Effectiveness, safety and acceptability of no-test medical abortion provided via telemedicine: a national cohort study
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Summary Box

What is already known on this topic
The UK’s National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) conducted a systematic review and recommended using telemedicine to improve access to medical abortion care. Several models for using telemedicine to facilitate medical abortion have been described, but most existing trials are small, and many required attendances to have medicines administered or for an ultrasound scan or blood tests.

What this study adds
This study (n=52,142) is the first to assess a real-world no-test telemedicine abortion care pathway in a national population. The new national model demonstrates how a permissive framework for medical abortion can deliver significant quality improvements to those needing to access abortion care. There was no difference in effectiveness (p=1.0) or safety (p=0.6) when compared to a traditional in-person model, but the no-test telemedicine pathway improved access to care, was highly acceptable to patients and is likely to be especially beneficial for vulnerable groups and in resource-poor settings.
Abstract

Objectives
To compare the effectiveness, safety and acceptability of medical abortion before and after the introduction of no-test telemedicine abortion care.

Design
Cohort study to assess whether a no-test telemedicine-hybrid care model (telemedicine with in-person provision only when indicated) was non-inferior to the traditional service model (blanket in-person provision including ultrasound scan).

Setting
The three main abortion providers in England and Wales.

Participants
All patients having an early medical abortion in the two months before and after the service model change. Patient demographic and clinical characteristics were compared between the cohorts to adjust for any systematic differences in the two groups.

Main outcome measures
Access: waiting time, gestation at abortion
Effectiveness: the proportion of successful medical abortions
Safety: significant adverse events defined as: haemorrhage requiring transfusion, significant infection requiring hospital admission, major surgery, death. We also examined the incidence of ectopic pregnancy and late gestation.
Acceptability: Patient-reported outcomes of satisfaction, future preference, and privacy of consultation

Results
The study sample included 52,142 medical abortions; 22,158 in the traditional cohort and 29,984 in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort, of which 61% were provided using no-test telemedicine. The cohorts accounted for 85% of all medical abortions provided in England and Wales during the study period. Mean waiting times were 4.2 days shorter in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort, and 40% were provided at ≤6 weeks’ gestation compared to 25% in the traditional cohort (p<0.001). There was no difference in success rates between the two groups (98.2% vs. 98.8%, p=1.0), nor in the prevalence of serious adverse events (0.04% vs. 0.02%, p=0.557). The incidence of ectopic pregnancy was equivalent in both cohorts (0.2%, p=0.796), with no significant difference in the proportions being treated after abortion (0.01% vs 0.03%, p=0.123). In 0.04% of cases the abortion appeared to have been provided at over 10 weeks’ gestation; these abortions were all completed at home without additional medical complications. In the telemedicine-hybrid group, the effectiveness for abortions conducted using telemedicine (n=18,435) was higher than for those conducted in-person (n=11,549), 99.2% vs. 98.1%, p<0.001. Acceptability was high (96% satisfied), 80% reported a future preference for telemedicine and none reported that they were unable to consult in private using teleconsultation.

Conclusions
Medical abortion provided through a hybrid model that includes no-test telemedicine without routine ultrasound is effective, safe, acceptable, and improves access to care.
**Introduction**

Improved access to abortion care would deliver significant advantages for both healthcare systems and the women who use them. Abortion is a common reason for needing healthcare – the global abortion rate is estimated at 39 abortions per 1000 women aged 15–49 years, with 28% of all pregnancies in developed countries ending in abortion. There is clear evidence that restricting access to abortion does not reduce abortion rates, it simply makes abortion less safe. Improving access is likely to benefit those who are most vulnerable, especially in resource-poor settings or where care has to be self-funded. In its 2019 guideline on abortion care, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) stated that improving access to abortion was a key priority.

Telemedicine, the use of information and communication technologies to improve patient outcomes by increasing access to care and medical information, has been noted to decrease costs and increase convenience and safety. It is an established service delivery model for abortion care in many settings, and it is recommended to improve access. The COVID-19 pandemic required urgent action by clinicians and policymakers to ensure delivery of essential health services, including abortion. In March 2020, the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RCOG) published guidelines to safeguard abortion care in the UK. The guidelines profoundly changed the way medical abortion care is delivered in Great Britain. Prior to the emergence of COVID-19, all patients seeking medical abortion were required to attend in-person to receive an ultrasound scan and have mifepristone administered within the clinic. Under the new guidelines, consultations were encouraged to take place by telephone or video call; an ultrasound scan was required only if indicated. All the British governments had issued emergency legal orders by March 30th 2020 to allow mifepristone to be used at home.
along with misoprostol up to 10 weeks’ gestation.\textsuperscript{10-12} These approvals permitted abortion providers to implement a telemedical service delivery model for medical abortion.

Great Britain’s new pathway for no-test telemedicine abortion is unusual among existing models because it is fully remote: no clinic visit, tests or ultrasound scan are required and both mifepristone and misoprostol are delivered by mail or collected from a clinic for use at home. This new service model thus presents an important opportunity to evaluate a potentially better way to provide medical abortion that could improve access and reduce the barriers posed by in-person care.\textsuperscript{13} We examined and compared the effectiveness, safety and acceptability of medical abortion provided up to 10 weeks’ gestation before and after the service model change.

Methods

Population and Cohorts

The study population comprised all patients who accessed an early medical abortion (EMA) at the three largest abortion providers in England and Wales - British Pregnancy Advisory Service (BPAS), MSI Reproductive Choices (MSUK), and the National Unplanned Pregnancy Advisory Service (NUPAS) - two months before and after the service model change. Medical abortion is defined as the use of medications to cause termination of a pregnancy without primary surgical intervention and ‘EMA’ applies to these procedures in the first trimester.\textsuperscript{14} The recommended EMA regimen uses the anti-progestogen mifepristone in an oral dose of 200mg and the prostaglandin analogue misoprostol by the sublingual, vaginal or buccal route. A single dose of 800mcg misoprostol used 24-48 hours after mifepristone has been
demonstrated to be highly effective up to 10 weeks’ gestation. Beyond 10 weeks additional doses of misoprostol are needed to maintain the same degree of effectiveness. 

Our dataset consisted of information on EMAs extracted directly from electronic service records and included fully de-identified patient clinical and demographic characteristics, as well as clinical outcomes. All data were extracted six weeks after the end of the study period to ensure the reporting of complications was as complete as possible.

Two cohorts were defined. The “traditional” cohort comprises all patients having an EMA between January 1st and March 1st 2020, prior to service model change. All patients in this cohort received care using the traditional pathway that included an in-person assessment and an ultrasound scan. The “telemedicine-hybrid” cohort comprises all patients accessing an EMA between April 6th and June 30th 2020, in a two month period after the service model change at each provider. Patients in this cohort received care using no-test telemedicine if they had low risk of ectopic pregnancy and their self-reported last menstrual period (LMP) indicated a gestation of less than 10 weeks. Those who were not eligible for telemedicine had an in-person assessment with ultrasound. Providers followed organisation-specific evidence-based policies informed by the RCOG and associated decision aid (figures 1 and 2) and earlier RCOG and NICE guidelines for general abortion care including in-person medical abortion.

In the traditional cohort, whilst some aspects of the pre-abortion consultation may have been carried out by phone, an in-person assessment with ultrasound scan and in-clinic administration of mifepristone were always required. In the telemedicine-hybrid cohort, we defined patients served by telemedicine as those who received medications for home use (either by mail
or collection with minimal contact from a clinic) following a phone or video consultation and
who did not receive an ultrasound scan or other tests.

We omitted the month of March 2020 because of the uncertainty and challenges posed by the
emergence of COVID prior to the definitive service model change. The dates of the telemedi-
cine-hybrid cohort take into account the roll-out of the telemedicine service across individual
clinics within a provider network. For the analysis of ectopic pregnancies, we applied the
timeframes stated above to all abortion consultations rather than all abortions provided be-
cause some patients with suspected ectopic pregnancies were referred to Early Pregnancy As-
seSSment Units (EPAU) and did not proceed to an abortion.

Outcome Measures

Access

Waiting time and gestation at treatment were used to assess how the two models impacted
access. Waiting time was defined as the interval from first contact with the abortion provider
to when medication was dispensed (either in-person in clinic or posted). Gestation was re-
corded as that applicable on the date mifepristone was dispensed or provided. Analysis was
of mean gestation and the proportion of abortions performed at ≤6 weeks’ gestation.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness was defined as the proportion of medical abortions that were successful.
Success was defined according to the MARE Guidelines as successful expulsion of an
intrauterine pregnancy without need for surgical intervention. Sub-categories of
unsuccessful abortion included: surgical management of continuing pregnancy, surgical
evacuation of retained products of conception, and continuing pregnancy where the patient opted for continuation or the outcome is unknown.

Safety

Safety was defined according to the proportions of medical abortions that involved one or more significant adverse events. We defined significant adverse events as haemorrhage requiring transfusion, significant infection requiring hospital admission, major surgery, and death. We also examined the incidence of ectopic pregnancy and when it was diagnosed in the care pathway. All patients referred for further diagnostics (e.g. serial βhCG monitoring) but who had no further treatment are included in the ectopic pregnancy group although a proportion of these will be pregnancy of unknown locations (PULs) that includes failed early intrauterine pregnancies. We analysed the proportion of cases where treatment was reported to have occurred at ≥10 weeks’ gestation in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort (this outcome does not apply to the traditional cohort since all gestations were determined by ultrasound scan).

Acceptability

Given the constraints of delivering healthcare during COVID-19 it was not possible to follow up with all patients to capture patient-reported outcomes. Two of the providers (BPAS and MSUK) collected data on patient feedback during the study period. Patients were invited to provide feedback one to three weeks after treatment, either by telephone using a structured interview tool (MSUK) or using an online form (BPAS). We analysed data on questions reporting on satisfaction, future preference and privacy. Although the questions were similar, only the MSUK survey included questions on the privacy of teleconsultation. All contact was by a non-clinician who had not been involved in the patient’s care.
The primary analysis was to assess whether the telemedicine-hybrid care model (telemedicine with in-person provision when indicated) was non-inferior to the traditional service model (blanket in-person provision). Non-inferiority is established by comparing effectiveness and safety in the two cohorts under the null hypothesis that the rates of successful abortion and serious adverse events are not different.

We first compared patient demographic and clinical characteristics between the cohorts to assess the need to covariate-adjust our hypothesis tests for systematic differences in the two groups that might affect abortion outcomes. All hypothesis tests were covariate adjusted for patient age, race/ethnicity, gestational age, parity, and prior abortions using logistic regression and weighted risk differences. We evaluated effectiveness by testing the alternative hypothesis that the rate of successful medical abortion in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort is lower than in the traditional cohort using a covariate-adjusted test of difference in proportions. We also performed a chi-squared test to evaluate whether the distribution of unsuccessful abortion sub-categories differed between the cohorts. We evaluated safety by testing the alternative hypothesis that significant adverse events occurred at higher rates in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort compared to the traditional cohort using a covariate-adjusted hypothesis test for difference of proportions. We also evaluated whether the prevalence of ectopic pregnancies managed before EMA and after EMA were different between the traditional and telemedicine-hybrid cohorts using chi-squared difference of proportions tests.
The secondary analysis was to compare effectiveness and safety of medical abortion for patients who received fully remote no-test telemedicine vs. in-person care in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort, primarily to assess whether any differences between the cohort service models were driven by one particular group. We evaluated patient demographic and clinical characteristic differences between the two groups to assess the need to covariate-adjust our hypothesis tests for systematic differences and all hypothesis tests were covariate adjusted for patient age, race/ethnicity, gestational age, parity, and prior abortions using the framework described above. We note, however, that these cohorts are fundamentally different despite covariate adjustment, as patients in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort were selected into in-person treatment based on characteristics that would affect the outcome of their abortion. We performed covariate-adjusted hypothesis tests under the null hypothesis of equal effectiveness and equal rates of significant adverse events in the telemedicine vs. in-person groups.

All analyses were performed using R, version 3.6.2. Statistical significance was defined using an alpha level of 0.05.

Ethics Approval

The study was reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Texas at Austin and a determination was made that the research did not meet the criteria for human subjects research as defined in the Common Rule (45 CFR 46) or FDA Regulations (21 CFR 56). Each provider ensured compliance with their own internal ethics and governance systems. The principles of the STROBE statement, and the MARE supplement, were followed.14

Results
In total, 52,142 medical abortions were provided during the study period; 22,158 in the traditional pathway and 29,984 in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort. Among those that took place in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort, 18,435 (61%) were provided entirely via telemedicine and 11,549 (39%) were provided in-person. Our sample represents 85% of the total number of medical abortions performed in England and Wales during the study period. The clinical and demographic characteristics of patients in the two cohorts are described in Table 1.

Access

Mean waiting time to treatment declined from 10.7 days (SD 19.9) in the traditional pathway to 6.5 days (SD 13.5) in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort (p<0.001). Mean gestational age at treatment also declined in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort resulting in 40% of abortions performed at 6 weeks’ gestation or less vs. 25% in the traditional pathway (p<0.001).

Effectiveness

Rates of successful medical abortion were high under both service delivery models (Table 2): 98.2% in the traditional cohort vs. 98.8% in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort. We found no evidence of a lower success rate with the telemedicine-hybrid pathway (p=1.0). The distribution of the different sub-categories of unsuccessful medical abortion did not differ between the cohorts (p=0.268).

Safety

Significant adverse events in both cohorts were rare (Table 3). Haemorrhage requiring transfusion was reported in 8 (0.04%) cases in the traditional cohort and 7 (0.02%) cases in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort. No cases of significant infection requiring hospital admission,
major surgery or death were reported. We found no evidence that significant adverse events
were higher in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort (p=0.557).

The overall incidence of ectopic pregnancy was equivalent in both cohorts, 39 (0.2%) in the
traditional pathway and 49 (0.2%) in the telemedicine pathway, p=0.796 (Table 4). The pro-
portions managed after EMA were not significantly different between the cohorts (0.01% in
the traditional pathway and 0.03% in the telemedicine-hybrid pathway, p=0.123). There were
11 cases (0.04%) in the telemedicine-hybrid cohort where the gestational age after abortion
was reported as being greater than the expected 10 weeks. In all these cases, the medical
abortion was completed at home without additional medical complications.

Acceptability
Patient-reported outcome data was available from 2453 respondents. 96% were “satisfied” or
“very satisfied” with their care, or rated their experience as “good” or “very good”. 80% re-
ported that they would choose telemedicine in the future or that it was their preferred option,
with 13% choosing in-person care and the remainder being unsure. No patient reported that
they were unable to consult in private using teleconsultation (n=1243).

Secondary Outcome Measures
Comparison of clinical outcomes for the telemedicine vs. in-person groups in the telemedi-
cine-hybrid cohort are shown in Tables S1-S3. Rates of successful medical abortion were
higher in the telemedicine group (99.2% vs 98.1%, p<0.001), and rates of significant adverse
outcomes were not significantly different between the two groups, 3 (0.02%) for telemedicine
vs. 4 (0.03%) for in-person, p=0.532.
Discussion

Principal Findings

We found that no-test telemedicine without routine ultrasound for medical abortion up to 10 weeks’ gestation is an effective, safe and acceptable service model. Clinical outcomes with telemedicine are equivalent to in-person care and access to abortion care is better, with both waiting times and gestational age at the time of abortion significantly reduced. Further evidence that the new telemedicine-hybrid model improved access comes from a study showing that the rate of women seeking abortion medication outside the formal healthcare setting reduced significantly in the UK following implementation of telemedicine. The most likely explanation is easier access as the opposite effect was seen in several other European countries who made no such provision. The implication is that those previously too vulnerable to attend in-person have been able to access care through telemedicine, potentially benefiting from the safeguarding, counselling and contraceptive services provided by regulated providers.

Our study confirms previous literature that medical abortion is safe and effective with low rates of significant complications. The slight increase in effectiveness we observed in the group that received telemedicine – even after controlling for lower average gestational age compared to the in-person group – may be due to the ability of patients to better control the timing at which they took the medication.

The telemedicine-hybrid model resulted in very low rates of undiagnosed ectopic pregnancy and later than expected gestations. Although the rate of ectopic pregnancy in the general population in the UK and USA is reported as 1-2%, the rate reported among patients hav-
ing an abortion is 10 times lower,\textsuperscript{28} which is consistent with our findings. Ultrasound is not used to screen for ectopic pregnancy in the general population – it is only used where signs and symptoms suggest a need.\textsuperscript{27} Routine screening of symptom-free women is associated with a high false positive rate when the prevalence of ectopic pregnancy is low, as is the case in women seeking abortion, and therefore it is unlikely there would be significant benefits.\textsuperscript{29} There is no clinical justification for maintaining this inconsistency in care between women wishing to continue their pregnancies and those choosing EMA.\textsuperscript{30,31}

However, given that over 200,000 people access abortion care each year in the UK alone, some will inevitably have an asymptomatic ectopic pregnancy and so will proceed with having mifepristone and misoprostol either through telemedicine or after a false negative scan. The essential issue for safety is that these are detected prior to causing harm rather than prior to beginning medical abortion treatment; treatment with mifepristone and misoprostol in itself will have no effect on an underlying ectopic pregnancy. Indeed, the reduction in waiting times afforded by the telemedicine model may facilitate earlier detection than traditional pathways where women present later, or are sent away to give additional time to visualise an intrauterine pregnancy on scan. Proceeding with early medical abortion without a scan may permit earlier diagnosis of a developing ectopic pregnancy owing to increased surveillance and index of suspicion, for example where there is minimal bleeding after misoprostol.\textsuperscript{9,18}

The proportion of cases where gestational age was later than expected based on LMP was low, as might have been expected given the evidence that women can determine the gestational age of their pregnancy with reasonable accuracy by LMP alone.\textsuperscript{31} Nevertheless inadvertent treatment of gestations over 10 weeks is inevitable and, consistent with our findings, the consequences for most are unlikely to be medically significant.\textsuperscript{32} The 10 weeks’ gestation
limit in the English government’s approval order is arbitrary, and not based on evidence of
safety or effectiveness. The Scottish government did not stipulate a limit, leaving the decision
to the discretion of the clinician in consultation with their patient. Moreover, the reported
success of self-managed abortions at >12–24 weeks’ gestation is 93%, with safety similar to
that expected in earlier gestations.33

Strengths and Weaknesses

While the study is not a clinical trial and we were not able to control the assignment of pa-
tients to treatment groups to conduct a direct comparison of fully remote telemedicine with
in-person care, the policy changes precipitated by COVID-19 created a rare opportunity to
conduct an evaluation of a major change in service delivery model with a very large sample
size. We were able to evaluate the outcomes of both the telemedicine-hybrid and traditional
in-person services as they operate in the real world, and we were able to adjust for key co-
variates. A key strength of the study is the generalisability of our findings given that our
sample included 85% of all medical abortions provided in England and Wales during the
study period.

The main limitation of this study is that we were unable to actively follow-up patients post-
abortion and therefore only significant adverse events can be reported with confidence. There
is a potential gap in the consistency of reporting incidents, due to some complications not
meeting the threshold of serious incidents, multiple routes of entry into the NHS and informal
communication between the NHS and abortion providers. Although it is possible that some
patients presented to other providers and a significant adverse event was not reported in our
dataset, the risk management and reporting systems within the NHS are well defined, with
serious incidents being routinely shared with regulators who would expect providers to en-
sure actions had been taken to mitigate risks to patients in the future. More importantly, there is no reason to suspect that any under-reporting that did occur would be more likely in either cohort so as to introduce bias. The governing body of the NHS in England alerted all commissioners of the need to report incidents relating to telemedicine and there were review meetings of key stakeholders to ensure compliance. We consulted with regulators and national agencies to ensure that we accounted for reports made directly to them. The independent regulator of all health and social care services in England, the Care Quality Commission (CQC), confirmed that all cases reported directly to them through various routes, for example, statutory notifications and the central NHS database of patient safety incident reports (the National Reporting and Learning System (NRLS) and the Strategic Executive Information System (StEIS)), were known to the providers.

**Implications for Clinicians and Policymakers**

This large study of 52,145 medical abortions demonstrates that incorporating no-test telemedicine into the care pathway is not inferior to the traditional pathway where all patients are seen in person and have an ultrasound scan. There are advantages - waiting times and gestation at abortion are reduced and it is highly rated by patients. There was no evidence of worse outcomes in failure rate, haemorrhage, need for surgery or in failure to detect ectopic pregnancy. In the 0.04% of cases where the abortion appeared to have been provided at over 10 weeks’ gestation, these were all completed at home without additional medical complications. Given the advantages of improving access to care, especially in vulnerable groups and in resource-poor healthcare systems or where patients often have to fund their own care, the evidence is compelling that no-test telemedicine should become routine in the provision of abortion care.
### Table 1: Clinical and demographic characteristics in the traditional and telemedicine-hybrid cohorts (n=52,142)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient Characteristic</th>
<th>Traditional (n=22,158)</th>
<th>Telemedicine-hybrid (n=29,984)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean gestational age in weeks (s.d.)</td>
<td>6.4 (1.3)</td>
<td>6.0 (1.4)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestational age at treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 weeks and under</td>
<td>5,582 (25.2)</td>
<td>11,947 (39.8)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 weeks</td>
<td>16,576 (74.8)</td>
<td>18,037 (60.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age in years (s.d.)</td>
<td>27.8 (6.6)</td>
<td>28.5 (6.7)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2,038 (9.2)</td>
<td>2,652 (8.8)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1,656 (7.5)</td>
<td>2,282 (7.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1,004 (4.5)</td>
<td>1,361 (4.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15,840 (71.5)</td>
<td>20,910 (69.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>489 (2.2)</td>
<td>638 (2.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1,131 (5.1)</td>
<td>2,141 (7.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous abortions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,098 (59.1)</td>
<td>16,741 (55.8)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+</td>
<td>9,060 (40.9)</td>
<td>13,243 (44.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,133 (45.7)</td>
<td>11,741 (39.2)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+</td>
<td>12,025 (54.3)</td>
<td>18,243 (60.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean waiting time in days (s.d.)</td>
<td>10.7 (19.9)</td>
<td>6.5 (13.5)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Comparison of effectiveness of medical abortions conducted in the traditional and telemedicine-hybrid cohorts (n=52,142)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Traditional n=22,158</th>
<th>Telemedicine-hybrid n=29,984</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful medical abortion</td>
<td>21,769 (98.2)</td>
<td>29,618 (98.8)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful medical abortion</td>
<td>389 (1.8)</td>
<td>366 (1.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing pregnancy treated with surgical management</td>
<td>161 (0.7)</td>
<td>150 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing pregnancy opted to continue or unknown outcome</td>
<td>3 (0.01)</td>
<td>8 (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained products treated with surgical management (ERPC)</td>
<td>225 (1.0)</td>
<td>208 (0.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As explained in the methods section, the p-value for successful medical abortion is the co-variate adjusted p-value (i.e. all differences in patient clinical and demographic characteristics, including gestational age, are controlled for) and was calculated using a hypothesis test where the null hypothesis is that the traditional cohort has the same effectiveness rate as the telemedicine-hybrid cohort and the alternative hypothesis is that the traditional cohort has a higher effectiveness rate than the telemedicine-hybrid cohort. The p-value for unsuccessful medication abortion is for the chi-squared test of whether the distribution of types of failure differ between the cohorts.
Table 3: Comparison of significant adverse events following medical abortions conducted in the traditional and telemedicine-hybrid cohorts (n=52,142)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Traditional (n=22,158)</th>
<th>Telemedicine-hybrid (n=29,984)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haemorrhage requiring transfusion</td>
<td>8 (0.04)</td>
<td>7 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection requiring hospital admission</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major surgery</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As explained in the methods section, the p-value was calculated using a hypothesis test where the null hypothesis is that the traditional cohort the same rate of adverse events than the telemedicine-hybrid cohort and the alternative hypothesis is that the traditional cohort has a lower rate of adverse events than the telemedicine-hybrid cohort.
Table 4: Significant outcomes among patients presenting for medical abortion in the traditional and telemedicine-hybrid cohorts (n=52,218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Traditional (n=22,197)</th>
<th>Telemedicine-hybrid (n=30,021)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ectopic Managed Pre-Treatment</td>
<td>37 (0.17)</td>
<td>39 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ectopic Managed Post-Treatment</td>
<td>2 (0.01)</td>
<td>10 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestational age later than expected*</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>11 (0.04)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The column Ns include patients who presented for an EMA but did not receive one because their ectopic pregnancy was identified pre-treatment.

*Note: The column Ns for the gestational age later than expected category are the same as those in Table 3, (all EMAs performed in the two cohorts, i.e. N = 52,142).
### Table S1: Patient clinical and demographic characteristics in the in-person vs. telemedicine groups for the telemedicine-hybrid cohort (n=29,984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient Characteristic</th>
<th>In-Person (n=11,549)</th>
<th>Telemedicine (n=18,435)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean gestational age in weeks (s.d.)</strong></td>
<td>6.2 (1.4)</td>
<td>5.8 (1.3)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gestational age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 weeks and under</td>
<td>3,673 (31.8)</td>
<td>8,274 (44.9)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 weeks</td>
<td>7,876 (68.2)</td>
<td>10,161 (55.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean age in years (s.d.)</strong></td>
<td>27.9 (6.6)</td>
<td>28.9 (6.7)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,060 (9.2)</td>
<td>1,592 (8.6)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>946 (8.2)</td>
<td>1,336 (7.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>557 (4.8)</td>
<td>804 (4.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7,868 (68.1)</td>
<td>13,042 (70.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>336 (2.9)</td>
<td>302 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>782 (6.8)</td>
<td>1,359 (7.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous abortions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,388 (55.3)</td>
<td>10,353 (56.2)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+</td>
<td>5,161 (44.7)</td>
<td>8,082 (43.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,931 (42.7)</td>
<td>6,810 (36.9)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+</td>
<td>6,618 (57.3)</td>
<td>11,625 (63.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean waiting time in days (s.d.)</strong></td>
<td>9.5 (20.3)</td>
<td>4.7 (5.6)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S2: Comparison of effectiveness of medical abortions conducted in the in-person vs. telemedicine groups for the telemedicine-hybrid cohort (n=29,984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>In-Person n=11,549</th>
<th>Telemedicine N=18,435</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful medical abortion</td>
<td>11,329 (98.1)</td>
<td>18,289 (99.2)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful medical abortion</td>
<td>220 (1.9)</td>
<td>146 (0.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing pregnancy treated with surgical management</td>
<td>133 (1.2)</td>
<td>17 (0.09)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing pregnancy opted to continue or unknown outcome</td>
<td>1 (0.01)</td>
<td>7 (0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained products treated with surgical management (ERPC)</td>
<td>86 (0.7)</td>
<td>122 (0.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As explained in the Methods section, the p-value for successful medical abortion is the co-variate adjusted p-value (i.e. all differences in patient clinical and demographic characteristics, including gestational age, are controlled for) and was calculated using a hypothesis test where the null hypothesis is that the in-person has the same effectiveness rate as the telemed group and the alternative hypothesis is that the in-person group has a lower effectiveness rate than the telemedicine group. The p-value for unsuccessful medical abortion is for the chi-squared test of whether the distribution of types of failure differ between in-person and telemed groups.
Table S3: Comparison of significant adverse events following medical abortions in the in-person vs. telemedicine groups for the telemedicine-hybrid cohort (n=29,984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>In-Person</th>
<th>Telemedicine</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haemorrhage requiring transfusion</td>
<td>4 (0.03)</td>
<td>3 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection requiring hospital admission</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major surgery</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As explained in the methods section, the p-value was calculated using a hypothesis test where the null hypothesis is that the in-person group has the same rate of adverse events than the telemedicine group and the alternative hypothesis is that the in-person group has a lower rate of adverse events than the telemedicine group.
Figure 1 – Summary of early medical abortion care management during COVID-19 pandemic (adapted from RCOG Coronavirus (COVID-19) infection and abortion care – information for healthcare professionals)⁹

[Note for editors – permission for reproduction obtained from RCOG]


If preferred, can provide original files in original Word format

Summary of early medical abortion care management during COVID-19 pandemic

Abortion is essential health care

Services should be organised so as to minimise delays in care

- Provide ultrasound if:
  - Unable to provide LMP of reasonable certainty within thresholds of eligibility or skill of provider
  - History or symptoms suggestive of high risk of ectopic pregnancy such as:
    - Unilateral abdominal pain and vaginal bleeding/speckling
    - Intrauterine device in-situ
    - History of tubal damage
    - Prior ectopic pregnancy

No need for routine blood testing

If STI screening indicated or chlamydia test recommended, use remote service (e.g. web-based home testing)

Consent can be given verbally, but discussion must be recorded in notes

Safeguarding assessment should be individualised; clinicians must be confident the woman can speak privately without coercion

Consider other ways to manage available resources and offer woman-centred care:

- Ensure maximum input from nursing staff
- For surgical abortion, consider pain relief that does not require theatre facilities or anaesthetic support
- Consider medical abortion in second trimester
- Collaborate with other providers
- Support staff to work from home where appropriate
Figure 2 – Decision aid for early medical abortion without ultrasound (adapted from RCOG Coronavirus (COVID-19) infection and abortion care – information for healthcare professionals)\textsuperscript{17}
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If preferred, can provide original files in original Powerpoint format
Decision aid for early medical abortion without ultrasound

**Clinician name:**
**Date and time:**
**Signature:**

**Affix Patient Label**
**Name**
**DOB**
**Number**

Questions to ask the patient:

1. Have you had a scan in this pregnancy?
   - Follow-up questions:
     - What was the date of the scan and how many weeks and days was the pregnancy then?
     - Where was the scan performed?
   - Clinician action: If scan available and from NHS provider, take the gestation date as accurate and stop at step 6

2. Do you know the date your last menstrual period began? (first day of proper bleeding – do not count light spotting prior to your full period)
   - Follow-up questions:
     - What was the date?
     - If unsure, can you either estimate the date when your period started, or how many weeks ago it was?
     - Do you usually get periods (proper bleeding, not just spotting) more frequently than once every 6 weeks?
   - Clinical action: Book scan if:
     - unable to provide a date or estimate
     - periods less frequent than every 6 weeks
     - date of conception not certain

3. Was it a normal period, or was it especially light or heavy?
   - Follow-up questions:
     - If especially light or just spotting, when was the first day of your last normal period?
     - If especially heavy, have you done a pregnancy test in the last few days?
   - Clinician action:
     - If especially light or just spotting, take date of the last (normal) menstrual period as accurate
     - If particularly heavy, ensure they have repeated a pregnancy test and take the date of last menstrual period as accurate

4. In the last 3 months, have you been taking the contraceptive pill or other hormonal contraception, or been breastfeeding?
   - Follow-up questions:
     - Have you been having regular periods until the last missed period?
     - When did you start to get feelings of being pregnant?
   - Clinician action: If uncertain, book scan

PTO

563
Are any of the following statements true for you?

- You have experienced abdominal (‘tummy’) or pelvic pain which is worse on one side, and vaginal bleeding/spotting
- You had an intrauterine device (e.g. ‘progestasert’, ‘Norplant’, ‘Mirena’, ‘Jaydess’, ‘Kyleena’, ‘Levovlar’) in place when you conceived
- You have experienced a previous ectopic pregnancy
- You have been informed, following an operation or scan, that your fallopian tubes (which connect the ovaries to the womb) are damaged
- You have had surgery on your fallopian tubes

If ‘yes’ to any, book scan

Gestation estimated to be <10 weeks and no indication for scan

Offer early medical abortion without ultrasound

Where early medical abortion without ultrasound is being offered, consider and discuss the following:

- Some pregnancies (less than one in a thousand) may be developing outside of the womb and are known as an ‘ectopic pregnancy’
- An early medical abortion remains safe, but will not treat the ectopic pregnancy; it is important that the ectopic pregnancy is identified
- You will be given advice about what to expect and what tests are needed to make sure the abortion care you receive is effective
- In the unlikely event you do develop worsening pain after your abortion care, especially if this is under your ribs or shoots up into your shoulder, then you should seek medical help immediately
- This advice is the same for anybody in early pregnancy who develops symptoms of an ectopic pregnancy, whether they choose to have abortion care or to continue pregnancy
- If you have to seek help, tell the doctor or nurse that you have had an early medical abortion without ultrasound
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