

House Health Committee  
Testimony for HB 2274  
February 20, 2019

I am Dr. Mae Winchester, an obstetrician and gynecologist in Kansas. My studies focus on maternal fetal medicine, commonly referred to as high risk pregnancies. I see around 60 patients a week.

Medication abortion is one of the safest procedures in medicine. The rate of significant complication from a medication abortion is half that of a routine colonoscopy (1, 2). The rate of mortality is 43 times less than that of a pregnancy at term (3, 4).

So-called abortion reversal, on the other hand, has not been studied and has not been proven safe for patients. Dr. Delgado, a California physician has led unethical and unmonitored research on women which has inspired HB 2274. He has offered two studies, both of which are purely observational and suffer from small sample size, lack of long-term follow-up, and no oversight by an institutional review board or ethics committee that put those patients in potential danger (5, 6). When Dr. Delgado's results were combined with other studies in a systematic review by Dr. Grossman, in an attempt to better study so-called reversal, there was "no credible evidence that using medication after mifepristone is better than expectant management in a continuing pregnancy and suggesting otherwise is scientifically untenable" (7).

In any other field of medicine, potential drugs and treatments must undergo rigorous and extensive randomized controlled trials to prevent undue harm to patients. There have been no such studies on abortion reversal. There is no credible data on the safety or efficacy of this concept. At this time, "abortion reversal" is purely experimental.

HB 2274 asks physicians to knowingly mislead their patients. So-called "abortion reversal" has not been proven to be effective or safe, and to state as such is dishonest. This interferes with patients' rights to make personal medical decisions based on adequate information. Physicians should not be mandated to lie to a patient for someone else's political gain.

To assume that "abortion reversal" may be effective is to place women into an unmonitored research experiment. The women of Kansas are valued citizens, not women upon which to be experimented. To give them deceitful information as HB 2274 would mandate, is ethically and morally wrong. It is every humans right to receive relevant and accurate information so that they can make sound decisions about their potential treatments.

HB 2274 introduces dangerous political interference that puts the health of Kansas women at risk. Allowing falsified data to find its way into our legislation and the health of women is wrong.

## References

1. Cleland K, Creinin MD, Nucatola D, Nshom M, Trussell J. Significant adverse events and outcomes after medical abortion. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2013; 121(1): 166.
2. Whitlock EP, Lin JS, Liles E, et al. Screening for colorectal cancer: a targeted, updated systematic review for the U.S. Preventative Service Task Force. *Ann Int Med* 2008; 149:638-58.
3. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Pregnancy Mortality Surveillance System. <https://www.cdc.gov/reproductivehealth/maternalinfanthealth/pregnancy-mortality-surveillance-system.htm>. Accessed 18 February 2019.
4. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Severe Maternal Morbidity in the United States. <https://www.cdc.gov/reproductivehealth/maternalinfanthealth/severematernalmorbidity.html>. Accessed 18 February 2019.
5. Delgado, G. The Reversal of Mifepristone with Progesterone. *Issues in Law and Medicine.* 2015 Autumn; 30 (2): 169-77.
6. Davenport, M. Delgado G, Harrison MP, Khauv V. Embryo Survival after Mifepristone: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Issues in Law & Medicine.* 2017 Spring ;32 (1): 3-18.
7. Grossman D, White K, Harris L, et al. Continuing pregnancy after mifepristone and “reversal” of first-trimester medical abortion: a systematic review. *Contraception.* 2015; 92: 206-211.