

# **HHS Public Access**

Author manuscript

N Engl J Med. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2017 July 28.

Published in final edited form as:

N Engl J Med. 2016 July 28; 375(4): 396–398. doi:10.1056/NEJMc1605389.

## Requests for Abortion in Latin America in the Wake of Zika Virus

Abigail R.A Aiken, PhD<sup>1,2</sup>, James G Scott, PhD<sup>3,4</sup>, Rebecca Gomperts, PhD<sup>5</sup>, James Trussell, PhD<sup>1,6</sup>, Marc Worrell<sup>5</sup>, and Catherine E Aiken, PhD<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Office of Population Research, Princeton University; Princeton, NJ, 08544, USA <sup>2</sup>LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, 78712, USA <sup>3</sup>Department of Statistics and Data Sciences, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA <sup>4</sup>McCombs School of Business, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, 78712, USA <sup>5</sup>Women on Web, Amsterdam, The Netherlands <sup>6</sup>Chalmers Centre, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH3 9ES, UK <sup>7</sup>University Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of Cambridge; NIHR Cambridge Comprehensive Biomedical Research Centre, CB2 2SW, UK

On November 17th 2015, the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) issued an epidemiological alert regarding Zika virus in Latin America. Several countries subsequently issued health advisories, including cautions about microcephaly, declarations of national emergency, and unprecedented warnings urging women to avoid pregnancy. Yet in most Latin-American countries, abortion is illegal or highly restricted, leaving pregnant women with few options.

For several years, one such option for women in Latin America has been Women on Web (WoW), a nonprofit organization that provides medical abortion outside the formal healthcare setting through online telemedicine, in countries where safe abortion is not universally available.<sup>3</sup> We analyzed data on requests for abortion through WoW between January 1st 2010 and March 2<sup>nd</sup> 2016 in 19 Latin-American countries. Using a regression-discontinuity design, we assessed whether requests for abortion increased after the PAHO alert on November 17<sup>th</sup>, compared to pre-announcement trends.

We classified requests by self-reported country of origin and divided countries into three groups: Group A, with autochthonous Zika transmission, legally restricted abortion, and public advisories to pregnant women; Group B, with no autochthonous Zika transmission and legally restricted abortion; and Group C, with autochthonous Zika transmission, legally restricted abortion, and no advisories. We also included three control countries where no Zika-related rise in requests was expected: Chile, Poland, and Uruguay (see online appendix). During the final three study weeks, women were asked specifically if they were seeking abortion because of Zika.

<sup>&#</sup>x27;Corresponding author: aaiken@princeton.edu, (+1)512-810-9285, 259 Wallace Hall, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA. Financial Disclosure Statement

ARAA and JT report grants from National Institutes of Health. JGS reports a grant from the National Science Foundation. RG is Founder and Director of Women on Web. JT serves on the Board of Directors of Women on Web Foundation. MW is an IT Consultant for Women on Web. CEMA declares no competing interests. Neither of the sources of funding had any involvement in data collection, analysis or interpretation, and no role in the writing of this manuscript or the decision to submit for publication.

Aiken et al. Page 2

In all Group A countries (except Jamaica), requests for abortion through WoW exhibited statistically significant increases of 36–108% over existing trends (Table 1 and appendix, Figure S3). In Group B, small increases were observed in two countries: Argentina and Peru (where officials sparked concern about Zika by asking the government to declare a preemptive state of emergency<sup>4</sup>). No significant increases were observed in Group C or any control countries. We cannot definitively attribute the rapid acceleration in requests in Group A to worries about Zika. However, the percentage of women in each country who reported Zika as their reason for seeking abortion correlates with the observed country-specific increases over baseline trends (appendix, Table S1).

In Latin-American countries that issued warnings to pregnant women about Zika-related complications, requests for abortion through WoW increased substantially. Our approach may underestimate the impact of the advisories on demand for abortion, since many women may have used an unsafe method, accessed misoprostol via local pharmacies or the black market, or visited local underground providers. But accurate data on these choices are difficult to obtain. Our data thus provide a window on how Zika has affected the lives of pregnant women in Latin America.

World Health Organization (WHO) mathematical models predict 3–4 million Zika cases across the Americas over the next year, and Zika will inevitably spread to other countries where access to safe abortion is restricted. Official information and advice about Zika must be accompanied by efforts to ensure that all reproductive choices are safe, legal, and accessible. To do otherwise would be irresponsible public-health practice and unjust policy.

#### **Supplementary Material**

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

### **Acknowledgments**

The authors thank Maaike Schippefelt and Verónica Fernandez-Montes Gámez for excellent research assistance.

#### References

- Epidemiological Alert: Increase of microcephaly in the northeast of Brazil. Pan American Health Organization/World Health Organization Regional Office for the Americas; http://wwwpahoorg/hq/indexphp?option=com\_docman&task=doc\_view&Itemid=270&gid=32285&lang=en Accessed 28th Feb 2016
- In Brief: Facts on Abortion in Latin America and the Caribbean. Guttmacher Institute; Nov. 2015 https://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/IB\_AWW-Latin-America.pdf Accessed 28<sup>th</sup> Feb 2016
- 3. Gomperts RJ, Jelinska K, Davies S, Gemzell-Danielsson K, Kleiverda G. Using telemedicine for termination of pregnancy with mifepristone and misoprostol in settings where there is no access to safe services. BJOG. 2008; 115(9):1171–5. discussion 5–8. [PubMed: 18637010]
- 4. Northern Peru braces for mosquito-borne Zika virus. Peru Reports; (http://perureports.com/ 2016/01/25/northern-peru-braces-for-mosquito-borne-zika-virus/) Accessed 7th March 2016
- 5. Gerdts C, Vohra D, Ahern J. Measuring unsafe abortion-related mortality: a systematic review of the existing methods. PLoS One. 2013; 8(1):e53346. [PubMed: 23341939]

Aiken et al.

Page 3

Table 1

Actual versus expected numbers of requests in the post-Zika period for each country included in the study.

Country	Actual Requests	<b>Expected Requests</b>	Percent Increase Over Baseline Trend	p-value
Group A: Zika; no abortion; pregnancy advisory				
Brazil	1210	581.7	108.0	< 0.001
Colombia	141	101.7	38.7	< 0.001
Costa Rica	67	49.2	36.1	0.043
El Salvador	24	17.7	35.6	0.010
Ecuador	71	34.2	107.7	< 0.001
Honduras	36	20.5	75.7	< 0.001
Jamaica	25	37.2	-32.9	0.654
Venezuela	86	44.5	93.3	< 0.001
Group B: No Zika; no abortion				
Argentina	270	221.7	21.8	0.004
Bahamas	15	10.5	42.8	0.277
Peru	81	67.2	20.5	0.035
Trinidad and Tobago	12	10.0	20.6	0.704
Group C: Zika; no abortion; no pregnancy advisory				
Bolivia	21	12.5	68.4	0.166
Dominican Republic	17	21.2	-20.0	0.608
Guatemala	32	29.5	8.4	0.651
Mexico†	172	184.4	-6.7	0.982
Nicaragua	11	8.8	24.3	0.811
Panama	21	17.3	21.3	0.122
Paraguay	16	12.8	24.5	0.356
Controls				
Chile	442	463.4	-4.6	0.984
Uruguay	5	5.1	-1.0	0.852
Poland	1574	1487.7	5.8	0.731

 $<sup>^{\</sup>dagger}$ Abortion is highly restricted except in the capital, the Federal District, which decriminalized first-trimester abortions in 2007.

Actual and expected requests are cumulative counts for the post-Zika period since November  $17^{th}$  2015. Expected requests are obtained as forecasts using each country's null model, assuming no discontinuity on November  $17^{th}$  2015. Percent increases are percentages, calculated as 100\*(Actual-Expected)/Expected. P-values are obtained from a likelihood ratio test of the regression-discontinuity model versus the null model of no discontinuity. Low p-values indicate evidence for the presence of a discontinuity (i.e. that the percent increase over baseline is statistically significant).