

## ELECTRONIC SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

### **Relationship satisfaction and outcome in women who meet their partner while using oral contraception**

*S. Craig Roberts, Kateřina Klapilová, Anthony C. Little, Robert P. Burriss, Benedict C. Jones, Lisa M. DeBruine, Marion Petrie, Jan Havlíček*

#### 1 **Supplemental Results**

#### 2 *Supplemental Analysis 1: Effect of unplanned pregnancy*

3 Our results demonstrate an unexpected positive association between oral contraceptive  
4 use at the time couples met and relationship survival and length, which we attribute to  
5 higher general (as opposed to sexual) satisfaction in such couples. An alternative  
6 explanation could be that couples who met while the woman was not using oral  
7 contraception were more likely to have an unplanned pregnancy, and that this group  
8 may consequently contain a higher proportion of couples with relatively low  
9 commitment to the relationship. In total, 592 women reported their pregnancy as  
10 unplanned and 1926 said it was planned (one did not answer this question). Analysis  
11 confirmed that there was a significantly higher rate of unplanned pregnancy in women  
12 not using oral contraception when couples met (30.4%, compared with 13.8% amongst  
13 oral contraception users when couples met; Chi-square = 91.5,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), and  
14 a higher rate of separation amongst those with unplanned pregnancy (51.4%,  
15 compared with 22.6% amongst those whose pregnancy was planned; Chi-square =  
16 179.6,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ). However, after excluding women who had unplanned  
17 pregnancies, the positive association between relationship survival and oral  
18 contraceptive use during partner choice remained significant (702/866 users and  
19 770/1036 non-users were still together, Chi-square = 12.24,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ). The  
20 effect of oral contraceptive use when couples met also remained significant after

21 controlling for SOI-R score and women's age (logistic regression:  $\exp B = 0.693$ ,  $P =$   
22  $0.002$ ). Furthermore, as in the main analysis, relationship length was longer (in those  
23 couples that did separate) if women met their partner while using oral contraception ( $z$   
24  $= 2.30$ ,  $P = 0.022$ ). On the basis of these results, we can exclude the possibility that the  
25 reported effects of oral contraceptive use during partner choice are due to between-  
26 group differences in commitment to the relationship.

27

### 28 ***Supplemental Analysis 2: Effect of regional variation***

29 We checked that results hold across geographical region from which participants  
30 came. Since the majority of the sample was drawn from either the United States or the  
31 Czech Republic/Slovakia, we excluded participants from other countries in these  
32 checks. Including geographical region as a random factor in the main analyses of  
33 variance for sexual or general relationship satisfaction (also controlling for  
34 sociosexuality, relationship duration and current hormonal status), we found no main  
35 effect of geographical region for any analysis and no significant interactions involving  
36 geographical region. Although there was a difference in separation rates (with  
37 separation occurring with higher frequency in the US than the Czech sample,  $P <$   
38  $0.001$ ), if geographical region was included as a categorical predictor in the logistic  
39 regression analyses, the effect of contraceptive use during partner choice remained  
40 significant ( $\exp B = 0.66$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). Furthermore, the effect of contraceptive use  
41 during partner choice on separation rate also remained significant if the logistic  
42 regression was run separately for either the US ( $\exp B = 0.73$ ,  $P = 0.022$ ) or the Czech  
43 Republic ( $\exp B = 0.66$ ,  $P = 0.037$ ).

44

45

46

**Table S1. Spearman rank correlation matrix for measures included in calculation of sexual satisfaction composite scores (all  $P < 0.001$ ).**

| Measure            | Adventurousness | Orgasm | Partner attraction | Sexual proceptivity |
|--------------------|-----------------|--------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Arousal            | 0.852           | 0.522  | 0.651              | 0.651               |
| Adventurousness    |                 | 0.473  | 0.573              | 0.557               |
| Orgasm             |                 |        | 0.415              | 0.468               |
| Partner attraction |                 |        |                    | 0.750               |

**Table S2. Spearman rank correlation matrix for measures included in calculation of general (nonsexual) satisfaction composite scores (all  $P < 0.001$ ).**

| Measure              | Faithfulness/loyalty | Intelligence | Ambition | Support |
|----------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------|---------|
| Financial provision  | 0.404                | 0.498        | 0.524    | 0.424   |
| Faithfulness/loyalty |                      | 0.560        | 0.406    | 0.545   |
| Intelligence         |                      |              | 0.572    | 0.514   |
| Ambition             |                      |              |          | 0.514   |