

Implications of *Dobbs v. Jackson* for patients and providers: a scoping review

Authors

David T. Zhu¹

Lucy Zhao²

Tala Alzoubi³

Novera Shenin²

Teerkasha Baskaran⁴

Julia Tikhonov⁵

Catherine Wang⁶

Affiliations

1. School of Medicine, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA
2. Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada
3. Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada
4. Bayview Secondary School, Richmond Hill, ON, Canada
5. School of Interdisciplinary Sciences, Faculty of Science, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada
6. Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada

Corresponding Author

David T. Zhu

Virginia Commonwealth University

School of Medicine

1201 E Marshall St

Richmond, VA 23298

Email: davetzhu@gmail.com

Phone: 256-951-2881

Word Count: 3,487 words

1 **Abstract**

2

3 **Introduction**

4 On June 24, 2022, the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson* overturned the right to
5 abortion set forth by *Roe v. Wade*, granting states the authority to regulate access to abortion
6 services. This has led to widespread bans, threatening patients' access to, and healthcare
7 providers' abilities to provide, the full spectrum of reproductive health services. The ruling
8 disproportionately affects marginalized groups, exacerbating existing social disparities in health
9 and is an emerging public health crisis.

10

11 **Methods**

12 We conducted a scoping review to evaluate the impact of *Dobbs* on patients' health outcomes
13 and access to health services, as well as on medical trainees' and healthcare providers' ability to
14 access abortion training and provide reproductive health services. The search was based on the
15 PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRSIMA-ScR) guidelines. We searched eight
16 bibliographic databases (PubMed, Scopus, Embase, PsycINFO, Google Scholar, Science Direct,
17 JSTOR, and Web of Science) and three preprint servers (medRxiv, bioRxiv, and Europe PMC)
18 using various combinations of keywords related to 'abortion' and 'Dobbs v. Jackson' on March
19 22, 2023. Four reviewers independently screened the studies based on pre-specified eligibility
20 criteria and one reviewer performed data extraction for pre-identified themes.

21

22 **Results**

23 A total of 18 studies met the inclusion criteria. We found that *Dobbs* led to a surge in demand
24 for contraception, compounded existing travel- and cost-related barriers to access, increased
25 polarizing views on social media (e.g., Twitter), and evoked significant fears and concerns
26 among medical trainees regarding their scope of practice and fears of legal repercussions for
27 offering standard-of-care and related services to patients seeking abortions.

28

29 **Conclusion**

30 Our study offers valuable insights into the clinical implications of *Dobbs* on patients' health
31 outcomes and access to health services, as well as providers' reproductive health practices.

32

33 **Keywords:** Dobbs; Roe; Wade; abortion; contraception; travel; healthcare

34

35 **1. Introduction**

36

37 The U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization* in June

38 2022 overturned nearly a half-century of the constitutionally protected right to abortion in the

39 U.S. initially set forth by *Roe v. Wade* in 1973.^{1,2} This ruling grants individual states the authority

40 to regulate access to abortion care and reproductive health services with varying degrees of

41 restrictions.^{1,2} To date, approximately half of the U.S. states have imposed partial or complete

42 bans on the provision of induced abortions.^{2,3} Abortions are both safe and effective, and there

43 is extensive global evidence that restricting access to legal abortions does not lower the overall

44 rate of abortions; rather, it merely limits the rate of legal abortions, thus, increasing the rate of

45 unsafe abortions, which are more prone to adverse health outcomes and complications.^{4,5}

46

47 The implications of *Dobbs v. Jackson* on patients’ health outcomes and providers’ ability to

48 provide the full spectrum of reproductive health services have been harmful and widespread.

49 Roughly 60% of women of reproductive age live in U.S. states that are “hostile” to abortions.³ A

50 recent study predicts that a nationwide abortion ban would increase maternal mortality from

51 childbirth or pregnancy complications by 21% in the general U.S. population and 33% among

52 Black Americans.⁶ *Dobbs* is likely to stretch existing social and reproductive health disparities,

53 given that abortions are disproportionately needed by patients from low-income backgrounds,

54 those who identify with one or more racial/ethnic minorities, and other medically-underserved

55 groups.⁷⁻⁹ *Dobbs* is also likely to exacerbate existing barriers to access abortion care, including

56 cost and travel; e.g., those living in abortion-hostile states will likely need to travel out-of-state

57 to access abortion or reproductive health services.¹⁰ The previous literature shows that women
58 who are unable to terminate a pregnancy against their wishes were more likely to experience
59 continued intimate partner violence (IPV) compared to those who had access to comprehensive
60 services for pregnancy termination.¹¹ This may also have collateral effects on other fields, such
61 as healthcare provision for congenital diseases and neonates.¹²

62
63 To the best of our knowledge, there have been no other reviews that have comprehensively
64 evaluated the clinical implications of *Dobbs* on patients and providers, likely due to the novelty
65 of this health issue. To address this gap in the literature, we conducted a scoping review to
66 overview the impact of *Dobbs* on (1) patients' health outcomes or access to abortions and
67 reproductive health services; (2) medical trainees' access to comprehensive abortion training;
68 and (3) providers' ability to provide the full spectrum of reproductive health services.

69

70

2. Methods

71

2.1 Methodological approach

72

73
74 We conducted a scoping review in accordance with the methodological framework created by
75 Arksey & O'Malley¹³ and the PRISMA extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) guidelines¹⁴
76 **(Table S1)** to capture both peer-reviewed and grey literature related to the clinical implications
77 of *Dobbs v. Jackson*. Given the novelty and rapidly evolving nature of this topic, the flexibility
78 and breadth of a scoping review is well-suited to address our research objectives.

79

80 **2.2 Information sources and search strategy**

81

82 We conducted a literature search in eight bibliographic databases (PubMed, Scopus, Embase,
83 PsycINFO, Google Scholar, Science Direct, JSTOR, and Web of Science) to capture published
84 peer-reviewed studies, in addition to three other servers (medRxiv, bioRxiv, and Europe PMC)
85 to capture preprint studies. Various combinations of the search terms “Dobbs”, “Roe”,
86 “abortion”, “pregnancy termination”, “unintended pregnancy”, “abortifacient”, “misopristol”,
87 “mifeprex”, “mifepristone”, “cytotec”, were used to retrieve articles on March 22, 2023. Given
88 that the *Dobbs v. Jackson* ruling occurred in June 2022, we restricted our search from 2022 to
89 2023 to optimize our search. The detailed search strategy, including combinations of MeSH
90 terms and Boolean operators, can be found in **(Table S2)**.

91

92 **2.3 Selection of sources of evidence**

93

94 Four reviewers (LZ, TA, NS, TB) independently screened the title and abstracts of retrieved
95 articles based on pre-specified inclusion and exclusion criteria **(Table 1)**. Abstracts were
96 included. At this stage, studies that were classified as being potentially relevant subsequently
97 underwent full-text screening by the same reviewers. The final subset of studies included in this
98 review were verified and approved by all reviewers. Any screening conflicts that arose were
99 resolve by a neutral fifth reviewer (DTZ).

100

101 **2.4 Data charting process and items**

102

103 Following full-text screening, one reviewer (DTZ) performed data extraction and all other co-

104 authors verified the data. Relevant information was collected and inputted into a data

105 extraction form with prespecified endpoints such as the publication year, authors, study design,

106 data collection period, data sources, methods and data analysis, and the main outcomes and

107 findings related to abortion and reproductive health services. The data extraction template

108 consisted of two sections (one for patient-oriented studies and another for studies involving

109 medical trainees and healthcare providers). Preprints and abstracts remaining after screening

110 were updated with their final peer-reviewed versions if available.

111

112 **2.5 Analysis, synthesis, and presentation of results**

113

114 The final sample of studies were analyzed thematically, such as discussion of contraception

115 [e.g., permanent contraception (PC), emergency contraception (EC), and other forms of

116 contraception], facilitators and barriers that patients (and providers) face with accessing (and

117 providing) care after *Dobbs*, health outcomes, public attitudes, and other relevant themes to

118 abortion and reproductive health services in the post-*Dobbs* landscape.

119

120

3. Results

121

122 **3.1 Sample and article characteristics**

123
124 Our initial search yielded 2,609 articles. Through automatic deduplication by Covidence, 936
125 articles were removed. Title and abstract screening removed another 1,638 articles and, lastly,
126 full-text screening removed an additional 17 articles. Our final sample consisted of 18 articles
127 (i.e., 12 full-text articles and 6 abstracts) which all underwent data extraction. Our screening
128 process yielded a Cohen's Kappa score of 0.82. An overview of our screening process is
129 presented in **(Figure 1)**. The study designs were predominantly cross-sectional (n=6), modeling
130 (n=5), and observational (n=4), and additionally, there was one retrospective chart review, one
131 NLP-based study, and one commentary **(Table 2)**.

132

133 **3.2 Contraception**

134

135 Seven studies (38.9%) in our sample discussed contraception **(Table 2)**.^{15-20,31} After *Dobbs*, we
136 observed an increase in the demand for PCs. Notably, there was an increase in the number of
137 Google searches for vasectomies immediately after *Dobbs* on June 24, 2022, as well as to a
138 smaller extent immediately after the U.S. Supreme Court's draft of *Dobbs v. Jackson* was leaked
139 on May 2, 2022.¹⁶⁻¹⁹ The five states with the highest "vasectomy" search rates were Oklahoma,
140 South Dakota, Idaho, New Mexico, and Hawaii.¹⁹ This is consistent with the increase of
141 vasectomy requests, consultations, and procedures actually performed, identified using
142 vasectomy billing data.¹⁵ Men who are younger (especially less than 30 years of age) and do not
143 have children were more likely to seek vasectomy consultations after *Dobbs* was announced.¹⁵
144 Interestingly, the demand for vasectomies was inversely proportional to the ratio of urologists

145 to adult men in states, therefore, *Dobbs* is expected to further strain the urological workforce in
146 these states and increase delays.¹⁶ Similarly, there was an increase in the number of Google
147 searches for “tubal ligation” after *Dobbs*, albeit to a lesser extent than for vasectomies.^{18,19} The
148 Northern and Southwestern regions of the U.S. had the highest surge in Google searches for
149 vasectomies, whereas the Midwestern regions had the highest surge in tubal ligation
150 searches.¹⁸

151
152 Similarly, the demand for ECs also surged after *Dobbs* (**Table 2**). The number of Google searches
153 for “morning after pill” rose by approximately 8-fold after *Dobbs* and was most pronounced in
154 Idaho, District of Columbia, South Dakota, Oklahoma, and North Dakota.¹⁹ Maintaining access
155 to ECs after *Dobbs* is vital to mitigate a wide array of adverse health outcomes, e.g., a modeling
156 study predicted that maintaining access to ECs after *Dobbs* for a theoretical cohort of 750,000
157 patients capable of pregnancy was associated with a reduction in 41,052 abortions, 11,168
158 miscarriages, 1,611 cases of preeclampsia, 3,839 preterm births, 4 maternal deaths, 83
159 neonatal deaths, and 34 neurodevelopmental delays; in addition, it was associated with an
160 additional 13,634 quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs) and US\$541,716,923 in healthcare
161 expenditure savings.²⁰ Most forensics nurses believed that *Dobbs* would not affect prescribing
162 of ECs (79.77%), although a minority believed that EC prescribing would increase (6.94%) and
163 an even smaller proportion believed that this would decrease (0.58%).³¹ Several nurses cited
164 concerns about current or legal restrictions around EC prescribing after *Dobbs* (e.g., fear of
165 prosecution).³¹

166

167 Additionally, the demand for other contraceptives increased after *Dobbs* (**Table 2**). The number
168 of Google searches for “IUD”, “birth control pill”, and “condom” similarly spiked after *Dobbs*,
169 albeit to a lower extent than PCs and ECs.¹⁹ Google searches for “IUD” were most pronounced
170 in Utah, District of Columbia, Montana, Colorado, Minnesota, whereas Google searches for
171 “condom” were most frequent in Delaware, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Mississippi.¹⁹
172 the modest spike in Google searches for “birth control pills” was suggested by the authors to be
173 due to possible factors such as a lack of awareness, concerns about efficacy or side effects,
174 cost-related barriers to access, or lack of convenience.¹⁹

175

176 **3.3 Medications**

177

178 Two studies (11.1%) in our sample discussed the impact of *Dobbs* on medications other than
179 contraceptives (**Table 2**).^{22,26} One study found that requests for self-managed abortion
180 medications via Aid Access, a telemedicine nonprofit organization that enables individuals to
181 order abortion medications via mail,³³ rose from 82.6 to 137.1 mean daily requests after the
182 leaked draft of *Dobbs* on May 2, 2022, followed by a further increase to 213.7 mean daily
183 requests after *Dobbs* officially passed.²² The requests rose in every U.S. state, although states
184 that implemented total bans experienced the largest increase.²² The number of requesters
185 citing “current abortion restrictions” as a primary reason increase from 31.4% to 62.4% after
186 *Dobbs*, which tended to be most pronounced in abortion-hostile states but were also prevalent
187 in states in which state laws governing abortion did not immediately change after *Dobbs*.²²
188 Patients seeking teratogenic medications after *Dobbs* also faced difficulties. Notably, one study

189 found that approximately 1 in 17 people experienced unexpected barriers to accessing
190 methotrexate after *Dobbs*, of which 21.7% were directly related to *Dobbs* (e.g., prescription
191 delays or refusals citing pregnancy risks or concerns related to abortion).²⁶

192

193 **3.4 Travel as a barrier to abortion access**

194

195 Four studies (22.2%) in our sample discussed travel-related barriers to accessing abortion clinics
196 and other reproductive health services (**Table 2**).²¹⁻²⁴ These studies consistently found that
197 state laws under *Dobbs* would compound existing travel-related barriers. A modeling study
198 predicted that the number of women facing restricted access to both contraception and
199 abortion facilities would significantly increase after *Dobbs*, rising from 11% (pre-*Dobbs*) to 46%
200 (post-*Dobbs*), affecting approximately 1.6 million women across 34 U.S. states.²³ Similarly,
201 another modeling study found that, between January 2021 to September 2022, the mean
202 surface travel time (e.g., car or public transport) to abortion facilities increased from 27.8
203 minutes (pre-*Dobbs*) to 100.4 minutes (post-*Dobbs*), resulting in approximately 33.3% of
204 reproductive-age women living in a census tract more than 60 minutes from an abortion facility
205 compared to only 14.6% before *Dobbs*.²¹ Marginalized or medically-underserved populations
206 were disproportionately affected by these travel-related barriers to accessing abortion care,
207 e.g., census tracts located more than 60 minutes from an abortion facility predominantly
208 consisted of residents of racial/ethnic minorities with a lower mean income and without health
209 insurance, a high school diploma, or internet.²¹ The rise in prevalence of reproductive-age
210 females living in a census tract more than 60 minutes from an abortion facility was higher

211 among Black (25.6 p.p. increase), Hispanic (21.7 p.p. increase), and American Indian or Alaskan
212 Native (20.4 p.p. increase) compared to White reproductive-age females (18.0 p.p. increase); in
213 contrast, this change was smaller for Asian (14.1 p.p. increase) and Native Hawaiian or Pacific
214 Islander reproductive-age females (11.8 p.p. increase).²¹ Racial/ethnic disparities were also
215 documented with regards to the relative proximity of crisis pregnancy centers (CPCs) and
216 abortion facilities. A modeling study predicted that, after *Dobbs*, the ratio of CPCs to abortion
217 facilities would rise from approximately 1:3 to 1:5, affecting Hispanic (29.6 p.p. increase) more
218 than White patients (24.4 p.p. increase), followed by Black (23.6 p.p. increase), Native American
219 or Alaskan Native (20.6 p.p. increase), and Asian or Pacific Islander (19.2 p.p. increase)
220 patients.³² Another survey found that those living in abortion-restricted states were more likely
221 to experience travel-related barriers to access, rely on financial assistance, pay out-of-pocket
222 for abortion care, and face financial barriers.²⁴

223

224 **3.5 Public attitudes**

225

226 Only one study (5.6%) of our study sample discussed public attitudes towards *Dobbs* (**Table 2**).²⁵
227 By conducting sentiment analysis on tweets related to abortion and reproductive healthcare,
228 they observed a growing polarization after *Dobbs*, in line with their expectations.²⁵ Contrary to
229 their expectations, this polarization was driven by a small (0.17 p.p.) increase in the proportion
230 of overall negative/unfavorable tweets towards abortion and *Roe v. Wade*, as well as a modest
231 (4.71 p.p.) decrease in positive/favorable tweets.²⁵ These changes were most pronounced for
232 tweets about “*Roe v. Wade*”, for which there was a 10.8 p.p. increase and 5.63 p.p. decrease in

233 negative and positive tweets, respectively, followed by tweets about “family planning”, for
234 which there was a 5.35 p.p. increase and 3.28 p.p. decrease in negative and positive tweets,
235 respectively.²⁵ Pro-life tweets typically centered around personal religious belief or support for
236 conservative policies extending pro-life movements.²⁵ In contrast, pro-choice tweets typically
237 expressed anger and dismay with the *Dobbs* decision, highlighted the need for abortion,
238 demonstrated fear over losing access to contraception after *Dobbs*, and perceived *Dobbs* as
239 violating fundamental human rights for people capable of pregnancy.²⁵

240

241 **3.6 Medical residency and fellowship programs**

242

243 Three studies (16.7%) in our sample discussed the implications of *Dobbs* on medical trainees,
244 residents, and fellows (**Table 2**).²⁸⁻³⁰ One study examined a sample of 286 obstetrics and
245 gynecology (OB-GYN) residency training programs across the US and found that 38.8% of
246 programs are located in states certain to ban comprehensive abortion care training after *Dobbs*,
247 while an additional 5.9% are located in states likely to ban this training.³⁰ This is equivalent to
248 43.9% of OB-GYN residents, totaling 2,638 individuals, that are training in programs located in
249 states certain or likely to ban abortion after *Dobbs*.³⁰ Significant concerns were brought up
250 relating to the impact of *Dobbs* on restricting healthcare providers’ scope of practice. Notably,
251 approximately 35.1-41.8% and 38.5-40.8% of residents and fellows in OB-GYN-related training
252 programs across the U.S. believed that they would have to stop providing standard-of-care for
253 induced abortion during the first and second trimester, respectively, after *Dobbs*.²⁹ Similarly,
254 approximately 38.5-40.8% and 62.3-63.0% expressed fear over facing charges for providing the

255 standard-of-care for induced abortion during the first and second trimester, respectively, after
256 *Dobbs*.²⁹ This fear of legal consequences for providing standard-of-care abortion services was
257 prevalent among residents and fellows after *Dobbs*, as evidenced by the following percentages:
258 48.4-51.2% for clinical management of abortion complications, 31.7-32.0% for early pregnancy
259 loss care, 26.5-35.1% for caring for ectopic or molar pregnancies, and 31.2-38.2% for providing
260 care using assisted reproductive technologies involving embryos.²⁹ Maternal-fetal medicine
261 (MFM) fellowship programs in abortion-hostile states are more likely to be associated with
262 fertility and infertility (FI) centers, while MFM fellowships in abortion-friendly states are more
263 likely to be associated with complex family planning (CFP) fellowship.²⁸ Further, MFM fellows in
264 abortion-friendly states are more likely to be female, participate in pro-abortion advocacy, and
265 placed a higher emphasis on abortion-related training in their fellowship training.²⁸

266

267 Discussion

268

269 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first scoping review that examined the clinical
270 implications of *Dobbs* on patients and healthcare providers or trainees (e.g., medical residents
271 and fellows). Our early findings contribute to better understanding how *Dobbs* has transformed
272 the current landscape of abortion and reproductive healthcare, spanning various forms of
273 contraception, access to medications and health services, social and environmental barriers
274 (e.g., travel- and cost-related barriers to access), public attitudes, and medical training
275 programs. In the nascent stages of the post-*Dobbs* era, our findings offer valuable insights into
276 further avenues for clinical and public health research to characterize the longer-term

277 consequences of *Dobbs* on people with the capacity for pregnancy, as well as informing policy
278 priorities and interventions that need to be taken to safeguard patient outcomes and abortion
279 providers' practices.

280
281 Notably, studies^{15-20,31} frequently described the impact of *Dobbs* on demand for, and access to,
282 PCs (e.g., vasectomies and tubal ligation), ECs, and other forms of contraception (e.g., IUD, birth
283 control pill, condoms, etc.). The number of Google searches for contraception spiked after
284 *Dobbs*, corroborating with an increase in the number of consultations and actual vasectomies
285 performed as per billing data,¹⁵ demonstrating a greater interest and demand for contraception
286 after *Dobbs*. This emphasizes the need for widespread access to contraception, reliable sources
287 of information to guide decision-making (e.g., trusted online websites or improving access to
288 healthcare professionals to guide abortion care, reproductive health services, or complex family
289 planning), and active efforts to combat misinformation related to contraception. Further, we
290 consistently observed that demand for, and access to, contraception after *Dobbs* was relatively
291 lower among states with more restrictive abortion laws.^{16,18,19} This is concerning given the
292 disproportionately higher number of contraceptive deserts in abortion-hostile states,
293 underscoring the importance of redoubling efforts to increase equitable access to
294 contraception.³⁴⁻³⁶ Of further concern, we observed that patients faced new barriers to other
295 medications such as methotrexate after *Dobbs* due to providers' hesitancy or refusal to
296 prescribe them since they are capable of being teratogenic.²⁶ This foreshadows the rising
297 collateral impact and encroachment of *Dobbs* on other fields such as oncology or

298 rheumatology, calling for cross-specialty and collective efforts in the healthcare system to
299 address this issue.

300

301 Further, travel and financial concerns were frequently cited as barriers to accessing abortion in
302 the post-*Dobbs* landscape.²¹⁻²⁴ This has been extensively documented in the existing literature,
303 complicating access to proper care due to the geographical inaccessibility of abortion
304 facilities,¹⁰ legal restrictions (e.g., requiring cross-state travel to access reproductive health
305 services),³⁷ time constraints,¹⁰ cost burdens for those need to take time off work and find
306 childcare services,³⁸ emotional distress,³⁹ among other mechanisms.⁴⁰ These barriers are most
307 pronounced for historically marginalized and medically-underserved communities, such as
308 those who are Black, Latinx, uninsured, undocumented, low-income, and others, who are also
309 the populations who tend to face the most health complications and adverse health outcomes
310 from an abortion.⁴¹ Preliminary evidence shows that *Dobbs* is likely to expand and compound
311 these barriers and disparities,²¹⁻²⁴ emphasizing the need for cross-sectoral, multi-level
312 partnerships to address these social and environmental barriers to abortion care after *Dobbs*.³⁶

313

314 Finally, studies²⁸⁻³⁰ frequently discussed medical trainees' and healthcare providers' concerns
315 about the impact of *Dobbs* on their scope of practice, particularly since a large proportion of
316 OB-GYN-related residency and training programs are located in abortion-hostile states. Fellows
317 frequently cited concerns over no longer being able to legally provide standard-of-care services
318 for patients in need of abortions and similar reproductive health services, as well as a fear of
319 legal prosecution and charges for offering these services amidst the new restrictions under

320 *Dobbs*.²⁹ It is clear that *Dobbs* has already severely limited medical trainees' abilities to receive
321 training for, and healthcare providers' abilities to provide, the full spectrum of reproductive
322 health services in abortion-hostile states. There is an urgent need for further advocacy from
323 healthcare organizations at the regional, state, and national levels to safeguard and expand
324 access to reproductive healthcare training and provision.

325
326 There are several limitations to our study. Firstly, we conducted a scoping review less than a
327 year after *Dobbs* passed with the aim of conducting an exploratory analysis and serving a
328 hypothesis-generating foundation for further studies. As such, our data sources were limited
329 and our findings are not intended to be representative of the general U.S. population. Further,
330 we did not attempt to quantitatively synthesize the proportions and rates overviewed in our
331 study, thus, a meta-analysis may be warranted. More research is warranted to comprehensively
332 describe the implications of *Dobbs* on patients and providers at a national level with a longer
333 follow up period. Further, one-third of our articles reviewed were only available in their
334 abstract form, thus, our findings are not final and may be subject to change once the full-text
335 articles are made available in the future. Secondly, our screening process involved four
336 reviewers, which may have introduced inconsistencies. Although we achieved a relatively high
337 kappa score (0.82) and attempted to mitigate these inconsistencies by training all reviewers
338 (e.g., screening a subset of articles together to help achieve a more consistent reasoning
339 process), this may have still affected the reliability of our screening and findings. Finally, we
340 excluded qualitative studies as we wanted to focus our analyses on observational studies,

341 therefore, a future review that reviews qualitative studies and identify key themes related to
342 patients' and providers' lived experiences after *Dobbs* may be appropriate.

343

344 **Conclusion**

345

346 The clinical impact of *Dobbs v. Jackson* on patients' health outcomes and access to health
347 services, as well as providers' abilities to continue providing the full spectrum of abortion and
348 reproductive health services, is substantial. Further actions and research are needed from
349 multiple spheres of action— healthcare providers, policymakers, legislators, public health
350 agencies, and the public—to describe the consequences of *Dobbs* on the healthcare system and
351 advocate for continued access to reproductive health services in the post-*Dobbs* landscape.

352

353 **Supporting information**

354 **Table S1. PRISMA-ScR checklist.**

355 (DOCX)

356 **Table S2. Systematic review search strategy (restricted between 2022-2023)**

357 (DOCX)

358

359 **Author contributions**

360 **Conceptualization:** David T. Zhu

361 **Data curation:** David T. Zhu, Lucy Zhao, Tala Alzoubi, Novera Shenin, Teerkasha Baskaran, Julia

362 Tikhonov, Catherine Wang

363 **Formal analysis:** David T. Zhu, Lucy Zhao, Tala Alzoubi, Novera Shenin, Teerkasha Baskaran,

364 Julia Tikhonov, Catherine Wang

365 **Investigation:** David T. Zhu, Lucy Zhao, Tala Alzoubi, Novera Shenin, Teerkasha Baskaran, Julia

366 Tikhonov, Catherine Wang

367 **Methodology:** David T. Zhu

368 **Project administration:** David T. Zhu

369 **Supervision:** David T. Zhu

370 **Writing — original draft:** David T. Zhu

371 **Writing — review & editing:** David T. Zhu, Lucy Zhao, Tala Alzoubi, Novera Shenin, Teerkasha

372 Baskaran, Julia Tikhonov, Catherine Wang

373

374 **Declaration of interests**

375 We declare no competing interests.

376

377 **Acknowledgements**

378 Funding: No funding was received for this work.

References

1. Supreme Court of the United States. Dobbs, state health officer of the Mississippi Department of Health, et al. v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization et al. June 24, 2022. https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/21pdf/19-1392_6j37.pdf. Date accessed: June 27, 2023.
2. Kaufman, R, Brown, R, Coral, CM, Jacob, J, Onyango, M, Thomasen, K. Global impacts of Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization and abortion regression in the United States. Sex Reprod Health Matters. 2022;30(1):2135574. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2022.2135574> PMID: 36383177
3. Guttmacher Institute. Interactive map: US abortion policies and access after Roe. July 5, 2023. <https://states.guttmacher.org/policies/>. Date accessed: June 27, 2023.
4. Raymond, EG, Grimes, D. The comparative safety of legal induced abortion and childbirth in the United States. Obstet Gynecol. 2012;119:215-219. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0b013e31823fe923> PMID: 22270271
5. Guttmacher Institute. Abortion worldwide 2017: unevent progress and unequal access. 2017. https://www.guttmacher.org/sites/default/files/report_pdf/abortion-worldwide-2017.pdf. Date accessed: June 27, 2023.
6. Stevenson, AJ. The pregnancy-related mortality impact of a total abortion ban in the United States: a research note on increased deaths due to remaining pregnant. Demography. 2021;58(6):2019-2028. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00703370-9585908> PMID: 34693444

7. Kozhimannil, KB, Hassan, A, Hardeman, RR. Abortion access as a racial justice issue. NEJM. 2022;387:1537-1539. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2209737> PMID: 36069823
8. Dehlendorf, C, Weitz, T. Access to abortion services: a neglected health disparity. JHCPU. 2011;22(2):415-421. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2011.0064> PMID: 21551921
9. Redd, SK, Rice, WS, Aswani, MS, Blake, S, Julian, Z, Sen, B, et al. Racial/ethnic and educational inequities in restrictive abortion policy variation and adverse birth outcomes in the United States. BMC Health Serv Res. 2021;21:1139. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-07165-x> PMID: 34686197
10. Bearak, JM, Lagasse, K, Jones, RK. Disparities and change over time in distance women would need to travel to have an abortion in the USA: a spatial analysis. Lancet Pub Health. 2017;2(11):e493-e500. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(17\)30158-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(17)30158-5) PMID: 29253373
11. Tobin-Tyler, E. A grim new reality — intimate-partner violence after Dobbs and Bruen. NEJM. 2022;387:1247-1249. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2209696> PMID: 36193948
12. World Health Organization. Packages of interventions for family planning, safe abortion care, maternal, newborn and child health. 2010. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/70428>. Date accessed: June 27, 2023.
13. Arksey, H, O'Malley, L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. Int J Soc Res Methodol. 2005;19-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
14. Tricco, AC, Lillie, E, Zarin, W, O'Brien, KK, Colquhoun, H, Levac, D, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): checklist and explanation. Ann Intern Med. 2018;169(7):467-473. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850> PMID: 30178033

15. Bole, R, Lundy, SD, Pei, E, Bajic, P, Parekh, N, Vij, SC. Rising vasectomy volume following reversal of federal protections for abortion rights in the United States. *Nature*. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41443-023-00672-x> PMID: 36788351
16. Patel, RD, Loloi, J, Labagnara, K, Watts, KL. Search trends signal increased vasectomy interest in states with sparsity of urologists after overrule of Roe vs. Wade. 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JU.0000000000002901> PMID: 36082550
17. Sellke, N, Tay, K, Sun, HH, Tatem, A, Loeb, A, Thirumavalavan, N. The unprecedented increase in Google searches for “vasectomy” after the reversal of Roe vs. Wade. *Fertil Steril*. 2022;118(6):1186-1188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fertnstert.2022.08.859> PMID: 36180257
18. Ghomeshi, A, Diaz, P, Henry, V, Ramasamy, R, Masterson, TA. The interest in permanent contraception peaked following the leaked Supreme Court majority opinion of Roe vs. Wade: a cross-sectional Google Trends analysis. *Cureus*. 2022;14(10):e30582. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.30582> PMID: 36420253
19. Datta, PK, Chowdhury, SR, Aravindan, A, Nath, S, Sen, P. Looking for a silver lining to the dark cloud: a Google Trends analysis of contraceptive interest in the United States post Roe vs. Wade verdict. *Cureus*. 2022;14(7):e27012. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.27012> PMID: 35989835
20. Dzubay, SK, Doshi, U, Chaiken, SR, Arora, M, Caughey, AB. Impact of banning emergency contraception in states with abortion bans: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2023;223(1):S734. Accessed: June 27, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2022.11.1225>

21. Rader, B, Upadhyay, UD, Sehgal, NKR, Reis, BY, Brownstein, JS, Hswen, Y. Estimated travel time and spatial access to abortion facilities in the US before and after the Dobbs v Jackson Women's Health decision. JAMA. 2022;328(20):2041-2047.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2022.20424> PMID: 36318194
22. Aiken, ARA, Starling, JE, Scott, JG, Gomperts, R. Requests for self-managed medication abortion provided using online telemedicine in 30 US states before and after the Dobbs v Jackson Women's Health Organization decision. JAMA. 2022;328(17):1768-1770.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2022.18865> PMID: 36318139
23. Rodriguez, MI, Meath, THA, Watson, K, Daly, A, Myers, C, McConnell, KJ. Predicted changes in travel distance for abortion among counties with low rates of effective contraceptive use following Dobbs v Jackson. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2023;228(6):752-753. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2023.01.032> PMID: 36738910
24. Jones, RK, Chiu, DW. Characteristics of people obtaining abortions in states likely to ban it: findings from a 2021–2022 national study.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2022.09.020>. Accessed: June 27, 2023.
25. Mane, H, Yue, X, Yu, W, Doig, AC, Wei, H, et al. Examination of the public's reaction on Twitter to the over-turning of Roe v Wade and abortion bans. Healthcare. 2022;10(12):2390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2023.01.032> PMID: 36738910
26. Wipfler, K, Cornish, A, Schumacher, R, Shaw, Y, Katz, P, Michaud, K. Impact on access to methotrexate in the post-Roe era. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2022;74(suppl 9). Contraception. 2022;116:72. <https://acrabstracts.org/abstract/impact-on-access-to-methotrexate-in-the-post-roe-era/>. Accessed: June 27, 2023.

27. Miller, HE, Henkel, A, Zhang, J, Leonard, SA, Quirin, AP, Maskiaia, SA, et al. Abortion restriction impact on burden of neonatal single ventricle congenital heart disease: a decision-analytic model. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2023;228(1):S483.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2022.11.834>. Accessed: June 27, 2023.
28. Cheng, C, Byrne, JJ, Hernandez, Michalek, JE, Pierce, CM, Martinez, M, et al. Fellow perspectives of abortion-related training in maternal-fetal medicine fellowship: regional differences in a post-Roe world. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2023;228(1):S106-S107.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2022.11.220>. Accessed: June 27, 2023.
29. Meriwether, KV, Krashin, JW, Kim-Fine, S, Avlove, T, Dale, L, Orejuela, FJ, et al. Trainee opinions regarding the effect of the Dobbs v. Jackson women's health organization Supreme Court decision on obstetrics and gynecology training. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2023;228(3):S816-S817. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2022.12.045>. Accessed: June 27, 2023.
30. Vinekar, K, Karlapudi, A, Nathan, L, Turk, JK, Rible, R, Steinauer, J. Projected implications of overturning Roe v Wade on abortion training in U.S. obstetrics and gynecology residency programs. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2022;140(2):146-149.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0000000000004832> PMID: 35852261
31. Downing, NR, Avshman, E, Valentine, JL, Johnson, LM, Chapa, H. Forensic nurses' understanding of emergency contraception mechanisms: implications for access to emergency contraception. *J Forensic Nurs.* 2023.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/JFN.0000000000000430> PMID: 36917678

32. Thomsen, C, Levitt, Z, Gernon, C, Spencer, P. Presence and absence: crisis pregnancy centers and abortion facilities in the contemporary reproductive justice landscape. *Hum Geogr J.* 2022;16(1):64-74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19427786221109959>
33. Aid Access. <https://aidaccess.org/en/>. Date accessed: June 27, 2023.
34. Kreitzer, RJ, Smith, CW, Kane, KA, Saunders, TM. Affordable but inaccessible? Contraception deserts in the US states. *J Health Polit Policy Law.* 2021;46(2):277-304. <https://doi.org/10.1215/03616878-8802186> PMID: 32955562
35. Salganicoff, A, Ranji, U. A focus on contraception in the wake of Dobbs. WHI. June 13, 2023. <https://www.kff.org/womens-health-policy/perspective/a-focus-on-contraception-in-the-wake-of-dobbs/>. Date accessed: June 27, 2023.
36. Zhu, DT. Cross-sectoral community and civic engagement after Dobbs v. Jackson. *Lancet Reg Health Am.* 2023;22:100514. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2023.100514> PMID: 37250688
37. Borgmann, CE, Jones, BS. Legal issues in the provision of medical abortion. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2000;183(2):S84-S94. <https://doi.org/10.1067/mob.2000.108229> PMID: 10944373
38. Barr-Walker, JB, Jayaweera, RT, Ramirez, AM, Gerdts, C. Experiences of women who travel for abortion: A mixed methods systematic review. *PLoS ONE.* 2019;14(4): e0209991. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0209991> PMID: 30964860
39. Kimport, K, Rasidjan, MP. Exploring the emotional costs of abortion travel in the United States due to legal restriction. *Contracept.* 2023;120:109956. <https://doi.org/>

40. Doran, F, Nancarrow, S. Barriers and facilitators of access to first-trimester abortion services for women in the developed world: a systematic review. *BMJ Sex Reprod Health.* 2015;41;3:170-180. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0209991> PMID: 30964860
41. Studnicki, J, Fisher, JW, Sherley, JL. Perceiving and addressing the pervasive racial disparity in abortion. *Health Serv Res Manag.* 2020;7:1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2333392820949743> PMID: 32875006

Table 1. Eligibility criteria

The following articles were included:
Any adult patient population (either general or specialized) based in the United States
Includes the exposure of interest (i.e., <i>Dobbs v. Jackson</i> ruling)
Evaluates the patient-centered outcomes of interest (i.e., access to abortion and reproductive health services, health outcomes related to physical and psychological wellbeing)
Evaluates the provider-centered outcomes of interest (i.e., access to comprehensive abortion training, facilitators and barriers to providing abortion services)
English language
Studies with primary quantitative data (e.g., primary observational studies)
Published after May 2, 2022 (when the U.S. Supreme Court's draft of <i>Dobbs</i> became leaked)
The following articles were excluded:
Patient populations outside the United States
Does not include the exposure of interest
Does not include information on the patient- or provider-centered outcomes of interest
No English language
Studies with only qualitative data
Studies with only secondary data (e.g., reviews, editorials, letters to the editor, etc.)
Published before May 2, 2022

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.10.23292460>; this version posted July 12, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Table 2. Study characteristics and major findings

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
<i>Patient-oriented studies</i>							
Rising vasectomy volume following reversal of federal protections for abortion rights in the United States ¹⁵	Bole et al.	Retrospective chart review (full text available)	Adults seeking vasectomies	July-August 2021 (pre- <i>Dobbs</i>) and July-August 2022 (post- <i>Dobbs</i>)	Vasectomy procedural billing data	Number of vasectomy consultation requests after <i>Dobbs</i>	35.0 p.p. increase
						Number of vasectomy consultations after <i>Dobbs</i>	22.4 p.p. increase
						Number of vasectomy completed (within 16 months of baseline)	20.7 p.p. increase
						Number of vasectomies per month after <i>Dobbs</i>	109.6 p.p. increase
Search trends signal increased vasectomy	Patel et al.	Observational (full text)	No restrictions	March 25, 2022 – June	Google Trends	Mean RSV for “vasectomy”	78.5% (vs. Oklahoma)

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
interest in states with sparsity of urologists after overrule of Roe vs. Wade ¹⁶		available)		29, 2022		after <i>Dobbs</i> in prohibited states	
						Mean RSV for “vasectomy” after <i>Dobbs</i> in legal states	64.2% (vs. Oklahoma)
						Spearman’s ρ (RSV vs. ratio of urologists to adult men)	-0.36
The unprecedented increase in Google searches for “vasectomy” after the reversal of Roe vs. Wade ¹⁷	Sellke et al.	Observational (full text available)	No restrictions	July 2017 – July 2022	Google Trends	RSV for “vasectomy” on day of <i>Dobbs</i>	100%
						Mean difference in RSV for “vasectomy” after <i>Dobbs</i>	30.1 p.p. increase (2 weeks after vs. 2 weeks before <i>Dobbs</i>)
						RSV for “vasectomy” on day of	60% (vs. day of <i>Dobbs</i>)

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						U.S. Supreme Court leaking <i>Dobbs</i> draft	
						RSV for “vasectomy” on day of Alabama House Bill 314	55% (vs. day of <i>Dobbs</i>)
The interest in permanent contraception peaked following the leaked Supreme Court majority opinion of <i>Roe vs. Wade</i> : a cross-sectional Google Trends analysis ¹⁸	Ghomeshi et al.	Observational (full text available)	No restrictions	April 25, 2022 – May 8, 2022	Google Trends	Mean difference in SVI for “vasectomy” after Supreme Court leaking <i>Dobbs</i> draft	121 p.p. increase (1 week after vs. 1 week before leaked draft)
						Mean difference in SVI for “tubal ligation” after Supreme	70 p.p. increase (1 week after vs. 1 week before leaked draft)

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						Court leaking <i>Dobbs</i> draft	
Looking for a silver lining to the dark cloud: a Google Trends analysis of contraceptive interest in the United States post <i>Roe vs. Wade</i> verdict ¹⁹	Datta et al.	Observational (full text available)	No restrictions	April 6, 2022 – July 5, 2022	Google Trends	Mean difference in SVI for “vasectomy” after <i>Dobbs</i>	614 p.p. increase (maximum SVI vs. SVI on June 23)
						Mean difference in SVI for “tubal ligation” after <i>Dobbs</i>	489 p.p. increase (maximum SVI vs. SVI on June 23)
						Mean difference in SVI for “IUD” after <i>Dobbs</i>	80 p.p. increase (maximum SVI vs. SVI on June 23)
						Mean difference in SVI for “birth control pill” after <i>Dobbs</i>	75 p.p. increase (maximum SVI vs. SVI on June 23)
						Mean difference in	57 p.p. increase

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						SVI for “condom” after <i>Dobbs</i>	(maximum SVI vs. SVI on June 23)
						Mean difference in SVI for “morning after pill” after <i>Dobbs</i>	700 p.p. increase (maximum SVI vs. SVI on June 23)
Impact of banning emergency contraception in states with abortion bans: a cost-effectiveness analysis ²⁰	Dzubay et al.	Modeling (abstract only)	Theoretical cohort of people capable of pregnancy in states with abortion bans under a hypothetical EC ban	—	—	Number of abortions after <i>Dobbs</i>	41,052 cases increase (EC ban vs. EC accessible)
						Number of miscarriages after <i>Dobbs</i>	11,168 cases increase (EC ban vs. EC accessible)
						Number of pre-eclampsia cases after <i>Dobbs</i>	1,611 cases increase (EC ban vs. EC accessible)
						Number of maternal	4 cases increase (EC

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						deaths after <i>Dobbs</i>	ban vs. EC accessible)
						Number of preterm births after <i>Dobbs</i>	3,839 cases increase (EC ban vs. EC accessible)
						Number of neonatal deaths after <i>Dobbs</i>	83 cases increase (EC ban vs. EC accessible)
						Number of neurodevelopmental cases after <i>Dobbs</i>	34 cases increase (EC ban vs. EC accessible)
						Cost	\$541,716,923 increase (EC ban vs. EC accessible)
						QALYs	13,643 QALYs increase (EC ban vs. EC accessible)

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
Estimated travel time and spatial access to abortion facilities in the US before and after the Dobbs v Jackson Women’s Health decision ²¹	Rader et al.	Modeling (full text available)	Females of reproductive age living in the U.S.	January-December 2021 (pre- <i>Dobbs</i>) and September 2022 (modeled post- <i>Dobbs</i> period, assuming all abortion facilities were to be closed in states with total or 6-week abortion bans)	Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health database, 2020 American Community Survey	Median surface travel time to abortion facilities after <i>Dobbs</i>	6.1 minutes increase
						Mean surface travel time to abortion facilities after <i>Dobbs</i>	72.6 minutes increase
						Proportion of individuals living more than 60 minutes from an abortion facility after <i>Dobbs</i>	18.7 p.p. increase
Requests for self-managed medication abortion provided using online telemedicine in 30 US	Aiken et al.	Cross-sectional (full text available)	Individuals requesting self-managed medications	September 1, 2021 – May 1, 2022 (baseline), May 2, 2022	Aid Access	Mean daily requests for self-managed medication abortions	54.5 daily requests increase (vs. baseline)

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
states before and after the <i>Dobbs v Jackson Women's Health Organization</i> decision ²²			abortions from Aid Access	– June 23, 2022 (after Supreme Court leaking of <i>Dobbs</i> draft), and June 24, 2022 – August 31, 2022 (after <i>Dobbs</i> officially passed)		after Supreme Court leaked <i>Dobbs</i> draft	
						Mean daily requests for self-managed medication abortions after <i>Dobbs</i> officially passed	131.1 daily requests increase (vs. baseline)
Predicted changes in travel distance for abortion among counties with low rates of effective contraceptive use following <i>Dobbs v Jackson</i> ²³	Rodriguez et al.	Modeling (full text available)	Reproductive age Medicaid recipients (ages 15-44 years)	—	Medicaid Transformed Medicaid Statistical Information System Analytic Files	Proportion of women living in counties with low contraceptive use and restricted access to abortion after <i>Dobbs</i>	36 p.p. increase

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
Characteristics of people obtaining abortions in states likely to ban it: findings from a 2021–2022 national study ²⁴	Jones & Chiu	Cross-sectional (abstract only)	Individuals obtaining abortions in a random sample of abortion facilities	June 2021 – June 2022	Survey	Proportion non-Hispanic Black in abortion-hostile states	15 p.p. higher (vs. abortion-safe states)
						Proportion non-Hispanic White in abortion-hostile states	7 p.p. higher (vs. abortion-safe states)
						Proportion obtaining medication abortions in abortion-hostile states	11 p.p. higher (vs. abortion-safe states)
						Proportion traveling out-of-state to an abortion-hostile state	2.1 p.p. higher (vs. traveling out-of-state to an abortion-safe state)

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						Proportion paying \$0 for an abortion in abortion-hostile states	45 p.p. lower (vs. abortion-safe states)
						Proportion paying out of pocket for an abortion	87%
						Proportion facing financial barriers for an abortion	56%
Examination of the public's reaction on Twitter to the overturning of <i>Roe v. Wade</i> and abortion bans ²⁵	Mane et al.	NLP (full text available)	1% random sample of publicly available tweets based on keywords related to <i>Roe v. Wade</i> and abortion	May 1, 2021 – July 15, 2021 (pre- <i>Dobbs</i>) and May 1, 2022 – July 15, 2022 (post- <i>Dobbs</i>)	Twitter API for Academic Research	Proportion of negative tweets related to <i>Roe v. Wade</i> and abortion after <i>Dobbs</i>	0.17 p.p. increase (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i>)
						Proportion of neutral tweets	2.55 p.p. increase (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i>)

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						related to <i>Roe v. Wade</i> and abortion after <i>Dobbs</i>	
						Proportion of supportive tweets related to <i>Roe v. Wade</i> and abortion after <i>Dobbs</i>	4.71 p.p. decrease (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i>)
Impact on access to methotrexate in the post- <i>Roe</i> era ²⁶	Wipfler et al.	Cross-sectional (abstract only)	Adults participating in FORWARD	—	FORWARD Survey (the National Databank for Rheumatic Diseases)	Proportion facing a barrier to methotrexate access (confirmed due to <i>Dobbs</i>)	1.25%
						Proportion facing a barrier to methotrexate access (likely)	1.5%

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						due to <i>Dobbs</i>)	
Abortion restriction impact on burden of neonatal single ventricle congenital heart disease: a decision-analytic model ²⁷	Miller et al.	Modeling (abstract only)	Theoretical cohort of neonates under various policy scenarios	—	—	Complete ban scenario	
						Incidence of SVCD per 100,000 live births	10.8 p.p. increase (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i> baseline)
						Incidence of SVCD-related heart surgery per 100,000 live births	9.4 p.p. increase (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i> baseline)
						Incidence of SVCD-related death per 100,000 live births	3.1 p.p. increase (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i> baseline)
						Ban beyond 13 weeks of gestation scenario	
						Incidence of SVCD per 100,000 live births	10.0 p.p. increase (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i> baseline)

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						Incidence of SVCD-related heart surgery per 100,000 live births	8.8 p.p. increase (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i> baseline)
						Incidence of SVCD-related death per 100,000 live births	2.8 p.p. increase (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i> baseline)
						Ban beyond 20 weeks of gestation scenario	
						Incidence of SVCD per 100,000 live births	7.7 p.p. increase (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i> baseline)
						Incidence of SVCD-related heart surgery per 100,000 live births	6.9 p.p. increase (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i> baseline)
						Incidence of SVCD-related death per	2.3 p.p. increase (vs.

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						100,000 live births	pre- <i>Dobbs</i> baseline)
<i>Provider-oriented studies</i>							
Fellow perspectives of abortion-related training in maternal-fetal medicine fellowship: regional differences in a post-Roe world ²⁸	Cheng et al.	Cross-sectional (abstract only)	Maternal-fetal medicine fellows	June 2022	Survey	Fellowship associated with CFP fellowship	22.2% lower among fellows in hostile states (vs. fellows in open states)
						Fellowship associated with FI center	15.3% higher among fellows in hostile states (vs. fellows in open states)
						Fellowship faculty's pro-abortion legislative advocacy rated as an important factor in	19.5% lower among fellows in hostile states (vs. fellows in open states)

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						pursuing that fellowship	
						Personal participation in pro-abortion advocacy	17.6% lower among fellows in hostile states (vs. fellows in open states)
Trainee opinions regarding the effect of the Dobbs v. Jackson women's health organization Supreme Court decision on obstetrics and gynecology training ²⁹	Meriwether et al.	Cross-sectional (abstract only)	OB-GYN residents and fellows	October 31, 2022	Survey	Believes they will have to stop providing standard of care in this area during training post-Dobbs:	
						Early pregnancy loss	4.98-7.4%
						Fetal demise in second trimester and beyond	10.77-13.1%
						Pregnancy of unknown location	10.73-13.1%
						Ectopic pregnancy	5.02-8.3%

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						Molar pregnancy	4.98-7.4%
						Assisted reproductive technologies involving embryos	9.2-10.7%
						Induced abortion in first trimester (if rape or incest)	31.7-34.4%
						Induced abortion in first trimester (if maternal or fetal health outcomes)	25.8-29.5%
						Induced abortion in first	35.1-41.8%

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						trimester (any)	
						Induced abortion in second trimester (if rape or incest)	34.4-37.8%
						Induced abortion in second trimester (if maternal or fetal health outcomes)	31.0-31.1%
						Induced abortion in second trimester (any)	38.5-40.8%
						Management of abortion complications	48.36-51.2%

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						Concern for facing charges for providing standard of care in this area during training post- <i>Dobbs</i> :	
						Early pregnancy loss	31.7-32.0%
						Fetal demise in second trimester and beyond	29.1-28.7%
						Pregnancy of unknown location	36.1-41.5%
						Ectopic pregnancy	29.5-35.1%
						Molar pregnancy	26.5-27.1%
						Assisted reproductive technologies involving embryos	31.2-38.2%

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						Induced abortion in first trimester (if rape or incest)	53.3-54.9%
						Induced abortion in first trimester (if maternal or fetal health outcomes)	53.7-57.4%
						Induced abortion in first trimester (any)	55.6-57.4%
						Induced abortion in second trimester (if rape or incest)	56.6-59.7%

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						Induced abortion in second trimester (if maternal or fetal health outcomes)	57.4-58.7%
						Induced abortion in second trimester (any)	62.3-63.0%
						Management of abortion complications	48.36-51.2%
Projected implications of overturning Roe v Wade on abortion training in U.S. obstetrics and gynecology residency programs ³⁰	Vinekar et al.	Commentary (full text available)	Residents in accredited U.S. OB-GYN residency programs	—	American Medical Association database of OB-GYN residency programs in the U.S. and	Proportion of OB-GYN residents in states certain to ban abortion	38.4%
						Proportion of OB-GYN	38.8%

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
					the Guttmacher Institute	residency programs in states certain to ban abortion	
						Proportion of OB-GYN residents in states likely to ban abortion	5.5%
						Proportion of OB-GYN residency programs in states likely to ban abortion	5.9%
Forensic nurses' understanding of emergency contraception mechanisms:	Downing et al.	Cross-sectional (full text available)			Survey	Proportion that believe their prescribing of EC will	6.94%

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
implications for access to emergency contraception ³¹						increase after <i>Dobbs</i>	
						Proportion that believe their prescribing of EC will decrease after <i>Dobbs</i>	0.58%
						Proportion that believe their prescribing of EC will not change after <i>Dobbs</i>	79.77%
						Proportion unsure if their prescribing of EC will change after <i>Dobbs</i>	12.72%

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
Presence and absence: crisis pregnancy centers and abortion facilities in the contemporary reproductive justice landscape ³²	Thomsen et al.	Modeling (full text available)	—	—	Advancing New Standards In Reproductive Health database, Reproaction Fake Clinic database, IPUMS National Historical GIS project, National Center for Health Statistics	Proportion living in areas with CPCs closer than abortion facilities after <i>Dobbs</i>	26.5 p.p. increase (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i>)
						Proportion living in areas with abortion facilities closer than CPCs after <i>Dobbs</i>	0.1 p.p. decrease (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i>)
						Proportion living in areas with CPCs and abortion facilities equidistant after <i>Dobbs</i>	26.4 p.p. decrease (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i>)
						Proportion living in areas within 30	24.7 p.p. decrease (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i>)

Publication	Authors	Study Design	Population	Data Collection Period	Data Sources	Outcome(s)	Magnitude
						minutes of an abortion facility after <i>Dobbs</i>	
						Proportion living in areas within 60 minutes of an abortion facility after <i>Dobbs</i>	9.6 p.p. decrease (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i>)
						Proportion living in areas within more than 120 minutes of an abortion facility after <i>Dobbs</i>	38.9 p.p. decrease (vs. pre- <i>Dobbs</i>)

Note: p.p., percentage-points; RSV, relative search volume; SVI, Search volume index; ρ , Spearman's correlation coefficient; EC, emergency contraception; CFP, complex family planning; FI, fertility and infertility; SVCD, single ventricle congenital heart disease; OB-GYN, obstetrics and gynecology; QALYs, quality-adjusted life years; NLP, natural language processing; EC, emergency contraception; CPC, crisis pregnancy center.