

Supplemental Table 1. Additional Study Data

Study	Mifepristone dose (mg); misoprostol dose (µg), [supplementary dose of misoprostol, if offered]	Route of misoprostol administration	Hours between mifepristone and misoprostol administration	Maximum gestational age of participants (days)	Length of time between mifepristone administration and follow-up	Women accompanied during home administration of misoprostol (%)	Comparative participant characteristics at baseline*
Akin et al. 2004	200; 400	Oral	48	56	14 days	55	No significant differences between groups
Alam et al. 2013	200; 800 [800]	Buccal	48	63	10-14 days	73.3	No significant differences between groups
Alam et al. 2018	200; 800	Buccal	24	63	10-14 days	79.0	Unclear; no comparison reported
Bracken et al. 2006	200; 400	Oral	48	56	14 days	67.8	No significant differences between groups
Bracken et al. 2010	200; 400	Oral	48	56	14 days	84.2	Home users were 1.6 y older than clinic users on average ($p=0.008$)
Dagousset et al. 2004,	600; 400 [400**]	Oral		49	10-15 days	NR	Home users were older and more educated and fewer of them were primigravida; marital status not reported
Elul et al. 2001	200; 400	Oral	48	56	14 days	78	Unclear; No comparison reported; marital status not reported
Elul et al. 2001	200; 400	Oral	48	56	14 days	76	Unclear; no comparison reported; marital status not reported
Hajri et al. 2004	200; 400	Oral	48	56	14 days	~75	Home users were more educated than clinic users by an average of 1.4 y ($P = 0.02$)
Iyengar et al. 2016	200; 800 [400]	Varied	48	63	10-15 days	74.141	Home users were younger than clinic users by an average of 1.1 y ($p=0.016$). Clinic users had a higher gestational age

							by an average of 1.2 w (p=0.000)
Karki et al. 2009 ¹	200; 400	Oral	48	56	12 days	77.9	Unclear; no comparison reported
Li et al. 2017	75; 400	Oral	24	35	Completion of post-treatment menstruation	NR	No significant differences between groups
Ngoc et al. 2004	200; 400	Oral	48	56	14 days	73.4	Home users had an average of 2.4 y more of education (p<0.001), had lower maximum gestational age by an average of 1.5 w (p=0.001) and lower gravidity by an average of 7.7% (p<0.001)
Okonufua et al. 2014	200; 400	Oral	48	63	14 days	42.2	Unclear; no comparison reported
Provansal et al. 2009	600; 400	Oral	36-48	49	10-20 days	100	Home users were older by an average of 2.3 y (p<0.001), had higher gestational age by an average of 1 w (p<.001), and had lower rates of parity by an average of 13.8% (p<.01)
Raghavan et al. 2012	200; 400	Oral	48	56	14 days	Not reported	Unclear; no comparison reported
Shrestha et al. 2014 ¹	200; 800	Vaginal	24	63	14 days	Not reported	No significant differences between groups
Shuchita al. 2008	200; 400	Sublingual	48	56		75	Unclear; no comparison reported
Song 2018	100; 200	Sublingual	24	49	Completion of post-treatment menstruation	Not reported	No significant differences between groups; marital status and education not reported

*p-values are reported where available

**Additional 400 µg of misoprostol offered to clinic participants only

***p < 0.05

Supplemental Table 2. Risk of Bias-RCTs, Successful abortion

Study	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of personnel and participants	Blinding of outcome assessors	Incomplete outcome data	Selective outcome reporting	Overall
Li 2017	Unclear	Unclear	Low	High	Low	Unclear	Unclear
Shrestha 2014	Low	Unclear	Low	High	Low	Unclear	Unclear
Song 2018	Unclear	Unclear	Low	High	Low	Low	Unclear

Supplemental Table 3. Risk of Bias-NRSs, Successful abortion

Study	Confounding	Selection of participants into study	Classification of interventions	Deviations from intended interventions	Missing data	Measurement of outcomes	Selection of reported results	Overall bias
Akin 2004	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Alam 2013	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate	High
Alam 2018	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	High	Moderate	High
Bracken 2006	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate	High
Bracken 2010	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate	High
Dagousset 2004	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	High	Moderate	High
Elul 2001-Tunisia	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate	High
Elul 2001-Vietnam	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate	High
Hajri 2004	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate	High
Iyengar 2016	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate	High

Karki 2009	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate	High
Ngoc 2004	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate	High
Okonufua 2014	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	High	High	Moderate	High
Provansal 2009	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	High	High	Moderate	High
Raghavan 2012	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate	High
Shuchita 2008	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	High	Moderate	High