

Manuscript Number: THELANCET-D-17-04038R1

Title: A systematic, meta-analytic review of prospective risk and protective factors for intimate partner violence victimisation among women

Article Type: Conference Abstracts

Corresponding Author: Miss Alexa Rachel Yakubovich, M.Sc.

Corresponding Author's Institution: University of Oxford

First Author: Alexa Rachel Yakubovich, M.Sc.

Order of Authors: Alexa Rachel Yakubovich, M.Sc.; Heidi Stöckl, PhD; Joseph Murray, PhD; G.J. Melendez-Torres, PhD; Janina I Steinert, MSc; Calla E Glavin, MPhil; David K Humphreys, PhD

Manuscript Region of Origin: UNITED KINGDOM

Abstract: Background The lifetime prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV), violence committed by a current or former partner, is estimated to be 30% among women worldwide. Effective prevention requires targeting conditions that increase and decrease the risk of IPV—or risk and protective factors, respectively. We aimed to systematically review and quantify the associations between prospective longitudinal risk and protective factors and IPV against women and identify evidence gaps.

Methods Systematic searches were conducted in English in 16 databases including MEDLINE and PsycINFO from inception to 1 June 2016, using free-text terms and controlled vocabulary for violence, partner, adults, and study design. English-language studies that prospectively analysed an adjusted association between any risk or protective factor(s) and self-reported IPV victimisation among women were included. Study quality was assessed using the Cambridge Quality Checklists. Studies investigating the same risk or protective factor using similar measures, and with appropriate data available, were combined to compute odds ratios using random-effects meta-analyses. Heterogeneity was indicated by I^2 and τ^2 . All results, including those not meta-analysed, were synthesised using harvest plots to illustrate evidence gaps and trends towards negative or positive associations. The study protocol is registered with PROSPERO (CRD42016039213).

Findings Of 18 608 studies identified, 60 were included and 35 meta-analysed. The strongest evidence for modifiable risk factors for IPV against women were: unplanned pregnancy (OR 1.66 [95% CI 1.20–1.31]) and having parents with less than a high school education (OR 1.55 [95% CI 1.10–2.17]). Being older (OR 0.96 [95% CI 0.93–0.98]) and married (OR 0.93 [95% CI 0.87–0.99]) were protective.

Interpretation Study limitations include English-language restrictions and low statistical power. Nevertheless, to our knowledge this is the first systematic, meta-analytic review of all risk and protective factors for IPV against women without location, time, or publication

restrictions. Education and sexual health interventions may be effective targets for preventing IPV against women, with young, unmarried women most at-risk. More prospective evidence for perpetrator- and context-related risk and protective factors for women's IPV experiences outside the USA is urgently needed to inform global recommendations.

Funding Rhodes Trust and Canadian Institutes of Health Research (DFS152265).

A systematic, meta-analytic review of prospective risk and protective factors for intimate partner violence victimisation among women

Alexa R Yakubovich^{1*} MSc, Heidi Stöckl² PhD, Prof Joseph Murray³ PhD, G J Melendez-Torres⁴ PhD, Janina I Steinert¹ MSc, Calla E Y Glavin¹ MPhil, David K Humphreys^{1,5} PhD

¹Department of Social Policy and Intervention, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

²Department of Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

³Center for Epidemiological Research, Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil

⁴Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Warwick, United Kingdom

⁵Green Templeton College, University of Oxford.

***Doctoral student**

Correspondence to: Ms Alexa R Yakubovich, Department of Social Policy and Intervention, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 2ER, United Kingdom, alexa.yakubovich@spi.ox.ac.uk

Background The lifetime prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV), violence committed by a current or former partner, is estimated to be 30% among women worldwide. Effective prevention requires targeting conditions that increase and decrease the risk of IPV—or risk and protective factors, respectively. We aimed to systematically review and quantify the associations between prospective longitudinal risk and protective factors and IPV against women and identify evidence gaps.

Methods Systematic searches were conducted in English in 16 databases including MEDLINE and PsycINFO from inception to 1 June 2016, using free-text terms and controlled vocabulary for violence, partner, adults, and study design. English-language studies that prospectively analysed an adjusted association between any risk or protective factor(s) and self-reported IPV victimisation among women were included. Study quality was assessed using the Cambridge Quality Checklists. Studies investigating the same risk or protective factor using similar measures, and with appropriate data available, were combined to compute odds ratios using random-effects meta-analyses. Heterogeneity was indicated by I^2 and τ^2 . All results, including those not meta-analysed, were synthesised using harvest plots to illustrate evidence gaps and trends towards negative or positive associations. The study protocol is registered with PROSPERO (CRD42016039213).

Findings Of 18 608 studies identified, 60 were included and 35 meta-analysed. The strongest evidence for modifiable risk factors for IPV against women were: unplanned pregnancy (OR 1.66 [95% CI 1.20–1.31]) and having parents with less than a high school education (OR 1.55 [95% CI 1.10–2.17]). Being older (OR 0.96 [95% CI 0.93–0.98]) and married (OR 0.93 [95% CI 0.87–0.99]) were protective.

Interpretation Study limitations include English-language restrictions and low statistical power. Nevertheless, to our knowledge this is the first systematic, meta-analytic review of all risk and protective factors for IPV against women without location, time, or publication restrictions. Education and sexual health interventions may be effective targets for preventing IPV against

women, with young, unmarried women most at-risk. More prospective evidence for perpetrator- and context-related risk and protective factors for women's IPV experiences outside the USA is urgently needed to inform global recommendations.

Funding Rhodes Trust and Canadian Institutes of Health Research (DFS152265).

Contributors

ARY and DKH designed the study and ARY, HS, JM, GJMT, and DKH oversaw its implementation. ARY coordinated all review activities. ARY, JIS, and CEY collaborated in study screening and data extraction. ARY, GJMT, and DKH planned the meta-analyses and ARY did the analyses. ARY wrote the abstract. All authors have seen and approved the final version of the abstract for publication.

Conflicts of interests

We declare no competing interests.

A systematic, meta-analytic review of prospective risk and protective factors for intimate partner violence victimisation among women

Alexa R Yakubovich^{1*} MSc, Heidi Stöckl² PhD, Prof Joseph Murray³ PhD, G J Melendez-Torres⁴ PhD, Janina I Steinert¹ MSc, Calla E Y Glavin¹ MPhil, David K Humphreys^{1,5} PhD

¹Department of Social Policy and Intervention, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

²Department of Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

³Center for Epidemiological Research, Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil

⁴Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Warwick, United Kingdom

⁵Green Templeton College, University of Oxford.

***Doctoral student**

Correspondence to: Ms Alexa R Yakubovich, Department of Social Policy and Intervention, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 2ER, United Kingdom, alexa.yakubovich@spi.ox.ac.uk

Background The lifetime prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV), violence committed by a current or former partner, is estimated to be as high as 30% among women worldwide. Effective prevention requires targeting conditions that increase and decrease the risk of IPV—or risk and protective factors, respectively. We aimed to systematically review and quantify the associations between prospective longitudinal risk and protective factors and IPV victimisation among women and identify evidence gaps.

Methods Systematic searches were conducted in English in 16 databases including MEDLINE and PsycINFO from inception to 1 June 2016, using free-text terms and controlled vocabulary for violence, partner, adults, and study design. Studies in English language studies that prospectively analysed an adjusted association between any risk or protective factor(s) and self-reported IPV victimisation among women were included. Study quality was assessed using the Cambridge Quality Checklists. Studies investigating the same risk or protective factor using similar measures, and with appropriate data available, were meta-analysed combined to compute odds ratios using random-effects meta-analyses. Heterogeneity was indicated by I^2 and τ^2 . All results, regardless of meta-analysis eligibility including those not meta-analysed, were synthesised using harvest plots to illustrate evidence gaps and trends towards negative or positive associations. The study protocol is registered with PROSPERO (CRD42016039213).

Findings Of 18 608 studies identified, 60 were included and 35 meta-analysed. The strongest evidence for modifiable risk factors for women's IPV victimisation IPV against women were: unplanned pregnancy (OR 1.66 [95% CI 1.20–1.31]) and having parents with less than a high school education (OR 1.55 [95% CI 1.10–2.17]). Being older (OR 0.96 [95% CI 0.93–0.98]) and married (OR 0.93 [95% CI 0.87–0.99]) were protective. Several factors trended towards risk associations including women's experiences of child abuse and lower education as well as partners' substance use and low parental monitoring.

Interpretation Study limitations include English-language restrictions and low statistical power. Nevertheless, to our knowledge this is the first systematic, meta-analytic review of all risk and

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

protective factors for IPV against women without location, time, or publication restrictions. Education, ~~parenting, substance misuse,~~ and sexual health interventions ~~may be effective for~~ may be effective targets for preventing IPV against women, with young, unmarried women most at-risk. More prospective evidence for perpetrator- and context-related risk and protective factors for women's ~~victimisation~~ IPV experiences outside the USA is urgently needed to inform global recommendations.

Funding Rhodes Trust and Canadian Institutes of Health Research (DFS152265).

Contributors

ARY and DKH designed the study and ARY, HS, JM, GJMT, and DKH oversaw its implementation. ARY coordinated all review activities. ARY, JIS, and CEY collaborated in study screening and data extraction. ARY, GJMT, and DKH planned the meta-analyses and ARY did the analyses. ARY wrote the abstract. All authors have seen and approved the final version of the abstract for publication.

Conflicts of interests

We declare no competing interests.

Response to reviewers letter

[Click here to download Necessary additional data: Response to Lancet PH Reviewers - Yakubovich final.docx](#)