## TABLE 1. Summary of emergency contraception-related studies among males and health care providers

## MALES

## Quantitative/nonclinical samples

Corbett et al., 2006 ${ }^{21}$
Delbanco et al., 199715
Delbanco et al., 1998 ${ }^{16}$
Delbanco et al.,1998 ${ }^{17}$
Harper and Ellertson, 1995 ${ }^{14}$

Harper et al., 2003 ${ }^{18}$

Miller, $2011^{24}$

Nguyen and Zaller, 200925

Salganicoff et al., 2004 ${ }^{19}$

Sawyer and Thompson, 2003 ${ }^{20}$

Urena and Yen, 200922

Vahratian et al., 2008 ${ }^{23}$

## Qualitative/nonclinical samples

Harper and Ellertson, 1995 ${ }^{26}$

Johnson et al., 2010 ${ }^{27}$

Merkh et al., $2009^{28}$

## Quantitative/clinical samples

Armstrong et al., 2010 ${ }^{30}$

Cohall et al., 1998 ${ }^{29}$

- Convenience sample of 97 college students in Wilmington,NC - $25 \%$ male
- Random national sample of 2002 adults
- $50 \%$ male
- $50 \%$ response rate
- Stratified random national sample of 1,510 teenagers
- $50 \%$ male
- $50 \%$ response rate
- Stratified random national sample of 843 adults
- $23 \%$ male
- $59 \%$ response rate
- Random sample of 550 university students in Princeton, NJ
- $58 \%$ male
- $82 \%$ response rate


## - Convenience sample of 519 adults in San Francisco <br> -0\% male

- Convenience sample of 692 college students in Edinboro,PA
-49\% male
- $97 \%$ response rate
- Selective sample of 303 adults in Providence, RI
- $46 \%$ male
- Random sample of 1,151 California teenagers and adults
- Proportion of males not reported
- $95 \%$ response rate
-Convenience sample of 693 college students in College Park,MD
- $50 \%$ male
- $95 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 518 California high school students
-41\% male
- Random sample of 1,585 college students in Ann Arbor,MI
- $29 \%$ male
- $23 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 100 adults in Princeton, NJ
- $30 \%$ male
- Snowball sample of 47 teenagers and adults in New York - 40\% male
- Purposive sample of 41 sexually active young adults in Pennsylvania
- 100\% male
- $71 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 157 teenagers and adults in New York
- $100 \%$ male
- $100 \%$ male
- $90 \%$ response rate
-Convenience sample of 197 teenagers and adults in New York
- $20 \%$ male
- $87 \%$ response rate
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior - Results reported by gender
- Measured knowledge
- Results not reported by gender
- Multivariate analyses focused on females
- Measured knowledge, behavior
- Some results reported by gender
- Most multivariate analyses focused on females
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Results reported by gender
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Some results reported by gender
- Multivariate analyses did not stratify by gender or examine interactions between gender and other measures
- Measured knowledge, behavior
- Examined women's views of males' role
- Multivariate analyses presented
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Results reported by gender
- Bivariate analyses presented
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
-Results reported by gender
- Multivariate analyses presented
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Some results reported by gender
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Some results reported by gender
- Measured knowledge, attitudes
-Results reported by gender
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
-Results reported by gender
- Measured knowledge, attitudes
- Results not reported by gender
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Results not reported by gender
- Measured knowledge,attitudes, behavior
- Measured knowledge
- Measured knowledge, behavior
- Some results reported by gender

CLINICIANS
Quantitative

Beckman et al., $2001^{38}$

Chuang and Freund, 2005 ${ }^{39}$

Chuang et al., 2004 ${ }^{36}$

Delbanco et al., 1997 ${ }^{15}$

Delbanco et al., $1998^{17}$

Gold et al., $1997^{40}$

Golden et al., 2001 ${ }^{34}$

Kelly et al., 2008 ${ }^{32}$

Lawrence et al., 201041

Lim et al., 2008 ${ }^{43}$

McCarthy et al., 2005 ${ }^{45}$

Sable et al., 2006 ${ }^{31}$

Sills et al., 2000 ${ }^{35}$

Sobata et al., $2008^{37}$

Upadhya et al., 2009 ${ }^{42}$

Veloudis and Murray, 200044

Xu et al., 200733

- Convenience sample of 102 clinicians ( $64 \%$ physicians, $36 \%$ other
clinicians) in San Diego County, CA
- $62 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 56 clinicians ( $87 \%$ physicians, $13 \%$ other
clinicians) at a Boston hospital
- $78 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 292 clinicians ( $36 \%$ obstetrician-gynecologists, 34\% family physicians, 31\% internists) in Massachusetts
- $59 \%$ response rate
- Random national sample of 307 obstetrician-gynecologists
- $77 \%$ response rate
- Random national sample of 754 clinicians ( $40 \%$ obstetriciangynecologists, $31 \%$ family physicians, $30 \%$ nurse practitioners or physician assistants)
- $83 \%$ response rate
- Random national sample of 167 clinicians ( $67 \%$ pediatricians, $23 \%$ obstetrician-gynecologists, $10 \%$ other physicians)
- $55 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 233 clinicians (type not reported) in
New York State
- $24 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 96 primary care providers ( $52 \%$ family physicians, 30\% obstetrician-gynecologists, $18 \%$ pediatricians) at universities in the South and Midwest
-70\% response rate
- Random national sample of 1,154 obstetrician-gynecologists
- $66 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 101 pediatric residents at three hospitals in New York
- $84 \%$ response rate
- National convenience sample of 250 providers ( $70 \%$ nurse practitioners, $9 \%$ physician assistants, $21 \%$ other staff) at health centers based in public high schools
- $73 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 96 primary care providers ( $52 \%$ family physicians,30\% obstetrician-gynecologists, $18 \%$ pediatricians) at universities in the South and Midwest
- $70 \%$ response rate
-Convenience sample of 121 providers (type not reported) in
Washington,DC
- $61 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 35 providers (type not provided) at a community-based health center in New York
- $80 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 141 Baltimore-area pediatric residents
- $50 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 176 physicians in training ( $43 \%$ internists, $26 \%$ pediatricians, $21 \%$ family physicians, $11 \%$ obstetrician-gynecologists) at a hospital in Lexington, KY
- $48 \%$ response rate
- Random sample of 252 providers (type not reported) in Michigan
-32\% response rate
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Baseline data from intervention study
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Baseline data from intervention study
- Measured behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Multivariate analyses presented
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured knowledge, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Multivariate analyses presented
- Measured attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Multivariate analyses presented
- Measured knowledge, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Multivariate analyses presented
- Measured behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Multivariate analyses presented
- Measured attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Multivariate analyses presented


## PHARMACISTS

## Quantitative

Bennett et al., 2003 ${ }^{46}$

Borrego et al., 2006 ${ }^{48}$

Davidson et al., 201053

El-Ibiary et al., 200750

Fuentes and Azize-Vargas, 2007 ${ }^{51}$

Gordon, 200755

Landau et al., $2009^{56}$

Nguyen and Zaller, 2010 ${ }^{52}$

Orr and Kachur, $2007^{49}$

Sommers et al., 2001 ${ }^{54}$

Van Riper and Hellerstedt, 200547

- Random sample of 315 pharmacists (70\% chain,30\% nonchain) in Pennsylvania
- $98 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 523 pharmacists (setting type not reported) in New Mexico
- 40\% response rate
- Convenience sample of 668 pharmacists (setting type not reported) in Nevada
- 34\% response rate
- Convenience sample of 76 pharmacists (setting type not reported) in San Francisco
- $62 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 332 pharmacists (47\% community, 28\% chain, 25\% hospital) in Puerto Rico
- Stratified random survey of 155 pharmacists (setting type not reported) in New York
- Stratified random national sample of 2,725 pharmacists (64\% chain, 31\% independent, $5 \%$ other)
- 19\% response rate
- Convenience sample of 226 pharmacists ( $88 \%$ chain, $11 \%$ independent) in Rhode Island
- 60\% response rate
- Random sample of 85 pharmacists ( $62 \%$ chain, $17 \%$ grocery store, 15\% independent, $6 \%$ superstore) in Rhode Island
- 61\% response rate
- Convenience sample of 159 pharmacists ( $58 \%$ chain, $26 \%$ independent, 10\% other, $6 \%$ unknown) in Washington
- $51 \%$ response rate
- Convenience sample of 510 pharmacists (69\% retail, 22\% hospital, 8\% government) in South Dakota
- $67 \%$ response rate
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Multivariate analyses presented
- Measured knowledge, attitudes
- Did not focus on males
- Measured attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured knowledge, attitudes
- Did not focus on males
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured knowledge, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Multivariate analyses presented
- Measured attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Measured knowledge, attitudes, behavior
- Did not focus on males
- Multivariate analyses presented

Notes: Where no response rate is shown, the rate was not reported or measured. Percentages may not total 100 because of rounding. For complete references (indicated by superscripts), see page 191.

