



PEARL

Are we prepared for change? The need for evidence on healthcare practitioner readiness for current and future trends in abortion provision in the UK

French, Rebecca S.; Shawe, Jill; Palmer, Melissa J.; Reiter, Jennifer; Wellings, Kaye

Published in:

BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health

DOI:

[10.1136/bmj-srh-2021-201243](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-srh-2021-201243)

Publication date:

2021

Link:

[Link to publication in PEARL](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

French, R. S., Shawe, J., Palmer, M. J., Reiter, J., & Wellings, K. (2021). Are we prepared for change? The need for evidence on healthcare practitioner readiness for current and future trends in abortion provision in the UK. *BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health*, 0(0).

<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-srh-2021-201243>

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Wherever possible please cite the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

Are we prepared for change? The need for evidence on healthcare practitioner readiness for current and future trends in abortion provision in the UK

French RS¹, Shawe J², Palmer M¹, Reiter J³, Wellings K¹ and the SACHA Study Team

1 Department of Public Health, Environments and Society, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK

2 Public Health, London Borough of Lambeth, London, UK

3 School of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, UK

Corresponding author:

Dr Rebecca French,

Department of Public Health, Environments and Society,

Faculty of Public Health and Policy,

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine,

15-17 Tavistock Place,

London

WC1H 9SH

Tel: +44(0)20 7927 2047

Keywords: Abortion; Healthcare Professionals; Health Service Delivery; Health Services Research; Health Policy

Word count: 1000

Significant changes are occurring in the landscape of abortion provision in the UK. More women are having medical abortions and self-managing these at home, resulting in an increase in the proportion of abortions performed before 10 weeks' gestation.[1]. Since 2018, women in Britain have been able to take misoprostol, the second medication for medical abortion, at home provided they have attended a clinic to have it prescribed. The COVID pandemic has accelerated the trend towards self-management. As an emergency and temporary measure due to concerns about reduced health service access for women with unwanted pregnancies during the pandemic, consultations about pregnancy options have occurred by telephone or video and, if women wish and are deemed clinically appropriate, a medical abortion pack of both mifepristone and misoprostol can be posted to their home (up to nine weeks, six days gestation in England and Wales, and no restriction in Scotland, but clinical guidelines state up to 11 weeks, six days). Laws prohibiting abortion have been repealed in Northern Ireland, effectively decriminalising most abortions, and pressure for decriminalisation has been mounting in the rest of the UK. The changes are taking place alongside shifts in thinking about healthcare generally. Recognition of patient-centred approaches and supported self-management, alongside enhancement of activities that complement clinical care in sexual and reproductive health, has gained more prominence.

The changes have significant implications for all methods of abortion delivery and care. The roles and scope of non-abortion specialist healthcare practitioners, such as pharmacists, general practitioners (GPs), nurses and midwives, in administering and supporting abortion procedures (including medical abortion and vacuum aspiration) are being reconsidered. The location and staffing of abortion services has a major role in normalising abortion and removing stigma. Abortion is a common procedure, but its "separateness" can isolate it from mainstream services and marginalise those providing abortion services. Changes to the legal framework of abortion provision alone will remove some, but not all, barriers to access - for either women or practitioners. Where decriminalisation has occurred elsewhere, as in Australia, stigma and negative attitudes toward abortion among some health practitioners have persisted.[2] A GP survey in Northern Ireland examining the effect of recent decriminalisation found only around 40% felt abortion services should be part of general practice, and only half would be willing to prescribe abortion pills.[3] No relevant data are available on the inclination of healthcare practitioners in other parts of the UK to expand their role in abortion provision. In Canada, however, where training has been provided, more doctors have been willing to undertake abortions.[4] Medical abortion delivery and care provided by nurses, midwives and pharmacists have been found to be effective, safe and acceptable to women. Evidence from low and middle income countries, where task-shifting and sharing is more widespread, illustrates trained nurses and midwives can safely and effectively provide vacuum aspirations,[5] and within NHS early pregnancy units, nurses have long performed the same procedure where pregnancy is non-viable. In UK primary care, the development of new clinical roles such as Advanced Clinical Practitioners and General Practice Assistants, provide expanded opportunities for multidisciplinary service provision. A systematic review has highlighted lessons to be learnt about abortion provision in these settings for the UK context.[6] While rates of effectiveness and safety outcomes were comparable between specialist and non-specialist abortion providers, job satisfaction increased amongst midwives and nurses and abortion specialists were freer to manage more complex cases. However, potential negative consequences of transferring more early medical abortion to primary care settings included the imposition of a greater burden on GPs and longer patient waiting times.

Self and home administration of medications for abortion are effective and acceptable for women, for many even preferable particularly where decision-making is made jointly with the healthcare provider.[7] Telemedicine consultations for those having early medical abortions at home have also been reported to be safe, acceptable and effective.[8] Additional benefits include reduced waiting

times and gestation age at abortion and greater privacy and convenience for many patients. Yet, the appropriate balance of e-health delivery and face-to-face contact clearly depends on context and patient preference.

A consultation conducted by the Scottish Government in June 2021 on continuing permission for mifepristone at home found much of the opposition was driven by pro-life campaigners and faith groups.[9] For the benefits of recent trends to be enhanced, and any costs diminished, a robust evidence-base is needed to inform and underpin programmatic action and policy. Evidence necessary to understand and support workforce willingness and preparedness for changes in abortion care and provision in the UK is scant. Provider education for non-abortion specialist healthcare practitioners is not yet in place in the UK and little is known about the level of training required and what the demand would be. Research is needed on optimal ways of increasing non-specialist practitioner confidence and competence to support women both in face-to-face and remote consultations with self- and home management and to understand potential barriers, such as concerns around financing and medicolegal factors.

The SACHA (Shaping Abortion for Change) Study, funded by the National Institute for Health Research, aims to provide an evidence-base to inform optimal configuration of health services and systems for abortion provision in the UK. We will collate and synthesise existing research findings on novel models of care, draw lessons from countries spearheading reforms in abortion provision, and consult women, practitioners and key stakeholders on approaches likely to be most feasible and acceptable in the UK context. An important component of this work is a national survey to assess healthcare practitioners' views on the desirability and perceived consequences of decriminalisation and demedicalisation of abortion. A comprehensive understanding of UK healthcare practitioners' attitudes, current practices and future intentions will help identify and address challenges and opportunities for future provision of high-quality abortion care. The COVID pandemic has acted as a catalyst to innovation in some European countries, but in others inequalities in abortion access have widened.[10] The SACHA Study is timely and will provide essential evidence for future abortion provision in the UK and elsewhere.

References

- 1 Department of Health & Social Care. Abortion statistics for England and Wales: 2020. 21 July, 2021 <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/abortion-statistics-for-england-and-wales-2020/abortion-statistics-england-and-wales-2020> (Accessed 20/07/21)
- 2 Keogh L, Croy S, Newton D, Hendron M, Hill S. General practitioner knowledge and practice in relation to unintended pregnancy in the Grampians region of Victoria, Australia. *Rural and Remote Health*. 2019 Nov;19(4):5156. doi:10.22605/rrh5156.
- 3 O'Connor R, O'Doherty J, O'Mahony M, Spain E. Knowledge and attitudes of Irish GPs towards abortion following its legalisation: a cross-sectional study. *BJGP Open*. 2019; 3 (4) doi: 10.3399/bjgpopen19X101669
- 4 Munro S, Guilbert E, Wagner M-S, Wilcox ES, Devane C, Dunn S, et al. Perspectives Among Canadian Physicians on Factors Influencing Implementation of Mifepristone Medical Abortion: A National Qualitative Study. *The Annals of Family Medicine*. 2020;18(5):413-21.
- 5 Sheldon S, Fletcher J. Vacuum aspiration for induced abortion could be safely and legally performed by nurses and midwives. *J Fam Plann Reprod Health Care*. 2017;43(4):260-264. doi: 10.1136/jfprhc-2016-101542.
- 6 Zhou J, Blaylock R, Harris M. Systematic review of early abortion services in low- and middle-income country primary care: potential for reverse innovation and application in the UK context. *Globalization and Health*. 2020;16:91. doi:10.1186/s12992-020-00613-z.
- 7 Gambir K, Kim C, Necastro KA, Ganatra B, Ngo TD. Self-administered versus provider-administered medical

abortion. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2020. Issue 3. Art. No.: CD013181. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD013181.pub2.

8 Meurice ME, Whitehouse KC, Blaylock R, JJ Chang, Lohr P. Client satisfaction and experience of telemedicine and home use of mifepristone and misoprostol for abortion up to 10 weeks' gestation at British Pregnancy Advisory Services: A cross-sectional evaluation. *Contraception* 2021;104:61-66. doi: [10.1016/j.contraception.2021.04.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2021.04.027)

9 Scottish Government. Future Arrangements for Early Medical Abortion at Home. Consultation Analysis Report. June 2021. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/future-arrangements-early-medical-abortion-home-consultation-analysis/documents/> (Accessed 20/07/21)

10 Moreau C, Shankar M, Glasier A, Cameron S, Gemzell-Danielsson K. Abortion regulation in Europe in the era of COVID-19: a spectrum of policy responses. *BMJ Sex Reprod Health*.2020;0:1-8 doi:10.1136/bmjsex-2020-200724.

Contributorship Statement

RF drafted the paper and JS, MP, JR and KW contributed to subsequent drafts. All members of the SACHA Study team were sent the final draft and provided comments.

Acknowledgements

The SACHA Study (<https://www.lshtm.ac.uk/research/centres-projects-groups/sacha>) is funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Services and Delivery Research Programme (NIHR Ref No NIHR129529). The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the funders.