Reversal of medication abortion with progesterone: a systematic review

Supplementary File 2: tables

Supplementary Table 1. Critical appraisal of 3 case series included in a systematic review of abortion reversal

	Delgado & Davenport (2012)	Garratt & Turner (2017)	Delgado, et al (2018)
Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series?	No	Yes	No
Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series?	No	Yes	No
Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series?	No	Unclear	No
Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants?	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear
Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants?	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear
Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?	No	No	No
Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?	No	Yes	No
Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information?	No	No	No
Was statistical analysis appropriate?	N/A	N/A	No

Supplementary Table 2. Detailed explanation for critical appraisal of case series

	Delgado & Davenport (2012)	Garratt & Turner (2017)	Delgado, et al (2018)
Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series?	No – criteria for inclusion in the series are not specified	Yes – only criterion specified was < 48 hours from mifepristone, no misoprostol	No – one criterion specified (72 hours or less after mifepristone, no misoprostol); unclear why 954 women did not initiate progesterone; ultrasound was done in some but not all cases (unknown how many) prior to progesterone administration
Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series?	No – no mention of an ultrasound protocol to assess viability of pregnancy after treatment	Yes – follow up ultrasound arranged to assess viability after treatment with progesterone	No – no mention on how outcome data were obtained or measured
Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series?	No – one patient did not have a live embryo documented prior to taking mifepristone; no mention of how other pregnancies were confirmed; no mention of how viability of pregnancy was assessed after treatment	Unclear – no mention of how pregnancies were initially confirmed, presumably at abortion clinics (ultrasound?)	No – no information on how pregnancies were initially confirmed or assessed for viability after treatment; significant variability due to >300 providers involved
Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants?	Unclear – no comment on whether inclusion of participants was consecutive	Unclear– no comment on whether inclusion of participants was consecutive	Unclear– no comment on whether inclusion of participants was consecutive
Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants?	Unclear – no mention of whether case series includes all patients treated by the authors with progesterone	Unclear – no mention of whether case series includes all patients treated by the authors with progesterone	Unclear what happened to the 954 women who called the hotline but did not initiate progesterone – were some excluded because ultrasound was done and showed there was no live embryo?
Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?	No – no demographic information included	No – no demographic information included	No – no demographic information included
Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?	No – for some participants, no information on gestational age or progesterone dose received	Yes – gestational age and progesterone dose given for all participants	No – for some participants, no information on gestational age or progesterone dose received
Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported?	Yes – information available for primary outcome (ongoing pregnancy), except for participants lost to follow-up (1)	Yes – information available for primary outcome (ongoing pregnancy)	Yes – information available for primary outcome (ongoing pregnancy), except for participants lost to follow-up (112)
Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information?	No – no description of clinical sites	No – no description of clinical sites	No – no description of clinical sites
Was statistical analysis appropriate?	N/A	N/A	No – inappropriate statistical analysis comparing various regimens and gestational ages with a single data point from another study (25% “embryo survival rate” after mifepristone, based on a study in which all participants were < 7 weeks)

Supplementary Table 3. Critical appraisal of a randomized controlled trial included in a systematic review of abortion reversal

	Creinin et al (2020)
Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups?	Yes
Was allocation to treatment groups concealed?	Yes
Were treatment groups similar at the baseline?	Yes
Were participants blind to treatment assignment?	Yes
Were those delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment?	Yes
Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?	Unclear
Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?	Yes
Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analyzed?	Yes
Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?	Yes
Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?	Yes
Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?	Yes
Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Yes
Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design (individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial?	Yes