

Chairman Burke, Vice Chairman Huffman, Ranking Member Antonio, and Members of the Ohio Senate Health, Human Services and Medicaid Committee, thank you for letting me testify in opposition to SB 155.

During the proponent hearing, it was claimed that this process "has been tested and proven to save lives," that it was "64-68% effective," and that this is shown from the Delgado et al. study of "754 cases of this reversal process". I'd like to use my testimony to go over this study with you and examine these claims.

Let's start with the last claim, that the Delgado et al. study was of 754 cases of the reversal process. On the first page this appears to be true. The "Methods" section of the abstract says: "This is a retrospective analysis of clinical data of 754 patients who decided to attempt to reverse the medical abortion process".

However if we move to the "Results" section of the paper you come across Figure 1 which documents that although 754 patients initiated progesterone therapy, only 547 of them were eligible for analysis. So the claim that this paper documents 754 cases of the reversal process is a misrepresentation of what the science actually says. If you changed the statement and claimed that this paper shows 547 cases of reversal that's also not accurate because the paper clearly states that of those 547 patients "There were 257 births".

Next is the claim that this reversal process is 64-68% effective. In the "Conclusion" section, it recommends two progesterone regimens, high doses orally or at least 7 intramuscular injections. I would like to direct your attention to the "Discussion" section, particularly Table 1. The "high dose oral" group had 31 patients and a success rate of 68%. The 68% success rate number is based off of a patient population of only 31 people. If you add up the groups that received at least seven intramuscular injections you get 38 patients. The 64% success rate is based off of a patient population of only 38 people.

These sample sizes are literally too small to draw any kind of legitimate causative scientific conclusions from, and to use this paper to claim that this method has been proven effective at a rate of 64-68% is complete misrepresentation of the science.

This study has a lot of issues, issues like being briefly retracted because the originally published version claimed it received IRB approval from the University of San Diego when it definitely did not. Issues like using the study Maria et al. as a control group, even though Maria et al. only studied patients who were 6 and 7 weeks pregnant and Delgado et al. studied patients who were up to 9 weeks pregnant. That's not a comparative control. The study itself concedes that so many patients were lost to follow up that it could have affected the results.

SB 155 states that doctors must inform women that "It may be possible to reverse the intended effects of a mifepristone abortion" and although not named in the bill it is using the Delgado et al. case series to justify that mandate. I commend the legislature for wanting to give women all

the options, I really do, but I condemn them for using junk science to justify mandating medical misinformation.

During the proponent hearing it was also claimed that over 900 children were born after this procedure. As I mentioned, this study only documents 257 births. I look forward to the case series documenting the over 600 children saved using this method, but until then I have to treat it as what it is, a claim based on spurious scientific evidence. I also heard someone suggest during the proponent hearing that if a person who underwent the reversal protocol brought in their child to committee, that would be evidence enough. That's just not how science works. Please don't make the world laugh at you by pretending it is.

That covers all the major points I wanted to bring up during my testimony, and I welcome questions at this time. Thank you.