In this study of a community sample of Veterans from the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts (N = 634), researchers assessed the prevalence of hazardous drinking. Gender differences in the risk and protective factors for hazardous drinking were also examined. Thirty percent of the men and 16% of the women engaged in hazardous drinking.

Key Findings:
- In this sample, 30% of male Veterans and 16% of female Veterans reported scores indicative of hazardous drinking.
- Among male Veterans, younger age, higher incidence of exposure to assaultive trauma, and higher levels of conflict in interpersonal relationships were predictive of hazardous drinking.
- Among female Veterans, younger age and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms, especially emotional numbing, were predictive of hazardous drinking.

Implications for Programs:
- Programs could educate practitioners about gender differences associated with hazardous drinking among Service members.
- Programs could tailor their services to align with the distinct risk and protective factors for males and females.
- Programs could consider creating systematic referral systems and establishing collaborations with community-based mental health centers to maximize access to treatment for Service members engaging in hazardous drinking.
- Programs could consider training practitioners in evidence-based practices shown to reduce hazardous drinking among Service members.

Implications for Policies:
- Policies could recommend continued funding for programs designed to support military personnel with substance abuse issues.
- Policies could fund the development and evaluation of programs that meet the unique needs of male and female Service members who engage in hazardous drinking.
- Policies could consider routine screening for hazardous drinking among Service members at specified intervals across the deployment cycle.

Avenues for Future Research:
- Future studies could investigate how hazardous drinking may change across the course of the deployment cycle.
- Future longitudinal studies could investigate potential causes and adverse outcomes of hazardous drinking among Service members.
**Methodology:**
- Data was collected during phase 2 of the Women Veterans Cohort Study (WVCS). Participants were enrolled for care at a VA hospital in Indiana or the New England region (Response Rate: 8%).
- Veterans completed a self-report survey that assessed hazardous drinking, PTSD, depression, combat exposure, traumatic events, military sexual trauma, social support, and interpersonal conflict.
- Correlation and multivariate logistic regression were used to analyze the data.

**Participants:**
- 634 Veterans participated.
- Demographics: Gender: 54% female, 46% male; Age: M = 37.8 years (SD = 10.3)
- Race/Ethnicity: 84% White, 7% Hispanic, 6% Black, 2% Asian, and 1% Native American
- Branch: 65% Army, 17% Air Force, 10% Navy, 8% Marines; Component: 36% Active Duty, 37% National Guard, 27% Reserve.

**Limitations:**
- Given the low response rate (8%), participants may differ from non-participants in meaningful ways (e.g., those who responded may be functioning differently than those who did not respond).
- This study relied on self-report rather than diagnostic measures.
- Data were collected in two regions of the country; the ability to extrapolate these findings to Veterans in other parts of the United States is unknown.

### Assessing Research that Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Design and Sample</th>
<th>Quality Rating: 3 ⭐️</th>
<th>2 ⭐️</th>
<th>1 ⭐️</th>
<th>Questionable</th>
<th>(⭐️ ⭐️ ⭐️)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The design of the study (e.g., research plan, sample, recruitment) used to address the research question was...</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☒️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Methods</th>
<th>Quality Rating: 3 ⭐️</th>
<th>2 ⭐️</th>
<th>1 ⭐️</th>
<th>Questionable</th>
<th>(⭐️ ⭐️ ⭐️)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The research methods (e.g., measurement, analysis) used to answer the research question were...</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☒️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>Quality Rating: Minor Limitations</th>
<th>Few Limitations</th>
<th>Several Limitations</th>
<th>Questionable Many/Severe Limitations</th>
<th>(⭐️ ⭐️ ⭐️)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The limitations of this study are...</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☒️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Quality Rating: 3 ⭐️</th>
<th>2 ⭐️</th>
<th>1 ⭐️</th>
<th>Questionable</th>
<th>(⭐️ ⭐️ ⭐️)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The implications of this research to programs, policies and the field, stated by the authors, are...</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☒️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Not applicable because authors do not discuss implications

**Overall Quality Rating** 3 ⭐️