

## References

- [1] Kettrey HH, Thompson MP, Marx RA, Davis AJ. Effects of campus sexual assault prevention programs on attitudes and behaviors among American college students: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Adolesc Health* 2023;72:831–44.
- [2] Hollander JA. Women's self-defense and sexual assault resistance: The state of the field. *Sociology Compass* 2018;12:e12597.
- [3] Senn CY, Eliasziw M, Barata PC, et al. Efficacy of a sexual assault resistance program for university women. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:2326–35.
- [4] Cermele J, McCaughey M. Self-defense as an effective and neglected form of sexual assault prevention: A commentary and overdue correction to the literature. *Sex Roles* 2022;86:493–503.
- [5] Orchowski LM, Edwards KM, Hollander JA, et al. Integrating sexual assault resistance, bystander, and men's social norms strategies to prevent sexual violence on college campuses: A call to action. *Trauma Violence Abuse* 2018;21:811–27.
- [6] Dardis CM, Ullman SE, Brecklin LR. "It's worth the fight!": Women resisting rape. Sexual assault risk reduction and resistance. Academic Press; 2018:111–33.
- [7] Ullman SE. Rape resistance: A critical piece of all women's empowerment and holistic rape prevention. *J Aggress Maltreat Trauma* 2022;31:519–39.

## Kettrey et al.'s Meta-Analysis Is Not About Empowerment Self-Defense Programs: A Response to Hollander et al.



As the authors of a meta-analysis that does not focus on empowerment self-defense programs [1], we are surprised that Hollander et al. have criticized our analysis for its purportedly inaccurate conclusions regarding these programs.

Our meta-analysis evaluates the effects of a broad range of campus sexual assault prevention programs. As part of this analysis, we coded approximately 30 variables that have the potential to influence these effects. Self-defense content is only one of these variables.

Hollander et al. note that our findings regarding the effects of programs containing (any) self-defense content are not representative of the effects of "empowerment self-defense programs," which they define in their letter to the editor. We agree. In fact, we make no claim about the effects of empowerment self-defense programs. We never use the term "empowerment self-defense program" in our article, and we believe our findings are stated in a way that matches our conceptualization of variables.

Hollander et al.'s criticism that we omitted Senn et al.'s study [2] from our meta-analysis was similarly surprising. The title of our article states that our meta-analysis focuses on American college students, whereas Senn et al.'s study was conducted in Canada. Our preregistered protocol notes that studies must be conducted in the United States to be included in the meta-analysis. As scientists, we cannot make an exception to our eligibility criteria when a study narrowly falls outside of these criteria (e.g., being conducted "five minutes across the United States-Canada border," as Hollander et al. argue). We find it imperative to rigorously apply our preregistered methods to every study that we screen.

Hollander et al. note that we never explicitly acknowledge our exclusion of Senn et al.'s study. This is true. As documented in our PRISMA diagram, we screened almost 10,000 reports for inclusion. Thus, our vast search and screening processes do not make it feasible to acknowledge every study that we exclude.

We understand that Hollander et al. do not want readers to conclude that our findings are representative of empowerment

self-defense programs. We share this goal. We also do not want Hollander et al.'s concerns about empowerment self-defense programs to overshadow the larger findings of our meta-analysis, which evaluates the effects of a broad range of campus sexual assault prevention programs. We believe our meta-analysis highlights a range of findings that may be helpful to researchers and practitioners working toward preventing sexual assault on college campuses across the United States.

### Funding Sources

This project was supported by Grant No. 2019-SI-AX-0004 awarded by the Office on Violence Against Women, United States Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Department of Justice.

Heather Hensman Kettrey, PhD  
*Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice*  
Clemson University  
Clemson, South Carolina

Martie P. Thompson, PhD  
*Department of Health and Exercise Science*  
Appalachian State University  
Boone, North Carolina

Robert A. Marx, PhD  
*Department of Child and Adolescent Development*  
San Jose State University  
San Jose, California

Alyssa J. Davis, MS  
*Department of Sociology, Vanderbilt University*  
Nashville, Tennessee

## References

[1] Kettrey HH, Thompson MP, Marx RA, Davis AJ. Effects of campus sexual assault prevention programs on attitudes and behaviors among American

college students: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Adolesc Health* 2023;72:831–44.

[2] Senn CY, Eliasziw M, Barata PC, et al. Efficacy of a sexual assault resistance program for university women. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:2326–35.

# Value of Rigorous Review and Evaluation to Support Implementation of Effective Sexual Violence Prevention Programming



The goal of identifying evidence-based programming that reduces sexual violence (SV) on college campuses and elsewhere is crucial given SV's high lifetime frequency, the range of mental and physical health consequences linked to SV, and its economic costs [1]. To reduce SV on college campuses, the US Campus Sexual Assault Violence Elimination (SaVE) Act of 2013 ([www.campusaveact.org](http://www.campusaveact.org)) mandated institutions of higher learning to provide primary prevention and awareness programming to reduce SV. Sexual Assault Violence Elimination (SaVE) now acts as an impetus for novel SV prevention programming development and evaluation. Yet when SaVE was enacted, few SV prevention programs had been rigorously evaluated for their efficacy to prevent or reduce SV, including in which settings and with which students. Systematic reviews are strategic approaches to establish the effectiveness of SV programming to prevent SV or mitigate the, often life-long, trauma associated with SV [2,3] and are used to inform resources that can be used by communities for action. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's STOP SV resource for action [4] provides a summary of the best available evidence needed to establish an evidence base for selecting SV prevention programming. While important, the STOP SV resource for action was published in 2016, and an update is needed to reflect the recent evaluations as well an expanded range of settings and persons that could benefit from SV prevention intervention programming.

In their systematic review and meta-analysis, Kettrey et al. [5] provide a rigorous review of the effectiveness of US-based campus sexual assault programming on students' attitudes and behaviors. Scientific challenges were noted [6] and addressed [7]. This exchange is a good example of healthy scientific communication in service of identifying SV prevention programs that are effective and work well based on their strategy and target population. Continued efforts are needed to systematically review promising new strategies and approaches to prevent SV and/or mitigate the impact that SV has on survivors. Expanding these systematic review efforts across national borders can be challenging given unique legal or policy implications that may shape program content and recommen-

dations. If, however, the focus of a comprehensive systematic review involves what programs work well, in which settings, and with which populations, a broad and inclusive systematic review incorporating evidence across national borders would be beneficial. We therefore call for international systematic reviews of SV prevention research to evaluate the existing evidence and consider the cultural context.

Ann L. Coker, Ph.D.

*Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology  
College of Medicine, University of Kentucky  
Lexington, Kentucky*

Colleen M. Ray, Ph.D.

*Division of Violence Prevention  
National Center for Injury Prevention and Control  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
Atlanta, Georgia*

## References

[1] Fast facts: Preventing sexual violence [Violence Prevention|Injury Center] CDC. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/sexualviolence/fastfact.html>. Accessed September 19, 2023.

[2] DeGue S, Valle LA, Holt MK, et al. A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for sexual violence perpetration. *Aggress Violent Behav* 2014;19:346–62.

[3] Finnie RKC, Okasako-Schmucker DL, Buchanan L, et al. Intimate partner and sexual violence prevention among youth: A community guide systematic review. *Am J Prev Med* 2022;62:e45–55.

[4] Basile KC, DeGue S, Jones K, et al. STOP SV: A technical package to prevent sexual violence. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2016.

[5] Kettrey HH, Thompson MP, Marx RA, Davis AJ. Effects of campus sexual assault prevention programs on attitudes and behaviors among American college students: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Adolesc Health* 2023;72:831–44.

[6] Empowerment Self-Defense Prevents Rape: A Response to Kettrey et al.'s Meta-Analysis. Hollander JA, Edwards KM, McCaughey M, Cermele J, Ullman SE, Senn CY, Beaujolaïs B, Orchowski LM, Sarah Peitzmeier, S.

[7] Kettrey et al.'s Meta-analysis is Not About Empowerment Self-Defense Programs: A Response to Hollander et al. Kettrey HH, Thompson MP, Marx RA, Davis JA.

**Conflicts of interest:** The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.  
**Disclaimer:** The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.