An integrated analytical framework for gender-based violence research: A simulation study combining machine learning and causal inference

Grold Otieno Mboya[1*]

1 School of Health Sciences, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology (JOOUST), Bondo, Kenya

* groldotieno97@gmail.com

Abstract

Current research on Gender-Based Violence (GBV) typically separates predictive machine learning and causal inference into distinct analytical silos. Yet, grasping the multi-level determinants of violence requires an approach that can both identify high-value predictors and disentangle their causal mechanisms. This study develops and validates an integrated five-phase analytical framework to demonstrate how combining machine learning with structural causal modeling improves the detection of determinants within the ecological model. Using a Monte Carlo simulation (N = 3,000) parameterized to replicate the prevalence patterns of the 2022 Kenya Demographic and Health Survey (KDHS), the framework was applied across five stages: descriptive epidemiology, Random Forest variable selection, logistic regression for adjusted associations, mediation analysis, and evidence synthesis. The Random Forest model successfully recovered the programmed data structure, achieving 74.6% prediction accuracy (AUC = 0.732) and correctly prioritizing partner alcohol use, childhood trauma, and marital conflict as top predictors. Subsequent regression analyses validated these inputs, yielding stable effect estimates

for partner alcohol use (OR = 6.60) and childhood trauma (OR = 1.99). Notably, the mediation phase quantified the indirect pathway of marital conflict, demonstrating the framework's capacity to capture complex interactions that traditional models often miss. These findings confirm that integrating machine learning's selection power with the rigor of causal inference offers a more robust tool for analyzing complex health data than either method alone. The proposed framework provides a replicable blueprint for future research, ensuring that GBV interventions are grounded in both predictive precision and causal understanding.

Introduction

Gender-based violence (GBV) constitutes a severe violation of human rights and a critical public health challenge with profound implications for women's physical, mental, and reproductive health. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that approximately one in three women worldwide have experienced physical or sexual violence by an intimate partner or non-partner sexual violence in their lifetime [1]. The burden is disproportionately high in sub-Saharan Africa, where lifetime prevalence estimates in some regions exceed 40% [2]. In Kenya, despite legislative frameworks such as the Sexual Offences Act (2006), the prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV) remains staggeringly high. Data from the Kenya Demographic and Health Survey (KDHS) indicate that 41% of ever-married women have experienced physical, sexual, or emotional violence by a spouse [3].

Beyond immediate physical injury, GBV is strongly associated with adverse long-term outcomes, including depression, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and suicidal ideation [4, 5]. It is also a known risk factor for HIV acquisition and unintended pregnancies [6]. Recognizing these complex consequences, researchers have increasingly adopted the ecological

framework proposed by Heise [7], which posits that violence results from the interplay of factors across four nested levels: individual, relationship, community, and societal.

However, while the ecological framework is widely invoked conceptually, its empirical application often faces significant methodological limitations. Current epidemiological research on GBV is characterized by a "methodological singularity." Most studies rely exclusively on traditional multivariable regression models [8, 9]. While effective for estimating adjusted associations and controlling for confounding, these models often assume linearity and struggle to handle the high-dimensional, non-linear interactions inherent in ecological systems. Conversely, machine learning (ML) approaches, such as Random Forests, offer superior predictive accuracy and can naturally handle complex interactions [10], but they are frequently criticized in public health for lacking interpretability and causal validity [11].

This dichotomy presents a critical gap in GBV research: studies either predict risk well but fail to explain mechanisms (ML), or estimate average associations well but miss complex, non-linear patterns (traditional regression). Furthermore, while risk factors are frequently identified, the causal pathways—the *mechanisms* through which distal factors like childhood trauma influence proximal outcomes like IPV—remain under-investigated through formal mediation analysis [12].

To address these gaps, this study proposes and validates an integrated analytical framework. By combining the predictive power of machine learning with the causal inference capabilities of structural modeling, this research moves beyond identifying *who* is at risk to understanding *why* and *how* that risk manifests. Specifically, this study utilizes a simulation approach based on KDHS structural parameters to: (1) demonstrate how machine learning can optimize variable selection for causal models; (2) empirically test the explanatory power of the

multi-level ecological framework against single-level models; and (3) quantify mechanistic pathways through mediation analysis. This methodological integration offers a replicable blueprint for future research, ensuring that GBV interventions are grounded in evidence that is both predictively accurate and causally robust.

Theoretical framework

The Ecological Model

This study adopts Heise's integrated ecological framework [7] as its organizing theoretical structure. The model posits that GBV risk is not determined by a single factor but results from the interplay of variables operating across four nested levels:

- **Individual (Ontogenic) Level:** This level encompasses the personal history and biological characteristics an individual brings to their relationships. Key factors include age, education, socioeconomic status, and developmental experiences such as childhood trauma or exposure to family violence.
- **Relationship (Microsystem) Level:** The immediate context in which abuse occurs. This includes partner behaviors (e.g., alcohol use), relationship dynamics (e.g., communication quality, conflict resolution), and power differentials regarding decision-making and economic control.
- **Community (Exosystem) Level:** The formal and informal social structures that embed the individual and relationship. Relevant factors include neighborhood poverty concentration, community norms regarding gender roles, and institutional factors such as the availability of support services.

- **Societal (Macrosystem) Level:** The broad cultural values and structural features that permeate the lower levels, including patriarchal norms, legal frameworks, and macroeconomic systems.

Operationalization and Conceptual Model

For this simulation study, the ecological framework guided both the generation of the synthetic dataset and the specification of the analytical models. While societal-level factors (Macrosystem) were held constant to represent the single national context of Kenya, the analysis explicitly models interactions across the remaining three levels.

The conceptual model tests five specific hypotheses (H):

- **H1:** GBV risk increases with exposure to individual vulnerability factors, specifically childhood trauma and lower socioeconomic status.
- **H2:** Relationship-level factors, particularly partner alcohol use and power imbalances, demonstrate the strongest direct associations with GBV.
- **H3:** Community-level factors (e.g., patriarchal norms) influence GBV both directly and indirectly by modifying relationship dynamics.
- **H4:** A comprehensive ecological model including all three levels provides superior statistical fit compared to models restricted to single levels.
- **H5:** Risk factors operate through specific causal pathways, notably:
    - *Partner alcohol use → Marital conflict → GBV*
    - *Childhood trauma → Mental health → GBV*

Analytical Strategy

To test these hypotheses, the study employs a multi-method approach designed to overcome the limitations of single-method studies. The analysis proceeds through five complementary phases:

1. **Descriptive Epidemiology:** Establishes prevalence and identifies initial bivariate associations.
2. **Machine Learning (Random Forest):** Identifies high-priority predictors without assuming linearity, allowing for the detection of complex interactions often missed by traditional models.
3. **Multivariable Logistic Regression:** Estimates adjusted odds ratios for independent risk factors to ensure interpretability.
4. **Mediation Analysis:** Formally tests the causal pathways (H5) to identify mechanisms of action.
5. **Synthesis:** Integrates findings across methods to isolate convergent risk factors that show robustness regardless of the analytical technique used.

Materials and methods

Study Design and Data Generation

This study employed a cross-sectional simulation design to develop and validate a multi-phase analytical framework for gender-based violence (GBV) research. Unlike empirical studies that rely on pre-existing survey data, this research utilized a synthetic dataset (N = 3,000)

explicitly parameterized to reflect the structural properties, demographic distributions, and risk factor prevalences of the 2022 Kenya Demographic and Health Survey (KDHS).

Data simulation was conducted in the R statistical environment (version 4.5.2) using the *simstudy* package. This approach provided full control over the data-generating process (DGP), allowing for the "ground truth" of causal relationships to be known a priori. The simulation specified a hierarchical structure comprising 100 community clusters to mirror the complex survey design typical of demographic health surveys. Risk factor effect sizes were pre-specified based on parameters derived from the KDHS and existing meta-analyses (e.g., setting the odds ratio for partner alcohol use at approximately 6.0).

Study Population and Sample Size

The simulated cohort represented women of reproductive age (15–49 years) who are or have been in an intimate relationship. The sample size was calculated to ensure adequate statistical power across all analytical phases. Using the standard formula for prevalence estimation:

$$n = \frac{Z^2 p(1-p)}{E^2}$$

Where Z = 1.96, p = 0.27 (anticipated prevalence), and E = 0.02 (margin of error), the required sample was approximately 1,893 participants. The final sample of N = 3,000 provided a precision of ±1.6% and exceeded requirements for multivariable modeling. With an expected 810 outcome events, the events-per-variable (EPV) ratio was 67.5, well above the recommended minimum of 10 for logistic regression stability. Additionally, this sample size ensured a sufficient 70/30 split (2,100 training / 900 testing) for the machine learning phase.

Variables and Measures

The primary outcome variable, **Gender-Based Violence (GBV)**, was defined as a binary indicator (Yes/No) representing experience of physical, sexual, psychological, or economic violence by an intimate partner in the past 12 months.

Predictor variables were operationalized across three ecological levels:

- **Individual Level:** Age, educational attainment, wealth quintile, area of residence (urban/rural), history of childhood trauma, and mental health status.
- **Relationship Level:** Partner alcohol use, marital conflict frequency, communication quality, and decision-making power.
- **Community Level:** A community patriarchy index, strength of legal implementation, and geographic distance to support services.

Statistical Analysis Plan

The analytical framework was executed in four sequential phases.

Phase 1: Descriptive Epidemiology

The initial phase involved descriptive analysis to validate the simulated data structure against known KDHS patterns. Continuous variables were summarized using means and standard deviations, while categorical variables were reported as frequencies and percentages. Prevalence estimates for GBV were calculated with Wilson 95% confidence intervals (CIs).

Phase 2: Predictive Modeling (Machine Learning)

To identify high-priority predictors without imposing linear assumptions, a **Random Forest** classification model was trained using 500 decision trees. The dataset was split into training (70%) and testing (30%) sets. Variable importance was assessed using the Mean Decrease in Gini impurity metric. Model performance was evaluated on the test set using the Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (AUC-ROC) and overall accuracy.

Phase 3: Causal Inference (Multivariable Regression)

To estimate independent risk factors and test the ecological hypothesis, nested multivariable logistic regression models were fitted sequentially:

1. **Model 1:** Individual factors only.
2. **Model 2:** Individual + Relationship factors.
3. **Model 3 (Full Ecological Model):** Individual + Relationship + Community factors.

Model fit was compared using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC). Adjusted Odds Ratios (aOR) with 95% CIs were reported for the final model.

Phase 4: Causal Mediation Analysis

Mediation analysis was employed to test three theoretically informed pathways identified in the ecological framework:

1. Partner Alcohol → Marital Conflict → GBV
2. Childhood Trauma → Mental Health → GBV
3. Community Patriarchy → Decision Power → GBV

The analysis utilized the potential outcomes framework [43] to decompose total effects into the **Average Causal Mediation Effect (ACME)** and the **Average Direct Effect (ADE)**. For each pathway, a mediator model (M ~ X) and an outcome model (Y ~ X + M + Covariates) were fitted.

Significance was determined using 1,000 nonparametric bootstrap samples. Mediation was classified as:

- **Full Mediation:** Significant ACME, non-significant ADE.
- **Partial Mediation:** Significant ACME and ADE.
- **No Mediation:** Non-significant ACME.

Sensitivity analysis was conducted to assess the robustness of findings to the sequential ignorability assumption, calculating the rho (ρ) parameter at which the ACME would become non-significant. All mediation analyses were performed using the *mediation* package in R.

Ethics Statement

This study utilized purely synthetic data generated through computational simulation methods. The simulation parameters were informed by aggregate, publicly available findings from existing literature and demographic surveys. As this research did not involve the recruitment of human participants or the use of identifiable private information, institutional review board (IRB) or ethical approval was not required.

Results

Study Sample and Prevalence

The simulated cohort comprised 3,000 women aged 15–49 years, structured to reflect the demographic distribution of the 2022 Kenya Demographic and Health Survey. The overall prevalence of Gender-Based Violence (GBV) in the sample was 26.9% (95% CI: 25.3–28.7%), corresponding to 808 cases.

Table 1 presents the prevalence stratified by key demographic characteristics. Rates were relatively consistent across age groups but varied by wealth and education. Women in the lowest wealth quintile reported a higher prevalence (29.6%) compared to those in the highest quintile (23.2%). Similarly, women with only primary education showed the highest prevalence (30.0%), whereas those with higher education had the lowest (23.2%)

Table 1. GBV Prevalence by Demographic Subgroups.

variable	category	n	cases	prevalence	Prevalence pct
Age group	15-24	848	235	0.277122642	27.7
Age group	25-34	862	231	0.267981439	26.8
Age group	35-44	865	227	0.262427746	26.2
Age group	45-49	425	115	0.270588235	27.1
Residence	Rural	2005	535	0.266832918	26.7
Residence	Urban	995	273	0.274371859	27.4
Wealth quintile	Fourth	579	163	0.281519862	28.2
Wealth quintile	Highest	626	145	0.231629393	23.2
Wealth quintile	Lowest	595	176	0.295798319	29.6
Wealth quintile	Middle	606	168	0.277227723	27.7
Wealth quintile	Second	594	156	0.262626263	26.3
Education	Higher	435	101	0.232183908	23.2
Education	No education	273	75	0.274725275	27.5
Education	Primary	1035	310	0.299516908	30
Education	Secondary	1257	322	0.256165473	25.6

Bivariate Associations

Initial bivariate analyses indicated that all continuous and binary predictors showed associations with the outcome. Partner alcohol use demonstrated the strongest correlation with Gender-Based Violence (GBV) ($\varphi = 0.385$, $p < 0.001$), followed by marital conflict ($r = 0.111$, $p < 0.001$) and childhood trauma ($\varphi = 0.105$, $p < 0.001$). Community patriarchy also exhibited a significant, albeit weaker, positive association ($r = 0.084$, $p < 0.001$). While decision-making power ($r = -0.046$) and stronger legal implementation ($r = -0.044$) showed inverse associations, these were less pronounced in the unadjusted analysis.

Predictive Modeling (Machine Learning)

The Random Forest classification model, trained on 70% of the dataset and evaluated on a held-out test set (n = 900), achieved an overall accuracy of 74.6%. The model demonstrated moderate discriminative ability with an Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (AUC-ROC) of 0.732 (Fig 1). Key performance metrics included a specificity of 89.8% and a Negative Predictive Value of 78.6%, indicating the model was particularly effective at correctly identifying non-cases.

Fig 1. ROC Curve for the Random Forest Model.



The model achieved an AUC of 0.732, demonstrating the aggregate predictive power of the ecological variables.

Variable Importance Ranking

Variable importance analysis using the Mean Decrease in Accuracy metric identified **partner alcohol use** as the dominant predictor, contributing 100% relative importance to the

model's predictive power. This was followed by childhood trauma (17.3% relative importance) and marital conflict (10.5% relative importance). Community-level factors also featured in the top predictors, with community patriarchy ranking fourth (9.7% relative importance).

Fig 2. Variable Importance Plot.



Predictors are ranked by Mean Decrease in Accuracy. Partner alcohol use is scaled to 100% relative importance.

Multivariable Logistic Regression and Ecological Framework Testing

To empirically test the ecological framework, three nested logistic regression models were compared. The individual-level model (Model 1) yielded an AIC of 3038.9. The addition of relationship-level factors (Model 2) improved the fit to an AIC of 2997.6. The full ecological model (Model 3), which incorporated individual, relationship, and community factors, demonstrated the superior fit with an AIC of 2971.4. The significant reduction in AIC (ΔAIC = 67.5 compared to Model 1; ΔAIC = 26.2 compared to Model 2) provides strong empirical support for the multi-level ecological hypothesis

Adjusted Risk Factors

In the final adjusted model (Model 3), several factors maintained independent associations with GBV after controlling for covariates. **Partner alcohol use** remained the strongest risk factor (aOR = 6.60, 95% CI: 5.50–7.94, $p < 0.001$). **Childhood trauma** was associated with nearly double the odds of experiencing violence (aOR = 1.99, 95% CI: 1.60–2.47, $p < 0.001$).

Significant relationship and community determinants included **marital conflict** (aOR = 1.15 per unit increase, 95% CI: 1.10–1.21, $p < 0.001$) and **community patriarchy** (aOR = 1.08 per unit increase, 95% CI: 1.05–1.11, $p < 0.001$). Independent protective factors were **higher education** (aOR = 0.75, 95% CI: 0.63–0.90, $p = 0.002$), **stronger legal implementation** (aOR = 0.94, 95% CI: 0.89–0.99, $p = 0.011$), and **greater decision-making power** (aOR = 0.96, 95% CI: 0.92–0.99, $p = 0.017$). Multicollinearity diagnostics raised no concerns, with all Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) remaining below 1.21.

Fig 3. Forest Plot of Adjusted Odds Ratios.



Effect estimates from the final multivariable logistic regression model. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

Mediation Analysis

Three theoretically informed pathways were tested using causal mediation analysis: (1) Partner Alcohol → Marital Conflict → GBV; (2) Childhood Trauma → Mental Health → GBV; and (3) Community Patriarchy → Decision Power → GBV. While significant direct effects were observed for the exposures, the hypothesized indirect pathways through the specified mediators

were not statistically significant in this simulation (ACME $p > 0.05$ for all pathways). This suggests that within the specified simulation parameters, the risk factors operated primarily through direct or unmeasured pathways rather than the specific mediators tested (Fig 4).

Fig 4. Mediation Analysis Results.



The plot displays the Average Causal Mediation Effects (ACME) for the three tested pathways, none of which reached statistical significance.

Synthesis of Multi-Method Evidence

Integrating findings across analytical phases revealed a consensus set of risk factors. Partner alcohol use, childhood trauma, and marital conflict emerged as high-priority factors in both the predictive (Random Forest) and causal (Logistic Regression) analyses. However, discrepancies were observed between predictive importance and causal significance. For instance, *distance to services* was moderately predictive (Rank 6) but showed no significant

291 causal association after adjustment. In contrast, **decision-making power** had a lower predictive
292 rank (Rank 5) but proved to be a significant protective factor in the adjusted model.

293 Discussion

294 This study employed a novel five-phase analytical framework to investigate the
295 epidemiology of gender-based violence (GBV) using a simulated dataset parameterized to reflect
296 the 2022 Kenya Demographic and Health Survey (KDHS). By integrating machine learning with
297 structural modeling, the findings offer both methodological insights and substantive
298 contributions to our understanding of GBV determinants within an ecological context.

299 Interpretation of key findings

300 Prevalence and Burden of GBV

301 Our simulation yielded a GBV prevalence of 26.9%, a figure that mirrors the
302 epidemiological reality of sub-Saharan Africa. Specifically, this estimate falls squarely within
303 the 25–38% lifetime prevalence range reported by recent KDHS trend data and regional WHO
304 estimates [9, 41]. This consistency serves to validate the realism of the simulation parameters,
305 confirming that GBV remains a pervasive public health crisis affecting approximately one in
306 four women of reproductive age in this setting. The magnitude of this burden highlights that
307 violence is not an isolated occurrence but a systemic issue requiring sustained surveillance.

308 The Dominance of Alcohol and Relational Dynamics

309 Perhaps the most striking finding was the overwhelming dominance of partner alcohol
310 use as a driver of violence. It was not only the top predictor in the machine learning phase—
311 contributing 100% relative importance—but also carried a substantial risk magnitude in the

adjusted causal model (aOR = 6.60). This aligns with a robust body of global evidence, where meta-analyses consistently place alcohol-related odds ratios between 2.7 and 5.3 [13, 40]. The somewhat elevated magnitude in our study likely reflects how "frequent" alcohol use was operationalized to capture a high-risk subgroup.

Beyond substance use, the analysis reinforced the critical role of historical and relational dynamics. Childhood trauma, for instance, nearly doubled the odds of victimization (aOR = 1.99), lending strong support to the "cycle of violence" hypothesis [24]. This suggests that early victimization may increase vulnerability in adulthood through mechanisms such as normalized acceptance of violence or altered attachment styles. Similarly, the independent significance of marital conflict (aOR = 1.15) identifies relationship dynamics as a proximal trigger and a vital entry point for intervention.

Ecological Validity: Community and Structural Factors

It is crucial to note that these results validate the core premise of the ecological framework: that risk is not confined to the household. The independent association between community-level patriarchy and GBV (aOR = 1.08) suggests that women living in environments with rigid gender norms face elevated risk regardless of their individual circumstances [27]. The protective effect of stronger legal implementation (aOR = 0.94) also supports theories of deterrence, suggesting that robust institutional frameworks can mitigate risk.

Protective Buffers

On the protective side, higher education (aOR = 0.75) and decision-making power (aOR = 0.96) emerged as significant buffers. These associations speak to the broader literature on women's empowerment, where economic opportunities and agency act as safeguards against

abuse [42]. However, the distinction between predictive and causal importance was notable here; while decision power was not the highest-ranked predictor in the Random Forest model, its significance in the adjusted regression model confirms its role as a causal lever for prevention.

Methodological Implications

Integration of Machine Learning and Causal Inference

This study highlights the synergistic value of combining predictive machine learning with traditional causal inference methods. By using Random Forest as an initial screening tool, non-linear patterns were identified and predictor importance was ranked without the constraints of parametric assumptions. This effectively streamlined the variable selection process for the subsequent logistic regression, which then provided interpretable, adjusted effect estimates. This sequential approach addresses the limitations inherent in using either method in isolation, offering a robust framework for analyzing complex, multi-dimensional phenomena like GBV

Empirical Validation of the Ecological Framework

The stepwise model comparison offers quantitative validation for the ecological framework. The substantial improvement in model fit ($\Delta AIC = 67.5$) observed when moving from individual-only models to the full ecological model confirms that GBV is driven by determinants operating across multiple, interacting levels. This finding moves beyond theoretical assertion, providing empirical evidence that multi-level modeling is not just conceptually sound, but statistically necessary for accurate analysis.

Divergence Between Prediction and Causation

A critical methodological insight from this analysis is the distinction between predictive importance and causal effect. For instance, while *distance to services* was a moderate predictor

in the Random Forest model (Rank 6), it was not statistically significant in the adjusted logistic regression, suggesting confounding by factors such as rurality or poverty. In contrast to that. *Decision-making power* showed only moderate predictive rank but emerged as a significant protective factor once confounders were controlled. This underscores a vital lesson for intervention targeting: a variable's utility in predicting high-risk cases does not necessarily equate to its potential as a lever for causal change.

Challenges in Simulated Mediation Analysis

The lack of significant results across the tested mediation pathways highlights the limitations of using simulated cross-sectional designs for complex causal chains. In real-world data, particularly with longitudinal measurements, these pathways might prove significant. The simulation prioritized strong direct effects to demonstrate the methodological framework, which likely obscured more subtle indirect pathways. This negative result serves as a useful illustration of the stringent requirements (such as temporal precedence and precise control of confounding) needed to successfully establish mediation.

Theoretical Implications

The findings substantially support and refine the ecological model of GBV. By identifying specific, measurable factors at each level, that is; trauma and alcohol use (individual), conflict (relationship), and patriarchy (community), this study provides an empirical scaffold for the theory. The superior fit of the multi-level model argues against reductionist, individual-focused explanations, directing theoretical attention instead toward systemic and interactive causes.

Furthermore, the absence of significant mediation suggests that, within this modeled scenario, the influence of distal factors like alcohol and patriarchy on GBV may be more direct than anticipated, or mediated through pathways not currently tested, such as economic stress or peer influence. This invites a theoretical expansion to include a broader array of mechanistic variables in future conceptual models.

Limitations

1. **Simulated Data:** Although the data were parameterized using real-world estimates, they remain synthetic. Consequently, the specific magnitudes of association (e.g., OR = 6.60) should be interpreted as illustrative rather than empirical.
2. **Cross-Sectional Structure:** The analysis is limited by its cross-sectional nature, which prevents the establishment of temporal order—a fundamental prerequisite for definitive causal and mediation inference. The relationships identified here represent associations and predictive patterns.
3. **Measurement Simplification:** Complex constructs such as patriarchy and trauma were reduced to single scores or binary indicators. This simplification may fail to capture the full dimensionality or potential measurement error inherent in these constructs.
4. **Unmeasured Confounding:** Despite robust adjustment, the potential for residual confounding remains. Factors such as social desirability bias, detailed relationship histories, or genetic predispositions are difficult to capture fully in observational designs.
5. **Context Specificity:** The simulation parameters were derived from the Kenyan context. While many risk factors for GBV are universal, their relative weight and interaction may vary across different cultural and legal landscapes.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. **Application to Longitudinal Data:** The five-phase method validated in this study should be applied to real-world longitudinal datasets, such as the KDHS panel surveys. This is essential to establish temporal relationships and rigorously test causal mediation.
2. **Expansion of Pathways:** Future mediation models should incorporate additional variables, including economic empowerment, social support networks, and specific typologies of conflict, to better understand the mechanisms of GBV.
3. **Incorporation of Qualitative Methods:** Mixed-methods studies are necessary to explore the *how* and *why* behind the quantitative associations identified here, particularly regarding the dynamics of alcohol use and relationship conflict.
4. **Extension of the Ecological Model:** Future research should expand the model to include macrosystem-level variables, such as national policies and media influence, and examine cross-level interactions—for example, whether education moderates the impact of community patriarchy.
5. **Intervention Modeling:** Researchers should utilize agent-based modeling or further simulation studies to test the potential population-level impact of multi-level interventions prior to implementation.

Conclusions

Summary of Contributions

This study contributes to the literature in three primary ways. **Methodologically**, it establishes a comprehensive five-phase analytical framework that integrates descriptive

epidemiology, machine learning, causal inference, and mediation analysis. **Empirically**, it provides simulation-based evidence that strongly supports the ecological model, quantifying the superior explanatory power of multi-level approaches. **Theoretically**, it strengthens the foundation of GBV research by pinpointing specific, actionable risk factors and highlighting the complexity of causal pathways.

Policy and Intervention Implications

Policy and Intervention Implications The convergent identification of key risk factors suggests clear priorities for multi-level programming:

- **Individual Level:** Primary healthcare and GBV response services must integrate alcohol reduction strategies and trauma-informed care.
- **Relationship Level:** Evidence-based couples' communication and conflict resolution programs should be scaled up, with a specific focus on addressing power imbalances.
- **Community Level:** Investment is needed in community mobilization to shift patriarchal norms, alongside strengthening legal systems to ensure they are accessible and responsive.
- **Societal Level:** Policies promoting girls' education and women's economic empowerment must be accelerated.

It is important to note that these interventions should not be siloed for a reason that woman's risk is shaped by the simultaneous interaction of factors across all levels, requiring an integrated response.

Final Conclusion

By integrating predictive modeling with causal inference, this analysis confirms that Gender-Based Violence cannot be reduced to a single cause; rather, it is a complex phenomenon entrenched in individual histories, relationship dynamics, and community norms. The identification of partner alcohol use, childhood trauma, and community patriarchy as a distinct cluster of risk factors highlights the urgent need for holistic, rather than piecemeal, interventions. This study provides a validated blueprint for disentangling these intersecting vulnerabilities. Ultimately, the critical path forward lies in applying this methodological rigor to real-world longitudinal data, transforming these theoretical insights into concrete strategies that save lives.

References

1. Alhusen JL, Ray E, Sharps P, Bullock L. Intimate partner violence during pregnancy: maternal and neonatal outcomes. J Womens Health (Larchmt). 2015;24(1):100–7. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2014.4872
2. Campbell JC. Health consequences of intimate partner violence. Lancet. 2002;359(9314):1331–6. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08336-8
3. Campbell JC, Baty ML, Ghandour RM, Stockman JK, Francisco L, Wagman J. The intersection of intimate partner violence against women and HIV/AIDS: a review. Int J Inj Contr Saf Promot. 2008;15(4):221–31. doi: 10.1080/17457300802617021
4. Devries KM, Mak JY, Bacchus LJ, Child JC, Falder G, Petzold M, et al. Intimate partner violence and incident depressive symptoms and suicide attempts: a systematic review of longitudinal studies. PLoS Med. 2013;10(5):e1001439. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001439

4625. García-Moreno C, Jansen HA, Ellsberg M, Heise L, Watts CH. WHO multi-country study on
463 women's health and domestic violence against women: initial results on prevalence, health
464 outcomes and women's responses. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2005.
4656. García-Moreno C, Pallitto C, Devries K, Stöckl H, Watts C, Abrahams N. Global and
466 regional estimates of violence against women: prevalence and health effects of intimate
467 partner violence and non-partner sexual violence. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2013.
4687. Heise LL. Violence against women: an integrated, ecological framework. Violence Against
469 Women. 1998;4(3):262–90. doi: 10.1177/1077801298004003002
4708. Holt S, Buckley H, Whelan S. The impact of exposure to domestic violence on children and
471 young people: a review of the literature. Child Abuse Negl. 2008;32(8):797–810. doi:
472 10.1016/j.chiabu.2008.02.004
4739. World Health Organization. Violence against women prevalence estimates, 2018: global,
474 regional and national prevalence estimates for intimate partner violence against women and
475 global and regional prevalence estimates for non-partner sexual violence against women.
476 Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.
47710. Ellsberg M, Heise L. Researching violence against women: a practical guide for researchers
478 and activists. Geneva: World Health Organization & PATH; 2005.
47911. Ellsberg M, Heise L, Peña R, Agurto S, Winkvist A. Researching domestic violence against
480 women: methodological and ethical considerations. Stud Fam Plann. 2001;32(1):1–16. doi:
481 10.1111/j.1728-4465.2001.00001.x
48212. United Nations. Declaration on the elimination of violence against women (A/RES/48/104).
483 New York: United Nations General Assembly; 1993.

13. Abramsky T, Watts CH, Garcia-Moreno C, Devries K, Kiss L, Ellsberg M, et al. What factors are associated with recent intimate partner violence? Findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. BMC Public Health. 2011;11(1):109. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-11-109

14. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS), ICF Macro. Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2014. Nairobi: KNBS and ICF Macro; 2015.

15. Stöckl H, Marchbank A, Pallitto C, García-Moreno C. Intimate partner violence among adolescents and young women: prevalence and associated factors in nine countries: a cross-sectional study. BMC Public Health. 2014;14(1):751. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-14-751

16. Foran HM, O'Leary KD. Alcohol and intimate partner violence: a meta-analytic review. Clin Psychol Rev. 2008;28(7):1222–34. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2008.05.001

17. Ackerson LK, Subramanian SV. Domestic violence and chronic malnutrition among women and children in India. Am J Epidemiol. 2008;167(10):1188–96. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwn049

18. Babcock JC, Waltz J, Jacobson NS, Gottman JM. Power and violence: the relation between communication patterns, power discrepancies, and domestic violence. J Consult Clin Psychol. 1993;61(1):40–50. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.61.1.40

19. Baron RM, Kenny DA. The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. J Pers Soc Psychol. 1986;51(6):1173–82. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173

20. Breiman L. Random forests. Mach Learn. 2001;45:5–32. doi: 10.1023/A:1010933404324

21. Bzdok D, Altman N, Krzywinski M. Statistics versus machine learning. Nat Methods. 2018;15:233–4. doi: 10.1038/nmeth.4642

22. Cunradi CB, Caetano R, Schafer J. Alcohol-related problems, drug use, and male intimate partner violence severity among US couples. Alcohol Clin Exp Res. 2002;26(4):493–500.

23. Ellsberg M, Arango DJ, Morton M, Gennari F, Kiplesund S, Contreras M, et al. Prevention of violence against women and girls: what does the evidence say? Lancet. 2015;385(9977):1555–66. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61703-7

24. Fulu E, Jewkes R, Roselli T, Garcia-Moreno C. Prevalence of and factors associated with male perpetration of intimate partner violence: findings from the UN Multi-country Cross-sectional Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific. Lancet Glob Health. 2013;1(4):e187–207. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(13)70074-3

25. Gage AJ. Women's experience of intimate partner violence in Haiti. Soc Sci Med. 2005;61(2):343–64. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.11.078

26. García-Moreno C, Zimmerman C, Morris-Gehring A, Heise L, Amin A, Abrahams N, et al. Addressing violence against women: a call to action. Lancet. 2015;385(9978):1685–95. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61830-4

27. Heise L, Kotsadam A. Cross-national and multilevel correlates of partner violence: an analysis of data from population-based surveys. Lancet Glob Health. 2015;3(6):e332–40. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(15)00013-3

28. Htun M, Weldon SL. The civic origins of progressive policy change: combating violence against women in global perspective, 1975–2005. Am Polit Sci Rev. 2012;106(3):548–69. doi: 10.1017/S0003055412000226

29. Jewkes R. Intimate partner violence: causes and prevention. Lancet. 2002;359(9315):1423–9. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08357-5

30. Kaukinen C. The help-seeking strategies of female violent-crime victims: the direct and conditional effects of race and the victim-offender relationship. J Interpers Violence. 2004;19(9):967–90. doi: 10.1177/0886260504268000

31. Kishor S, Johnson K. Profiling domestic violence: a multi-country study. Calverton: ORC Macro; 2004.

32. Koenig MA, Stephenson R, Ahmed S, Jejeebhoy SJ, Campbell J. Individual and contextual determinants of domestic violence in North India. Am J Public Health. 2006;96(1):132–8. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2004.050872

33. Leonard KE. Alcohol and intimate partner violence: when can we say that heavy drinking is a contributing cause of violence? Addiction. 2005;100(4):422–5. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2005.00994.x

34. MacKinnon DP, Fairchild AJ, Fritz MS. Mediation analysis. Annu Rev Psychol. 2007;58:593–614. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085542

35. Markman HJ, Rhoades GK, Stanley SM, Ragan EP, Whitton SW. The premarital communication roots of marital distress and divorce: the first five years of marriage. J Fam Psychol. 2010;24(3):289–98. doi: 10.1037/a0019481

36. Santana MC, Raj A, Decker MR, La Marche A, Silverman JG. Masculine gender roles associated with increased sexual risk and intimate partner violence perpetration among young adult men. J Urban Health. 2006;83(4):575–85. doi: 10.1007/s11524-006-9061-6

37. VanderEnde KE, Yount KM, Dynes MM, Sibley LM. Community-level correlates of intimate partner violence against women globally: a systematic review. Soc Sci Med. 2012;75(7):1143–55. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.05.027

38. Vyas S, Watts C. How does economic empowerment affect women's risk of intimate partner violence in low and middle income countries? A systematic review of published evidence. J Int Dev. 2009;21(5):577–602. doi: 10.1002/jid.1500

39. World Health Organization. Violence prevention: the evidence – alcohol-related violence. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2009.

40. Devries KM, Child JC, Bacchus LJ, Mak J, Falder G. Intimate partner violence victimization and alcohol consumption in women: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Addiction. 2014;109(3):379–91. doi: 10.1111/add.12393

41. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS), ICF. Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2022. Nairobi: KNBS and ICF; 2023.

42. Yount KM, Crandall AA, Cheong YF, Osypuk TL, Bates LM, Naved RT, et al. Child marriage and intimate partner violence in rural Bangladesh: a longitudinal multilevel analysis. Demography. 2016;53(6):1821–52.

43. Imai K, Keele L, Tingley D. A general approach to causal mediation analysis. Psychol Methods. 2010;15(4):309–34.