

study	link	sampling_method	total_contacted	n_regret	regret_percent	loss_mentioned	n_loss	loss_rate	sample_size
Blanchard et al. (1989)	https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.11	annual questionnaire - method not mentioned	132	4	3.06%	yes	21	15.91%	111
Bouman (1988)	https://journals.lww.com/annalsplastics	post-operative follow-up (author's cases) - method not mentioned	67	1	1.82%	yes	12	17.91%	55
Cohen-Kettenis & van Goozen (1997)	https://www.jaacap.org/article/S0890-81	psychological interview including psychometrics > 12 months post-surgery	22	0	0.00%	yes	3	13.64%	19
De Cuypere et al. (2006)	https://www.sciencedirect.com/science	6 completed paper questionnaires, 56 were interviews by 2 psychologists > 12 month post-surgery	107	2	3.23%	yes	45	42.06%	62
García et al. (2014)	https://tau.amegroups.com/article/view	random selection of 25 participants from caseload; in person interview and exam by surgeon		0	0.00%	no	N/A	N/A	25
Imbimbo et al. (2009)	https://www.jsm.jsmed.org/article/S1	telephone invitations; 46 interviewed by telephone by urologist, 93 interviewed in person	163	8	5.76%	yes	24	14.73%	139
Jung et al. (2018)	https://www.jsm.jsmed.org/article/S1	telephone interviews	30	1	7.14%	yes	16	53.33%	14 ???
Johansson et al. (2010)	https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007	clinical interview with psychiatrist (5 years into transition or 2 years post-surgery)	60	0	0.00%	yes	18	30.00%	42
Judge et al. (2014)	https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.1007	retrospective case analysis?	4	4	7.27%	no	N/A	N/A	55 ???
Krege et al. (2001)	https://bjui-journals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com	post-surgery consultations with gynaecologist	46	0	0.00%	yes	15	32.61%	31
Kuiper & Cohen-Kettenis (1998)	https://www.researchgate.net/profile/PeStudy	targeted role-reversers after surgery for in-home interviews (sample limited to those with regrets)		10	100.00%	no	N/A	N/A	10
Lander et al. (1998)	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.11	analysis of case records held by Swedish authorities	218	13	5.96%	yes	0	0.00%	218
Lawrence (2003)	https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023	mail-out written questionnaires > 12 months post-surgery	417	15	6.47%	yes	185	44.36%	232
Lobato et al. (2006)	https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007	telephone and clinic-based follow-up appointments; interviewers not specified, though likely psychs	26	0	0.00%	yes	7	26.92%	19
Nelson et al. (2009)	https://www.jprasurg.com/article/S1748	postal questionnaire (avg. 10 months post-surgery; range = 2-23 months)	17	0	0.00%	yes	5	29.41%	12
Olson-Kennedy et al. (2018)	https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama	telephone invitations for electronic interview (10 minutes in duration)	94	1	1.47%	yes	26	27.66%	68
Papadopoulos et al. (2017)	https://www.jsm.jsmed.org/article/S1	postal questionnaire (avg. 19 months post-surgery; range = 6-58 months)	83	0	0.00%	yes	36	43.37%	47
Pfafflin et al. (1993)	https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/1	Sample 2 - clinical follow-up in author's office	297	3	1.02%	yes	2	0.67%	295
Poudrier et al. (2019)	https://journals.lww.com/plasreconsurg	online survey distributed to lead author's former patients	81	2	3.45%	yes	23	28.40%	58
Rehman et al. (1999)	https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023	mail-out questionnaire and follow-up telephone interview > 3 years post-surgery	47	0	0.00%	yes	19	40.43%	28
Smith et al. (2001)	https://www.jaacap.org/article/S0890-81	assessment one year post-surgery - method not mentioned	20	0	0.00%	yes	0	0.00%	20
Song et al. (2011)	https://www.thieme-connect.com/prod	five-year follow-up of penile function, aesthetics, and psych effects of surgery - method not mentioned	19	0	0.00%	yes	11	57.89%	8
Van de Grift et al. (2018)	https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0092623X.2017.1326190		546	8	5.88%	yes	145	63.19%	136
Weyers et al. (2009)	https://www.jsm.jsmed.org/article/S1	mail-out questionnaire > 6 months post-surgery	143	0	0.00%	yes	7	4.78%	143 ???
Weyers et al. (2009)	https://www.jsm.jsmed.org/article/S1	mail-out questionnaire > 6 months post-surgery	70	0	0.00%	yes	20	28.57%	50
Weyers et al. (2018)	https://www.jsm.jsmed.org/article/S1	retrospective analysis of clinic case records		14	0.25%	no	N/A	N/A	4863 ???
Zavlin et al. (2018)	https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s2f500266-017-1003-z			1	2.50%	no	N/A	N/A	40
Average			123	3.22	5.77%		22	38.18	252.00
Average excluding Kuiper & Cohen-Kettenis (1998)			123.14	2.96	2.15%		22	38.18	261.31
Under paper - extracted information is a best guess based on the information provided									
Probably should not be included in a study of regret prevalence									
Van de Grift et al. (2018) - starting sample does not represent only those undergoing GAS, but is anybody seeking any gender-affirming treatment									