Supplement Figure 1: *Assessment and Intervention Schedule*

**Welcome call with coach**

Review research study protocol; Verbal informed consent; Randomization & instructions

**ePREP**

**Waitlist**

**Observe Phase**

* Feedback on relationship
* Select Relationship Issue to focus on during program

Mid program survey *(1 month since randomization)*

Post program survey *(2 months since randomization)*

2 month follow up survey *(4 months since randomization)*

4 month follow up survey *(6 months since randomization)*

Screening & Pretest surveys

**Understand Phase**

* DEEP Understanding of Relationship Issue
* Communication Skills

**Post Observe Call**

* Evaluate fit and number of Relationship Issue(s)

**Post Understand Call**

* Empathic joining or unified detachment of DEEP material

**Chapters 1 & 2**

* Time Out & Communication Danger Signs
* Speaker Listener Technique (SLT)

**OurRelationship**

**ePREP 2 Call**

* Practice SLT
* Review Time Out strategy

**Chapters 3 & 4**

* Events, Issues, & Hidden Issues model
* Problem Solving Skills

**ePREP 3 Call**

* Practice SLT
* Review XYZ statements

**Respond Phase**

* Acceptance & Change
* Problem solve Relationship Issue & Patterns of Communication

**Post Respond Call**

* Discuss agreed-upon changes
* Review progress in program

**Chapters 5 & 6**

* Understanding commitment and building dedication
* Fun & Friendship

**ePREP 4 Call**

* SLT about Fun & Friendship
* Plan moving forward

Online Supplement Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics across Study Waves for Relationship Quality Variables, and Correlations at Baseline.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Means* (*SD*) | | | | | *r* | | | |
|  | Baseline | Mid | Post | 4-Month | 6-Month | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. |
| **Full Sample** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Satisfaction | 9.22 (4.69) | 10.62 (4.85) | 11.79 (5.09) | 11.76 (4.95) | 11.86 (5.23) |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Breakup Pot. | 2.74 (1.10) | 2.32 (1.15) | 2.08 (1.10) | 2.06 (1.12) | 2.08 (1.17) | -.71\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| 1. Intimacy | 13.73 (3.40) | 14.50 (3.52) | 15.13 (3.58) | 15.10 (3.66) | 15.05 (3.73) | .70\*\*\* | -.59\*\*\* |  |  |
| 1. Conflict | 21.35 (4.87) | 18.74 (5.41) | 17.12 (5.76) | 17.19 (5.72) | 17.03 (5.83) | -.58\*\*\* | .52\*\*\* | -.55\*\*\* |  |
| 1. IPV | 0.27 (0.44) | 0.13 (0.34) | 0.09 (0.29) | 0.09 (0.29) | 0.09 (0.29) | -.09\*\*\* | .16\*\*\* | -.12\*\*\* | .24\*\*\* |
| **Waitlist Control** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Satisfaction | 9.31 (4.79) | 9.74 (4.80) | 10.42 (4.84) | 10.11 (4.72) | 10.49 (5.17) |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Breakup Pot. | 2.74 (1.14) | 2.52 (1.16) | 2.32 (1.12) | 2.41 (1.19) | 2.38 (1.23) | -.72\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| 1. Intimacy | 13.59 (3.46) | 14.08 (3.50) | 14.22 (3.47) | 13.91 (3.66) | 14.11 (3.79) | .71\*\*\* | -.63\*\*\* |  |  |
| 1. Conflict | 21.20 (4.82) | 19.96 (5.02) | 19.08 (5.38) | 19.21 (5.09) | 18.78 (5.39) | -.59\*\*\* | .52\*\*\* | -.53\*\*\* |  |
| 1. IPV | 0.26 (0.43) | 0.17 (0.37) | 0.13 (0.33) | 0.13 (0.33) | 0.13 (0.33) | -.07 | .16\*\*\* | -.17\*\* | .25\*\*\* |
| **OurRelationship** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Satisfaction | 9.30 (4.61) | 11.04 (4.77) | 12.85 (5.15) | 12.86 (4.97) | 12.75 (5.11) |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Breakup Pot. | 2.75 (1.11) | 2.24 (1.11) | 1.94 (1.08) | 1.88 (1.04) | 1.94 (1.13) | -.72\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| 1. Intimacy | 13.93 (3.38) | 14.70 (3.55) | 15.87 (3.52) | 15.86 (3.50) | 15.74 (3.56) | .67\*\*\* | -.60\*\*\* |  |  |
| 1. Conflict | 21.80 (4.55) | 18.57 (5.40) | 15.97 (5.78) | 16.23 (5.79) | 16.34 (5.75) | -.57\*\*\* | .55\*\*\* | -.55\*\*\* |  |
| 1. IPV | 0.31 (0.46) | 0.14 (0.35) | 0.09 (0.28) | 0.09 (0.29) | 0.08 (0.28) | -.12\*\* | .17\*\*\* | -.08 | .24\*\*\* |
| **ePREP** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Satisfaction | 9.04 (4.87) | 11.08 (4.97) | 12.13 (4.72) | 12.30 (5.19) | 12.33 (4.62) |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Breakup Pot. | 2.74 (1.06) | 2.20 (1.15) | 1.97 (1.06) | 1.90 (1.05) | 1.92 (1.11) | -.69\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| 1. Intimacy | 13.66 (3.36) | 14.71 (3.47) | 15.31 (3.55) | 15.52 (3.53) | 15.31 (3.65) | .72\*\*\* | -.55\*\*\* |  |  |
| 1. Conflict | 21.04 (5.08) | 17.69 (5.58) | 16.30 (5.67) | 16.13 (5.71) | 15.98 (5.95) | -.58\*\*\* | .49\*\*\* | -.55\*\*\* |  |
| 1. IPV | 0.25 (0.44) | 0.09 (0.28) | 0.06 (0.24) | 0.06 (0.24) | 0.06 (0.25) | -.11\* | .14\*\* | -.11\*\* | .23\*\*\* |

*Note:* \* *p* < .05; \*\* *p* < .01; \*\*\* *p* < .001. All statistics were computed within each imputed data set and then averaged. Means for IPV represent the proportion of respondents endorsing IPV.

**Supplemental Results – Frequency of Intimate Partner Violence**

See Table S2 for results from analysis of count IPV (i.e., IPV frequency). Among participants reporting any IPV, there was no impact of the OurRelationship intervention on IPV frequency during the treatment period (*b* = -0.015, *p* = .320) or over follow-up (*b* = 0.005, *p* = .513). There was, however, a small but significant reduction in IPV frequency among participants in the ePREP condition during the treatment period (*b* = -0.038, *p* = .030, *d* = -0.13 [-0.25, 0.00]), which was maintained through follow-up (*b* = 0.020, *p* = .289). This treatment effect was moderated by whether participants were initially clinically distressed (*b* = 0.098, *p* = .002), such that among participants who were distressed at baseline, there was no significant impact on IPV (*b* = -0.019, *p* = .312), whereas those who were not clinically distressed at baseline showed a significant reduction in IPV due to ePREP (*b* = -0.156, *p* = .001). The ePREP effect on IPV was also moderated by gender (*b* = -0.049, *p* = .044): men in the ePREP condition reported a reduction in IPV (*b* = -0.057, *p* = .014), but women did not (*b* = -0.030, *p* = .252).

Although there were no main effects for changes in IPV during the follow-up period, gender moderated IPV slopes over the follow-up period for the waitlist and OurRelationship groups. In the waitlist control group, male participants showed an increase in reported IPV frequency over follow-up (*b* = 0.016, *p* = .009) whereas female participants did not (*b* = -0.010, *p* = .240). In contrast, in the OurRelationship group, male participants decreased in reported IPV frequency over follow-up (*b* = -0.024, *p* = .002), and female participants reported increased IPV frequency over the same period (*b* = 0.031, *p* = .007).

See Table S3 for results comparing the ePREP and OurRelationship conditions directly. Although there were treatment effects relative to waitlist control for ePREP but not OurRelationship, there was no significant difference between the two active interventions when tested directly (*b* = -0.021, *p* = .242). At the same time, both gender (*b* = -0.060, *p* = .013) and initial distress (*b* = 0.090, *p* = .006) moderated the relative effectiveness of the two interventions. Among males, ePREP reduced IPV frequency significantly more than OurRelationship (*b* = -0.074, *p* = .002); among females, there was no difference between the two conditions (*b* = 0.025, *p* = .367). There were also no differences between the two conditions for participants who were clinically distressed at baseline (*b* = -0.009, *p* = .667), whereas for nondistressed participants, ePREP reduced IPV significantly more than OurRelationship (*b* = -0.124, *p* < .001).

Table S2. *Supplemental Results of Treatment Effects for Count IPV.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *b* | *s.e.* | *p* |
| Intercept (at Program Completion) |  |  |  |
| Waitlist | 0.967 | 0.080 | 0.000 |
| OUR | 0.205 | 0.112 | 0.067 |
| ePREP | -0.250 | 0.133 | 0.059 |
| Gender | 0.277 | 0.097 | 0.004 |
| Distress | 0.232 | 0.137 | 0.089 |
| Intervention Period |  |  |  |
| Waitlist | 0.008 | 0.010 | 0.435 |
| x Gender | 0.005 | 0.017 | 0.781 |
| x Distress | 0.027 | 0.022 | 0.226 |
| OUR | -0.015 | 0.015 | 0.321 |
| x Gender | 0.013 | 0.022 | 0.554 |
| x Distress | 0.008 | 0.030 | 0.785 |
| ePREP | -0.038 | 0.017 | 0.030 |
| x Gender | -0.049 | 0.024 | 0.044 |
| x Distress | 0.098 | 0.032 | 0.002 |
| Follow-Up Period |  |  |  |
| Waitlist | 0.001 | 0.005 | 0.864 |
| x Gender | 0.020 | 0.010 | 0.034 |
| x Distress | -0.001 | 0.012 | 0.952 |
| OUR | 0.005 | 0.007 | 0.513 |
| x Gender | -0.039 | 0.012 | 0.001 |
| x Distress | -0.006 | 0.015 | 0.685 |
| ePREP | 0.010 | 0.010 | 0.289 |
| x Gender | -0.026 | 0.016 | 0.090 |
| x Distress | -0.007 | 0.019 | 0.706 |

Table S3. *Supplemental Results of Relative Program Effects for Count IPV.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *b* | *s.e.* | *p* |
| Intercept (at Program Completion) |  |  |  |
| OUR | 1.144 | 0.084 | 0.000 |
| vs ePREP | -0.444 | 0.134 | 0.001 |
| Gender | 0.465 | 0.125 | 0.000 |
| Distress | 0.314 | 0.183 | 0.086 |
| Intervention Period |  |  |  |
| OUR | -0.011 | 0.011 | 0.347 |
| x Gender | 0.036 | 0.020 | 0.074 |
| x Distress | 0.041 | 0.029 | 0.156 |
| vs ePREP | -0.021 | 0.018 | 0.242 |
| x Gender | -0.060 | 0.024 | 0.013 |
| x Distress | 0.090 | 0.033 | 0.006 |
| Follow-Up Period |  |  |  |
| OUR | 0.007 | 0.005 | 0.137 |
| x Gender | -0.025 | 0.009 | 0.005 |
| x Distress | -0.009 | 0.011 | 0.457 |
| vs ePREP | 0.005 | 0.009 | 0.610 |
| x Gender | 0.010 | 0.015 | 0.498 |
| x Distress | -0.002 | 0.019 | 0.932 |