



Original research article

Video counseling about emergency contraception: an observational study☆☆☆☆



Jessica N. Sanders*, Linh A. Moran, Madeline Mullholand, Erica Torres, David K. Turok

University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 4 September 2018

Received in revised form 22 February 2019

Accepted 25 February 2019

Keywords:

Emergency contraception

Video decision support tool

Difference-in-difference analysis

Knowledge

Satisfaction

ABSTRACT

Objective: This study assesses emergency contraception (EC) dispensed before and after a 3-min video counseling intervention on EC.

Methods: We used a quasi-experimental design and two data sources to assess the impact of offering the video counseling intervention. We used electronic health records from six Planned Parenthood Association of Utah health centers with onsite oral EC dispensing to determine pre- and postintervention EC distribution. Beginning July 2015, three participating locations offered the video counseling intervention to English-speaking EC clients. These clients completed a brief survey assessing EC knowledge and uptake, providing a patient-level data source. We used a difference-in-difference analysis of the clinic-level data to assess the effect of the video counseling intervention. This analysis compares the variation in oral EC distribution between clinics offering the video intervention and clinics not offering the video counseling before and after the video counseling was introduced. Multivariable logistic regression assessed client characteristics associated with receiving ulipristal.

Results: The six health centers served 8269 English-language EC clients during 2015. At participating sites, provision of ulipristal increased from 12% (269/2315) preintervention to 28% (627/2266) postintervention ($p < .001$). Nonparticipating sites did not see a change. Clients seeking EC at sites offering video counseling were more likely to receive ulipristal even after controlling for age, insurance and ethnicity (adjusted OR 3.4, 95% CI 3.0–3.9). Using the difference-in-difference analysis, the video counseling intervention accounted for an 18% (95% CI 14%–21%) increase in ulipristal provision at the participating health centers. Among the 2266 women seeking EC who were offered video counseling, 19% (425/2266) watched the video, and 60% (254/425) reported the video affected their EC preferences. Knowledge of the IUD for EC increased, but reported uptake of this method remained low (6.8%).

Conclusions: Exposure to video counseling increased use of more effective oral EC and increased knowledge about all EC options.

Implications: Use of a brief informational video about EC options at family planning clinics may increase the proportion of EC clients receiving more effective EC methods.

© 2019 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

* Conflict of interest: The Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Utah, receives contraceptive clinical trials research funding from Bayer, Cooper Surgical (formerly Teva), Medicines360, Merck and Sebelo Pharmaceuticals. We presented preliminary findings as a poster at the Society of Family Planning's annual North American Forum on Family Planning in Denver in November 2016. The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

** Funding: The University of Utah Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology Division of Family Planning independently funded the study. We collected and managed study data using REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) software hosted at the University of Utah; this service is supported by Center for Clinical and Translational Sciences grant 8UL1TR000105 (formerly UL1RR025764, NCATS/NIH). The University of Utah IRB approved the study (IRB 00071231). Team members receive support from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development and the Office of Research on Women's Health of the National Institute of Health, J.N.S. via award number K12HD085852 and D.K.T. via K24HD087436. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official view of any of the funding agencies or participating institutions, including the National Institutes of Health, the University of Utah or Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.

★ Study location: Salt Lake City, Utah

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 801 581 2124.

E-mail address: Jessica.Sanders@hsc.utah.edu (J.N. Sanders).

1. Introduction

Women seeking emergency contraception (EC) desire to prevent a pregnancy after unprotected intercourse. Currently, the EC options for women in the United States include oral levonorgestrel (LNG), oral ulipristal acetate (UPA) and the T380 copper IUD. The two oral options can be dispensed at the pharmacy, and the IUD requires an in-office procedure with a trained provider. The fourth EC option is the Yuzpe method of combined oral contraceptive pills. This less effective approach can still be used if the above options are not available or affordable, but its use will not be further addressed here. EC clients need to consider time since unprotected intercourse, risk of pregnancy, body mass index (BMI) and desire for a reliable ongoing contraceptive option when choosing which option is best for them.

EC users can access oral LNG, the most commonly used EC method, in pharmacies without a prescription. In 2010, the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved oral UPA, a selective progesterone receptor modulator, for prescription EC use. However, women using EC who weigh more than 160 lb experience significantly lower efficacy with oral LNG relative to oral UPA [1]. Additionally, UPA efficacy and FDA approval for use extend up to 120 h following unprotected sexual intercourse [2]. FDA approval and the package insert limit use of oral LNG to 72 h after intercourse, but efficacy may go beyond that time frame [3,4]. The final and most effective form of EC is the copper IUD, which has a pregnancy risk of 1/1000, 1/10th the risk of UPA [5]. It also is the only option that continues to provide highly effective contraception for as long as the user desires up to 12 years after insertion. Though the FDA has labeled the copper IUD for up to 10 years of use, strong evidence indicates that it is effective for up to 12 years [6]. Disadvantages of the IUD for EC include its greater expense, the additional time for placement by a medical provider, patient discomfort at the time of placement, and potential unwanted side effects.

Several studies demonstrate gaps in patient knowledge of EC [7–9]. Patient-oriented video decision support tools provide an ideal opportunity to support EC clients to make an informed choice when multiple EC options are offered [10]. To meet this need, we developed a 3-min video counseling for emergency contraception that seeks to counsel clients on their EC options. (Appendix 1. Video counseling script or for the full video https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_Q2E8tsyCQE). We evaluated the impact of the video counseling on oral EC dispensing at the clinic level. Among clients who watched the video, we assessed EC knowledge, changes in EC plans and satisfaction with the video as a decision support tool.

2. Methods

2.1. Study design

We used a quasi-experimental design (i.e., without random assignment to treatment and control groups) and two data sources to assess the video counseling intervention. At the clinic level, we used electronic health records from January 2015 to December 2015 from six Planned Parenthood Association of Utah health centers with onsite oral EC dispensing. In the second half of the assessment period, from July 2015 to December 2015, three locations adopted the video counseling intervention. Participants who watched the video completed a brief survey which provided a second data source. These clinics provide three EC options: oral LNG, UPA and the copper IUD. In addition, while pharmacies provide oral LNG for EC without a prescription, Planned Parenthood remains the preferred EC provider among patients in these communities because the clinics provide EC services on a sliding scale based on

ability to pay, making it more affordable than pharmacies. Out-of-pocket cost of EC at Utah's Planned Parenthood clinics varies from \$5 for oral LNG, \$30 for UPA and around \$500 for the copper IUD; however, the payment scale slides to zero, if needed, for all EC visits. Women preferring oral LNG may approach the clinic front desk and receive the medication in less than 5 min without an appointment. Oral UPA requires a prescription and involves a minimal encounter with an advanced practice clinician. Finally, a copper IUD demands a full clinic appointment including counseling on the device and the insertion procedure. However, during the time of the intervention, not all clinics had a clinician available for IUD insertion every day. On these days, clinics provided clients with the oral EC of their choice and scheduled them for an IUD insertion at a later date.

During the intervention period, front desk staff offered English-speaking clients presenting for EC the opportunity to watch the video. The animated English-language video included information on oral LNG, oral UPA and the copper IUD. Eligible women spoke English and requested EC at a participating health center during the 6-month intervention period. The study protocol did not include any additional eligibility criteria. Prior to starting the video and survey, an electronic cover letter approved by the University of Utah IRB explained the details of the study and continuation to the video implied consent. The counseling video content compared method characteristics of oral LNG, oral UPA and the copper IUD and provided information on method efficacy, impact of BMI and availability. This included the over-the-counter availability of oral LNG, the need for a prescription with UPA and the need for professional placement with the copper T380 IUD. We developed the script based on information included on commonly used client sheets for EC users shared at Planned Parenthood clinics and on the Bedsider.org website. After watching the video, the client completed an anonymous survey reporting basic demographics, prior knowledge of EC, the impact of the video on their EC choice and if they would recommend this video to other women seeking EC (Appendix 2. Video counseling survey). The client then continued with their clinic visit per standard of care. We used REDCap, a secure web application, to build, administer and manage the online survey and database [17].

First, to examine the impact of the video counseling intervention, we used pharmacy dispensing records from participating and non-participating health centers for the 6 months prior to the video counseling intervention and during the 6-month video counseling intervention. We describe characteristics of clients' age, race/ethnicity and insurance status by sale of oral LNG and oral UPA, and use logistic regression to assess client characteristic associations with selection of UPA. During the study period, clinics did not have standardized reporting of which clients receiving IUDs used them specifically for EC; thus, these data were not available from the clinical data. We compared oral EC dispensing data using a difference-in-difference analysis to assess the impact of the intervention on UPA, the more effective oral EC option. Difference-in-difference estimates the specific intervention effect of the intervention by comparing the observed outcome trend to an unobserved counterfactual. Second, using the survey data, we describe characteristics of the video counseling participants, baseline EC knowledge, EC type participants planned to request before watching the video and what participants planned to request after video counseling. We used multivariable logistic regression to determine associations between patient characteristics and changing their mind on the type of EC they planned to request at their visit after watching the video. We adjusted for available sociodemographic data with potential associations with EC method selection including age, race/ethnicity, insurance status, gravidity, income and highest level of education. We used Stata14 or higher to analyze all data (College Station, TX, USA). The University of Utah Institutional Review Board approved this study.

3. Results

The six health centers with onsite EC dispensing reported 8269 EC visits during 2015. Of these, 51% (n=4216) occurred from January to June and 49% (n=4053) from July to December. Approximately half of visits occurred at the three participating clinics (55%; n=4581). EC clients at participating and nonparticipating clinics had similar ages and insurance status; however, nonparticipating clinics had larger proportions of Hispanic, nonwhite clients (38% versus 22%; p value<.001) (Table 1). UPA dispensing increased from 12% (269/2315) preintervention to 28% (627/2266) postintervention (p<.001) at participating health centers; the other nonparticipating health centers did not see a change in UPA (10% vs, 9%; p value=.11). Using the difference-in-differences analysis, the video counseling intervention accounted for an 18% (95% CI 14%–21%) increase in use of UPA at the participating health centers. Fig. 1 provides observed monthly proportions of oral LNG and oral UPA among EC clients at participating clinics and nonparticipating clinics pre- and postintervention. Fig. 2 provides both the observed monthly averages and the regression predicted values of EC method uptake during the pre- and postintervention periods. In this figure, we visualize the 18% intervention effect as the difference between the observed outcome trends and the unobserved counterfactual. Using multivariable logistic regression, we identified two variables associated with selecting UPA: insurance status and potential for video counseling exposure. Individuals using insurance (Medicaid or private insurance) reported UPA use 3.3 times more often (95% CI 2.7–4.2) than self-pay individuals. Clients seeking EC at sites offering video counseling were more likely to receive ulipristal even after controlling for age, insurance and ethnicity (adjusted OR 3.4, 95% CI 3.0–3.9) (Table 2).

Table 1
Demographic characters of pre- and postintervention by participating (n=3) and nonparticipating (n=3) clinics, January 2015–December 2015, from medical records^a.

	Participating clinics (n=3)		Nonparticipating clinics (n=3)	
	Pre (n=2315)	Post (n=2266)	Pre (n=1901)	Post (n=1787)
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Age group				
≤21	723 (31)	758 (33)	639 (34)	626 (35)
22–25	731 (31)	701 (31)	603 (32)	499 (28)
26–29	430 (19)	393 (17)	347 (18)	301 (17)
30+	431 (19)	414 (18)	312 (16)	361 (18)
Insurance status				
Private	102 (4)	111 (52)	73 (4)	73 (4)
Public	7 (0.3)	12 (0.5)	4 (0.2)	6 (0.3)
None/self-pay	2206 (95)	2143 (95)	1824 (96)	1708 (96)
Race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	1511 (65)	1539 (68)	960 (51)	928 (52)
Hispanic, non-White	533 (23)	476 (21)	733 (39)	650 (37)
Non-Hispanic, other	271 (12)	251 (11)	208 (11)	209 (11)
Clinic location				
Clinic 1A/2A	398 (17)	366 (16)	1388 (73)	1371 (77)
Clinic 1B/2B	1279 (55)	1222 (54)	261 (14)	244 (14)
Clinic 1C/2C	638 (28)	678 (30)	252 (13)	172 (9)
EC type				
Oral LNG	2046 (88)	1639 (72)	1710 (90)	1635 (91)
Oral UPA	269 (12)	627 (28)	191 (10)	152 (9)

^a p values all nonsignificant (p>.10) between pre- and postintervention with the exception of EC type (p<.001). The only statistical differences between participating and nonparticipating clinics were race/ethnicity (p<.001) and EC type (p<.001).




Fig. 1. Medical record data on EC dispensing before and after video counseling was offered at participating health centers compared to health centers offering no video counseling (intervention starts month 6).

A total of 2266 eligible EC visits occurred during the intervention period at participating clinics; 19% (425/2266) of clients opted to watch the video counseling for EC and completed the survey. Individuals completing the survey ranged in age from 16 years to 43 years with a mean of 23 years old. The majority of participants in the video counseling intervention reported being single, noncohabitating (76%); having no prior pregnancies (86%); and having annual household incomes of less than \$24,000 per year (71%). Table 3 shows the demographics of the intervention participants.

Among those completing the survey, over half (56%) of participants lacked awareness of EC options beyond oral LNG prior to watching the video, two thirds (67%) did not know of more effective EC options, and three quarters (77%) did not know that EC efficacy decreased for heavier women (>160 lb). The majority of women (60%) who engaged with the video counseling indicated that the video changed their EC choice they planned to request that day (Fig. 3). Among the clients who said they changed their mind, 4%




Fig. 2. Predicted mean monthly proportion of EC users receiving oral UPA at clinics that do and do not offer video counseling; data from medical records (intervention starts month 6).

Table 2
Associations between video counseling on emergency contraception and selected EC approach

Variables	Unadjusted OR	95% CI	Adjusted OR ^a	95% CI
Age (years)	1.00	[1.00, 1.00]	1.01	[1.00, 1.02]
Race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Hispanic, non-White	0.87	[0.75, 1.00]	1.02	[0.88, 1.46]
Non-Hispanic, other	1.12	[0.93, 1.35]	1.20	[0.99, 1.46]
Insurance used				
Self-pay	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Public or private	3.28	[2.63, 4.08]	3.31	[2.64, 4.16]
Clinic location	1.13	[1.09, 1.17]	0.98	[0.94, 1.02]
Intervention				
Not exposed to video counseling	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Exposed to video counseling	3.37	[2.98, 3.82]	3.54	[3.06, 4.10]

^a Adjusted for age, ethnicity, insurance status and clinic location.

Table 3
Demographic characteristics of participants who completed surveys after video counseling on emergency contraception (n=425)^a

Patient characteristics	n	%
Age group		
16–18	58	17.0
19–21	101	29.6
22–25	95	27.9
26–29	48	14.1
30+	39	11.4
Relationship status		
Single/divorced/separated	315	75.5
Married/living with partner	102	24.5
Race/ethnicity		
White, non-Hispanic	260	64.4
Hispanic, non-White	95	23.5
Other, non-Hispanic	49	12.1
Gravidity		
Nulligravida	354	85.9
Gravid	58	14.1
Annual income		
≤\$24,000	304	71.5
\$24,001–\$60,000	81	19.1
>\$60,000	40	9.4
Insurance status		
None	154	47.1
Public	28	8.6
Private	145	44.3
Education level		
High school or less	146	35.2
Some college or currently enrolled	189	45.5
College graduation or beyond	80	19.3
Employment status		
Unemployed/homemaker	65	16.0
Student	63	15.5
Employed, part-time	124	30.5
Employed, full-time	155	38.1

^a If columns do not add up to 425, it is due to missing data.




Fig. 3. Preferred methods of EC before and after video counseling among those receiving video counseling and completing surveys (n=425).

opted for a less effective option, while 96% indicated they changed to selecting a more effective method of EC than originally planned. Overall, 48% of the 319 women who walked into the clinic expecting to obtain oral LNG for EC ended up requesting UPA instead after watching the video. Using multivariable logistic regression, we assessed patient characteristics associated with changing desired EC method after watching the video compared to their desired method before watching the video. Fig. 4 demonstrates this changed desire of EC method. Clients who had incomes over \$24,000 more commonly reported they had changed their mind after watching the video. Age, ethnicity, insurance, previous pregnancy and education did not have a significant association with reporting a change in EC method requested after watching the video (Table 4). Overall, patients reported high satisfaction with the video as almost all participants (96%) said they would recommend the video to other women at the clinic to get EC.




Fig. 4. Change in preferred method of EC after receiving video counseling among those completing surveys (n=425). **Note:** The width of arrows corresponds to the proportion of participants reporting that particular combination of EC choices.

Table 4
Variables associated with participants reporting selection of a method of emergency contraception after receiving video counseling that differed from their initially intended method of emergency contraception (n=425)

Variables	Unadjusted OR	95% CI	Adjusted OR ^a	95% CI
Age	1.04	[1.00, 1.09]	1.04	[0.97, 1.11]
Race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Hispanic, non-White	1.36	[0.83, 2.22]	1.30	[0.64, 2.63]
Non-Hispanic, other	1.00	[0.54, 1.86]	0.68	[0.30, 1.54]
Insurance status				
None	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Public	0.97	[0.43, 2.20]	0.91	[0.33, 2.51]
Private	1.20	[0.75, 1.90]	0.73	[0.39, 1.36]
Gravidity				
Nulligravida	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Gravid	1.30	[0.73, 2.33]	0.97	[0.41, 2.29]
Income category				
<\$24,000	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
\$24,001–\$60,000	1.99 ^a	[1.17, 3.39]	3.31 ^b	[1.50, 7.32]
>\$60,000	1.46	[0.74, 2.91]	4.82 ^a	[1.29, 18.00]
Highest level of education				
High school or less	0.92	[0.59, 1.43]	0.59	[0.31, 1.11]
Some college or currently enrolled	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
College grad or beyond	1.02	[0.60, 1.74]	0.52	[0.24, 1.11]

^a Adjusted model includes age, race/ethnicity, insurance status, gravidity, annual income and education.

4. Discussion

Our findings showed that a brief video intervention can increase the uptake of more effective EC options and is highly acceptable to clients. After the patients viewed the video counseling, 4 out of 10 women decided to change their planned method of EC to a more effective form of EC. Although we lacked the ability to assess the effect of the video counseling on the uptake of IUDs for EC in the clinic data, we did see an increase in self-reports of selecting an IUD among participants in the survey. Additionally, nearly all patients who engaged with the intervention said they would recommend this video to other women seeking EC counseling. Limited prior studies address patient knowledge of EC options. Hickey and colleagues [7,8] identified patient knowledge gaps pertaining to oral LNG but did not address knowledge or misconceptions related to oral UPA or the copper IUD for EC. Batur and colleagues [18] addressed knowledge gaps among clinicians, finding that 95% of reproductive health clinicians had heard of oral LNG, with 81% actively prescribing it to patients, and only 52% had heard of UPA, with 14% of them prescribing it for EC. Most reproductive health clinicians (83%) had heard of the copper IUD as a method for EC, but only 35% actively prescribed it for this purpose. These knowledge and practice gaps can be attributed to the convenience of oral LNG being offered over the counter. UPA and the copper IUD require more clinician attention. Our study identifies knowledge gaps among EC users and provides a counseling tool widely accepted by this population of women. This work expands scientific literature to include information on the use of video counseling for EC to discuss alternatives to levonorgestrel pills [19].

A final critical aspect of placing this work in current context involves the complexities of transitioning to other hormonal contraception following UPA. When this video was developed, we were unaware that women who initiate oral contraceptives soon after taking ulipristal are more likely to ovulate [20,21]. Current best practice requires sharing this information with women seeking EC, in addition to the information provided in the counseling video we studied.

Study limitations include the small proportion of EC clients that viewed the video counseling (19% of eligible clients). With a limited number of iPads available, clinic staff offered many patients video counseling, but they did not want to wait for an iPad to become available. In addition, clinics lacked the ability to provide participant-level data from the clinic records for those exposed to video counseling. Therefore, specific patients who received video counseling could not be followed to confirm their use of their reported EC choice. Additionally, we lack specific data on the population unexposed to video counseling. Selection bias may have played a role in that those with video counseling exposure may have known less about EC, and their exposure could have been driven by the desire for more information about EC. Thus, the surveyed population may not be representative of the entire EC population. We also did not ask about the reasons why participants may or may not have changed their EC strategy. For instance, among the 4% of participants that opted for the less effective options, we did not gauge why they changed their mind and if the video influenced the change. Understanding rationale for changes in behavior is an important area of future research. It is possible that clients may have been more comfortable watching the video in a private room rather than a waiting room; however, our team opted to use headphones in the waiting room to reduce disruption to clinic flow and to allow individuals who wished to continue with their purchase of LNG EC to do so without waiting for an exam room.

In conclusion, clinics that encourage women seeking EC to watch a 3-min video about their EC options appear to increase the number of women receiving more effective forms of EC.

Acknowledgments

Local Salt Lake City artist Kate Wolsey designed and animated the video counseling on emergency contraception video (KateWolseyArt). Erica Torres was the voice in the video. The authors would also like to thank Planned Parenthood Association of Utah health center staff at participating locations for all of their hard work, especially Marci Fjelstad, who led the effort.

Appendix 1. Wait-A-MinuteScript

HEY! WAIT A MINUTE!

*Are you here for Emergency Contraception?
(also known as EC)*

It's not just the morning after pill, there are THREE options!

1. Option #1 is the most effective, it's the Copper IUD. If 1000 women use an IUD for EC, 0 or 1 will get pregnant that month. Another great thing about the copper IUD is that you also get super effective birth control that prevents pregnancy for up to ten years. Or you can have it taken out at any time you like.
1. Option #2 is a pill called Ella - If 1000 women use Ella for EC, around 13 of them will become pregnant that month.
2. Option #3 is **Plan B**, this pill is the least effective with about 20 out of 1000 women using this method having a pregnancy that month.

Here are a few other things you should know about these methods.

The IUD is the most effective option and has several other advantages over the pills.

1. It works great within 5 days after unprotected sex, and it has no hormones.
2. It doesn't matter how much you weigh, it still works great

If this sounds like a good option for you, then you'll need to stick around the clinic to have it placed.

Option #2 is Ella

If you decide an IUD is not for you, Ella is the next best option.

1. Ella is effective for up to five days after unprotected sex (but sooner is best)
 2. Ella is better at preventing pregnancy than Plan B, for women of all sizes.
- Our clinic can prescribe this and give it to you now.

Option #3, **Plan B**, is the least effective form of EC, but it can still do the job.

Plan B is effective at preventing pregnancy for up to three days after unprotected sex.

If you weigh more than 165 pounds Plan B probably doesn't work as well and if you weigh more than 175 pounds it may barely work.

Now that you are more aware of your options, you can better decide which one is best for you. The people who work here are contraceptive experts and are happy to answer any questions you have.

Also, if you don't want the IUD today please ask us about a regular method of birth control... or for some extra Ella to have on-hand.

Thank you so much for coming to our clinic today. We are here to help you have a safe and enjoyable sex life.

Appendix 2. VCEEnrollment_VideoCounseling_Survey

Confidential

Video Counseling for Emergency Contraception (VCEC)
Page 1 of 3

VCEC Enrollment

Record ID _____

Consent Cover Letter Video Counseling for Emergency Contraception The purpose of this research study is to provide an informational video to patients who desire emergency contraception (EC). We will then assess if preferences of the different types of EC have changed before and after exposure to the video. We will also see if patients feel that the video is useful. The risks of this study are minimal. You may feel upset as you think about or discuss the sensitive subject of emergency contraception. These risks are similar to those you experience when discussing personal information with others. If you feel upset from this experience, you can tell the researcher or clinical staff, and they will tell you about resources available to help. The benefits of this study include exposure to information about EC before you choose with method you would like. To participate in this study, we request that you watch a short informational video explaining your options for Emergency Contraception. At the end of the video you will be asked to answer a few short questions about the video. The survey is completely anonymous. It will not be associated with your name, medical record number, date of birth, or any other identifying information. After you have watched the video and completed the survey, you will continue with your clinic visit as normal. If you have any questions, complaints, or if you feel you have been harmed by this research please contact Linh Moran with the University of Utah OB/GYN department, phone number 801-581-7647. Contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) if you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant. Also, contact the IRB if you have questions, complaints or concerns which you do not feel you can discuss with the investigator. The University of Utah IRB may be reached by phone at (801) 581-3655 or by e-mail at irb@hsc.utah.edu. It should take 2-3 minutes to watch the video and 1-2 minutes to complete the survey. Participation in this study is voluntary. You can choose not to take part. You can choose not to finish the questionnaire or omit any question you prefer not to answer without penalty or loss of benefits. By watching the video and completing the survey, you are giving your consent to participate. Thank you for your participation in our study. Would you like to continue to watch the video?

- Yes
- No

Now we are going to ask some questions about you.

What is your age? _____

What is your race/ethnicity

- White
- Hispanic or Latino
- Asian-American
- Native-Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Native American
- African American or Black
- Other

Confidential

Page 2 of 3

Other

(Please specify)

What is your marital status?

- Single, never married
- Single, living with partner
- Married
- Divorced
- Separated
- Widowed

What best describes your work status

- Unemployed
- Employed full-time
- Employed, part-time
- Student
- Homemaker
- Other

Other

(Please specify)

What best describes your level of education?

- Did not complete high school
- Currently in high school
- Completed high school or GED
- Currently in college
- Graduated from college
- Education beyond college

What is your annual household income?

- Less than \$12,000
- \$12,000-\$23,999
- \$24,000-\$35,999
- \$36,000-\$47,999
- \$48,000-\$60,000
- More than \$60,000

How many people does this income support including you?

(Number)

Which of the following best describes your insurance status?

- Private insurance
 - Medicaid
 - I don't have insurance
 - I don't know
- (This doesn't impact your ability to participate in this study.)

If you have insurance, does it cover birth control?

- Yes
- No
- I don't have insurance
- I don't know

Confidential

Page 3 of 3

What birth control method(s) have you ever used ever?

- None; I have never used any contraceptive method
 - Withdrawal
 - Male condom
 - Female condom
 - Fertility awareness methods/rhythm method
 - Cervical cap or sponge
 - Spermicide
 - Diaphragm
 - Oral contraceptive, "The Pill"
 - Contraceptive patch (Ortho Evra)
 - Vaginal ring (NuvaRing)
 - 3 month injection (Depo-Provera)
 - 3 year hormonal IUD (Skyla)
 - 3 year hormonal IUD (Liletta)
 - 5 year hormonal IUD (Mirena)
 - non-hormonal copper IUD (Paragard)
 - contraceptive implant (Nexplanon)
 - Sterilization (tied tubes, hysterectomy or male partner has had a vasectomy)
 - Emergency contraception (Plan B, Ella, Next Choice, or The Morning After Pill)
 - Abstinence
 - Other
- (select all that apply)

If other, please specify:

Prior to watching this video, did you know that there was more than one option for EC?

-
- Yes
 - No

Prior to watching this video, did you know that Plan B doesn't work as well if you weigh more?

- Yes
- No

Did this video change which type of EC you are going to ask for today?

- Yes
- No

If no, what are you going to ask for ?

- Copper IUD
- Ella
- PlanB

If yes, what were you planning on getting prior to watching this video?

- Copper IUD
- Ella
- Plan B

What are you going to ask for now?

- Copper IUD
- Ella
- Plan B

Would you recommend the video to other women who are here to get EC?

- Yes
- No

References

- [1] Glasier A, Cameron ST, Blithe D, Scherrer B, Mathe H, Levy D, et al. Can we identify women at risk of pregnancy despite using emergency contraception? Data from randomized trials of ulipristal acetate and levonorgestrel. *Contraception* 2011;84:363–7.
- [2] Glasier AF, Cameron ST, Fine PM, Logan SJ, Casale W, Van Horn J, et al. Ulipristal acetate versus levonorgestrel for emergency contraception: a randomised non-inferiority trial and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2010;375:555–62.
- [3] Piaggio G, Kapp N, von Hertzen H. Effect on pregnancy rates of the delay in the administration of levonorgestrel for emergency contraception: a combined analysis of four WHO trials. *Contraception* 2011;84:35–9.
- [4] Duramed Pharmaceuticals I. In: FDA, editor. Plan B One-Step (levonorgestrel) tablet, 1.5 mg, for oral use; 2009.
- [5] Cleland K, Zhu H, Goldstuck N, Cheng L, Trussell J. The efficacy of intrauterine devices for emergency contraception: a systematic review of 35 years of experience. *Hum Reprod* 2012;27:1994–2000.
- [6] Dean G, Schwarz EB. Intrauterine Contraceptives. In: Hatcher RA, Trussell J, Nelson A, et al, editors. *Contraceptive technology*. 20th ed. New York: Ardent Media; 2011.
- [7] Hickey MT, White J. Female college students' experiences with and perceptions of over-the-counter emergency contraception in the United States. *Sex Reprod Healthc* 2015;6:28–32.
- [8] Hickey MT. Female college students' knowledge, perceptions, and use of emergency contraception. *J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs* 2009;38:399–405.
- [9] Mollen CJ, Miller MK, Hayes KL, Barg FK. Knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs about emergency contraception: a survey of female adolescents seeking care in the emergency department. *Pediatr Emerg Care* 2013;29:469–74.
- [10] O'Connor AM, Wennberg JE, Legare F, Llewellyn-Thomas HA, Moulton BW, Sepucha KR, et al. Toward the 'tipping point': decision aids and informed patient choice. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2007;26:716–25.
- [17] Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)—a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* 2009;42:377–81.
- [18] Batur P, Cleland K, McNamara M, Wu J, Pickle S, Group ECS. Emergency contraception: a multispecialty survey of clinician knowledge and practices. *Contraception* 2016;93:145–52.
- [19] Schwarz EB, Gerbert B, Gonzales R. Computer-assisted provision of emergency contraception a randomized controlled trial. *J Gen Intern Med* 2008;23:794–9.
- [20] Brache V, Cochon L, Duijkers IJ, Levy DP, Kapp N, Monteil C, et al. A prospective, randomized, pharmacodynamic study of quick-starting a desogestrel progestin-only pill following ulipristal acetate for emergency contraception. *Hum Reprod* 2015;30:2785–93.
- [21] Edelman AB, Jensen JT, McCrimmon S, Messerle-Forbes M, O'Donnell A, Hennebold JD. Combined oral contraceptive interference with the ability of ulipristal acetate to delay ovulation: a prospective cohort study. *Contraception* 2018;98:463–6.