

Supplementary File 2. Confidence in the Evidence from Reviews of Qualitative research (CERQual) evidence profile.

Summary of review findings	Studies contributing to the review findings	Methodological limitations	Coherence	Relevance	Adequacy of data	Overall CERQual assessment of confidence	Explanation of decision
Forces that incite the arm wrestling	Aiken et al. 2018; Altshuler et al. 2017; Ciren & Fjeld, 2019; De Medeiros Guimarães & Da Silva, 2017; Kilander et al. 2018; LaRoche et al. 2018; Machado et al. 2015; Makleff et al. 2019	Moderate concerns regarding methodological limitations, as there is insufficient clarity regarding the relationship of the researcher and the participants, as well as their possible influence during the data collection and analysis phases	Minor concerns regarding coherence, as data from primary articles and findings are consistent	Minor concerns about relevance	No or very little concern about adequacy of data (rich data support this finding)	High confidence	Minor concerns about coherence, and relevance; Very minor concerns about adequacy of data; Moderate concerns about methodological limitations
Facing social stigma	Aiken et al. 2018; Altshuler et al. 2017; Cano & Foster, 2016; Ciren & Fjeld, 2019; De Medeiros Guimarães & Da Silva, 2017; Johnson 2018; Kilander et al. 2018; Machado et al. 2015	Moderate concerns regarding methodological limitations, as there is insufficient clarity regarding the relationship of the researcher and the participants, as well as their possible influence during the data collection and analysis phases	Minor concerns regarding coherence, as data from primary articles and findings are consistent	Moderate concerns about relevance, since the causes for abortion are diverse	No or very little concern about adequacy of data (rich data support this finding)	Moderate confidence	Minor concerns about coherence; Very minor concerns about adequacy of data; Moderate concerns about methodological limitations and relevance
Defeated by a greater rival	Aiken et al. 2018; Altshuler et al. 2017; Cano & Foster, 2016; Ciren & Fjeld, 2019; De Medeiros Guimarães & Da Silva, 2017; Johnson 2018; Kilander et al. 2018; LaRoche et al.	Moderate concerns regarding methodological limitations, as there is insufficient clarity regarding the relationship of the researcher and the	Minor concerns regarding coherence, as data from primary articles and findings are consistent	Moderate concerns about relevance, since the causes for abortion are diverse	No or very little concern about adequacy of data (rich data support this finding)	Moderate confidence	Minor concerns about coherence; Very minor concerns about adequacy of data; Moderate concerns about methodological limitations and relevance

Summary of review findings	Studies contributing to the review findings	Methodological limitations	Coherence	Relevance	Adequacy of data	Overall CERQual assessment of confidence	Explanation of decision
	2018; Machado et al. 2015; Makleff et al. 2019	participants, as well as their possible influence during the data collection and analysis phases					

*Definitions of levels of confidence from the CERQual evaluation (Lewin et al., 2015):

- **High confidence:** It is highly likely that the review finding is a reasonable representation of the phenomenon of interest.
- **Moderate confidence:** It is likely that the review finding is a reasonable representation of the phenomenon of interest.
- **Low confidence:** It is possible that the review finding is a reasonable representation of the phenomenon of interest.
- **Very low confidence:** It is not clear whether the review finding is a reasonable representation of the phenomenon of interest.