

Title Page

Review of publicly available state reimbursement policies for removal and reinsertion of Long-Acting Reversible Contraception

Ekwutosi M. Okoroh^{1, #a, ¶}, Charlan D. Kroelinger^{1, * ¶}, Olivia R. Sappenfield^{2, ¶}, Julia F. Howland^{2, ¶}, Lisa M. Romero^{1, ¶}, Kerriann Uesugi^{2, ¶}, Shanna Cox^{1, ¶}

¹ Division of Reproductive Health, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America

² Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, United States of America

^{#a}Current Address: River People Health Center, Indian Health Service, Scottsdale, Arizona, United States of America

*Corresponding author
Email: dwz8@cdc.gov (CDK)

¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

Short title: State policies on removal and reinsertion of Long-Acting Reversible Contraception

CRedit Taxonomy:

EMO conceptualized and developed the methodology for the study and led the original draft writing as well as the review and editing process.

CDK conceptualized and developed the methodology for the study, provided supervision, and led the original draft writing as well as the review and editing process.

ORS curated the data and participated in the investigation, led software development and formal analysis.

JFH curated the data and participated in the investigation, led software development and formal analysis.

LMR provided supervision and validation of data results.

KU led project administration and provided supervision, supported development of the methodology and resources, and supported conceptualization of the manuscript.

SC provided support in development of the methodology and provided review and editing of the manuscript.

1 **Abstract**

2 We examined reimbursement policies for the removal and reinsertion of long-acting reversible
3 contraception (LARC). We conducted a standardized, web-based review of publicly available
4 state policies for language on reimbursement of LARC removal and reinsertion. We also
5 summarized policy language on barriers to reimbursement for LARC removal and reinsertion.
6 Twenty-six (52%) of the 50 states had publicly available policies that addressed reimbursement
7 for LARC removal. Of these, 14 (28%) included language on reimbursement for LARC
8 reinsertion. Eleven states included language on barriers for reimbursement for removal and/or
9 reinsertion: five state policies included language with other requirements for removal only,
10 three policies included language with additional requirements for reinsertion only, and three
11 included language with additional requirements for both. Three state policies specified no
12 barriers be placed on reimbursement for removal and one specified no barriers be placed on
13 reimbursement for reinsertion. Half of the states in the U.S. do not have publicly available
14 policies on reimbursement for the removal and reinsertion of LARC devices. Inclusion of
15 unrestricted access to these services is important for reproductive autonomy.

16 **Introduction**

17
18 Reproductive autonomy includes the right to decide and control contraceptive use [1–2]. Long-
19 acting reversible contraception (LARC) methods (i.e. defined as intrauterine devices (IUD) and
20 contraceptive implants) are safe, highly effective, and satisfactory options available to women
21 who have been appropriately counseled [3]. Yet, multiple barriers to utilization have been
22 identified [4–6] including hesitation from providers on ‘early’ LARC removal [7–9], delay in
23 placement [10], and variations in available individual health coverage [11–12]. As of September
24 2010, the Affordable Care Act (ACA) requires many insurance plans to provide in-network
25 coverage without cost sharing of certain clinical preventive services including all FDA-approved
26 contraceptive methods [13]; however, additional requirements for reimbursement of services
27 in individual state-level policies, exist. For instance, health plans or issuers of plans may use
28 reasonable medical management techniques to control cost by imposing cost sharing when
29 equivalent branded drugs are used [13]. Barriers to LARC removal and reinsertion access may
30 also occur due to imposing prior authorization and step therapy, approval for medically
31 necessary procedures only [9], or other non-medical reasons [11]. Therefore, it is important to
32 understand how reimbursement policies for LARC devices, specifically for removal and
33 reinsertion, affect health services delivery at the population level. This review summarizes
34 language in state-level reimbursement policies on LARC removal and reinsertion, and language
35 on reimbursement requirements.

36

37

38 **Materials and methods**

39 Study authors conducted a systematic, web-based review of publicly available state-level
40 documents from October 2017 to May 2018. Detailed search terms, data abstraction process,
41 and methodology are described elsewhere [14–15]. Briefly, reimbursement policies (e.g.,
42 Medicaid Bulletin, Family Planning Waiver, State Plan Amendment) authored by the state or an
43 entity with authority to create billing policies, were categorized as ‘State issued’. We used the
44 term ‘Health Plan’, to categorize polices (e.g., Provider Manual and Insurance Manual) authored
45 from a health plan with authority from the state to bill for services. When developing the
46 definition of state-based reimbursement policies for LARC removal or reinsertion, study authors
47 reviewed language in all documents that referred to or detailed reimbursement for LARC. If the
48 word ‘removal’ or ‘reinsertion’ was included in the policy language or if the policy contained
49 International Classification of Diseases codes (e.g., Z30.46, Z30.433) or Current Procedural
50 Terminology (e.g., 11982, 11983, 58301) representing removal or reinsertion of a LARC device
51 or Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System codes (e.g., J7296, J7297, J7300, J7307), [16]
52 the state was categorized as having reimbursement policies for LARC removal or reinsertion.
53 Likewise, a state was categorized as having reimbursement language for reinsertion if the
54 language included words such as ‘replacement’ ‘maintain’ and/or ‘re-implanted’ when
55 describing LARC services or reimbursement policies.

56

57 We categorized reimbursement requirements for removal or reinsertion into ‘not specified’ if
58 policies did not specify reimbursement requirements for LARC removal or reinsertion, ‘no
59 requirement for provision of services’ if the language prohibited limitations on removal or

60 reinsertion services, and ‘specified’ if specific requirements were mentioned. Among policies
61 with specific language, we categorized requirements into the following groupings: *Coverage-*
62 *related requirements*—represented policy language that limits reimbursement to preferred in-
63 network providers or by other stipulations in the members’ benefit. *Step-therapy related*
64 *requirements*—allowed for reimbursement only after a therapeutic equivalency device has
65 been used. *Time-related requirements*—limited reimbursement to mandated periods of
66 effectiveness (e.g., 3 years), or required minimum time allotment prior to a device’s removal or
67 reinsertion (e.g., 6 months). *Diagnosis-related requirements*—limited reimbursement to when
68 the removal or reinsertion was needed secondary to the presence of a medical condition (e.g.,
69 bleeding issues, infection) or when the patient was treated for an unrelated diagnosis or for a
70 visit not coded as a family planning visit. Lastly, *same-day related requirements*—represented
71 language that limits reimbursement to same day visits.

72

73 We used descriptive statistics to analyze the abstracted information. This study was determined
74 to be public health practice and, therefore, did not require Institutional Review Board approval
75 at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the University of Illinois at Chicago.

76

77

78

79

80 Results

81 Twenty-six (52%) of the 50 states had publicly available policies that addressed reimbursement
 82 for LARC removal or reinsertion Table 1.

83 **Table 1: Publicly Available Reimbursement Policies on LARC Removal Or Reinsertion By Policy**
 84 **Type and Source for All States, 2017–2018. (N=50)**

States	Policy Characteristics			
	Publicly Available Policy ^a	Policy Types		Policy Source
		State Issued ^b	Health plan ^c	
Alabama	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medicaid Guidance & Health Plan Benefit Guide
Alaska	—	—	—	—
Arizona	—	—	—	—
Arkansas	Yes	Not available ^d	Yes	Health Plan Benefit Guide
California	Yes	Not available	Yes	Health Plan Benefit Guide
Colorado	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	—	—	—	—
Delaware	—	—	—	—
Florida	—	—	—	—
Georgia	—	—	—	—
Hawaii	Yes	Not available	Yes	Health Plan Benefit Guide
Idaho	Yes	Yes	Not available	Medicaid Guidance
Illinois	Yes	Yes	Yes	Statutory Provision & Health Plan Benefit Guide
Indiana	—	—	—	—
Iowa	—	—	—	—

Kansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	State Plan Amendment & Health Plan Benefit Guide
Kentucky	Yes	Not available	Yes	Health Plan Benefit Guide
Louisiana	—	—	—	—
Maine	Yes	Yes	Not available	Medicaid Guidance
Maryland	—	—	—	—
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Not available	Medicaid Guidance
Michigan	—	—	—	—
Minnesota	Yes	Not available	Yes	Health Plan Benefit Guide
Mississippi	—	—	—	—
Missouri	Yes	Yes	Not available	Medicaid Guidance
Montana	Yes	Yes	Not available	Medicaid Guidance
Nebraska	Yes	Yes	Not available	Medicaid Guidance & Title X
Nevada	Yes	Yes	Not available	Medicaid Guidance
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	Not available	Medicaid Guidance
New Jersey	Yes	Not available	Yes	Health Plan Benefit Guide
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	Not available	Medicaid Guidance
New York	—	—	—	—
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Statutory Provision & Health Plan Benefit Guide
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	Not available	Medicaid Guidance
Ohio	—	—	—	—
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	Not available	State Plan Amendment
Oregon	—	—	—	—
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—
Rhode Island	—	—	—	—
South Carolina	—	—	—	—

South Dakota	Yes	Yes	Not available	Medicaid Guidance
Tennessee	—	—	—	—
Texas	—	—	—	—
Utah	Yes	Not available	Yes	Health Plan Benefit Guide
Vermont	—	—	—	—
Virginia	—	—	—	—
Washington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medicaid Guidance & Health Plan Benefit Guide
West Virginia	Yes	Not available	Yes	Health Plan Benefit Guide
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Statutory Provision & Health Plan Benefit Guide
Wyoming	—	—	—	—

85 LARC, Long-acting reversible contraception

86 ^a The dashes in these columns represent states that **did not** have a publicly available policy.

87

88 ^b State issued policy type represents reimbursement policies authored by the state or an entity
89 with authority to create billing policies such as Medicaid, a Statute, or a State Plan Amendment.

90

91 ^c Health plan policy type represents reimbursement policies authored by a health plan, with
92 authority from the state, to bill for services within the state.

93

94 ^d ‘Not available’ represents policies that did not specify a statewide or a health plan policy type.

95

96

97 While all 26 states included language in policies that addressed reimbursement for LARC

98 removal, only 14 policies included language to address reinsertion Table 2.

99

100

101

102 **Table 2: Summary of Reimbursement Policies and Requirements on LARC Removal or**
 103 **Reinsertion Among States with Publicly Available Policies, 2017–2018 (N=26)**

State with Publicly Available Policies	Reimbursement Policy for LARC Removal	Requirement for Reimbursing LARC Removal ^a	Reimbursement Policy for LARC Reinsertion	Requirement for Reimbursing LARC Reinsertion
Alabama	Yes	Not specified	— ^b	—
Arkansas	Yes	Not specified	—	—
California	Yes	Coverage-related requirements Step-therapy related requirements	—	—
Hawaii	Yes	Time-related requirements	—	—
Idaho	Yes	Diagnosis-related requirements	—	—
Illinois	Yes	No restriction for provision of services	Yes	No restriction for provision of services
Kansas	Yes	Not specified	—	—
Kentucky	Yes	Not specified	Yes	Time-related requirements
Maine	Yes	Not specified	—	—
Massachusetts	Yes	Not specified	Yes	Not specified
Minnesota	Yes	Not specified	Yes	Not specified
Missouri	Yes	Not specified	Yes	Not specified
Montana	Yes	Not specified	Yes	Not specified
Nebraska	Yes	Same-day related requirements	Yes	Same-day related requirements
Nevada	Yes	Step-therapy related requirements	Yes	Step-therapy related requirements
New Hampshire	Yes	Not specified	Yes	Not specified
New Jersey	Yes	Coverage-related requirements	Yes	Coverage-related requirements
New Mexico	Yes	Not specified	—	—
North Carolina	Yes	No restriction for provision of services	—	—

North Dakota	Yes	Diagnosis-related requirements	—	—
Oklahoma	Yes	No restriction for provision of services	Yes	Time-related requirements
South Dakota	Yes	Time-related requirements	—	—
Utah	Yes	Not specified	—	—
Washington	Yes	Not specified	Yes	Not specified
West Virginia	Yes	Not specified	Yes	Time-related requirements
Wisconsin	Yes	Not specified	Yes	Not specified

104 LARC, Long-acting reversible contraception

105 ^a *Not specified* represents policies that did not specify reimbursement requirements for LARC
 106 removal or reinsertion. *Coverage-related requirements* represent policy language that limits
 107 the reimbursement of LARC removal or reinsertion to preferred in-network providers or by
 108 other stipulations in the members' benefit coverage. *Step-therapy related requirements*
 109 represent policy language that allows for removal or reinsertion of LARC reimbursement only
 110 after a therapeutic equivalency device has been used. *Time-related requirements* represent
 111 policy language that limits the reimbursement of LARC removal or reinsertion to mandated
 112 periods of effectiveness (e.g., 3 years), or requires minimum time allotment prior to a device's
 113 removal or reinsertion (e.g., 6 months). *Diagnosis-related requirements* represent policy
 114 language that limits the reimbursement of LARC removal or reinsertion to when the removal or
 115 reinsertion was needed secondary to the presence of a medical condition (e.g., bleeding issues,
 116 infection) or when the patient was treated for an unrelated diagnosis or for a visit not coded as
 117 a family planning visit. *No restriction for provision of services* represents policies where the
 118 provided language specifically prohibits restrictions on removal or reinsertion services. *Same-*
 119 *day related requirements* represent policy language that limits reimbursement and no cost
 120 sharing, for the removal or reinsertion of LARC, to same day visits.

121
 122 ^b The dashes in these columns represent policies that **did not** include language on reinsertion or
 123 its reimbursement.

124
 125

126

127 Three policies included language that specified no restrictions be placed on reimbursement for
 128 removal and one state specified no restrictions on reimbursement for reinsertion. The most
 129 common type of reimbursement requirement was time-related (n=5); the least common was
 130 same-day related requirements (n=1). Table 2.

131 **Discussion and conclusions**

132 We found that more than a quarter of states had policy language on reimbursement for LARC
133 removal, while fewer addressed reimbursement for reinsertion. Only three states had policy
134 language indicating no reimbursement requirement for provision of services. Most states with a
135 publicly available reimbursement policy for LARC removal or reinsertion were Medicaid policies,
136 with few states' Health Plans policies publicly available for review. The public availability of
137 more Medicaid policies likely reflects the efforts undertaken by the Centers for Medicare and
138 Medicaid Services (CMS)/Center for Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Program Services
139 (CMCS) who, in 2014, launched the Maternal and Infant Health Initiative with the primary goal
140 of increasing access and use of effective contraceptives including LARC [17] though use among
141 Medicaid recipients varies by state [17–18].

142
143 One potential reason for requirements for reimbursement could be concerns that 'early'
144 removal would be costly [19–20]. However, LARC devices are cost neutral as early as three
145 months post insertion, prior to full duration of effectiveness, when compared with short-acting
146 reversible contraception options (i.e., patches, rings, oral contraceptive pills and injections) or
147 no method use at all [21]. This finding of cost neutrality is still present even when the cost
148 implications of removing the device before the end of its effective date is included [21].

149
150 Our findings of state-level variation in LARC removal and reinsertion reimbursement policies is
151 consistent with existing literature demonstrating variation in LARC access policies. [9,11,14,15,
152 22]. Specific reimbursement practices may present barriers for LARC removal or reinsertion. For

153 women in states with policies that include reimbursement requirements, such as diagnosis and
154 time-related requirements, preferences for LARC maybe impacted if women lack assurance that
155 removal will be covered [9,23]. Moreover, access to LARC removal or reinsertion without
156 restrictions is vitally important, particularly for populations who have experienced restraint of
157 reproductive autonomy (e.g., American Indian/Alaskan Native people, Black people, people
158 with disabilities, people experiencing poverty and people who are incarcerated or detained)
159 [24–30].

160
161 Recognizing these concerns, national clinical organizations encourage patient-centered
162 counseling based on individual patient contraceptive preferences, needs, and values, thus
163 ensuring that patient values guide all clinical decisions [31]. Similarly, the American College of
164 Obstetricians and Gynecologists recommends a reproductive justice framework be employed
165 during contraceptive counseling which entails shared decision-making with the patient and
166 provision of information on the benefits and risks of all contraceptive methods with the
167 avoidance of potential coercion [32]. Recently, a multidisciplinary group of experts developed a
168 Reproductive and Sexual Health Equity framework; a key principle is the concept of honoring
169 bodily autonomy, emphasizing ongoing difficulties women have accessing LARC removal [33].

170
171 Several limitations exist in interpreting our findings. First, we did not contact all states to verify
172 their reimbursement policies on removal or reinsertion of LARC. Second, we only included
173 publicly available policies, potentially missing any new, non-publicly available or unpublished
174 policies. Third, while our reviewed focused on reimbursement policies and its effect on LARC
175 access, numerous other barriers such as lack of provider knowledge [34], blocked time for

176 provider training [35], credentialing gaps [36], and myths and misinformation from patients [32]
177 may contribute to the ability of women to access LARC removal and/or reinsertion. Fourth,
178 since the data collection timeframe, some state policies may have been reviewed or amended,
179 potentially affecting our categorization of policy language. However, amendment of state
180 policies may require multiple annual policy cycles depending on whether the policy is a law,
181 regulation, standard, or protocol [17].

182
183 Given that reimbursement policies can influence service delivery [37], review of language may
184 identify administrative, financial, or medical barriers to reimbursement for LARC removal or
185 reinsertion [9,30,38]. For example, states could consider including reimbursement language
186 that allows providers to bill per-service rather than per-visit, allowing insertion, removal, or
187 reinsertion of a LARC during a single clinical encounter [39], if desired by the woman. Lastly,
188 standardizing training of family medicine [35] or primary care residents [36] on insertion and
189 removal with expanded reimbursement could increase timely access to LARCs.

190
191 LARC removal and reinsertion are important aspects of contraception access. Reimbursement
192 requirements may restrict contraceptive access. Removal of barriers to these services supports
193 both the ability of providers to offer comprehensive contraceptive services, and patient
194 reproductive autonomy.

195

Acknowledgements

None.

References

1. Gomez AM, Fuentes L, Allina A. Women or LARC first? Reproductive autonomy and the promotion of long-acting reversible contraceptive methods. *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2014 Sep. doi: 10.1363/46e1614.
2. Upadhyay UD, Dworkin SL, Weitz TA, Foster DG. Development and validation of a reproductive autonomy scale. *Stud Fam Plann*. 2014 Mar. doi: 10.1111/j.1728-4465.2014.00374.x.
3. Trussell J. Contraceptive failure in the United States. *Contraception*. 2011; 83(5): 397–404.
4. Hopkins B. Barriers to Health Care Providers' Provision of Long-Acting Reversible Contraception to Adolescent and Nulliparous Young Women. *Nurs Womens Health*. 2017; 21(2): 122–128.
5. Baron MM, Potter B, Schrage S. A Review of Long-Acting Reversible Contraception Methods and Barriers to Their Use. *WMJ: official publication of the State Medical Society of Wisconsin*. 2018; 117(4): 156–159.
6. Holden EC, Lai E, Morelli SS, Alderson D, Schulkin J, Castleberry NM, McGovern PG. Ongoing barriers to immediate postpartum long-acting reversible contraception: a physician survey. *Contracept Reprod*. 2018 Nov 08. doi: 10.1186/s40834-018-0078-5.

7. Amico JR, Bennett AH, Karasz A, Gold M. "I wish they could hold on a little longer": physicians' experiences with requests for early IUD removal. *Contraception*. 2017; 96(2): 106–110.
8. Manzer JL, Bell AV. The limitations of patient-centered care: The case of early long-acting reversible contraception (LARC) removal. *Soc Sci Med*. 2022 Jan. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114632.
9. Strasser J, Borkowski L, Couillard M, Allina A, Wood SF. Access to Removal of Long-acting Reversible Contraceptive Methods Is an Essential Component of High-Quality Contraceptive Care. *Womens Health Issues*. 2017; 27(3): 253–255.
10. Runyan A, Welch RA, Kramer KJ, Cortez S, Roberts LJ, Asamoah C, et al. Long-Acting Reversible Contraception: Placement, Continuation, and Removal Rates at an Inner-City Academic Medical Center Clinic. *J Clin Med*. 2021 Apr 28. doi: 10.3390/jcm10091918.
11. Armstrong E, Gandal-Powers M, Levin S, Kimber Kelson A, Luchowski AT, Thompson K. Intrauterine devices and implants: A guide to reimbursement. ACOG, NFPRHA, NHeLP, NWLC, UCSF. 2015. Available from <https://larcprogram.ucsf.edu/>
12. Ela EJ, Broussard K, Hansen K, Burke KL, Thaxton L, Potter JE. Satisfaction, Resignation, and Dissatisfaction with Long-Acting Reversible Contraception among Low-Income Postpartum Texans. *Womens Health Issues*. 2022 Jul-Aug. doi: 10.1016/j.whi.2022.02.006.
13. Department of Labor/Health and Human Services/and Treasury. FAQs About Affordable Care Act Implementation (Part XXVI). 2015; Available from: [Affordable Care Act Implementation FAQs - Set 12 | CMS](#).

14. Kroelinger CD, Okoroh EM, Uesugi K, Romero L, Sappenfield O R, Howland JF, et al.
Immediate Postpartum Long-Acting Reversible Contraception: Review of Insertion and Device Reimbursement Policies. *Womens Health Issues*. 2021; 31(6): 523–531.
15. Romero L, Sappenfield OR, Uesugi K, Howland JF, Kroelinger CD, Okoroh EM, et al.
Review of Publicly Available State Policies for Long-Acting Reversible Contraception Device Reimbursement. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)*. 2022 Jan 17. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2021.0361.
16. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Coding for the Contraceptive Implant and IUDs. 2021; Available from: <https://www.acog.org/-/media/project/acog/acogorg/files/pdfs/publications/larc-coding-guide.pdf>.
17. Centers of Medicare and Medicaid Services. CMCS informational bulletin: state Medicaid payment approaches to improve access to long-acting reversible contraception. 2016; Available from <https://www.medicaid.gov/sites/default/files/Federal-Policy-Guidance/Downloads/CIB040816.pdf>
18. Rodriguez MI, Meath THA, Watson K, Daly A, Tracy K, McConnell KJ. Geographic Variation In Effective Contraceptive Use Among Medicaid Recipients In 2018. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2023 Apr. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2022.00992.
19. Chiou CF, Trussell J, Reyes E, Knight K, Wallace J, Udani J, et al. Economic analysis of contraceptives for women. *Contraception*. 2003; 68(1):3-10.

20. Eisenberg D, McNicholas C, Peipert JF. Cost as a barrier to long-acting reversible contraceptive (LARC) use in adolescents. *J Adolesc Health*. 2013 Apr. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.01.012.
21. Trussell J, Hassan F, Lowin J, Law A, Filonenko A. Achieving cost-neutrality with long-acting reversible contraceptive methods. *Contraception* 2015; 91(1): 49–56.
22. Walls J, Gifford K, Ranji U, Salganicoff A, Gomez I. Medicaid coverage of family planning benefits: Results from a state survey. 2022; Available from: <https://www.kff.org/womens-health-policy/report/medicaid-coverage-of-family-planning-benefits-findings-from-a-2021-state-survey/>
23. Sobel L, Salganicoff A, Kurani N. Coverage of contraceptive services: A review of health insurance plans in five states. 2015. Available from: <http://kff.org/reportsection/coverage-of-contraceptive-services-introduction/>
24. Lawrence J. The Indian Health Service and the sterilization of Native American women. *American Indian quarterly*. 2000; 24(3): 400–419.
25. Roberts D. *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty*, New York: Vintage Book; 1997.
26. Stern AM. Sterilized in the name of public health: race, immigration, and reproductive control in modern California. *Am J Public Health*. 2005; 95(7): 1128–1138.
27. Paltrow LM, Flavin J. Arrests of and forced interventions on pregnant women in the United States, 1973-2005: implications for women's legal status and public health. *J Health Polit Policy Law*. 2013; 38(2): 299–343.

28. Ohlheiser A. California Prisons Were Illegally Sterilizing Female Inmates. Atlantic. 2013 Jul 7 [Cited 2024 March 11]. Available from:
<https://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2013/07/california-prisons-were-illegally-sterilizing-female-inmates/313591/>
29. Gold RB. Guarding Against Coercion While Ensuring Access: A Delicate Balance. Guttmacher Policy Review. 2014; 17:8-14.
30. Levandowski BA, Green T, Liu L, Betstadt S, Thevenet-Morrison K, Harrington A. Results of Immediate Postpartum Long Acting Reversible Contraception Provision After Expanded Reimbursement Policy Implementation at an Academic Medical Institution. Matern Child Health J. 2023 Nov. doi: 10.1007/s10995-023-03738-w.
31. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. National Academies Press (US); 2001
32. ACOG Committee Opinion No. 735: Adolescents and Long-Acting Reversible Contraception: Implants and Intrauterine Devices. Obstet Gynecol. 2018; 131(5): e130–e139.
33. Dehlendorf C, Akers AY, Borrero S, Callegari LS, Cadena D, Gomez AM, et al. Evolving the Preconception Health Framework: A Call for Reproductive and Sexual Health Equity. Obstet Gynecol. 2021; 137(2): 234–239.
34. Luchowski AT, Anderson BL, Power ML, Raglan GB, Espey E, Schulkin J. Obstetrician-gynecologists and contraception: practice and opinions about the use of IUDs in

nulliparous women, adolescents and other patient populations. *Contraception*. 2014
89(6): 572–577.

35. Callen EF, Na'Allah R, Lewis A, Kerns J, Hester CM. Block Scheduling for LARC in a Family
Medicine Residency Program. *Fam Med*. 2023 Dec 20. doi:

10.22454/FamMed.2023.253918. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 38241742.

36. Holaday LW, Gover M, Iyer SV, DeLuca JP, Stella J, Gold M, et al. Effectiveness of training
primary care internal medicine residents in etonogestrel implants and impact on their
future practice: A cross-sectional study. *Contraception*. 2022 Nov. doi:

10.1016/j.contraception.2022.07.013.

37. Vela VX, Patton EW, Sanghavi D, Wood SF, Shin P, Rosenbaum S. Rethinking Medicaid
Coverage and Payment Policy to Promote High Value Care: The Case of Long-Acting
Reversible Contraception. *Womens Health Issues*. 2018; 28(2): 137–143.

38. Centers for Disease Control Prevention. The 6/18 initiative: Prevent unintended
pregnancy. 2016; Available from:

<https://www.cdc.gov/sixteen/pregnancy/index.htm>

39. Orris A, Mauser G, Bachrach D, Grady A. A toolkit for states enhancing access to family
planning services in Medicaid: ManattHealth. 2019; Available from: [Arnold-](#)

[Ventures_Family-Planning-Toolkit_FINAL.PDF \(manatt.com\)](#)