group). Women in both groups could administer a second dose of 800mcg sublingual misoprostol at home after 12h if they did not experience any bleeding. Participants returned after 7 days for evaluation including ultrasound examination. Our primary outcome was gestational sac expulsion at the follow-up visit and no additional surgical intervention.

Results**:** Gestational sac expulsion at the follow-up visit with no additional surgical intervention occurred in 107/126 women (85.0%) in the mifepristone-misoprostol group and 120/ 143 women (83.9%) in the misoprostol-alone group (relative risk 1.0, 95% CI 0.9-1.1). Women assigned to mifepristone-misoprostol were significantly less likely to use the additional dose of misoprostol (26/126 women or 20.6%) than women who received misoprostol alone (50/143 women or 34.9%) (relative risk 0.6, 95% CI: 0.4-0.9). Women who received misoprostol alone were more likely to report that side effects were "bad" or "very bad" (65/142 or 45.8%) compared to women who received mifepristone-misoprostol (47/125 or 37.6%) (relative risk 0.82, 95% CI: 0.61-1.09).

Conclusions: Pretreatment with mifepristone did not significantly improve the effectiveness of sublingual misoprostol for treatment of missed abortion when women were allowed to use additional doses of misoprostol if they believed bleeding was too scanty. However, women who received mifepristone-misoprostol were significantly less likely to self-administer an additional dose of misoprostol and reported that side effects were more tolerable than women who received misoprostol alone.

doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2019.03.005

Using telemedicine to reduce the cost of medical abortion to patients and extend the reach of providers to rural areas and across state lines

Chong E on behalf of The TelAbortion Project Team

Gynuity Health Projects, New York, NY, USA

Introduction: In May 2016, we launched the TelAbortion Project, which enables women in participating states to obtain medical abortion from home by telemedicine and mail without coming in person to an abortion facility. We will present updated service statistics and discuss the implications of this model for improving abortion access in the U.S.

Methods: To obtain a TelAbortion, a woman contacts a project site and receives counseling and instructions by videoconference. She has screening tests at facilities close to her. If she is eligible, the site mails or prescribes a standard medical abortion regimen. She obtains follow-up tests and speaks with TelAbortion staff to confirm complete abortion. Women or their insurance carriers pay for all services received outside project sites, and since late 2017, also for services obtained directly from the project. TelAbortion is currently implemented by providers in Hawaii, Oregon, and Maine, some of whom are also licensed to practice in New York and Washington.

Results: Through December 2018, TelAbortion clinicians provided treatment to 250 women. Of women in the continental U.S., 39% lived more than 100 miles from the treating facility, and 27% received treatment across state lines. In Hawaii, 65% of women were treated across islands. Abortion outcomes did not vary by distance or by cross-state or cross-island dispensing. Of 36 women who paid out-of-pocket for the abortion itself, 52% used or planned to use Medicaid or private insurance to cover the costs of the screening tests. We are initiating TelAbortion in Colorado, New Mexico, and Georgia soon and will report results from those states at the meeting.

Conclusion: Direct-to-patient telemedicine is safe and acceptable for providing abortion over long distances and may particularly benefit women with limited ability to access the service locally. Cross-state prescribing may be a valuable strategy for scaling up this type of service quickly. Separating the screening and follow up testing from the abortion itself can allow women without coverage for abortion to use insurance for part of their care, such that the cost is comparable and in some cases less expensive than paying out of pocket for an in-clinic medical abortion.

doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2019.03.006

Characteristics of patients using telemedicine compared with in-person visits for state-mandated informed consent before abortion in Utah

Daniel S, Kaller S, Raifman S, Grossman D

Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health (ANSIRH) UCSF, San Francisco, CA, USA

Introduction: Utah requires abortion patients to wait at least 72 hours between attending mandatory information sessions and having an abortion. In 2015, Planned Parenthood Association of Utah (PPAU) began offering telemedicine as a way for patients to attend state-mandated information visits in order to avoid an unnecessary clinic visit. This study examines demographic and abortion differences between in-clinic patients and patients using telemedicine for the informed consent visit.

Method: We used data from PPAU's practice management database and electronic health records that included all informed consent and abortion encounters from January 2015 – March 2018. We compared patient characteristics by informed consent visit type and calculated the distances from the patient's residential zip code to the nearest PPAU health center offering state-mandated informed consent visits. We also matched the informed consent visits with corresponding abortion visits and compared the time interval between the informed consent visit and abortion visit, and the gestational age at the time of abortion for the two groups.

Results: Of the 9,175 informed consent visits, 91% were in-clinic (n=8,395) and 9% were telemedicine (n=780). Compared to in-clinic patients, telemedicine patients were slightly older (27 vs. 26 years on average, p=.002), more likely to live out of state (47% vs. 4%, p<.001) and live further away from PPAU clinics offering informed consent visits (92 miles vs. 19 miles on average, p<.001). Sixty-eight percent (n=6,223) of the informed consent visit patients obtained an abortion at the Salt Lake City clinic (68% of in-clinic patients (n=5,709), 67% of telemedicine patients (n=524), p=.64). A higher proportion of telemedicine patients obtained abortions greater than 14 weeks gestation (13% vs. 7%, p<.001). There were no differences in abortion method (surgical vs. medication) as well as the number of days between the informed consent visit and the abortion visit (11.7 vs 11.4 days on average, p=.47).

Conclusions: Although a small proportion of patients used telemedicine for the informed consent visit, our findings indicate that telemedicine can reduce the burden of multiple clinic visits, especially for those living far from clinics, including those from out of state.

doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2019.03.007