



Public Health  
England

Protecting and improving the nation's health

# **The range and magnitude of alcohol's harm to others**

## **Accompanying tables**

## About Public Health England

Public Health England exists to protect and improve the nation's health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities. We do this through world-leading science, knowledge and intelligence, advocacy, partnerships and the delivery of specialist public health services. We are an executive agency of the Department of Health and Social Care, and a distinct delivery organisation with operational autonomy. We provide government, local government, the NHS, Parliament, industry and the public with evidence-based professional, scientific and delivery expertise and support.

Public Health England  
Wellington House  
133-155 Waterloo Road  
London SE1 8UG  
Tel: 020 7654 8000  
[www.gov.uk/phe](http://www.gov.uk/phe)  
Twitter: [@PHE\\_uk](https://twitter.com/PHE_uk)  
Facebook: [www.facebook.com/PublicHealthEngland](https://www.facebook.com/PublicHealthEngland)

Prepared by: Dr Robyn Burton, Gemma Kane, Jenny Mason, and Dr Caryl Beynon  
For queries relating to this document, please contact: [alcoholenquiries@phe.gov.uk](mailto:alcoholenquiries@phe.gov.uk)



© Crown copyright 2019

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0. To view this licence, visit [OGL](https://www.ogilive.com/). Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Published June 2019  
PHE publications  
gateway number: GW-467

PHE supports the UN  
Sustainable Development Goals



## 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**

Survey number	Country, year of survey (reference)	Sample size n (age)	Co-operation rate / Response rate	Sampling (analytical approach)	Survey method	Recall period	Outcomes
1	England, 2015/16 (1)	4,874 ( $\geq 16$ years)	Not reported	National, random probability/simple quota sampling (weighted)	Self-completed face-to-face interview	Previous 12 months	...any harm (a positive response to any of 18 harm questions)
2	Wales, 2015 (2)	1,071 ( $\geq 18$ years)	16.8%	National, random sampling (weighted)	Telephone interviews	Previous 12 months	...any harm (a positive response to any of 18 harm questions or 'other harm')
3	North West of England 2014 (3)	1,020 ( $\geq 18$ years)	Not reported	Quota sampling (not reported)	Self-completed online survey	Previous 12 months	...any harm (a positive response to any of 20 harm questions)
4	Scotland, 2012 (4)	1,007 ( $\geq 16$ years)	Not reported	National, quota sampling (not reported)	Face to face interviews	Previous 12 months	...any harm (a positive response to any of 16 harm questions)
5	Republic of Ireland, 2006 and 2010 combined (5)	2,011 ( $\geq 18$ years)	Not reported	National, quota sampling (weighted)	Face to face interviews	Previous 12 months	...any harm (a positive response to any of 5 harm domains)
6	Northern Ireland, 2014/15 (6)	[DN - complete]	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

## Appendix 2: An overview of all surveys included in this review and their key features

Survey number	Country, year of survey (reference)	Sample size n (age)	Co-operation rate / Response rate	Sampling (analytical approach)	Survey method	Recall period	Outcomes
7	USA, 2015 (7)	764 (>=18 years) <sup>1</sup>	Cooperation rate: 60.0% Response rate: not reported	Stratified random sampling (weighted)	Telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...child yelled at ...child witnessed violence ...family services called ...child left unsupervised ...child physically hurt ...not enough money for child's needs ...family problems or marriage difficulties ...being pushed, hit or assaulted ...being physically harmed
8	USA, 2014/15 (8)	5,922 (>=18 years)	Cooperation rate: 59.8% Response rate: 43.4%	National stratified, targeted, random sampling (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	... being harassed, bothered, called names or otherwise insulted ....feeling threatened or afraid ...having house, car or other property vandalised ...having financial trouble ...being in a traffic accident
9	USA, 2014/15 (9)	5,619 (>=18 years)	Cooperation rate: 52.0% (mobile) 38.7% (landline) Response rate: 27.3% (mobile)	Random, stratified, national sampling of landlines and mobiles	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 2 weeks	...quality of life <sup>2</sup> ...distress <sup>3</sup> ...financial trouble

<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>2</sup> Self-reported as excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor

<sup>3</sup> Measured using the four-item 'Patient Health Questionnaire-4'

Survey number	Country, year of survey (reference)	Sample size n (age)	Co-operation rate / Response rate	Sampling (analytical approach)	Survey method	Recall period	Outcomes
			16.1% (landline) sample	(not reported)			
10	Australia, 2013 (10)	20,570 (>=18 years)	Cooperation rate: 49.1% Response rate: not reported	Stratified random sampling (not reported)	Computer assisted telephone interviews of mobiles and landlines	Previous 12 months	...verbal abuse ...physical abuse ...experience fear
11	Norway, 2013 (11)	2,182 (18-69 years)	Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 54.6% <sup>4</sup>	Stratified sampling drawn from a web panel <sup>5</sup> (weighted)	Web-survey	Previous 12 months	...being kept awake at night by noise in the neighbourhood or in the street ...being exposed to unwanted sexual attention ...having their clothes or other belongings of value damaged ...being shouted at or insulted ...being in a situation where they have been afraid that someone would hurt them ...being physically hurt ...have a serious argument ...feel threatened ...emotionally hurt or neglected ...physically hurt ...put at risk in the car ...injured in a car accident ...forced or pressured into sex or something sexual ...negatively affect a social occasion
12	Canada, 2013 (12)	375 (>=18 years)	Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 11.9%	Stratified random sampling across five provinces (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	

<sup>4</sup> Calculated by authors

<sup>5</sup> Panel comprised 55,000 residents

The range and magnitude of alcohol's harm to others – accompanying tables

Survey number	Country, year of survey (reference)	Sample size n (age)	Co-operation rate / Response rate	Sampling (analytical approach)	Survey method	Recall period	Outcomes
							...failed to do something they were being counted on to do ...did not do their share of household work ...gone without seeing friends or family as much ...break or damage something that mattered to you ...take money or valuables that were yours ...gone without food ...had to leave home to stay somewhere else ...less money for household expenses
13	Norway, 2012 (13)	3,652 (16-79 years)	Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 53.3%	National survey, sampling not reported (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...worried about someone else's alcohol use
14	Denmark, 2011 (14)	2,569 (15-79 years)	Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 64% (no dp)	Random sampling drawn from a panel <sup>6</sup> (weighted)	Web-based questionnaire or telephone interview <sup>7</sup>	Previous 12 months	...family/partnership ...work/study harms ...financial harms ...injuries
15	Australia, 2011 and 2008 (15)	2,649 (2008) (>=18 years) <sup>8</sup>	Cooperation rate: not reported	Stratified random sampling of landlines	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...serious argument that did not include physical violence ...feel threatened ...verbally abused

<sup>6</sup> Panel consisted of 8,000 respondents aged 15-79 years

<sup>7</sup> 68% of respondents completed the web questionnaire, 32% were interviewed by telephone

<sup>8</sup> 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

Survey number	Country, year of survey (reference)	Sample size n (age)	Co-operation rate / Response rate	Sampling (analytical approach)	Survey method	Recall period	Outcomes
		1,106 (2011) <sup>9</sup> (>=18 years) <sup>10</sup>	Response rate: 35% (2008) 42% (2011) (no dp)	(weighted 2008 only)			...emotionally hurt or neglected ...physically hurt ...put at risk in the car ...forced or pressured into sex ...they negatively affected a social occasion ...had to stop seeing them ...failure to do something they were counted on to do ...break or damage something that mattered to you ...couldn't bring friends home ...they did not do their share of their work around the house ...had to leave home or sleep somewhere else ...less money for household expenses
16	USA, 2010 (16)	5,885 (>=18 years)	Co-operation rate: 49.9% Response rate: not reported	National random sampling (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...family problems/marital difficulties ...financial trouble ...being pushed, hit or assaulted
17	USA, 2010 (17)	5,590 <sup>11</sup> (>=18 years)	Co-operation rate: 49.9% Response rate: not reported	Random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Not reported <sup>12</sup>	...depression <sup>13</sup> ...distress <sup>14</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The original 2008 survey included 2,649 respondents – to be eligible, respondents had to have completed both surveys

<sup>10</sup> A sub-sample of 83 respondents were analysed for greater insight

<sup>11</sup> Drawn from a larger sample of 6,957: to be eligible, participants had to have data relating to depression

<sup>12</sup> Measures of distress and depression were not over a specific period, measures of harm were over the previous 12 months

<sup>13</sup> Measured using the 'Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale (CES-D8)'

<sup>14</sup> Based on "How much distress are you currently experiencing in your life?" divided into at least some distress and not much/none



Survey number	Country, year of survey (reference)	Sample size n (age)	Co-operation rate / Response rate	Sampling (analytical approach)	Survey method	Recall period	Outcomes
18	Australia, 2010 (18)	1,677 <sup>15</sup> (>=18 years)	Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...ability to do your job been negatively affected ...have you had to work extra hours
19	New Zealand, 2008/09 (19)	3,068 (12-80 years)	Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 64% (no dp)	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...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

<sup>15</sup> 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

Survey number	Country, year of survey (reference)	Sample size n (age)	Co-operation rate / Response rate	Sampling (analytical approach)	Survey method	Recall period	Outcomes
							...meals not cooked ...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
20	New Zealand, 2008/09 (20)	3,068 (12-80 years)	Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 64% (no dp)	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...personal wellbeing index ...EQ5D <sup>16</sup>
21	New Zealand 2008/09 (21)	3,068 (12-80 years)	Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 64% (no dp)	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...had to call the police ...had to get medical treatment at a GP or after-hours doctor ...went to a hospital/emergency department ...got counselling/professional advice <sup>17</sup>
22	Australia, 2008 (22)	2,649 (>=18 years)	Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...negatively affect a social occasion ...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

<sup>16</sup> European Quality of Life-5 Dimensions

<sup>17</sup> In the analysis all measures relating to healthcare were collapsed into a single variable defined as 'experiencing/not experiencing having to use health services'

Survey number	Country, year of survey (reference)	Sample size n (age)	Co-operation rate / Response rate	Sampling (analytical approach)	Survey method	Recall period	Outcomes
							...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
23	Australia, 2008 (23)	2,649 (>=18 years)	Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...had to call the police ...admission to hospital ...emergency department visit ...receiving other medical treatment ...receiving professional counselling <sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> In the analysis, i-iv were collapsed into a single variables defined as 'experiencing/not experiencing at least one harm'

Survey number	Country, year of survey (reference)	Sample size n (age)	Co-operation rate / Response rate	Sampling (analytical approach)	Survey method	Recall period	Outcomes
24	Australia, 2008 (24)	2,622 (>=18 years)	Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...how satisfied are you with your mental wellbeing ...EQ5D <sup>19</sup>
25	Australia, 2008 (25)	2,422 (>=18 years)	Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...personal wellbeing ...health status
26	Australia, 2008 (26)	1,142 (>=18 years) <sup>20</sup>	Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2% <sup>21</sup>	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...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
27	Australia, 2008 (27)	778 <sup>22</sup>	Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...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

<sup>19</sup> European Quality of Life-5 Dimensions

<sup>20</sup> 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

<sup>21</sup> These rates apply to the original 2008 survey rather than the parental subset. Rates for the subset were not reported

<sup>22</sup> Derived from a larger sample of 2,649 – to be eligible, respondents had to report spending time caring for a heavy drinker

Survey number	Country, year of survey (reference)	Sample size n (age)	Co-operation rate / Response rate	Sampling (analytical approach)	Survey method	Recall period	Outcomes
28	Australia, 2008 (28)	778 <sup>23</sup> (>=18 years)	Cooperation rate: 49.7% Response rate: 35.2%	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...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
29	USA, 2005 (29)	3,614 (12-17 years)	Does not report	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Lifetime	...drug/alcohol facilitated rape <sup>24</sup>
30	USA, 2005 (30)	2,550 <sup>25</sup> (>=18 years)	Cooperation rate: 56% (no dp) Response rate: not reported	Stratified random sampling of landlines from 50 states (weighted)	Does not report	Lifetime and previous 12 months	...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

<sup>23</sup> 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

<sup>24</sup> Also asked questions on non-alcohol-related dating violence

<sup>25</sup> The original survey included 6,919 respondents, however the questions relating to externalities were randomly delivered to a smaller sample

Survey number	Country, year of survey (reference)	Sample size n (age)	Co-operation rate / Response rate	Sampling (analytical approach)	Survey method	Recall period	Outcomes
31	USA, 2004/05 (31)	2,255 (18>= years) <sup>26</sup>	Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 81% (no dp)	Stratified national sampling (weighted)	Face-to-face computerised interview	Previous 12 months	...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
32	New Zealand, 2004 and 2003 <sup>27</sup> (32)	16,480 (18-65 years)	Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 59% (no dp)	Stratified random sampling of landlines (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...physical assault ...sexual assault
33	Finland, 2000 and 2008 (33)	1,932 (2000) 2,725 (2008) (15-69 years)	Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 78% (2000) 74% (2008) (no dp)	National random sampling (weighted)	Face-to-face interview	Previous 12 months	...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

<sup>26</sup> 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

<sup>27</sup> Two different surveys were merged – one collected data in 2003, and one in 20014

Survey number	Country, year of survey (reference)	Sample size n (age)	Co-operation rate / Response rate	Sampling (analytical approach)	Survey method	Recall period	Outcomes
34	USA, 2000 and 2005 (34)	10,121 7,613 (2000) 6,919 (2005) (>=18 years)	Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 58% (2000) 56% (2005) (no dp)	National random sampling (weighted)	Computer assisted telephone interview	Previous 12 months	...marriage difficulties ...financial trouble ...having property vandalised ...pushed, hit or assaulted
35	Norway, 1995-1997 (35)	11,584 couples (20-70 years) <sup>28</sup>	Cooperation rate: not reported Response rate: 59.5%	Whole region <sup>29</sup> invited to a health screen (not reported)	Self-reported postal survey	Previous 2 weeks	...hospital anxiety and depression scale

<sup>28</sup> 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

<sup>29</sup> Nord-Trøndelag County, Norway

## References

1. Beynon C, Bayliss D, Mason J, Sweeney K, Perkins C, Henn C. Alcohol-related harm to others in England: a cross-sectional analysis of national survey data. *BMJ open*. 2019 Apr 1;9(5):e021046.
2. Quigg Z, Bellis AM, Grey H, Ashton K, Hughes K, Webster J. Alcohol's harms to others: the harms from other people's alcohol consumption in Wales. Cardiff: Public Health Wales; 2016. Available: [www.wales.nhs.uk/sitesplus/documents/888/PHW%20Harms%20to%20Others%20Report%20E%287%29.pdf](http://www.wales.nhs.uk/sitesplus/documents/888/PHW%20Harms%20to%20Others%20Report%20E%287%29.pdf) [Accessed: 07.01.19]
3. Gell L, Ally A, Buykx P, Hope A, Meier P. Alcohol's harm to others. Sheffield: The University of Sheffield; 2015. Available: [www.ias.org.uk/uploads/pdf/IAS%20reports/rp18072015.pdf](http://www.ias.org.uk/uploads/pdf/IAS%20reports/rp18072015.pdf) [Accessed: 07.01.19]
4. Hope A, Curran J, Bell G, Platts A. Unrecognised and under-reported: the impact of alcohol on people other than the drinker in Scotland. Alcohol Focus Scotland; 2013. Available: [www.alcohol-focus-scotland.org.uk/media/59857/Unrecognised-and-under-reported-summary.pdf](http://www.alcohol-focus-scotland.org.uk/media/59857/Unrecognised-and-under-reported-summary.pdf) [Accessed: 07.01.19]
5. Hope A. Alcohol's harm to others in Ireland. Dublin: Health Service Executive; 2014. Available: [www.drugs.ie/resourcesfiles/ResearchDocs/Ireland/2014/ah2oreport.pdf](http://www.drugs.ie/resourcesfiles/ResearchDocs/Ireland/2014/ah2oreport.pdf) [Accessed: 07.01.19]
6. Ireland IADN. Drug Prevalence in Northern Ireland Key Facts – 2014/15. 2015. Available: [www.health-ni.gov.uk/news/drug-prevalence-northern-ireland-key-facts-%E2%80%93-201415](http://www.health-ni.gov.uk/news/drug-prevalence-northern-ireland-key-facts-%E2%80%93-201415) [Accessed: 07.01.19]
7. Kaplan LM, Nayak MB, Greenfield TK, Karriker-Jaffe KJ. Alcohol's harm to children: findings from the 2015 United States National Alcohol's Harm to Others Survey. *The Journal of pediatrics*. 2017;184:186-92.
8. Karriker-Jaffe KJ, Greenfield TK, Kaplan LM. Distress and alcohol-related harms from intimates, friends, and strangers. *Journal of substance use*. 2017;22(4):434-41.
9. Karriker-Jaffe KJ, Li L, Greenfield TK. Estimating mental health impacts of alcohol's harms from other drinkers: Using propensity scoring methods with national cross-sectional data from the US. *Addiction*. 2018.
10. Stanesby O, Rankin G, Callinan S. Experience of harm from others' drinking and support for stricter alcohol policies: Analysis of the Australian National Drug Strategy Household Survey. *International Journal of Drug Policy*. 2017;45:25-32.
11. Lund IO, Moan IS, Storvoll EE. Harm from others' drinking: How problematic do people with and without experience of harm perceive it to be? *International Journal of Drug Policy*. 2016;38:43-9.
12. Lewis-Laietmark C, Wettlaufer A, Shield KD, Giesbrecht N, April N, Asbridge M, et al. The effects of alcohol-related harms to others on self-perceived mental well-being in a Canadian sample. *International journal of public health*. 2017;62(6):669-78.
13. Moan IS, Storvoll EE, Lund IO. Worries about others' substance use—Differences between alcohol, cigarettes and illegal drugs? *International Journal of Drug Policy*. 2017;48:108-14.
14. Seid AK, Grittner U, Greenfield TK, Bloomfield K. To cause harm and to be harmed by others: new perspectives on alcohol's harms to others. *Substance abuse: research and treatment*. 2015;9:SART. S23506.
15. Laslett AM, Jiang H, Room R. Alcohol's involvement in an array of harms to intimate partners. *Drug and alcohol review*. 2017;36(1):72-9.
16. Kaplan LM, Karriker-Jaffe KJ, Greenfield TK. Drinking context and alcohol's harm from others among men and women in the 2010 US National Alcohol Survey. *Journal of substance use*. 2017;22(4):412-8.
17. Greenfield TK, Karriker-Jaffe KJ, Kerr WC, Ye Y, Kaplan LM. Those harmed by others' drinking in the US population are more depressed and distressed. *Drug and alcohol review*. 2016;35(1):22-9.



18. Dale CE, Livingston MJ. The burden of alcohol drinking on co-workers in the Australian workplace. *Med J Aust.* 2010;193(3):138-40.
19. Casswell S, Harding JF, You RQ, Huckle T. Alcohol's harm to others: self-reports from a representative sample of New Zealanders. *NZ Med J.* 2011;124(1336):75-84.
20. Casswell S, You RQ, Huckle T. Alcohol's harm to others: reduced wellbeing and health status for those with heavy drinkers in their lives. *Addiction.* 2011;106(6):1087-94.
21. Huckle T, Wong K, Parker K, Casswell S. Increased use of police and health-related services among those with heavy drinkers in their lives in New Zealand. *New Zealand medical journal.* 2017;130(1455):102-10.
22. Laslett, Room R, Ferris J, Wilkinson C, Livingston M, Mugavin J. Surveying the range and magnitude of alcohol's harm to others in Australia. *Addiction.* 2011;106(9):1603-11.
23. Mugavin J, Livingston M, Laslett AM. Seeking help because of others' drinking. *Drug and alcohol review.* 2014;33(2):161-8.
24. Ferris JA, Laslett A-M, Livingston M, Room R, Wilkinson C. The impacts of others' drinking on mental health. *The Medical Journal of Australia.* 2011;195(3):22.
25. Livingston M, Wilkinson C, Laslett A-M. Impact of heavy drinkers on others' health and well-being. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs.* 2010;71(5):778-85.
26. Laslett, Ferris J, Dietze P, Room R. Social demography of alcohol-related harm to children in Australia. *Addiction.* 2012;107(6):1082-9.
27. Jiang H, Callinan S, Laslett AM, Room R. Correlates of caring for the drinkers and others among those harmed by another's drinking. *Drug and alcohol review.* 2015;34(2):162-9.
28. Ferris J, Devaney M, Davis G, Mazerolle L. Reporting of problematic drinkers and the harm they cause: Assessing the role of alcohol use, sex, and age of those affected by a problematic drinker. *Experimental and clinical psychopharmacology.* 2016;24(1):48.
29. Wolitzky-Taylor KB, Ruggiero KJ, Danielson CK, Resnick HS, Hanson RF, Smith DW, et al. Prevalence and correlates of dating violence in a national sample of adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry.* 2008;47(7):755-62.
30. Greenfield TK, Ye Y, Kerr W, Bond J, Rehm J, Giesbrecht N. Externalities from alcohol consumption in the 2005 US National Alcohol Survey: implications for policy. *International journal of environmental research and public health.* 2009;6(12):3205-24.
31. Gonzalez JMR, Connell NM, Businelle MS, Jennings WG, Chartier KG. Characteristics of adults involved in alcohol-related intimate partner violence: results from a nationally representative sample. *BMC public health.* 2014;14(1):466.
32. Connor J, You R, Casswell S. Alcohol-related harm to others: a survey of physical and sexual assault in New Zealand. *The New Zealand Medical Journal (Online).* 2009;122(1303).
33. Huhtanen P, Tigerstedt C. Women and young adults suffer most from other people's drinking. *Drug and alcohol review.* 2012;31(7):841-6.
34. Karriker-Jaffe KJ, Greenfield TK. Gender differences in associations of neighbourhood disadvantage with alcohol's harms to others: A cross-sectional study from the USA. *Drug and alcohol review.* 2014;33(3):296-303.
35. Rognmo K, Torvik FA, Røysamb E, Tambs K. Alcohol use and spousal mental distress in a population sample: the nord-trøndelag health study. *BMC public health.* 2013;13(1):319.