Hi Alex,

Thanks again for the analysis.

1. So for the attitudes towards gender relations scale, we have an almost effect for men (community scale = .09; individual scale = .05). Is this updated based on considering gender by subject number, not what the participant indicated (e.g. W53 treat as female, although 'male' indicated during interview; for 'other' treat as indicated by subject number)?

2. For the categorical help-seeking items, I do think it will be useful to compare by intervention group. Can you do this for -

a. women, question Q64 1b (we want to see if those in the exposure condition are more or less likely to seek help from family, partner's family, close friends, religious leaders, police, social institutions, lawyer, doctor/medical personnel, or mental health workers).

b. men, question Q65 2b (we want to know if those in the exposure condition are more or less likely to seek help from  family, partner's family, close friends, religious leaders, police, social institutions, lawyer, doctor/medical personnel, or mental health workers).

3. Can you look at Q 68a 3b (for women) and Q70a 3d (for men) as outcomes? We want to know if those in the exposure condition are more likely to indicate that the person (Rahima or Yusuf) would seek help for abuse.

4. Can you look at individual items as outcomes (for both men and women) for the acceptability of IPA section (Q45)? This is really a crucial outcome, especially for men, and it seems we only have an effect for women, so I am wondering about individual items.

5. Can you look at the IPA (CTS-2 Scale) as outcome? (1 = abuse in last year, any # of times, sum for scale score) We don't expect abuse to actual differ by exposure condition of course, but I realize that reporting of abuse (willingness to report/endorse to interviewer) may actually differ by exposure condition so it would be useful to examine.

6. Please examine Q110 2 as an individual item outcome for both women and men (as this may be associated with IPA-related help-seeking, although it is also linked to non IPA help-seeking so not a great variable).

Please double check that everyone in the exposure condition answered Q113 1 correctly (yes, visited and saw poster) and those in the control condition also answered correctly (yes, visited but did not show poster). Please let me know if there are any issues (beyond what we discussed previously when working on reconciling subject numbers).

Thanks so much,

Courtney

Hi Alex,

In addition to the items below, I spoke with Leah and we also suggest the following -

Gender Relations

1. Although there is a note about this in the original 'instructions' doc I sent, please double check that items are reverse coded correctly - specifically - Q27/Q28 my community/I think men should share the housework with women; Q39/40 my community/I think people should be treated the same whether they are male or female.

2. For this same scale, please also try analyzing with items 41, 42, 43, 44 excluded as these are about fate and help-seeking (not really gender relations).

Children and IPA

3. Q61 compare each categorical item separately for exposure and control groups, for both women and men.

Help-seeking

4. Q68 compare the following items separately for exposure and control groups, for both women and men: don't get involved; call an organization or community group directly, and specific to each case vignette - encourage Rahima/Yusuf to - seek help from an organization; ....seek help from family/friends.

5. Q70 (women) - why might Rahima might not want to seek help? examine all items separately for exposure vs control group

6. Q72 (men) - why might Yusuf not want to seek help? examine all items separately for exposure vs control group

Thanks so much.