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Central question

The Zambian government attribute a third of Zambia’s high maternal mortality rate to unsafe abortion

Why is mortality and morbidity from unsafe induced abortion so high in a setting with adequate legislative provision pregnancy termination?
A hospital-based study design to compare safe/unsafe dichotomy

- In-depth interviews and economic questionnaire with women immediately following discharge after safe abortion or PAC following an unsafe abortion (n=112)

- Collation and analysis of these women’s medical notes
Pathways to study hospital

First attempt
- 14 (34%) attempt TOP with non-hospital clinical methods
- 24 (59%) attempt TOP with non-clinical methods
- 4 (11%) seek an alternative method

Second attempt
- 2 (50%) attempt TOP with non-hospital clinical methods
- 2 (50%) attempt TOP with non-clinical methods
- 1 attempts third non-clinical TOP

Government hospital
- 34 (89%) go to hospital
- 22 (65%) receive referral
- 41 (37%) visit different providers
- 112 women
- 71 (63%) report going straight to hospital
- 11 (15%) receive referral
- No information about 3 (7%)
- Includes 2 ambiguous cases
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Examples:
- Visit to the doctor’s home for TOP
- MA pills from a pharmacist
- MA pills from a friend
Pathways to study hospital

- **First attempt**
  - 14 (34%) attempt TOP with non-hospital clinical methods
  - 24 (59%) attempt TOP with non-clinical methods
  - 4 (11%) seek an alternative method

- **Second attempt**
  - 2 (50%) attempt TOP with non-hospital clinical methods
  - 2 (50%) attempt TOP with non-clinical methods

- **34 (89%) go to hospital**
  - 11 (15%) receive referral
  - 22 (65%) receive referral
  - 71 (63%) report going straight to hospital
  - 24 (59%) attempt TOP with non-clinical methods
  - 4 (11%) seek an alternative method

- **112 women**
  - 41 (37%) visit different providers
  - 11 (15%) receive referral
  - 71 (63%) report going straight to hospital

In includes 2 ambiguous cases

**Government hospital**

- **Eg:**
  - Overdose of combined oral contraceptive pill *Microgynon*
  - Overdose of paracetamol
  - Unknown pills from a partner
  - Insertion of small pipe
  - A stick from a herbalist

- 1 attempts third non-clinical TOP
### Pathways to study hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>% (N=112)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe abortion at hospital</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC at hospital after unsafe abortion:</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Self-medication]</td>
<td>[14.7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Other method e.g.: overdose, insert foreign object]</td>
<td>[25.5]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who had safe or unsafe abortions in the study?
Younger women more likely to have an unsafe abortion

Percentage of women in our study by age and un/safe abortion

- **Safe**
- **Unsafe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35+</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poorer women more likely to have an unsafe abortion

Percentage of women by un/safe abortion and wealth

- **Poorest below average**: 0.0% Safe, 15.0% Unsafe
- **Below average**: 0.0% Safe, 15.0% Unsafe
- **Average**: 0.0% Safe, 15.0% Unsafe
- **Above average**: 10.0% Safe, 5.0% Unsafe
- **Wealthiest**: 15.0% Safe, 10.0% Unsafe

Legend:
- **Green**: Safe
- **Red**: Unsafe
What influenced their trajectory to **safe** or **unsafe** abortion?
Knowledge: pregnant woman’s, and those around her

• Advice women sought and received, or did not seek, was important in determining pathway to hospital

• How much influencers knew was key

• Who women seek advice from depends on their relationships with those people, so it’s different for different people
The influence of advice: **safe abortion**

She is 33 years old and married. She has two children aged under 3 and lives in a township with her husband. They both run small businesses and just get by. Her pregnancy was unplanned and unexpected – they had been using condoms.

“I called a friend, I explained my situation. // And she gave me a [study hospital] doctor’s number and who I called.”
The influence of advice: unsafe abortion

She is 28 years old, married and daughter who is still very young. She kept both her pregnancy and subsequent actions secret from her husband.

I: So when you knew that you were pregnant did you do anything to try and terminate it?

R: I only had some Panadol... I only took two

She reports continuing to take her contraceptive pills, possibly hoping to precipitate a miscarriage. When the pregnancy continued, she escalated her attempts and went to a herbalist.

“I was given something to insert... I was given medicine, a stick... They inserted it themselves”

Subsequently, her husband brought her to the hospital at night, as an emergency admission, after telling her husband that she had high blood pressure. She seems to have had no knowledge of the possibility of a safe(r) TOP.
Susceptibility to fraud

- Lack of knowledge made women susceptible to clandestine payments to government physicians

- Introduced significant delays to securing procedures even in the ‘safe trajectory’
Clandestine payment to doctors: safe abortion

For some women, the clandestine cost of a safe ToP within the hospital could be significant, and introduce further delays.

02002 is 20 years old, from a poor family and stays with her mother’s friend (‘aunty’) as a maid. She told her aunty who called a hospital doctor for a TOP and they came to the hospital. However they were charged more than they expected and had to leave to find the outstanding balance. Only when returning a several weeks later was she given a medical abortion.

I thought that... when we got here, everything would happen. That I would be admitted and given some medicine, but than that did not happen... Yes, I had come before, almost a month ago... About the money. We did not manage the money that we were told was not enough... We thought that maybe we would be charged 100, so that is the money we come with. So we gave him a 100 and had a balance of 200 [still to pay]. So that is how we went back....We paid 200 [today], but it is not enough yet, we still have a balance.
Conclusions

• Zambian women are not accessing safe and legal abortion services because of low levels of knowledge
• This is being exploited by registered doctors who extort money for services that should be provided for free
• Increased population sensitisation of the circumstances under which safe abortion is available would decrease the use of unsafe abortions, and associated sequelae
• Availability of medical abortion drugs in the retail sector mean that substantial proportions of women are self-inducing abortions without appropriate advice or support
• The health system burden of post-abortion care following unsafe abortions could be reduced if women knew their rights