Trauma, Violence, & Abuse

Randomised controlled trials of interventions addressing intimate partner violence in sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review.

Journal:	Trauma, Violence, & Abuse
Manuscript ID	TVA-17-125.R3
Manuscript Type:	Review Manuscripts
Keywords:	Domestic violence and cultural contexts < Domestic Violence, Intervention/treatment < Domestic Violence, Anything related to domestic violence < Domestic Violence, Anything related to domestic violence < Domestic Violence < Cultural Contexts

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts ZICZ

Page 1 of 36

Randomised controlled trials of interventions addressing intimate partner violence in sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review.

Abstract

Background: Intimate partner violence (IPV) perpetrated by males is the most prevalent form of violence against women across the globe. A systematic review was carried out to identify published randomised controlled trials of interventions aiming to prevent or reduce IPV in sub-Saharan Africa. Details were sought on the interventions, outcomes, and risk of bias in evaluations.

Methods: Articles were identified by searching MEDLINE, Embase, Web of Science, and PsychInfo. The search included terms pertaining to IPV, the research design and the target geographical region. To be included, studies needed to have assessed the impact of an intervention on reported incidence, prevalence of IPV, or measures of related attitudes and behaviours. Fifteen papers were included in the final review. Risk of bias was evaluated using the Cochrane Library 'Risk of Bias' tool.

Results: Findings suggest that interventions have the potential to reduce IPV-related behaviours and attitudes. Certain types of IPV were more amenable to change than others. Higher levels of efficacy were identified in interventions that had longer follow-up, addressed IPV as a main aim, and occurred at the community level or multiple levels of the social ecology.

Conclusions: Findings should be interpreted in light of varying risks of bias. Suggestions are made for future research and practice.

Randomised controlled trials of interventions addressing intimate partner violence in sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review. Introduction

Violence against women affects approximately one third of women in their lifetime (WHO, 2013). Intimate partner violence (IPV), defined as behaviour within an intimate relationship that causes physical, sexual or psychological harm, including acts of physical aggression, sexual coercion, psychological abuse, and controlling behaviours (WHO, 2010), is the biggest contributor to this high prevalence (WHO, 2013). Although IPV can be perpetrated by women, and violence can exist in same-sex relationships, the most common type of IPV is that inflicted by men against female partners (UN Women, 2013).

Women who have experienced IPV are significantly more likely to report poor physical health (Ellsberg et al., 2008), and it is associated with numerous negative reproductive health outcomes (Hindin et al., 2008), and alcohol abuse (WHO, 2013). Women who have experienced IPV are more likely to experience depression (WHO, 2013), and report more suicide attempts (Ellsberg et al., 2008). Additionally, as the positive association between IPV and HIV is strongest in regions with high prevalence rates of HIV, such as sub-Saharan Africa, women experiencing IPV in this region are particularly vulnerable to infection (Durevall et al., 2015; UNAIDS, 2014). These physical and mental health implications have led the WHO (2013) to identify IPV as a global public health problem of epidemic proportions.

Economically, IPV incurs both direct costs, such as the cost of treating physical injuries, and indirect costs, related to the detrimental impact it has on women taking advantage of economic opportunities (International Rescue Committee [IRC], 2012). Fearon and Hoeffler (2014) estimated the global costs of IPV to be 5.2% of global gross domestic

Page 3 of 36

Trauma, Violence, & Abuse

product. These associations demonstrate that addressing IPV is essential in the pursuit of global health, economic and social development (García-Moreno et al., 2015).

Understandings of violence against women have shifted from individual level explanations, to recognising the complex interplay of multiple factors (Michau et al., 2015) such as gender inequality and discrimination (UN Women, 2013). In this vein, the WHO (2010) described violence against women as a social problem rooted in unequal power and resource distributions between men and women and institutionalised through laws, policies, and norms that afford preferential rights to men. Jewkes (2002) concluded that two factors are necessary for IPV: the unequal position of women in a relationship and in society; and the normative use of violence, suggesting that the influence of a number of other factors is mediated through their effect on these two main factors. A different but related perspective on IPV is the integrated ecological model of violence (Heise, 1998; 2011). In this model, violence against women, including IPV, is seen as a result of the interaction of individual, relationship, community, and societal factors (which may include gender inequality), and is a widely accepted foundation for programming and research. Cools and Kotsadam (2015) propose a 'contextual acceptance employment' hypothesis according to which female employment leads to a higher risk of abuse in settings where social norms are such that acceptability of physical IPV is high. Based on these theoretical foundations, many interventions aim to tackle gender-power imbalances, economic empowerment, and social norms.

While progress on IPV legislation has been made, the law alone cannot prevent violence (World Bank Group, 2014) and system-wide changes, such as community-interventions, are needed to improve enforcement (Morrison et al., 2007). Preventative approaches to IPV take one of two forms: primary prevention decreases the number of new cases of violence; while secondary prevention mitigates harm after violence has occurred

Trauma, Violence, & Abuse

(Arango et al., 2014). Promising preventative interventions may entail social/economic empowerment of women, promoting change in attitudes and behaviours through education of both men and women, or participatory community mobilisation (Garcia-Moreno et al., 2015). Rates of perpetration of IPV are strongly predicted by both men's and women's attitudes condoning such acts (Abramsky et al., 2011), highlighting the importance of addressing both men's and women's attitudes, however behaviour change must ultimately be the main objective of interventions. In high income countries (HIC) secondary prevention has received more attention while in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) there is a greater focus on primary prevention. That said, however, the overall number of services and evaluations is lower in LMIC and what has been evaluated in HIC may not be relevant to LMIC (Arango et al., 2014). Therefore it is essential to synthesise information from other regions to assist with developing and implementing interventions. Despite the vast differences within the 46 countries in sub-Saharan Africa (Alesina et al., 2003) all countries share in common prevalence rates of IPV above the global average (WHO, 2013).

This systematic review aimed to synthesise findings from randomised controlled trials (RCTs) that have evaluated interventions aiming to prevent/reduce IPV perpetrated against adult females in sub-Saharan Africa. It sought to gather information on aspects of studies such as facilitator training, recruitment methods, and underlying theoretical models which will assist in the future planning of interventions. Potential sources of bias in each RCT were identified to improve future research.

Methods

The "Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Statement" (Moher et al., 2009) and PRISMA-P guidelines (Shamseer et al., 2015) guided this review. The protocol was recorded on the PROSPERO database.

Studies were included if they were: randomised controlled trials that collected primary data evaluating pre- and post-intervention measures of the incidence/prevalence of IPV or related attitudes/behaviours; published in English in peer-reviewed journals; and conducted in a sub-Saharan African country with adults as the target population. Studies that did not state that addressing IPV was an aim of the intervention, and/or studies evaluating interventions addressing only the sequelae of IPV were not included. Web of Science, PsychInfo, MEDLINE, and EMBASE were systematically searched for articles published up to the 31st of March 2016. Appendix A provides the search strategy for one of these databases. Search terms relating to designs other than RCTs were included to ensure that no RCTs were inadvertently missed. Sub-Saharan African countries were those listed by the UN Development Programme (UNDP, n.d.). Primary authors of included studies were contacted for information on potentially eligible papers. Of 17 authors contacted, 9 replied suggesting a number of resources. The reference lists of included papers were hand-searched for additional studies. After duplicates were removed, two researchers (C.C. & P.N) independently scanned the abstracts and titles of the papers for suitable papers. Full text articles were then examined by both researchers for eligibility. In general the level of agreement was high and any differences were resolved through discussion of the eligibility criteria and consensus agreement. Relevant data was extracted and tabulated. Two researchers (C.C. & N.B) independently assessed bias in the studies using the Cochrane Collaboration's 'Risk of Bias' tool (Higgins et al., 2008).

Results

Figure 1. shows the results of the literature search. Briefly, 592 studies were initially identified, 62 full-text articles screened, and 15 articles included.

Study Characteristics

Fifteen studies drawing on 11 unique datasets were included. Sample sizes were large ranging from 478 (Jones et al., 2013) to 11,448 (Wagman et al., 2015) unique participants enrolled at baseline (Median = 981, IQR = 1,199): 8,099 were male and 15,095 female. Four studies were carried out in Uganda (Abramsky et al., 2014; Green et al., 2015; Kyegombe et al., 2014; Wagman et al., 2015), three in Côte d'Ivoire (Falb et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2013; Hossain et al., 2014), six in South Africa (Jewkes et al., 2008; Jones et al., 2013; Kim et al., 2009; Minnis et al., 2015; Pronyk et al., 2006; Wechsberg et al., 2013), and two in Kenya (L'Engle et al., 2014; Parcesepe et al., 2016). Twelve studies were cluster RCTs (Abramsky et al., 2014; Falb et al., 2015; Green et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2014; Hossain et al., 2014; Jewkes et al., 2008; Jones et al., 2013; Kim et al., 2009; Kyegombe et al., 2014; Minnis et al., 2015 Pronyk et al., 2006; Wagman et al., 2015). The remaining three studies were randomised at the participant level. The interventions had varied and sometimes multiple underlying theoretical models. Some of these included: gender equality/issues and gender equitable relationships (Falb et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2013; Jewkes et al., 2008; Kim et al., 2009; Minnis et al., 2015; Pronyk et al., 2006; Wechsberg et al., 2013); economic empowerment and poverty alleviation (Falb et al., 2015; Green et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2013: Kim et al., 2009; Pronyk et al., 2006); cognitive behavioural skill training (Jones et al., 2013); ecological model of violence and power imbalances (Abramsky et al., 2014; Kyegombe et al., 2014); social norms theory (Hossain et al., 2014); and stages of change (L'Engle et al., 2014; Parcesepe et al., 2016; Wagman et al., 2015). All interventions were primary interventions, i.e. they aimed to decrease the number of new cases of violence. No interventions aimed to solely address IPV but addressed multiple psychosocial problems such as poverty alleviation (Green et al., 2015); HIV prevention (Abramsky et al, 2014; Kyegombe et al, 2014); and reducing alcohol use (L'Engle et al., 2014; Parcesepe et al., 2016). Three studies were of interventions whose aim was reducing IPV through the incremental effects of

adding features to pre-existing programmes (Falb et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2013; Hossain et al., 2014). Two studies were of an intervention that was solely community based (Abramsky et al., 2014; Kyegombe et al., 2014). Four studies described interventions that used a mix of community-based interventions and interventions targeted at groups or individuals (Hossain et al., 2014; Kim et al., 2009; Pronyk et al., 2006; Wagman et al., 2015). Nine described targeted interventions aimed only at small groups or individuals (Falb et al., 2015; Green et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2013; Jewkes et al., 2008; Jones et al., 2013; L'Engle et al., 2014; Minnis et al., 2015; Parcesepe et al., 2016; Wechsberg et al., 2013). Interventions were facilitated by: previously untrained unpaid lay people supported by an existing organisation (Abramsky et al., 2014; Kyegombe et al., 2014; Wechsberg et al., 2013); trained NGO field staff (Falb et al., 2015; Green et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2013; Jewkes et al., 2008; Kim et al., 2009; Pronyk et al., 2006); trained professionals/paraprofessionals (Jones et al., 2013; L'Engle et al., 2014; Minnis et al., 2015; Parcesepe et al., 2016); and both trained lay people and trained professionals or paraprofessionals (Wagman et al., 2015). A description of the interventions and underlying theoretical models can be found in Table 1. Further details on the characteristics of the studies including recruitment strategies and facilitator training details can be accessed by contacting the corresponding author.

Risk of Bias

Figure 2 provides a summary of each study's classification on the various 'risks of bias' indices (i.e. high/low/unclear). As a domain based evaluation, the tool for evaluation of risk of bias is not intended to give an overall 'score' for each study but rather to allow a judgement of whether outcome assessments may be affected by different types of bias. The main bias related concerns for the studies as a whole were allocation concealment, blinding of participants/outcomes, and incomplete outcome data. As is the case with many psychosocial interventions, blinding of participants and personnel either did not take place, or

was not addressed in any of these studies. In all trials except one, blinding of outcome assessment either did not occur or the reported information was not sufficient to make a judgement. Blinding of outcome assessment was achieved in one trial of an individualised counselling intervention by masking treatment allocation to the study investigators until data handling was finalised (L'Engle et al, 2014; Parcesepe et al., 2016), decreasing the risk of detection bias in studies of this trial - it may be easier to maintain blinding in individualised interventions compared to community interventions. Regarding incomplete data outcomes, one study analysed results on a per-protocol basis (Pronyk ey al., 2006), while in two studies it was not clear whether analysis was per-protocol or intention to treat (ITT; Kim et al., 2009; Minnis et al., 2015). In one study it was not possible to judge the risk of attrition bias (Falb et al., 2015) while in another, a significantly greater number of participants in the control group were lost (Wagman et al., 2015), potentially affecting trial results.

Study Outcomes

Key results of each study are summarised in Table 2. Follow up times ranged from 6-8 weeks (Jones et al., 2013) to 4 years (Abramsky et al., 2014; Kyegombe et al., 2014) post-baseline (Median= 16 months, IQR= 12 months). The conceptualisation of most behaviours and how they were measured was not uniform across the studies. The conceptualisations of some abusive behaviours varied notably between studies: for example, emotional violence was measured according to different definitions between studies (Falb et al., 2015; Jones et al., 2013; Wagman et al., 2015); and the measures for 'marital control' or 'controlling behaviour' in some studies overlapped with those relating to economic abuse and emotional violence in others (e.g. Green et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2009; Pronyk et al., 2006).

Behavioural indicator outcomes: intervention groups vs. controls

Trauma, Violence, & Abuse

Unless stated otherwise, the results reported here are based on comparisons between the intervention and control groups. Physical IPV was lowered among women in the SASA! intervention with a large effect size (Abramsky et al., 2014), but not significantly. Physical IPV significantly decreased in the high adherent group of the VSLA and GDG intervention (Gupta et al., 2013), but not in low adherent or ITT analyses. When this sample was stratified by age of marriage, ITT analysis showed that physical IPV significantly decreased in nonchild brides, but not in child brides (Falb et al., 2015). Physical IPV was significantly lower in the Safe Homes And Respect for Everyone (SHARE) intervention group at 35 months but not 16 months, and the effect size was small (Wagman et al., 2015). Physical IPV significantly decreased in the PartnerPlus intervention (Jones et al., 2013) with a large effect size. Adding a Men's Discussion Group (MDG) to a community GBV prevention programme vielded a reduction in women's self-reported experience of physical IPV compared to the GBV programme alone, but not significantly (Hossain et al., 2014). Physical IPV was not significantly reduced compared to controls in two studies (Parcesepe et al., 2016; Wechsberg et al., 2013). Sexual IPV was reduced only in 'non-child brides' participants in the VSLA and GDG intervention compared to VSLA alone with a large effect size and trending towards

GDG intervention compared to VSLA alone with a large effect size and trending towards significance (Falb et al., 2015). It was also significantly reduced in the SHARE intervention at the second follow-up but the effect size was small (Wagman et al., 2015). The additional MDG showed large but non-significant effect sizes for a decrease in women's reported sexual IPV in all dose levels compared to the GBV programme alone (Hossain et al., 2014). Women's experience of forced sex from a partner was significantly lower in SHARE intervention groups at 35 months but the effect size was small (Wagman et al., 2015). There was no statistically significant reduction in sexual IPV in SASA! (Abramsky et al., 2014; Kyegombe et al., 2014) or a Brief Alcohol Intervention (L'Engle et al., 2014).

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tva

An aggregate measure of physical and/or sexual IPV was reduced in non-child brides in the VSLA and GDG intervention, with a large effect size and trending towards significance but with wide confidence intervals (Falb et al., 2015). Rates of a similar measure were significantly reduced in IMAGE with large effect sizes (Kim et al., 2009; Pronyk et al., 2006). The effect of IMAGE on this measure when compared to microfinance was less reliable (Kim et al., 2009). Physical and/or sexual IPV was reduced in the MDG intervention relative to a community GBV prevention programme alone (Hossain et al., 2014) but not significantly. There were no significant effects for physical or sexual IPV with the Stepping Stones intervention (Jewkes et al., 2008). There was no notable change on 'physical/emotional violence' in the WINGS or Women Plus interventions (Green et al., 2015). 'Victimization' was reduced by a gender-separate health coop (MHC/WHC) six months post intervention, compared to both the Women's only Health Coop (WHC) control and a Couples Coop intervention (CHC). This reached statistical significance and was associated with a large effect size (Minnis et al., 2015).

Economic abuse was statistically significantly reduced in all populations and levels of adherence to the VSLA and GDG intervention, with large effect sizes (Falb et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2013). Emotional abuse significantly decreased in non-child brides in the VSLA and GDG intervention compared to VSLA, with a large effect size but increased in childbrides albeit with a small effect size and not statistically significantly (Falb et al., 2015). Emotional violence was not reduced in PartnerPlus or SHARE (Jones et al., 2013; Wagman et al., 2015). Marital control significantly increased in Women's Income Generating Support (WINGS) compared to a waitlist control, but decreased in Women Plus compared to WINGS, though not significantly (Green et al., 2015). IMAGE had a small but non-significant decreasing effect on experience of controlling behaviour, compared to a microfinance control (Kim et al., 2009). On the other hand, microfinance alone slightly increased marital control

Trauma, Violence, & Abuse

relative to controls (Kim et al., 2009) suggesting that this difference in effect is due to a decrease in controlling behaviour in the IMAGE group and a corresponding increase in the microfinance group.

Women in CHC reported significantly greater increases in relationship control compared to WHC with a large effect size, but wide confidence interval. However, women in the CHC condition reported less shared decision making in relationships, significantly so compared to MHC/WHC which promoted shared decision making (Minnis et al., 2015). Hossain and colleagues' (2014) measure of men's hostility and conflict management alongside no reports of threatening behaviour significantly increased in the intervention group with large effect sizes and moderate confidence intervals for all conditions. Men's reported perpetration of physical/sexual IPV was significantly lower in Stepping Stones at two year follow-up with a moderate effect size and confidence interval range (Jewkes et al., 2008). In SHARE, men's reported emotional and physical abuse seemed to decrease at 16 months but not at 35 months (Wagman et al., 2015).

Outcomes of attitudinal measures in intervention groups compared to controls

Women's social acceptance of physical IPV towards females was significantly lower in the SASA! intervention with a large effect size (Abramsky et al., 2014). It was also significantly lower in ITT and high adherence participants of the VSLA and GDG intervention (Gupta et al. 2013). Acceptance that a woman can refuse to have sex was significantly lower in women in SASA!, with moderate effect sizes (Abramsky et al., 2014) but did not change in any analysis of the VSLA and GDG intervention (Gupta et al., 2013). IMAGE produced a moderate effect estimate for an increase in 'progressive attitudes towards IPV', significantly so compared to microfinance (Kim et al., 2009), and non-significantly compared to not treatment (Kim et al., 2009; Pronyk et al., 2006). Women in the SASA! intervention were

significantly more likely to report feeling able to refuse sex from their husbands, but the effect size was small (Kyegombe et al., 2014). Women's subscription to statements supportive of female autonomy/empowerment significantly increased in CHC compared to the standard WHC group but the confidence interval was wide (Minnis et al., 2015). This measure did not increase in the gender separate intervention (Minnis et al., 2015). A similar measure was not affected by WINGS or Women Plus (Green et al., 2015). Women in the IMAGE intervention were more likely to challenge statements supportive of women's subservience with a large effect size but wide confidence interval (Pronyk et al., 2006).

In the SASA! intervention, men's reported acceptance of physical IPV was not significantly reduced, while men's reported acceptability that a woman can refuse to have sex with her husband significantly increased with a moderate effect size but a wide confidence interval (Abramsky et al., 2014). This also increased in the MDG intervention but not significantly in any analysis (Hossain et al., 2014). Reported intention to perpetrate physical IPV was non-significant in all analyses in the intervention group however the effect size was moderate in the high-dose analysis compared to controls (Hossain et al., 2014). Perceptions of women's autonomy and rights did not improve in the WINGS programme compared to control (Green et al., 2015).

Discussion

IPV is a significant global problem requiring the development of adequate interventions. The results of the current review suggest that there is potential for interventions to change behaviours and attitudes related to IPV in sub-Saharan Africa. Studies that measured both sexual and physical IPV outcomes for the same intervention suggest that sexual IPV outcomes are more difficult to change (Abramsky et al., 2014; Falb et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2013; Kyegombe et al., 2014; L'Engle et al., 2014; Parcesepe et al., 2016). On the other hand,

less physically controlling behaviours and economic abuse may be more amenable to change (Falb et al., 2015; Green et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2013; Hossain et al., 2014). While behavioural outcomes were measured in all studies, measures of attitudinal outcomes were less commonly utilised (included in 8 evaluations). The studies with the most successful changes in attitudinal outcomes (Abramsky et al., 2014; Gupta et al., 2013; Kyegombe et al., 2014; Minnis et al. 2015[CHC only]) appeared to approach imbalances in power between men and women as an integrated community activity, or with couples working together to address them, and in the cases of interventions involving microfinance these activities had to specifically address finance (as opposed to gender roles more broadly). However while addressing attitudes may be important for reducing IPV, behaviour change must be the key objective of interventions and attitudinal change in the absence of behaviour change will not suffice.

No interventions solely targeted IPV; therefore it cannot be deduced whether such interventions produce more reliable effects than those targeting multiple problems. It was suggested in one study that the synergistic nature of interventions with multiple aims might lead to broader beneficial effects (Kim et al., 2009). Indeed, interventions yielding more significant and large effects tended to work at the community level or at multiple levels of the social ecology (Abramsky et al. 2014; Hossain et al., 2014; Kyegombe et al., 2014; Minnis et al., 2015; Wagman et al., 2015). This is consistent with theories posited by the integrated ecological model of violence (Heise, 2011), which suggests that factors operating at multiple levels from the micro- to the macro-level contribute to IPV. Evaluations of microfinance/economic empowerment alone indicate that they do not suffice to decrease IPV-related measures and may increase controlling behaviours (Green et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2013; Kim et al., 2009) and suggest that microfinance programmes should be accompanied by comprehensive couples training (Gupta et al., 2013).

Interventions in which IPV was not a primary aim, but rather a secondary aim, were not generally successful in changing outcomes relating to IPV, for example the brief alcohol intervention (L'Engle et al., 2014; Parcesepe et al., 2016), and microfinance alone (Green et al., 2015 [WINGS]; Kim et al., 2009 [microfinance only condition]). The exception to this was a short intervention with a short follow-up time of which a main aim was not IPV, but which had a significant impact on physical violence (Jones et al., 2013). This could be due to the fact that it engaged a high risk group of women along with their partner, with a joint aim of preventing transmission of HIV to their child. The underlying theoretical models that the interventions were based on convey current prevailing theories of IPV such as gender inequality and related power imbalances, economic empowerment, social norms, and less frequently, individual behaviour change. However there did not appear to be an observably more beneficial effect associated with any one of these theoretical bases. It could tentatively be said that studies with longer follow-up times yielded more significant positive changes. This may be due to a beneficial effect from interventions of a longer duration or due to a latency period being required for change to occur.

Considering that the VSLA+GDG intervention measured the incremental effects of a relatively short programme, GDG, the decreases in women's reported IPV are noteworthy (Falb et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2013). Utilising a different format, SASA! was notably effective for attitudinal outcomes. Due to the nature of this project, it is difficult to specify what the active ingredients were, but building an intervention from the bottom up may ensure its relevance and acceptability (Chowdhary et al., 2013). Another extensive community programme yielded similarly successful results on behavioural outcomes (Wagman et al., 2015).

These findings, however, should be interpreted in light of varying risks of bias. While almost all studies did not succeed in blinding participants/personnel or outcome assessment,

Page 15 of 36

Trauma, Violence, & Abuse

in some studies there were also additional risks of bias such as that resulting from inadequate allocation concealment, and incomplete outcome data. Inadequate or unclear reporting of, allocation concealment, lack of blinding in randomized trials, and per-protocol compared to ITT analysis, are all associated with more exaggerated estimated intervention effects (Pildal et al., 2007; Portal, Bonet, & Cobo, 2007). This exaggeration appears to occur more in trials with more subjective outcomes (Wood et al., 2008). While in the current review, per protocol and ITT analyses were not notably different in the studies that reported both, some studies reported only per-protocol analysis, or were not clear on how analysis was conducted. Thus, the effect sizes of outcomes in studies with risks of bias in multiple domains should be treated with caution, particularly those reporting more subjective outcomes such as attitude change.

Female reports of IPV are considered to be more reliable than males' (Wagman et al., 2015), however studies could gain valuable insight from including male reports, which were recorded less frequently in the included studies. Wagman and colleagues (2015) found significant reductions in women's experiences of IPV but not in men's reported perpetration, whilst in Jewkes and colleagues' (2008) study the reverse was found. Hossain and colleagues (2014) found that adding a targeted men's intervention to a community GBV intervention increased men's use of conflict management tactics, but wasn't successful in significantly changing IPV or IPV-related attitudes. Similar to Hossain et al. (2014), Green and colleagues (2015) found that increasing male partners' engagement did not significantly improve IPV outcomes however in both studies the results were in the hypothesised direction. Minnis and colleagues (2015) found varying beneficial effects of a couples' intervention and a gender-separate intervention on different outcomes. These findings suggest a need for a closer examination of mechanisms driving these differential effects in order to develop the most beneficial interventions, particularly in the area of male engagement.

Differential outcomes associated with specific groups such as child brides (Falb et al., 2015), and female sex workers (L'Engle et al., 2014; Parcesepe et al., 2016) emphasise the need for future interventions to be tailored to such populations, accounting for any sub-groups whose social circumstances and relationships may be particularly resistant to change. A number of studies used innovative recruitment methods attempting to purposefully access vulnerable populations instead of relying upon, for example, voluntary participation.

While some effect sizes were notably large, less than a third of measured outcomes yielded statistically significant results (34 statistically significant outcomes out of 118 IPV related outcomes measured across all included studies). However some studies, particularly those analysing by cluster-level ITT, may not have been sufficiently powered to detect significant results, as there were examples of large effect sizes without corresponding statistical significance in such studies (e.g. Abramsky et al., 2014; Hossain et al., 2014). Perprotocol analyses showed that some interventions might hold more promise if they become more acceptable and well-attended in communities (Gupta et al., 2013). However four perprotocol or dose-effect analyses showed no results that were tangibly different to ITT (Green et al., 2015; Hossain et al., 2014; Jewkes et al., 2008; Kyegombe et al., 2014). This may be due to systematic differences in the characteristics of participants who attend more intervention sessions than those who attend less.

This review provides an opportunity to reflect on the importance of having adequately trained individuals delivering interventions, which has been highlighted as a key issue in low-resource settings (Kakuma et al., 2011). A number of studies, some with successful IPV-related outcomes, used previously untrained lay persons to deliver interventions (Abramsky et al., 2014; Kyegombe et al., 2014; Wagman et al., 2015; Wechsberg et al., 2013). These examples show that previously untrained lay persons can be successfully utilised to deliver

interventions in a cost-effective way. This has previously been highlighted as an effective way of implementing interventions (van Ginneken et al., 2013).

There were limitations associated with the included studies: firstly, most neglected measures assessing emotional and/or psychological IPV which could be partly due to ambiguity regarding the definition of these terms; secondly, there were overlap and gaps between measures of emotional IPV, economic abuse, and controlling behaviour; finally, the studies originated from only four geographically distant countries. Therefore the results cannot be translated into generalisations of what types of interventions are effective across the Sub-Saharan Region. With regards to the current review, only studies published in peer-reviewed journals were included meaning this review may be susceptible to publication bias.

Conclusions

The implications of this review for future research and practice are summarised in Table 3. This review included only the most rigorously tested interventions and used a standard tool for assessing risk of bias. While there were inconsistencies in the measures employed and the interventions being evaluated, a number of studies showed promising results for efforts aimed at addressing IPV-related indices. These studies tended to have longer-term follow up, addressed IPV as a primary aim, and acted at the level of the community or on multiple ecological levels. Interventions were more successful in changing sexual IPV compared to physical IPV, and in changing controlling behaviours/economic abuse. Microfinance interventions should be accompanied by comprehensive couples training and differential effects on more vulnerable subgroups should be considered. The development of the skills of existing human resources such as non-specialists and lay-people for intervention facilitation should be encouraged. Future research should explore in what circumstances groups should be single-sex or mixed, the differential effects of interventions by gender, and how to effectively engage men. Future trials should use standardised conceptualisation and

measurement of IPV, and rigorously test interventions with sufficiently powered samples so that policy makers and NGOs can invest in those that are most effective. The proliferation of new studies in recent years illustrates the momentum gathering in this field. It is hoped that the findings in the current review can provide useful guidance for future endeavours.

References

- Abramsky, T., Devries, K., Kiss, L., Nakuti, J., Kyegombe, N., Starmann, E, ... Watts, C. (2014). Findings from the SASA! study: A cluster randomized controlled trial to assess the impact of a community mobilization intervention to prevent violence against women and reduce HIV risk in Kampala, Uganda. *BMC Medicine, 12*, 122-122. doi:10.1186/s12916-014-0122-5
- Abramsky, T., Watts, C., García-Moreno, C., Devries, K., Kiss, L., Ellsberg, M., ... Heise, L. (2011). What factors are associated with recent intimate partner violence?
 Findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *BMC Public Health*, *11*, 109-109. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-11-109
- Alesina, A., Devleeschauwer, A., Easterly, W., Kurlat, S., & Wacziarg, R. (2003).
 Fractionalization. *Journal of Economic Growth*, *8*, 155-194.
 doi:10.1023/A:1024471506938
- Arango, D., Morton, M., Gennari, F., Kiplesund, S., & Ellsberg, M. (2014). Interventions to Prevent and Reduce Violence Against Women and Girls: A Systematic Review of Reviews. *Women's Voice, Agency, and Participation Research Series*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Chowdhary, N., Jotheeswaran, A., Nadkarni, A., Hollon, S., King, M., Jordans, M., ... Patel, V. (2014). The methods and outcomes of cultural adaptations of psychological

treatments for depressive disorders: A systematic review. Psychological Medicine,
44, 1131-1146. doi:10.1017/S0033291713001785
Cools, S. & Kotsadam, A. (2015). Resources and intimate partner violence in Sub-Saharan
Africa. Retrieved from
https://andreaskotsadam.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/resources-and-intimate-
partner-violence.pdf
Durevall, D., Lindskog, A., & Gothenburg Centre for Globalization and Development
(GCGD). (2015). Intimate partner violence and HIV in ten sub-Saharan African
countries: What do the demographic and health surveys tell us? Lancet Global
Health, 3, E34-E43. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(14)70343-2
Ellsberg, M., Jansen, H. A., Heise, L., Watts, C. H., García-Moreno, C., & WHO Multi-
country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women Study
Team. (2008). Intimate partner violence and women's physical and mental health in
the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: An
observational study. The Lancet, 371, 1165-1172. doi:10.1016/S0140-
6736(08)60522-X
Falb, K. L., Annan, J., Kpebo, D., Cole, H., Willie, T., Xuan, Z., Gupta, J. (2015).
Differential impacts of an intimate partner violence prevention program based on
child marriage status in rural Côte d'Ivoire. The Journal of Adolescent Health :
Official Publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine, 57, 553.
doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.08.001

Fearon, J. & Hoeffler, A. (2014). Benefits and Costs of the Conflict and Violence Targets for the Post-2015 Development Agenda. (Assessment paper prepared for the Copenhagen Consensus Center). Retrieved from <u>http://www.copenhagenconsensus.com/sites/default/files/conflict_assessment_-</u> <u>hoeffler_and_fearon_0.pdf</u>

García-Moreno, C., Zimmerman, C., Morris-Gehring, A., Heise, L., Amin, A., Abrahams,
N., ...Watts, C. (2015). Addressing violence against women: A call to action. *Lancet* (*London, England*), 385, 1685-1695. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61830-4

Green, E. P., Blattman, C., Jamison, J., & Annan, J. (2015). Women's entrepreneurship and intimate partner violence: A cluster randomized trial of microenterprise assistance and partner participation in post-conflict Uganda (SSM-D-14-01580R1). *Social Science & Medicine, 133*, 177-188. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.03.042

Gupta, J., Falb, K. L., Lehmann, H., Kpebo, D., Xuan, Z., Hossain, M., ... Annan, J. (2013).
Gender norms and economic empowerment intervention to reduce intimate partner violence against women in rural Côte d'Ivoire: A randomized controlled pilot study. *BMC International Health and Human Rights, 13*, 46. doi:10.1186/1472-698X-13-46

Heise, L. (1998). Violence against women: An integrated, ecological framework. *Violence Against Women, 4*, 262-290. doi:10.1177/1077801298004003002

Heise, L. (2011). What works to prevent partner violence? An evidence overview. London: Strive Research Consortium. Retrieved from <u>http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/PDF/Outputs/Gender/60887-</u>

PartnerViolenceEvidenceOverview.pdf

Higgins, J.P.T., Altman, D., & Sterne, J. (2008). Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in included studies. In: J.P.T Higgins and S. Green (Eds.), *Cochrane handbook for* systematic reviews of interventions Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011] The

	Cochrane Collection 2011. [Accessed May 2016] Retrieved from
	http://www.cochrane-handbook.org/.
Hinc	lin, M.J., Kishor, S., & Ansara, D.L. (2008). Intimate partner violence among coupl
	10 DHS countries: Predictors and health outcomes. DHS Analytical Studies No.
	Calverton, Maryland, USA: Macro International Inc. Retrieved from
	http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadn620.pdf
Hoss	ain, M., Zimmerman, C., Kiss, L., Abramsky, T., Kone, D., Bakayoko-Topolska, M
	Watts, C. (2014). Working with men to prevent intimate partner violence in a
	conflict-affected setting: A pilot cluster randomized controlled trial in rural Côte
	d'Ivoire. BMC Public Health, 14, 339-339. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-339
IRC	(2010). Men and Women in Partnership: The International Rescue Committee – Ivo
	Coast. International Rescue Committee and Sonke Gender Justice Network.
	Retrieved from http://www.genderjustice.org.za/publication/men-and-women-in-
	partnership/
IRC	(2012). Let me not die before my time: Domestic violence in West Africa. Retrieve
	from http://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/resource-
	file/IRC_Report_DomVioWAfrica.pdf
Jewł	xes, R. (2002). Intimate partner violence: Causes and prevention. <i>The Lancet, 359</i> , 1- 1429. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08357-5
	xes R Nduna M Levin J Jama N Dunkle K Puren A Haves (2008) Im
Jewł	
Jewł	of stepping stones on incidence of HIV and HSV-2 and sexual behaviour in rural
Jewł	of stepping stones on incidence of HIV and HSV-2 and sexual behaviour in rural South Africa: Cluster randomised controlled trial. <i>BMJ</i> , <i>337</i> , 391-395.

Jones, D. L., Peltzer, K., Villar-Loubet, O., Shikwane, E., Cook, R., Vamos, S., & Weiss, S.
M. (2013). Reducing the risk of HIV infection during pregnancy among South African women: A randomized controlled trial. *AIDS Care, 25*, 702-709. doi:10.1080/09540121.2013.772280

Kakuma, R., Minas, H., van Ginneken, N., Dal Poz, M. R., Desiraju, K., Morris, J. E., ... Scheffler, R. M. (2011). Human resources for mental health care: Current situation and strategies for action. *Lancet (London, England), 378,* 1654. DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61093-3

- Kim, J., Ferrari, G., Abramsky, T., Watts, C., Hargreaves, J., Morison, L., ... Pronyk, P. (2009). Assessing the incremental effects of combining economic and health interventions: The IMAGE study in South Africa. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 87, 824-832. doi:10.2471/BLT.08.056580
- Kyegombe, N., Abramsky, T., Devries, K. M., Starmann, E., Michau, L., Nakuti, J., ...
 Watts, C. (2014). The impact of SASA!, a community mobilization intervention, on reported HIV-related risk behaviours and relationship dynamics in Kampala, Uganda. *Journal of the International AIDS Society, 17*, 1-16. doi:10.7448/IAS.17.1.19232
- L'Engle, K. L., Mwarogo, P., Kingola, N., Sinkele, W., & Weiner, D. H. (2014). A randomized controlled trial of a brief intervention to reduce alcohol use among female sex workers in Mombasa, Kenya. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes, 67,* 446-453. doi:10.1097/QAI.00000000000335
- Michau, L., Horn, J., Bank, A., Dutt, M., & Zimmerman, C. (2015). Prevention of violence against women and girls: Lessons from practice. *Lancet (London, England)*, 385, 1672-1684. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61797-9

	s, A. M., Donerty, I. A., Kline, I. L., Zule, W. A., Myers, B., Carney, I., &
	Wechsberg, W. M. (2015). Relationship power, communication, and violence among
	couples: Results of a cluster-randomized HIV prevention study in a South African
	township. International Journal of Women's Health, 7, 517.
	doi:10.2147/IJWH.S77398
Mohe	r, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D.G., & The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred
	Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA
	Statement. PLoS Medicine, 6, e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097
Morri	son, A., Ellsberg, M., & Bott, S. (2007). Addressing gender-based violence: A critical
	review of interventions. World Bank Research Observer, 22, 25-51.
	doi:10.1093/wbro/Ikm003
Parces	sepe, A. M., L'Engle, K. L., Martin, S. L., Green, S., Sinkele, W., Suchindran, C.,
	Kingola, N. (2016). The impact of an alcohol harm reduction intervention on
	interpersonal violence and engagement in sex work among female sex workers in
	Mombasa, Kenya: Results from a randomized controlled trial. Drug and Alcohol
	Dependence, 161, 21-28. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.12.037
Pildal	, J., Hróbjartsson, A., Jørgensen, K.J., Hilden, J., Altman, D.G., & Gøtzsche, P.C.
	(2007). Impact of allocation concealment on conclusions drawn from meta-analyses
	of randomized trials. International Journal of Epidemiology. 36: 847-857. doi:
	10.1093/ije/dym087
Porta,	N., Bonet, C., & Cobo, E. (2007). Discordance between reported intention-to-treat and
	per protocol analyses. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 60, 663-669.
	doi:10.1016/i.jclineni.2006.09.013

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tva

Pronyk, P. M., Hargreaves, J. R., Kim, J. C., Morison, L. A., Phetla, G., Watts, C Porter, J.
D. (2006). Effect of a structural intervention for the prevention of intimate-partner
violence and HIV in rural South Africa: A cluster randomised trial. The Lancet, 368,
1973-1983. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(06)69744-4

Shamseer, L., Moher, D., Clarke, M., Ghersi, D., Liberati, A., Petticrew, M., ... PRISMA-P Group. (2015). Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: Elaboration and explanation. *BMJ-British Medical Journal*, 349, g7647. doi:10.1136/bmj.g7647

UNAIDS (2014, July). The Gap Report. Retrieved from

http://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/UNAIDS_Gap_report_en.pdf

- UNDP (n.d.). About Sub-Saharan Africa. Retrieved from http://www.africa.undp.org/content/rba/en/home/regioninfo/
- UN Women. (2013). End Violence Against Women and Girls Programming Essentials, Monitoring & Evaluation. Retrieved from

http://www.endvawnow.org/uploads/modules/pdf/1372349234.pdf

Van Ginneken, N., Tharyan, P., Lewin, S., Rao, G.N., Meera, S.M., Pian, J., ... Patel, V. (2013). Non-specialist health worker interventions for the care of mental, neurological and substance-abuse disorders in low- and middle-income countries. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Review, 11*, Art. No.: CD009149. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD009149.pub2.

Wagman, J. A., Gray, R. H., Campbell, J. C., Thoma, M., Ndyanabo, A., Ssekasanvu, J., ...Brahmbhatt, H. (2015). Effectiveness of an integrated intimate partner violence andHIV prevention intervention in Rakai, Uganda: Analysis of an intervention in an

Trauma, Violence, & Abuse

existing cluster randomised cohort. The Lancet. Global Health, 3, e23-e33.
doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(14)70344-4
Wechsberg, W. M., Jewkes, R., Novak, S. P., Kline, T., Myers, B., Browne, F. A Parry, C.
(2013). A brief intervention for drug use, sexual risk behaviours and violence
prevention with vulnerable women in South Africa: A randomised trial of the
women's health CoOp. BMJ Open, 3, e002622. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-002622
WHO (2010). Preventing intimate partner violence and sexual violence against women:
Taking action and generating evidence. Retrieved from
http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/publications/violence/978924156400
7_eng.pdf
WHO (2013). Global and regional estimates of violence against women: prevalence and
health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence. Geneva:
World Health Organization. Retrieved from
http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/85239/1/9789241564625_eng.pdf
Wood, L., Egger, M., Gluud, L.L., Schulz, K., Jüni, P., Altman, D.G.,, Sterne J.A.C.
(2008). Empirical evidence of bias in treatment effect estimates in controlled trials
with different interventions and outcomes: meta-epidemiological study. BMJ, 336,
601-605. doi:10.1136/bmj.39465.451748.AD
World Bank Group (2014). Voice and agency: Empowering women and girls for shared
prosperity. Retrieved from
http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/document/Gender/Voice_and_ag
ency_LOWRES.pdf



Figure 1. Flow chart of study selection

Trauma, Violence, & Abuse

Author (Publication year)	Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Selective reporting (reporting bias)
Abramsky et al., (2014)						
Falb et al., (2015)						
Green et al., (2015)						
Gupta et al., (2013)						
Hossain et al., (2014)						
Jewkes et al., (2008)						
Jones et al., (2013)						
Kim et al. (2009)						
Kyegombe et al. (2014)						
L'Engle et al. (2014)						
Minnis et al. (2015)						
Parcesepe et al. (2016)						
Pronyk et al. (2006)						
Wagman et al. (2015)						
Wechsberg et al. (2013)						
Key: Red= High risk; Gi	reen= Low ris	k; Amber= U	nclear risk			

Figure 2. Risk of bias summary

Table 1 Theoretical models and interventions

Utary SASA Abaransky et al. (2014) Theory: Designed around the ecological model of violence. Intervention: Promoting critical analysis and discussion of power and power inequities (particularly between men and women) through social diffusion and community mobilisation. People intersettion activities were not stringently prescribed by a developed in response to the community. Due to interruptions, participants had experienced 2.8 years of intervention activities were not stringently prescribed by developed in response to the community. Due to interruptions, participants had experienced 2.8 years of intervention at 4 year follow-up. VSLA + GDG Gupta et al. (2015) Theory: Gender equality (GDG) & conomic empowerment (VSLA). GDG based on Stages of Change constructs of the Transflecentical Model. Intervention: VSLA - groups of 15-30 women contribute to a fand. Members borrow from it and pay back at a small interest rate. On a pay-out date each member receives their savings plus rutum. (DD 5 - long participants and male partners: reflect on financial devices ins and goals, the value of women, respect and communication between men and women, and alternatives to violence. Eight group sessions of 1.5-2.5 hours over 16 weeks separate to the weekly VSLA sessions. WINCS;W+ Theory: Diverty alleviation (WINGS) and engagement with male partners (W+). Intervention: Roverty alleviation (WINGS) and supervision. Four days of training. AVSL staff visited every 6 weeks for 6 nonths. Partner rangement version (Hev) program clients were encouraged to attell training with someone from their household (usually a male partner). One extra day of training involving material on culture, gender, communication, and children, gender equilable beliefs, violence; household roles; and hostility and conflit toustade womete, men, and	Author	Theoretical model & Intervention
SASA! Abramsky et al. (2014) Theory: Designed around the ecological model of violence. Intervention: Promoting critical analysis and discussion of power and power inequities (particularly between men and wormon) through social diffusion and community mobilisation. People interested in issues of power, violence, and rights selected as community activists and underwent training. Analysis of imbalances in power encouraged through informal activities and fostering involvement and activism. The specifics of intervention activities were not stringently prescribed but developed in response to the community. Due to interruptions, participants had experienced 2.8 years of intervention at 4 year follow-up. VSLA + CDG Gupt et al. (2015) Theory: Gender equality (GDG) & economic empowerment (VSLA). GDG based on Stages of Change constructs of the Transtheoretical Model. Fab et al. (2015) Theory: Gender equality (GDG) & economic empowerment (VSLA). GDG based on Stages of Change constructs of the Transtheoretical Model. WINCS;W+ Theory: Powerty alleviation (WINGS) and engagement with male partners dougles, the value of women, respect and communication between men and women, and alternatives to violence. Eight group sessions of 1.5-2.5 hours over 16 weeks separate to the weekly VSLA sessions. WINCS;W+ Theory: Powerty alleviation (WINGS) of dengagement with male partners (W+). Intervention: Influencing inequitable gendered attitudes, behaviours, and expectations among men. MDG: based on Mer & Women In Parnners Based MOG + GBV Programming Theory: Engaging with male partners. Based on social norm theory. Intervention: Influencing inequitable gendered attitudes, behaviours, and expectations formed	(Publication Year)	
Abramsky et al. Theory: Designed around the ecological model of violence. (2014) Intervention: Promoting critical analysis and discussion of power and power inequities (particularly between men and women) through social diffusion and community mobilisation. People interested in issues of power, violence, and rights selected as community activities and discussion of power renormaces in power encouraged through informal activities and fostering involvement and activism. The specifics of intervention activities were not stringently prescribed but developed in response to the community. Due to interruptions, participants had experienced 2.8 years of intervention at 4 year follow-up. VSLA + GDG Gupta et al. Theory: Gender equality (GDG) & econonic empowerment (VSLA), GDG based on Stages of Change constructs of the Transtheoretical Model. (2015) Theory: Gender equality (GDG) & econonic empowerment (VSLA), GDG based on Stages of Change constructs of the Collogic - Long participants and male partners receives their savings plus return. (2015) GGG - Long participants and male partners receives their savings plus return. (2015) GGG - Long participants and male partners receives their savings plus return. (2015) Theory: Poverty alleviation (WINGS) and engagement with male partners. (2014) Theory: Poverty alleviation (WINGS) offering cash to women and encouraging nonfarm businesses. Clients participate in training, information of all-help groups, and supervision. Four days of training. AVSI staff Visited every 6 weeks for 6 months. Partnere neggementevision (W-): program clients were encouraged to atten	SASA!	
Kyegombe et al. (2014) ub developed in response to the community. Due to interruptions, participants had experienced 2.8 years of intervention at 4 year follow-up. VSLA + GDG Gupta et al. (2015) Theory: Gender equality (GDG) & economic empowerment (VSLA). GDG based on Stages of Change constructs of the Transhtoeretical Model. Falb et al. (2015) Theory: Gender equality (GDG) & economic empowerment (VSLA). GDG based on Stages of Change constructs of the Transhtoeretical Model. GDG - Ioon participants and male partners reflect on financial decisions and goals, the value of women, respect and communication between men and women, and alternatives to violence. Eight group sessions of 1.5-2.5 hours over 16 weeks separate to the weekly VSLA sessions. WINGS:W+ Theory: Poverty alleviation (WINGS) and engagement with male partners (W+). Intervention: Poverty alleviation (WINGS): offering eash to women and encouraging nonfarm businesses. Clients participate in training, formation of self-help groups, and supervision. Four days of training. AVSI staff visited every 6 weeks for 6 nomble. Partner engagement version (W+). MDG + GBV Programming Hossain et al. (2014) Theory: Engaging with male partners. Based on social norm theory. Response Theory: Engaging with male partners. Based on social norm theory. Separate but complementary to a community-based GBV prevention programme occurring in both control and intervention arms. One session of 3 hours per week (from: IRC, 2010) Stepping Stome Theory: Cognitive behavioural skill building int	Abramsky et al. (2014)	Theory: Designed around the ecological model of violence. Intervention: Promoting critical analysis and discussion of power and power inequities (particularly between men and women) through social diffusion and community mobilisation. People interested in issues of power, violence, and rights selected as community activists and underwent training. Analysis of imbalances in power encouraged through informal activities and fostering involvement and activism. The specifics of intervention activities were not stringently prescribed
VSLA + GDG Gupta et al. (2013) Theory: Gender equality (GDG) & economic empowerment (VSLA). GDG based on Stages of Change constructs of the Transtheoretical Model. Thervention: VSLA - groups of 15-30 women contribute to a fund. Members borrow from it and pay back at a small interest rate. On a pay-out date each member receives their savings plus return. GDG - Ioan participants and male partners reflect on financial decisions and goals, the value of women, respect and communication between men and women, and alternatives to violence. Eight group sessions of 1.5-2.5 hours over 16 weeks separate to the weekly VSLA sessions. WINCS;W+ Theory: Poverty alleviation (WINGS) and engagement with male partners (W+). (2015) Intervention: Poverty alleviation (WINGS) offering cash to women and encouraging nonfarm businesses. Clients participate in training, formation of self-help groups, and supervision. Four days of training. AVSI staff visited every 6 weeks for 6 months. Partner engagement version (W+) program clients were encouraged to attend training with someone from their household (usually anale partner). One extra day of training involving material on culture, gender, communication, and joint-problem solving. MDG + GBV Programming Theory: Engaging with male partners. Based on social norm theory. Intervention: Influencing inequitable gendered attitudes, behaviours, and expectations among men. MDG: based on Me & Women in Partnership Initiative. 16 week IPV prevention intervention for men. Material on: GBV towards women, men, and children, gender equitable beliefs; violence; household roles; and hostility and conflict management. Separate but complementary to a community-based GBV prevention programme occurring in both control and intervention: 50 hourt H	Kyegombe et al. (2014)	but developed in response to the community. Due to interruptions, participants had experienced 2.8 years of intervention at 4 year follow-up.
Gupta et al. (2013) Theory: Gender equality (GDG) & economic empowerment (VSLA). GDG based on Stages of Change constructs of the (2013) Transheoretical Model. Intervention: VSLA - groups of 15-30 women contribute to a fund. Members borrow from it and pay back at a small interest rate. On a pay-out date each member receives their savings plus return. (3DG - loan participants and male partners reflect on financial decisions and goals, the value of women, respect and communication between men and women, and alternatives to violence. Eight group sessions of 1.5-2.5 hours over 16 weeks separate to the weekly VSLA sessions. WINCS;W+ Theory: Poverty alleviation (WINGS) and engagement with male partners (W+). Intervention: Poverty alleviation (WINGS) and supervision. Four days of training. AVSI staff visited every 6 weeks for 6 months. Partner engagement version (W+): program clients were encouraged to attend training with someone from their household (usually a male partner). One extra day of training involving material on culture, gender, communication, and joint-problem solving. MDG + GBV Programming Theory: Engaging with male partners. Based on social norm theory. Intervention: Influencing inequilable belefs; violence; household roles; and hostility and conflict management. Separate but complementary to a community-based GBV prevention programme occurring in both control and intervention: s0 hour HV prevention programme for men and women, using participatory learning to build knowledge, risk awareness, communication skills, and encourage critical reflection. Delivered to single-sex groups. Thirteen 3 hour sessions with 3 meetings with male and female peer groups and a final community meeting over 6-8 weeks. Material on sexual education, GBV, sexually transmitted diseases and HIV, communication skulls.	VSLA + GDG	
Falb et al. (2015) Intervention: VSLA - groups of 15-30 women contribute to a fund. Members borrow from it and pay back at a small interest rate. On a pay-out date each member receives their savings plus return. GDG - loan participants and male partners reflect on financial decisions and goals, the value of women, respect and communication between men and women, and alternatives to violence. Eight group sessions of 1.5-2.5 hours over 16 weeks separate to the weekly VSLA sessions. WINGS;W+ Theory: Poverty alleviation (WINGS) and engagement with male partners (W+). Intervention: Poverty alleviation (WINGS) offering eash to women and encouraging nonfarm businesses. Clients participate in training, formation of self-help groups, and supervision. Four days of training. AVSI staff visited every 6 weeks for 6 months. Partner engagement version (W+): program clients were encouraged to attend training with someone from their household (usually a male partner). One extra day of training involving material on culture, gender, communication, and joint-problem solving. MDG + GBV Programming Hossain et al. (2014) Theory: Engaging with male partners. Based on social norm theory. Intervention: Influencing inequitable gendered attitudes, behaviours, and expectations among men. MDG: based on Men & Women in Partnership Initiative. Io week IPV prevention intervention for men. Material on: GBV towards women, men, and children; gender equitable beliefs; violence; household roles; and hostility and conflict management. Separate but complementary to a community-based GBV prevention programme occurring in both control and intervention: 30 hour HIV prevention programme for men and women, using participatory learning to build knowledge, risk awareness, communication skills, and encourage critical reflection. Delivered to single-sex groups. Thirteen 3 hour session	Gupta et al. (2013)	Theory: Gender equality (GDG) & economic empowerment (VSLA). GDG based on Stages of Change constructs of the Transtheoretical Model.
WINGS;W+ Green et al. (2015) Theory: Poverty alleviation (WINGS) and engagement with male partners (W+). Intervention: Poverty alleviation (WINGS): offering cash to women and encouraging nonfarm businesses. Clients participate in training, formation of self-help groups, and supervision. Four days of training. AVSI staff visited every 6 weeks for 6 months. Partner engagement version (W+): program clients were encouraged to attend training with someone from their household (usually a male partner). One extra day of training involving material on culture, gender, communication, and joint-problem solving. MDG + GBV Programming Theory: Engaging with male partners. Based on social norm theory. Intervention: Influencing inequitable gendered attitudes, behaviours, and expectations among men. MDG: based on Men & Women in Partnership Initative. I & week IPV prevention intervention for men. Material on: GBV towards women, men, and children; gender equitable beliefs; violence; household roles; and hostility and conflict management. Separate but complementary to a community-based GBV prevention programme occurring in both control and intervention: So hour HIV prevention programme for men and women, using participatory learning to build knowledge, risk awareness, communication skills, and encourage critical reflection. Delivered to single-sex groups. Thirteen 3 hour sessions with 3 meetings with male and female peer groups and a final community meeting over 6-8 weeks. Material on sexual education, GBV, sexually transmitted diseases and HIV, communication skills. PartnerPlus Intervention: 4 week programme of 90-120 min sessions incorporating a prevention of mother-to-child (HIV) transmission intervention, plus skill building to improve communication, sexual negotiation, conflict resolution, STI/HIV prevention, use of condoms, and gender-relevant i	Falb et al. (2015)	Intervention: VSLA - groups of 15-30 women contribute to a fund. Members borrow from it and pay back at a small interest rate. On a pay-out date each member receives their savings plus return. GDG - loan participants and male partners reflect on financial decisions and goals, the value of women, respect and communication between men and women, and alternatives to violence. Eight group sessions of 1.5-2.5 hours over 16 weeks separate to the weekly VSLA sessions.
Green et al. Theory: Poverty alleviation (WINGS) and engagement with male partners (W+). (2015) Intervention: Poverty alleviation (WINGS): offering cash to women and encouraging nonfarm businesses. Clients participate in training, formation of self-help groups, and supervision. Four days of training. AVSI staff visited every 6 weeks for 6 months. Partner engagement version (W+): program clients were encouraged to attend training with someone from their household (usually a male partner). One extra day of training involving material on culture, gender, communication, and joint-problem solving. MDG + GBV Programming Hheory: Engaging with male partners. Based on social norm theory. (2014) Hossain et al. Theory: Engaging with male partners. Based on social norm theory. Intervention: Influencing inequitable gendered attitudes, behaviours, and expectations among men. MDG: based on Men & Women in Partnership Initiative. 16 week IPV prevention intervention for men. Material on: GBV towards women, men, and children; gender equitable beliefs, violence; household roles; and hostility and conflict management. Separate but complementary to a community-based GBV prevention programme occurring in both control and intervention: 30 hour HIV prevention programme for men and women, using participatory learning to build knowledge, risk awareness, communication skills, and encourage critical reflection. Delivered to single-sex groups. Thirteen 3 hour sexions with 3 meetings with male and female peer groups and a final community meeting over 6-8 weeks. Material on secual education, GBV, sexually transmitted diseases and HIV, communication skills. PartnerPlus <td< td=""><td>WINGS;W+</td><td></td></td<>	WINGS;W+	
MDG + GBV Programming Hossain et al. Theory: Engaging with male partners. Based on social norm theory. (2014) Intervention: Influencing inequitable gendered attitudes, behaviours, and expectations among men. MDG: based on Men & Women in Partnership Initiative. 16 week IPV prevention intervention for men. Material on: GBV towards women, men, and children; gender equitable beliefs; violence; household roles; and hostility and conflict management. Separate but complementary to a community-based GBV prevention programme occurring in both control and intervention arms. One session of 3 hours per week (from: IRC, 2010) Stepping Stones Theory: Gender equitable relationships. (2008) Intervention: 50 hour HIV prevention programme for men and women, using participatory learning to build knowledge, risk awareness, communication skills, and encourage critical reflection. Delivered to single-sex groups. Thirteen 3 hour sexual education, GBV, sexually transmitted diseases and HIV, communication skills. Jones et al. Theory: Cognitive behavioural skill building (2013) Intervention: 4 week programme of 90-120 min sessions incorporating a prevention of mother-to-child (HIV) transmission intervention, plus skill building to improve communication, sexual negotiation, conflict resolution, STU/HIV prevention, use of condoms, and gender-relevant issues. Single-sex group sessions of max. 10 participants per group. IMAGE Theory: Poverty focused microfinance and 'Sisters-for-life': Microfinance - groups of 5 women serve as guarantors for each other's loans and must pay them back before applying for more credit. Groups of approximately 40	Green et al. (2015)	Theory: Poverty alleviation (WINGS) and engagement with male partners (W+). Intervention: Poverty alleviation (WINGS): offering cash to women and encouraging nonfarm businesses. Clients participate in training, formation of self-help groups, and supervision. Four days of training. AVSI staff visited every 6 weeks for 6 months. Partner engagement version (W+): program clients were encouraged to attend training with someone from their household (usually a male partner). One extra day of training involving material on culture, gender, communication, and joint-problem solving.
Hossain et al. Theory: Engaging with male partners. Based on social norm theory. (2014) Intervention: Influencing inequitable gendered attitudes, behaviours, and expectations among men. MDG: based on Men & Women in Partnership Initiative. 16 week IPV prevention intervention for men. Material on: GBV towards women, men, and children: gender equitable beliefs; violence; household roles; and hostility and conflict management. Separate but complementary to a community-based GBV prevention programme occurring in both control and intervention arms. One session of 3 hours per week (from: IRC, 2010) Stepping Stones Intervention: 50 hour HIV prevention programme for men and women, using participatory learning to build knowledge, risk awareness, communication skills, and encourage critical reflection. Delivered to single-sex groups. Thirteen 3 hour sessions with 3 meetings with male and female peer groups and a final community meeting over 6-8 weeks. Material on sexual education, GBV, sexually transmitted diseases and HIV, communication skills. PartnerPlus Theory: Cognitive behavioural skill building Intervention: 4 week programme of 90-120 min sessions incorporating a prevention of mother-to-child (HIV) transmission intervention, plus skill building to improve communication, sexual negotiation, conflict resolution, STI/HIV prevention, use of condoms, and gender-relevant issues. Single-sex group sessions of max. 10 participants per group. IMAGE Pronyk et al. Catory: Poverty focused microfinance initiative with gender and HIV education. Participatory learning and action principles. Intervention: IMAGE made up of microfinance and 'Sisters-for-life': Microfinance - groups of 5 women serve as guarantors for each other's loans and must pay	MDG + GBV Pro	ogramming
Stepping Stones Jewkes et al. (2008) Theory: Gender equitable relationships. Intervention: 50 hour HIV prevention programme for men and women, using participatory learning to build knowledge, risk awareness, communication skills, and encourage critical reflection. Delivered to single-sex groups. Thirteen 3 hour sessions with 3 meetings with male and female peer groups and a final community meeting over 6-8 weeks. Material on sexual education, GBV, sexually transmitted diseases and HIV, communication skills. PartnerPlus Jones et al. (2013) Theory: Cognitive behavioural skill building Intervention: 4 week programme of 90-120 min sessions incorporating a prevention of mother-to-child (HIV) transmission intervention, plus skill building to improve communication, sexual negotiation, conflict resolution, STI/HIV prevention, use of condoms, and gender-relevant issues. Single-sex group sessions of max. 10 participants per group. IMAGE Theory: Poverty focused microfinance initiative with gender and HIV education. Participatory learning and action principles. Intervention: IMAGE made up of microfinance and 'Sisters-for-life': Microfinance - groups of 5 women serve as guarantors for each other's loans and must pay them back before applying for more credit. Groups of approximately 40 meet fortnightly; Sisters-for-life program - 2 phases delivered over 12-15 months: ten 1 hour training sessions during	Hossain et al. (2014)	Theory: Engaging with male partners. Based on social norm theory. Intervention: Influencing inequitable gendered attitudes, behaviours, and expectations among men. MDG: based on Men & Women in Partnership Initiative. 16 week IPV prevention intervention for men. Material on: GBV towards women, men, and children; gender equitable beliefs; violence; household roles; and hostility and conflict management. Separate but complementary to a community-based GBV prevention programme occurring in both control and intervention arms. One session of 3 hours per week (from: IRC, 2010)
Jewkes et al. Theory: Gender equitable relationships. (2008) Intervention: 50 hour HIV prevention programme for men and women, using participatory learning to build knowledge, risk awareness, communication skills, and encourage critical reflection. Delivered to single-sex groups. Thirteen 3 hour sessions with 3 meetings with male and female peer groups and a final community meeting over 6-8 weeks. Material on sexual education, GBV, sexually transmitted diseases and HIV, communication skills. PartnerPlus Jones et al. Theory: Cognitive behavioural skill building (2013) Intervention: 4 week programme of 90-120 min sessions incorporating a prevention of mother-to-child (HIV) transmission intervention, plus skill building to improve communication, sexual negotiation, conflict resolution, STI/HIV prevention, use of condoms, and gender-relevant issues. Single-sex group sessions of max. 10 participants per group. IMAGE Theory: Poverty focused microfinance initiative with gender and HIV education. Participatory learning and action principles. Intervention: IMAGE made up of microfinance and 'Sisters-for-life': Microfinance - groups of 5 women serve as guarantors for each other's loans and must pay them back before applying for more credit. Groups of approximately 40 meet fortnightly; Sisters-for-life program - 2 phases delivered over 12-15 months: ten 1 hour training sessions during	Stepping Stones	
PartnerPlus Jones et al. (2013) Theory: Cognitive behavioural skill building Intervention: 4 week programme of 90-120 min sessions incorporating a prevention of mother-to-child (HIV) transmission intervention, plus skill building to improve communication, sexual negotiation, conflict resolution, STI/HIV prevention, use of condoms, and gender-relevant issues. Single-sex group sessions of max. 10 participants per group. IMAGE Theory: Poverty focused microfinance initiative with gender and HIV education. Participatory learning and action principles. Intervention: IMAGE made up of microfinance and 'Sisters-for-life': Microfinance - groups of 5 women serve as guarantors for each other's loans and must pay them back before applying for more credit. Groups of approximately 40 meet fortnightly; Sisters-for-life program - 2 phases delivered over 12-15 months: ten 1 hour training sessions during	Jewkes et al. (2008)	Theory: Gender equitable relationships. Intervention: 50 hour HIV prevention programme for men and women, using participatory learning to build knowledge, risk awareness, communication skills, and encourage critical reflection. Delivered to single-sex groups. Thirteen 3 hour sessions with 3 meetings with male and female peer groups and a final community meeting over 6-8 weeks. Material on sexual education, GBV, sexually transmitted diseases and HIV, communication skills.
Jones et al. (2013) Theory: Cognitive behavioural skill building Intervention: 4 week programme of 90-120 min sessions incorporating a prevention of mother-to-child (HIV) transmission intervention, plus skill building to improve communication, sexual negotiation, conflict resolution, STI/HIV prevention, use of condoms, and gender-relevant issues. Single-sex group sessions of max. 10 participants per group. IMAGE Pronyk et al. (2006) Theory: Poverty focused microfinance initiative with gender and HIV education. Participatory learning and action principles. Intervention: IMAGE made up of microfinance and 'Sisters-for-life': Microfinance - groups of 5 women serve as guarantors for each other's loans and must pay them back before applying for more credit. Groups of approximately 40 meet fortnightly; Sisters-for-life program - 2 phases delivered over 12-15 months: ten 1 hour training sessions during	PartnerPlus	
IMAGE Pronyk et al. Theory: Poverty focused microfinance initiative with gender and HIV education. Participatory learning and action principles. Intervention: IMAGE made up of microfinance and 'Sisters-for-life': Microfinance - groups of 5 women serve as guarantors for each other's loans and must pay them back before applying for more credit. Groups of approximately 40 meet fortnightly; Sisters-for-life program - 2 phases delivered over 12-15 months: ten 1 hour training sessions during	Jones et al. (2013)	Theory: Cognitive behavioural skill building Intervention: 4 week programme of 90-120 min sessions incorporating a prevention of mother-to-child (HIV) transmission intervention, plus skill building to improve communication, sexual negotiation, conflict resolution, STI/HIV prevention, use of condoms, and gender-relevant issues. Single-sex group sessions of max. 10 participants per group.
Pronyk et al. Theory: Poverty focused microfinance initiative with gender and HIV education. Participatory learning and action principles. (2006) Intervention: IMAGE made up of microfinance and 'Sisters-for-life': Microfinance - groups of 5 women serve as guarantors for each other's loans and must pay them back before applying for more credit. Groups of approximately 40 meet fortnightly; Sisters-for-life program - 2 phases delivered over 12-15 months: ten 1 hour training sessions during	IMAGE	
loan meetings, including sessions on gender roles, domestic violence, HIV, and culture. Phase 2 encouraged wider	Pronyk et al. (2006)	Theory: Poverty focused microfinance initiative with gender and HIV education. Participatory learning and action principles. Intervention: IMAGE made up of microfinance and 'Sisters-for-life': Microfinance - groups of 5 women serve as guarantors for each other's loans and must pay them back before applying for more credit. Groups of approximately 40 meet fortnightly; Sisters-for-life program - 2 phases delivered over 12-15 months: ten 1 hour training sessions during loan meetings, including sessions on gender roles, domestic violence, HIV, and culture. Phase 2 encouraged wider
Kim et al. community mobilisation to engage young people and men in participatory learning. Selected women undertake further training and work to address priority issues.	Kim et al. (2009)	community mobilisation to engage young people and men in participatory learning. Selected women undertake further training and work to address priority issues.
Brief Alcohol Intervention	Brief Alcohol Int	ervention
L'Engle et al. Theory: Stages of change and social cognitive health behaviour change theories. (2014) Intervention: 6 monthly counselling sessions, based on WHO Brief Intervention for Alcohol Use (Babor & Higgins-	L'Engle et al. (2014)	Theory: Stages of change and social cognitive health behaviour change theories. Intervention: 6 monthly counselling sessions, based on WHO Brief Intervention for Alcohol Use (Babor & Higgins-
(Parcesepe et al., 2016) Biddle, 2001). One-on-one sessions of 20 mins. Motivational interviewing techniques, goal-setting, increasing self-efficacy, positive feedback and encouragement.	(Parcesepe et al., 2016)	Biddle, 2001). One-on-one sessions of 20 mins. Motivational interviewing techniques, goal-setting, increasing self- efficacy, positive feedback and encouragement.

	Trauma, Violence, & Abuse
Author (Publication Year)	Theoretical model & Intervention
Minnis et al. (2015)	Theory: Equitable gender based power in relationships. Core elements based in feminist and empowerment theories. Intervention: Two 3 hour group sessions delivered one week apart. WHC - Information on sexual behaviours, HIV, relationship power, negotiation, violence and violence strategies. MHC - Similar to WHC, including elements from the Men as Partners program designed to engage men in reducing GBV. CHC - Extends WHC by integrating components from a couples based HIV intervention. Focused on communication, negotiation, gender roles and conflict. Couples practiced exercises in dyads as well as the larger intervention group.
SHARE	
Wagman et al. (2015)	Theory: Ecological framework. Based on stages of change theory. Intervention: 4 years 7 months. Community programme aspect involved HIV services, material on IPV's negative consequences, changing IPV attitudes & behaviours, advocacy, capacity building, community activism, learning materials disseminated, events and campaigns. Brief (5-10 mins) violence prevention intervention offered to all abuse and/or HIV infected females. Men and boys program involved group and one-on-one discussions of concepts of masculinity and its impact on HIV and IPV, alcohol, and conflict resolution (retrieved from Appendix 1 online, Wagr et al., 2015)
WHC	
Wechsberg et al. (2013)	Theory: Grounded in an empowerment framework and feminist theory. Intervention: Four module intervention over 2 sessions with each module lasting approx. 1hour. Included informatio on drug use, sexual behaviours, HIV risk, relationship power, communication, negotiation, violence against women. Delivered to groups of 4-6 women.
Key: CHC= Co Microfinance for Safe Homes and Women's Incom	uples Health CoOp; GBV= Gender Based Violence; GDG= Gender Discussion Groups; IMAGE= Intervention with r AIDS and Gender Equity; MDG= Men's Discussion Groups; MHC= Men's Health CoOP; OR= Odds Ratio; SHARE Respect for Everyone; VSLA= Village Savings and Loans Association; WHC= Women's Health CoOp; WINGS= the Generating Support: W== Women Plue; v/o= version of the second
	http://mc.mapuscriptcentral.com/tua

Table 2 Outcomes from the intervention groups compared to controls

Author (Publication Year)	Characteristics of sample & location	Analysis	Comparison Group	Behaviours	Attitudes
SASA!					
Abramsky et al. (2014)	4 pair matched clusters. Surveys: 1,583 at baseline. 18- 49 y/o, male & females, community members. Mean	Cluster level ITT 4 years post- baseline Adj RR / 95% CI	Active waitlist control	<u>Women's past year :</u> (-)Physical IPV: (0.4 / 0.16-1.39) (-)Sexual IPV: (0.76 / 0.33-1.72)	Acceptability of physical violence by a man against partner: (-) Male attitudes= (0.13 / 0.01-1.15) (-) Female attitudes= (0.54 / 0.38-0.79) Acceptability that a woman can refuse to have sex (with husband): (+) Male attitudes= (1.31 / 1.00-1.70) (+) Female attitudes= (1.28 / 1.07-1.52)
Kyegombe et al. (2014)	age: 27.8 y/o. Kampala, Uganda.			(-) Past year experience of sexual IPV: (0.81 / 0.31-2.10)	(+) Feels able to refuse sex with partner: (1.16 / 1.00 1.35)
VSLA + GDG	-	-	-		
Gupta et al.	981 eligible			Past year Adj OR / 95% CI	β / 95% CI
(2013)	(partnered) women (24 villages) enrolled at baseline.	ITT ≈22 months post- baseline	Group Savings only (VSLA)	 (-) Physical and/or sexual IPV: (0.92 / 0.58-1.47) p=0.72 (-) Physical IPV: (0.69 / 0.3-1.21) p=0.19 (-) Sexual IPV: (0.71 / 0.40-1.25) p=0.24 (-) Economic abuse: (0.39 / 0.25-0.60) p<0.0001 	(-) Justification for wife beating: (-0.97 / -1.66-[- 0.28]) p=0.006 (+) Attitudes towards woman's ability to refuse sex (from husband): (0.10 / -0.19-0.39) p=0.49
	>18 y/o. Mean age 37.7 y/o. North and north-western Côte d'Ivoire.	High adherent (>75% sessions) vs. VSLA ≈22 months post- baseline	-	 (-) Physical and/or sexual IPV: (0.64 / 0.35-1.16) p=0.14 (-) Physical IPV: (0.45 / 0.21-0.94) p=0.04 (-) Sexual IPV: (0.54 / 0.27-1.10) p=0.11 (-) Economic abuse: (0.47 / 0.27-0.81) p=0.01 	(-) Justification for wife beating: (-1.14 / -2.01- [- 0.28]) p=0.01 (+) Woman's ability to refuse sex: (0.12 / -0.24-0.48 p=0.50
		Low adherent (<75% sessions) vs. VSLA ≈22 months post- baseline	-	 (+) Physical and/or sexual IPV: (1.19, 95% CI, 0.69-2.05) p=0.64 (-) Physical IPV: (0.93 / 0.49-1.77) p=0.82 (-) Sexual IPV: (0.85 / 0.44-1.64) p=0.63 (-) Economic abuse: (0.31 / 0.18-0.52) p<0.0001 	(-) Justification for wife beating: (-0.19 / -1.13-0.74) p=0.69 (+) Woman's ability to refuse sex: (0.07 / -0.32-0.46) p=0.72
Falb et al. (2015)	692 included at baseline (those with data on age of marriage). >18 y/o	ITT ≈22 months post- baseline	-	Child brides (past year) • (+) Physical and/or sexual IPV: (1.51 / 0.54-4.20) p=0.42 • (-) Physical IPV: (0.56 / 0.15-2.00) p=0.37 • (+) Sexual IPV: (1.05 / 0.32-3.43) p=0.92 • (+) Emotional IPV: (1.20 / 0.51-2.85) p=0.66	

females. Sub- analysis stratified by those married as child brides. North and north-western Côte d'Ivoire.			 (-) Economic abuse: (0.33 / 0.13-0.85) p=0.02 Non-child brides (past year) (-) Physical and/or sexual IPV: (0.54 / 0.28-1.04) p=0.06 (-) Physical IPV: (0.45 / 0.20-1.01) p=0.05 (-) Sexual IPV: (0.46 / 0.20-1.05) p=0.06 	
Phase 1: 120 clusters			 (-) Emotional IPV: (0.44 / 0.25-0.77) p=0.004 (-) Economic abuse: (0.36 / 0.20-0.66) p=0.001 	
Phase 1: 120 clusters				
(villages) 1,800 participants	ITT ≈20 months post- baseline β / 95% CI	Waitlist control	 <u>Phase 1: WINGS</u> Women (+) Physical/emotional abuse in past 8 months (including a measure of whether women refused sex): (0.02 / -0.1-0.14) (+) Marital control in past 8 months: (0.14 / 0.01-0.27) 	Phase 1: WINGS Perceptions of women's autonomy/rights (+) Men & women: (0.07 / -0.04-0.18) (+) Women only: (0.05 / -0.07-0.17)
Male & female. Average age 27.3. >85% female. Phase 2: 60 clusters (waitlist control from phase 1), 904 participants, male & female. Gulu and Kitgum districts, Usende		Standard programme (WINGS)	Phase 2: W+ Women who had intimate partners (-) Physical/emotional abuse in past 8 months(including a measure of whether women refused sex): (0.08 / -0.2-0.04) (-) Marital control in past 8 months: (-0.07 / -0.26-0.12)	Phase 2: W+ Women who had intimate partners (-) Perceptions of women's autonomy/rights: (-0.01 / 0.22-0.2)
Uganda.				
12 communities. 346 males >15 y/o males and current partners (255) interviewed at	ITT vs. control ≈ 18 months post- baseline Adj RR /	Community- based prevention programme	Women (last 12 months)experience of: (-) Physical and/or sexual IPV: (0.52 / 0.18-1.51) (-) Physical IPV: (0.64 / 0.24-1.73) (-) Sexual IPV: (0.50 / 0.14-1.80) (+) Man uses at least 1 hostility/conflict mgmt. technique and no female partners report him threatening during arguments: (1.30 / 1.06-1.58)	Men: (-) Intention to use physical IPV: (0.83 / 0.66-1.06) (+) Belief a women can refuse sex in all circumstances (from husband): (1.21 / 0.77-1.91)
baseline. Mean age 36.5 y/o. Various rural sites, Côte d'Ivoire.	95% CI Low dose (≤12 sessions) vs. control ≈ 18 months	_	Women (last 12 months) experience of: (-) Physical and/or sexual IPV: (0.59 / 0.18-1.90) (-) Physical IPV: (0.60 / 0.39-0.94) (-) Sexual IPV: (0.70 / 0.18-2.76) (+) Man uses at least 1 hostility/conflict mgmt. technique and no female partners	Men: (-) Intention to use physical IPV: (0.95 / 0.71-1.27) (+) Belief a women can refuse sex in all circumstances (from husband): (1.33 / 0.86-2.07)
	Male & female. Average age 27.3. >85% female. Phase 2: 60 clusters (waitlist control from phase 1), 904 participants, male & female. Gulu and Kitgum districts, Uganda. rogramming 12 communities. 346 males >15 y/o males and current partners (255) interviewed at baseline. Mean age 36.5 y/o. Various rural sites, Côte d'Ivoire.	p / 35 % ClMale & female.Average age27.3. >85%female.Phase 2: 60clusters (waitlistcontrol fromphase 1), 904participants,male & female.Gulu andKitgumdistricts,Uganda.rogramming1212communities.346 males >15y/o males andcurrent partnersinterviewed atbaseline. Meanage 36.5 y/o.Various ruralsites, Côtesessions) $\alpha'Ivoire.xs. control\approx 18monthspost-$	Male & female.Standard programme (WINGS)Average age 27.3. >85% female.Standard programme (WINGS)Phase 2: 60 clusters (waitlist control from phase 1), 904 participants, male & female.WINGS)Phase 2: 60 clusters (waitlist control from phase 1), 904 participants, male & female.Standard programme (WINGS)12ITT vs. control 346 males >15 (255)Community- baseline post- post- gessions)Community- based prevention programme21ITT vs. control baseline interviewed at Adj RR / baseline. Mean age 36.5 y/o.Community- control baseline (≤ 12 sessions) vs. control ≈ 18 months post-	Male & female. Standard Phase 2: W+ Average age 27.3 > 85% programme (WINGS) (WINGS) Phase 2: W+ Phase 2: 60 (WINGS) (-) Physical/emotional abuse in past 8 months (including a measure of whether women refused sex): (0.08 / -0.2-0.04) clusters (waitlist control in past 8 months: (-0.07 / -0.26-0.12) (-) Marital control in past 8 months: (-0.07 / -0.26-0.12) order form phase 1), 904 participants, male & female. (-) Marital control in past 8 months: (-0.07 / -0.26-0.12) Gulu and Kitgum districts, Uganda. Uganda. (-) Physical and/or sexual IPV: (0.52 / 0.18-1.51) rogramming (-) Physical and/or sexual IPV: (0.52 / 0.18-1.51) (-) Sexual IPV: (0.54 / 0.24-1.73) yo males and months post- prevention (-) Sexual IPV: (0.50 / 0.14-1.80) current partners post- (-) Physical and/or sexual IPV: (0.59 / 0.18-1.51) yo males and months post- post- (-) Sexual IPV: (0.50 / 0.14-1.80) urrent partners post- (-) Physical and/or sexual IPV: (0.59 / 0.18-1.50) (+) Man uses at least 1 hostilityconflict mgmt. technique and no female partners report him threatening during arguments: (1.30 / 1.06-1.58) age 36.5 y/o. Low dose Women (last 12 months) experinence of: Yarious rura

Author (Publication Year)	Characteristics of sample & location	Analysis	Comparison Group	Behaviours	Attitudes
		baseline Adj RR / 95% CI High dose (>13 sessions) vs. control Adj RR / 95% CI ≈ 18 months post- baseline	_	 Women (last 12 months) (-) Experience of physical and/or sexual IPV: (0.68 / 0.31-1.49) (-) Experience of physical IPV: (0.90 / 0.31-2.66) (-) Experience of sexual IPV: (0.61 / 0.22-1.68) (+) Man uses at least 1 hostility/conflict mgmt. technique and no female partners report him threatening during arguments: (1.31 / 1.04-1.64) 	<i>Men:</i> (-) Intention to use physical IPV: (0.60 / 0.33-1.06 (+) Belief a women can refuse sex in all circumstances (from husband): (1.03 / 0.62-1.71)
Stepping Ston	es	-	-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Jewkes et al. (2008)	70 clusters (villages). 2776 participants (1360 male and 1416 female), 15-26 y/o, mostly attending schools. Eastern Cape, South Africa.	ITT 12 months/24 months post baseline Adj RR / 95% CI	One three hour session on HIV, safer sex, and condoms.	 >1 incident of physical or sexual IPV in the last 12 months/24 months: (-) <i>Women</i> (receipt): (0.97 / 0.64-1.18, p=0.36)/(1.14 / 0.77-1.68, p=0.51) (-) <i>Men</i> (perpetration): (0.73 / 0.50-1.06, p=0.099)/(0.62 / 0.38-1.01, p=0.054) 	
PartnerPlus	-	-			
Jones et al. (2013)	478 individuals (239 couples) Pregnant women, 18+ y/o, and male partner. Mean age 28.2. Mpumalanga, South Africa.	6-8 weeks post- baseline Mean (SD)/N% n=478 (nominal data) in the past month	PMTCT in time-matched sessions	Past month verbal aggression: Baseline experimental: 94(79%)Past month physical violence: Baseline experimental: 51(43%)Post-intervention experimental: 76(64%) (McNemar's test, p=0.01)Post-intervention experimental: 21(18%) (McNemar's test, p=0.01)Baseline control: 89(74%) Post-intervention control: 84(70%) (McNemar's test, p=0.49)Post-intervention control: 46(38%) (McNemar's test, p=0.1)(-) Calculated: RR= 0.91, 95% CI, 0.8- 1.04, p=0.16(-) Calculated: RR= 0.48, 95% CI, 0.35- 0.65, p<.0001	
IMAGE	-	•	-	· · ·	
Pronyk et al. (2006)	8 clusters (villages). 843 women (or matched	Per- protocol analysis ≈24 months	None	 (-) Past year experience of controlling behaviour by intimate partner:0.80 (0.35-1.83) (-) Past year experience of physical and/or sexual IPV: 0.45 (0.23-0.91) 	 (+) Greater challenge of established gender roles (challenging statements supportive of female subservience): 1.57 (0.87-2.81) (+) More progressive attitudes to IPV (acceptability physical and sexual IPV): 1.49 (0.86-2.60)

Author (Publication Year)	Characteristics of sample & location	Analysis	Comparison Group	Behaviours	Attitudes	
	interviewed at baseline. Mean age: 41.5 (range 33-49). Limpopo, South Africa	baseline Adj RR (95% CI)				
Kim et al. (2009)	12 clusters (villages). 1409, >18 y/o females. Median age: 45. Limpopo, South Africa.	-	1. Micro- finance alone 2. None	Past year experience of controlling behaviour by intimate partner: Past year experience of physical and/or sexual IPV: (+) MF vs control: (1.18, 0.77-1.80) (-) IMAGE vs control: (0.84, 0.38-1.87) (-) IMAGE vs MF: (0.69, 0.35-1.36) (-) IMAGE vs MF: (0.59, 0.09-3.66)	Attitudes condoning IPV (acceptability of physical and sexual IPV) (+) MF vs control: (1.05, 0.81-1.36) (-) IMAGE vs control: (0.73, 0.42-1.27) (-) IMAGE vs MF: (0.67, 0.50-0.90)	
Brief Alcohol	Intervention	-	-			
L'Engle et al. (2014)	818 FSW, >18 residents of Mombasa, moderate risk	ITT Adj RR, 95% CI	Time matched non- alcohol related	<u>Sexual violence from non-paying partners</u> (-) 6 months post-baseline: (0.92 / 0.66-1.29, p=0.69) (-) 12 months post-baseline: (0.76 / 0.53-1.08, p=0.19)		
Parcesepe et al. (2016)	drinkers. Mean age 27.5 y/o. Mombasa, Kenya.	ITT OR, 95% CI	nutrition intervention	Physical violence by non-paying partner past 30 days (-) Immediately post-intervention: (0.64 / 0.38-1.08, p=0.09) (-) 6 months post-intervention: (0.57 / 0.30-1.06, p=0.08)		
WHC; CHC;	WHC/MHC			•		
Minnis et al. (2015)	3 clusters (neighbourhood s). Female partners of 18- 35 y/o male, Black Africans, reporting drinking alcohol, frequenting shebeens and having unprotected sex. 290 women enrolled. Mean age of 24.2 years (range 18- 39 years). K havelitsha	6 months post- enrolment	WHC/ CHC	Woman's influence/control in relationship [Effect estimate (β) (95% Cl)] (+) CHC vs WHC(standard): 0.92 (0.02-1.83) p=0.045 (increased for CHC) (+) MHC/WHC vs WHC(standard): 0.53 (-0.40-1.46) p=0.263 (+) CHC vs MHC/WHC: 0.39 (-0.48-1.27) p=0.379 Shared decision making [Effect estimate (β) (95% Cl)] (-) CHC vs WHC(standard): -0.77 (-1.76-0.21) p=0.124 (+) MHC/WHC vs WHC(standard): 0.69 (-0.32-1.71) p=0.181 (-) CHC vs MHC/WHC: -1.46 (-2.42-[-0.50]) p=0.003 (decreased for CHC) No victimization (verbal/emotional and physical violence and intimidation) experienced in previous 3 months [OR, (95% Cl)] (+) CHC vs WHC(standard): 1.17 (0.64-2.12) p=0.614 (+) MHC/WHC vs WHC(standard): 3.05 (1.55-6.00) p=0.001 (greater increase for MHC/WHC) (+) CHC vs MHC/WHC: 0.38 (0.20-0.74) p=0.004 (greater increase for MHC/WHC)	Less traditional gender roles and female autonomy [Effect estimate (β) (95% CI)] (+) CHC vs WHC(standard): 0.99 (0.07-1.91) p=0.035 (greater increase for for CHC) (+) MHC/WHC vs WHC(standard): 0.77 (-0.18-1.7 p=0.111 (+) CHC vs MHC/WHC: 0.22 (-0.67-1.11) p=0.620	

(Publication Year)	of sample &	Analysis	Comparison Group	Beha	viours	Attitudes
SHARE						
Wagman et al. (2015)	11,448 male & female participants enrolled aged 15-49 y/o. Rakai, Uganda.	ITT aPRR (95% CI) 16 months post- baseline/35 months post- baseline	Standard care HIV services	Women's experience of past-year (+) Emotional (verbal) abuse:1.02 (0.92- 1.14)/0.91 (0.79-1.04) (-) Physical IPV:0.97 (0.85-1.11)/0.79 (0.67-0.92) (+) Sexual IPV:1.12 (0.96-1.31)/0.80 (0.67-0.97) (+) Forced sex:1.12 (0.95-1.32)/0.79 (0.65-0.96)	<u>Men's perpetration of past-year</u> (-) Emotional (verbal) abuse:0.88 (0.78- 0.98)/0.99 (0.85-1.16) (-) Physical IPV:0.80 (0.64-1.00)/1.00 (0.77-1.30) (-) Sexual IPV:0.90 (0.63-1.28)/0.81 (0.52- 1.26) (-/+) Forced sex:1.00 (0.65-1.55)/0.85 (0.50-1.42)	
WHC			-	-		
Wechsberg et al. (2013)	720 drug using females, 18-33 y/o. Cape Town, South Africa.	ITT Adj OR (95% CI) 6 months and 12 months post- baseline	HIV counselling & testing	<u>No Physical IPV in past 6 months:</u> <u>Month 6</u> (+) Control/Nutrition: 1.1 (0.8-1.4) p=0.465 (+) Control/WHC:1.1 (0.8-1.6) p=0.657 (-) Nutrition/WHC: 0.9 (0.7-1.4) p=0.688 <u>Month 12</u> (+) Control/Nutrition: 1.02 (0.8-1.4) p=0.53 (+) Control/WHC: 1.1 (0.8-1.6) p=0.632 (-) Nutrition/WHC: 0.9 (0.7-1.7) p=0.788	5	
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Key: Adj= Adj with Microfina Child Transmis Support; W +=	justed; aPRR = Adju nce for AIDS and G ssion; RR = Relative Women Plus; y/o =	usted Prevalenc ender Equity; I Risk; SHARE years old; β= re	e Risk Ratios; CH TT= Intention to t = Safe Homes and gression coefficies	IC= Couples Health CoOp; CI= Confidence In treat; MDG= Men's Discussion Groups; MF= I Respect for Everyone; VSLA= Village Savin nt; (-/+)= indicates an increase or decrease in t	terval; GBV = Gender Based Violence; GDG = Gender Microfinance; MHC = Men's Health CoOP; OR = Od gs and Loans Association; WHC = Women's Health C he variable in the intervention group compared to cont	er Discussion Groups; IMAGE = Interventior ds Ratio; PMTCT = Prevention of Mother to CoOp; WINGS = Women's Income Generatin trols; ≈ = Approximately. Outcomes in bold
Key: Adj= Adj with Microfinau Child Transmis Support; W+= indicate signific	justed; aPRR = Adju nce for AIDS and G ssion; RR = Relative Women Plus; y/o = y cant results.	usted Prevalenc ender Equity; Ι Risk; SHARE : years old; β= re	e Risk Ratios; CH TT= Intention to t = Safe Homes and gression coefficie	IC= Couples Health CoOp; CI= Confidence In treat; MDG= Men's Discussion Groups; MF= I Respect for Everyone; VSLA= Village Savin nt; (-/+)= indicates an increase or decrease in t	hterval; GBV = Gender Based Violence; GDG = Gender Microfinance; MHC = Men's Health CoOP; OR = Od gs and Loans Association; WHC = Women's Health C he variable in the intervention group compared to cont	er Discussion Groups; IMAGE = Interventior ds Ratio; PMTCT = Prevention of Mother to 20Op; WINGS = Women's Income Generatin trols; ≈ = Approximately. Outcomes in bold
Key: Adj= Adj with Microfinau Child Transmis Support; W+= indicate signific	justed; aPRR = Adju nce for AIDS and G ssion; RR = Relative Women Plus; y/o = <u>y</u> cant results.	usted Prevalenc ender Equity; Ι Risk; SHARE : years old; β = re	e Risk Ratios; CH TT= Intention to to = Safe Homes and gression coefficie	IC= Couples Health CoOp; CI= Confidence In treat; MDG= Men's Discussion Groups; MF= I Respect for Everyone; VSLA= Village Savin nt; (-/+)= indicates an increase or decrease in t	terval; GBV = Gender Based Violence; GDG = Gender Microfinance; MHC = Men's Health CoOP; OR = Od gs and Loans Association; WHC = Women's Health C he variable in the intervention group compared to cont	er Discussion Groups; IMAGE = Intervention ds Ratio; PMTCT = Prevention of Mother to 20Op; WINGS = Women's Income Generatin trols; ≈ = Approximately. Outcomes in bold
Key: Adj= Adj with Microfina Child Transmis Support; W+= indicate signific	justed; aPRR = Adjunce for AIDS and G ssion; RR = Relative Women Plus; y/o = y cant results.	usted Prevalenc iender Equity; Ι Risk; SHARE : years old; β= re	e Risk Ratios; CH TT= Intention to to = Safe Homes and gression coefficie	IC= Couples Health CoOp; CI= Confidence In treat; MDG= Men's Discussion Groups; MF= l Respect for Everyone; VSLA= Village Savin nt; (-/+)= indicates an increase or decrease in t	terval; GBV = Gender Based Violence; GDG = Gender Microfinance; MHC = Men's Health CoOP; OR = Od gs and Loans Association; WHC = Women's Health C he variable in the intervention group compared to cont	er Discussion Groups; IMAGE = Intervention ds Ratio; PMTCT = Prevention of Mother to 20Op; WINGS = Women's Income Generatin trols; ≈ = Approximately. Outcomes in bold
Key: Adj= Adj with Microfinan Child Transmis Support; W+= indicate signific	justed; aPRR = Adju nce for AIDS and G ssion; RR = Relative Women Plus; y/o = <u>y</u> cant results.	usted Prevalenc iender Equity; I Risk; SHARE : years old; β = re	e Risk Ratios; CH TT= Intention to to = Safe Homes and gression coefficie	IC= Couples Health CoOp; CI= Confidence In treat; MDG= Men's Discussion Groups; MF= l Respect for Everyone; VSLA= Village Savin nt; (-/+)= indicates an increase or decrease in t	hterval; GBV = Gender Based Violence; GDG = Gender Microfinance; MHC = Men's Health CoOP; OR = Od gs and Loans Association; WHC = Women's Health C he variable in the intervention group compared to cont	er Discussion Groups; IMAGE = Interventior ds Ratio; PMTCT = Prevention of Mother to 20Op; WINGS = Women's Income Generatin trols; ≈ = Approximately. Outcomes in bold
Key: Adj= Adj with Microfinau Child Transmis Support; W+= indicate signific	justed; aPRR = Adju nce for AIDS and G ssion; RR = Relative Women Plus; y/o = <u>y</u> cant results.	usted Prevalenc iender Equity; I Risk; SHARE years old; β = re	e Risk Ratios; CH TT= Intention to t = Safe Homes and gression coefficie	IC= Couples Health CoOp; CI= Confidence In treat; MDG= Men's Discussion Groups; MF= l Respect for Everyone; VSLA= Village Savin nt; (-/+)= indicates an increase or decrease in t	hterval; GBV = Gender Based Violence; GDG = Gender Microfinance; MHC = Men's Health CoOP; OR = Od gs and Loans Association; WHC = Women's Health C he variable in the intervention group compared to cont	er Discussion Groups; IMAGE = Interventior ds Ratio; PMTCT = Prevention of Mother to 20Op; WINGS = Women's Income Generatin trols; ≈ = Approximately. Outcomes in bold
Key: Adj= Adj with Microfinau Child Transmis Support; W+= indicate signific	justed; aPRR = Adjunce for AIDS and G ssion; RR = Relative Women Plus; y/o = <u>y</u> cant results.	usted Prevalenc ender Equity; I Risk; SHARE : years old; β= re	e Risk Ratios; CH TT= Intention to t = Safe Homes and gression coefficie	IC= Couples Health CoOp; CI= Confidence In treat; MDG= Men's Discussion Groups; MF= l Respect for Everyone; VSLA= Village Savin nt; (-/+)= indicates an increase or decrease in t	hterval; GBV = Gender Based Violence; GDG = Gender Microfinance; MHC = Men's Health CoOP; OR = Od gs and Loans Association; WHC = Women's Health C he variable in the intervention group compared to cont	er Discussion Groups; IMAGE = Interventior ds Ratio; PMTCT = Prevention of Mother to 'oOp; WINGS = Women's Income Generatin trols; ≈ = Approximately. Outcomes in bold
Key: Adj= Adj with Microfinau Child Transmis Support; W+= indicate signific	justed; aPRR = Adju nce for AIDS and G ssion; RR = Relative Women Plus; y/o = <u>y</u> cant results.	usted Prevalenc ender Equity; I Risk; SHARE : years old; β= re	e Risk Ratios; CH TT= Intention to t = Safe Homes and gression coefficie	IC= Couples Health CoOp; CI= Confidence In treat; MDG= Men's Discussion Groups; MF= I Respect for Everyone; VSLA= Village Savin nt; (-/+)= indicates an increase or decrease in t	hterval; GBV = Gender Based Violence; GDG = Gender Microfinance; MHC = Men's Health CoOP; OR = Od gs and Loans Association; WHC = Women's Health C he variable in the intervention group compared to cont	er Discussion Groups; IMAGE = Interventior ds Ratio; PMTCT = Prevention of Mother to 'oOp; WINGS = Women's Income Generatin trols; ≈ = Approximately. Outcomes in bold
Key: Adj= Adj with Microfinau Child Transmis Support; W+= indicate signific	justed; aPRR = Adju nce for AIDS and G ssion; RR = Relative Women Plus; y/o = <u>y</u> cant results.	usted Prevalenc ender Equity; I Risk; SHARE years old; β= re	e Risk Ratios; CH TT= Intention to t = Safe Homes and gression coefficie	IC= Couples Health CoOp; CI= Confidence In treat; MDG= Men's Discussion Groups; MF= I Respect for Everyone; VSLA= Village Savin nt; (-/+)= indicates an increase or decrease in t	nterval; GBV = Gender Based Violence; GDG = Gende Microfinance; MHC = Men's Health CoOP; OR = Od gs and Loans Association; WHC = Women's Health C he variable in the intervention group compared to cont	er Discussion Groups; IMAGE = Interventior ds Ratio; PMTCT = Prevention of Mother to 20Op; WINGS = Women's Income Generatin trols; ≈ = Approximately. Outcomes in bold
Key: Adj= Adj with Microfinau Child Transmis Support; W+= indicate signific	justed; aPRR = Adju nce for AIDS and G ssion; RR = Relative Women Plus; y/o = <u>y</u> cant results.	usted Prevalenc ender Equity; I Risk; SHARE : years old; β= re	e Risk Ratios; CH TT= Intention to t = Safe Homes and gression coefficie	IC= Couples Health CoOp; CI= Confidence In treat; MDG= Men's Discussion Groups; MF= l Respect for Everyone; VSLA= Village Savin nt; (-/+)= indicates an increase or decrease in t	hterval; GBV = Gender Based Violence; GDG = Gende Microfinance; MHC = Men's Health CoOP; OR = Od gs and Loans Association; WHC = Women's Health C he variable in the intervention group compared to cont	er Discussion Groups; IMAGE = Interventior ds Ratio; PMTCT = Prevention of Mother to 'oOp; WINGS = Women's Income Generatin trols; ≈ = Approximately. Outcomes in bold

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
/		
ð 0		
9 10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31 32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41 42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51 E2		
52 52		
55 54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		

Implicatio	ns for research and practice				
	Varying outcomes according to participants' gender suggest that the mechanisms driving				
Research	these results need to be more closely examined in order for future interventions to engage				
	men and women in the most beneficial way to reduce IPV. The results from these studies				
	suggested that engaging men did not necessarily lead to more beneficial outcomes.				
	Innovative research should investigate ways of effectively addressing sexual IPV through				
	preventative interventions in these contexts.				
	Efforts should be made to use standardised conceptualisations and measurements of IPV				
	in future research.				
	The study outcomes suggest that there are differences in how amenable certain types of				
	IPV are to change. Sexual IPV appears to be more difficult to change compared to				
	physical IPV, while less physically controlling behaviours, and economic abuse may be				
	more amenable to change.				
	Interventions yielding more significant and large effects tended to work at the community				
	level or at multiple levels of the social ecology, consistent with the ecological model of				
	violence. They also tended to have longer follow-up times, and their primary aim was				
	IPV reduction. Microfinance programmes alone do not suffice to address IPV, and may				
Practice	increase controlling behaviours.				
	While fewer studies included measures of attitude change, those that had successful				
	changes in attitudes used an integrated approach involving the whole community, or				
	involved couples working together. In cases where the intervention involved a				
	microfinance aspect, work with couples had to specifically address finance issues.				
	Some studies with successful IPV-related outcomes used previously untrained lay persons				
	to deliver interventions. These examples show that previously untrained lay persons can				
	be successfully utilised to deliver interventions in a cost-effective way which is an				
	important factor in low resource settings.				

1 2 3 4 5 6	
7 8 9	#
10 11 12 13	#
14 15 16	#
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	#
24 25	#
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	
44 45 46 47	
. /	

Appendix A Search terms used for 'Web of Science' database

4	45	#4 AND #3 AND #2 AND #1
1	+3	DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;
#	<i>‡</i> 4	TOPIC: ((randomi?ed-controlled-trial*) OR (RCT) OR (controlled NEAR/2 (trial OR study)) OR (non-controlled NEAR/2 (trial OR study)) OR (uncontrolled trial) OR Evaluation OR (outcome assessment) OR ((treatment OR intervention) NEAR/2 (efficacy OR effectiveness)) OR (clinical NEAR/2 (trial OR study)) OR (quasi-experimental) OR (randomly-selected)) <i>DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;</i>
#	#3	TOPIC: (((abus* OR violen*) NEAR/3 (partner OR spous* OR husband OR wife OR marital OR couple OR domestic)) OR (battered wom?n)) DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;
#	‡2	TOPIC: ("sub-Saharan Africa" OR Angola OR Gabon OR Nigeria OR Benin OR Gambia OR Rwanda OR Botswana OR Ghana OR "Sao Tome and Principe" OR "Burkina Faso" OR Guinea OR Senegal OR Burundi OR Guinea-Bissau OR Seychelles OR Cameroon OR Kenya OR Sierra Leone OR Cape Verde OR Lesotho OR South Africa OR Central African Republic OR Liberia OR South Sudan OR Chad OR Madagascar OR Swaziland OR Comoros OR Malawi OR Tanzania OR Democratic Republic Congo OR Mali OR Togo OR Congo OR Mauritania OR Uganda OR Cote dIvoire OR Mauritius OR Zambia OR Equatorial Guinea OR Mozambique OR Zimbabwe OR Eritrea OR Namibia OR Ethiopia OR Niger) <i>DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;</i>
#	<i>‡</i> 1	TOPIC: (interven*) OR TOPIC: (prevent*) OR TOPIC: (program*) DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;
		Ch