


**Figure S1.** Generalized SEM Model with Indistinguishable Dyads controlling for income.



**Figure S2.** Generalized SEM Model with Distinguishable Dyads controlling for income

**Table S1.** Direct and indirect effects of conflict on drinking in indistinguishable dyads controlling for income.

Effect	Path	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	IRR	LCI	UCI
Direct	Conflict → A Drinking	0.06	0.03	0.063	1.06	1.00	1.13
Indirect	Conflict → A Coping → A Drinking	0.10	0.02	<0.001	1.11	1.07	1.15
Indirect	Conflict → P Coping → A Drinking	-0.01	0.02	0.437	0.99	0.96	1.02
Total	Conflict → A Drinking	0.15	0.02	<0.001	1.16	1.11	1.22

Note. IRR = Incident Rate Ratio. LCI and HCI are lower and upper 95% confidence intervals from bias-corrected bootstrapping with 1000 resamples. A = actor; P = partner. *n* = 327.

**Table S2.** Direct and indirect effects of conflict on men and women partners' coping and drinking controlling for income.

<b>Effect</b>	<b>Path</b>	<b><i>b</i></b>	<b><i>SE</i></b>	<b><i>p</i></b>	<b>IRR</b>	<b>LCI</b>	<b>UCI</b>
Direct	Conflict → M Drinking	0.02	0.03	0.645	1.02	0.95	1.08
Indirect	Conflict → M Coping → M Drinking	0.07	0.03	0.005	1.07	1.02	1.13
Indirect	Conflict → W Coping → M Drinking	0.04	0.02	0.111	1.04	0.99	1.09
Total	Conflict → M Drinking	0.12	0.03	<0.001	1.13	1.07	1.20
Direct	Conflict → W Drinking	0.03	0.04	0.542	1.03	0.94	1.12
Indirect	Conflict → W Coping → W Drinking	0.16	0.03	<0.001	1.17	1.11	1.26
Indirect	Conflict → M Coping → W Drinking	-0.06	0.03	0.048	0.94	0.89	1.00
Total	Conflict → W Drinking	0.13	0.03	<0.001	1.14	1.07	1.21

*Note.* IRR = Incident Rate Ratio. LCI and HCI are lower and upper 95% confidence intervals from bias-corrected bootstrapping with 1000 resamples. *n* = 289. M = men; W = women.