

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

**Individual Participant Data Network Meta-analysis of psychosocial interventions for survivors  
of intimate partner violence: Study protocol**

**Authors:** Christina Palantza [christina.palantza@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:christina.palantza@bristol.ac.uk)<sup>1</sup>, Karen Morgan  
[karen.morgan@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:karen.morgan@bristol.ac.uk)<sup>1</sup>, Nicky J. Welton [nicky.welton@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:nicky.welton@bristol.ac.uk)<sup>1</sup>, Hannah M.  
Micklitz [hannah.micklitz@psychologie.uni-freiburg.de](mailto:hannah.micklitz@psychologie.uni-freiburg.de)<sup>2</sup>, Lasse B. Sander  
[lasse.sander@mps.uni-freiburg.de](mailto:lasse.sander@mps.uni-freiburg.de)<sup>2</sup>, Gene Feder [gene.feder@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:gene.feder@bristol.ac.uk)<sup>1</sup>

- 1. Bristol Medical School, Department of Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol,  
Bristol, United Kingdom*
- 2. Medical Psychology and Medical Sociology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Freiburg,  
Freiburg, Germany*

## ABSTRACT

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

Many systematic reviews and meta-analyses have been conducted in the field of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) and the evidence shows small to moderate effect sizes in improving mental health. However, there is considerable heterogeneity due to great variation in participants, interventions and contexts. It is therefore important to establish which participant and intervention characteristics affect the different psychosocial outcomes in different contexts. Individual Participant Network Meta-analysis (IPDNMA) is a gold-standard method to estimate the effects with the highest precision possible and estimate moderating effects, compare the effectiveness of the different interventions and thus answer the question of which intervention is best-suited for whom. We will conduct an IPDNMA of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of psychosocial interventions for IPV survivors aimed at improving mental health, well-being, risk-lowering and intervention acceptability outcomes compared to any type of control (PROSPERO registration number: CRD42023488502). We aim to establish a collaboration with the authors of the eligible RCT, to obtain and to harmonise the Individual Participant Data of the trials, and conduct an one-stage IPDNMA will be conducted under a Bayesian framework using the multinma package in R, after testing which characteristics of the participants and interventions are effect modifiers. There are however inherent limitations of IPDMAs, such as depending on data availability and missing nuancing through the harmonisation of variables. We aim to address these possibly by creating pseudo-IPD and sensitivity analyses. This approach is novel in the field and it can inform more efficient clinical and policy-related decision making.

## 38 **Introduction**

39           The term Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) covers all forms of aggression towards a current or  
40 former intimate partner, including psychological, physical, sexual, or coercive controlling behaviours  
41 (1). One of the most severely impacted aspects is the mental health of the survivors (2); in fact mental  
42 disorders are more common among both men and women involved in IPV than in the general  
43 population (3). The course of IPV is intertwined with the course of mental distress (4). IPV is a  
44 worldwide public health issue (5), and it has highly adverse outcomes for victims/survivors,  
45 perpetrators and children (6,7,8). IPV was further exacerbated during the COVID-19 pandemic (9).  
46 This increase has been consistently associated with a generally well-established risk factor for IPV,  
47 which is financial strain (10,11). Therefore, it is likely to continue rising during the current cost of  
48 living crisis, which is affecting many regions around the world (12), and non-governmental  
49 organisations working with survivors are already reporting the negative impact of the crisis (13).  
50 There is thus a heightened necessity for efficient services that are targeted to meet individuals' needs  
51 by utilising only the resources that are needed.

52           Despite the heightened need, psychosocial care for survivors appears inadequate both in terms  
53 of accessibility and quality (14). The psychosocial interventions tested in research settings show some  
54 potential (15), but effect sizes are rather small (i.e. Standardised Mean Difference of -0.15 to -0.26) for  
55 major psychological outcomes such as depression, or inconsistent across reviews for safety and re-  
56 victimisation, and both clinical and statistical heterogeneity of the intervention effects are high  
57 (15,16). This could be attributed to heterogeneous populations (17). Moreover, the quality of the  
58 evidence is questionable, as many studies do not use optimal design (18), and those that do have not  
59 reported all necessary information sufficiently (16). In addition, many important aspects, such as long-  
60 term effects, harms, and differential effects for survivors with different characteristics from different  
61 contexts remain unanswered, despite the indications towards considerable impact of these differences  
62 (16,18). This is particularly problematic, because the survivors are indeed quite diverse and come from  
63 different contexts (e.g. staying with the perpetrator, staying in a shelter, co-parenting with the  
64 perpetrator) indicating different needs from psychosocial support (19).

65 Micklitz and colleagues categorised the tested psychosocial interventions into three main  
66 categories: psychological, advocacy-oriented and integrated (a combination of the two). Psychological  
67 interventions are psychotherapeutic interventions that employ cognitive, behavioural or emotion-  
68 focused techniques, and are usually delivered by a therapist through talking. Advocacy interventions  
69 could be summarised as advice on practical matters and continued support and counselling, enhanced  
70 access to other resources such as shelters, and facilitated safety planning (17). A realist review of  
71 advocacy interventions highlighted the critical impact of the nuances both among survivors and  
72 contexts, and the importance of matching the intervention to the survivor's context and needs (17).  
73 However, the hypotheses were not tested statistically, and there was considerable variation among  
74 interventions, that was not examined quantitatively. The heterogeneity of interventions has not  
75 allowed conclusions on the effectiveness to be drawn for large groups of survivors, such as mothers  
76 (20) and also blurs the evidence on certain types of interventions (21). This might also explain the  
77 contradictory evidence on effectiveness of web-based interventions (22,23). There are indications that  
78 all types of interventions have effects up to an extent for some of the possible outcomes (24), but these  
79 effects should be investigated in further detail.

80 A methodological approach that is well-suited for investigating such nuances in terms of  
81 population and intervention, is Individual Participant Data meta-analysis (IPDMA). This form of  
82 meta-analysis pools individual level data instead of the aggregate data from the existing studies, by  
83 requesting the datasets with the raw data from each eligible study and combining them all into one  
84 harmonised dataset (25). Meta-analyses of aggregate data are limited to the outcomes reported in  
85 publications and rely on study-level moderators lacking statistical power and are vulnerable to  
86 ecological bias (26). IPDMA overcomes these limitations by allowing outcomes and effect modifiers  
87 to be comparable across studies, enabling testing and adjusting for various within and between study  
88 moderators, both participant and intervention-related, to establish the effect sizes for different  
89 interventions and survivors (26,27,28). Importantly IPDMA has increased statistical power compared  
90 to the original studies by pooling effects. This way, the findings of (29) that participant and  
91 counselling characteristics have differential impact will be further elucidated.

92           Given the limited resources of health systems (30) and the different interventions tested for  
93 IPV (16), it is promising to compare the efficacy of different interventions, and identify the best-suited  
94 intervention for an individual based on their characteristics and context. A method that compares  
95 multiple different interventions and ranks their efficacy is Network Meta-analysis (NMA) (31). This is  
96 achieved by forming a network of all the interventions that have been tested for an outcome and  
97 integrating direct and indirect evidence from direct comparisons of interventions (i.e. compared in the  
98 same trial) with indirect ones (i.e. two interventions have not been tested in the same trial, but they  
99 were tested against the same control condition), thus allowing for estimation of relative effects of pairs  
100 of interventions and hierarchical ranking (32). The key assumption is that all included studies do not  
101 differ in terms of factors that could impact the relative effects (32). An issue can be  
102 inconsistency/imprecision, which occurs when the direct and indirect evidence give contradictory  
103 results, and the use of IPD can help with increasing precision and validity of the estimates (33).  
104 Individual Patient Data Network Meta-analysis (IPDNMA), which combines IPDMA to explore  
105 individual and study-level moderators, and NMA to compare multiple interventions, provides the tools  
106 to compare different interventions for different populations (34).

## 107 **Aim and research questions**

108           We will conduct an IPDNMA, an aggregate data network meta-analysis (NMA), a  
109 conventional meta-analysis, and an IPDMA of the overall efficacy of psychosocial interventions, to  
110 provide reliable and robust estimates of interventions and to examine which psychosocial intervention  
111 suits individual IPV survivors best to improve psychosocial and safety outcomes. More specifically  
112 the following research questions will be answered:

- 113           1. What is the overall efficacy and acceptability of psychosocial interventions in mental health  
114           and safety of IPV victims/survivors (conventional meta-analysis)?
- 115           2. What is the precise overall efficacy and acceptability of psychosocial interventions in  
116           achieving clinically relevant improvement or deterioration in the mental health and safety of  
117           IPV victims/survivors (IPDMA)?

- 118 3. Which psychosocial intervention is comparatively the most effective and acceptable in  
119 improving mental health and safety of IPV victims/survivors (NMA)?
- 120 4. Which victim/survivor and intervention characteristics moderate the efficacy and acceptability  
121 of psychosocial interventions in improving mental health and safety of IPV victims/survivors  
122 (IPDMA)?
- 123 5. Which victim/survivor and intervention characteristics moderate the comparative effectiveness  
124 and acceptability of each different psychosocial intervention in improving mental health and  
125 safety of IPV victims/survivors (IPDNMA)?

## 126 **Materials and Methods**

### 127 **Design**

128 This study aims to provide more precise and less biased estimates of the clinically relevant  
129 benefits and harms, as well as moderators to that, of each type of psychosocial intervention  
130 comparatively by obtaining the IPD of the studies to enable exploration and adjustment of effect  
131 modifiers. For these purposes, an IPDNMA will be conducted, and also a conventional meta-analysis,  
132 an aggregate data network meta-analysis, and an individual participant data meta-analysis, to compare  
133 the results and investigate the differences. The study is an update and extension of the systematic  
134 review of Micklitz and colleagues.

### 135 **Protocol registration**

136 The study protocol has been preregistered on PROSPERO (CRD42023488502) and a project  
137 has been created on the Open Science Framework  
138 [https://osf.io/72uwe/?view\\_only=1ba290a378514c3a929d7eac035bfd67](https://osf.io/72uwe/?view_only=1ba290a378514c3a929d7eac035bfd67). The Preferred Reporting  
139 Items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) statements for systematic review protocols  
140 (PRISMA-P) (35) are followed (see appendix).

### 141 **Eligibility criteria**

142 The eligibility criteria based on the PICO (Participants, Interventions, Comparators and  
143 Outcomes) are listed in Table 1.

144 **Table 1. Eligibility criteria by PICO**

<b>Participants</b>	Individuals or couples reporting either past or ongoing IPV at randomisation, but studies solely on those involved in perpetration are excluded
<b>Interventions</b>	Psychosocial interventions aimed at IPV survivors using any mode of delivery at any setting. Both psychotherapeutic and advocacy interventions are deemed as psychosocial. Interventions aimed solely at perpetrators, primary prevention to individuals who have not experienced IPV at baseline, non-psychological risk factors such as sexual behaviour or financial situation, and physical safety (such as being in a refuge/shelter and police interventions) are not included.
<b>Comparators</b>	All comparators are eligible, including no intervention, waiting list, Treatment as Usual (TAU), another active intervention, placebo or sham version of the intervention. The interventions will be categorised and classified into nodes of the network based on their description regardless of whether they were tested as control or active condition in the original studies.
<b>Outcomes</b>	Eligible outcomes are all outcomes related to mental health and well-being (e.g. depression, quality of life).

145

146 Only randomised controlled trials (RCTs) are eligible for inclusion, including pilot RCTs and studies  
147 with few participants, as they will be merged with larger studies testing a similar intervention. All  
148 papers published in peer-reviewed journals are eligible, as well as protocols and trial registrations in  
149 case the authors already have data that they can provide. No language or publication date restrictions  
150 are applied.

## 151 **Identification of studies-information sources**

152 A search strategy with keywords and phrases such as “intimate partner violence” and  
153 “psychotherapy” will be used to search the Web of Science database from inception to late November  
154 2023 (see appendix for full search string). This search strategy was used by Micklitz and colleagues,  
155 so an update of their search will be performed in the databases they searched (PsycINFO, Medline,  
156 Embase, and Cochrane Central). Clinical trial registries will be searched, and forward and backward  
157 search will be performed.

## 158 **Study selection process**

159 Two independent researchers will screen the titles and abstracts. All completed studies  
160 included in the systematic review of Micklitz et al will be included. The authors of all the protocols  
161 and trial registrations identified by Micklitz and colleagues will be contacted to find out whether data  
162 are available, and if they agree to share their data, they will be offered co-authorship of the  
163 publications derived from the study. If the studies or protocols included at this stage have been  
164 published, the full text will be screened by the two independent researchers. In the case of trial  
165 registrations, the complete registrations will be screened by the two independent researchers, or a  
166 detailed description will be requested from the principal investigators of the studies. In case of  
167 disagreement between the two researchers, a third, senior member of the team will be consulted. The  
168 screening and inclusion of abstracts and full texts will be done using Rayyan (36).

## 169 **Ethical considerations**

170 Since this type of study is essentially a secondary analysis of existing data, it does not need to  
171 be ethically approved. However, the trialists of the eligible RCTs are responsible for the ethical re-use  
172 of the data they collected, so it is up to them to either consult their local Ethical Review Boards and  
173 possibly to submit this re-use for ethical approval, or to request us to sign a Data Sharing Agreement  
174 with them. The secure handling of this sensitive type of data is described in the following section  
175 “Data Management”.

## 176 **Data management**



177 A collaborative project will be created on the Research Data Storage Facility of the University  
178 of Bristol, managed by GF and accessible to the rest of the authors. The data can be uploaded to that  
179 space by the authors of the primary studies. This cloud is compliant with the General Data Protection  
180 Regulation. In case the authors face unresolvable issues with this cloud, secure sharing links to a  
181 private folder at the institutional OneDrive of CP will be generated. As soon as the data have been  
182 uploaded, they will be saved directly in the RDSF and removed from OneDrive. The data will be  
183 copied to the university-managed and password protected device of CP for analysis. Since the data are  
184 sensitive, a Data Protection Impact Assessment will be performed.

## 185 **Data extraction of study characteristics and aggregate data**

186 The study characteristics to be extracted in a spreadsheet are: author, publication year, citation,  
187 country, recruitment setting, trial setting, number of trial arms, number of follow-ups, timing of  
188 follow-ups, timing of post-treatment, primary and secondary outcomes, type of randomisation, unit of  
189 allocation, method of randomisation, sample size in total and in each arm, treatment and study  
190 dropout, intention-to-treat or per-protocol analysis, age, gender, current frequency and/or severity of  
191 IPV, past frequency and/or severity of IPV, specific target population, eligibility criteria, description  
192 of intervention, theoretical orientation, delivery mode, type of therapists/facilitators, number and  
193 duration of sessions, frequency of sessions, description of control. The characteristics and aggregate  
194 data extracted by Micklitz et al (16) will be used.

## 195 **Data collection**

196 The corresponding authors of eligible studies will be emailed and invited to share the  
197 individual-level data of their study. The most recent email address of the author will be sought. If  
198 necessary, a reminder will be sent after three weeks and six weeks. If unreachable, the same process  
199 will be followed for the senior author of the study. If no valid email address of neither the  
200 corresponding nor the senior author can be found, social networking websites such as ResearchGate  
201 and LinkedIn will be used to reach the authors, and the same number of reminders will be sent if  
202 necessary. The IPD will be deemed unavailable if no response is received after three weeks of the

203 second reminder to the senior author (12 weeks in total). After authors have accepted to share the IPD,  
204 there is no specific time limit to send the data.

## 205 **Data items**

206 It is expected that not all eligible studies have collected data on all possible moderating  
207 characteristics, such as income level, and in such a multifaceted issue, there can be various potentially  
208 impactful variables. Therefore, the complete datasets will be requested including baseline and all  
209 available follow-ups, with an exception for variables that could lead to the identification of a  
210 participant and violate anonymity.

## 211 **Data harmonisation**

212 A standard coding of the characteristics of participants will be established based on the  
213 operationalisation used by the majority of the studies and the data of each individual study will be  
214 recoded accordingly. We currently propose the operationalisation below, but the final one will depend  
215 on the data. If a study has not collected any data on some of the listed demographic or socio-economic  
216 characteristics, this will be taken into account in the quality assessment.

- 217 1. Biological sex: female/male/intersex
- 218 2. Gender identity: cisgender/transgender/gender non-conforming
- 219 3. Sexual orientation: heterosexual/homosexual/bisexual/other
- 220 4. Age at baseline: continuous variable
- 221 5. Relationship status: being in a relationship/not being in a relationship/not sure
- 222 6. Cohabitation status: cohabiting with partner/non-cohabiting with partner
- 223 7. Parenthood: parent living with children/parent having some contact with their children/ parent  
224 having no contact with their children/non-parent
- 225 8. Education: Uneducated / Primary education/ Secondary education/ Tertiary education/Other
- 226 9. Employment status: student/employed/unemployed seeking employment/unemployed not  
227 seeking/retired or disability

- 228 10. Income level: OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) quintiles
- 229 11. Ethnicity: categorical variable with the respective ethnicities in the respective country/trial
- 230 12. Presence of psychiatric/developmental disorder
- 231 13. Presence of history of abuse in the family
- 232 14. Presence of substance dependence

233 The data from different validated scales will be divided by the standard deviation. If a study uses more  
234 than one scale for the same outcome, these scales will be combined in a sort of “within-study-  
235 synthesis”. If any scale on characteristics of the therapists, such as level of empathy, is available, it  
236 will be used.

### 237 **IPD integrity**

238 In order to check the integrity of the data received, a replication of the summary statistics and  
239 main analysis of each study will be attempted by two researchers, and if it fails, the authors will be  
240 asked for clarification. In addition, conventional MA with the aggregate data will be performed to  
241 replicate the existing findings, and the statistical package that we will use (multinma) accounts for  
242 differences by IPD availability status. More details are provided in the statistical analysis section.

### 243 **Risk of bias and quality assessment**

244 The risk of bias of the studies will be assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias Assessment  
245 2.0 (37), which assesses bias arising from the randomization process, bias due to deviations from the  
246 intended interventions, bias due to missingness of outcome data, bias in the measurement of outcome,  
247 and bias due to selective reporting of outcomes. Publication or small sample bias will be examined  
248 through visual inspection of the funnel plots for each outcome. The overall quality of the evidence will  
249 be assessed with the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation  
250 (GRADE)—Guidelines (38), which, apart from the risk of bias, assesses inconsistency, indirectness,  
251 imprecision and overall quality of the evidence. These assessments will be performed by two  
252 independent researchers and disagreements will be resolved through discussion with a third more

253 senior researcher. For the studies already assessed by Micklitz and colleagues (16), the domains of  
254 bias arising from missing data and selective outcome reporting will be revisited in case the IPD can  
255 elucidate previously unclear points. Publication bias will be assessed through a funnel plot and  
256 Egger's test.

## 257 **Categorisation of interventions and control conditions**

258 Based on the work of Micklitz and colleagues, the interventions that have been tested so far  
259 can be categorised into the following nodes:

- 260 1. Advocacy interventions: interventions based on the empowerment theory of Dutton (39) and  
261 the stages of change model (40), where facilitators use non-directive techniques such as  
262 motivational interviewing to guide the survivors to reach specialised services (also legal and  
263 financial ones), and to establish a safety plan
- 264 2. Integrative interventions: interventions combining the elements of the advocacy interventions  
265 with those of the psychological ones, including safety planning
- 266 3. Cognitive behavioural interventions: psychological interventions employing cognitive and  
267 behavioural techniques, such as cognitive restructuring
- 268 4. Third wave therapies: psychological interventions with more targeted cognitive approaches,  
269 such as mindfulness
- 270 5. Systemic interventions: family or couple based psychological interventions
- 271 6. Other psychological interventions: other psychological approaches tested by a small number  
272 of studies, such as interpersonal, humanistic or mindfulness/mediation based

273 The control conditions are expected to be categorised for the NMA as follows, unless different clusters  
274 of control conditions with common elements appear in the final set of eligible studies:

- 275 1. Waiting list
- 276 2. No intervention
- 277 3. Information on services
- 278 4. Referral to services

- 279 5. Active psychiatric care
- 280 6. Contact
- 281 7. Community care
- 282 8. Support groups
- 283 9. Hotlines

284 However, small changes might be made depending on the elements included in the control conditions  
285 of the included studies.

## 286 **Outcomes and effect measures**

287 There is a vast array of psychosocial, risk lowering and safety-behaviour outcomes of interest  
288 tested by the primary studies, which is not ideal to establish the effectiveness of interventions with  
289 certainty, but it is the reality of the field (41). Psychosocial interventions use primarily psychological  
290 techniques that target mental health symptoms (16). So, in our study, the primary outcomes are some  
291 of the most commonly measured psychological distress symptoms of

- 292 1. depression
- 293 2. anxiety
- 294 3. PTSD

295 The secondary psychosocial outcomes are: suicidal ideation, substance use, perceived self-  
296 efficacy, self-esteem, quality of life, social support, decisional conflict, empowerment, space for  
297 action, all as scores in validated self- or clinician-rated scales, clinical interviews, or composites of  
298 scales. The main timepoint is post-treatment, but all available follow-ups will be extracted, and if there  
299 is sufficient homogeneity in the timing of follow-ups, analyses will be conducted.

300 Additionally, the risk-lowering outcomes are: continuation of frequency/intensity of IPV, as a  
301 whole (using the total scores of scales), and also the subtypes of psychological, physical, sexual abuse  
302 and coercive control separately when available (as scores on subscales), which will all be  
303 operationalised continuously as scores on validated (sub)scales. Safety-related behaviours will be

304 examined only if there is not too much heterogeneity in the definition and operationalisation of this  
305 outcome by the primary studies.

306 It is also interesting to investigate the effects of the interventions on service use, and  
307 acceptability of the interventions. Service use will be operationalised as scores on checklists.  
308 Satisfaction with the treatment will also be operationalised as scores on respective questionnaire items.  
309 Acceptability of the interventions will be defined as the number of participants dropping out of the  
310 intervention (not necessarily the whole study and assessments) (dichotomous outcome). The effect  
311 size for all continuous outcomes will be Hedge's  $g$ , and for all dichotomous outcomes the odds ratios  
312 will be calculated. Like for primary outcomes, the main timepoint of interest is post-treatment, but all  
313 available follow-ups will be extracted, and if there is sufficient homogeneity in the timing of follow-  
314 ups, analyses will be conducted.

## 315 **Statistical analysis-synthesis**

316 Firstly, a conventional meta-analysis excluding studies comparing active psychosocial  
317 interventions will be conducted to establish the overall efficacy of psychosocial interventions.  
318 Secondly, an aggregate data network meta-analysis will be conducted to compare and rank the efficacy  
319 of each psychosocial intervention; the active interventions that were tested as controls in the original  
320 studies will be classified in the node of active interventions they share the same elements and  
321 approaches with. Thirdly, an Individual Participant Data Meta-analysis will be conducted (excluding  
322 the studies that compare two active psychosocial interventions) to establish the overall precise effects  
323 and moderators of efficacy of psychosocial interventions as a whole. Given the high chance that  
324 numerous potential moderators will be available, participant or intervention related, we will conduct  
325 the analysis in two steps, as demonstrated by (42). Missing data will be multiply imputed for each  
326 study using multiple imputation. If the regression coefficients are available in the publications of  
327 studies that do not provide IPD, we will create pseudo-IPD for continuous outcomes, as described in  
328 (43).

329           The same procedure will be repeated including all studies for the Individual Participant Data  
330 Network meta-analysis. Additionally, in the first step we will select the variables that show a higher  
331 interaction with the different nodes, by fitting a penalised linear regression model for continuous  
332 outcomes and a penalised logistic regression for dichotomous outcomes. This will be done through the  
333 lasso technique in STATA. In this step we will also test whether survivor and setting characteristics  
334 (such as being separated or still living together with their partner, and clinical or community settings)  
335 are effect modifiers or prognostic factors, and based on the results, the following stages of the analysis  
336 will be divided into subgroups of studies that are similar in effect modifiers, so that the transitivity  
337 assumption is met. In the second step, a one-stage IPDNMA will be conducted under a Bayesian  
338 framework using the multinma package in R. The characteristics of the interventions, such as number  
339 of sessions, format and mode of delivery will be tested as effect modifiers. We will also conduct a  
340 multilevel network meta-regression (using multinma in R) to enable studies providing IPD to be  
341 combined with those that do not, as demonstrated by (44). For the outcome of acceptability (defined as  
342 dropout from the intervention) we will measure an absolute treatment effect, as many control  
343 conditions are inactive, by modelling the probability of dropout through a generalised model of  
344 binomial likelihood, as in (42). Heterogeneity will be assessed by comparing the fit of fixed and  
345 random effects models, reporting between-study variance,  $\tau^2$ , and explored through inspection of  
346 regression coefficients and sub-group analyses. Inconsistency will be assessed by fitting a model that  
347 relaxes the consistency assumption, and explored further using a node-splitting model. In all of the  
348 aforementioned models where this is possible (aggregate data NMA, IPDMA, IPDNMA), if it is still  
349 appropriate with the combination of elements/components the interventions consist of, we will explore  
350 fitting IPD component NMA models (45,46,47). A sensitivity analysis excluding studies with high risk  
351 of bias will be conducted separately for each bias domain. The rankings of the interventions and the  
352 Surface Under the Cumulative Ranking (SUCRA) scores will be calculated to summarise the results of  
353 the IPDNMA.

354           The results of all analyses will be compared to further investigate the precision of the  
355 estimates.

## 356 **Discussion**

357           We plan to conduct an IPDNMA to estimate precisely the effects of psychosocial interventions  
358 on the mental health of IPV survivors, to compare the interventions, and to examine potential  
359 moderating effects of the characteristics of the participants and the interventions. We intend to fulfil  
360 this aim by establishing a collaboration with the authors of the RCTs and thus obtaining the datasets of  
361 the studies and combining them.

## 362 **Strengths and limitations**

363           This methodology is considered a gold standard in evidence synthesis (27) and it is novel in  
364 the field of IPV. The synthesis approach allows research findings to be integrated to increase precision  
365 (26), whilst thoroughly investigating factors affecting the effects of the interventions on the outcomes  
366 with advanced statistical methods. These factors will pertain to individuals, interventions and contexts,  
367 and possibly their interaction, to address heterogeneity as fully as possible. The certainty of the  
368 evidence will also be assessed under the GRADE method (38).

369           However, there are admittedly limitations to our approach. We will be limited by the data  
370 measured in the included studies, and statistical power is bound to vary across outcomes. In addition,  
371 harmonising the outcomes across studies that have measured them in different ways means that some  
372 nuancing might be missed, but we plan to address this by sensitivity analyses. Another common issue  
373 of IPDMAs is that the IPD are often impossible to obtain (48). We plan to deal with this issue by  
374 attempting to contact the researchers through different channels and by using pseudo-IPD (43). Efforts  
375 will be made to reduce publication bias by expanding the literature search of Micklitz and colleagues,  
376 and searching trial registries and grey literature.

## 377 **Relevance**

378           The field of IPV is highly heterogeneous, and matching individuals and contexts with  
379 interventions is crucial (17). This has not been done yet with quantitative methods that limit personal



380 biases and offer precise estimates of the impact of each of the many factors intertwined in the  
381 provision of psychosocial support of IPV survivors. Pinpointing impactful factors and comparing the  
382 existing interventions can contribute to more efficient decision making both for practice and policy.

383 **S1 Table. Eligibility criteria by PICO**

384 **Funding statement:** Christina Palantza is in receipt of an annual stipend from the University of  
385 Bristol from 2023 to 2027. This is the only funding source of this review. The funder had no role in  
386 the development of this protocol.

387 **Author contributions:** Christina Palantza conceptualised the main aims and methods of the review,  
388 drafted the protocol. Karen Morgan and Gene Feder oversaw the development of the protocol and  
389 provided expert advice on conceptual aspects. Nicky Welton oversaw the development of the protocol  
390 and provided expert advice on methodological and statistical aspects. Lasse Sander and Hannah  
391 Micklitz conducted the systematic review and meta-analysis that is to be updated and extended by this  
392 review, reviewed the protocol and provided the materials of their review.

393 **Financial competing interest:** None apart from CP's stipend.

394 **Non-Financial competing interest:** None

395 **Patient and Public Involvement:** A Patient and Public Involvement group of survivors of intimate  
396 partner violence from the UK was consulted and provided input on conceptual aspects.

397 **Transparency Declaration:** Christina Palantza affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and  
398 transparent account of the study being outlined; no important aspects of the study have been omitted.

399 **Data Availability Statement:** Data availability is not applicable to this article as it is a protocol  
400 merely outlining research that has not been conducted yet. Upon completion of the study, it will still  
401 not be possible to make the data publicly available, as it belongs to the researchers that conducted the  
402 eligible studies; they are to share them with us only for the purposes of this study.

403

## 404 **References**

- 405 1. Mitchell C, Anglin D. Intimate partner violence : a health-based perspective. Oxford ; New  
406 York: Oxford University Press; 2009.
- 407 2. Jonas S, Khalifeh H, Bebbington PE, McManus S, Brugha T, Meltzer H, et al. Gender  
408 differences in intimate partner violence and psychiatric disorders in England: results from the  
409 2007 adult psychiatric morbidity survey. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*. 2013 Jun  
410 10;23(2):189–99.
- 411 3. Trevillion K, Oram S, Feder G, Howard LM. Experiences of Domestic Violence and  
412 Mental Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. van Os J, editor. *PLoS*  
413 *ONE* [Internet]. 2012 Dec 26;7(12):e51740. Available from: [https://research-](https://research-information.bristol.ac.uk/files/84447061/journal.pone.0051740.pdf)  
414 [information.bristol.ac.uk/files/84447061/journal.pone.0051740.pdf](https://research-information.bristol.ac.uk/files/84447061/journal.pone.0051740.pdf)
- 415 4. Fogarty A, Brown SJ, Gartland D, Mensah F, FitzPatrick KM, Giallo R. Mental health  
416 trajectories of women experiencing differing patterns of intimate partner violence across the  
417 first 10 years of motherhood. *Psychiatry Research* [Internet]. 2023 Jul 1 [cited 2023 Jun  
418 27];325:115261. Available from:  
419 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165178123002111>
- 420 5. WHO | Understanding and addressing violence against women. *WhoInt* [Internet].  
421 2014 Nov 28; Available from:  
422 [https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/topics/violence/vaw\\_series/en/](https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/topics/violence/vaw_series/en/)
- 423 6. Bogat GA, Levendosky AA, Cochran K. Developmental Consequences of Intimate  
424 Partner Violence on Children. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*. 2023 Feb  
425 15;19(1).
- 426 7. Stubbs A, Szoek C. The effect of intimate partner violence on the physical health and  
427 health-related behaviors of women: A systematic review of the literature. *Trauma,*  
428 *Violence, & Abuse*. 2021 Feb 5;23(4):1157–72.

- 429 8. Ulloa EC, Hammett JF. The Effect of Gender and Perpetrator–Victim Role on Mental  
430 Health Outcomes and Risk Behaviors Associated With Intimate Partner Violence.  
431 Journal of Interpersonal Violence. 2014 Dec 18;31(7):1184–207.
- 432 9. Kim B, Royle M. Domestic Violence in the Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic: A  
433 Synthesis of Systematic Reviews. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse. 2023 Feb  
434 27;152483802311555
- 435 10. Carlson C, Namy S, Norcini Pala A, Wainberg ML, Michau L, Nakuti J, et al.  
436 Violence against children and intimate partner violence against women: overlap and  
437 common contributing factors among caregiver-adolescent dyads. BMC Public Health.  
438 2020 Jan 29;20(1).
- 439 11. Campbell L, Jin K, Uhlich M, Francis JM, Mark K, Miall N, et al. Intimate Partner  
440 Violence During COVID-19 Restrictions: A Study of 30 Countries From the I-  
441 SHARE Consortium. 2023 Jan 26;088626052211418-088626052211418.
- 442 12. Whiting K. The cost-of-living crisis is having a global impact - here's what countries  
443 are doing to help [Internet]. World Economic Forum. 2022. Available from:  
444 <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/09/cost-of-living-crisis-global-impact/>
- 445 13. Cost of Living and the impact on survivors of domestic abuse [Internet]. Available  
446 from: [https://www.womensaid.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Cost-of-Living-](https://www.womensaid.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Cost-of-Living-Crisis-Impact-on-Survivors-of-DA.docx.pdf)  
447 [Crisis-Impact-on-Survivors-of-DA.docx.pdf](https://www.womensaid.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Cost-of-Living-Crisis-Impact-on-Survivors-of-DA.docx.pdf)
- 448 14. Oram S, Fisher HL, Minnis H, Seedat S, Walby S, Hegarty K, et al. The Lancet  
449 Psychiatry Commission on intimate partner violence and mental health: advancing  
450 mental health services, research, and policy. The Lancet Psychiatry [Internet]. 2022  
451 Jun 1 [cited 2022 May 16];9(6):487–524. Available from:  
452 [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpsy/article/PIIS2215-0366\(22\)00008-](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpsy/article/PIIS2215-0366(22)00008-6/fulltext?fbclid=IwAR2DG_eBCn9sS-2mkRayn0rLX3IUdHSLO2iizCvX1muEhhfTQXlmqZ74dEo)  
453 [6/fulltext?fbclid=IwAR2DG\\_eBCn9sS-](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpsy/article/PIIS2215-0366(22)00008-6/fulltext?fbclid=IwAR2DG_eBCn9sS-2mkRayn0rLX3IUdHSLO2iizCvX1muEhhfTQXlmqZ74dEo)  
454 [2mkRayn0rLX3IUdHSLO2iizCvX1muEhhfTQXlmqZ74dEo](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpsy/article/PIIS2215-0366(22)00008-6/fulltext?fbclid=IwAR2DG_eBCn9sS-2mkRayn0rLX3IUdHSLO2iizCvX1muEhhfTQXlmqZ74dEo)

- 455 15. Karakurt G, Koç E, Katta P, Jones N, Bolen SD. Treatments for Female Victims of  
456 Intimate Partner Violence: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in*  
457 *Psychology*. 2022 Feb 4;13(1).
- 458 16. Micklitz HM, Glass CM, Bengel J, Sander LB. Efficacy of Psychosocial Interventions  
459 for Survivors of Intimate Partner Violence: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.  
460 *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. 2023 May 6;152483802311694.
- 461 17. Rivas C, Vigurs C, Cameron J, Yeo L. A realist review of which advocacy  
462 interventions work for which abused women under what circumstances. *Cochrane*  
463 *Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2019 Jun 29;
- 464 18. Hameed M, O'Doherty L, Gilchrist G, Tirado-Muñoz J, Taft A, Chondros P, et al.  
465 Psychological therapies for women who experience intimate partner violence: a  
466 *Cochrane Review*. *BJPsych Advances*. 2021 Oct 25;27(6):356–6.
- 467 19. Paphitis SA, Bentley A, Asher L, Osrin D, Oram S. Improving the mental health of  
468 women intimate partner violence survivors: Findings from a realist review of  
469 psychosocial interventions. Munro-Kramer ML, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2022 Mar  
470 17;17(3):e0264845.
- 471 20. Austin AE, Shanahan ME, Barrios YV, Macy RJ. A Systematic Review of  
472 Interventions for Women Parenting in the Context of Intimate Partner Violence.  
473 *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. 2017 Jul 21;20(4):498–519.
- 474 21. Chu YC, Wang HH, Chou FH, Hsu Y, Liao KL. Outcomes of trauma-informed care  
475 on the psychological health of women experiencing intimate partner violence: A  
476 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health*  
477 *Nursing*. 2023 Sep 12;
- 478 22. Vicente Escudero JL & Sánchez Navarro B. Meta-Analysis of Webbased Treatments  
479 for PTSD in Women Exposed to Intimate Partner Violence and Sexual Abuse.  
480 *International Journal of Psychology & Psychological Therapy*. 2023 Mar 1;23(1): 93-  
481 105.

- 482 23. Linde DS, Bakiewicz A, Normann AK, Hansen NB, Lundh A, Rasch V. Intimate  
483 Partner Violence and Electronic Health Interventions: Systematic Review and Meta-  
484 Analysis of Randomized Trials. *Journal of Medical Internet Research [Internet]*. 2020  
485 Dec 11 [cited 2021 Apr 15];22(12):e22361. Available from:  
486 <https://www.jmir.org/2020/12/e22361/>
- 487 24. Tirado-Muñoz J, Gilchrist G, Farré M, Hegarty K, Torrens M. The efficacy of  
488 cognitive behavioural therapy and advocacy interventions for women who have  
489 experienced intimate partner violence: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Annals*  
490 *of Medicine*. 2014 Sep 11;46(8):567–86.
- 491 25. Riley RD, Tierney JF, Stewart LA. Individual participant data meta-analysis : a  
492 handbook for healthcare research. Hoboken, Nj: Wiley; 2021.
- 493 26. Cooper H, Patall EA. The relative benefits of meta-analysis conducted with individual  
494 participant data versus aggregated data. *Psychological Methods*. 2009;14(2):165–76.
- 495 27. Abo-Zaid G, Sauerbrei W, Riley RD. Individual participant data meta-analysis of prognostic  
496 factor studies: state of the art? *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2012 Apr 24;12(1).
- 497 28. Broeze KA, Opmeer BC, van der Veen F, Bossuyt PM, Bhattacharya S, Mol BWJ. Individual  
498 patient data meta-analysis: a promising approach for evidence synthesis in reproductive  
499 medicine. *Human Reproduction Update*. 2010 Sep 6;16(6):561–7.
- 500 29. Craven LC, Fields AM, Carlson RG, Combs EM, Howe ES. Counseling interventions  
501 for victims of intimate partner violence: A systematic review. 2023 May 13;
- 502 30. 5 ways to strengthen our health systems for the future [Internet]. *World Economic*  
503 *Forum*. Available from: [https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/01/5-ways-to-](https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/01/5-ways-to-strengthen-our-health-systems-for-the-future-healthcare/)  
504 [strengthen-our-health-systems-for-the-future-healthcare/](https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/01/5-ways-to-strengthen-our-health-systems-for-the-future-healthcare/)
- 505
- 506 31. Dias S, Ades AE, Welton NJ, Jansen JP, Sutton AJ. Network meta-analysis for  
507 comparative effectiveness research. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Ltd;  
508 2018.

- 509 32. Chaimani A, Caldwell DM, Li T, Higgins JPT, Salanti G. Chapter 11: Undertaking  
510 network meta-analyses. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T,  
511 Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*  
512 *Interventions* version 6.4 (updated August 2023). Cochrane, 2023. Available from  
513 [www.training.cochrane.org/handbook](http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook).
- 514 33. Kanters S, Karim ME, Thorlund K, Anis A, Bansback N. When does the use of  
515 individual patient data in network meta-analysis make a difference? A simulation  
516 study. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2021 Jan 13;21(1).
- 517 34. Riley RD, Dias S, Donegan S, Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Efthimiou O, et al. Using  
518 individual participant data to improve network meta-analysis projects. *BMJ Evidence-*  
519 *Based Medicine [Internet]*. 2023 Jun 1 [cited 2023 Jul 17];28(3):197–203. Available  
520 from: <https://ebm.bmj.com/content/28/3/197>
- 521 35. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred  
522 Reporting Items for Systematic Review and meta-analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P)  
523 2015 Statement. *Systematic Reviews [Internet]*. 2015 Jan 1;4(1):1–9. Available from:  
524 <https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/2046-4053-4-1>
- 525 36. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a Web and Mobile  
526 App for Systematic Reviews. *Systematic Reviews [Internet]*. 2016 Dec;5(1).  
527 Available from:  
528 [https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-016-](https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4)  
529 [0384-4](https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4)
- 530 37. Higgins, JPT, Thomas, J, Chandler, J, Cumpston, M, Li, T, Page, M, & Welch, V.  
531 *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions* version 6.3 (updated  
532 February 2022) John Wiley. [www.training.cochrane.org/handbook](http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook)
- 533 38. How to GRADE the quality of the evidence [Ryan & Hill]. Available from:  
534 [https://colorectal.cochrane.org/sites/colorectal.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/how\\_](https://colorectal.cochrane.org/sites/colorectal.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/how_to_grade.pdf)  
535 [to\\_grade.pdf](https://colorectal.cochrane.org/sites/colorectal.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/how_to_grade.pdf)

- 536 39. Mary Ann Dutton. Empowering and Healing the Battered Woman. Springer  
537 Publishing Company; 2000.
- 538 40. Prochaska JO, DiClemente CC. Transtheoretical therapy: Toward a more integrative  
539 model of change. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice* [Internet].  
540 1982;19(3):276–88. Available from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1984-26566-001>
- 541 41. Sprague S, McKay P, Madden K, Scott T, Tikasz D, Slobogean GP, et al. Outcome  
542 Measures for Evaluating Intimate Partner Violence Programs Within Clinical Settings:  
543 A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. 2016 Apr  
544 5;18(5):508–22.
- 545 42. Furukawa TA, Karyotaki E, Suganuma A, Pompoli A, Ostinelli EG, Cipriani A, et al.  
546 Dismantling, personalising and optimising internet cognitive–behavioural therapy for  
547 depression: a study protocol for individual participant data component network meta-  
548 analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2018 Nov;8(11):e026137.
- 549 43. Papadimitropoulou K, Stijnen T, Riley RD, Dekkers OM, Cessie S. Meta-analysis of  
550 continuous outcomes: Using pseudo IPD created from aggregate data to adjust for  
551 baseline imbalance and assess treatment-by-baseline modification. *Research*  
552 *Synthesis Methods*. 2020 Jul 25;
- 553 44. Phillippo DM, Dias S, Ades AE, Belger M, Brnabic A, Schacht A, et al. Multilevel network  
554 meta-regression for population-adjusted treatment comparisons. *Journal of the Royal*  
555 *Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*. 2020 Jun;183(3):1189–210.
- 556 45. Welton NJ, Caldwell DM, Adamopoulos E, Vedhara K. Mixed Treatment Comparison Meta-  
557 Analysis of Complex Interventions: Psychological Interventions in Coronary Heart Disease.  
558 *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2009 Mar 3;169(9):1158–65.
- 559 46. Caldwell DM, Welton NJ. Approaches for synthesising complex mental health  
560 interventions in meta-analysis. *Evidence Based Mental Health*. 2016 Jan 20;19(1):16–  
561 21.

562 47. Petropoulou M, Efthimiou O, Rücker G, Schwarzer G, Furukawa TA, Pompoli A, et al. A  
563 review of methods for addressing components of interventions in meta-analysis. Mathes T,  
564 editor. PLOS ONE. 2021 Feb 8;16(2):e0246631.

565 48. Wang H, Chen Y, Lin Y, Abesig J, Wu IX, Tam W. The methodological quality of individual  
566 participant data meta-analysis on intervention effects: systematic review. BMJ. 2021 Apr  
567 19;n736.

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584