Trauma-informed approaches in primary healthcare and community mental healthcare: a mixed methods systematic review of system change interventions (TAPCARE study)

Natalia V Lewis, PhD[1 3], Angel Bierce[1], Gene S Feder, MD, FRCGP[1 3], John Macleod, PhD, FRCGP [1 2], Katrina M Turner, PhD[1 2 3], Stan Zammit, PhD, MRCPsych[1 3 4], Shoba Dawson, PhD[1]

[1] Centre for Academic Primary Care, Bristol Medical School (Population Health Sciences), University of Bristol, UK

[2] National Institute for Health Research Applied Research Collaboration West (NIHR ARC West) at University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust, UK

[3] NIHR Bristol Biomedical Research Centre, University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and University of Bristol, UK

[4] Division of Psychological Medicine and Clinical Neurosciences, Cardiff University, UK

Correspondence: Natalia V Lewis, Centre for Academic Primary Care, University of Bristol, Canynge Hall, Bristol, BS8 2PS, UK, nat.lewis@bristol.ac.uk

Abstract

A Trauma-informed approach in healthcare services is a framework for system-level interventions that address the universal prevalence and impact of trauma. This mixed methods systematic review integrated evidence on the models, effects, and

programme theories of trauma-informed system-level interventions in primary healthcare and community mental healthcare. We searched five electronic databases (January 1990-June 2021) and grey literature and consulted subject experts. The quantitative descriptive and qualitative framework syntheses were integrated through a line of argument and mapped onto a logic model. We included six studies (two non-randomised quantitative, one non-randomised mixed methods, three qualitative) that evaluated eight interventions with varied theoretical development, components, and outcome measures. The common components were budget allocation, workforce development, identification/response to violence and trauma, evaluation. The varied outcomes were grouped into eleven domains and mapped onto intermediate psychological/behavioural and long-term health outcomes constructs of the logic model. We found limited conflicting evidence for intervention effects on patient and provider psychological, behavioural, and health outcome domains. Four studies reported improvement in organisational readiness to provide trauma-informed care and sense of community while three reported conflicting effects on provider behaviour. Four studies reported some improvement in patient readiness for disease management and access to services; however, the evidence for patient satisfaction was conflicting. Two studies found that patients and providers felt safe. Interventions worked as a whole package and through tailoring to the local context, staff education and self-care activities, safe environments, shared decision making. Intervention effects were moderated by contextual (health system values, policies, governance, business models, trauma-informed movement, organisational culture, social determinants of health) and intervention factors (buy-in from all staff, collective learning through conversations, equal attention to well-being of staff and

patients, sustainable funding). No studies measured adverse events/harm, cost effectiveness, staff health.

Keywords

Trauma-informed approaches, psychological trauma, violence, primary health care, mental health, systematic review, health services research

1. INTRODUCTION

Psychological trauma has devastating impact on the health of individuals, communities, and societies (Magruder, McLaughlin, & Elmore Borbon, 2017). Traumatic experiences can be caused by single events (e.g., sexual assault, unexpected family death) or chronic phenomena (e.g., adverse childhood experiences (ACEs), domestic abuse, community violence, historical trauma) (Ruglass & Kendall-Tackett, 2014). Individual traumatic experiences can occur in the context of structural violence (e.g., healthcare, economic, gender, and racial disparities) that may exacerbate effects of interpersonal trauma (Rylko-Bauer & Farmer, 2016). Traumatic experiences are associated with risk-taking behaviours, poorer health, adverse socio-economic outcomes, and increased use of primary and mental health services (Magruder et al., 2017). If the high prevalence and impacts of trauma are not acknowledged within health services, that can cause re-traumatisation through invasive procedures and coercive practices (e.g., removal of choice regarding treatment, judgemental attitudes following a disclosure of abuse, lack of acceptable services) (DHSC, 2018). Re-traumatisation within health services can affect both patients and staff, with the latter experiencing vicarious trauma (Figley & Kleber, 1995).

Over the last two decades, a trauma-informed approach has gained momentum as a framework for system-change interventions that address the high prevalence and impact of trauma. The approach differs from standard 'trauma blind' service delivery by integrating 4 *Rs* throughout healthcare systems: **r**ealising and **r**ecognising the impacts of trauma on patients and staff, **r**esponding by integrating knowledge about trauma into policies and practices, and creating environments and relationships that prevent **r**e-traumatisation and promote physical and emotional safety for all (Melz,

Morrison, Ingoldsby, Cairone, & Mackrain, 2019). The framework of a trauma-informed approach is not a protocol but a high-level guidance for system change interventions that can be adapted to any health service. Although authors use differing terminology and definitions, moistly they align with the philosophy and principles of the system-level trauma-informed approach proposed by Harris and Fallot (Harris & Fallot, 2001) and developed further by the frequently cited US Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) (SAMHSA, 2017). Subsequent developments drew attention to the intersection of individual trauma and structural violence, universal applicability of the trauma-informed approach, benefits to patients and staff, and application to services other than mental health and addiction (Table 1).

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Its proponents consistently highlight the system (synonym organisational) level of a trauma-informed approach, requiring changes in the structure and culture of the system/organisation (organisational domain). These organisational changes precede changes in clinical practices (clinical domain) (Harris & Fallot, 2001). Becoming a trauma-informed health system is described as a transformation process rather than a one-off activity. The transformation work is guided by six key principles of safety, trust, collaboration, choice, empowerment, and cultural sensitivity (SAMHSA, 2017). These principles can be implemented through varied intervention components and activities tailored to organisational and wider contexts (SAMHSA, 2017) (Table 1). One contested component is screening for a history of traumatic events in adult health care settings (Raja, Rabinowitz, & Gray, 2021). Most authors consider it an essential component, while some think that disclosure of violence and trauma is not

the goal in a trauma-informed approach and service providers do not necessarily need to know about peoples' lived experiences to provide appropriate healthcare. The conceptual mutability of a trauma-informed approach framework and lack of empirical evidence for effectiveness has been challenged (Birnbaum, 2019). These and the various definitions and applications might have contributed towards misconceptions about a trauma-informed approach (Sweeney & Taggart, 2018).

A growing body of literature, policies and guidelines recommend implementation of trauma-informed approaches at the health system level; however, the evidence base for the effectiveness is still being developed. Our feasibility searches and consultations with experts found extensive literature on articulating system-level trauma-informed approaches and how and why we should implement and evaluate (Table 1). We identified a booming market of training and certification on trauma-informed approaches. In contrast, we found a small number of evaluations of the effectiveness of system change interventions within health systems. Currently, studies of standalone training interventions about trauma-informed care without any other system-level components dominate the evaluation literature (Purtle, 2020). While a few evaluations of trauma-informed system change interventions were conducted in secondary mental healthcare (Sweeney, Clement, Filson, & Kennedy, 2016) and services for children (Bendall et al., 2020; Bryson et al., 2017), we found no systematic reviews of the trauma-informed approach in adult primary care and community mental healthcare. These services are a patient’s first point of contact with a health system (WHO & UNICEF, 2018).

This systematic review is part of a programme of research on trauma-informed health systems (TAPCARE study). We aimed to systematically identify, appraise,

and synthesise the empirical evidence on trauma-informed system change interventions in primary healthcare and community mental health care to understand:

1. What models of trauma-informed system change interventions have been implemented?
2. What are the effects of these interventions on patient or healthcare provider psychological, behavioural, health outcomes?
3. Are these interventions cost-effective?
4. What programme theories were proposed to explain intervention effects?

2. MATERIALS & METHODS

2.1. Design

We conducted a mixed methods systematic review with concurrent analysis of quantitative and qualitative data and results-based convergent integration through developing a line of argument (Sandelowski, Voils, & Barroso, 2006) and mapping on a logic model (Rohwer et al., 2016). We treated quantitative and qualitative findings equally and did not undertake data transformation. To address the complexity of the system-level trauma-informed approach, we used the SAMHSA framework (SAMHSA, 2017) and the four-level framework of the healthcare system (Ferlie & Shortell, 2001) to inform our data extraction, analysis, and synthesis. This report follows the PRISMA guidelines (Page et al., 2021). We registered the protocol with PROSPERO (CRD42020164752) and published it elsewhere (Dawson et al., 2021).

2.2. Patient and Public Involvement

In line with the key principles of a trauma-informed approach (SAMHSA, 2017), we involved people with lived experience of trauma in each stage of the review. We

recruited two study advisory groups. The public advisory group included eight people with lived experience of trauma, and experience of health services. The professional advisory group included ten people who plan, fund, and deliver health services. Both groups brainstormed research questions and listed outcomes that are meaningful to patients, service providers, managers, and funders. The professional group developed a list of UK primary and community mental health services. Professional stakeholders highlighted inconsistent terminology used in the UK (i.e., ACEs, trauma-informed approach/care/practice, psychologically informed environments). They emphasised the need for empirical evidence and evidence-informed policies on trauma-informed approaches that are relevant to the UK context. We met with the advisory groups every six months to consult on data extraction, logic model refinement, interpretation, and dissemination of study findings.

2.2. Development of a logic model

To produce evidence that is understandable to healthcare providers and policy makers, we applied the staged logic model approach (Rohwer et al., 2016). At protocol development stage, we used the measurement model for trauma-informed primary care (Germán, Crawford, & Dumpert, 2020) as a foundation for our logic model. We consulted both study advisory groups on the outcomes that were meaningful for patient and providers, incorporated their suggestions, and produced version 1 of our logic model (Dawson et al., 2021). We further developed version 1 with data from background literature, synthesis tables, and input from the study team and advisory groups. Version 2 incorporated findings at the data extraction stage. Version 3 incorporated revisions at the data synthesis stage and included the following constructs:

- A component of the trauma-informed system change intervention categorised by the ten implementation domains (SAMHSA, 2017).
- An intermediate psychological (cognitive or affective) or behavioural outcome regarding trauma-informed care that the components might lead to (e.g., provider readiness or practices) categorised by the four-level framework of the healthcare system (Ferlie & Shortell, 2001).
- A long-term health-related outcome/phenomenon of interest that the intermediate outcomes/phenomenon of interest might lead to (e.g., patient or provider mental health) categorised by the four-level framework (Ferlie & Shortell, 2001).
- A moderator – a factor that could affect either positively or negatively, the link between a component and any outcome (Figure 1).

2.3. Search strategy and selection criteria

Based on previous systematic reviews (Branson, Baetz, Horwitz, & Hoagwood, 2017; Champine, Lang, Nelson, Hanson, & Tebes, 2019) and the expertise of the research team and advisory groups, the first reviewer (SD) developed a search strategy combining MeSH and free-text terms. SD conducted scoping exercises in different databases to maximise the search strategy's sensitivity and specificity. The search terms were modified and tailored for five electronic bibliographic databases: Cochrane Library, MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) and PsycINFO. We limited the search to primary studies published between January 1990 and February 2020, updated in June 2021 (Appendix S1, Table 2).

SD searched the PROSPERO database for relevant systematic reviews in progress, and the ethos library and PROQUEST for dissertations. Additionally, SD conducted

grey literature search on websites of organisations involved in development and implementation of trauma-informed care. SD and NVL checked references and citations of included papers. NVL contacted corresponding authors, subject experts in trauma-informed approach, and study advisory groups for additional reports. We included primary studies of any design that evaluated a trauma-informed system change intervention in primary care or community mental health care (Table 2).

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

2.4. Study selection

We used Rayyan (Ouzzani, Hammady, Fedorowicz, & Elmagarmid, 2016) to combine, export, and screen the results of the database searches. The first reviewer (SD) and a second reviewer (AB or NVL) independently screened titles and abstracts and full reports against study inclusion criteria (Table 2). The reviewers met and resolved discrepancies through discussion. Where they could not reach consensus, senior team members (GF, JM) acted as third reviewers. We included multiple reports of the same study if they contained new information and collated multiple reports so that each study was the unit of analysis. Study ID references the earliest most detailed report.

2.5. Data extraction

SD adapted a Word data-extraction proforma from previous systematic reviews, tested on two studies, and refined. The proforma included report(s) information, study setting, aim, design, methods for data collection and analysis, participants characteristics, brief intervention description, referenced theories/hypothesis underpinning trauma-informed approach, and relevant quantitative results. For each quantitative outcome, we extracted type of measure and effect estimates as reported

in the primary study. If a follow-up measure was reported repeatedly, we extracted all results. If a study recruited a mixed sample or had multiple sites, we only extracted data relevant to adult primary care or community mental healthcare. SD extracted data and NVL checked and reconciled the forms, and asked all corresponding authors to check. Five of the six authors responded.

We treated included reports as primary qualitative data and used NVivo 12 to simultaneously extract and code data on intervention characteristics and qualitative phenomena of interest (i.e., perceptions of intervention effects or factors that might influence intervention effects). We used the framework synthesis method recommended for addressing applied policy questions (Dixon-Woods, 2011). Our initial coding frame included constructs from the SAMHSA framework of trauma-informed approach (SAMHSA, 2017), our logic model, and the four-level healthcare system framework (Ferlie & Shortell, 2001). Two reviewers (NVL, KT) deductively coded intervention description, participants' quotes, and authors interpretations relevant to our research questions. First, NVL and KT independently manually coded two reports and met to agree the codes. Then NVL imported the framework into NVivo and completed the coding refining the framework throughout this process and grouping codes into themes.

2.6 Quality appraisal

We conducted quality appraisal as part of data extraction to indicate methodological limitations in each included study. Since we included studies of multiple designs, we used the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) (Hong et al., 2018). SD completed the MMAT checklist for each study, NVL checked and reconciled through consensus.

2.7 Data synthesis

We conducted a results-based convergent synthesis (Sandelowski et al., 2006) at three stages: (i) concurrent quantitative and qualitative syntheses, (ii) integration of findings from the two syntheses and (iii) mapping on a logic model. At stage one, SD synthesised quantitative results in tables and descriptive summaries. Due to the variation of intervention models, measures, and outcomes, we could not conduct a meta-analysis. NVL grouped deductive codes into themes and wrote descriptive accounts with illustrative quotes.

At stage two, NVL and SD integrated quantitative and qualitative syntheses in tables and text. We integrated differing outcomes under 11 domains across the organisation, care team, and individual patient levels (Table 7). We judged intervention effects by improvement in any quantitative outcome and/or participant perception of improvement reported in the individual studies. In the quantitative synthesis, we used authors' interpretation of their results based on p values, 95% confidence intervals (CI), or point estimates. In the qualitative synthesis, we summarised participants' quotes and authors' interpretations of primary data about perceived intervention effects. We categorised measured and perceived effects as *improvement, mixed effect, nil effect*. We ascribed a *mixed effect* when one or more, but not all measures of the same outcome changed under the same intervention. If different studies reported contradicting findings on the same outcome, we categorised such evidence as *conflicting*.

At stage three, NVL mapped the integrated findings on the constructs of the logic model. The final logic model only included items that were supported by evidence from the included studies (Figure 2).

3. RESULTS

We included 13 reports (Bradley, 2020; Brooks, Barclay, & Hooker, 2017, 2018; Brooks, Hooker, & Barclay, 2020; Browne et al., 2018; Browne, Varcoe, Ford-Gilboe, Wathen, & Team, 2015; Cocozza et al., 2005; Dubay, Burton, & Epstein, 2018; Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018; Kimberg, Bakken, Chen, & Schillinger, 2019; Levine, Varcoe, & Browne, 2021; McHugo et al., 2005; Morrissey et al., 2005) of six studies (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Kimberg et al., 2019; McHugo et al., 2005) (Figure 2).

3.1 Characteristics of included studies

The primary studies from three high income countries used non-randomised quantitative and qualitative designs. Of six studies, three were from the US (Dubay et al., 2018; Kimberg et al., 2019; McHugo et al., 2005) and one each from the UK (Bradley, 2020), Canada (Browne et al., 2018) and Australia (Brooks et al., 2017). Three studies were qualitative service evaluations (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Dubay et al., 2018), two were studies of newly developed trauma-informed system change interventions (Browne et al., 2018; McHugo et al., 2005), and one was an evaluation of a quality improvement programme (Kimberg et al., 2019). The US Women Co-occurring Disorders and Violence Study (WCDVS) used a controlled before-after design (McHugo et al., 2005). The US Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ASPIRE) quality improvement evaluation was a cross-sectional analysis of routine data (Kimberg et al., 2019). The Canadian Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) study used a mixed- methods design: uncontrolled before-after survey with healthcare providers and patients, qualitative interviews with providers, and ethnographic facility observations (Browne et al., 2018). Only WCDVS and EQUIP had follow-up measures at 12 (McHugo et al., 2005), 18 and 24 months

(Browne et al., 2018) Three qualitative evaluations used focus groups and interviews (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Dubay et al., 2018). (Table 3).

Trauma-informed system change interventions were implemented in public primary care clinics that served populations with high rates of trauma (Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Kimberg et al., 2019) and public (Brooks et al., 2017; McHugo et al., 2005) and third sector (Bradley, 2020) specialist organisations that served women with a history of interpersonal violence. Two studies were single-site evaluations (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017) and four were multi-site studies (Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Kimberg et al., 2019; McHugo et al., 2005). The EQUIP study took place in four Canadian primary care clinics that implemented the same intervention model (Browne et al., 2018). From the WCDVS, we included the Washington DC site with four community mental health centres (McHugo et al., 2005). From the Dubay et al report (Dubay et al., 2018), we included three primary care settings that implemented different intervention models: Women's HIV Clinic San Francisco, Montefiore Medical Group of 22 primary care practices New York, and Family Health Clinic Philadelphia. From the ARISE evaluation (Kimberg et al., 2019) and Young Women's Clinic (Brooks et al., 2017), we extracted data for the patient group aged 18 and above.

The total number of participants exposed to trauma-informed system change interventions was 117447 patients and 137 healthcare providers. The number of patients ranged from 6 in qualitative service evaluation (Dubay et al., 2018) to 116,871 in analysis of routine data (Kimberg et al., 2019). The number of providers (nurses, physicians, counsellors, outreach workers and allied professionals) ranged from 4 (Bradley, 2020) to 117 (Browne et al., 2018).

3.2 Methodological quality of included studies

The quantitative non-randomised studies and mixed methods study components were of moderate quality. The methodological quality of qualitative study component was high (Table 4).

Most studies had clearly defined research questions, which were addressed by the data collected (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; McHugo et al., 2005). One study did not pose a clear research question (Kimberg et al., 2019). All four qualitative studies/component showed coherence between data sources, collection, analysis, and interpretation (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018). The three quantitative studies/component used appropriate sampling techniques and measures (Browne et al., 2018; Kimberg et al., 2019; McHugo et al., 2005); two had a good completion rate (Browne et al., 2018; McHugo et al., 2005). Only one study accounted for confounders (Browne et al., 2018) and one confirmed that the intervention was administered as intended (Browne et al., 2018). The only mixed methods study (Browne et al., 2018) provided a design rationale and adequately integrated the qualitative and quantitative components. However, it did not address the divergence or inconsistency between components, nor did it fulfil the methodological quality criteria (Table 5).

3.3. Models of trauma-informed system change interventions

The six studies evaluated eight different models of trauma-informed system change interventions. Although each model was tailored to the patient population, organisation, and wider contexts, all the models had sufficient common features for cross-study comparison. Our framework synthesis confirmed that each model

aligned with the *4Rs* of the SAMHSA framework. The models varied by their level of theoretical development, formalisation, and activities within each component. Three of eight interventions implemented existing models of trauma-informed system change interventions. The UK One-stop-shop Women's Centre had been implementing the Trauma-informed Service Systems model (Harris & Fallot, 2001) for less than a year (Bradley, 2020). The Family Health Clinic Philadelphia had been implementing the Sanctuary Model (Esaki et al., 2013), while the Women's HIV Clinic San Francisco had adapted the Trauma-informed Primary Care framework (Machtinger, Cuca, Khanna, Rose, & Kimberg, 2015) for more than two years (Dubay et al., 2018). The Canadian team developed and evaluated a 24-month implementation of the new EQUIP intervention (Browne et al., 2018). The other four sites (WCDVS Washington site, Montefiore Medical Group, Young Women's Clinic, San Francisco Health Network Primary Care) implemented bespoke system change interventions, with implementation ranging from 12 months (McHugo et al., 2005), 17 months (Kimberg et al., 2019), more than 24 months (Dubay et al., 2018) to 13 years (Brooks et al., 2017).

The intervention components varied in the extent to which they mapped onto the ten implementation domains (SAMHSA, 2017). Only EQUIP (Browne et al., 2018) and Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic (Brooks et al., 2017) included components from all ten implementation domains; the bespoke US Montefiore Medical Group intervention covered six domains (Dubay et al., 2018) (Table 6).

The four common domains across all eight models were: (i) budget, (ii) training and workforce development, (iii) identification and/or response to violence and trauma, and (iv) evaluation of system change. All interventions were funded through project

grants or joint financing. The budgets covered training and ongoing support for all staff, provision of trauma-informed practices, and changes in the physical environment. Workforce development included trauma champions and varied training, ongoing support, and self-care activities for all staff. The content, format, and duration of the training varied; the common features were delivery by external experts, tailoring to the organisational context and patient population, and booster sessions. Similarly, self-care activities were tailored to the organisational context; examples included mindfulness sessions, wellbeing days, and trauma-informed supervision. All models included on-site, or external trauma-specific interventions tailored to the needs of the population served. Five interventions included screening for history of trauma and/or mental health conditions (Bradley, 2020; Dubay et al., 2018; Kimberg et al., 2019; McHugo et al., 2005). Seven models made changes in the physical environment (Bradley, 2020; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; McHugo et al., 2005). These ranged from women-only spaces and activities (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; McHugo et al., 2005) and provision of childcare (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017), through redesigning waiting rooms and offices (Bradley, 2020; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018) to extending opening time (Browne et al., 2018) and consultation length (Brooks et al., 2017). Varied activities to monitor progress and quality were reported in seven models (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Kimberg et al., 2019). Cross-sectional collaboration was reported in six models (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Kimberg et al., 2019; McHugo et al., 2005). Engagement and involvement of people with lived experience in system change were reported in six models (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; McHugo et al., 2005). Organisations undertook

different engagement activities, from including people with lived experience of violence and trauma in working groups/committees (Dubay et al., 2018) to hiring them as advisers (Browne et al., 2018; Kimberg et al., 2019) and service providers (Bradley, 2020; McHugo et al., 2005). The least common domains were the leadership and governance support in five models (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Kimberg et al., 2019). Written policies and procedures that reflected commitment to trauma-informed approach were reported in three models (Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018; Kimberg et al., 2019).

3.4. Effects of trauma-informed system change interventions

We found limited conflicting evidence for the effects (or perceived effects) of trauma-informed system change interventions on 11 outcome domains, with an overall direction towards some improvement. Most evidence came from the controlled before-after WCDVS (McHugo et al., 2005), mixed methods EQUIP study (Browne et al., 2018), and three qualitative service evaluations (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Dubay et al., 2018). The evidence for each intervention model was based on a single study. None used the same measures (Table 7, Figure 2).

The studies reported improvement in four out of seven intermediate psychological and behaviour outcomes and in two out of four long-term health outcomes. Only three studies reported both intermediate psychological and long-term health outcomes (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018). Although most interventions offered training and self-care activities for staff, no studies measured provider health and wellbeing. No studies reported adverse events/harm among patients or staff. No studies evaluated cost-effectiveness.

3.4.1. Intermediate psychological and behavioural outcomes

We found limited evidence that some interventions may change organisational culture and create safe environments for patients and staff potentially leading to improved perceived safety, patient disease management and access to services. These changes were measured through assessing organisational readiness to provide trauma-informed care, provider sense of community, patient readiness for disease management and access to services, patient and provider perceived safety. However, the evidence for the effect on provider behaviour and patient satisfaction was conflicting.

3.4.1.1. Provider readiness for trauma-informed care. Four studies reported improvement in organisational readiness to provide trauma-informed care through developing provider awareness, attitudes, confidence, and skills in the topic (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018).

3.4.1.2. Provider sense of community. *At the organisational level,* two qualitative evaluations reported that staff felt supported and valued (Bradley, 2020; Dubay et al., 2018).

3.4.1.3. Provider behaviour regarding trauma-informed care. *At the organisation level,* the evidence for change in collective behaviour and practices was conflicting. While ARISE programme reported a 22% increase in screening rates for depression, substance abuse, and interpersonal violence (Kimberg et al., 2019), Dubay et al (Dubay et al., 2018) found that in three US interventions healthcare providers “had rich, nuanced views on the benefits and drawbacks of screening for trauma, which didn’t always neatly align with their organizations’ official policies. Several interviewees called screening for trauma “controversial,” said they were “conflicted”

or had “mixed” feelings about it, or said “there are pros and cons (p.24)”. Similarly, while Bradley et al (Bradley, 2020) found that staff used and appreciated well-being activities, Dubay et al (Dubay et al., 2018) reported that “many interviewees said they did not adopt new self-care techniques after trainings, but appreciated grantees’ efforts to promote self-care (p.VII)”.

3.4.1.4. Patient readiness for disease management. *At the care team level,* two qualitative studies reported that patients felt in control of treatment (Brooks et al., 2017; Dubay et al., 2018). *At the individual level,* four studies consistently reported improvement in confidence in managing health conditions and self-confidence (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018).

3.4.1.5. Patient satisfaction with services. *At the organisation level,* two studies found qualitative evidence for improved satisfaction with services (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017), while Dubay et al (Dubay et al., 2018) reported that “some patients felt frustrated by high staff turnover and by the lack of staff diversity in some practices (p.33)”.

3.4.1.6. Patient access to services. *At the organisation level*, three qualitative studies reported improved access to care through on-site provision or referrals to external organisations (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Dubay et al., 2018).

3.4.1.7. Provider and patient safety. *At the organisation level*, two qualitative studies reported improvement in perceived safety among patient and staff (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017) suggesting that the interventions created safe environments.

3.4.2. Long-term patient health outcomes

We found limited conflicting evidence suggesting that some interventions may improve some health outcomes among patients. Three studies reported conflicting evidence for four health outcome domains with improvement in two, nil effect on one, and conflicting effects on one. The EQUIP study (Browne et al., 2018; Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018) found strong evidence for improvement in patient quality of life, chronic pain, depression and PTSD symptoms at 18- and 24-month follow-up. Brooks et al (Brooks et al., 2017) found qualitative evidence for improvement in depressive symptoms. In contrast, the WCDVS reported nil effect on mental health symptoms and severity of alcohol and drug problems; the PTSD symptoms remained unchanged at 6 months then improved at 12 months (Cocozza et al., 2005; McHugo et al., 2005; Morrissey et al., 2005).

3.5. Programme theories of change

We found varied theoretical development behind four out of eight intervention models. The EQUIP intervention (Browne et al., 2018) and Sanctuary Model (Dubay et al., 2018) were grounded in high-level psycho-social and implementation theories. EQUIP was informed by complexity theory (Browne et al., 2015). The Sanctuary Model was grounded in constructivist self-development theory, burnout theory, and systems theory (Esaki et al., 2013). The Trauma-informed Service System was informed by the trauma theory (Harris & Fallot, 2001). The Trauma-informed Primary Care framework (Dubay et al., 2018) drew on the medical home, trauma-informed care, responses to intimate partner violence and ACEs interventions for PTSD and complex PTSD, and models of trauma-informed care in other settings (Machtinger et al., 2015).

3.5.1. Mechanisms

Authors proposed eight mechanisms to explain the link between intervention components and outcomes with limited evidence from five studies (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; McHugo et al., 2005) (Table 3).

3.5.1.1. Intervention as a whole was proposed in four studies (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021). *At the organisation level*, two studies reported qualitative evidence explaining the challenging process of changing organisational readiness to provide trauma-informed care (Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021). In the EQUIP study (Browne et al., 2018), this shift happened through "surfaced tensions that mirrored those in the wider community, including those related to racism, the impacts of violence and trauma, and substance use issues. Surfacing these tensions was disruptive but led to focused organizational strategies (p.1)." Similarly, Dubay et al (Dubay et al., 2018) described tensions due to differing values and attitudes among staff groups. Further, the EQUIP study reported evidence linking engagement with the intervention and increased awareness and confidence among staff (Browne et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021). Bradley (Bradley, 2020) found qualitative evidence for the link between trauma-informed service and patients satisfaction and provider sense of community.

Brooks et al (Brooks et al., 2017, 2018; Brooks et al., 2020) reported some qualitative evidence suggesting that all components of the Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic led to patient satisfaction with services through improving access to health care for young, disadvantaged women.

Two studies reported some evidence for the link between intervention as a whole and outcomes *at the level of individual patient*. The WCDVS study reported that "intervention condition and programme elements" led to improvement in women's trauma symptoms at 12 months (0.414 (95% CI 0.081 to 0.747) (Morrissey et al., 2005). After using the Trauma-informed Women's Clinic, some participants reported increased self-confidence, confidence in care, perceived safety and support, improved mental health (Brooks et al., 2017).

3.5.1.2. Women-only space increased patient satisfaction with services through improving access to care, perceived safety and support, self-confidence (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017). However, Brooks et al (Brooks et al., 2017) reported that "sometimes people get the wrong idea of the place, they think it's for people that are man-haters (p.15)".

3.5.1.3. EQUIP care dose was proposed as an indirect mechanism to patient health outcomes (Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018). When patients perceived their care as more equity-oriented and trauma-informed, they felt more comfortable and confident in that care. This led to patients feeling more confident in their own ability to manage health problems. Over time, these psychological changes translated into better quality of life and less depression, trauma symptoms, chronic pain.

3.5.1.4. Staff education was proposed as a mechanism to change in provider readiness *at the organisation level*. Two qualitative evaluations found that educating all staff about trauma-informed approach and self-care led to improvement in provider knowledge, skills (Bradley, 2020; Dubay et al., 2018), and relationships (Dubay et al., 2018).

3.5.1.5. Tailoring staff education to the local context was the EQUIP mechanism for unifying staff and identifying clinic-specific priorities for increasing readiness for trauma-informed care (Levine et al., 2021).

3.5.1.6. Staff self-care activities contributed to staff perceived safety (Bradley, 2020).

3.5.1.7. Safe environment created by the women-only policy, staff non-judgemental attitudes, and confidential services were reported as a link to patient safety and satisfaction through building trusting patient-provider relationships (Bradley, 2020) and increasing patient safety (Brooks et al., 2017).

3.5.1.8. Shared decision making led to patient safety and satisfaction through education, feeling of control over treatment, and empowerment (Brooks et al., 2017).

3.5.2. Moderators

We developed two themes with eight subthemes summarising factors that facilitated or hindered intervention effects:

1. contextual factors at the levels of wider political and economic environments, organisation (culture, resources), and individual patient (social determinants of health)
2. intervention factors at the organisation level (intervention components, implementation process) (Table 8, Figure 2).

3.5.2.1. Contextual moderators. Three qualitative studies identified political and economic conditions that could affect intervention effects. These were relevant to values, regulatory, and financial regimes within the health system (Bradley, 2020; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021). Rigid policies,

governance, and profit-driven business models made it difficult for healthcare providers to find time for training participation, self-care, and other system change activities (Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021). Canadian and US providers acknowledged differing values between their organisations and the wider health system that acted as a barrier (Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018). Bradley (Bradley, 2020) reported similar conflicting regulations and values in the UK third sector. EQUIP "participants noted the amplifying influence of other trauma-informed initiatives in the community" (Levine et al., 2021) (p.6).

Two studies described negative moderators at the organisation level: unsupportive culture with high pressure environment, disconnected leaders, hierarchical structure, differing values, and power imbalances (Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021). In contrast, a supportive work environment and organisational values aligned with the principles of trauma-informed approach were described as positive moderators (Levine et al., 2021). One study reported that their facility had limited capacity for changes in the physical environment (Bradley, 2020).

One study described negative moderators at the individual patient level. Path analysis found that the EQUIP intervention was less effective for patients with experiences of intersecting structural violence (i.e., financial strain and discrimination) (Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018).

3.5.2.2. Intervention moderators. Barriers to the intervention implementation were reported most frequently. Four studies described poor engagement of some members of staff in intervention activities (Dubay et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021), inadequate funding and dependence on project grants (Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Levine et al., 2021) as major barriers to sustainable system change. In

contrast, two studies reported factors enabling successful workforce development leading to changes in the organisational culture. First, healthcare providers thought that collective learning through interprofessional conversations worked better than didactic method (Levine et al., 2021). Second, they highlighted the importance of the leadership buy-in (Dubay et al., 2018). Third, providers emphasised the importance of involving all staff in educational activities (Dubay et al., 2018).

Two studies of services for women with a history of interpersonal violence found some evidence that components of the system change intervention can have a modifying effect. The hierarchical linear modelling in the WCDVS produced conflicting results. While receiving integrated counselling for trauma, mental health, and substance abuse resulted in better patient health outcomes, receiving more study services resulted in less improvement (Morrissey et al., 2005). Bradley (Bradley, 2020) quoted “one member of staff emphasised the importance of prioritising staff well-being as equal to the support provided to women (p.16)”.

4. DISCUSSION

This systematic review of six studies investigating eight models of trauma-informed system change interventions in primary care and community mental health care found limited conflicting evidence for their effects on patient and healthcare provider psychological, behavioural, and health outcomes. Four studies reported improvement in provider readiness for trauma-informed care and sense of community. However, two studies reported that only some providers implemented self-care activities and screening for traumatic experiences. Four studies reported some improvement in patient readiness for disease management and access to services; however, the evidence for patient satisfaction was conflicting. Two studies

found that patients and providers felt safe. While one study reported some improvement in patient quality of life and chronic pain, three studies reported conflicting findings regarding effect on mental health symptoms, and one found nil effect on alcohol and drug problem severity. No studies measured adverse events/harm, cost effectiveness, and staff health. The limited evidence for programmes' mechanisms suggested that interventions may work as a whole package and through separate components – staff education tailored to the local context, self-care activities for staff, safe environments, and shared treatment decision making. We identified contextual and intervention factors that may moderate intervention effects. Contextual moderators included health system values, policies, governance, and business models, wider trauma-informed programmes, organisational culture, and patient social determinants of health. Intervention moderators included buy-in and engagement from all staff, collective learning through interprofessional conversations, equal attention to well-being of staff and patients, sustainable funding.

Our first important finding is the very limited empirical evidence base for the effectiveness of trauma-informed system change interventions in primary care and community mental health care. Despite exhaustive searches, we only identified three non-randomised studies and three qualitative service evaluations of different intervention models. One of the reasons for the evidence gap could be the methodological challenges of evaluating system-level interventions. However, the literature offers varied tools and guidance on how to monitor and evaluate the implementation of a trauma-informed approach (Champine et al., 2019; Germán et al., 2020; Thirkle, Kennedy, & Sice, 2021). Another reason could be the funding

landscape where project grants for trauma-informed initiatives do not cover evaluation. It is possible that some evaluation reports have not been made public. Our second important finding is that despite heterogeneity in the included models and evaluation designs, we found comparable domains for intervention components, outcomes, mechanisms, and moderators. By mapping intervention components on the SAMHSA trauma-informed approach framework (SAMHSA, 2017), we showed that all eight interventions were built on the *4Rs* assumptions and all included components within the same domains: (i) budget allocation, (ii) training and workforce development, (iii) identification and/or response to violence and trauma, and (iv) evaluation of the organisational change. Such similarities in implementation components can explain convergence of effects when these were detected. They may work through the same mechanisms of changing provider readiness, sense of community, and safety to changes in patient readiness, satisfaction, safety, and health. Our findings on outcome domains and possible mechanisms are in line with recent systematic reviews of trauma-informed interventions at the organisation/system level that did not include any of our studies (Melz et al., 2019; Purtle, 2020). Both reviews found conflicting effects on provider readiness and practices regarding trauma-informed care, and service user perception of care. None of our studies used a validated measures for evaluating organisational readiness, culture, and performance identified by Melz et al (Melz et al., 2019). The overlapping mechanism for increased provider readiness was staff education and ongoing support (Melz et al., 2019).

Our third important finding raises question about the contribution of screening for trauma to the effects of trauma-informed system-change interventions on patient outcomes. In our review, EQUIP, Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic, and

Sanctuary Model did not implement screening for trauma. However, they produced improvement in patient readiness for disease management, safety, and health. This finding can be explained by the country, clinic, and population context or the overall effect from all intervention components of the non-screening models. However, our analysis of moderating factors found that screening was not proposed as a mechanism for any outcomes. Instead, screening rates were reported as a measure of provider behaviour change in two studies which reported increased screening rate and conflicting providers' views on screening acceptability and feasibility. This finding is in line with the recent systematic reviews (Melz et al., 2019; Purtle, 2020). No studies explored the mechanisms linking screening to health outcomes or harm among patients and staff.

5. Strengths and limitations

We conducted a methodologically robust systematic review with two reviewers working in parallel at each stage. Our rigorous search strategy included both peer-reviewed and grey literature without language restrictions other than inclusion of an English abstract. This resulted in a global view of trauma-informed system change interventions in primary and community mental health care. Additionally, we contacted and received responses from study authors to identify other relevant studies and to clarify information regarding data extraction and quality appraisal. A methodological limitation is that we used search terms based on trauma-informed terminology introduced in early 2000, which meant that earlier studies meeting the inclusion criteria may have been excluded as they were not labelled as 'trauma-informed'. We addressed this limitation through seeking input from our public and professional advisory groups when designing the search strategy. We involved people with lived experience and professionals in different stages of the review to

ensure that our findings are relevant and beneficial to them. By using a logic model to map review findings, we produced findings that are understandable to healthcare providers and policy makers. Exclusion of papers without an English abstract might have resulted in missing relevant studies reported in other languages.

The evidence we found is very limited and uncertain due to the small number and non-randomised quantitative and qualitative designs of the primary studies. That said, the included studies were generally characterised by good sample size. Non-randomised studies provide weaker evidence of causal effects of interventions on outcomes. Although we tried to hypothesise causal links through mapping onto our logic model, these are assumptions supported by six studies at the bottom of the hierarchy of evidence and further high-quality research in this area is warranted.

Future research exploring trauma-informed approaches in primary care and community mental healthcare should include randomised designs and validated measures to capture changes across all the levels of the health system and enable meta-analysis. Studies should also evaluate adverse events/harm, provider health, and cost-effectiveness.

6 CONCLUSIONS

Trauma-informed system change interventions in primary care and community mental healthcare may improve provider readiness and sense of community, patient readiness for disease management and access to services, provider and patient safety, and some patient health outcomes, but the evidence is very limited and conflicting.

7. REFERENCES

Bendall, S., Eastwood, O., Cox, G., Farrelly-Rosch, A., Nicoll, H., Peters, W., . . . Scanlan, F. (2020). A Systematic Review and Synthesis of Trauma-Informed Care Within Outpatient and Counseling Health Settings for Young People. *Child Maltreat*, 1077559520927468. doi:10.1177/1077559520927468

Birnbaum, S. (2019). Confronting the Social Determinants of Health: Has the Language of Trauma Informed Care Become a Defense Mechanism? *Issues Ment Health Nurs, 40*(6), 476-481. doi:10.1080/01612840.2018.1563256

Bradley, A. (2020). *A qualitative evaluation of the Nelson Trust Bridgwater Women's Centre. Final report*. Retrieved from

Branson, C. E., Baetz, C. L., Horwitz, S. M., & Hoagwood, K. E. (2017). Trauma-informed juvenile justice systems: A systematic review of definitions and core components. *Psychol Trauma, 9*(6), 635-646. doi:10.1037/tra0000255

Brooks, M., Barclay, L., & Hooker, C. (2017). *Young Women's Clinic evaluation. Blue Mountains Women's Health and Resourse Centre*. Retrieved from

Brooks, M., Barclay, L., & Hooker, C. (2018). Trauma-informed care in general practice: Findings from a women's health centre evaluation. *Aust J Gen Pract, 47*(6), 370-375. doi:10.31128/AJGP-11-17-4406

Brooks, M., Hooker, C., & Barclay, L. (2020). Artspace: Enabling young women's recovery through visual arts: A qualitative study. *Health Promot J Austr, 31*(3), 391-401. doi:10.1002/hpja.328

Browne, A. J., Varcoe, C., Ford-Gilboe, M., Nadine Wathen, C., Smye, V., Jackson, B. E., . . . Blanchet Garneau, A. (2018). Disruption as opportunity: Impacts of an

organizational health equity intervention in primary care clinics. *Int J Equity Health, 17*(1), 154. doi:10.1186/s12939-018-0820-2

Browne, A. J., Varcoe, C., Ford-Gilboe, M., Wathen, C. N., & Team, E. R. (2015). EQUIP Healthcare: An overview of a multi-component intervention to enhance equity-oriented care in primary health care settings. *Int J Equity Health, 14*, 152. doi:10.1186/s12939-015-0271-y

Bryson, S. A., Gauvin, E., Jamieson, A., Rathgeber, M., Faulkner-Gibson, L., Bell, S., . . . Burke, S. (2017). What are effective strategies for implementing trauma-informed care in youth inpatient psychiatric and residential treatment settings? A realist systematic review. *Int J Ment Health Syst, 11*, 36. doi:10.1186/s13033-017-0137-3

Centre for Health Care Strategies. What is trauma-informed care? (2021).

Champine, R. B., Lang, J. M., Nelson, A. M., Hanson, R. F., & Tebes, J. K. (2019). Systems Measures of a Trauma-Informed Approach: A Systematic Review. *Am J Community Psychol, 64*(3-4), 418-437. doi:10.1002/ajcp.12388

Cocozza, J. J., Jackson, E. W., Hennigan, K., Morrissey, J. P., Reed, B. G., Fallot, R., & Banks, S. (2005). Outcomes for women with co-occurring disorders and trauma: Program-level effects. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 28*(2), 109-119. doi:10.1016/j.jsat.2004.08.010

Dawson, S., Bierce, A., Feder, G., Macleod, J., Turner, K. M., Zammit, S., & Lewis, N. V. (2021). Trauma-informed approaches to primary and community mental health care: protocol for a mixed-methods systematic review. *BMJ Open, 11*(2), e042112. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042112

DHSC. (2018). *The Women's Mental Health Taskforce. Final report*. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-womens-mental-health-taskforce-report:

Dixon-Woods, M. (2011). Using framework-based synthesis for conducting reviews of qualitative studies. *BMC Med, 9*, 39. doi:10.1186/1741-7015-9-39

Dubay, L., Burton, R. A., & Epstein, M. (2018). *Early adopters of trauma-informed care. An implementation analysis of the advancing trauma-informed care grantees. Research report.* Retrieved from Washington, DC:

Esaki, N., Benamati, J., Yanosy, S., Middleton, J., Hopson, L., Hummer, V., & Bloom, S. (2013). The Sanctuary Model: theoretical framework. *Families in Society, 94*(2), 87-95. doi:10.1606/1044-3894.4287

Ferlie, E. B., & Shortell, S. M. (2001). Improving the quality of health care in the United Kingdom and the United States: a framework for change. *Milbank Quarterly, 79*(2), 281-315. doi:10.1111/1468-0009.00206

Figley, C. R., & Kleber, R. J. (1995). Beyond the “Victim”. In R. J. Kleber, C. R. Figley, & B. P. R. Gersons (Eds.), *Beyond Trauma. The Plenum Series on Stress and Coping.* . Boston, MA: Springer.

Ford-Gilboe, M., Wathen, C. N., Varcoe, C., Herbert, C., Jackson, B. E., Lavoie, J. G., . . . Program, E. R. (2018). How Equity-Oriented Health Care Affects Health: Key Mechanisms and Implications for Primary Health Care Practice and Policy. *Milbank Quarterly, 96*(4), 635-671. doi:10.1111/1468-0009.12349

Germán, M., Crawford, D., & Dumpert, K. (2020). *Measuring the impact of trauma-informed primary care: are we missing the forest for the trees?* Retrieved from https://www.chcs.org/resource/measuring-the-impact-of-trauma-informed-primary-care-are-we-missing-the-forest-for-the-trees/:

Government of Canada. Trauma and violence-informed approaches to policy and practice. (2018, 2 February 2018).

Harris, M., & Fallot, R. (2001). *Using trauma theory to design service systems*. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass.

Hong, Q., Pluye, P., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., . . . Vedel, I. (2018). *Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), version 2018. Registration of Copyright (#1148552), Canadian Intellectual Property Office, Industry Canada.* Retrieved from http://mixedmethodsappraisaltoolpublic.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/127916259/MMAT_2018_criteria-manual_2018-08-01_ENG.pdf:

Kimberg, L., Bakken, E. H., Chen, E., & Schillinger, D. (2019). The “Behavioral Health Vital Signs” Initiative. A safety net system’s trauma-informed approach to integrating interpersonal violence into behavioral health programs in primary care. *NEJM Catalyst. Innovations in Care Delivery*. https://catalyst.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/CAT.19.0697

Kimberg, L., & Wheeler, M. (2019). Trauma and trauma-informed care. In M. Gerber (Ed.), *Trauma-informed healthcare approaches : a guide for primary care* (pp. 25-56). New York, NY: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Law, C., Wolfenden, L., Sperlich, M., & Taylor, J. (2021). *Trauma-informed care in the perinatal period* Retrieved from https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/a-good-practice-guide-to-support-implementation-of-trauma-informed-care-in-the-perinatal-period/:

Levine, S., Varcoe, C., & Browne, A. J. (2021). "We went as a team closer to the truth": impacts of interprofessional education on trauma- and violence- informed care for staff in primary care settings. *J Interprof Care, 35*(1), 46-54. doi:10.1080/13561820.2019.1708871

Machtinger, E. L., Cuca, Y. P., Khanna, N., Rose, C. D., & Kimberg, L. S. (2015). From treatment to healing: the promise of trauma-informed primary care. *Womens Health Issues, 25*(3), 193-197. doi:10.1016/j.whi.2015.03.008

Magruder, K. M., McLaughlin, K. A., & Elmore Borbon, D. L. (2017). Trauma is a public health issue. *Eur J Psychotraumatol, 8*(1), 1375338. doi:10.1080/20008198.2017.1375338

McHugo, G. J., Kammerer, N., Jackson, E. W., Markoff, L. S., Gatz, M., Larson, M. J., . . . Hennigan, K. (2005). Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study: evaluation design and study population. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 28*(2), 91-107. doi:10.1016/j.jsat.2004.08.009

Melz, H., Morrison, C., Ingoldsby, E., Cairone, K., & Mackrain, M. (2019). Review of trauma-informed initiatives at the systems level. Trauma-informed approaches: connecting research, policy, and practice to build resilience in children and families. In (pp. 37). https://aspe.hhs.gov/system/files/pdf/262051/TI_Approaches_Research_Review.pdf.

Morrissey, J. P., Jackson, E. W., Ellis, A. R., Amaro, H., Brown, V. B., & Najavits, L. M. (2005). Twelve-month outcomes of trauma-informed interventions for women with co-occurring disorders. *Psychiatr Serv, 56*(10), 1213-1222. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.56.10.1213

NHS Education for Scotland. Transforming psychological trauma: a knowledge and skills framework for the Scottish workforce. (2017). In. https://www.nes.scot.nhs.uk/media/3971582/nationaltraumatrainingframework.pdf

https://www.nes.scot.nhs.uk/media/3983113/NationalTraumaTrainingFramework.

Ouzzani, M., Hammady, H., Fedorowicz, Z., & Elmagarmid, A. (2016). Rayyan-a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev, 5*(1), 210. doi:10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., . . . Moher, D. (2021). Updating guidance for reporting systematic reviews: development of the PRISMA 2020 statement. *J Clin Epidemiol, 134*, 103-112. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.02.003

Purtle, J. (2020). Systematic Review of Evaluations of Trauma-Informed Organizational Interventions That Include Staff Trainings. *Trauma Violence Abuse, 21*(4), 725-740. doi:10.1177/1524838018791304

Raja, S., Rabinowitz, E. P., & Gray, M. J. (2021). Universal screening and trauma informed care: Current concerns and future directions. *Fam Syst Health*. doi:10.1037/fsh0000585

Rohwer, A., Booth, A., Pfadenhauer, L., Brereton, L., Gerhardus, A., Mozygemba, K., . . . Rehfuess, E. (2016). *Guidance on the use of logic models in health technology assessments of complex interventions [Online].* Retrieved from http://www.integrate-hta.eu/downloads/:

Ruglass, L. M., & Kendall-Tackett, K. (2014). What Is Psychological Trauma? In L. Ruglass & K. Kendall-Tackett (Eds.), *Psychology of trauma 101* (pp. 1-24). New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Rylko-Bauer, B., & Farmer, P. (2016). Structural Violence, Poverty, and Social Suffering. In D. Brady & L. Burton (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of the social science of poverty* (pp. xiv, 915 pages). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

SAMHSA. (2017). SAMHSA's concept of trauma and guidance for a trauma-informed approach. In (pp. 27). https://store.samhsa.gov/system/files/sma14-4884.pdf.

Sandelowski, M., Voils, C. I., & Barroso, J. (2006). Defining and Designing Mixed Research Synthesis Studies. *Res Sch, 13*(1), 29.

Sweeney, A., Clement, S., Filson, B., & Kennedy, A. (2016). Trauma-informed mental healthcare in the UK: what is it and how can we further its development? *Mental Health Review Journal, 21*(3), 174-192. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/MHRJ-01-2015-0006

Sweeney, A., & Taggart, D. (2018). (Mis)understanding trauma-informed approaches in mental health. *J Ment Health, 27*(5), 383-387. doi:10.1080/09638237.2018.1520973

Thirkle, S., Kennedy, A., & Sice, P. (2021). Instruments for Exploring Trauma-Informed Care. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration, 44*(1), 30-44. doi:10.37808/jhhsa.44.1.2

WHO. (2017). *Strengthening health systems to respond to women subjected to intimate partner violence or sexual violence: a manual for health managers*. Retrieved from Geneva, Switzerland.:

WHO, & UNICEF. (2018). *A vision for primary health care in the 21st century: towards universal health coverage and the Sustainable Development Goals.* . Retrieved from https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/primary-health/vision.pdf: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/primary-health/vision.pdf

Table 1. Defining trauma-informed approach at the system level

Authors	Definition of trauma	Definition of trauma-informed approach	Assumptions	Philosophy and principles	Implementation domains
2001. Harris and Fallot (Harris & Fallot, 2001)	Current or past sexual or physical abuse trauma (p. 3). Trauma is not a single discrete event but rather an organising experience that forms the core of the individual's identity. (p. 11)	Trauma-informed services are not designed to treat symptoms or syndromes related to sexual or physical abuse. Regardless of their primary mission – to deliver mental health or addiction services or provide housing support or employment counselling, - their commitment is to provide services in a manner that is welcoming and appropriate to the special needs of trauma survivors. (p. 5) Paradigm shift within service delivery systems. (p. 21)	1. To know the history of past and current abuse 2. To understand the impact of violence and victimization 3. Accommodate the vulnerabilities of trauma survivors 4. Facilitate consumer participation in treatment (p. 4) 5. Avoid retraumatising and revictimizing consumers. (p. 21)	1. Understanding the impact of trauma 2. Holistic approach 3. Strength-based approach to prevent problematic behaviour 4. Collaborative clinical decision making 5. Open and genuine collaboration between providers 6. Trust and safety (p. 10)	Certain conditions need to be in place for a trauma-informed system to be established. Those conditions reflect the structure and culture of the organisation, and they predate any actual changes in clinical services: 1. Administrative commitment to change 2. Universal screening, trauma assessment 3. Training and education for all staff 4. Sensitive hiring practices 5. Review of policies and procedures.
2014. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), US (SAMHSA, 2017)	Individual trauma results from an **event**, series of events, or set of circumstances that is **experienced** by an individual as physically or emotionally harmful or life threatening and that has lasting adverse **effects** on the individual's functioning and mental, physical, social, emotional, or spiritual well-being (p. 7)	A strength-based service delivery approach that is grounded in an understanding of and responsiveness to the impact of trauma, that emphasise physical, psychological, and emotional safety for both providers and survivors, and that creates opportunities for survivors to rebuild a sense of control and empowerment.	The *four Rs*: 1. Realisation of the impact of trauma and understanding paths to recovery. 2. Recognition of signs and symptoms of trauma. 3. Response by integrating knowledge about trauma into policies, procedures and practices. 4. Resist re-traumatisation. (p. 9)	1. Safety 2. Trustworthiness and transparency 3. Peer support 4. Collaboration and mutuality 5. Empowerment, voice and choice 6. Cultural, historical, and gender issues (p. 10)	1. Governance and leadership 2. Policy 3. Physical environments 4. Cross sector collaboration 5. Screening, assessment, treatment services 6. Training and workforce development 7. Progress monitoring and quality assurance 8. Financing 9. Evaluation
2017. NHS Education for Scotland and Scottish Government, UK ("NHS Education for Scotland. Transforming psychological trauma: a knowledge and skills framework for the Scottish workforce," 2017)	SAMHSA definition	The Transforming Psychological Trauma framework	1. Recognises prevalence and impact of trauma 2. Respond 3. Prevent re-traumatisation (p. 13)	1. Safety 2. Choice 3. Collaboration 4. Trust 5. Capacity-strengthening approach 6. Acknowledges rights 7. Access to treatment	1. Training for all workforce 2. Staff well-being
2017. Centre for Health Care Strategies, Inc. ("Centre for Health Care	SAMHSA definition. Examples of trauma include physical, sexual and emotional abuse,	SAMHSA definition.	SAMHSA four Rs	1. Patient empowerment 2. Choice 3. Collaboration	Organisational reform precedes the adoption of trauma-informed clinical

Authors	Definition of trauma	Definition of trauma-informed approach	Assumptions	Philosophy and principles	Implementation domains
Strategies. What is trauma-informed care?," 2021)	childhood neglect, having a family member with mental health or substance abuse disorder, violence in the community and poverty and systemic discrimination.			4. Safety 5. Trustworthiness	practices. 1. Leading and communication about the transformation process 2. Engaging patients in organisational planning 3. Training clinical and non-clinical staff 4. Creating a safe environment 5. Preventing secondary traumatic stress in staff 6. Hiring a trauma-informed workforce 7. Clinical practices: involving patients in the treatment process, screening for trauma, training staff in trauma-specific treatment approaches, engaging referral services and partnering organisation.
2018. The Women's Mental Health Taskforce, UK (DHSC, 2018)	Violence, abuse, poverty and inequality. (p. 27)	Gender- and trauma-informed approach To work in a 'trauma-informed' way refers to an approach by which organisations operate with an awareness of trauma and its impact and avoid re-traumatisation. (p. 6)	1. Recognise the impact of trauma, often through violence and victimisation 2. Avoid re-traumatisation for staff or service users 3. Identify recovery from trauma as a primary goal (p. 37)	1. Whole organisation approach 2. Equal access 3. Recognition and response to violence and trauma 4. Respectful, compassionate, trustful relationships 5. Safety 6. Engagement of service users 7. Capacity- strengthening, empowering approach 8. Holistic approach 9. Gender-informed approach (p. 35)	
2018. Public Health Agency of Canada ("Government of Canada. Trauma and violence-informed approaches to policy and	Trauma-informed approaches are familiar to many organizations and service providers. Recently, this term has been expanded to include "and violence", an important	Trauma and violence-informed approaches are policies and practices that recognize the connections between violence, trauma, negative health outcomes and behaviours.	Recognise connections between violence, trauma, behaviour, health	1. Understand trauma and violence, and their impacts on peoples' lives and behaviours 2. Create emotionally and physically safe	1. Policies and practices 2. Environments

Authors	Definition of trauma	Definition of trauma-informed approach	Assumptions	Philosophy and principles	Implementation domains
practice," 2018)	change in the language which underscores the connections between trauma and violence.	These approaches increase safety, control and resilience for people who are seeking services in relation to experiences of violence and/or have a history of experiencing violence.		environments 3. Foster opportunities for choice, collaboration, and connection 4. Provide a strengths-based and capacity-building approach to support client coping and resilience	
2019. Kimberg and Wheeler (Kimberg & Wheeler, 2019)	SAMHSA definition of individual trauma, complex trauma, historical trauma, structural violence. (p. 27)	SAMHSA definition Trauma-informed systems of care strive to become vicarious trauma-informed by attending pro-actively and compassionately to the vicarious trauma of healthcare providers and staff. (p. 48)		SAMHSA principles AND *Four Cs* of clinical care: 1. Calm 2. Contain 3. Care 4. Cope (p. 33)	
2021. NHS England and NHS Improvement, UK (Law, Wolfenden, Sperlich, & Taylor, 2021)	SAMHSA definition	SAMHSA definition		1. Compassion and recognition 2. Communication and collaboration 3. Consistency and continuity 4. Recognising diversity and facilitating recovery	1. Leading and communicating change 2. Staff training 3. Supervision and peer support 4. Co-production and service co-design 5. Evaluation and culture of improvement

Table 2. Study inclusion and exclusion criteria

	Inclusion criteria	**Exclusion criteria**
Population	People aged 18 and over receiving healthcare (synonyms patient, service user) AND/OR Healthcare providers - individuals or organisations that provide healthcare services in a systematic way. An individual provider refers to doctors, nurses, midwives, and allied professionals, health services managers, and policy makers and funders within the health system. An organisational provider refers to hospitals, clinics, primary care centres and other service delivery points within the health system (WHO, 2017).	People aged under 18 years
Intervention	Trauma-informed system change intervention. To address the heterogeneity in terminology and definitions, we used the SAMHSA's framework for trauma-informed approach that is grounded in a set of four assumptions, six key principles and ten implementation domains (SAMHSA, 2017). The four assumptions: trauma-informed programme, organisation, or system: (1) realises the widespread impact of trauma and understands potential paths for recovery, (2) recognises the signs and symptoms of trauma in clients, families and staff, and others involved in the system; and (3) responds by fully integrating knowledge about trauma into policies, procedures, and practices, and seeks to actively (4) resist re-traumatisation. The six key principles: (1) safety, (2) trustworthiness and transparency, (3) peer support, (4) collaboration and mutuality, (5) empowerment, voice and choice, (6) cultural, historical, and gender issues. The ten implementation domains of system change cover (1) governance and leadership, (2) written policies and protocols, (3) physical environment, (4) training and workforce development, (5) engagement and involvement of service users, (6) cross-sector collaboration, (7) progress monitoring and quality assurance, (8) financing, (9) evaluation, (10) screening, assessment, and treatment for trauma.	Interventions that do not incorporate key assumptions and principles at the system level (e.g., standalone professional training about trauma-informed care, standalone screening for adverse childhood experiences or intimate partner violence). Standalone trauma-specific interventions that treat trauma symptoms (e.g., trauma-focused cognitive behavioural therapy for post-traumatic stress disorder).
Comparator	No trauma-informed system change intervention. We included studies without a control group.	
Quantitative outcomes **Qualitative phenomenon of interest**	Main outcomes: any psychological, behaviour, health outcomes at the organisational level. Additional outcomes: any psychological, behavioural, health outcomes at the individual level. Psychological outcomes can be measured through cognitive (e.g., knowledge, skills), affective (e.g., attitudes), behavioural (e.g., clinical practices) outcomes regarding trauma-informed care. Perceived effects of interventions, views on factors that can impact intervention effects.	No outcomes reported. No phenomenon of interest reported.
Context	Any organisations providing primary care and/or community mental healthcare services in public, private, and third sector.	Organisations that do not provide primary care and/or community

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
	WHO defines a primary health care organisation as setting providing services that are usually the first point of contact with a health care provider (WHO & UNICEF, 2018). Depending on the country, they can include any open access, community based first point of care service, for example, general practice, community-based clinics, primary care home visits, day-care centres, multicentre health clinics, one stop crisis centre, Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) services. We included studies with mixed samples only if they reported outcomes for the primary care and/or community mental health care sub-sample irrespective of the proportion of the sub-sample.	mental health care services. Studies with mixed samples that did not reported separately outcomes for the primary care and/or community mental health care sub-sample.
Types of studies	Empirical primary studies of any design that evaluated a trauma-informed system change intervention. Qualitative studies if they reported participant quotes.	Theoretical papers, systematic reviews, editorials, policy documents, and books. We used reference lists of these sources to identify relevant empirical primary studies.
Time frame	From 1990. Although the seminal paper introducing the philosophy and principles of TI care in mental health services was published in 2001 (Harris & Fallot, 2001), professional stakeholders advised to extend searches to the preceding 10 years to capture early discussions of trauma-informed care principles from a global perspective.	
Language	No language restrictions provided an English language abstract is available.	Paper without abstract in English.

Table 3. Characteristics of included studies

Study ID, location, reports	Study design, duration	Setting	Participants	Trauma-informed organisational change intervention	Mechanisms proposed	Moderators identified	Outcomes/ phenomena of interest domains
Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study (WCDVS), McHugo 2005, US (Cocozza et al., 2005; McHugo et al., 2005; Morrissey et al., 2005)	Controlled before-after study: repeated cross-sectional structured interviews with patients. 12 months	Site 4/D: 4 outpatient community mental health centres (2 intervention vs 2 service as usual) providing mental health, trauma, and substance abuse services for women with co-occurring disorders and histories of abuse	153 intervention 98 control All female; aged 42 (+8.6); 82.1% African American; 76.8% high school; 17.5% employed; 70.1% mood disorder; 23.9% schizophrenia spectrum disorder; 34.3% alcohol disorder; 22.7% crack/cocaine; 10.4% opioids.	Comprehensive, integrated, trauma-informed, and survivor involved services: 1. eight core services (outreach and engagement, screening and assessment, treatment activities, parenting skills training, resource coordination and advocacy, trauma-specific services, crisis intervention, peer-run services); 2. integration of trauma-specific, addiction, and mental health services at organisational and clinical level; 3. trauma-informed services; 4. patients with lived experience in advisory and service provision roles	1. Whole intervention → change patient health	1. Intervention components	1. Patient mental health 2. Patient substance abuse
EQUIP Primary Care study (Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity), Browne 2018, Canada (Browne et al., 2018; Browne et al., 2015; Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021)	Mixed methods: uncontrolled before-after cross-sectional survey with healthcare providers; qualitative interviews with providers; observations of setting and provider meetings; repeated structured interviews with patients. 24 months	4 public primary health care clinics from diverse geographical areas that serve marginalised populations	86 provider survey 31 provider interviews: 10 nurses, 3 physicians, 4 managers, 5 social service providers, 3 receptionists, 3 administrative, 3 other. 380 hours of observational data. 395 patient repeated structured interviews: 60% female; aged 45.8 (SD 14.6; 18-94); 42% Indigenous; 42% did not complete	An organisational-level, multicomponent health equity EQUIP intervention: 1. all staff education; 2. trauma champions; 3. organisational integration of three dimensions of equity-oriented care: cultural safety, trauma- and violence-informed care; 4. intervention tailoring to context 5. patients with lived experience in advisory role	1. Whole intervention → change staff awareness and confidence → tensions → disrupted usual practice →change organisational culture 2. Tailoring staff education to local context 3. EQUIP dose → change patient comfort and confidence in care →change management health problems → change patient health	1. Political and economic environments 2. Organisational culture. 3. Implementation process 4. Staff education 5. Patient characteristics	1. Provider readiness for trauma-informed care 2. Patient readiness for disease management 3. Patient satisfaction 4. Patient quality of life 5. Patient chronic pain 6. Patient mental health

Study ID, location, reports	Study design, duration	Setting	Participants	Trauma-informed organisational change intervention	Mechanisms proposed	Moderators identified	Outcomes/ phenomena of interest domains
			school; 60% unemployed; 29.4% on social assistance; 38.7% disability benefits.				
Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme, Kimberg 2019, US (Kimberg et al., 2019)	Cross sectional routine data	San Francisco Health Network Primary Care clinics	116,871 screening records. Patients aged 18+.	Quality improvement programme: 1. quality improvement team; 2. staff education; 3. trauma-informed team-based clinical practice; 3. internal single performance metric for depression, alcohol/substance use; interpersonal violence; 4. single screening tool and pathway for depression, alcohol/substance use, interpersonal violence; 5. cross-sector partnerships; 6. on-site and external therapy.	Not reported	Not reported	1. Provider behaviour regarding trauma-informed care
Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative, Dubay 2018, US (Dubay et al., 2018)	Qualitative service evaluation: interviews with healthcare providers and patients.	3 organisations providing primary care and behavioural health services to populations with high rates of traumatic experiences: 1. Women's HIV Clinic at University of California, San Francisco 2. Montefiore Medical Group of 22 primary care practices New York 3. Family Health Clinic Philadelphia	35 providers: 16 managers, 19 frontline staff (physicians, nurses, social workers, administrative) 6 patients	3 different models, common components: 1. activities on changing organisational culture; 2. all staff education and self-care; 4. trauma champions; 5. screening for trauma; 6. trauma-specific services; 7. patients with lived experience in advisory role	1. Whole intervention → change organisational culture. 2. Staff education → change awareness, knowledge, skills, staff relationships	1. Political and economic environments 2. Organisational culture 3. Implementation process 4. Staff education	1. Provider readiness for trauma-informed care 2. Provider sense of community 3. Provider behaviour regarding trauma-informed care 4. Patient readiness for disease management 5. Patient access to services
Trauma-informed Young Women's	Qualitative service evaluation: focus	The Blue Mountains Women's Health and	12 providers: 2 general practitioners,	Trauma-informed youth-oriented clinic:	1. Whole intervention → change access to	1. Implementation process	1. Provider readiness for trauma-informed

Study ID, location, reports	Study design, duration	Setting	Participants	Trauma-informed organisational change intervention	Mechanisms proposed	Moderators identified	Outcomes/ phenomena of interest domains
Clinic, Brooks 2018, Australia (Brooks et al., 2017, 2018; Brooks et al., 2020)	groups and interviews with healthcare providers and patients.	Resource Centre, Young Women's Clinic that serves marginalised populations	2 nurses, 2 counsellors, 2 receptionists, art therapist, manager, youth worker, social work intern. 14 patients: aged 12-25; 10 Anglo-Australian, 1 Aboriginal, 2 from culturally and linguistically diverse background, 1 in wheelchair.	1. women only policy; 2. drop-in appointment with a nurse, counsellor and general practitioner; 3. trauma-informed clinical practice; 4. drop-in facilitated art group; 5. patients with lived experience in service provision role	services 2. Staff self-care → change HCPs feeling valued 3. Women only space →change access to services, safety, support, better health 4. Staff education →change awareness 5. Staff self-care →change HCP feeling valued 6. Safe environment →change patient trust, safety 7. Shared decision making →change patient education, feeling in control.		care 2. Patient readiness for disease management 3. Patient satisfaction 4. Patient access to services 5. Patient safety
One-stop-shop Women's Centre, Bradley 2020, UK (Bradley, 2020)	Qualitative service evaluation: focus groups and interviews with patients, interviews with healthcare providers.	The Nelson Trust charity, One-stop-shop Women's Centre for women with addiction, history of abuse, and criminal justice involvement	4 providers 8 women	Trauma-informed service system: 1. hiring practices; 2. all staff education and self-care; 3. trauma champions; 4. monthly trauma-informed guide team; 5. trauma-informed environment; 6. trauma-informed practices; 7. patients with lived experience in advisory role	1. Whole intervention → change patient and HCPs safety and support, patient self-confidence, confidence in care, health. 2. Women only space →change access to services, safety, support, health. 3. Staff education → change HCP knowledge, skills. 4. Staff self-care →change HCP feeling valued. 5. Safe environment →change patient trust.	1. Political and economic environments. 2. Organisational resources 3. Implementation process 4. Intervention components.	1. Provider readiness for trauma-informed care 2. Provider sense of community 2. Provider behaviour regarding trauma-informed care 3. Patient readiness for disease management 4. Patient satisfaction 5. Patient access to services 6. Provider and patient safety

Table 4: Methodological quality of included studies

Study ID	Screen		Qualitative					Quantitative					Mixed methods					Total
	S1	**S2**	**1.1**	**1.2**	**1.3**	**1.4**	**1.5**	**3.1**	**3.2**	**3.3**	**3.4**	**3.5**	**5.1**	**5.2**	**5.3**	**5.4**	**5.5**	**Y %**
Browne 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Cannot tell	88
Kimberg 2019	No	Cannot tell	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	No	No	Cannot tell	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	29
Dubay 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	100
Brooks 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	100
Bradley 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	100
McHugo 2005	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cannot tell	Cannot tell	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	71

Note. NA not applicable

Table 5: Methodological quality for the overall study design, data collection and analysis

	Yes		**No**		**Cannot tell**		**Total assessed**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Screening questions S1. Are there clear research questions?	5	83	1	17	0	0	6	100

	Yes		No		Cannot tell		Total assessed	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
S2. Do the collected data allow to address the research questions?	5	83	0	0	1	17	6	100
Qualitative study component 1.1. Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	4	100	0	0	0	0	4	100
1.2. Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	4	100	0	0	0	0	4	100
1.3. Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	4	100	0	0	0	0	4	100
1.4. Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	4	100	0	0	0	0	4	100
1.5. Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?	4	100	0	0	0	0	4	100
Quantitative non-randomised study component 3.1. Are the participants representative of the target population?	3	100	0	0	0	0	3	100
3.2. Are measurements appropriate regarding both the outcome and intervention (or exposure)?	3	100	0	0	0	0	3	100
3.3. Are there complete outcome data?	2	67	1	33	0	0	3	100
3.4. Are the confounders accounted for in the design and analysis?	1	33	1	33	1	34	3	100
3.5 During the study period, is the intervention administered (or exposure occurred) as intended?	1	33	0	0	2	67	3	100
Mixed methods study component 5.1. Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods design to address the research question?	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
5.2. Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	100

	Yes		No		Cannot tell		Total assessed	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
5.3. Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
5.4. Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	100
5.5. Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	100

Table 6. Models of trauma-informed system change interventions in primary care and community mental health care

Implementation domains (SAMHSA, 2017)	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 (Cocozza et al., 2005; McHugo et al., 2005; Morrissey et al., 2005)	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 (Browne et al., 2018; Browne et al., 2015; Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021)	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 (Kimberg et al., 2019)	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 (Dubay et al., 2018)			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2018 (Brooks et al., 2017, 2018; Brooks et al., 2020)	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 (Bradley, 2020)	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
1. Governance and leadership	Not reported	Engagement of clinical/administrative leaders/managers in consultations with clinicians and other staff to conduct local needs assessment, select 3-5 priorities, and develop plan for addressing each priority.	The quality improvement team includes the Director of Primary Care, Behavioural Health, the Primary Care Director of Population Health and Quality, the quality improvement coordinator, and senior clinicians.	Not reported	Not reported	Complies with the Sanctuary Model certification. Steering Committee, monthly meetings open to all staff.	Organisation mission statement reflects a social model of health care and includes commitment to providing trauma-informed care.	Organisation mission statement includes commitment to providing trauma-informed care.	**5**
2. Written policies and procedures	Not reported	New harm reduction policies and practices for supporting patients with substance use issues.	System-wide quality improvement priorities, aligned with state and national performance metrics and associated incentives for depression and alcohol/substance use. Standardise, team-based workflow. Screening and response protocols.	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Written policy recognises impact of gender-based violence, promotes women's role in service delivery, commitment to staff development	Not reported	**3**
3. Physical environment	Women only space.	Removed sign 'Check in or you will lose your appointment' from the reception desk.	Not reported	Redesigned waiting room to be more calming for staff and	Waiting room posters about the importance of behavioural health	Natural light in many rooms. Open	Women only space. Located in an older house in the	Women only space. Female only staff.	**7**

Implementation domains (SAMHSA, 2017)	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 (Cocozza et al., 2005; McHugo et al., 2005; Morrissey et al., 2005)	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 (Browne et al., 2018; Browne et al., 2015; Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021)	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 (Kimberg et al., 2019)	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 (Dubay et al., 2018)			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2018 (Brooks et al., 2017, 2018; Brooks et al., 2020)	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 (Bradley, 2020)	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
		Opened clinic doors 30 min earlier so that patients could wait indoors to book appointments. Repurposed a section of the waiting room to create a child-friendly space for patients with small children.		patients. Chair sessions with massage therapist for patients. Service dog for patients to pet. Free food for patients. Leaving out colouring pages. Calming music.	treatment for traumatic experiences	space.	community. Comfortable furniture. Service users' art and posters affirming women's rights. Consultation length is tailored to patient needs. Childcare during clinic activities.	Variety of services in one location. Fully staffed creche for childcare during activities. Non-clinical reception and waiting area. Open safe space. Empowering and motivational quotes, bright paintings. Light and comfortable room for group work. Physical environment is regularly assessed through 'walk-throughs' and reflective	

Implementation domains (SAMHSA, 2017)	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 (Cocozza et al., 2005; McHugo et al., 2005; Morrissey et al., 2005)	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 (Browne et al., 2018; Browne et al., 2015; Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021)	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 (Kimberg et al., 2019)	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 (Dubay et al., 2018)			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2018 (Brooks et al., 2017, 2018; Brooks et al., 2020)	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 (Bradley, 2020)	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
								practices.	
4. Engagement and involvement of people with lived experience	Service users and HCP with lived experience helped design and/or deliver trauma-specific interventions. Sourcebook for developing partnerships between HCPs and people with lived experience.	Hired and integrated an Indigenous Elder to participate in clinic activities.	Patient advisory board. Educational message on the screening tool to precede the questions and a checklist of coping behaviours and resilience factors to facilitate patient-centred conversations about preferred treatment.	Stakeholder group including four patients and representatives from each department meets monthly. The group provides feedback, helps design and implement organisational change.	Not reported	Not reported	Person-centred care. Shared decision making.	Lived experience panels and forums. Recruit staff with lived experience. Varied activities, food sharing, creative projects.	**6**
5. Cross sector collaboration	Linkages across agencies, all services were comprehensive, integrated, and trauma informed.	Developed new working relationship with the local Indigenous community.	Formalised partnerships with a community-based domestic violence agency, a legal aid organisation, a trauma-specific treatment organisation, and a national non-profit violence prevention resource centre.	Partnerships.	Not reported	Not reported	Referrals from the local high school and other services supporting young people experiencing adversity. Partnership with community youth-oriented services.	Engaged with local partnerships and companies to improve service and supplies for women. Collaborative partners are trauma-informed.	**6**

Implementation domains (SAMHSA, 2017)	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 (Cocozza et al., 2005; McHugo et al., 2005; Morrissey et al., 2005)	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 (Browne et al., 2018; Browne et al., 2015; Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021)	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 (Kimberg et al., 2019)	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 (Dubay et al., 2018)			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2018 (Brooks et al., 2017, 2018; Brooks et al., 2020)	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 (Bradley, 2020)	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
6. Screening, assessment, treatment services	Screening, assessment. Simultaneous and coordinated provision of substance abuse, mental health, and trauma services. On-site trauma-specific group intervention TREM (Trauma Recovery and Empowerment Model). Peer groups, advocates, facilitators, drop-in clinic.	Integrated trauma- and violence-informed approaches into the routine provision of care. Chronic pain group.	Screening all patients concurrently for depression, alcohol/substance use and interpersonal violence. Single screening tool and pathway for depression, alcohol/substance use, and interpersonal violence. On-site cognitive behavioural interventions and interpersonal violence advocate. Referrals to mental health and substance abuse services in the community.	Screening for interpersonal violence, PTSD, substance abuse, chronic pain. On- and off-site psychosocial services. Collocate a licensed clinical social worker to offer on-site therapy. Group intervention on skill building for patients who aren't ready for traditional talk therapy.	Screening for ACEs. On-site behavioural health counsellors.	On-site talking therapy, creative art therapies. On-site social workers, behaviour health counsellors, nutritionist, fitness centre, yoga and mindfulness classes for patients.	Drop-in appointments with a nurse, counsellor, and general practitioner. Trauma-sensitive gynaecological care. Drop-in facilitated art group with peer facilitators.	Universal screening for histories of trauma. On-site drop-in support, one to one support, well-being groups, trauma-specific interventions, tailored rehabilitation support.	**8**
7. Training and workforce development	Community support specialists trained in trauma, mental health, and substance abuse.	All staff training: 2- and 8-hour workshops, online 8-hour self-directed programme. Strategy and support for vicarious trauma	Staff training	All staff training. Three half-day initial mandatory trainings, three 1.5-hour training for new	All staff training with mandatory initial training. New Critical Incident Management Team to	All-staff training with mandatory initial training. All-staff meetings.	Staff supervision sessions with a trauma specialist counsellor. Self-care for	Trauma champion in each team. Hiring practices. All staff training	**8**

Implementation domains (SAMHSA, 2017)	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 (Cocozza et al., 2005; McHugo et al., 2005; Morrissey et al., 2005)	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 (Browne et al., 2018; Browne et al., 2015; Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021)	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 (Kimberg et al., 2019)	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 (Dubay et al., 2018)			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2018 (Brooks et al., 2017, 2018; Brooks et al., 2020)	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 (Bradley, 2020)	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
		among staff. Trauma champion practice consultant.		hires. Weekly staff meetings and pre-clinic meetings. Outside trainer attends once a month to discuss trauma with staff. Trauma champion clinical social worker.	counsel practices after traumatic event (e.g., a shooting). Quarterly learning collaboratives for teams. Role-specific, in-person trainings led by therapists. Relaxation hotline for staff.	Mindfulness and yoga classes for staff. 2 hours a month for staff self-care. An "Undoing Racism" committee. Reflective supervision.	staff.	including self-care and well-being, specialised training for staff wishing to deliver trauma-responsive and trauma-specific services. Staff wellbeing days. Trauma-informed supervision, clinical supervision.	
8. Progress monitoring and quality assurance	Not reported	Trauma champion assisted staff to evaluate the progress and adjust the plan.	The Behavioral Health Vital Signs (BHVS) performance metric, BHVS screening tool and quality improvement process. Data visualisation dashboards for tracking progress and a monthly meeting for clinics to share best practices. Electronic health record	Stakeholder group provides feedback. Ongoing monitoring and evaluation.	Tracking progress by interviewing or surveying staff.	Tracking progress by interviewing or surveying staff.	Solicit feedback from service users. Regular staff check in with management. Annual planning days that encourage staff feedback.	Monthly meetings of the organisation wide reflective group focussed on the question – How trauma informed are we?	**7**

Implementation domains (SAMHSA, 2017)	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 (Cocozza et al., 2005; McHugo et al., 2005; Morrissey et al., 2005)	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 (Browne et al., 2018; Browne et al., 2015; Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021)	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 (Kimberg et al., 2019)	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 (Dubay et al., 2018)			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2018 (Brooks et al., 2017, 2018; Brooks et al., 2020)	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 (Bradley, 2020)	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
			templates and data.						
9. Financing	Grant from SAMHSA.	Grant from the Canadian Institute of Health Research, each clinic received $10,000 for 24 months.	Federal funds for on-site behavioural health clinicians. Incentivised performance metrics for depression and alcohol and substance abuse disorders. ARISE grant.	24-month grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.			Medicare bulk billing and partnership with community youth-oriented services. Free for patients.	Grants from the National Lottery, fundraising.	**8**
10. Evaluation	12-month quantitative study	24-month mixed methods study	Quantitative evaluation of the quality improvement programme	Cross-sectional qualitative service evaluation			Cross-sectional qualitative service evaluation	Cross-sectional qualitative service evaluation. Lived experience forums, feedback opportunities in group work, comments box in the centre.	**8**
Domains, n	**7**	**10**	**9**	**8**	**6**	**7**	**10**	**9**	

Note. Studies listed in chronological order. SAMHSA, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. ACEs, adverse childhood experiences.

Table 7. Evidence for effects and perceived effects of trauma-informed system change interventions on patients and provider outcomes/phenomena of interest

Outcomes/phenomena of interest domain	**Nil effect**		**Improvement**		**Mixed effect**	
	Quantitative	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**
INTERMEDIATE COFNIYIVE, AFFECTIVE, AND BEHAVIOURAL OUTCOMES						
1. Provider readiness for trauma-informed care	None	None	**Organisation level** 1.1. Confidence (bespoke scale) 5.8 (SD 2.02) →6.9 (SD 2.00) →7.7 (SD 1.34) (Browne 2018 (Browne et al., 2018))	**Organisation level** 1.1. Confidence (Browne 2018, Levine 2020) 1.2. Awareness (Browne 2018, Levine 2020, Bradley 2020) 1.3. Skills (Dubay 2018, Bradley 2020) 1.4. Attitudes towards patients (Browne, Bradley, Brooks)	None	None
2. Provider sense of community				**Organisation level** 2.1. Perceived support (Dubay 2018, Bradley 2020) 2.2. Perception of being valued (Bradley 2020)		
3. Provider behaviour regarding trauma-informed care	None	None	**Organisation level** 3.1. Screening rates for traumatic experiences (routine service data) 25% →47% (Kimberg 2019)	**Organisation level** 3.2. Uptake of self-care activities (Bradley 2020)	None	**Organisation level** 3.1. Screening for traumatic experiences (Dubay 2018) 3.2. Uptake of self-care activities (Dubay 2018)
4. Patient readiness for disease management	None	None	**Individual-patient level** 4.2. Confidence in preventing and managing health conditions (bespoke scale) β=0.213, p<0.001 (Ford-Gilboe	**Care-team level** 4.1. Feeling in control of treatment (Brooks 2018, Brooks 2019, Dubay 2018) **Individual patient level** 4.2. Self-confidence (Brooks 2018, Brooks 2019, Bradley 2020)	None	None

Outcomes/phenomena of interest domain	Nil effect		Improvement		Mixed effect	
	Quantitative	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**
			2018)			
5. Patient satisfaction	None	None	**Organisation level** 5.1. Comfort and confidence in care (bespoke scale) β=0.5284, p<0.001 (Ford-Gilboe 2018)	**Organisation level** 5.1. Comfort and confidence in care (Brooks 2017-19, Bradley 2020, Dubay 2018) 5.2. Perceived support (Brooks 2017-19, Bradley 2020) 5.3. Satisfaction with services (Brooks 2017-19, Bradley 2020)	None	**Organisation level** Satisfaction with services (Dubay 2018)
6. Patient access to services	None	None	None	**Organisation level** Access to services (Dubay 2018, Brooks 2017-19, Bradley 2020)	None	None
7. Provider and patient safety	None	None	None	**Organisation level** 7.1. Provider perceived safety (Bradley 2020) 7.2. Patient perceived safety (Brooks 2018, Brooks 2019, Bradley 2020)	None	None
LONG-TERM HEALTH OUTCOMES, INDIVIDUAL-PATIENT LEVEL						
8. Quality of life	None	None	Quality of life (European Health Interview Survey-Quality of Life index): 18 months β=0.322, p<0.001; 24 months β=0.130, p<0.001 (Ford-Gilboe 2018)	None	None	None
9. Chronic pain	None	None	Chronic pain (Chronic Pain Scale): 18 months β= - 0.194, p<0.001; 24 months β= - 0.078, p<0.001 (Ford-Gilboe 2018)	None	None	None
10. Mental health	10.1. Mental health symptoms (Global Severity Index): 6-month effect size 95% CI crosses 0 (Cocozza 2005); 12-month 0.274 (95% CI -0.053 to 0.600)	None				None

Outcomes/phenomena of interest domain	Nil effect		Improvement		Mixed effect	
	Quantitative	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**
	(Morrisey 2005)		10.2. Depressive symptoms (Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale score): 18 months β= - 0.302, p<0.001; 24 months β= - 0.1223, p<0.001 (Ford-Gilboe 2018) 10.3. PTSD (PTSD Checklist): 18 months β= - 0.305, p<0.001; 24 months β= - 0.123, p<0.001 (Ford-Gilboe 2018)	10.2. Depressive symptoms (Brooks 2018, Brooks 2019)	10.3. PTSD (Posttraumatic Symptom Scale): 6-month 95% CI crosses 0 (Cocozza 2005); 12-month 0.414 (95% CI 0.081 to 0.747) (Morrisey 2005)	
11. Substance abuse	11.1. Alcohol use problem severity (Addiction Severity Index alcohol composite score): 6-month 95% CI crosses 0 (Cocozza 2005); 12-month 0.017 (95% CI 0.073 to 0.107) (Morrissey 2005) 11.2. Drug use problem severity (Addiction Severity Index drug composite score): 6-month 95% CI crosses 0 (Cocozza 2005); 12-month 0.004 (95% CI -0.086 to 0.094) (Morrisey 2005)	None	None	None	None	None

Note. WCDVS, Women, Co-occurring Disorders and Violence Study. EQUIP, Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity study. ARISE, Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity quality improvement programme.

Table 8. Factors affecting effectiveness of trauma-informed organisational change interventions

Factor theme	Definition	Discussed by	Supporting quote
1. Contextual factors	Hindering or enabling conditions under which trauma-informed system change intervention is implemented.	(Bradley, 2020; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021)	
1.1. Political and economic environments	Governance, financial, payment regulations and health system values.	(Bradley, 2020; Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018)	1. "One interviewee said: "Trauma-informed systems is focused on relationships and building or repairing relationships, which takes time and processes. That is part of the work that needs to happen. But at the same time, we all have goals and need to see a certain number of clients, and we all need to process a certain number of contracts, whatever our own department is responsible for." Clinical staff in three organizations said it was difficult to participate in trauma-informed efforts when most of their day was spent seeing patients and the business model of the organization depends on revenues from treating patients." (Dubay et al., 2018) 2. "Staff members realized that their organizational mandates to pay attention to equity were somewhat 'out of step' with values driving the larger health care system, and that the positioning of the clinics within the wider health care system limited their possibilities to provide EOHC [equity-oriented health care]." (Browne et al., 2018)
1.2. Wider trauma-informed movement	Parallel trauma-informed initiatives in the community, health system.	(Levine et al., 2021)	3. "Participants noted the amplifying influence of other trauma-informed initiatives in the community, with one saying: "There's been lots of information and training within the community, the community organizations just like us and I think that it's making a difference in how we work. (601, Counselor)" (Levine et al., 2021)
1.3. Organisational culture	Organisational values, psychological environment, leadership style, receptiveness to principles of trauma-informed care.	(Browne et al., 2018; Dubay et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021)	4. "I'm not convinced that administration has any concept of how swamped we're all feeling. This lack of communication from the board, and this is what I'm hearing, and I'm kind of seeing it, this lack of involvement from the board has caused … low morale. Sometimes I feel like there's a bit of a disconnect between the primary care providers, like what happens down here, like providing care for the patients, and then what goes on upstairs [in the administration area]?" (Browne et al., 2018) 5. "One primary care physician observed cultural differences between her professional field and the behavioral health care field, which she believed explained why some primary care staff were less interested in some self-care activities. This interviewee felt that primary care staff did not have the luxury of thinking about things like yoga because they already had enough trouble making time to eat lunch, with their hectic work schedules. A behavioral health provider at another organization agreed: "Medical doctors are funny people. There's not a lot of self-care. In the mental health world, we talk about self-care all the time. In the medical world, it seems far less talked about." (Dubay et al., 2018) 6. "organizational hierarchy was a barrier to becoming trauma-informed. Hierarchy

Factor theme	Definition	Discussed by	Supporting quote
			challenges varied across respondents and organizations and included lack of racial diversity in leadership roles and hiring practices; power dynamics among physicians, therapists, nurses, and medical assistants; inconsistent supervisory support to give voice and innovate around trauma-informed efforts; and insufficient incorporation of patient voices, needs, and requests into the practice." (Dubay et al., 2018) 7. "Multiple participants described how their particular clinic context helped or hindered their efforts at TVIC [trauma- and violence-informed care]. Clinic mandates and culture often aligned with TVIC concepts. However, the extent to and ways in which TVIC was taken up in each clinic was influenced by the existing interprofessional culture, tensions and power dynamics. One leader described how the culture in her team supported TVIC practice: We have a work environment that allows us to be supportive of each other so that we can have the emotional reserves to be able to provide trauma informed care. I think we're flexible: if you have somebody that comes in that's in a particular trauma or crisis, our colleagues are always really good about accommodating that time. (502, Administrator)" (Levine et al., 2021)
1.4. Organisational resources	Facility characteristics and material conditions for trauma-informed organisational changes.	(Bradley, 2020)	8. "The Women's Centre is based in a listed building and as such, it is acknowledged that renovations to the physical space may not be straight forward." (Bradley, 2020).
1.5 Patient characteristics	Individual patient characteristics that hindered or facilitated intervention effects.	(Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018)	9. Patient "financial strain and experiences of discrimination had significant negative effects on all health outcomes." (Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018)
2. Intervention factors	Hindering or enabling factors in the intervention design and implementation process.	(Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Dubay et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021; Morrissey et al., 2005)	
2.1. Implementation process	Barriers and enablers to intervention implementation: staff engagement in intervention activities, funding for organisational change.	(Bradley, 2020; Brooks et al., 2017; Dubay et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021)	10. "Another barrier was resistance or pushback from subsets of staff (which varied by organization but often spanned many staff levels), both during and after trainings, to changes such as increasing the use of an ACEs [Adverse Childhood Experiences] screening questionnaire and participating in staff self-care strategies such as meditation and yoga classes." (Dubay et al., 2018) 11. "most organizations relied on funding from this and other grants to implement and enhance their trauma-informed efforts; these opportunities may not be available to all organizations or providers." (Dubay et al., 2018)
2.2. Staff education	Barriers and enablers for staff education: interactive learning, buy-in from leadership, all staff, accessibility	(Dubay et al., 2018; Levine et al., 2021)	12. "A key finding in this study was that staff at both clinics found the interprofessional conversations more impactful than the didactic education. These conversations provided staff with the opportunity to learn together, to learn about one another's perspectives on violence and trauma in their practices, and to take a level of collaborative action together

Factor theme	Definition	Discussed by	Supporting quote
			that was unprecedented." (Levine et al., 2021) 13. "Staff at nearly all organizations felt that leadership buy-in was one of the most important elements and that when leadership did not believe in the value of a training, neither would staff from that organization. And for trainings to happen, leadership needed to believe that they were worth the money and time away from patient care. At some organizations, only a limited number of staff were excused from clinical duties to attend some trainings, which obviously limited the reach of these trainings." (Dubay et al., 2018)
2.1. Intervention components	Intervention components that modified intervention effect: integrated services, varied services, equal attention to supporting patients and staff.	(Bradley, 2020; Morrissey et al., 2005)	14. "Analysis of key program elements demonstrated that integrating substance abuse, mental health, and trauma-related issues into counseling yielded greater improvement, whereas the delivery of numerous core services yielded less improvement relative to the comparison group." (Morrissey et al., 2005) 17. "One member of staff emphasised the importance of prioritising staff well-being as equal to the support provided to women." (Bradley, 2020)



Figure 2. PRISMA 2020 flow diagram.



Figure 1. Logic model for trauma-informed system change interventions in primary and community mental healthcare