

1 Intimate partner violence and its correlates in middle-aged 2 and older adults during the COVID-19 pandemic: A multi- 3 country secondary analysis

4
5 Gwendolyn Chang^{1,2*}, Joseph Tucker^{3,4}, Kate Walker⁵, Claire Chu⁶, Naomi Miall⁴, Rayner
6 Tan^{7,8,9}, Dan Wu^{4, 10*}

7
8 ¹ London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK.

9 ² Centre for Population Research in Sexual Health and HIV, University College London,
10 London, UK.

11 ³ Institute of Global Health and Infectious Diseases, University of North Carolina at Chapel
12 Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA.

13 ⁴ Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical
14 Medicine, London, UK.

15 ⁵ Faculty of Public Health and Policy, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine,
16 London, UK.

17 ⁶ Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel
18 Hill, USA.

19 ⁷ Dermatology Hospital of Southern Medical University, Guangzhou, China.

20 ⁸ University of North Carolina Project-China, Guangzhou, China.

21 ⁹ Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of Singapore, Singapore,
22 Singapore.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 ¹⁰ Department of Social Medicine and Health Education School of Public Health, Nanjing
24 Medical University, Nanning, China.

25

26 Corresponding authors:

27 Gwendolyn.chang@ucl.ac.uk (GC)

28 Danwu@njmu.edu.cn (DW)

29

30 Word count: 4170 (main text excluding tables, figures); 308 (abstract)

31 **Abstract**

32 **Background:** Intimate partner violence (IPV) may have been exacerbated during the
33 COVID-19 pandemic. Middle-aged and older adults, ages 45 years or older, are at higher
34 risk of COVID-19 mortality and social isolation. However, most studies on IPV during the
35 pandemic do not focus on this important subpopulation. Informed by the social-ecological
36 theory, this study examines individual, household, community, and country-level correlates
37 of IPV among middle-aged and older adults in multiple countries using a cross-sectional
38 online survey.

39

40 **Methods:** Data from 2867 participants aged over 45 in the International Sexual Health and
41 Reproductive Health (I-SHARE) survey from July 2020 to February 2021 were described
42 using univariate analysis. IPV was defined using four validated WHO measures. Individual
43 characteristics included self-isolation and food security. At the country-level, we examined
44 social distancing stringency. Logistic regression models with a random intercept for country
45 were conducted to explore IPV correlates among 1730 eligible individuals from 20 countries
46 with complete data.

47

48 **Results:** Most participants were heterosexual (2469/2867), cisgender (2531/2867) females
49 (1589/2867) between the ages of 45-54 (1539/2867). 12.1% (346/2867) of participants
50 experienced IPV during social distancing measures. After adjustment, participants who self-
51 isolated experienced 1.4 (95% CI 1.0, 2.0, $p=0.04$) times the odds of IPV compared to those
52 who had not isolated. Those who reported an increase in food insecurity compared to pre-
53 pandemic experienced 2.2 times the odds (95% CI 1.6, 3.0, $p<0.0001$) of IPV compared to
54 those who did not report increased food insecurity. People in countries with more stringent
55 social distancing policies were less likely to experience IPV compared to people in countries
56 with lower levels of stringency (aOR=0.6, 95% CI 0.4, 0.9, $p=0.04$).

57

58 **Conclusions:** IPV was common among middle-aged and older adults during the COVID-19
59 pandemic. Our data suggest the need for further crisis management and social protection
60 measures for middle-aged and older adults who have intersecting vulnerabilities to IPV to
61 mitigate COVID-19 impact.

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84

85 **Background**

86 Intimate partner violence (IPV) is defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) as “any
87 behaviour within an intimate relationship that causes physical, psychological, or sexual harm
88 to those in the relationship” by current or former partners(1,2). IPV is a pervasive public
89 health issue with an estimated global lifetime prevalence of 30% among women and 10%
90 among men (3,4). IPV is also a growing problem that intersects with population aging (5).
91 Middle-aged and older people are at higher risk of disability, social isolation, chronic illness,
92 and cognitive impairment, which make them more vulnerable to new or worsening forms of
93 violence (6). But previous literature on IPV primarily focuses on younger people (7),
94 neglecting the unique experiences among middle-aged and older adults, such as increasing
95 dependence on partners as caregivers and menopause (8). A nationally representative
96 survey conducted in the United States of over 5,000 older adults (2009) found nearly 10% of
97 older adults faced some form of violence or abuse and that partners and spouses were the
98 perpetrators of more than half of the reported violence (9). This analysis focused on adults
99 aged 45 or older, capturing middle-aged and older people.

100 Previously reported correlates of IPV were operationalised at four levels based on an
101 adapted social-ecological theory (2006) (10). These were individual-level sociodemographic

102 and behavioral characteristics; relationship/household level factors capturing characteristics
103 of intimate partners, family members, and peers; community contexts such as residential
104 areas; and larger country-level societal factors including socioeconomic conditions, gender
105 inequity, social policies (10). Violence is a complex interplay between each of these levels.
106 This multi-level theory has been used to understand different types of violence, including IPV
107 (11) and elder abuse (12). Understanding factors at each of these levels is important in
108 public health to identify populations at risk and develop interventions and policies that
109 address violence at different levels (10,11).

110 Since the COVID-19 pandemic, there have been concerns that widespread social distancing
111 measures could put more people at risk of IPV (5,13,14). The pandemic may have
112 exacerbated some IPV risk factors such as dependency on others for care (15). While social
113 distancing measures effectively reduced COVID-19 infections, these measures may have
114 unintended consequences that increased IPV risk. There is limited multi-country data on IPV
115 risk during COVID-19. No studies have focused on IPV among middle-aged and older
116 adults during COVID-19. More research is needed to understand the unintended
117 consequences of social distancing policies and their potential ongoing and long-lasting
118 consequences on IPV.

119 This secondary analysis seeks to address the gap in literature by analysing correlates of IPV
120 during COVID-19 in middle-aged and older adults using the International Sexual Health and
121 Reproductive Health in the times of COVID-19 (I-SHARE 2020-21) survey data. The I-
122 SHARE 2020-21 survey is a multi-country online survey that harmonises sexual and
123 reproductive health instruments for global comparison using an open science approach (16).
124 This analysis was used to research multi-country and multi-level correlates of IPV among
125 middle-aged and older adults.

126

127 **Methods**

128 The overall aim of this analysis was to investigate IPV in middle-aged and older adults using
129 a subset of data from the International Sexual Health and Reproductive Health (I-SHARE)
130 conducted during COVID-19. Cross-sectional, country-level data using website data verified
131 by academic or international health organizations were collected along with the survey.

132 We adapted a social-ecological theory to reflect the factors captured at the individual,
133 relationship/household, community, and country levels (10) (S1 Table).

134 **Study Design (I-SHARE)**

135 The I-SHARE survey was a cross-sectional online survey administered in 30 low-, middle-,
136 and high-income countries between July 2020 and February 2021 (17). I-SHARE partnered
137 with national family planning, academic, and non-profit groups in each country as well as
138 global partners like the United Nation Family Planning Association, to support the survey
139 implementation and establish trust in the research (16). Participants of the I-SHARE survey
140 were at least 18 years old, a current resident of the country where they completed the
141 survey, and able to provide online informed consent (16). Participants could stop
142 participating or skip any questions they wished. No identifiable data was collected.⁴⁰ Country
143 studies linked survivors to local IPV resources.

144 Each in-country lead researcher organised translation to local languages, field testing, and
145 ethical review (16). Surveys were piloted for translation on sensitive topics. The I-SHARE
146 survey was distributed in each country through local partner organisations, sexual and
147 productive health networks, email listservs, and social media groups determined by the in-
148 country research lead (16). Due to varying COVID-19 restriction measures, different
149 countries adopted sampling methods that were most contextually feasible at the time being.
150 Twenty-three countries used convenience sampling by distributing the survey through social
151 media, email listservs, sexual and reproductive health networks, and other non-profit and
152 academic partners identified by in-country researchers. Six countries used online panel

153 sampling based on key sociodemographic characteristics identified by in-country
154 researchers and had varying degrees of population representativeness (16). Two countries
155 used population-representative samples with frames identified by in-country researchers (S2
156 Table). All surveys were conducted online on personal devices.

157 The survey captured information on sociodemographic, relationships, sexual health and
158 behaviour, intimate partner violence, and mental health during COVID-19 social distancing
159 measures. Survey questions used a mix of existing validated and newly developed scales
160 (16). To define the time period of interest for survey items which ask participants about their
161 experiences “during social distancing measures,” I-SHARE researchers determined the start
162 date of social distancing measures in each country based on local policies. Less than 1% of
163 people had been socially distancing for 3 months or less at the time of completing the
164 survey. About 20% had been socially distancing for 3 to 6 months, over 56% for 6 to 9
165 months, about 15% for 9 months to 12 months, and 10% for over 12 months. Each country
166 survey underwent one to three rounds of testing (16).

167

168 **Variables selection and management**

169 Variables were selected from each level of the social-ecological theory for analysis.
170 Associated variables and confounders identified in the literature (S1 Table) were considered
171 potential correlates in this study.

172 **Outcome: Intimate partner violence**

173 The I-SHARE survey measured physical, sexual, psychological, and financial IPV during
174 COVID-19 social distancing measures using six questions. Of the six questions, five were
175 operationalised in this study to construct psychological, sexual, and physical violence
176 experienced during the COVID-19 social distancing measures, in congruence with the WHO
177 validated Violence Against Women (VAW) Instrument (18) (S3 Table). Physical violence was
178 captured from the question, ‘Has a partner slapped, pushed, hit, kicked or choked you or

179 thrown something at you that could hurt you?’ Sexual violence was a composite of
180 responses to two questions which captured forced sexual intercourse and sexual coercion:
181 ‘Has a partner physically forced you to have sexual intercourse when you did not want to?’
182 and ‘Has a partner made you have sexual intercourse when you did not want to because you
183 were afraid of what your partner might do?’ Psychological violence was a composite of
184 responses to two questions which captured controlling behaviours and emotional abuse:
185 ‘Has a partner tried to restrict (online or phone) contact with your family?’ and ‘Has a partner
186 insulted you or made you feel bad about yourself?’ Financial violence was excluded because
187 it was not part of the validated WHO instrument (19). Participants could choose between the
188 responses “No,” “Yes, once,” or “Yes, multiple times” for all the violence questions.

189 A composite IPV variable was created for people who answered all five questions regarding
190 physical, sexual, or psychological violence during the COVID-19 social distancing measures,
191 from July 2020 to February 2021. If people answered ‘yes’ to any of the questions, they were
192 coded as having experienced IPV during the COVID-19 social distancing measures.

193 **Correlates at each social-ecological level**

194 Several variables were recoded for analysis to reduce data sparsity issues. Details on the I-
195 SHARE 2020-21 survey are available in S5 Table.

196 Individual level

197 Age was collected in the data as a continuous variable but was recoded into age groups,
198 capturing people who are 45-54, 55-64, and 65 or more years old. Sex assigned at birth was
199 collected as ‘male’, ‘female’, or ‘other’. Gender was captured as ‘cisgender,’ ‘non-cisgender,’
200 and ‘other.’ Those who selected ‘other’ (<1%) were regrouped with ‘non-cisgender.’ Sexual
201 orientation was collected as a categorical variable of ‘heterosexual’, ‘bisexual’, ‘gay’,
202 ‘lesbian’, ‘questioning or unsure’, ‘asexual’, ‘pansexual’, and ‘other’. Very few respondents
203 identified as a sexual minority, so it was recoded as ‘heterosexual’ and ‘other sexual

204 orientation.’ Education level was collected as a categorical variable and recoded based on
205 the UNESCO International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) categories.⁴⁸
206 Employment status was recoded as ‘unemployed’, ‘employed’ which included those who
207 were self-employed or informal workers, ‘retired’, and ‘other’ which included those who were
208 students (<1%). Isolation due to COVID-19 was captured as a binary ‘yes’ or ‘no’ response.
209 Ethnic minority status was recoded as a binary outcome by the I-SHARE team based on the
210 in-country demographics of the participant.

211 Household and community level

212 Cohabitation was captured as part of the responses to a question regarding cohabitation and
213 relationship status and recoded to a binary response to only reflect the responses regarding
214 cohabitation. Food insecurity during COVID-19 was recoded to be a binary response: ‘Yes,
215 more than before’ or ‘No or less than before’. At the community level, residential area was
216 captured as a binary ‘urban’ or ‘rural’ response.

217 Country level

218 At the country level, social distancing stringency was created by categorising the Oxford
219 COVID-19 Government Response Tracker (Ox-CGRT) score of each country as ‘low’ if the
220 score was less than 50 and ‘high’ if the score was greater than 50 (20). The cut off was
221 determined based on the median stringency score. The measure of COVID-19 social
222 distancing stringency used in this analysis is the mean stringency that the country
223 experienced in the duration of time from when the country’s social distancing measures
224 began to when the surveys were administered. The start of country social distancing
225 measures was determined by I-SHARE in-country researchers.

226 Gender Inequality Index (GII) scores were recoded as a binary outcome with scores less
227 than or equal to 0.25 as high gender equality and scores from 0.25-0.5 as low gender
228 equality. All countries had GII scores within 0-0.5. The cut off was selected based on the

229 median. The most recent GII scores from 2019 represent the gender inequality of each
230 country in the data.

231 The 2020 Social Progress Index (SPI) was chosen to represent social and environmental
232 protection progress for each country in the study. The range of SPI scores was between
233 about 50-100, so social progress was recoded as a binary with scores less than or equal to
234 75 as 'low progress' and scores higher than 75 as 'high progress.' The cut off was selected
235 based on the median.

236 Country income was based on World Bank 2019-20 criteria. Low- (<\$1,085) or lower-middle
237 income (\$1,086-4,255) economies were Nigeria, Lebanon, and Mozambique. Upper-middle
238 income (\$4,256-13,205) economies were Argentina, Botswana, Colombia, Mexico, Moldova,
239 and Malaysia. High-income (>\$13,205) economies were Australia, Canada, Czech Republic,
240 Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Panama, Portugal, Singapore,
241 Spain, Uruguay, and the United States.

242

243 **Data inclusion and analysis**

244 All data management and analysis were performed using STATA/SE 17.0. All individual,
245 household, community, and country-level variables described above were tabulated. The
246 prevalence of overall IPV and subtypes of IPV was tabulated. Country social distancing
247 stringency, gender inequality, social progress, and country income level were tabulated to
248 describe country level characteristics. We compared the characteristics of those missing
249 data on any of the IPV variables to that of the whole sample and found them to be broadly
250 similar (S6 Table A).

251

252 Of the 23067 participants in the I-SHARE survey, 4454 people were \geq 45 years old.

253 Participants who had missing data for key variables—age, sex at birth, sexual orientation,

254 relationship status, education level, and geographic area, and any of the five questions used
255 to construct IPV outcome (S3 Table) were excluded from this analysis.

256 Twenty-four countries were represented in this study—Argentina, Australia, Botswana,
257 Canada, Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon,
258 Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Moldova, Mozambique, Nigeria, Panama, Portugal,
259 Singapore, Spain, Uruguay, and United States. The final sub-population included in the
260 descriptive analysis (N=2867) were middle-aged and older adults who had completed the
261 key sociodemographic items and all five IPV variables (S4 Fig).

262 We conducted descriptive analysis of these data to understand prevalence of IPV among
263 this sub-population and relevant characteristics. Unadjusted odds ratios of IPV among all
264 potential correlates were explored using logistic regression models with a random intercept
265 for country to account for within-country clustering.

266 To run a fully adjusted model, people with missing data on gender, social isolation, or food
267 insecurity were dropped by STATA due to modelling requirements. 1730 individuals from 20
268 countries were included for regression modelling (S2 Table). The multivariable logistic
269 regression model included age, sex at birth, gender, sexual orientation, education level,
270 employment status, social isolation, residential area, cohabitation status, food insecurity,
271 country social distancing stringency level, gender inequality, social progress, and country
272 income level were all identified as potential correlates (S4 Fig). All potential correlates were
273 included in the final model to avoid over-fitting.⁴⁹ The random-intercept logistic regression
274 model was fitted with Gauss-Hermite quadrature approximation. Collinearity was checked
275 using a backward-deletion strategy by removing correlates individually and assessing
276 whether the confidence intervals of the remaining correlates narrowed in the model (21).
277 Correlates were only removed from the model if there was evidence of collinearity. No
278 collinearity was found so all correlates were included in the final model. Likelihood ratio tests
279 were performed to obtain a global p-value for each correlate.

280 Two sensitivity analyses were conducted, first to test if the model produced similar results in
281 middle-aged and older adults in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC), and second with
282 IPV defined by only physical and sexual violence (17).

283 **Ethical Approval**

284 The I-SHARE survey received local ethical approval and institutional review board approval
285 in each country. A data sharing agreement was signed by all collaborating institutions.
286 Participants provided informed consent and no identifying data was collected. This study
287 was approved by the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine Ethics Committee.

288

289 **Results**

290 **Sample characteristics**

291 Data from 2867 middle-aged and older adults in 24 countries were analysed. The majority of
292 participants were college or university educated (63.7%), heterosexual (86.1%), cisgender
293 (88.6%), females (55.4%), and between the ages of 45-54 (53.7%). Three-quarters were
294 employed and two-thirds lived in an urban area. During COVID-19, most people lived with a
295 partner (77.2%), did not isolate due to COVID-19 (84.7%), and did not experience increased
296 food insecurity (82.9%) (Table 1).

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308 **Table 1: Description of study sample characteristics from I-SHARE 2020-21 (N=2867**
309 **unless otherwise specified).**

		N*	% (Column %)	% of IPV (Row %)
Age group in years	45-54	1539	53.7	14.6
	55-64	824	28.7	11.5
	≥ 65	504	17.6	5.6
Sex at birth	Male	1278	44.6	11.3
	Female	1589	55.4	12.8
	Other ¹	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender (N=2857)	Cisgender	2531	88.6	11.7
	Non-cisgender	326	11.4	15.6
Sexual orientation	Heterosexual	2469	86.1	12.0
	Other sexual orientation ²	398	13.9	13.1
Ethnic minority status³ (N=1509)	Minority	197	13.1	24.4
	Not ethnic minority	1312	86.9	10.1
Education level	No formal and primary	70	2.4	10.0
	Secondary	755	26.3	8.0
	College/University	1826	63.7	13.5
	Other ¹	216	7.5	16.2
Employment status	Employed	2154	75.1	12.9
	Unemployed	83	2.9	14.5
	Retired	526	18.4	6.1
	Other ¹	104	3.6	25.0
Residential area	Rural	944	32.9	8.7
	Urban	1923	67.1	13.8
Cohabitation status	Not living with partner	653	22.8	14.6
	Living with partner	2214	77.2	11.4
Ever isolated due to COVID-19 (N=2859)	No	2422	84.7	11.4
	Yes	437	15.3	16.5
Food insecurity during the pandemic (N=1741)	No or less than before	1444	82.9	13.5
	Yes more than before	297	17.1	26.9
Country social distancing stringency	Low stringency	897	31.3	12.7
	High stringency	1970	68.7	11.9

Gender inequity index (GII)⁵	Low equality	913	31.9	18.8
	High equality	1954	68.2	9.0
Social progress index (SPI)⁶	Low progress	570	19.9	22.1
	High progress	2297	80.1	9.7
World Bank country income level⁷	High	2118	73.9	9.4
	Upper-middle	735	25.6	19.7
	Low or lower-middle	14	0.5	21.4

* Numbers may differ from the total sample size of 2867 due to missing values.

¹ "Other" was a survey response option. Participants were unable to specify further.

² "Other sexual orientation" includes people who responded as bisexual, gay, lesbian, questioning or unsure, asexual, pansexual, and other.

³ Individual's ethnic minority status was identified based on their country demographics.

⁴ Country social distancing stringency levels were based on the Ox-CGRT score. Countries with ≤ 50 had low stringency and countries with >50 had high stringency.

⁵ GII measures gender inequalities within a society. Scores ≤ 0.25 had the most gender equality and scores from 0.25-0.5 had low equality.

⁶ SPI measures the social and environmental progress of a country. Scores ≤ 75 were considered low and >75 was high.

⁷ Countries were grouped based on World Bank 2019-20 criteria.

310

311 Half of the participants resided in a country with a high social distancing policy stringency
 312 level (68.7%) and the majority were from countries with higher gender equality (68.2%) and
 313 greater social progress (80.1%). More participants were in high-income countries compared
 314 to low and middle-income countries (Fig 1).

315 **Fig 1: Countries with middle-aged and older adults from the I-SHARE 2020-21 survey**
 316 **included in this study (N=2867).**

317

318 **Prevalence of overall and subtypes of IPV**

319 Among the 2867 participants in the study 12.1% (346/2867) of people experienced some
 320 form of IPV during COVID-19 social distancing measures (Table 2). Ethnic minorities
 321 (368/1509) reported more than twice the prevalence of IPV compared to people who were
 322 not ethnic minorities (152/1509). People who experienced more food insecurity during the
 323 pandemic experienced almost twice the amount of IPV (468/1741) compared to those who
 324 did not (235/1741). IPV was also lower in countries with high gender equality (258/2867),
 325 social progress (278/2867), and income (269/2867). The frequency of IPV appeared to be

326 almost equal between countries with high (341/2867) and low (364/2867) social distancing
 327 stringency levels (Table 1).

328 The prevalence of overall and subtypes of IPV was lower in people aged 55 or older
 329 compared to those aged 45-54 years (Table 2). Psychological violence was experienced by
 330 10.9% (312/2867) of participants. It was more prevalent than physical violence (1.8%,
 331 52/2867) and sexual violence (2.1%, 60/2867). Participants in the oldest group (≥ 55)
 332 reported 6 times more psychological violence was 6 times than sexual violence and 9 times
 333 more than physical violence. Among people 45-54 years, psychological violence was
 334 experienced 5 times more than physical and sexual violence. (Table 2).

335 **Table 2: The prevalence of overall IPV and subtypes of IPV, including physical, sexual,**
 336 **psychological violence across the age groups from the I-SHARE 2020-21 survey**
 337 **(N=2867).**

		Percentage of all participants in each age group			
Age groups (years)	N	Any violence	Physical violence	Sexual violence	Psychological violence
45-54	1539	14.6	2.5	2.7	13.0
≥ 55	1328	9.3	0.9	1.4	8.4
Overall	2867	12.1	1.8	2.1	10.9

338
 339 Among the 348 people who reported experiencing IPV during the COVID-19 pandemic,
 340 16.4% (57/348) experienced two or more forms of violence and 5.5% (19/348) experienced
 341 all three subtypes of IPV (Fig. 2). 14.7% (51/348) experienced physical violence and 2.9%
 342 (10/348) experienced physical violence as their only form of IPV. 17.5% (61/348) reported
 343 experiencing sexual violence and 7.1% (25/348) experienced only sexual violence. 89.6%
 344 (312/348) experienced psychological violence by their partners and 73.5% (256/348)
 345 experienced only psychological violence (Fig. 2). Psychological violence was not only the
 346 most prevalent subtype of IPV, but also the most frequently co-occurring subtype with the
 347 others among middle-aged and older adults who experienced violence during the pandemic.

348 Of the 16.4% (57/348) who experienced multiple forms of violence, 98.2% of them (56/57)
349 experienced psychological violence. 10.4% (36/348) experienced sexual violence and 11.8%
350 (41/348) experienced physical violence.

351 Physical and sexual violence are often conceptualised as commonly co-occurring with one
352 another. Of those experiencing physical violence, 40% also experienced sexual violence
353 (20/51). Of those experiencing sexual violence, a third also experienced physical violence
354 (20/61).

355

356 **Fig 2: Proportion of each subtype and overlapping subtypes of IPV experienced**
357 **among middle-aged and older adults during the pandemic in the I-SHARE 2020-21**
358 **survey (N=348).** Areas are not proportional to the values. Adapted from Yoshihama and
359 Sorenson (1994).⁵²

360

361 **Identifying individual, household, community, and country level** 362 **correlates**

363 Age group, sex at birth, sexual orientation, and education level did not appear to be
364 associated with IPV in bivariate analyses accounting for clustering by country. At the
365 individual level, people who ever isolated due to COVID-19 were more likely to have
366 experienced IPV compared to those who did not after accounting for clustering by country
367 (clustered OR (cOR)=1.5, 95% CI 1.1, 2.0). At the household level, those who experienced
368 more food insecurity were more likely to have experienced IPV compared to those who did
369 not have increased food insecurity (cOR=2.4, 95% CI 1.8, 3.3). At the country level, people
370 who lived in high social distancing stringency countries (cOR=0.5, 95% CI 0.3, 0.8) or highly
371 socially progressive countries (cOR=0.6, 95% CI 0.4, 0.9) were less likely to have
372 experienced IPV compared to their counterparts.

373 The final model, which adjusted for all other correlates and accounted for clustering by
 374 country, showed that some of the above associations remained significant. Ever being
 375 isolated (aOR=1.4, 95% CI 1.0, 2.0), increased food insecurity during the pandemic
 376 (aOR=2.2, 95% CI 1.6, 3.0), and living in countries with a high level of social distancing
 377 stringency (aOR=0.6, 95% CI 0.4, 0.9) remained significant associated factors. But social
 378 progressiveness, gender inequality and country income level were not found to be
 379 associated with IPV in the final model (Table 3).

380 **Table 3: Unadjusted and adjusted association between correlates and IPV during**
 381 **COVID-19 social distancing among middle-aged and older adults in the I-SHARE 2020-**
 382 **21 survey (N=1730)¹.**

			Unadjusted OR (95% CI) ²	Final model: aOR ³ (95% CI)	Global P- value ⁴
Individual Level	Age group in years	45-54	1	1	0.54
		55-64	0.8 (0.6, 1.1)	0.9 (0.6, 1.2)	
		≥ 65	0.7 (0.4, 1.1)	0.7 (0.4, 1.4)	
	Sex at birth	Male	1	1	0.40
		Female	1.0 (0.8, 1.3)	0.9 (0.7, 1.2)	
	Gender	Cisgender	1	1	0.18
		Non-cisgender	1.2 (0.8, 1.9)	1.3 (0.9, 2.0)	
	Sexual orientation	Heterosexual	1	1	0.97
		Other sexual orientation	1.0 (0.7, 1.4)	1.0 (0.7, 1.5)	
	Education level	No formal and primary	1	1	0.89
		Secondary	0.8 (0.3, 2.2)	1.0 (0.4, 2.6)	
		College/University	0.9 (0.3, 2.3)	1.1 (0.4, 2.5)	
		Other	1.0 (0.3, 2.9)	1.2 (0.4, 3.3)	
	Employment status	Employed	1	1	0.03
Unemployed		1.3 (0.7, 2.5)	1.2 (0.6, 2.4)		
Retired		0.8 (0.5, 1.4)	1.1 (0.6, 2.0)		
Other		2.3 (1.4, 3.8)	2.2 (1.3, 3.7)		
Ever isolated due to COVID-19	No	1	1	0.04	
	Yes	1.5 (1.1, 2.0)	1.4 (1.0, 2.0)		
Household & Community Level	Cohabitation status	Not living with partner	1	1	0.81
		Living with partner	1.0 (0.7, 1.4)	1.1 (0.8, 1.4)	
	Food insecurity during the pandemic	No or less than before	1	1	<0.0001
		Yes more than before	2.4 (1.8, 3.3)	2.2 (1.6, 3.0)	
	Residential area	Rural	1	1	0.80
Urban		1.2 (0.8, 1.7)	1.0 (0.7, 1.5)		

Country Level	Country social distancing stringency	Low stringency	1	1	0.04
		High stringency	0.5 (0.3, 0.8)	0.6 (0.4, 0.9)	
	Gender inequality index (GII)	Low equality	1	1	0.41
		High equality	0.7 (0.5, 1.1)	0.8 (0.5, 1.3)	
	Social progress index (SPI)	Low progress	1	1	0.14
		High progress	0.6 (0.4, 0.9)	0.4 (0.1, 1.4)	
	World Bank country income level	High	1	1	0.49
		Upper-middle	1.4 (0.8, 2.3)	0.5 (0.2, 1.7)	
		Low or Lower-middle	1.7 (0.4, 6.7)	0.7 (0.1, 4.2)	

¹ Total N is lower due to missing data.

² Accounts for clustering by country.

³ Adjusted for all other covariates. Accounts for clustering by country. The final model includes data from 20 countries—Australia, Canada, Colombia, France Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Moldova, Mozambique, Nigeria, Panama, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Uruguay, and USA.

³ This is the p-value for the final model. Global p-values were determined by likelihood ratio tests.

Note: Ethnic minority status was excluded in regression models due to missing values.

383

384 Sensitivity Analyses

385 A sensitivity analysis among the 749 participants from LMIC resulted in the same overall
 386 associations between social isolation (aOR 1.8, 95%CI 0.6, 1.7, p=0.02), food insecurity
 387 (aOR 3.4, 95% CI 1.5, 3.8, p=0.0004), and country social distancing stringency level (aOR
 388 0.5, 95% CI 0.3, 0.8, p=0.02) (S7 Table A). A sensitivity analysis among 2867 participants to
 389 operationalise IPV with another standard definition which only includes physical and sexual
 390 violence resulted in similar directions and effect sizes for social isolation (aOR 1.6, 95% CI
 391 0.9, 2.8, p=0.13), food insecurity (aOR 2.0, 95% CI 1.2, 3.5, p=0.02), and country social
 392 distancing stringency level (aOR 0.5, 95% CI 0.3, 1.0, p=0.06) compared to the final model
 393 (S7 Table B). However, fewer correlates appeared to be associated with this IPV outcome.

394

395 Discussion

396 12.1% of middle-aged and older adults reported experiencing IPV in the period between their
 397 local social distancing measures and the I-SHARE survey. The prevalence of IPV was the
 398 same between males and females and decreased as age group increased. Psychological
 399 violence was the most common subtype of violence. Increased isolation, increased food

400 insecurity and lower social distancing stringency were associated with greater IPV among
401 middle-aged and older adults. This secondary analysis of I-SHARE 2020-21 extends the
402 literature by focusing on middle-aged and older adults using multi-country data.

403 The overall prevalence of IPV during COVID-19 among middle-aged and older adults
404 estimated by this study was found to be higher than the 7.0% (1,070/15,336) of participants
405 from the whole I-SHARE sample who reported experiencing IPV. The most common form of
406 IPV across all middle and older age groups was psychological violence. This is consistent
407 with the existing literature on IPV during COVID-19 (22–26) and broader patterns seen in
408 IPV (27–29). Psychological violence was found to overlap with physical and sexual subtypes
409 of IPV. Previous studies suggest that psychological violence is an important risk factor for
410 other types of violence (27,28).

411 Several studies have highlighted the extreme toll that psychological violence has on mental
412 distress (30,31), self-esteem, feeling worthless, loss of identity, as well as a higher
413 prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and complex-PTSD (29,32–34).
414 Unfortunately, middle-aged and older people experiencing IPV during the pandemic also had
415 reduced access to IPV support services (35) and general mental health resources (36). Low
416 digital connectivity among this age group has also made many remote service replacements
417 inaccessible, leaving them without access to necessary support (37).

418 There was strong evidence that having isolated due to COVID-19 was associated with
419 increased odds of IPV compared to those who did not isolate among middle-aged and older
420 adults. This finding coincides with a broader base of literature that identifies social isolation
421 as a risk factor for IPV (38–40) and conversely that social support is protective (41). During
422 the pandemic, many people self-isolated (42). There are several possible explanations for
423 the observed association between social isolation and experiences of IPV. Isolation leads to
424 weakened social networks, decreasing help-seeking opportunities while increasing a
425 perpetrator's ability to control and coerce survivors (38). Additionally, perpetrators could

426 blame survivors who are isolating due to symptoms or exposure to COVID-19 for putting
427 them at risk of infection, triggering heightened stress, anxiety, and poor mental health in both
428 survivors and perpetrators, which could lead to new or escalating forms of IPV (22,26,43).

429 Higher odds of IPV were observed in people who experienced increased food insecurity
430 during the COVID-19 pandemic compared to those who did not. The association between
431 food insecurity and IPV has been well established in many countries (44–46). Food
432 insecurity is often discussed in the context of a general lack of material security, such as
433 housing or economic insecurity (44–46). Stress theory suggests that insufficient or limited
434 resources at the individual and household level is a source of tension that can increase risk
435 of IPV (45–47). It posits that stress associated with too much demand over too little
436 resources leads to IPV (47).

437 We found lower odds of IPV in countries with higher social distancing stringency. Current
438 literature on the effect of social distancing policies on IPV has produced mixed evidence on
439 its relationship with IPV (13), and in many previous studies, social distancing was found to
440 be associated with an increased prevalence of IPV while simultaneously keeping IPV hidden
441 (5,48,49). Our study findings among middle-aged and older adults were inconsistent with
442 most of these previous findings. One potential explanation may be that these countries with
443 more stringent social distancing policies might also be more likely to implement stronger
444 social protections (50). Literature on social protection during COVID-19 shows that cash
445 transfers were the most commonly implemented social protections, as well as food vouchers
446 and wage subsidies (51). These protections were primarily implemented by high-income
447 countries alongside social distancing policies (51). Without indexes that capture the impact
448 of concurrent COVID-19 policy responses, the relationship between social distancing
449 stringency, social protections, and IPV cannot be disaggregated.

450 Our study has several limitations. We used a cross-sectional online survey, which is unable
451 to determine the direction of association between correlates and outcomes. As a result,

452 causal claims cannot be made for any of the correlates identified in this study. Participants
453 may not be comfortable disclosing experiences of IPV which could lead to an
454 underestimation of the prevalence of IPV.

455 Missing data from this study could impact the generalisability of the findings and is a
456 limitation. About 30% of people had missing IPV outcome data. However, people with
457 missing data for IPV had similar sociodemographic characteristics to those people who were
458 included in the descriptive analysis. Efforts were made to increase the generalisability of
459 these findings by using diverse sampling methods in the I-SHARE survey, such as including
460 population representative sampling frames and using online panels (S2 Table). Sensitivity
461 analysis showed that the model is also sensitive across LMIC subpopulations, with the same
462 directions of associations and larger effect sizes compared to the final model (S7 Table A).

463 Further studies are needed to understand the relationship between country level variables,
464 like social distancing stringency, and the pathways through which they impact IPV in various
465 country settings. Future research to evaluate the impacts of social distancing and social
466 protection policies on IPV during COVID-19 are needed. Until now, research on violence
467 during COVID-19 considers single policy measures. Intimate partner violence and the
468 intersection of aging is a complex phenomenon that needs to be understood in the context of
469 suites of pandemic and crisis policies, which interact in multifaceted ways to shape
470 experiences of violence. Detailed examination of mediation effects and cross-level
471 interactions within the social-ecological theory is needed to continue to expand the
472 understanding of how correlates are associated with IPV.

473

474 **Declarations**

475 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

476 The I-SHARE survey received local ethical approval and institutional review board approval
477 in each country. A data sharing agreement was signed by all collaborating institutions.
478 Participants provided informed consent and no identifying data was collected. This study
479 was approved by the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine Ethics Committee.

480 **Consent for publication**

481 Not applicable.

482 **Availability of data and materials**

483 The survey protocol and final survey instrument are available. Requests for data access
484 must follow the rules outlined in the I-SHARE data sharing agreement. Data code can be
485 made available upon request to the corresponding author.

486 **Competing interests**

487 The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship and/or
488 publication of this article.

489 **Funding**

490 The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research and/or
491 authorship of this article: JT received support from the US NIH (NIAID K24AI143471,
492 UH3HD096929). The funder played no role in study design, the methods of collection,
493 analysis, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the
494 article for publication.

495 **Authors' contributions**

496 GC, JT, DW, and CC conceptualized the study. GC wrote the first draft of the manuscript.
497 GC completed the data analysis with support from JT, KW, and DW. All authors critically
498 revised the article for important intellectual content and approved the final version. All
499 authors contributed to the knowledge generated, article processing fees, and are available
500 for future correspondences regarding the paper. All authors had full access to all of the data
501 and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

502

503 **Acknowledgements**

504 We want to acknowledge the following I-SHARE members for their contributions to this
505 article: Kristien Michielsen, Vinicius Jobim Fischer, Amr Abdelhamed, Noor Ani Ahmad,
506 Juliana Anderson, Nicolás Brunet, Sharyn Burns, Leonardo Chavane, Juan Carlos Rivillas,
507 Fiorella Farje De la Torre, José de Jesús González- Salazar, Gert Martin Hald, Devon
508 Hensel, Corina Iliadi-Tulbure, Olena Ivanova, Anna Kågesten, Kateřina Klapilová, Lucia
509 Knight, Dorie Kogut, Eneyi Kpokiri, Gunta Lazdane, Alejandra Lopez-Gomez, Ismael
510 Maatouk, Filippo Maria Nimbi, Caroline Moreau, Rocio Murad Rivera, Viola Nilah Nyakato,
511 Pedro Nobre, Caitlin Alsandria O'Hara, Shania Pande, Emilie Peeters, Carles Pericas, Lore
512 Remmerie, Juan Rivillas, Eusebio Rubio-Aurioles, Osama Shaeer, Jenna Marie Strizzi, Kun
513 Tang, Inês M. Tavares, Jennifer Toller Erausquin, Sonam Shah, Eline Van Damme, Wah
514 Yun Low, and WeiHong Zhang. A full list of I-SHARE consortium members can be found on
515 the I-SHARE website. We would like to thank the Academic Network for Sexual and
516 Reproductive Health and Rights Policy, Social Entrepreneurship to Spur Health, the London
517 School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine Sexually Transmitted Research Interest Group,
518 and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Institute for Global Health and Infectious
519 Diseases.

520

521 **REFERENCES**

- 522 1. World Health Organization. Violence Info: Intimate Partner Violence [Internet]. 2022.
523 Available from: <https://apps.who.int/violence-info/intimate-partner-violence/>
- 524 2. Garcia-Moreno C, Guedes A, Knerr W. Understanding and addressing violence against
525 women. World Health Organ [Internet]. 2012; Available from:
526 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-RHR-12.36>
- 527 3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Intimate Partner Violence, Sexual Violence,
528 and Stalking Among Men. 2020; Available from:
529 [https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/men-](https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/men-ipvsvandstalking.html)
530 [ipvsvandstalking.html](https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/men-ipvsvandstalking.html)
- 531 4. World Health Organization. Violence against women prevalence estimates, 2018: global,
532 regional and national prevalence estimates for intimate partner violence against women

- 533 and global and regional prevalence estimates for non-partner sexual violence against
534 women. 2021; Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240022256>
- 535 5. Emandi R, Encarnacion J, Seck P, Tabaco R. Measuring the Shadow Pandemic: Violence
536 against women during COVID-19. UN Women [Internet]. 2021 Nov 24; Available from:
537 <https://data.unwomen.org/publications/vaw-rga>
- 538 6. Gerino E, Caldarera AM, Curti L, Brustia P, Rollè L. Intimate Partner Violence in the
539 Golden Age: Systematic Review of Risk and Protective Factors. *Front Psychol* [Internet].
540 2018 [cited 2022 Dec 23];9. Available from:
541 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01595>
- 542 7. Yakubovich AR, Stöckl H, Murray J, Melendez-Torres GJ, Steinert JI, Glavin CEY, et al.
543 Risk and Protective Factors for Intimate Partner Violence Against Women: Systematic
544 Review and Meta-analyses of Prospective–Longitudinal Studies. *Am J Public Health*.
545 2018 Jul;108(7):e1–11.
- 546 8. Pathak N, Dhairyawan R, Tariq S. The experience of intimate partner violence among
547 older women: A narrative review. *Maturitas*. 2019 Mar 1;121:63–75.
- 548 9. Acierno R, Hernandez-Tejada MA, Anetzberger GJ, Loew D, Muzzy W. The National
549 Elder Mistreatment Study: An 8-year longitudinal study of outcomes. *J Elder Abuse Negl*.
550 2017 Aug 8;29(4):254–69.
- 551 10. Dahlberg LL, Krug EG. Violence a global public health problem. *Ciênc Saúde*
552 *Coletiva*. 2006 Jun;11(2):277–92.
- 553 11. Heise LL. Violence against women: an integrated, ecological framework. *Violence*
554 *Women*. 1998 Jun;4(3):262–90.
- 555 12. Schiamberg LB, Gans D. An Ecological Framework for Contextual Risk Factors in
556 Elder Abuse by Adult Children. *J Elder Abuse Negl*. 1999 Oct 20;11(1):79–103.
- 557 13. Peterman A, O'Donnell M, Palermo T. COVID-19 and Violence against Women and
558 Children.
- 559 14. Guterres A. Warning of Rise in Gender-Based Violence during COVID-19 Pandemic,
560 Secretary-General Observance Message Says Policies to Tackle Root Causes, Protect
561 Women Can End Abuse | UN Press [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 23]. Available from:
562 <https://press.un.org/en/2021/sgsm21034.doc.htm>
- 563 15. Davis M, Gilbar O, Padilla-Medina DM. Intimate Partner Violence Victimization and
564 Perpetration Among U.S. Adults During the Earliest Stage of the COVID-19 Pandemic.
565 *Violence Vict*. 2021 Oct 1;36(5):583–603.
- 566 16. Michielsen K, Larrson EC, Kågesten A, Erausquin JT, Griffin S, Van de Velde S, et
567 al. International Sexual Health And REproductive health (I-SHARE) survey during COVID-
568 19: study protocol for online national surveys and global comparative analyses. *Sex*
569 *Transm Infect*. 2021 Mar;97(2):88–92.
- 570 17. Campbell L, Tan RKJ, Uhlich M, Francis JM, Mark K, Miall N, et al. Intimate Partner
571 Violence Prior to and During COVID-19 Measures in 30 Countries: A Global Cross-
572 Sectional Study From the I-SHARE Consortium. *SSRN Electron J* [Internet]. 2021 [cited
573 2022 Dec 25]; Available from: <https://www.ssrn.com/abstract=3974550>

- 574 18. World Health Organization. Researching violence against women : practical
575 guidelines for researchers and activists [Internet]. World Health Organization; 2005 [cited
576 2022 Dec 25]. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/42966>
- 577 19. Hossain M, Heise L. Heise, L ., Hossain, M., STRIVE Technical Brief: Measuring
578 Intimate Partner Violence; London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK;
579 2017. 2017.
- 580 20. Hale T, Angrist N, Goldszmidt R, Kira B, Petherick A, Phillips T, et al. A global panel
581 database of pandemic policies (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker). *Nat*
582 *Hum Behav.* 2021 Apr;5(4):529–38.
- 583 21. Greenland S, Daniel R, Pearce N. Outcome modelling strategies in epidemiology:
584 traditional methods and basic alternatives. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2016 Apr 1;45(2):565–75.
- 585 22. Pérez YM, Gama A, Pedro AR, de Carvalho MJL, Guerreiro AE, Duarte V, et al. The
586 links of stress, substance use and socio-demographic factors with domestic violence
587 during the Covid-19 pandemic in Portugal. *J Public Health Oxf Engl.* 2022 Mar
588 21;fdac024.
- 589 23. O'Hara CA, Tan RKJ. Intimate partner violence before and during the COVID-19
590 lockdown: findings from a cross-sectional study in Singapore. *Sex Health.* 2022
591 Jun;19(3):192–201.
- 592 24. Ojeahere MI, Kumswa SK, Adiukwu F, Plang JP, Taiwo YF. Intimate Partner
593 Violence and its Mental Health Implications Amid COVID-19 Lockdown: Findings Among
594 Nigerian Couples. *J Interpers Violence.* 2022 Sep 1;37(17–18):NP15434–54.
- 595 25. Ebert C, Steinert JI. Prevalence and risk factors of violence against women and
596 children during COVID-19, Germany. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2021 Jun 1;99(6):429–38.
- 597 26. Parrott DJ, Halmos MB, Stappenbeck CA, Moino K. Intimate Partner Aggression
598 During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Associations With Stress and Heavy Drinking. *Psychol*
599 *Violence.* 2022 Mar;12(2):95–103.
- 600 27. Sullivan T, McPartland T, Armeli S, Jaquier Erard V, Tennen H. Is it the Exception or
601 the Rule? Daily Co-Occurrence of Physical, Sexual, and Psychological Partner Violence
602 in a 90-Day Study of Substance-Using, Community Women. *Psychol Violence.* 2012 Apr
603 1;2.
- 604 28. Salis K, Salwen-Deremer J, O'Leary KD. The Predictive Utility of Psychological
605 Aggression for Intimate Partner Violence. *Partn Abuse.* 2014 Jan 1;5:83–97.
- 606 29. Dokkedahl S, Kristensen TR, Murphy S, Elklit A. The complex trauma of
607 psychological violence: cross-sectional findings from a Cohort of four Danish Women
608 Shelters. *Eur J Psychotraumatology.* 2021;12(1):1863580.
- 609 30. Romito P, Pellegrini M, Saurel-Cubizolles MJ. Intimate Partner Violence Against
610 Women During the COVID-19 Lockdown in Italy: A Multicenter Survey Involving Anti-
611 Violence Centers. *Violence Women.* 2022 Jul;28(9):2186–203.
- 612 31. Buchbinder E, Band-Winterstein T. “Like a Wounded Bird”: Older Battered Women’s
613 Life Experiences with Intimate Violence. *J Elder Abuse Negl.* 2003 Feb 1;15:23–44.

- 614 32. Beaulaurier RL, Seff LR, Newman FL, Dunlop B. External Barriers to Help Seeking
615 for Older Women Who Experience Intimate Partner Violence. *J Fam Violence*. 2007 Nov
616 1;22(8):747–55.
- 617 33. McGarry J, Simpson C, Mansour M. How domestic abuse affects the wellbeing of
618 older women. *Nurs Older People*. 2010 Jun;22(5):33–7.
- 619 34. Mears J. Survival is not Enough: Violence Against Older Women in Australia.
620 *Violence Women*. 2003 Dec 1;9(12):1478–89.
- 621 35. Williams EE, Arant KR, Leifer VP, Balcom MC, Levy-Carrick NC, Lewis-O'Connor A,
622 et al. Provider perspectives on the provision of safe, equitable, trauma-informed care for
623 intimate partner violence survivors during the COVID-19 pandemic: a qualitative study.
624 *BMC Womens Health*. 2021 Aug 27;21(1):315.
- 625 36. Menculini G, Tortorella A, Albert U, Carmassi C, Carrà G, Cirulli F, et al. Access to
626 Mental Health Care during the First Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic in Italy: Results
627 from the COMET Multicentric Study. *Brain Sci*. 2021 Oct 26;11(11):1413.
- 628 37. Mubarak F, Suomi R. Elderly Forgotten? Digital Exclusion in the Information Age and
629 the Rising Grey Digital Divide. *Inq J Med Care Organ Provis Financ*.
630 2022;59:469580221096272.
- 631 38. Drieskens S, Braekman E, Ridder KD, Gisle L, Charafeddine R, Hermans L, et al.
632 Domestic violence during the COVID-19 confinement: do victims feel more socially
633 isolated? *Arch Public Health Arch Belg Sante Publique*. 2022 Jan 25;80(1):39.
- 634 39. Hague G, Thiara R, Mullender A. Disabled Women, Domestic Violence and Social
635 Care: The Risk of Isolation, Vulnerability and Neglect. *Br J Soc Work - BRIT J SOC*
636 *WORK*. 2010 Jan 20;40.
- 637 40. Xavier Hall CD, Evans DP. Social comorbidities? A qualitative study mapping
638 syndemic theory onto gender-based violence and co-occurring social phenomena among
639 Brazilian women. *BMC Public Health*. 2020 Aug 18;20(1):1260.
- 640 41. Dias NG, Costa D, Soares J, Hatzidimitriadou E, Ioannidi-Kapolou E, Lindert J, et al.
641 Social support and the intimate partner violence victimization among adults from six
642 European countries. *Fam Pract*. 2019 Mar 20;36(2):117–24.
- 643 42. Kotwal AA, Holt-Lunstad J, Newmark RL, Cenzer I, Smith AK, Covinsky KE, et al.
644 Social Isolation and Loneliness Among San Francisco Bay Area Older Adults During the
645 COVID-19 Shelter-in-Place Orders. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2021 Jan;69(1):20–9.
- 646 43. Grolli RE, Mingoti MED, Bertollo AG, Luzardo AR, Quevedo J, Réus GZ, et al. Impact
647 of COVID-19 in the Mental Health in Elderly: Psychological and Biological Updates. *Mol*
648 *Neurobiol*. 2021 May;58(5):1905–16.
- 649 44. Diamond-Smith N, Conroy AA, Tsai AC, Nekkanti M, Weiser SD. Food insecurity and
650 intimate partner violence among married women in Nepal. *J Glob Health*. 2019
651 Jun;9(1):010412.
- 652 45. Hatcher AM, Neilands TB, Rebombo D, Weiser SD, Christofides NJ. Food insecurity
653 and men's perpetration of partner violence in a longitudinal cohort in South Africa. *BMJ*
654 *Nutr Prev Health*. 2022;5(1):36–43.

- 655 46. Fedina L, Ashwell L, Bright C, Backes B, Newman M, Hafner S, et al. Racial and
656 Gender Inequalities in Food, Housing, and Healthcare Insecurity Associated with Intimate
657 Partner and Sexual Violence. *J Interpers Violence*. 2022 Dec;37(23–24):NP23202–21.
- 658 47. Fox GL, Benson ML, DeMaris AA, Van Wyk J. Economic Distress and Intimate
659 Violence: Testing Family Stress and Resources Theories. *J Marriage Fam*.
660 2002;64(3):793–807.
- 661 48. Peitzmeier SM, Fedina L, Ashwell L, Herrenkohl TI, Tolman R. Increases in Intimate
662 Partner Violence During COVID-19: Prevalence and Correlates. *J Interpers Violence*.
663 2022 Nov;37(21–22):NP20482–512.
- 664 49. Akel M, Berro J, Rahme C, Haddad C, Obeid S, Hallit S. Violence Against Women
665 During COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Interpers Violence*. 2022 Jul 1;37(13–14):NP12284–309.
- 666 50. Mendez-Lopez A, Stuckler D, McKee M, Semenza JC, Lazarus JV. The mental
667 health crisis during the COVID-19 pandemic in older adults and the role of physical
668 distancing interventions and social protection measures in 26 European countries. *SSM -
669 Popul Health*. 2022 Mar 1;17:101017.
- 670 51. Gentilini U, Almenfi M, Orton I, Dale P. Social Protection and Jobs Responses to
671 COVID-19: A Real-Time Review of Country Measures [Internet]. Washington, DC: World
672 Bank; 2020 Apr [cited 2023 Feb 5]. Available from:
673 <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/33635>
- 674 52. Miller AP, Mugamba S, Bulamba RM, Kyasanku E, Nkale J, Nalugoda F, et al.
675 Exploring the impact of COVID-19 on women’s alcohol use, mental health, and
676 experiences of intimate partner violence in Wakiso, Uganda. *PloS One*.
677 2022;17(2):e0263827.
- 678 53. Abu-Elenin MM, Elshora AA, Sadaka MS, Abdeldaim DE. Domestic violence against
679 married women during the COVID-19 pandemic in Egypt. *BMC Womens Health*. 2022
680 Mar 27;22(1):94.
- 681 54. Moawad AM, El Desouky ED, Salem MR, Elhawary AS, Hussein SM, Hassan FM.
682 Violence and sociodemographic related factors among a sample of Egyptian women
683 during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Egypt J Forensic Sci*. 2021;11(1):29.
- 684 55. Nagashima-Hayashi M, Durrance-Bagale A, Marzouk M, Ung M, Lam ST, Neo P, et
685 al. Gender-Based Violence in the Asia-Pacific Region during COVID-19: A Hidden
686 Pandemic behind Closed Doors. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022 Feb
687 16;19(4):2239.
- 688 56. Plášilová L, Hůla M, Krejčová L, Klapilová K. The COVID-19 Pandemic and Intimate
689 Partner Violence against Women in the Czech Republic: Incidence and Associated
690 Factors. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021 Oct 6;18(19):10502.
- 691 57. Sun S, Sun X, Wei C, Shi L, Zhang Y, Operario D, et al. Domestic Violence
692 Victimization Among Men Who Have Sex with Men in China During the COVID-19
693 Lockdown. *J Interpers Violence*. 2022 Dec;37(23–24):NP22135–50.
- 694 58. Lyons M, Brewer G. Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence during Lockdown and
695 the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Fam Violence*. 2022;37(6):969–77.

- 696 59. Abrahams Z, Boisits S, Schneider M, Prince M, Lund C. The relationship between
697 common mental disorders (CMDs), food insecurity and domestic violence in pregnant
698 women during the COVID-19 lockdown in Cape Town, South Africa. Soc Psychiatry
699 Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2022 Jan;57(1):37–46.
- 700 60. El-Nimr NA, Mamdouh HM, Ramadan A, El Saeh HM, Shata ZN. Intimate partner
701 violence among Arab women before and during the COVID-19 lockdown. J Egypt Public
702 Health Assoc. 2021 Jun 16;96(1):15.
- 703 61. Yılmaz Karaman İG, Akı Z, Çanakçı ME, Altınöz AE, Özakın E. Violence Against
704 Women During COVID-19 Pandemic: A Comparative Study from a Turkish Emergency
705 Department. Prehospital Disaster Med. 2022 Aug;37(4):462–7.

706
707

708 **Supporting Information**

709

710 **S1 Table: Potential correlates identified from literature on IPV during COVID-19**
711 **organised into the four-level social-ecological theory adapted from Dahlberg and Krug**
712 **(2006).** Items in bold and italics were collected in I-SHARE 2020-21 or publicly available
713 through country-level indexes. Items in bold were included in the final model (except for
714 ethnic minority status). Items in italics were conceptualised as mediators and therefore not
715 included in the final model.

716

717 **S2 Table: Number and percentage of countries in I-SHARE 2020-21 by sampling**
718 **strategy.** Low- (<\$1,085) or lower-middle income (\$1,086-4,255) economies were Nigeria,
719 Lebanon, and Mozambique. Upper-middle income (\$4,256-13,205) economies were
720 Argentina, Botswana, Colombia, Mexico, Moldova, and Malaysia. High-income (>\$13,205)
721 economies were Australia, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy,
722 Latvia, Luxembourg, Panama, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Uruguay, and the United States.

723

724 **S3 Table: I-SHARE 2020-21 adaptations of the WHO Violence Against Women (VAW)**
725 **questions used to construct IPV.**

726

727 **S4 Fig: Descriptive analysis population (N=2867) and bivariate and final model**
728 **population (N=1730) selection parameters from I-SHARE 2020-21.**

729

730 **S5 Table: Questions on the I-SHARE 2020-21 survey used for the analysis.**

731

732 **S6 Table A: Characteristics of people missing and not missing IPV outcome**
733 **responses in the study from I-SHARE 2020-21 (N=4057).**

734

735 **S6 Table B: Characteristics of people excluded from the final model due to missing**
736 **data on gender, isolation, and food insecurity from I-SHARE 2020-21 (N=2867).**

737

738 **S7 Table A: A sensitivity analysis with participants from LMICs to determine if the**
739 **model is sensitive within this population from the I-SHARE 2020-21 survey (N=749).**

740

741 **S7 Table B: Sensitivity analysis of the construction of IPV. It is defined in this analysis**
742 **as physical and sexual violence using data from the I-SHARE 2020-21 survey**
743 **(N=2867).**

744

745 **S8 Table: Percentage of people in each country social distancing stringency level at**
746 **each country-level variable in I-SHARE 2020-21 (N=2867).**

747

748

749

750

751

752

753




Figure 1




Figure 2