

and friends. The poorer health of carers should therefore be a priority for UK public health.

OP92

A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF PROSPECTIVE RISK AND PROTECTIVE FACTORS FOR INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE VICTIMISATION AMONG WOMEN

¹AR Yakubovich*, ²H Stöckl, ³J Murray, ⁴GJ Melendez-Torres, ¹JL Steinert, ¹CEY Glavin, ¹DK Humphreys. ¹*Social Policy and Intervention, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK;* ²*Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK;* ³*Center for Epidemiological Research, Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil;* ⁴*Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Warwick, UK*

10.1136/jech-2017-SSMAbstracts.91

Background Rates of intimate partner violence (IPV) against women are unacceptably high worldwide. There has been no systematic review in over 10 years of all risk and protective factors without location or peer-review restrictions. Resultantly, there is no recent, systematically-developed model of the causes of IPV at all levels (individual, relationship, community, and structural) that accounts for differences, similarities, and evidence-gaps across low- to high-income contexts. This remains a barrier to the effective prevention of IPV, with significant uncertainty over what works and within which contexts. We aimed to systematically review all prospective, longitudinal risk and protective factors of IPV victimisation among women.

Methods Systematic searches were conducted in 16 databases and references of relevant studies were hand-searched. Published or unpublished studies in English that prospectively analysed the association between any risk or protective factor(s) and self-reported IPV victimisation among women, controlling for at least one other variable, were included. Study quality was assessed using the Cambridge Quality Checklists. Study screening, extraction, and quality appraisal were completed and checked by three independent reviewers. Results were graphically synthesised using harvest plots, which allow for the synthesis of heterogeneous evidence and identification of trends towards negative, null, or positive associations.

Results Searches retrieved 10 444 unique results. After title and abstract review, 387 studies were screened by full-text. Sixty studies from 35 cohorts met inclusion criteria. Most studies were from the USA (80.0%). A total of 71 risk/protective factors were identified, mostly at the individual- (n=21) or relationship-level (n=25) rather than the community- (n=7) or structural-level (n=18). Variables that showed positive or a mix of null-positive associations with women's IPV victimisation were: at the individual-level, women's identification as non-white, younger age, alcohol use, depressive symptoms, antisocial behaviour, aggressive personality, and experience of child abuse; at the relational-level, partners' identification as non-white, alcohol use, antisocial behaviour, low relationship satisfaction, poor parental relationship quality, and experience of low parental monitoring; and at the structural-level, partners' unemployment, women's lower education, and financial difficulties. Other variables were under-studied (≤ 2 studies) or showed mixed or mainly null effects.

Conclusion Significant work is needed to develop an ecological model of IPV against women using prospective data. Many commonly accepted risk factors for IPV victimisation among women such as exposure to inter-parental violence and

community factors have little (if any) prospective evidence from outside the USA. Further prospective research on the aetiology of IPV against women is needed to inform rigorous prevention models.

Food policy

OP93

STAKEHOLDERS' FRAMING OF EVIDENCE ABOUT THE UK SUGAR-SWEETENED BEVERAGE TAX: A NEWS MEDIA ANALYSIS

¹S Hilton*, ¹CH Buckton, ¹SV Katikireddi, ²F Lloyd-Williams, ¹C Patterson, ²L Hyseni, ²A Elliott-Green, ²S Capewell. ¹*MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK;* ²*Department of Public Health Policy, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK*

10.1136/jech-2017-SSMAbstracts.92

Background In politically-contested health debates, such as sugar-sweetened beverage (SSB) taxation, stakeholders seek to present evidence and arguments for or against the specific policy initiatives, based on their interests. The news media play a crucial role in shaping public opinion by selectively choosing which messages to focus on. While the literature suggests that media debates should be a key concern for those interested in understanding public health policy processes, as yet there has been only limited research in this area. This study examined how stakeholders' positions and evidence on SSB taxation were represented in the media to inform SSB advocacy strategies.

Methods Quantitative and qualitative content analysis of 1632 articles about sugar consumption and SSB taxation published in eleven national UK newspapers, chosen for diversity in political views and genre. We conducted a systematic search of the Nexis database to identify all articles relating to SSBs published between 1 April 2015 and 30 November 2016. A coding frame was developed. Two reviewers then coded a 10% random sample of articles to ensure consistency in the definition and application of codes. All remaining articles were coded by one reviewer. Data were analysed thematically, following the principle of constant comparison and attention to contradictory data. We used Beauchamp's theory of market justice and social justice frames to analyse stakeholders' messages on SSB taxation.

Results A wide range of stakeholders sought to present evidence and arguments for or against SSB taxation. Stakeholder positions were largely shaped by their vested political interests. For example, corporate stakeholders were more likely to draw upon market justice frames promoting individual-level drivers for high rates of sugar consumption and individual-level solutions such as education. Whereas, public health advocates were more likely to draw upon social justice frames promoting population-level drivers for high sugar consumption and SSB taxation as a policy-level measure.

Conclusion There is a complex, poorly-understood, interdependency between the framing of evidence in public policy debates, media representations of this evidence and the influencing strategies used by stakeholders. These early insights into stakeholders' framing of evidence, both scientific and non-scientific, in the case of SSB taxation could potentially inform wider debates about the media strategies of global