



RETRACTED: Expression of Concern: The Turnaway Study: A Case of Self-Correction in Science Upended by Political Motivation and Unvetted Findings

Priscilla K. Coleman*

Human Development and Family Studies, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH, United States

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Stephen Sammut,
Franciscan University of Steubenville,
United States

Reviewed by:

Robin Pierucci,
Western Michigan University,
United States
Steven Braatz,
American Association of ProLife
ObGyns, United States
Tara Sander Lee,
Charlotte Lozier Institute,
United States
John Thorp,
University of North Carolina at Chapel
Hill, United States

*Correspondence:

Priscilla K. Coleman
pcolema@bgsu.edu

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Health Psychology,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Psychology

Received: 26 March 2022

Accepted: 24 May 2022

Published: 17 June 2022

Citation:

Coleman PK (2022) Expression of
Concern: The Turnaway Study: A
Case of Self-Correction in Science
Upended by Political Motivation and
Unvetted Findings.
Front. Psychol. 13:905221.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.905221

This review begins with a detailed focus on the Turnaway Study, which addresses associations among early abortion, later abortion, and denied abortion relative to various outcomes including mental health indicators. The Turnaway Study was comprised of 516 women; however, an exact percentage of the population is not discernable due to missing information. Extrapolating from what is known reveals a likely low of 0.32% to a maximum of 3.18% of participants sampled from the available the pool. Motivation for conducting the Turnaway Study, methodological deficiencies (sampling issues and others), and bias are specifically addressed. Despite serious departures from accepted scientific practices, journals in psychology and medicine have published dozens of articles generated from the study's data. The high volume of one-sided publications has stifled dialogue on potential adverse psychological consequences of this common procedure. Following a critical analysis of the Turnaway Study, an overview of the strongest studies on abortion and mental health is offered. This comprehensive literature comprised of numerous large-scale studies from across the globe has been largely overlooked by scientists and the public, while the Turnaway Study dominates the media, information provided to women, and legal challenges involving abortion restrictions. In the final section of this article, literature reviews by professional organizations are considered, demonstrating that the biased science characterizing the Turnaway Study is aligned with a pervasive and systemic phenomenon wherein deriving reliable and valid results *via* careful attention to methodology and scrutiny by the scientific community have been supplanted by politics.

Keywords: abortion, mental health, turnaway study, bias, politicized science

INTRODUCTION

“Comte argued long ago that the basis for the success of science was experience and observation. We now know that that is only part of the story, albeit an important part. Nevertheless, we can use this argument to remember that the basis for *our* trust in science is, in fact, experience and observation—not of empirical reality, *but of science itself*. It is what Comte argued long ago: that just as we can only understand the natural world by observing it, so we can only understand the social world by observing it. When we observe scientists, we find that they have developed a variety

of practices for vetting knowledge—for identifying problems in their theories and experiments and attempting to correct them. While these practices are fallible, we have substantial empirical evidence that they do detect error and insufficiency. They stimulate scientists to reconsider their views and, as warranted by evidence, to change them. This is what constitutes progress in science.” (Oreskes, 2021, p. 64).

The Turnaway Study explored responses of women (including minors) who obtained or were denied abortions around the gestational limit of clinics throughout the United States (Turnaway Study Operating Procedures Manual, 2016). The authors also included women who had first trimester abortions for comparison purposes (Turnaway Study Operating Procedures Manual, 2016). More specifically, the authors recruited participants with three distinct profiles: (1) women whose pregnancies were dated between one day and three weeks after clinic gestational limits and were therefore unable to secure an abortion; (2) women whose pregnancies were between one day to two weeks shy of the clinic gestational limit and had an abortion; and finally, (3) women who had a first trimester abortion (Turnaway Study Operating Procedures Manual, 2016). Most of the participants in the Turnaway Group (68%) gave birth; 32% had abortions at another location or had a miscarriage or stillbirth (Miller et al., 2020). According to Miller et al. (2020), the investigators checked for eligibility and then relayed information about a phone interview that would transpire at 6-month intervals over five years. Topics included aspects of women’s mental and physical health, background characteristics, and questions on the health and development of participants’ children (Turnaway Study Operating Procedures Manual, 2016). Baseline interviews occurred approximately 1 week after having or being denied an abortion (Turnaway Study Operating Procedures Manual, 2016).

In January 2022, Kaiser Health News¹ interviewed Turnaway Study principal investigator, Foster, reporting, “Data from the Turnaway Study has resulted in the publication of more than 50 peer-reviewed studies, and the answer to nearly all the questions asked, said Foster, is that the women who got abortions fared better in respect to economics and health, including their mental health, compared with those who did not have abortions.” In an article in the December 2021 issue of *Scientific American*,² a sociology professor, Amanda Stevenson was quoted as saying, “It’s impossible to overstate how scholarly the design of the study is.”

The purpose of this review article is to step back from the far-reaching and laudatory comments in major media and popular press that have described the study as “debunking most anti-abortion arguments” (New Yorker, 7-7-20³), proving “restricting abortion harms women” (Ms. Magazine, 6-30-20⁴), and as “landmark” [Scientific American (see footnote 2)] to

¹ <https://khn.org/news/article/abortion-ruling-supreme-court-public-opinion/>

² <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/being-denied-an-abortion-has-lasting-impacts-on-health-and-finance/#>

³ <https://www.newyorker.com/books/under-review/the-study-that-debunks-most-anti-abortion-arguments>

⁴ <https://msmagazine.com/2020/06/30/the-turnaway-study-new-research-proves-restricting-abortion-harms-women/>

examine what can be gleaned from the study’s inception to efforts to answer the question replete with political ramifications, does abortion place women at risk for mental health problems?

Following a detailed analysis of the Turnaway Study, an overview of the strongest studies available world-wide related to abortion and mental health is provided. This comprehensive literature has been largely ignored as the Turnaway Study dominates the media, information provided to women, and legal challenges involving abortion restrictions. In the final section of this article, literature reviews by professional organizations are addressed to illustrate that the biased science characterizing the Turnaway Study is aligned with a pervasive and systemic phenomenon wherein scientific principles have been held captive by a political agenda that has no room for vetting knowledge and skeptical scientists.

THE TURNAWAY STUDY ORIGINS, BASICS, AND METHODOLOGICAL FLAWS

In 2016, Martin observed that Warren Buffett had provided a minimum of \$88,000,000 to the University of California San Francisco’s (UCSF) reproductive health research institute, with the funds supporting researchers with outspoken political agendas. Martin (2016) explained, “The research initiative dates back at least to the early 2000s and became more urgent after the high court held in 2007 that in cases of ‘medical and scientific uncertainty,’ legislatures could have ‘wide discretion’ to pass laws restricting abortion. Since then, a primary objective of abortion rights supporters has been to establish a high level of medical certainty—both about the safety of the procedure and about what happens when a woman’s reproductive options are drastically curtailed or eliminated.” (p. 2). Martin further pointed out, Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health (ANSIRH) was founded in 2002 within UCSF’s Bixby Center for Global Reproductive Health and “foundation-backed researchers had already begun to churn out studies aimed at debunking some of the most common justifications for new abortion restrictions. . . that the psychological damage caused by grief and regret after abortions often persists for years and ruins women’s lives.” (p. 2). The Turnaway Study was conducted by ANSIRH.

Turnaway Study results suggested more positive psychological outcomes for abortion recipients compared to those denied wanted abortions for being past clinic gestational limits (e.g., Biggs et al., 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017; Foster et al., 2015). However, the analysis below of the sampling procedures and other methodological problems clearly demonstrates that the Turnaway Study cannot yield reliable data, precluding generalizability to women seeking United States abortions. In an affidavit for the Supreme Court case, *June Medical Services v. Gee*⁵ submitted as an appendix to an amicus curiae brief,⁶ the

⁵ https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/18/18-1323/127325/20200102151531266_Appendix.pdf

⁶ https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/18/18-1323/127325/2020010215154780_Amicus%20Brief.pdf

author of this review provided a preliminary analysis of several shortcomings of the Turnaway Study and addressed problems with the professional reviews of the abortion and mental health literature. Where appropriate, this affidavit is referenced.

The Turnaway Study investigators do not clearly articulate the sampling plan, the size of the population, or precisely how sites situated in different cities were chosen (see footnote 6). Only very generalized information on these issues is described in the Operating Procedures Manual (2016) and the cities are not identified. In one of the study's published articles, Biggs et al. (2014) noted, "From 2008 to 2010, we recruited women seeking abortion care at 30 facilities in 21 states throughout the USA. Facilities were identified using the National Abortion Federation membership directory and by referral. Sites were selected based on their gestational age limits to perform an abortion procedure, where each facility had the latest gestational limit of any facility within 150 miles. Gestational age limits ranged from 10 weeks to the end of the second trimester. Facilities performed over 2,000 abortions a year on average" (Biggs et al., 2014, p. 2506). From this description, there is no way of knowing if all the selected facilities engaged in recruitment during the first year and continued efforts for the full three years. In another publication, Dobkin et al. (2014, p. e116) note, "We began recruiting participants from one abortion facility and gradually expanded to the 30 total facilities over the next 3 years." Although the number of facilities that engaged in recruitment during each of the 3 years is not stated, the excerpt does suggest that at least some of the facilities were retained after the initial year. The Turnaway Study Operating Procedures Manual (pp. 6–7), provided some more information, "Early in the project, Sandy Stonesifer, the Program Manager at the time, or PI Diana Foster conducted on-site orientation visits to twenty-three of the clinics. They met and trained the point people for the remaining clinics at the annual NAF meeting during the spring of 2008. Over time, additional clinical recruitment sites were added. In April 2010, we had 29 clinics participating in the study. In early 2010, Project Directors Rana Barar, Heather Gould, and other staff members visited all participating clinics, either to train them in participant recruitment (if they were new sites) or to motivate them to continue recruitment, and to share lessons learned from other successful recruitment sites." This seems to suggest 23 sites were retained in the first year and then by the third year there were 29 facilities actively recruiting.

Because the information is ambiguous, the reader has no way of knowing how many facilities recruited for 3 years, 2 years, 1 year, or less. Assuming there was continuous recruitment across the 3 years for the 23 clinics identified in the first year, the potential participants would include 138,000 for this segment based on 23 sites \times 2,000 average annual abortions \times 3 years. Further, assuming the remaining six sites were added in year 2 and recruited for 2 years, the maximum potential participant pool from the later segment would be 24,000 reflecting six sites \times 2,000 average annual abortions \times 2 years. Combining the two segments, the upper limit of the population would therefore be 162,000. Unfortunately, without more information there is no way of knowing the minimum number of women who comprised the population.

Based on information in the Dobkin et al. (2014) article, we know that only 7,486 women were screened in and of those screened in, only 3,045 were approached to participate across the three groups. The authors fail to explain why so many potential participants were not screened in to begin with and why only 41% of these women were approached about the study. This is potentially very problematic, because those not screened in or not approached could have been systematically different from those who were screened in or approached relative to background characteristics, situational factors and/or how they presented before, during, or immediately after the abortion experience.

Further, based on data offered by Dobkin et al. (2014), the percentages of women approached varied dramatically based on the study groups (described at the outset of this article). The Turnaway Group was 83.2%, the Near Limits Group was 58%, and the 1st Trimester Group was 22%. Agreement-to-participate rates derived from the percentage of women approached were 41% in the Turnaway Group, 42.2% in the Near Limits Group, and 33.8% in the 1st Trimester Group. The total number of women who agreed to participate across groups was $1,199/3,045 = 39.4\%$.

Biggs et al. (2016) explained that 210 women in the Turnaway Group (21.9% of women who were screened-in and 26.3% of approached), 413 in the Near Limits Group (18.05% of women who were screened-in and 31.1% of approached), and 254 in the 1st Trimester Group (6.1% of women who were screened-in and 25.9% of approached) completed the baseline measures. Overall, 877/3,045 or 28.8% of eligible women approached completed the baseline measures. The total percentage of women who finished the 5 year study from among those approached was $516/3,045$, a mere 16.9%, or if the women deemed ineligible after a phone call following consent to participate are eliminated from the denominator (65 women), the figure is 17.3% ($516/2,980$). Remarkably, in virtually every news story regarding the Turnaway study, including those with interviews of Foster, the figure cited is 1,000 women.

The final sample of 516 participants amounts to a miniscule 0.32% of the total abortions performed at the 29 facilities over 3 years if the high end 162,000 figure for the population is used. At 50% (81,000), the percentage only jumps to .64%, and at 10% (16,200), the percentage is 3.18%. The Turnaway Study researchers attempted to make generalized claims about women seeking abortion when the study itself likely did not even consider over 95% of women receiving abortions at the facilities included in the study. Given the extremely small percentage of women from the population represented in the sample, generalizations are precluded.

As indicated above, there are many potentially systematic reasons women may not have been screened in or approached that have relevance to the outcome measures. There are also numerous reasons women may themselves have chosen not to participate or dropped out after agreeing to participate. They could have been upset or worried about privacy, because a longitudinal design requires repeated contact with participants. Women whose voices were not represented are logically among those with the most significant mental health complications, because revisiting the experience may have been perceived

as too stressful or traumatic (Adler, 1976; Söderberg et al., 1998a). In one of the Turnaway studies led by Rocca et al. (2015), the investigators noted that participants most likely to be retained had among the highest rates of relief at baseline; whereas those with the lowest levels of relief at baseline were most likely to drop out before the 3rd year decision satisfaction measure was administered. There is a myriad of other ways the non-participants may have been distinct from the participants, creating a biased sample. For instance, they may have been busier with children, less in need of the \$50 gift card awarded at each point of data collection, working more, experienced more instability or unrelated trauma in their lives, or they may have simply been less interested in giving up personal time.

Based on these seriously compromised sampling issues, broader applicability is impossible to decipher. Experts in various academic fields have identified low response rates leading to non-response bias as a fatal flaw (Fowler, 1995; Draugalis et al., 2008; Amico, 2009). Non-response bias occurs when sample data under-represents certain types of participants from the population. When survey responders are distinct from non-responders relative to demographic, situational, behavioral, personality, psychological, and/or social factors the bias occurs. As a result, the sample is not representative of the target population precluding extrapolation.

Draugalis et al. (2008) noted response rates should be between 50 and 75% to be acceptable based on expert opinion. Fowler (1995) commented that mail survey samples with a 5–20% response rate offer little resemblance to the population. Respondents are self-selected, precluding detection of reliable and accurate information about the group from which they originated. Even if we consider only the percentage of participants who consented and completed the Turnaway Study, 17.3%, the results are of little to no scientific value and are not generalizable to all women who have obtained abortions.

Another serious problem with the Turnaway Study is those who underwent abortions near gestational limits included patients whose pregnancies ranged from 10 to 27 weeks gestation, despite the reality that women's reasons for aborting and their psychological reactions differ significantly at varying points in pregnancy (see footnote 6). For example, Kelly et al. (2010) reported that women who had later abortions suffered more psychologically compared to women who had earlier abortions. Another research group analyzed online surveys ($n = 374$) of women who had a first trimester abortion compared to those who had a second or third trimester abortion (Coleman et al., 2010), with 52% of the early abortion group and 67% of the later abortion group meeting criteria for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) symptoms. These data suggest that women aborting at different gestational ages should not be grouped together, especially when the nature of the data would have readily allowed for more sensitive separation by gestational age.

Another highly problematic aspect of the Turnaway Study is many of the outcome measures are assessed too simplistically, with two variables (anxiety and depression) containing only six items and two constructs assessed with a mere single item (self-esteem and life satisfaction) (see footnote 6). This is disconcerting with so many psychometrically sound lengthier surveys readily

attained from the literature (see footnote 6). Consensus among researchers is that multiple-item measures typically offer far more reliable and valid assessments of multifaceted psychological constructs, because they enable capturing all components in a more nuanced and thorough manner (Fisher et al., 2016). For the extremely common variables in the Turnaway study, dozens of well-designed measures are available. For example, authors Therrien and Hunsley (2012) identified 91 different scales to measure anxiety in the published literature. Dozens of these are far superior relative to coverage of the construct and in terms of psychometric properties compared to the instruments employed in the Turnaway Study.

In numerous Turnaway Study analyses, the authors failed to control for abortions that took place before or after the target abortion, when more than one abortion elevates risk for mental health problems compared to a single procedure (Steinberg and Finer, 2011). Any associations with abortions in this study are therefore likely confounded by the number and timing of additional abortions. For example, it is conceivable that those in the Turnaway group had more experience with abortion and delayed due to ambivalence.

Finally, the Turnaway Study does not incorporate a control group of women who have not undergone an abortion by choice; therefore, even if the study did not suffer from all the above methodological shortcomings, the results offer no information regarding differences in mental health trajectories for those who do and do not choose abortion.

When the impetus for the Turnaway Study and the deficiencies of the methodology employed are closely scrutinized, one is left grappling for answers as to how the authors have managed to populate the professional literature with dozens of articles, while shutting down dialogue on the complex question regarding whether or not abortion increases risk for mental illness. In the next section, a close examination of the world literature on this topic is provided.

ABORTION AND MENTAL HEALTH IN THE WORLD LITERATURE

For a significant percentage of patients, abortion initiates feelings of regret, loss, and alienation from others (Söderberg et al., 1998b; Kero and Lalos, 2000; Kero et al., 2004, 2009; Kimport et al., 2011; Kimport, 2012). *Management of Unintended and Abnormal Pregnancy: Comprehensive Abortion Care* published by leading abortion providers (Paul et al., 2009) included a chapter on counseling outlining numerous potential negative reactions to abortion including depression, guilt, shame, regret, and grief (Baker and Beresford, 2009).

The science linking abortion to elevated risk for mental health challenges is published in prominent journals, with dozens of large, prospective studies incorporating comparison groups and additional sophisticated control techniques, enhancing confidence in the published findings (see footnote 6). This extensive literature has shown that abortion increases risk for mental health problems including substance abuse, anxiety, depression, suicidal ideation, and suicide (e.g.,

Coleman et al., 2002a; Bradshaw and Slade, 2003; Cogle et al., 2003; Broen et al., 2004, 2006; Coleman et al., 2005, 2006; Gissler et al., 2005, 2015; Fergusson et al., 2006, 2008; Pedersen, 2007, 2008; Rees and Sabia, 2007; Dingle et al., 2008; McCarthy et al., 2015; Sullins, 2016) (see footnote 6).

Based on their narrative review of 30 journal articles, Bellieni and Buonocore (2013, p. 307) concluded, “The studies analyzed here show that abortion is a risk factor for mental illness when compared to childbirth.” Udzma and Achadi (2019) published an analysis of studies examining factors related to depression in pregnancy and they reported that a maternal history of abortion was a significant factor in four out of the six studies examined. Finally, Espinoza et al. (2020) analyzed results of 35 studies and found that compared to older women, adolescents tended to delay abortion decisions longer and were at higher risk for psychosocial harm.

Coleman (2011) published a meta-analysis in the *British Journal of Psychiatry* on the association between abortion experience and mental health outcomes with methodologically-based selection criteria that included sample size, inclusion of comparison group(s), and controls for potential confounding factors (e.g., demographic variables, violence exposure, and history of mental health problems). This meta-analysis incorporated 22 studies, 36 measures of effect, and 877,297 participants (163,880 had an abortion). The results demonstrated that abortion was associated with an 81% increased risk for mental health problems. Compared to unintended pregnancy delivered, abortion predicted a 55% increased risk of mental health problems. Results further demonstrated the following specific increased risks: anxiety disorders 34%; depression 37%; alcohol use/abuse 110%; marijuana use/abuse 220%; and suicide behaviors 155%. A population attributable risk analysis showed that almost 10% of mental health problems were directly related to abortion.

After this meta-analysis was published, renowned researcher, Dr. David Fergusson from New Zealand, with hundreds of journal articles to his credit, published a letter to the editor titled “A Further Meta-Analysis” revealing his independent meta-analysis was consistent with the results of the Coleman study.⁷ In his letter he noted, “The implications of this analysis are inescapable: despite the claims made in previous reviews about the absence of association between abortion and mental health, when data are pooled across studies there is consistent evidence suggesting that women having abortions are at modestly increased risks of mental health problems when compared with women coming to term with unplanned/unwanted pregnancies.”

Affirming commentary was also offered by Chilean researcher, Elard Koch and coauthored by two American researchers titled, “The elusive problem of causation on the relationship between abortion and mental health problems. Does it really matter to avoid public health recommendations?” (see footnote 14) The authors stated, “Previous letters by Howard et al., Robinson et al., Lagro-Janssen et al. submitted immediately after the publication

do not seem to even understand what Coleman really did or at least they are underestimating the rigorous methodology applied by the author, quoting substantially weaker studies or basing on the single study by Munk-Olsen et al., 2012 [5]—published after the submission of Coleman’s study to the *British Journal of Psychiatry*—to dismiss any evidence suggesting that abortion may have adverse effects on mental health.”

Several of the more recent large-scale investigations from throughout the world are summarized in **Table 1**. Among those presented is a 2018 study by Luo et al. (2018), wherein a stronger association was detected between abortion and suicidal ideation in participants with no known history of anxiety or depression. The authors noted, “The stronger association among those without anxiety or depression further corroborates our inference that induced abortion was associated with suicidality independent of mental disorders among this population.” (p. 7). Luo concluded, “An improvement of mental health of the population requires policy change, medical system support, enhanced communication between the service seekers and health care providers.” (p. 10).

Another notable study in the table is by Jacob et al. (2019b) comprised of more than 35,000 participants. Diagnoses were continuously documented, eliminating recall bias. In this study, significant associations between abortion and several psychiatric disorders were identified. The authors concluded, “Based on these results, information on the potential impact of induced abortion on mental health should be given to women before the abortion procedure is scheduled.” (p. 78).

When one examines materials related to potential adverse emotional reactions provided by mainstream abortion providers, studies indicating abortion increases risk of mental health problems from what is now an extensive literature are rarely mentioned and when they are noted, there is typically misrepresentation and dismissal. For example, on the Maria Stopes Australia website,⁸ the following statement is offered, “Warnings of depression as a result of abortion are the basis behind laws in nine U.S states mandating that women must first sit through counselling sessions detailing supposed side effects such as suicide, sexual dysfunction, flashbacks and substance abuse. There is no scientific basis to these claims, but nevertheless, women must endure them if they are to have a chance of an abortion” and “Late last year a study in *JAMA Psychiatry* debunked the theory that abortion causes depression. Rather, the study found that a lack of access to abortion services is more likely to cause depression, anxiety and low self-esteem. [This is a reference to the Turnaway Study].”

The National Abortion Federation (NAF) website,⁹ sidesteps the whole issue of potential increased risk for emotional and/or psychological problems on their website, but inaccurately describes the possibility of post-abortion regret, “People decide to have an abortion after concluding that it is the right choice for themselves and their lives. According to the best evidence, if you ask people who had an abortion five years later whether abortion

⁷<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/the-british-journal-of-psychiatry/article/abortion-and-mental-health-quantitative-synthesis-and-analysis-of-research-published-19952009/E8D556AAE1C1D2F0F8B060B28BEE6C3D#comments>

⁸<https://www.mariestopes.org.au/your-choices/world-health-day-myth-depression-abortion/>

⁹<https://prochoice.org/patients/abortion-what-to-expect/>

TABLE 1 | Recently published large scale research studies on the association between abortion and mental health.

Study	Results
Gissler et al., 2015	Examined suicide post-abortion between 1987 and 2012 in Finland. A 2-fold increased risk of suicide was observed even after new guidelines required post-abortion follow-up sessions at 2–3 weeks to monitor women's mental health
Gong et al., 2013	Large Chinese study (over 20,000 women), 7,683 of whom had an abortion. Abortion was related to increased risk of depression (OR: 1.381) and anxiety (OR: 1.211) in the first trimester of a later pregnancy after controlling for age, education, pre-pregnancy MBI, income, and residence. The comparison group was women experiencing a first pregnancy
Jacob et al., 2019a	Case-control study from the Disease Analyzer Database (IQVIA). Induced abortion was positively associated with the elevated risk of psychiatric disorders (ORs ranging from 1.75 to 2.01)
Jacob et al., 2019b	Examined women with a first abortion in 281 gynecological practices in Germany. Included 17,581 women with an abortion experience and 17,581 matched controls who had a live birth. Induced abortion predicted depression (HR = 1.34), adjustment disorder (HR = 1.45), and somatoform disorder (HR = 1.56) across the 10 year study period
Lega et al., 2020	Data were gathered from 10 regions in Italy. The suicide rate was 1.18 per 100,000 among women who gave birth (n = 2,876,193) and 2.77 among women who aborted (n = 650,549), a statistically significant difference
Luo et al., 2018	Examined 5,115 unmarried females from Shanghai, Beijing, and Guangzhou. Abortion was associated with nearly double the odds of suicidal ideation (OR = 1.89) after adjustment for numerous controls (age, education, years in the working place, tobacco use, alcohol consumption, daily internet use, attitude toward premarital pregnancy, multiple induced abortion, self-esteem, loneliness, depression, and anxiety disorders.) The association was stronger in those aged > 25 (OR = 3.37), among women with > 5 years in the work force (OR = 2.98), in the non-anxiety group (OR = 2.28, and in the non-depression group (OR = 2.94)
McCarthy et al., 2015	Women with one prior abortion had elevated stress (adjusted mean difference = 0.65) and depression (aOR = 1.25) at 15 weeks of gestation. Women with two prior abortions had increased perceived stress (adjusted mean difference = 1.43) and depression (aOR = 1.67)
Sullins, 2016	In a United States sample, after extensive control for other pregnancy outcomes and sociodemographic variables, abortion was associated with increased overall risk of mental health disorders (OR:1.45). A Population Attributable Risk analysis showed 8.7% of the prevalence of mental disorders was attributable to abortion
Wie et al., 2019	After adjusting for several demographic controls, women who had three abortions experienced elevated risk for suicidal ideation (OR: 1.510). This level of risk was significant even after controlling for depression (OR: 1.391). Risk of depressive mood in daily life was likewise elevated with more abortions even after controlling for depression (OR: 1.657)

was the right choice, over 99% of them will say that it was. [This is a reference to the Turnaway Study]. The story that women regret their abortions is one that is mostly made up by people who are against abortion.”

This second example is particularly concerning given that many women considering abortion do worry about potential regret (Brown et al., 1993; Coleman and Nelson, 1998; Fergusson et al., 2009) and the percentage quoted is highly misaligned with evidence outside the confines of the Turnaway Study. In a 2011 book titled, “The Ethics of Abortion: Women’s Rights, Human Life, and the Question of Justice,” author Kaczor acknowledges some women are content with their abortion choices (Greasley, 2012). However, Kaczor points out that regret rarely follows childbirth as it frequently does with abortion, even when women wholeheartedly believe they made the right choice (Greasley, 2012). He states, “What woman mourns the anniversary of her child’s birth? But how many women mourn usually in silence the anniversary of an abortion? What woman looks at her child and says, ‘If only I had aborted her?’ But how many women consider in the quiet of their hearts, ‘If I hadn’t had the abortion. . .?’ No group calls itself ‘Women Exploited by Giving Birth’ or ‘Women Victimized by Giving Life.’ Yet many groups exist to comfort women hurt by abortion such as ‘Women Exploited by Abortion’ or ‘Women Victimized by Abortion,’ organizations with thousands of members. No books are published to console women who gave birth rather than aborted. But how many books are published, from both pro-choice and pro-life perspectives, to help women with post-abortion grief?” (cited in Greasley, 2012, p. 706). This commonsense comparison captures the depth and potential

long-term consequences of choosing to abort a pregnancy that is entirely dismissed by the NAF.

In a study by Coleman and Nelson (1998), 38.7% of female college students voiced regret of their abortions in the first few years afterward. Similarly, Fergusson et al. (2009) reported that 32.7% of women aged 15–30 reported some level of regret (endorsing “somewhat” or “very much”) in association with an abortion experience. Finally, Söderberg et al.’s (1998) study revealed 76.1% of women who aborted would never consider abortion again. This indirectly suggests some level of regret.

A news article was published in Nature (10-26-21) titled, “Why hundreds of scientists are weighing in on a high-stakes US abortion case”¹⁰ related to Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization, the United States Supreme Court case considering a 2018 Mississippi law banning abortion after 15 weeks of pregnancy. Author Maxman reported that Foster (PI of the Turnaway Study) helped draft the “Brief of Social Science Experts as Amici Curiae in Support of Respondents”. The brief is heavily dominated by descriptions of findings from the Turnaway Study and numerous references to the publications. Efforts to influence policy have apparently come to fruition in this document now before the Supreme Court.

Fourteen states as of January 2022 require information on a range of positive and negative emotional responses to abortion, with eight states only addressing potential negative outcomes.¹¹ These laws are aligned with the empirical evidence indicating

¹⁰<https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-02834-7>

¹¹<https://www.guttmacher.org/state-policy/explore/counseling-and-waiting-periods-abortion>

abortion increases risk for adverse mental health outcomes. For example, in a Texas document, “A Woman’s Right to Know Informational Material,”¹² the following statement is made, “Women report a range of emotions after an abortion. This can include depression or thoughts of suicide. Some women, after their abortion, have also reported feelings of grief, anxiety, lowered self-esteem, regret, sexual dysfunction, avoidance of emotional attachment, flashbacks and substance abuse. For some women, these emotions may appear immediately after an abortion or gradually over a longer period of time.”

The political implications of science on the psychology of abortion cannot be understated given widespread efforts by legislators to enact evidence-based laws. The process of accurately doing so is clouded by studies like the Turnaway Study, which although published in peer-reviewed journals, are not based on sound scientific methodology. In the remainder of this article, skewed presentations of the literature on abortion and mental health generated by professional organizations are discussed.

BIASED REVIEWS BY PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

In 2008, the American Psychological Association (APA) released a report (APA, 2008) examining the science on abortion and mental health. The APA has a long history of embracing a political position on abortion, viewing it as a civil right dating back to 1969 (see footnote 6). When conducting the review, no precautions were established by the organization to ensure objectivity, and the final make-up of the Task Force was comprised of public advocates of the pro-choice view (see footnote 6). No effort was apparently made to fill the panel with researchers holding diverse views of abortion and/or include those whose work revealed increased risk of mental health problems with abortion (see footnote 6). Below is list of additional problems with the conduct of the APA Task Force Report that the author of this review previously described (see footnote 6).

First, three literature reviews (Thorp et al., 2003; Coleman et al., 2005; Coleman, 2006) were supposedly addressed in the APA report; however, the conclusions of the cited reviews were completely ignored without explanation.

Second, a meta-analysis was not included in the Task Force Report, because according to the authors, there were too few studies to perform a quantitative analysis, yet they felt a definitive conclusion regarding an absence of ill-effects was justified.

Third, as stated in the APA Report, the Task Force “evaluated all empirical studies published in English in peer-reviewed journals post-1989 that compared the mental health of women who had an induced abortion to the mental health of comparison groups of women (N = 50) or that examined factors that predict mental health among women who have had an elective abortion in the United States (N = 23).” What is problematic here is that the second group of studies was restricted to the United States and the exclusion of international studies resulted in elimination

of a minimum of 40 published articles, numerous demonstrating abortion experience predicted mental health declines.

Fourth, methodological criteria including sample size and representativeness, type of design, and use of control variables should have at least been used to select studies for the review, yet none were utilized.

Fifth, standards of evaluation shifted in the APA report depending on the degree of alignment with a pro-choice agenda. Studies indicating no association between abortion and mental health were reviewed less stringently than studies revealing abortion was associated with mental health declines. Further, positive elements of studies with null findings were emphasized and positive features of studies showing abortion significantly increased risks for mental health problems were minimized or entirely ignored in the report. A few examples of this bias are detailed below.

The Medi-Cal studies (Coleman et al., 2002b; Reardon et al., 2003) were harshly criticized on the basis of perceived inadequacy of controls. The Task Force overlooked the fact that with a large socio-demographically homogeneous sample most differences are equally dispersed across groups. Strengths of the study included actual medical claims data circumventing issues of simplistic measurement, concealment, recruitment, and retention. Cases with previous psychological claims were removed from the analyses and an extended time frame with repeated measurements was employed adding methodological rigor.

Fergusson et al.’s (2006) study had many methodological strengths (listed below) and yet it was dismissed in the APA report for being flawed.

1. women were assessed over 25 years;
2. mental health measures were comprehensive and based on standardized diagnostic criteria of DSM III-R disorders;
3. abortion concealment rates were determined to be low;
4. sample retention was between 80 and 83%;
5. primary analyses include extensive controls for potential confounds.

Sixth, in the APA Task Force Report, sample attrition is downplayed as a shortcoming of published research. For example, Major and colleagues’ studies revealing abortion was not associated with mental health declines based on data from Buffalo, NY were embraced as high-quality even though attrition rates as high as 60% were observed (Major et al., 1985, 2000; Major et al., 1990).

Finally, the conclusion in the APA Task Force Report inappropriately rested on a single United Kingdom study by Gilchrist et al. (1995), an investigation with many overlooked methodological shortcomings. Drawing a firm conclusion based on one study is in opposition to accepted scientific protocol as described by Wilkinson and the APA Task Force on Statistical Inference (1999). Wilkinson et al. (1999) cautioned, “Do not interpret a single study’s results as having importance independent of the effects reported elsewhere in the relevant literature. The thinking presented in a single study may turn the movement of the literature, but the results in a single study are

¹²<https://www.hhs.texas.gov/sites/default/files/documents/services/health/women-children/womans-right-to-know.pdf>

important primarily as one contribution to a mosaic of study effects” (p. 602). Flaws of the Gilchrist et al. (1995) study ignored by the APA Task Force are summarized below.

1. Only 34.4% of the termination group and 43.4% of the no termination were retained.
2. The initial response rate was not provided, and it is therefore impossible to know if the sample was even remotely representative of the population.
3. Measures to assess mental health were not standardized and evaluation of the patients was conducted by general practitioners (GPs) as opposed to psychiatrists.

Soon after the APA Task Force Report was released to the public, Dr. David Fergusson, the renowned New Zealand researcher discussed previously and the author of this review together wrote a letter of complaint to Dr. Alan Kazdin, President of the APA (see footnote 6). They both served as official reviewers for the report and drafted the letter, solicited support from other well-published researchers, and attached a long list of articles revealing an association between abortion and mental health declines authored by the signatories. Key points of the letter are summarized below, and a retraction or revision was requested; however, no action occurred.

1. Dismissal of most of the published literature on the topic was inappropriate.
2. Never before had a highly contested issue been resolved based on one out-of-date study.
3. The report was a biased assessment of the mental health risks of abortion with the Task Force’s conclusions unduly influenced by the views of its authors.

A few years after release of the APA Task Force Report, the NCCMH Royal College of Psychiatrists published a literature review on abortion and mental health (National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health at the Royal College of Psychiatrists, 2011). The author of the current review served as one of many reviewers of the NCCMH report. Several of the concerns voiced in the author’s review remained in the published version. Most of the author’s major criticisms were described in her affidavit for *June Medical Services v. Gee* (see footnote 6), and they are summarized in the text below. The Royal College Review incorporated four distinct types of studies:

1. Traditional and meta-analytic reviews.
2. Studies on the prevalence of abortion-related mental health concerns.
3. Studies of variables that increase risk for abortion-related mental health problems.
4. Mental health comparison studies of women who abort and carry to term.

Across all study types, numerous peer-reviewed articles were entirely over-looked, and significantly more were dismissed for unclear or baseless reasons. For example, with regard to the review category, only three documents were analyzed (APA, 2008; Charles et al., 2008; Coleman, 2011). The authors of the NCCMH report neglected to include 19 literature reviews published between 1990 and 2011 (e.g., Adler et al., 1992; Turell et al., 1990;

Zolse and Blacker, 1992; Coleman et al., 2005; Cameron, 2010). Criteria were not described, and the reader is unable to ascertain how and why only these reviews were considered. As for the third type of study (risk factors for abortion-related mental health problems), 27 studies were included. At a minimum, 20 relevant and unmentioned peer-reviewed journal articles published in respected outlets were ignored and were not included in the NCCMH appendix listing included and excluded studies (e.g., Kero and Lalos, 2000; Mufel, 2002; Prommanart et al., 2004; Vukelić et al., 2010).

In the NCCMH report, the committee stated, “Because the review aimed to assess mental health problems and substance use and not transient reactions to a stressful event, negative reactions and assessments of mental state confined to less than 90 days following the abortion were excluded from the review.” Problematic elements of this approach are listed below.

1. Removal of studies restricted to measurement of mental health up to 90 days does not effectively eliminate cases of transient reactions. The women very well may have continued to experience mental health problems following the early assessments.
2. Assessment of mental health challenges are logically inclined to be most accurate soon after the abortion occurs compared to months or years later, because as time elapses, natural healing, events that moderate the effects, and/or confounding life experiences may occur.
3. Focusing only on mental health outcomes that take place down the road has a high probability of missing the most serious and acute cases that are treated soon after the procedure.
4. Many of the studies eliminated on the basis of the abbreviated follow-up had incorporated controls for prior mental health and had additional study strengths. The samples of studies in each category of the NCCMH review were therefore not representative of the best science. For example, in the prevalence category, only 34 studies were analyzed, a majority of which lacked controls for previous mental health. In comparison, in the author’s meta-analysis (Coleman, 2011), more than half of the 22 studies incorporated had such controls.

The quality scales used in the NCCMH review to rate individual studies were not well-anchored and necessitated a substantial amount of subjective interpretation that lends itself to bias. The categories of the scales employed lacked essential methodological elements such as initial consent to participate rates and retention over time. In addition, the relative importance of criteria that were included was arbitrary and not based on scientific consensus. The requirements for a “+” or “-” designation within the categories were not available in the report. Finally, the authors failed to articulate how combinations of pluses and minuses in the categories resulted in overall ratings ranging from “Very Poor” to “Very Good.”

A third and final review by a professional organization, conducted by the National Academies of Sciences (NAS)

and titled, “The Safety and Quality of Abortion Care in the United States,” addressed abortion trends, clinical skills and procedures, abortion-related morbidity (physical and psychological), and mortality associated with the procedure (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018). As with the two previously described reviews, the author has critiqued this study in many forums, most commonly in oral presentations and in expert reports. In this section, the author summarizes primary concerns laid out in an affidavit for *June Medical Services v. Gee* (see footnote 6). Although the NAS Committee arrived at the general conclusion that United States abortion procedures are safe and effective, the highly skewed selection of studies focused on those indicating minimal risks to women. Large segments of the peer-reviewed literature were outright ignored.

The impetus for the NAS review was with funding sources (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018) as opposed to the NAS itself. Noted sponsors included the David and Lucile Packard Foundation and the Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation among others, all with high financial investments in pro-abortion and population control initiatives. Most NAS Committee members were not engaged in research on abortion safety and many of the reviewers were abortion providers or were connected to pro-choice organizations, suggestive of conflicts of interest.

In addition to ignoring hundreds of studies without articulating any basis for doing so, the NAS Committee did not describe what standards if any were used to select and evaluate the studies that led to the formulation of their vastly over-simplified conclusion. When addressing the mental health literature, the NAS Committee focused primarily on the flawed Turnaway Study, the APA Task Force Report, and the NCCMH Report to arrive at their conclusion that abortion does not increase risk mental illness.

The NAS has maintained close ties to industry, raising other conflict of interest allegations. Oftentimes the focus of the allegations is on the committees of scientists drafting reports. In 2006, the Center for Science in the Public Interest (CSPI),¹³ a consumer advocacy organization published a document titled, “Are the National Academies Fair and Balanced?” The authors of the CSPI report concluded: “Unfortunately, we found serious deficiencies in the NAS’s committee-selection process that could jeopardize the quality of future NAS reports. The NAS has allowed numerous scientists (and others) with blatant conflicts of interest to sit on committees. Compounding that problem, those conflicts of interest usually are not disclosed to the public.”

Despite extensive evidence revealing three major professional organizations have fallen short of providing objective and

¹³<https://www.cspinet.org/sites/default/files/attachment/nasreport.pdf>

REFERENCES

- Adler, N. E. (1976). Sample Attrition in Studies of Psychosocial Sequelae of Abortion: How Great a Problem? *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 6, 240–259. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1976.tb01329.x
- Adler, N. E., David, H. P., Major, B. N., Roth, S. H., Russo, N. F., and Wyatt, G. E. (1992). Psychological factors in abortion. A review. *Am. Psychol.* 47, 1194–1204. doi: 10.1037//0003-066x.47.10.1194

comprehensive literature reviews, their conclusions suggesting abortion experience does not elevate risk for post-procedure mental health problems have influenced and continue to influence policy. As a result, hundreds of thousands of women in the U.S. are often presented with misinformation in clinics and elsewhere as they decide if an abortion is the right choice for them.

CONCLUSION

The fundamental decision faced by most pregnant women seeking an elective abortion is not a medical decision. Instead, women must decide if they can maintain the pregnancy based on personal and situational factors. However, with widespread dissemination of misinformation generated from studies like the Turnaway Study, hundreds of thousands of women considering an abortion are likely unaware of the expansive literature demonstrating abortion is a significant risk factor for post-abortion psychological distress and mental health detriments. The science revealing the potential for serious, debilitating mental health consequences underscores the necessity of providing women with up-to-date information on the risks from the most rigorous scientific studies.

Journals opening their doors to allow virtually uncontested publication of some of the poorest work in the field, media outlets seizing the information that they believe the public desires, and abortion providers and their advocates using the data in attempts to remove and prevent installation of abortion restrictions: this is the status of mainstream science on the psychology of abortion in our world in 2022. Science on this topic is not self-correcting in the tradition articulated by Oreskes (2016), as she describes the perspective of Feminist philosopher, Helen Longino, noting she, “suggested that it is not so much that science corrects itself, but that scientists correct each other through the social processes that constitute ‘transformative interrogation.’ It is through the give and take of ideas—the challenging, the questioning, the adjusting and amending—that scientists integrate their colleagues’ work, offer up criticisms, and contribute to the growth of warranted knowledge.” (p. 51). Sadly, we are far beyond even a semblance of transformative interrogation on this topic and a reversal will require conscientious and influential individuals in the scientific community to finally stand up and say enough is enough. Women deserve better.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

PC conducted the literature review, wrote the first draft of the manuscript, and edited and approved the final manuscript.

- Amico, K. R. (2009). Percent total attrition: a poor metric for study rigor in hosted intervention designs. *Am. J. Public Health* 99, 1567–1575. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2008.134767
- APA (2008). *Report of the American Psychological Association Task Force on Mental Health and Abortion*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Baker, A., and Beresford, T. (2009). “Informed consent, patient education, and counseling,” in *Management of Unintended and Abnormal Pregnancies*, eds M.

- Paul, S. Lichtenburg, L. Borgatta, D. Grimes, P. Stubblefield, and M. Creinin (West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd), 48–62.
- Bellini, C. V., and Buonocore, G. (2013). Abortion and subsequent mental health: review of the literature. *Psychiatry Clin. Neurosci.* 67, 301–310. doi: 10.1111/pcn.12067
- Biggs, M. A., Neuhaus, J. M., and Foster, D. G. (2015). Mental Health Diagnoses 3 Years After Receiving or Being Denied an Abortion in the United States. *Am. J. Public Health* 105, 2557–2563. doi: 10.2105/ajph.2015.302803
- Biggs, M. A., Rowland, B., McCulloch, C. E., and Foster, D. G. (2016). Does abortion increase women's risk for post-traumatic stress? Findings from a prospective longitudinal cohort study. *BMJ Open* 6:e009698. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009698
- Biggs, M. A., Upadhyay, U. D., McCulloch, C. E., and Foster, D. G. (2017). Women's Mental Health and Well-being 5 Years After Receiving or Being Denied an Abortion: a Prospective, Longitudinal Cohort Study. *JAMA Psychiatry* 74, 169–178. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2016.3478
- Biggs, M. A., Upadhyay, U. D., Steinberg, J. R., and Foster, D. G. (2014). Does abortion reduce self-esteem and life satisfaction? *Qual. Life Res.* 23, 2505–2513. doi: 10.1007/s11136-014-0687-7
- Bradshaw, Z., and Slade, P. (2003). The effects of induced abortion on emotional experiences and relationships: a critical review of the literature. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* 23, 929–958. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2003.09.001
- Broen, A. N., Moum, T., Bødtker, A. S., and Ekeberg, O. (2004). Psychological impact on women of miscarriage versus induced abortion: a 2-year follow-up study. *Psychosom. Med.* 66, 265–271. doi: 10.1097/01.psy.0000118028.32507.9d
- Broen, A. N., Moum, T., Bødtker, A. S., and Ekeberg, O. (2006). Predictors of anxiety and depression following pregnancy termination: a longitudinal five-year follow-up study. *Acta Obstet. Gynecol. Scand.* 85, 317–323. doi: 10.1080/00016340500438116
- Brown, D., Elkins, T. E., and Larson, D. B. (1993). Prolonged grieving after abortion: a descriptive study. *J. Clin. Ethics* 4, 118–123.
- Cameron, S. (2010). Induced abortion and psychological sequelae. *Best Pract. Res. Clin. Obstet. Gynaecol.* 24, 657–665. doi: 10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2010.02.001
- Charles, V. E., Polis, C. B., Sridhara, S. K., and Blum, R. W. (2008). Abortion and long-term mental health outcomes: a systematic review of the evidence. *Contraception* 78, 436–450. doi: 10.1016/j.contraception.2008.07.005
- Coleman, P. K. (2006). Resolution of Unwanted Pregnancy During Adolescence Through Abortion Versus Childbirth: individual and Family Predictors and Psychological Consequences. *J. Youth Adolesc.* 35, 903–911. doi: 10.1007/s10964-006-9094-x
- Coleman, P. K. (2011). Abortion and mental health: quantitative synthesis and analysis of research published 1995–2009. *Br. J. Psychiatry* 199, 180–186. doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.110.077230
- Coleman, P. K., Coyle, C. T., and Rue, V. M. (2010). Late-term elective abortion and susceptibility to posttraumatic stress symptoms. *J. Pregnancy* 2010:130519. doi: 10.1155/2010/130519
- Coleman, P. K., and Nelson, E. S. (1998). The quality of abortion decisions and college students' reports of post-abortion emotional sequelae and abortion attitudes. *J. Soc. Clin. Psychol.* 17, 425–442. doi: 10.1521/jscp.1998.17.4.425
- Coleman, P. K., Reardon, D. C., Rue, V. M., and Cogle, J. (2002a). A history of induced abortion in relation to substance use during subsequent pregnancies carried to term. *Am. J. Obstet. Gynecol.* 187, 1673–1678. doi: 10.1067/mob.2002.127602
- Coleman, P. K., Reardon, D. C., Rue, V. M., and Cogle, J. (2002b). State-funded abortions versus deliveries: a comparison of outpatient mental health claims over 4 years. *Am. J. Orthopsychiatry* 72, 141–152. doi: 10.1037/0002-9432.72.1.1410155
- Coleman, P. K., Reardon, D. C., Strahan, T., and Cogle, J. R. (2005). The psychology of abortion: A review and suggestions for future research. *Psychol. Health* 20, 237–271. doi: 10.1080/0887044042000272921
- Cogle, J. R., Reardon, D. C., and Coleman, P. K. (2003). Depression associated with abortion and childbirth: a long-term analysis of the NLSY cohort. *Med. Sci. Monit.* 9, Cr105–Cr112.
- Dingle, K., Alati, R., Clavarino, A., Najman, J. M., and Williams, G. M. (2008). Pregnancy loss and psychiatric disorders in young women: an Australian birth cohort study. *Br. J. Psychiatry* 193, 455–460. doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.108.055079
- Dobkin, L. M., Gould, H., Barar, R. E., Ferrari, M., Weiss, E. I., and Foster, D. G. (2014). Implementing a prospective study of women seeking abortion in the United States: understanding and overcoming barriers to recruitment. *Womens Health Issues* 24, e115–e123. doi: 10.1016/j.whi.2013.10.004
- Draugalis, J. R., Coons, S. J., and Plaza, C. M. (2008). Best practices for survey research reports: a synopsis for authors and reviewers. *Am. J. Pharm. Educ.* 72:11. doi: 10.5688/aj720111
- Espinoza, C., Samandari, G., and Andersen, K. (2020). Abortion knowledge, attitudes and experiences among adolescent girls: a review of the literature. *Sex Reprod. Health Matters* 28:1744225. doi: 10.1080/26410397.2020.1744225
- Fergusson, D. M., Horwood, L. J., and Boden, J. M. (2008). Abortion and mental health disorders: evidence from a 30-year longitudinal study. *Br. J. Psychiatry* 193, 444–451. doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.108.056499
- Fergusson, D. M., Horwood, L. J., and Boden, J. M. (2009). Reactions to abortion and subsequent mental health. *Br. J. Psychiatry* 195, 420–426. doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.109.066608
- Fergusson, D. M., Horwood, L. J., and Ridder, E. M. (2006). Abortion in young women and subsequent mental health. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* 47, 16–24. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2005.01538.x
- Fisher, G. G., Matthews, R. A., and Gibbons, A. M. (2016). Developing and investigating the use of single-item measures in organizational research. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 21, 3–23. doi: 10.1037/a0039139
- Foster, D. G., Steinberg, J. R., Roberts, S. C., Neuhaus, J., and Biggs, M. A. (2015). A comparison of depression and anxiety symptom trajectories between women who had an abortion and women denied one. *Psychol. Med.* 45, 2073–2082. doi: 10.1017/s0033291714003213
- Fowler, F. J. (1995). *Improving Survey Questions: Design and Evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gilchrist, A. C., Hannaford, P. C., Frank, P., and Kay, C. R. (1995). Termination of pregnancy and psychiatric morbidity. *Br. J. Psychiatry* 167, 243–248. doi: 10.1192/bjp.167.2.243
- Gissler, M., Berg, C., Bouvier-Colle, M. H., and Buekens, P. (2005). Injury deaths, suicides and homicides associated with pregnancy, Finland 1987–2000. *Eur. J. Public Health* 15, 459–463. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/cki042
- Gissler, M., Karalis, E., and Ulander, V. M. (2015). Decreased suicide rate after induced abortion, after the current care guidelines in Finland 1987–2012. *Scand. J. Public Health* 43, 99–101. doi: 10.1177/1403494814560844
- Gong, X., Hao, J., Tao, F., Zhang, J., Wang, H., and Xu, R. (2013). Pregnancy loss and anxiety and depression during subsequent pregnancies: data from the C-ABC study. *Eur. J. Obstet. Gynecol. Reprod. Biol.* 166, 30–36. doi: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2012.09.024
- Greasley, K. (2012). Abortion and regret. *J. Med. Ethics* 38, 705–711. doi: 10.1136/medethics-2012-100522
- Jacob, L., Gerhard, C., Kostev, K., and Kalder, M. (2019a). Association between induced abortion, spontaneous abortion, and infertility respectively and the risk of psychiatric disorders in 57,770 women followed in gynecological practices in Germany. *J. Affect. Disord.* 251, 107–113. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2019.03.060
- Jacob, L., Kostev, K., Gerhard, C., and Kalder, M. (2019b). Relationship between induced abortion and the incidence of depression, anxiety disorder, adjustment disorder, and somatoform disorder in Germany. *J. Psychiatr. Res.* 114, 75–79. doi: 10.1016/j.jpsychires.2019.04.022
- Kelly, T., Suddes, J., Howel, D., Hewison, J., and Robson, S. (2010). Comparing medical versus surgical termination of pregnancy at 13–20 weeks of gestation: a randomised controlled trial. *Bjog* 117, 1512–1520. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2010.02712.x
- Kero, A., and Lalos, A. (2000). Ambivalence—a logical response to legal abortion: a prospective study among women and men. *J. Psychosom. Obstet. Gynaecol.* 21, 81–91. doi: 10.3109/01674820009075613
- Kero, A., Högberg, U., and Lalos, A. (2004). Wellbeing and mental growth-long-term effects of legal abortion. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 58, 2559–2569. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2003.09.004
- Kero, A., Wulff, M., and Lalos, A. (2009). Home abortion implies radical changes for women. *Eur. J. Contracept. Reprod. Health Care* 14, 324–333. doi: 10.3109/13625180903128609
- Kimport, K. (2012). (Mis)Understanding Abortion Regret. *Symb. Interact.* 35, 105–122. doi: 10.1002/symb.11
- Kimport, K., Foster, K., and Weitz, T. A. (2011). Social sources of women's emotional difficulty after abortion: lessons from women's abortion narratives. *Perspect Sex Reprod. Health* 43, 103–109. doi: 10.1363/4310311

- Lega, I., Maraschini, A., D'Aloja, P., Andreozzi, S., Spetoli, D., Giangreco, M., et al. (2020). Maternal suicide in Italy. *Arch. Womens Mental Health* 23, 199–206. doi: 10.1007/s00737-019-00977-1
- Luo, M., Jiang, X., Wang, Y., Wang, Z., Shen, Q., Li, R., et al. (2018). Association between induced abortion and suicidal ideation among unmarried female migrant workers in three metropolitan cities in China: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health* 18:625. doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-5527-1
- Major, B., Cozzarelli, C., Cooper, M. L., Zubek, J., Richards, C., Wilhite, M., et al. (2000). Psychological responses of women after first-trimester abortion. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* 57, 777–784. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.57.8.777
- Major, B., Cozzarelli, C., Sciacchitano, A. M., Cooper, M. L., Testa, M., and Mueller, P. M. (1990). Perceived social support, self-efficacy, and adjustment to abortion. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 59, 452–463. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.59.3.452
- Major, B., Mueller, P., and Hildebrandt, K. (1985). Attributions, expectations, and coping with abortion. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 48, 585–599. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.48.3.585
- Martin, N. (2016). *How One Abortion Research Megadonor Forced the Supreme Court's Hand*. San Francisco, CA: Mother Jones, Foundation for National Progress.
- McCarthy, F. P., Moss-Morris, R., Khashan, A. S., North, R. A., Baker, P. N., Dekker, G., et al. (2015). Previous pregnancy loss has an adverse impact on distress and behaviour in subsequent pregnancy. *BJOG* 122, 1757–1764. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.13233
- Miller, S., Wherry, L. R., and Foster, D. G. (2020). What Happens after an Abortion Denial? A Review of Results from the Turnaway Study. *AEA Papers Proc.* 110, 226–230. doi: 10.1257/pandp.20201107
- Mufel, N. (2002). Predictors of posttraumatic stress disorder following abortion in a former Soviet Union country. *J. Prenat. Perinat. Psychol. Health* 17:41.
- Munk-Olsen, T., Laursen, T. M., Pedersen, C. B., Lidegaard, O., and Mortensen, P. B. (2012). First-time first-trimester induced abortion and risk of readmission to a psychiatric hospital in women with a history of treated mental disorder. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* 69, 159–165. doi: 10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.153
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018). *The Safety and Quality of Abortion Care in the United States*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, doi: 10.17226/24950
- National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health at the Royal College of Psychiatrists (2011). *Induced abortion and mental health: A systematic review of the mental health outcomes of induced abortion, including their prevalence and associated factors*. London: Royal College of Psychiatrists.
- Oreskes, N. (2021). *Why trust science?*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Paul, M., Lichtenberg, S., and Borgatta, L. (2009). *Management of Unintended and Abnormal Pregnancy: Comprehensive Abortion Care*. Surrey: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Pedersen, W. (2007). Childbirth, abortion and subsequent substance use in young women: a population-based longitudinal study. *Addiction* 102, 1971–1978. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2007.02040.x
- Pedersen, W. (2008). Abortion and depression: a population-based longitudinal study of young women. *Scand. J. Public Health* 36, 424–428. doi: 10.1177/1403494807088449
- Prommanart, N., Phatharayuttawat, S., Boriboonhirunsarn, D., and Sunaneevithayakul, P. (2004). Maternal grief after abortion and related factors. *J. Med. Assoc. Thai* 87, 1275–1280.
- Reardon, D. C., Cogle, J. R., Rue, V. M., Shuping, M. W., Coleman, P. K., and Ney, P. G. (2003). Psychiatric admissions of low-income women following abortion and childbirth. *Cmaj* 168, 1253–1256.
- Rees, D. I., and Sabia, J. J. (2007). The relationship between abortion and depression: new evidence from the fragile families and child wellbeing study. *Med. Sci. Monit.* 13, Cr430–Cr436. doi: 10.12659/msm.502357
- Rocca, C. H., Kimport, K., Roberts, S. C., Gould, H., Neuhaus, J., and Foster, D. G. (2015). Decision Rightness and Emotional Responses to Abortion in the United States: a Longitudinal Study. *PLoS One* 10:e0128832. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0128832
- Söderberg, H., Andersson, C., Janzon, L., and Sjöberg, N. O. (1998a). Selection bias in a study on how women experienced induced abortion. *Eur. J. Obstet. Gynecol. Reprod. Biol.* 77, 67–70. doi: 10.1016/s0301-2115(97)00223-6
- Söderberg, H., Janzon, L., and Sjöberg, N. O. (1998b). Emotional distress following induced abortion: a study of its incidence and determinants among abortees in Malmö, Sweden. *Eur. J. Obstet. Gynecol. Reprod. Biol.* 79, 173–178. doi: 10.1016/s0301-2115(98)00084-0
- Steinberg, J. R., and Finer, L. B. (2011). Examining the association of abortion history and current mental health: a reanalysis of the National Comorbidity Survey using a common-risk-factors model. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 72, 72–82. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.10.006
- Sullins, D. P. (2016). Abortion, substance abuse and mental health in early adulthood: Thirteen-year longitudinal evidence from the United States. *SAGE Open Med.* 4:2050312116665997. doi: 10.1177/2050312116665997
- Therrien, Z., and Hunsley, J. (2012). Assessment of anxiety in older adults: a systematic review of commonly used measures. *Aging Ment. Health* 16, 1–16. doi: 10.1080/13607863.2011.602960
- Thorp, J. M. Jr., Hartmann, K. E., and Shadigian, E. (2003). Long-term physical and psychological health consequences of induced abortion: review of the evidence. *Obstet. Gynecol. Surv.* 58, 67–79. doi: 10.1097/00006254-200301000-00023
- Turell, S. C., Armsworth, M. W., and Gaa, J. P. (1990). Emotional response to abortion: a critical review of the literature. *Women Ther.* 9, 49–68. doi: 10.1300/j015v09n04_05
- Turnaway Study Operating Procedures Manual (2016). *Available Online and Published by Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health (ANSIRH), a Project of the Bixby Center for Global Reproductive Health*. San Francisco, CA: UCSF Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology & Reproductive Sciences.
- Udzma, U. M., and Achadi, A. (2019). "Factors affecting depression in pregnant mothers: A systematic review," in *The 6th International Conference on Public Health Best Western Premier Hotel, Solo*. (Indonesia), doi: 10.26911/the6thicph-FP.03.06
- Vukelić, J., Kapamadzija, A., and Kondić, B. (2010). Investigation of risk factors for acute stress reaction following induced abortion. *Med. Pregl.* 63, 399–403. doi: 10.2298/mpms1006399v
- Wie, J. H., Nam, S. K., Ko, H. S., Shin, J. C., Park, I. Y., and Lee, Y. (2019). The association between abortion experience and postmenopausal suicidal ideation and mental health: results from the 5th Korean National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (KNHANES V). *Taiwan. J. Obstet. Gynecol.* 58, 153–158. doi: 10.1016/j.tjog.2018.11.028
- Wilkinson, L., The Task Force on Statistical Inference, and APA Board of Scientific Affairs (1999). Statistical methods in psychology journals: guidelines and explanations. *Am. Psychol.* 54, 594–604. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.54.8.594
- Zolse, G., and Blacker, C. V. (1992). The psychological complications of therapeutic abortion. *Br. J. Psychiatry* 160, 742–749. doi: 10.1192/bjp.160.6.742

Conflict of Interest: The author declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2022 Coleman. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.