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Background

The tables included in this document are the accompanying tables to the rapid evidence review entitled ‘The range and magnitude of alcohol’s harm to others’.

The tables outline key methodological aspects of the surveys identified in the rapid evidence review, in addition to the five-nations surveys that were carried out and published in different years in England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, and the Republic of Ireland. These tables are intended to be read alongside the sections of the rapid review, so the methodological aspects of each survey can be considered alongside the key findings. Greater weight should be given to surveys with higher quality methods. The prevalence of AHTO has not been included in the accompanying tables since methodological differences preclude direct comparisons.
## Appendix 1: An overview of the five-nations surveys included in this review: England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey number</th>
<th>Country, year of survey (reference)</th>
<th>Sample size n (age)</th>
<th>Co-operation rate / Response rate</th>
<th>Sampling (analytical approach)</th>
<th>Survey method</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>England, 2015/16 (1)</td>
<td>4,874 (&gt;=16 years)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>National, random probability/simple quota sampling (weighted)</td>
<td>Self-completed face-to-face interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…any harm (a positive response to any of 18 harm questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wales, 2015 (2)</td>
<td>1,071 (&gt;=18 years)</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>National, random sampling (weighted)</td>
<td>Telephone interviews</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…any harm (a positive response to any of 18 harm questions or ‘other harm’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>North West of England 2014 (3)</td>
<td>1,020 (&gt;18 years)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Quota sampling (not reported)</td>
<td>Self-completed online survey</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…any harm (a positive response to any of 20 harm questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Scotland, 2012 (4)</td>
<td>1,007 (&gt;=16 years)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>National, quota sampling (not reported)</td>
<td>Face to face interviews</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…any harm (a positive response to any of 16 harm questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Republic of Ireland, 2006 and 2010 combined (5)</td>
<td>2,011 (&gt;=18 years)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>National, quota sampling (weighted)</td>
<td>Face to face interviews</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…any harm (a positive response to any of 5 harm domains)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Northern Ireland, 2014/15 (6)</td>
<td>[DN - complete]</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix 2: An overview of all surveys included in this review and their key features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey number</th>
<th>Country, year of survey (reference)</th>
<th>Sample size n (age)</th>
<th>Cooperation rate / Response rate</th>
<th>Sampling (analytical approach)</th>
<th>Survey method</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>USA, 2015 (7)</td>
<td>764 (&gt;=18 years)¹</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: 60.0%</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling (weighted)</td>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…child yelled at&lt;br&gt;…child witnessed violence&lt;br&gt;…family services called&lt;br&gt;…child left unsupervised&lt;br&gt;…child physically hurt&lt;br&gt;…not enough money for child’s needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response rate: not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>USA, 2014/15 (8)</td>
<td>5,922 (&gt;=18 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: 59.8%</td>
<td>National stratified, targeted, random sampling (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…family problems or marriage difficulties&lt;br&gt;…being pushed, hit or assaulted&lt;br&gt;…being physically harmed&lt;br&gt;…feeling threatened or afraid&lt;br&gt;…having house, car or other property vandalised&lt;br&gt;…having financial trouble&lt;br&gt;…being in a traffic accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>USA, 2014/15 (9)</td>
<td>5,619 (&gt;=18 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: 52.0%</td>
<td>Random, stratified, national sampling of landlines and mobiles</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 2 weeks</td>
<td>…quality of life²&lt;br&gt;…distress³&lt;br&gt;…financial trouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response rate: 38.7% (landline)&lt;br&gt;Response rate: 27.3% (mobile)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Taken from a subset of 2,830 respondents; to be eligible, respondents had to report having parental responsibility for at least one child aged <=17 years

² Self-reported as excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor

³ Measured using the four-item “Patient Health Questionnaire-4”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey number</th>
<th>Country, year of survey (reference)</th>
<th>Sample size n (age)</th>
<th>Sample size % (age)</th>
<th>Sampling (analytical approach)</th>
<th>Survey method</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Australia, 2013 (10)</td>
<td>20,570 (&gt;=18 years)</td>
<td>16.1% (landline sample)</td>
<td>(not reported)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interviews of mobiles and landlines</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>...verbal abuse ...physical abuse ...experience fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Norway, 2013 (11)</td>
<td>2,182 (18-69 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: 49.1%</td>
<td>Response rate: not reported</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling drawn from a web panel(^4) (weighted)</td>
<td>Web-survey</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Canada, 2013 (12)</td>
<td>375 (&gt;=18 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: not reported</td>
<td>Response rate: 11.9%</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling across five provinces (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) Calculated by authors

\(^5\) Panel comprised 55,000 residents
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey number</th>
<th>Country, year of survey (reference)</th>
<th>Sample size n (age)</th>
<th>Cooperation rate / Response rate</th>
<th>Sampling (analytical approach)</th>
<th>Survey method</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Norway, 2012 (13)</td>
<td>3,652 (16-79 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: not reported</td>
<td>National survey, sampling not reported (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…worried about someone else’s alcohol use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Denmark, 2011 (14)</td>
<td>2,569 (15-79 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: not reported</td>
<td>Random sampling drawn from a panel (weighted)</td>
<td>Web-based questionnaire or telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…family/partnership …work/study harms …financial harms …injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Australia, 2011 and 2008 (15)</td>
<td>2,649 (2008) (&gt;=18 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: not reported</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling of landlines</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…serious argument that did not include physical violence …feel threatened …verbally abused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 Panel consisted of 8,000 respondents aged 15-79 years
7 68% of respondents completed the web questionnaire, 32% were interviewed by telephone
8 The original 2008 survey included 2,649 respondents, however to be eligible, respondents had to have completed both the 2008 and 2011 survey leaving a sample size of 1,106. A sub-sample of 83 respondents who experienced harm in 2008 and 2011, or stopped experiencing harm between 2008 and 2011 were also analysed to gain a deeper understanding
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey number</th>
<th>Country, year of survey (reference)</th>
<th>Sample size n (age)</th>
<th>Co-operation rate / Response rate</th>
<th>Sampling (analytical approach)</th>
<th>Survey method</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1,106         | USA, 2011 (19)                    | 1,106 (2011)       | Response rate: 35%               | (weighted 2008 only)          | National random sampling (weighted) | Previous 12 months | ...emotionally hurt or neglected ...
|               |                                    | (2011)             | (2008) 42%                       |                                | Computer assisted telephone interview |                       | ...
|               |                                    | (>=18 years)       |                                  |                                |               |               | physically hurt ...
|               |                                    | (no dp)            |                                  |                                |               |               | ...
| 16            | USA, 2010 (16)                    | 5,885 (2011)       | Co-operation rate: 49.9%         | National random sampling (weighted) | Computer assisted telephone interview | Previous 12 months | ...
|               |                                    | (>=18 years)       | Response rate: not reported      |                                |               |               | family problems/marital difficulties ...
| 17            | USA, 2010 (17)                    | 5,590 (2011)       | Co-operation rate: 49.9%         | Random sampling of landlines (weighted) | Computer assisted telephone interview | Not reported         | ...
|               |                                    | (>=18 years)       | Response rate: not reported      |                                |               |               | depression ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |               |               | distress ...

9 The original 2008 survey included 2,649 respondents – to be eligible, respondents had to have completed both surveys
10 A sub-sample of 83 respondents were analysed for greater insight
11 Drawn from a larger sample of 6,957: to be eligible, participants had to have data relating to depression
12 Measures of distress and depression were not over a specific period, measures of harm were over the previous 12 months
13 Measured using the ‘Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale (CES-D8)’
14 Based on “How much distress are you currently experiencing in your life?” divided into at least some distress and not much/none
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey number</th>
<th>Country, year of survey (reference)</th>
<th>Sample size n (age)</th>
<th>Cooperation rate / Response rate</th>
<th>Sampling (analytical approach)</th>
<th>Survey method</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Australia, 2010 (18)</td>
<td>1,677(^{15}) (&gt;=18 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>...ability to do your job been negatively affected ...have you had to work extra hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>New Zealand, 2008/09 (19)</td>
<td>3,068 (12-80 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 64% (no dp)</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>...emotionally hurt or neglected ...less able to do your paid employment, or have to take time off ...a serious argument (not including physical violence) ...failure to do something they were being counted on ...had to stop seeing them ...have to take them somewhere ...not enough money for the things you needed ...had to clean up after them ...feel threatened or scared ...physically hurt ...feel at risk in the car when they were driving ...forced or pressured into sex or something sexual ...break or damage something that mattered to you ...had to take on extra responsibilities caring for children or others ...could not bring friends home ...had to leave home to stay somewhere else ...avoid seeing other friends/family because you were embarrassed ...injured in a car accident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{15}\) Derived from a larger sample of 2,649 – to be eligible, respondents had to be in paid employment or doing unpaid voluntary work and report experiencing harm in the workplace due to a co-workers drinking
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey number</th>
<th>Country, year of survey (reference)</th>
<th>Sample size n (age)</th>
<th>Cooperation rate / Response rate</th>
<th>Sampling (analytical approach)</th>
<th>Survey method</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 20            | New Zealand, 2008/09 (20)          | 3,068 (12-80 years) | Cooperation rate: not reported   | Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted) | Computer assisted telephone interview | Previous 12 months | ...meals not cooked ...
|               |                                    |                    | Response rate: 64% (no dp)       |                                |              |              |          |
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | no transport to and from places ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | they have not shown much interest in you ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | have you not seen them when you wanted to ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | money been stolen by them ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | gone without food ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | personal wellbeing index ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | EQ5D
| 21            | New Zealand 2008/09 (21)           | 3,068 (12-80 years) | Cooperation rate: not reported   | Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted) | Computer assisted telephone interview | Previous 12 months | ...had to call the police ...
|               |                                    |                    | Response rate: 64% (no dp)       |                                |              |              | had to get medical treatment at a GP or after-hours doctor ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | went to a hospital/emergency department ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | got counselling/professional advice
| 22            | Australia, 2008 (22)               | 2,649 (>=18 years)  | Cooperation rate: 49.7%         | Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted) | Computer assisted telephone interview | Previous 12 months | ...negatively affect a social occasion ...
|               |                                    |                    | Response rate: 35.2%            |                                |              |              | emotionally hurt or neglected ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | serious argument (not including physical violence) ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | failure to do something they were being counted on to do ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | additional driving responsibilities ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | time spent caring for them ...
|               |                                    |                    |                                  |                                |              |              | stop seeing them |

16 European Quality of Life-5 Dimensions
17 In the analysis all measures relating to healthcare were collapsed into a single variable defined as ‘experiencing/not experiencing having to use health services’
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey number</th>
<th>Country, year of survey (reference)</th>
<th>Sample size n (age)</th>
<th>Co-operation rate / Response rate</th>
<th>Sampling (analytical approach)</th>
<th>Survey method</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 23            | Australia, 2008 (23)                | 2,649 (>=18 years)  | Cooperation rate: 49.7%           | Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted) | Computer assisted telephone interview | Previous 12 months | ...additional cleaning responsibilities  
...felt threatened  
...additional caring responsibilities  
...broken or damaged property  
...drinker did not commit to share of housework  
...less money for household expenses  
...put at risk in the car when they were driving  
...could not bring friends home  
...physically hurt  
...had to leave home and stay elsewhere  
...forced or pressured into sex or something sexual  
...gone out of your way to avoid drunk people or places where drinkers are known to hang out  
...been kept awake at night or disturbed  
...been annoyed by people vomiting, urinating or littering  
...experienced trouble or noise related to licensed venue  
...felt unsafe waiting for or using public transport  
...felt unsafe in any other public place  
...had to call the police  
...admission to hospital  
...emergency department visit  
...receiving other medical treatment  
...receiving professional counselling[^a] |

[^a]: In the analysis, i-iv were collapsed into a single variables defined as ‘experiencing/not experiencing at least one harm’
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey number</th>
<th>Country, year of survey (reference)</th>
<th>Sample size n (age)</th>
<th>Cooperation rate / Response rate</th>
<th>Sampling (analytical approach)</th>
<th>Survey method</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Australia, 2008 (24)</td>
<td>2,622 (&gt;=18 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…how satisfied are you with your mental wellbeing …EQ5D(^{19})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Australia, 2008 (25)</td>
<td>2,422 (&gt;=18 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…personal wellbeing …health status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Australia, 2008 (26)</td>
<td>1,142 (&gt;=18 years)(^{20})</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%(^{21})</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…children left in an unsupervised or unsafe situation …children yelled at, criticised or verbally abused …children physically hurt …children witness serious violence in the home …a protection agency or family services called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Australia, 2008 (27)</td>
<td>778(^{22})</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…spend time caring for the most heavy drinker …extra responsibilities caring for children or others [dependents] …had to clean up after them …had to drive [the most heavy drinker] somewhere or pick them up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{19}\) European Quality of Life-5 Dimensions  
\(^{20}\) The original 2008 survey included 2,649 respondents, however a ‘parental’ subset consisting of all respondents who lived with children aged 17 years or younger were selected leaving a sample size of 1,142  
\(^{21}\) These rates apply to the original 2008 survey rather than the parental subset. Rates for the subset were not reported  
\(^{22}\) Derived from a larger sample of 2,649 – to be eligible, respondents had to report spending time caring for a heavy drinker
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey number</th>
<th>Country, year of survey (reference)</th>
<th>Sample size n (age)</th>
<th>Co-operation rate / Response rate</th>
<th>Sampling (analytical approach)</th>
<th>Survey method</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Australia, 2008 (28)</td>
<td>778(^{23}) (&gt;=18 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>...negatively affecting a social occasion...emotionally hurt or neglected...serious argument without physical violence...failing to do something they were being counted on to do...stop seeing them...feeling threatened...breaking or damaging something that mattered...being put at risk in the car...being physically hurt...forced or pressured into sex or something sexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>USA, 2005 (29)</td>
<td>3,614 (12-17 years)</td>
<td>Does not report</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>...drug/alcohol facilitated rape(^{24})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>USA, 2005 (30)</td>
<td>2,550(^{25}) (&gt;=18 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: 56% (no dp) Response rate: not reported</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling of landlines from 50 states (weighted)</td>
<td>Does not report</td>
<td>Lifetime and previous 12 months</td>
<td>...been a passenger with a driver who had too much to drink...been pushed, hit, or assaulted...family problems or marriage difficulties...property vandalised...been in a motor vehicle accident...had financial trouble...family problems or marriage difficulties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{23}\) The original sample included 2,649 respondents, however to be eligible for the analysis, respondents had to identify having at least one person in their immediate social network of household members, family, friends, or other known people, who the respondent considered to be a problem drinker

\(^{24}\) Also asked questions on non-alcohol-related dating violence

\(^{25}\) The original survey included 6,919 respondents, however the questions relating to externalities were randomly delivered to a smaller sample
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey number</th>
<th>Country, year of survey (reference)</th>
<th>Sample size n (age)</th>
<th>Cooperation rate / Response rate</th>
<th>Sampling (analytical approach)</th>
<th>Survey method</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>USA, 2004/05 (31)</td>
<td>2,255 (18+ years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: not reported</td>
<td>Stratified national sampling (weighted)</td>
<td>Face-to-face computerised interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…push, grab, or shove you …slap, kick, bite or hit …threaten with a weapon like a knife or gun …cut or bruise you …force you to have sex …injure you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>New Zealand, 2004 and 2003 (32)</td>
<td>16,480 (18-65 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: not reported</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…physical assault …sexual assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Finland, 2000 and 2008 (33)</td>
<td>1,932 (2000) 2,725 (2008) (15-69 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: not reported</td>
<td>National random sampling (weighted)</td>
<td>Face-to-face interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…afraid of intoxicated people in the street or other public places …harassed or bothered by intoxicated people in the street or other public places …hit, pushed or tackled by an unknown or partly known intoxicated person in a public place …been scolded at or insulted by an unknown or partly known intoxicated person in a public place …been kept awake at night due to noise from intoxicated persons in the street or in the neighbourhood …had belongings destroyed by or has lost property to an intoxicated person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 The original survey included 43,093 respondents, however to be eligible, respondents had to have completed waves I and II of the survey, report having an intimate partner (married, dating, or romantic relationship), and had to experience or perpetrate at least one violent event in the previous 12 months

27 Two different surveys were merged – one collected data in 2003, and one in 20014
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey number</th>
<th>Country, year of survey (reference)</th>
<th>Sample size n (age)</th>
<th>Cooperation rate / Response rate</th>
<th>Sampling (analytical approach)</th>
<th>Survey method</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>USA, 2000 and 2005 (34)</td>
<td>10,121 7,613 (2000)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: not reported</td>
<td>National random sampling (weighted)</td>
<td>Computer assisted telephone interview</td>
<td>Previous 12 months</td>
<td>…marriage difficulties …financial trouble …having property vandalised …pushed, hit or assaulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Norway, 1995-1997 (35)</td>
<td>11,584 couples (20-70 years)</td>
<td>Cooperation rate: not reported</td>
<td>Whole region invited to a health screen (not reported)</td>
<td>Self-reported postal survey</td>
<td>Previous 2 weeks</td>
<td>…hospital anxiety and depression scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response rate: 59.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

28 The original survey included 77,659 respondents, however to be eligible, respondents had to married or co-habiting couples with complete data on all variables of interest

29 Nord-Trøndelag County, Norway
The range and magnitude of alcohol’s harm to others – accompanying tables
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