregnancy outcomes before and after applying the weights. Covariate balance was evaluated using standardized mean differences. Additional details on the construction of weights and diagnostic assessments are provided in S1 File.

Data processing and description was conducted using conducted using Stata SE version 17·0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX). Statistical analyses and assessment of weight performance were conducted using R version 4.4.2 (R Core Team, Vienna, Austria).

RESULTS

Participation

Between April 2019 and December 2020, 8,849 women sought abortion care at the 22 recruitment sites in this study (Fig 2). 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. Nine individuals initially identified as pregnant at recruitment were later determined to have never been pregnant and excluded from analyses. At the six-week follow-up, these individuals reported not having received an abortion due to one of the following reasons: a negative pregnancy test or ultrasound, return of menstruation, or self-reporting that they were not pregnant. The criteria for excluding these individuals was finalized after publication of baseline data from this cohort,[19] and thus final baseline sample size presented here are slightly lower than those in the study’s first publication (1,832 vs 1,835).

Pregnancy outcomes

Of the 1,832 women who completed baseline surveys, 86 were lost before the six-week survey and four were lost after completing the six-week follow-up survey, at which point they were still pregnant (Fig 3). These 90 women (less than 5% of the baseline sample) were excluded from analyses due to the unknown outcome of their pregnancy, resulting in an analytical sample of 1742 women. Compared to participants with known pregnancy outcomes, these 90 women were more likely to be younger, unmarried, of Dalit ethnicity, and at greater than 10 weeks’ gestation or uncertain gestation at baseline. They were also more likely to have fewer children and to report lower pregnancy wantedness for the index pregnancy.

Of the 1,742 individuals with follow-up data, 890 received an abortion at that facility shortly after the time of recruitment, while 856 were initially denied. Of those denied, 275 ultimately gave birth. However, subsequent abortion attempts were reported by the majority of those initially denied, with 536 reporting later receiving an abortion. An additional 41 participants reported that they were initially denied abortion but were no longer pregnant. Of these, 29 reported no subsequent abortion attempts and that they had a miscarriage, nine did not specify how the pregnancy ended, and three reported having a miscarriage following a subsequent abortion attempt. There is ambiguity around these cases, but we classified them according to the participant's chosen language around their pregnancy outcome and all were ultimately categorized into the No Birth category. Four individuals who reported being still pregnant at the six-week survey after initial denial were lost to follow-up and excluded from any analyses that examined outcomes based on pregnancy outcome. Some pregnancy outcomes were ascertained after the publication of preliminary baseline data from this cohort, leading to slight differences in the analytical sample size (1,742 vs 1,663) presented here, compared to the study's first publication.[19]

Retention

Participants were followed for an average of 56 months (standard deviation = 12.4). Participation by survey round is show in Table 2. Assessments of retention are complicated by our ceasing of data collection in December 2024 when funding was exhausted. Only participants recruited prior to December 2019 were able to complete the full 60 months of interviews; all others were administratively censored. By the time of study completion, 1073 participants (62%) had completed 60-month interviews; 478 (27%) were still actively participating but were administratively censored after completing the 48-month or 54-month survey; 191 (11%) had been previously lost to follow-up.

Participants who received their abortion have on average three months longer follow-up than those who carried to term (56.5 vs. 53.7). This is a consequence of the fact that in the first month of recruitment, everyone seeking abortion was eligible for the study regardless of gestation. After the first month, recruitment was limited to those later in pregnancy (ten or more weeks) and those who did not know their gestational duration. Those recruited in the first month were both less likely to be denied an abortion or give birth (because they had earlier gestations on average) and more likely to complete 60 months of follow-up. Those recruited in subsequent months skewed later in pregnancy and were more likely to be denied an abortion and to give birth, as well as to be administratively censored by the end of data collection. Given that abortion denial differed by baseline characteristics, differences were also present across administrative censoring groups for the following indicators: caste, education, employment, facility type, clinic travel distance, gestational age, empowerment, income, and reason for abortion seeking (sex selection or fetal anomaly). However, as this informative censoring was administrative and dependent wholly on gestational age, outcomes for these individuals can be classified as "Missing at Random", meaning missingness is entirely dependent on known and measured variables.[21] Correctly specified analysis models using maximum-likelihood-based methods remain robust to informative loss-to-follow-up in cases where the "Missing at Random" assumptions are satisfied.[21] Thus, as long as analysis models for this study account for gestational age (either as a covariate in regression adjustment or as part of the balancing weights), and employ maximum-likelihood-based methods (including linear and generalized mixed models), it is reasonable to assume that all estimates are unbiased by administrative censoring.

Eleven percent of participants (n=191) were lost to follow-up after their pregnancy outcome was ascertained. After accounting for clustering by facility, loss to follow-up was nondifferential with

respect to pregnancy outcome. Among the 1,095 participants not at risk for administrative censoring (ie. recruited early enough to complete all 60 months of follow-up, 63% of all respondents), there was no association between pregnancy outcome and attrition, either in two-group analyses (No Birth: 11.6% vs Gave Birth: 11.8%; p=0.965), or three-group analyses (Abortion: 12.0% vs Turnaway – No Birth: 10.5% vs Turnaway – Birth: 11.8% p=0.784). Additionally, no systematic differences in characteristics were observed among those lost early compared to those retained to the end of the study.

Cohort characteristics at baseline

A total of 1742 women were retained in the study long enough to ascertain their pregnancy outcome and are used as the analysis dataset for this cohort. Table 3 contains overall, unweighted sample characteristics. Almost all women (97%, n=1694) were married at baseline, 33% (579) were under age 25, 29% (n=504) were 25-29 years, 22% (n=380) were 30-34 years, and 16% (n=279) were over age 35. Nearly two-fifths belonged to the Brahmin/Chhetri/Thakuri castes (39%, n=683), followed by Hill Janajati (24%, n=415), Terai Janajati (22%, n=378), and Dalit or other (15%, n=259). The majority (68%, n=1188) completed secondary or higher education, while 16% (n=279) had no schooling and 15% (n=267) had completed primary school. Just over half of participants were working at baseline (54%, n=935) and 74% (n=1270) reported adequate or more than adequate household income. Most women had at least one child (87%, n=1511) and 58% had at least one son (n=1016). Approximately 10% sought abortions for reasons of sex selection or fetal anomaly (n=167 and n=181, respectively). 37% (n=648) were at or below ten weeks a time of abortion seeking, 37% were above ten weeks (n=635), and 26% (n=459) did not know their gestational age. Nearly three quarters sought abortion services at private facilities (71%, n=1244), and 46% (n=787) traveled over an hour to reach the facility.

Most women rated their pre-pregnancy health as good or very good (91%, n=1575), though 39% (n=684) reported a history of chronic pain, 32% (n=551) reported a lifetime history of anxiety or depression and 23% (n=388) experienced intimate partner violence. About half (51%, n= 866) lacked household decision-making power, 24% (n=413) reported that their husband limited their mobility outside the home, and 9% (n=156) reported that their husband drank alcohol daily.

Baseline differences by study group and weight performance

The data in Table 3 demonstrate that those who gave birth differed at baseline from those who did not give birth. Those who gave birth were more likely to be younger, less likely to belong to the Brahmin, Chhetri, or Thakuri castes, and more likely to be in the disadvantaged Dalit caste; they were less likely to have secondary or higher education, less likely to be employed outside the home, and more likely to report having an inadequate income. They were also less likely to live within half an hour of the abortion facility. Those who gave birth were much more likely to have been at or above ten weeks of pregnancy than those who receive an abortion and they were more likely to be seeking abortion for reasons of sex selection but less likely to be seeking abortion for fetal anomaly. Women who gave birth were more likely to have a husband who drinks daily, have experienced intimate partner violence, lack decision-making power in the household, and to have limited mobility outside the home. Standardized mean differences greater than 0.1 are reflective of statistically significant differences.[22]

Table 4 similarly shows differences in baseline characteristics 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 ten 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 more likely to be younger than 25 years but less likely to be over 35 years, less likely to be Brahmin/Chhetri/Thakuri, more likely to be Dalit/other caste, less likely to have secondary or higher education, and more likely to have a husband who drinks daily.

As shown in Table 3 (and Fig C in S1 File), applying exposure balancing weights from propensity score models eliminated all baseline differences across the two abortion exposure groups. This occurs because the "overlap" weighting method employed in this study mathematically guarantees perfect covariate balance specifically when there are only two groups.[23] In contrast, as shown in Table 4 (and Fig D in S1 File), weights did not produce perfect balance with three exposure categories. Detailed formulas for weight generation are provided in S1 File. Nonetheless, for the three-arm abortion exposure, the weights achieved adequate covariate overlap, with all mean absolute standardized differences below 0.1.[22] Further assessment of weight performance and validity was confirmed by additional balance diagnostics, found in Fig A and Fig B in S1 File.

Additional findings to date

Baseline data from the Nepal Turnaway Study were previously used to describe the characteristics of abortion seekers overall and by care received, the burden and context of legal abortion denial, and care seeking trajectories following denial.[19] Puri and colleagues found that most who were denied (84%) were told that they were too far along, although many should have been deemed legally eligible for abortion upon this first care seeking attempt according to current laws. The most common reasons for seeking abortion focused on existing family structures – already having enough children, having a very young child, and being unable to afford another child.

Albach and colleagues investigated prior abortion attempts in this cohort [24], 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 [25] 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 allows researchers to study the effects of abortion denial in a context with high maternal mortality, documented practice of abortion outside the certified medical system, and high poverty levels. We followed abortion seekers to observe whether they were denied their abortion, their eventual pregnancy outcome, and their subsequent social, health, and economic wellbeing. Most of the studies that have attempted to estimate the morbidity that results from unintended pregnancies or unwanted births rely on cross-sectional or retrospective data.[26] Retrospective studies suffer from potentially severe biases. 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.[27,28] The Nepal Turnaway Study recruited individuals prior to the end of their pregnancy, enabling researchers to examine the predictors and consequences of the outcomes of unwanted pregnancy.

This paper proposes both two-arm and three-arm exposure definitions to assess the impact of different pregnancy outcomes. In both definitions, those who obtained a legal, facility-based abortion offer the appropriate counterfactual for both illegal abortion and carrying an unwanted pregnancy to term. Causal claims regarding the effects of abortion denial using data from this cohort are strengthened by the initiation of data collection prior to participants' having been denied or received an abortion. This establishes temporality by guaranteeing that the outcomes observed did not precede the exposure. Additionally, recruitment of participants at the point of abortion seeking allows us to control for risk factors common to women with unwanted pregnancy who seek abortion (the target population). We used propensity score weighting based on more than 15 baseline characteristics and their interactions to improve covariate balance and allow researchers to estimate average treatment effects. Specifically, we applied overlap weighting, a technique which ensures that treatment effects are estimated among individuals with sufficient representation across study groups. This approach is particularly useful when certain subgroups are highly likely to fall into only one exposure arm-- for example, participants presenting at the earliest possible gestation were very likely to obtain an abortion. By prioritizing individuals who could reasonably fall within all exposure groups, overlap weights yield more precise estimates of average treatment effects relevant to real-world situations.

In addition to collecting data on the health and wellbeing of women after being denied or obtaining an abortion, this study also followed the children of these women, both those born of an unwanted pregnancy and women's existing children at the time of abortion seeking. The majority of women seeking abortion services in this setting are already mothers and cite desire to care for one's existing children is a common reason for seeking an abortion.[19] Yet little data on the future outcomes of these existing children are available. Finally, in Nepal where societal attitudes about gender cultivate son preference,[29] data on the outcomes of girl children born following denial of abortion services are important to understand and inform policy around sex-selective abortion.

This study has several limitations to consider for future analyses. 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, several potential sources exist for selection bias. While less than five percent of individuals were lost to follow-up after baseline, these women lack pregnancy outcome data and differ from those retained in several key characteristics. Additionally, 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 that include 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 were lost to follow-up after their pregnancy outcome was ascertained, although this attrition was nondifferential with respect to abortion denial.

CONCLUSIONS

The Nepal Turnaway Study is the first prospective cohort to examine the experiences and trajectories of abortion seekers and their families in this context. Longitudinal data collected at the point of abortion receipt or denial make it possible to examine outcomes among women who were denied but did not carry to term, as well as those who experienced unwanted childbirth, compared with women who obtained legal procedures. Exposure balancing weights developed for this cohort will allow future researchers to isolate the health and economic impacts of abortion denial while accounting for factors associated with unwanted pregnancy. In addition, this study considers a wide range of consequences, including not only women's physical health and economic outcomes, but also their mental and emotional well-being and the health of their children.

Acknowledgements
We thank the members of the National Technical Advisory Committee members including Dr. Bibek Kumar Lal, for their guidance and support. We are grateful to seven government hospitals, MSI, the Family Planning Association of Nepal, and the Sunaulo Bhabishya Nepal 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.

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.

Collaboration and data sharing
The authors welcome proposals for collaboration, which should be directed to diana.greenefoster@ucsf.edu. The cohort dataset is available for five years from XXX database (accession number: XXX).

REFERENCES

1. Bearak J, Popinchalk A, Ganatra B, Moller AB, Tunçalp Ö, Beavin C, 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 Sep;8(9):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 Aug 5;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 Nov;361:117350. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117350

4. Ganatra B, Gerdts C, Rossier C, Johnson BR, Tunçalp Ö, Assifi A, et al. Global, regional, and subregional classification of abortions by safety, 2010–14: estimates from a Bayesian hierarchical model. Lancet. 2017 Nov;390(10110):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 Mar 12;382(11):1029–40. doi:10.1056/nejmra1908412

7. Say L, Chou D, Gemmill A, Tunçalp Ö, Moller AB, Daniels J, et al. Global causes of maternal death: a WHO systematic analysis. Lancet Glob Health. 2014 Jun;2(6):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 Aug;123(9):1489–98. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.13552

9. Ministry of Health. National Safe Abortion Policy [Internet]. Kathmandu, Nepal: Ministry of Health Department of Health Services, Family Health Division; 2002. Available from: https://mohp.gov.np/content/188/national-safe-abortion-policy/

10. Nepal Law Commission. The Right to Safe Motherhood and Reproductive Health Act, 2018. Act Number 9 of the Year 2075 (2018). 2018 Sep 18.

11. Center for Research on Environment Health and Population Activities (CREHPA). Women in Prison in Nepal for Abortion: A Study on Implications of Restrictive Abortion Law on Women's Social Status and Health. Kathmandu, Nepal; 2000.

12. Government of Nepal. Annual Report 2071/72 (2014/2015). Kathmandu, Nepal: Ministry of Health and Population, Department of Health Services; 2015.

13. Bell SO, Zimmerman L, Choi Y, Hindin MJ. Legal but limited? Abortion service availability and readiness assessment in Nepal. Health Policy Plan. 2018 Jan 1;33(1):99–106. doi:10.1093/heapol/czx149

14. Wu WJ, Maru S, Regmi K, Basnett I. Abortion care in Nepal, 15 years after legalization: gaps in access, equity, and quality. Health Hum Rights. 2017 Jun;19(1):221–30. PubMed PMID: 28630554.

15. Samandari G, Wolf M, Basnett I, Hyman A, Andersen K. Implementation of legal abortion in Nepal: a model for rapid scale-up of high-quality care. Reprod Health. 2012 Dec;9(1). doi:10.1186/1742-4755-9-7

16. Rocca C, Puri M, Dulal B, Bajracharya L, Harper C, Blum M, et al. Unsafe abortion after legalisation in Nepal: a cross-sectional study of women presenting to hospitals. BJOG. 2013 Aug;120(9):1075–84. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.12242

17. Puri M, Ingham R, Matthews Z. Factors affecting abortion decisions among young couples in Nepal. J Adolesc Health. 2007 Jun;40(6):535–42. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.01.010

18. Puri M, Singh S, Sundaram A, Hussain R, Tamang A, Crowell M. Abortion incidence and unintended pregnancy in Nepal. Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2016;42(4):197. doi:10.1363/42e2116

19. Puri MC, Raifman S, Daniel S, Karki S, Maharjan DC, Ahlbach C, et al. Denial of legal abortion in Nepal. PLoS ONE. 2023 Mar 21;18(3):e0282886. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0282886

20. Li F, Morgan KL, Zaslavsky AM. Balancing covariates via propensity score weighting. J Am Stat Assoc. 2018 Jan 2;113(521):390–400. doi:10.1080/01621459.2016.1260466

21. Vittinghoff E, Glidden DV, Shiboski SC, McCulloch CE. Regression Methods in Biostatistics: Linear, Logistic, Survival, and Repeated Measures Models. Boston, MA: Springer US; 2012. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-1353-0

22. Austin PC. Balance diagnostics for comparing the distribution of baseline covariates between treatment groups in propensity-score matched samples. STAT MED. 2009 Nov 10;28(25):3083–107. doi:10.1002/sim.3697

23. Li F, Li F. Propensity score weighting for causal inference with multiple treatments. Ann Appl Stat. 2019 Dec 1;13(4). doi:10.1214/19-aoas1282

24. Ahlbach C, Puri MC, Daniel S, Rocca CH, Karki S, Foster DG. Predictors of prior unsuccessful pharmacy abortion attempts among women presenting for abortion in government certified clinics in Nepal. Intl J Gynecology & Obste. 2022 Oct;159(1):160–5. doi:10.1002/ijgo.14141

25. Magar AA, Puri MC, Karki S, Maharjan DC, Murro R, Foster DG. Impact of COVID-19 among women seeking abortion services in Nepal: results from a longitudinal study. Arch Public Health. 2025 Oct 8;83(1):238. doi:10.1186/s13690-025-01705-1

26. Nelson HD, Darney BG, Ahrens K, Burgess A, Jungbauer RM, Cantor A, et al. Associations of unintended pregnancy with maternal and infant health outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA. 2022 Nov 1;328(17):1714. doi:10.1001/jama.2022.19097

27. Desai S, Lindberg LD, Maddow-Zimet I, Kost K. The impact of abortion underreporting on pregnancy data and related research. Matern Child Health J. 2021 Aug;25(8):1187–92. doi:10.1007/s10995-021-03157-9

28. Gerdts C, Tunçalp O, Johnston H, Ganatra B. Measuring abortion-related mortality: challenges and opportunities. Reprod Health. 2015 Dec;12(1):87. doi:10.1186/s12978-015-0064-1

29. Khatri SK, Pokhrel R. Son preference and socialization in Nepali society. Himalayan Geog. 2023 Dec 31;45–60. doi:10.3126/thg.v13i1.71346

Table 1. 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 2. Number of interviews and retention by survey round			
	No. interviews	**% 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 3. Distribution of baseline characteristics by two-arm exposure, unweighted and weighted

	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)	<0.01
25-29	504 (28.9)	415 (28.3)	89 (32.4)	0.09	(32.6)	(32.6)	<0.01
30-34	380 (21.8)	332 (22.6)	48 (17.5)	0.13	(17.8)	(17.8)	<0.01
35+	279 (16.0)	251 (17.1)	28 (10.2)	0.20	(10.9)	(10.9)	<0.01
Marital status							
Unmarried	48 (2.8)	42 (2.9)	6 (2.2)	--	(2.6)	(2.6)	--
Married	1694 (97.2)	1425 (97.1)	269 (97.8)	0.04	(97.4)	(97.4)	<0.01
Caste							
Brahmin/Chhetri/Thakuri	683 (39.4)	594 (40.6)	89 (32.6)	0.16	(34.5)	(34.2)	<0.01
Hill Janajati	415 (23.9)	346 (23.7)	69 (25.3)	0.04	(24.9)	(25.1)	<0.01
Dalit/other	259 (14.9)	192 (13.1)	67 (24.5)	0.29	(21.6)	(21.7)	<0.01
Terai Janajati	378 (21.8)	330 (22.6)	48 (17.6)	0.13	(19.0)	(19.1)	<0.01
Education							
None/ some formal schooling	279 (16.1)	230 (15.7)	49 (17.9)	0.06	(17.4)	(17.6)	<0.01
Primary	267 (15.4)	203 (13.9)	64 (23.4)	0.24	(21.1)	(21.1)	<0.01
Secondary	1069 (61.6)	920 (63.0)	149 (54.6)	0.17	(56.9)	(56.6)	<0.01
Higher	119 (6.9)	108 (7.4)	11 (4.0)	0.15	(4.7)	(4.7)	<0.01
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)	<0.01
No. of living children							
0	231 (13.3)	200 (13.6)	31 (11.3)	0.07	(12.1)	(12.1)	<0.01
1	520 (29.9)	438 (29.9)	82 (29.8)	<0.01	(30.0)	(30.0)	<0.01
2	621 (35.6)	530 (36.1)	91 (33.1)	0.06	(33.8)	(33.8)	<0.01
3+	370 (21.2)	299 (20.4)	71 (25.8)	0.13	(24.1)	(24.1)	<0.01
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)	<0.01
Income adequacy							
Not Adequate	463 (26.7)	357 (24.4)	106 (39.0)	0.31	(34.7)	(35.0)	<0.01
Adequate	1228 (70.9)	1066 (73.0)	162 (59.6)	0.28	(63.7)	(63.4)	<0.01
More than adequate	42 (2.4)	38 (2.6)	4 (1.5)	0.08	(1.5)	(1.5)	<0.01
Pregnancy and clinic factors							

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

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. Distribution of baseline sociodemographic characteristics by three-arm exposure, unweighted and weighted

	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									
LMUP 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 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 multiarm abortion denial exposure calculated using minimum and maximum means from the three study groups.

Figure 1. Map of Nepal with Turnaway study sites



Figure 2. Study recruitment



Figure 3. Classification of pregnancy outcomes