Joanne, Nicandro, Nnenna – ADA Project Responses

Kim

1. Nice clear presentation!
2. Suggest going back and checking unadjusted results precision for children
   1. 3-4 Children
      1. OR: 1.0840230
      2. CI: 0.9959901-1.1806214
3. Suggest put the DAG before the modeling results because the DAG is to meant to help you select covariates. Suggest including biasing paths in red.
   1. *See DAG below*

Kyle

1. Very clear background and objectives.
2. Good overview of sample
3. Good overview of variables – are all forms of IPV combined in your DV, or are these separate models?
4. Excellent sample descriptives.
5. Results table looks good – probably don’t need CI and p values.
6. Great looking DAG – can move this to earlier in the presentation.
7. Excellent summary, situating your study in the research, and directions for future research.
8. Please submit the DAG with the biasing paths shown along with the DAG showing what you controlled for

Imagen que contiene mapa, texto

Descripción generada automáticamente

Connections added:

1. Partner ACE 🡪 experiencing IPV

New biasing paths:

1. Education 🡪 place of residence 🡪 experiencing IPV
2. Education 🡪 Household wealth index 🡪 experiencing IPV

2. Run separate FULL models for each form of IPV and interpret your results.

Table A: Logit Model ORs for Predictors of Interests Based on IPV

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Emotional** | | | **Less Severe Physical** | | | **Severe Physical** | | | **Sexual** | | |
|  |  | **CI** | |  | **CI** | |  | **CI** | |  | **CI** | |
| **Predictor** | **OR** | ***Lower*** | ***Upper*** | **OR** | ***Lower*** | ***Upper*** | **OR** | ***Lower*** | ***Upper*** | **OR** | ***Lower*** | ***Upper*** |
| Children in household |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *1-2* | **0.91** | *0.83* | *0.99* | 1.05 | *0.94* | *1.19* | **0.80** | *0.68* | *0.94* | **0.76** | *0.65* | *0.89* |
| *3-4* | 1.01 | *0.92* | *1.11* | **1.33** | *1.18* | *1.51* | 0.86 | *0.72* | *1.03* | 0.93 | *0.79* | *1.10* |
| *5 or more* | 1.05 | *0.94* | *1.17* | **1.59** | *1.39* | *1.84* | 1.02 | *0.84* | *1.24* | 1.12 | *0.93* | *1.35* |
| Not employed | **0.93** | *0.89* | *0.98* | **0.89** | *0.84* | *0.94* | **0.67** | *0.61* | *0.74* | **0.88** | *0.81* | *0.96* |
| Partner alcohol  consumption | **2.19** | *2.06* | *2.32* | **2.90** | *2.67* | *3.18* | **3.38** | *2.94* | *3.91* | **2.18** | *1.94* | *2.45* |

***BOLD*** *represent significant’ p-value < 0.05*

*Models were adjusted for woman’s age, household wealth index, household residence*