medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Health and Social care in the Community

Trauma-informed approaches in primary healthcare and community mental healthcare: a mixed methods systematic review of organisational change interventions

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

[1] Centre for Academic Primary Care, Bristol Medical School (Population Health Sciences), University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 2PS, UK

[2] National Institute for Health Research Applied Research Collaboration West (NIHR ARC West) at University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust, Bristol, BS1 2NT, UK

[3] National Institute for Health Research Bristol Biomedical Research Centre, University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 2BN, UK

[4] Division of Psychological Medicine and Clinical Neurosciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, CF14 4XN, UK

Correspondence should be addressed to Natalia V Lewis; nat.lewis@bristol.ac.uk

Abstract

A trauma-informed approach is a framework for organisational/system change interventions that address the universal prevalence and impact of trauma. This mixed methods systematic review assessed the effects of trauma-informed approaches on psychological, behavioural, and health outcomes in healthcare providers and adult patients in primary care and community mental healthcare. We searched five databases (January 1990-June 2021) and grey literature and consulted experts. The quantitative descriptive and qualitative framework syntheses were integrated through a line of argument and mapped onto a logic model. We included six non-randomized studies that evaluated eight interventions with varied theoretical development, components, and outcomes. The common components were budget allocation

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

workforce development, identification/response to violence and trauma, evaluation. We found limited conflicting evidence for intervention effects. Four studies reported improvement in provider psychological readiness and sense of community while three reported conflicting effects on provider behaviour regarding delivery of trauma-informed care. 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 improvement in patient quality of life and chronic pain, another found nil effect on substance abuse, and three studies reported conflicting effects on mental health. Interventions mechanisms included a package of varied components, tailoring to the organisational needs, capacities, and preferences, staff education and self-care, creating safe environments and 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, providers' health. We need more methodologically robust evaluations of trauma-informed organisational change interventions.

Introduction

Psychological trauma has devastating impact on the health of individuals, communities, and societies [1]. 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) [2]. Structural inequalities (e.g., healthcare, economic, gender, and racial disparities) may exacerbate effects of these traumatic experiences [3]. Cumulative life course trauma is associated with risk-taking behaviours, poor health, adverse socio-economic outcomes, and increased use of primary and mental health services [1]. Coercive practices and invasive procedures within healthcare services (e.g., removal of choice regarding treatment, judgemental attitudes following a disclosure of abuse, lack of accessible services) can re-trigger or re-traumatise both patients and staff [4]. As a result of empathetic engagement with trauma survivors, healthcare providers can experience secondary traumatisation/vicarious trauma with symptoms mimicking post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) [5].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Over the last two decades, a trauma-informed approach has gained momentum as a framework for organisational (synonym system) change interventions that address the high prevalence and impact of trauma among service users and providers. The approach differs from standard 'trauma blind' service delivery by integrating 4 *Rs* throughout organisation/healthcare system: **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 [6]. The framework of a trauma-informed approach is not a protocol but high-level guidance for organisational change interventions that can be adapted to any health service. Although frameworks' authors use differing terminology and definitions, moistly they align with the philosophy and principles of the trauma-informed approach proposed by Harris and Fallot [7] and developed further by the frequently cited US Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) [8]. Subsequent developments draw attention to the intersection of individual and interpersonal trauma and structural inequalities, universal applicability of the trauma-informed approach, benefits to patients and staff, and application to services other than mental health and addiction (Table 1).

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

Authors	**Definition of trauma**	**Definition of trauma-informed approach**	**Assumptions**	**Philosophy and principles**	**Implementation domains**
2001. Harris and Fallot [7]	Current or past sexual or physical abuse trauma. Trauma is not a single discrete event but rather an organising experience that forms the core of the individual's identity.	Trauma-informed services are not designed to treat symptoms or syndromes related to sexual or physical abuse. Regardless of their primary mission their commitment is to provide services in a manner that is welcoming and appropriate to the special needs of trauma survivors.	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 5. Avoid retraumatising and revictimizing consumers	Paradigm shift within service delivery systems: 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	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. Training and education for all staff 3. Sensitive hiring practices 4. Review of policies and procedures 5. Universal screening, trauma assessment
2014. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), US [8]	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.	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.	1. Safety 2. Trustworthiness and transparency 3. Peer support 4. Collaboration and mutuality 5. Empowerment, voice, and choice 6. Cultural, historical, and gender sensitivity	1. Governance and leadership 2. Policy 3. Physical environments 4. Engagement and involvement 5. Cross sector collaboration 6. Screening, assessment, treatment services 7. Training and workforce development 8. Progress monitoring and quality assurance 9. Financing

Authors	Definition of trauma	Definition of trauma-informed approach	Assumptions	Philosophy and principles	Implementation domains
					10. Evaluation
2017. NHS Education for Scotland and Scottish Government, UK [9]	SAMHSA definition	The Transforming Psychological Trauma framework	1. Recognises prevalence and impact of trauma 2. Respond 3. Prevent re-traumatisation	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., US [10]	SAMHSA definition. Examples of trauma include physical, sexual, and emotional abuse, childhood neglect, having a family member with mental health or substance abuse disorder, violence in the community and poverty and systemic discrimination.	SAMHSA definition.	The SAMHSA *four Rs*	1. Patient empowerment 2. Choice 3. Collaboration 4. Safety 5. Trustworthiness	Organisational reform precedes the adoption of trauma-informed clinical practices. 1. Leading and communication about the transformation 2. Engaging patients in organisational planning 3. Training clinical and non-clinical staff 4. Creating safe environment 5. Preventing secondary traumatic stress in staff 6. Hiring a trauma-informed workforce Clinical practices: 7. Involving patients in the treatment process 8. Screening for trauma 9. Training staff in trauma-specific treatment approaches 10. Engaging referral services and partnering organisations

Authors	Definition of trauma	Definition of trauma-informed approach	Assumptions	Philosophy and principles	Implementation domains
2018. The Women's Mental Health Taskforce, UK [4]	Violence, abuse, poverty, and inequality.	Gender- and trauma-informed approach refers to an approach by which organisations operate with an awareness of trauma and its impact and avoid re-traumatisation	1. Recognise the impact of trauma 2. Avoid re-traumatisation for staff or service users 3. Identify recovery from trauma as a primary goal	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.	Not reported
2018. Public Health Agency of Canada [11]	Trauma-informed approaches are familiar to many organizations and service providers. Recently, this term has been expanded to include "and violence", an important change in the language which underscores the connections between trauma and violence	Trauma and violence-informed approaches are policies and practices that recognize the connections between violence, trauma, negative health outcomes and behaviours. 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	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 environments 3. Foster opportunities for choice, collaboration, and connection 4. Provide a strengths-based and capacity-building approach to support client coping and resilience	1. Policies and practices 2. Environments
2019. Kimberg and Wheeler [12]	SAMHSA definition of individual trauma, complex trauma, historical trauma, structural violence.	SAMHSA definition Trauma-informed systems of care strive to become vicarious trauma-informed by attending pro-actively	Not reported	SAMHSA principles AND *Four Cs* of clinical care: 1. Calm 2. Contain	Not reported

Authors	Definition of trauma	Definition of trauma-informed approach	Assumptions	Philosophy and principles	Implementation domains
		and compassionately to the vicarious trauma of healthcare providers and staff.		3. Care 4. Cope (p. 33)	
2021. NHS England and NHS Improvement, UK [13]	SAMHSA definition	SAMHSA definition	Not reported	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 Evaluation and culture of improvement

Note. SAMHSA, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration is a branch of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. US, United States. UK, United Kingdom. NHS, National Health Service.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Its proponents consistently highlight the organisational (synonym system) level of a trauma-informed approach, requiring changes in the structure and culture of the organisation (organisational domain). These organisational changes precede changes in clinical practices (clinical domain) [7]. Becoming a trauma-informed organisation 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 [8]. These principles can be implemented through varied intervention components and activities tailored to organisational needs, abilities and preferences and to the wider contexts [8] (Table 1). One contested component is screening for a history of traumatic events in adult health care settings [14]. Most authors consider it an essential component [7, 8, 10], 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 [11]. The conceptual mutability of a trauma-informed approach framework and lack of empirical evidence for effectiveness has been challenged [15]. These and the various definitions and applications might have contributed towards misconceptions about trauma-informed approaches at the organisation/system level, for example, that they treat people who have experiences trauma or can be implemented by individual practitioners [16].

A growing body of literature, policies and guidelines recommend implementation of trauma-informed approaches across healthcare organisations and health systems; however, the evidence base for the effectiveness is still being assessed. Our pilot searches and consultations with experts found extensive literature on articulating trauma-informed approaches and how and why we should implement and evaluate them. 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 trauma-informed organisational change interventions within healthcare. Currently, studies of standalone training interventions about trauma-informed care without any other components at the organisation/system level dominate the evaluation literature [17]. While a few evaluations of trauma-informed organisational change interventions were conducted in secondary mental healthcare [18] and services for children [19, 20], 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 [21].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

This systematic review is part of a programme of research on trauma-informed health systems (TAP CARE study). We aimed to systematically identify, appraise, and synthesise the empirical evidence on trauma-informed organisational change interventions in primary healthcare and community mental health care to understand:

1. What models of trauma-informed organisational change interventions have been implemented?
2. What are the effects of these interventions on psychological, behavioural, and health outcomes in healthcare providers and adult patients?
3. Are these interventions cost-effective?
4. What programme theories were proposed to explain intervention effects?

Materials and methods

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 [22] and mapping on a logic model [23]. The mixed methods design allowed us to include all available evidence and to better explore the complex phenomena of a trauma-informed approach through clarifying and explaining quantitative and qualitative findings. We treated quantitative and qualitative findings equally and did not undertake data transformation. Our data extraction, analysis and synthesis were informed by the SAMHSA framework for a trauma-informed approach [8] and the four-level (individual patient, care team, organisation, political and economic environment) model of the healthcare system [24]. This report follows the PRISMA 2020 statement [25]. We registered the protocol with PROSPERO (CRD42020164752) and published it elsewhere [26].

Patient and Public Involvement

In line with the key principles of a trauma-informed approach [8], 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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.

Development of a logic model

To produce evidence that is understandable to healthcare providers and policy makers, we applied the staged logic model approach [23]. At protocol development stage, we used the measurement model for trauma-informed primary care [27] 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 [26]. 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 organisational change intervention categorised by the SAMHSA ten implementation domains [8].
- An intermediate psychological (cognitive or affective) or behavioural outcome regarding trauma-informed care that the components might influence (e.g., provider readiness or practices) categorised by the four-level framework of the healthcare system [24].
- A long-term health-related outcome/phenomenon of interest that the intermediate outcomes/phenomenon of interest might influence (e.g., patient or provider mental health) categorised by the four-level framework [24].
- A moderator – a factor that could affect either positively or negatively, the link between a component and any outcome.

Search strategy and selection criteria

Based on previous systematic reviews [28, 29] and the expertise of the research team and advisory groups, the first reviewer (SD) developed a search strategy combining MeSH and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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 (Supplementary material Table S1).

SD searched the PROSPERO database for relevant systematic reviews in progress, and the ethos library and PROQUEST for dissertations. Additionally, SD conducted a grey literature search on websites of organisations involved in development and implementation of trauma-informed approaches. 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).

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 [30].	People aged under 18 years
Intervention	Trauma-informed organisational/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 [8].	Interventions that do not incorporate key assumptions and principles at the organisation/system level (e.g., standalone professional training about trauma-informed care, standalone screening for adverse

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Inclusion criteria	**Exclusion criteria**
	The *four Rs* 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 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.	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 organisational/system change intervention. We included studies without a control group.	
Quantitative outcomes	Main outcomes: any psychological, behaviour, health outcomes at the organisation/system 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 provision/receipt of trauma-informed care.	No outcomes reported.
Qualitative phenomenon of interest	Perceived effects of interventions, views on factors that can impact intervention effects.	No phenomenon of interest reported.
Context	Any organisations providing primary care and/or community mental healthcare services in public, private, and third sector. WHO defines a primary health care organisation as setting providing services that are usually the first point of contact	Organisations that do not provide primary care and/or community mental health care services. Studies with mixed samples that did not reported separately

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
	with a health care provider [21]. 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 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.	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 organisation/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 trauma-informed care in mental health services was published in 2001 [7], professional stakeholders advised to extend searches to the preceding 10 years to capture early discussions of trauma-informed approach principles from a global perspective.	
Language	No language restrictions provided an English language abstract is available.	Paper without abstract in English.

Note. SAMHSA, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration is a branch of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. WHO, World Health Organisation.

Study selection

We used Rayyan [31] 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. We used the earliest most detailed report as study ID.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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, participant 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 [32]. Our initial coding frame included constructs from the SAMHSA framework of trauma-informed approach [8], our logic model, and the four-level healthcare system framework [24]. 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 discuss the codes. Then NVL imported the framework into NVivo and completed the coding, refining the framework throughout this process and grouping codes into themes.

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) [33]. SD completed the MMAT checklist for each study, NVL checked and reconciled through consensus.

Data synthesis

We conducted a results-based convergent synthesis [22] at three stages: (i) concurrent quantitative and qualitative syntheses, (ii) integration of findings from the two syntheses and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(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. We judged intervention effects by change in any quantitative outcome and/or participant perception of change 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, negative effect/harm*. 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 1).

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

Results

We included 13 reports [34-46] of six studies [34, 35, 38, 41, 43, 45] (Figure 2).

INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE

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 [41, 43, 45] and one each from the UK [34], Canada [38] and Australia [35]. Three studies were qualitative service evaluations [34, 35, 41], two were studies of newly developed trauma-informed organisational change

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

interventions [38, 45], and one was an evaluation of a quality improvement programme [43]. The US Women Co-occurring Disorders and Violence Study (WCDVS) used a controlled before-after design [45]. The US Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ASPIRE) quality improvement evaluation was a cross-sectional analysis of routine data [43]. 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 [38]. Only WCDVS and EQUIP had follow-up measures at 12 [45], 18 and 24 months [38] Three qualitative evaluations used focus groups and interviews [34, 35, 41]. (Table 3).

Table 3. Characteristics of included studies

Study ID, location, reports	Study design, duration	Setting	Participants	Trauma-informed organisation/system change intervention	Outcome domains	Mechanisms proposed	Moderators identified	MMAT Yes %
Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study (WCDVS), McHugo 2005, US [40, 45, 46]	Controlled before-after: 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. Patient mental health 2. Patient substance abuse	1. Whole intervention → change patient health	1. Intervention components	71
EQUIP Primary Care study (Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity), Browne	Mixed methods: uncontrolled before-after cross-sectional survey with healthcare providers;	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.	An organisational-level, multicomponent health equity EQUIP intervention: 1. all staff education; 2. trauma champions; 3. organisational integration of three dimensions of equity-	1. Provider readiness for trauma-informed care 2. Patient readiness for disease management	1. Whole intervention → change staff awareness and confidence → tensions → disrupted usual practice →change	1. Political and economic environments 2. Organisational culture. 3. Implementation process	88

Study ID, location, reports	Study design, duration	Setting	Participants	Trauma-informed organisation/system change intervention	Outcome domains	Mechanisms proposed	Moderators identified	MMAT Yes %
2018, Canada [38, 39, 42, 44]	qualitative interviews with providers; observations of setting and provider meetings; repeated structured interviews with patients. 24 months		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 school; 60% unemployed; 29.4% on social assistance; 38.7% disability benefits.	oriented care: cultural safety, trauma- and violence-informed care; 4. intervention tailoring to context 5. patients with lived experience in advisory role	3. Patient satisfaction 4. Patient quality of life 5. Patient chronic pain 6. Patient mental health	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	4. Staff education 5. Patient characteristics	
Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme, Kimberg 2019, US [43]	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.	1. Provider behaviour regarding trauma-informed care	Not reported	Not reported	29

Study ID, location, reports	Study design, duration	Setting	Participants	Trauma-informed organisation/system change intervention	Outcome domains	Mechanisms proposed	Moderators identified	MMAT Yes %
Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative, Dubay 2018, US [41]	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. 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	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	100
Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic, Brooks 2018, Australia [35-37]	Qualitative service evaluation: focus groups and interviews with healthcare providers and patients.	The Blue Mountains Women's Health and Resource Centre, Young Women's Clinic that serves marginalised populations	12 providers: 2 general practitioners, 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	Trauma-informed youth-oriented clinic: 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	1. Provider readiness for trauma-informed care 2. Patient readiness for disease management 3. Patient satisfaction 4. Patient access to services 5. Patient safety	1. Whole intervention → change access to services 2. Staff self-care → change HCPs feeling valued 3. Women only space →change access to services, safety, support, better health	1. Implementation process	100

Study ID, location, reports	Study design, duration	Setting	Participants	Trauma-informed organisation/system change intervention	Outcome domains	Mechanisms proposed	Moderators identified	MMAT Yes %
			linguistically diverse background, 1 in wheelchair.			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.		
One-stop-shop Women's Centre, Bradley 2020, UK [34]	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. Provider readiness for trauma-informed care 2. Provider sense of community 2. Provider behaviour regarding trauma-informed care 3. Patient readiness for	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.	1. Political and economic environments. 2. Organisational resources 3. Implementation process 4. Intervention components.	100

Study ID, location, reports	Study design, duration	Setting	Participants	Trauma-informed organisation/system change intervention	Outcome domains	Mechanisms proposed	Moderators identified	MMAT Yes %
					disease management 4. Patient satisfaction 5. Patient access to services 6. Provider and patient safety	3. Staff education → change HCP knowledge, skills. 4. Staff self-care →change HCP feeling valued. 5. Safe environment →change patient trust.		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Trauma-informed organisational change interventions were implemented in public primary care clinics that served populations with high rates of trauma [38, 41, 43] and public [35, 45] and third sector [34] specialist organisations that served women with a history of interpersonal violence. Two studies were single-site evaluations [34, 35] and four were multi-site studies [38, 41, 43, 45]. The EQUIP study took place in four Canadian primary care clinics that implemented the same intervention model [38]. From the WCDVS, we included the Washington DC site with four community mental health centres [45]. From the Dubay et al report [41], 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 [43] and Young Women's Clinic [35], we extracted data for the patient group aged 18 and above.

The total number of participants exposed to trauma-informed organisational change interventions was 117447 patients and 137 healthcare providers. The number of patients ranged from 6 in qualitative service evaluation [41] to 116,871 in analysis of routine data [43]. The number of providers (nurses, physicians, counsellors, outreach workers and allied professionals) ranged from 4 [34] to 117 [38].

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 3). Most studies had clearly defined research questions, which were addressed by the data collected [34, 35, 38, 41, 45]. One study did not pose a clear research question [43]. All four qualitative studies/component showed coherence between data sources, collection, analysis, and interpretation [34, 35, 38, 41]. The three quantitative studies/component used appropriate sampling techniques and measures [38, 43, 45]; two had a good completion rate [38, 45]. Only one study accounted for confounders [38] and one confirmed that the intervention was administered as intended [38]. The only mixed methods study [38] 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 (Supplementary material Tables S2, S3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Models of trauma-informed organisational change interventions

The six studies evaluated eight different models of trauma-informed organisational 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 organisational change interventions. The UK One-stop-shop Women's Centre had been implementing the Trauma-informed Service Systems model [7] for less than a year [34]. The Family Health Clinic Philadelphia had been implementing the Sanctuary Model [47], while the Women's HIV Clinic San Francisco had adapted the Trauma-informed Primary Care framework [48] for more than two years [41]. The Canadian team developed and evaluated a 24-month implementation of the new EQUIP intervention [38]. The other four sites (WCDVS Washington site, Montefiore Medical Group, Young Women's Clinic, San Francisco Health Network Primary Care) implemented bespoke organisational change interventions, with implementation ranging from 12 months [45], 17 months [43], more than 24 months [41] to 13 years [35].

The intervention components varied in the extent to which they mapped onto the SAMHSA ten implementation domains [8]. Only EQUIP [38] and Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic [35] included components from all ten implementation domains; the bespoke US Montefiore Medical Group intervention covered six domains [41]. 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

population served. Five interventions included screening for history of trauma and/or mental health conditions [34, 41, 43, 45]. Seven models made changes in the physical environment [34, 38, 41, 45]. These ranged from women-only spaces and activities [34, 35, 45] and provision of childcare [34, 35], through redesigning waiting rooms and offices [34, 38, 41] to extending opening time [38] and consultation length [35]. Varied activities to monitor progress and quality were reported in seven models [34, 35, 38, 41, 43]. Cross-sector collaboration was reported in six models [34, 35, 38, 41, 43, 45]. Engagement and involvement of people with lived experience in system change were reported in six models [34, 35, 38, 41, 45]. Organisations undertook different engagement activities, from including people with lived experience of violence and trauma in working groups/committees [41] to hiring them as advisers [38, 43] and service providers [34, 45]. The least common domains were the leadership and governance support in five models [34, 35, 38, 41, 43]. Written policies and procedures that reflected commitment to a trauma-informed approach were reported in three models [35, 38, 43] (Table 4).

Table 4. Models of trauma-informed organisational change interventions in primary care and community mental health care

SAMHSA Implementation domains [8]	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 [40, 45, 46]	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 [38, 39, 42, 44]	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 [43]	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 [41]			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2017 [35-37]	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 [34]	**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	System-wide quality improvement priorities, aligned with state and	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Written policy recognises impact of gender-based violence,	Not reported	**3**

SAMHSA Implementation domains [8]	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 [40, 45, 46]	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 [38, 39, 42, 44]	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 [43]	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 [41]			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2017 [35-37]	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 [34]	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
		with substance use issues.	national performance metrics and associated incentives for depression and alcohol/substance use. Standardise, team-based workflow. Screening and response protocols.				promotes women's role in service delivery, commitment to staff development		
3. Physical environment	Women only space.	Removed sign 'Check in or you will lose your appointment' from the reception desk. Opened clinic doors 30 min earlier so that patients could	Not reported	Redesigned waiting room to be more calming for staff and patients. Chair sessions with	Waiting room posters about the importance of behavioural health treatment for	Natural light in many rooms. Open space.	Women only space. Located in an older house in the community.	Women only space. Female only staff. Variety of services in	**7**

SAMHSA Implementation domains [8]	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 [40, 45, 46]	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 [38, 39, 42, 44]	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 [43]	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 [41]			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2017 [35-37]	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 [34]	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
		wait indoors to book appointments. Repurposed a section of the waiting room to create a child-friendly space for patients with small children.		massage therapist for patients. Service dog for patients to pet. Free food for patients. colouring pages. Calming music.	traumatic experiences		Comfortable furniture. Service users' art and posters affirming women's rights. Consultation length is tailored to patient needs. Childcare during clinic activities.	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	

SAMHSA Implementation domains [8]	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 [40, 45, 46]	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 [38, 39, 42, 44]	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 [43]	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 [41]			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2017 [35-37]	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 [34]	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
								room for group work. Physical environment is regularly assessed through 'walk-throughs' and reflective 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	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	Stakeholder group including four patients and representatives from each department meets monthly. The group provides	Not reported	Not reported	Person-centred care. Shared decision making.	Lived experience panels and forums. Recruit staff with lived experience. Varied activities, food sharing,	**6**

SAMHSA Implementation domains [8]	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 [40, 45, 46]	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 [38, 39, 42, 44]	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 [43]	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 [41]			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2017 [35-37]	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 [34]	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
	for developing partnerships between HCPs and people with lived experience.		factors to facilitate patient-centred conversations about preferred treatment.	feedback, helps design and implement organisational change.				creative projects.	
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	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**

SAMHSA Implementation domains [8]	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 [40, 45, 46]	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 [38, 39, 42, 44]	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 [43]	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 [41]			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2017 [35-37]	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 [34]	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
			prevention resource centre.						
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).	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	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	Screening for adverse childhood experiences. 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**

SAMHSA Implementation domains [8]	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 [40, 45, 46]	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 [38, 39, 42, 44]	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 [43]	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 [41]			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2017 [35-37]	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 [34]	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
	Peer groups, advocates, facilitators, drop-in clinic.		interpersonal violence advocate. Referrals to mental health and substance abuse services in the community.	building for patients who aren't ready for traditional talk therapy.					
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 among staff. Trauma champion practice consultant.	Staff training	All staff training. Three half-day initial mandatory trainings, three 1.5-hour training for new hires. Weekly staff meetings and	All staff training with mandatory initial training. New Critical Incident Management Team to counsel practices after traumatic	All-staff training with mandatory initial training. All-staff meetings. Mindfulness and yoga classes for staff.	Staff supervision sessions with a trauma specialist counsellor. Self-care for staff.	Trauma champion in each team. Hiring practices. All staff training including self-care and well-being, specialised training for	**8**

SAMHSA Implementation domains [8]	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 [40, 45, 46]	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 [38, 39, 42, 44]	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 [43]	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 [41]			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2017 [35-37]	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 [34]	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
				pre-clinic meetings. Outside trainer attends once a month to discuss trauma with staff. Trauma champion clinical social worker.	event (e.g., a shooting). Quarterly learning collaboratives for teams. Role-specific, in-person trainings led by therapists. Relaxation hotline for staff.	2 hours a month for staff self-care. An "Undoing Racism" committee. Reflective supervision.		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	Stakeholder group provides feedback. Ongoing monitoring	Tracking progress by interviewing or surveying staff.	Tracking progress by interviewing or surveying staff.	Solicit feedback from service users.	Monthly meetings of the organisation wide reflective group	**7**

SAMHSA Implementation domains [8]	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 [40, 45, 46]	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 [38, 39, 42, 44]	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 [43]	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 [41]			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2017 [35-37]	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 [34]	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
			improvement process. Data visualisation dashboards for tracking progress and a monthly meeting for clinics to share best practices. Electronic health record templates and data.	and evaluation.			Regular staff check in with management. Annual planning days that encourage staff feedback.	focussed on the question – How trauma informed are we?	
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	24-month grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.			Medicare bulk billing and partnership with community youth-	Grants from the National Lottery, fundraising.	**8**

SAMHSA Implementation domains [8]	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 [40, 45, 46]	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 [38, 39, 42, 44]	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 [43]	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 [41]			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2017 [35-37]	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 [34]	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
			metrics for depression and alcohol and substance abuse disorders. ARISE grant.				oriented services. Free for patients.		
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**

SAMHSA Implementation domains [8]	**Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study,** McHugo 2005 [40, 45, 46]	**Equipping Primary Health Care for Equity (EQUIP) model,** Browne 2018 [38, 39, 42, 44]	**Aspire to Realize Improved Safety and Equity (ARISE) quality improvement programme,** Kimberg 2019 [43]	**Advancing Trauma Informed Care initiative,** Dubay 2018 [41]			**Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic,** Brooks 2017 [35-37]	**One-stop-shop Women's Centre (Trauma-informed service system model),** Bradley 2020 [34]	**Interventions models (n=8)**
				Women's HIV Clinic (Trauma-informed Primary Care model)	**Montefiore Medical Group**	**Family Health Services (Sanctuary model)**			
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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Effects of trauma-informed organisational change interventions on patient or healthcare provider psychological, behavioural, and health outcomes

We found limited conflicting evidence for the effects (or perceived effects) of trauma-informed organisational change interventions on 11 outcome domains, with an overall direction towards some improvement. Most evidence came from the controlled before-after WCDVS study [45], mixed methods EQUIP study [38], and three qualitative service evaluations [34, 35, 41]. The evidence for each intervention model was based on a single study. None used the same measures (Table 5, Figure 2).

The studies reported improvement in four out of seven psychological and behaviour outcomes and in two out of four health outcomes. Only three studies reported both psychological and health outcomes [34, 35, 38]. 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.

Table 5. Evidence for effects and perceived effects of trauma-informed organisational change interventions on patients and provider outcomes

Outcomes/phenomena of interest domain	**Nil effect**		**Improvement**		**Mixed effect**	
	Quantitative	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**
INTERMEDIATE COGNITIVE, 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) [38]	**Organisation level** 1.2. Confidence [38, 44] 1.2. Awareness [34, 38, 44] 1.3. Skills [34, 41] 1.4. Attitudes towards patients [34, 35, 38]	None	None
2. Provider sense of community				**Organisation level** 2.1. Perceived support [34, 41] 2.2. Perception of being valued [34]		
3. Provider behaviour regarding trauma-informed care	None	None	**Organisation level** 3.1. Screening rates for traumatic experiences (routine service data) 25% →47% [43]	**Organisation level** 3.2. Uptake of self-care activities [34]	None	**Organisation level** 3.1. Screening for traumatic experiences [41] 3.2. Uptake of self-care activities [41]
4. Patient readiness for disease management	None	None	**Individual-patient level**	**Care-team level** 4.1. Feeling in control of treatment [35, 36, 41] **Individual patient level**	None	None

Outcomes/phenomena of interest domain	Nil effect		Improvement		Mixed effect	
	Quantitative	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**
			4.2. Confidence in preventing and managing health conditions (bespoke scale) β=0.213, p<0.001 [42]	4.2. Self-confidence [34-36]		
5. Patient satisfaction	None	None	**Organisation level** 5.1. Comfort and confidence in care (bespoke scale) β=0.5284, p<0.001 [42]	**Organisation level** 5.1. Comfort and confidence in care [34-37, 41] 5.2. Perceived support [34-37] 5.3. Satisfaction with services [34-37]	None	**Organisation level** Satisfaction with services [41]
6. Patient access to services	None	None	None	**Organisation level** Access to services [34-37, 41]	None	None
7. Provider and patient safety	None	None	None	**Organisation level** 7.1. Provider perceived safety [34] 7.2. Patient perceived safety [34, 36, 37]	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 [42]	None	None	None

Outcomes/phenomena of interest domain	Nil effect		Improvement		Mixed effect	
	Quantitative	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**
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 [42]	None	None	None
10. Mental health	10.1. Mental health symptoms (Global Severity Index): 6-month effect size 95% CI crosses 0 [40]; 12-month 0.274 (95% CI -0.053 to 0.600) [46]	None				None
			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 [42]	10.2. Depressive symptoms [35, 36]		
			10.3. PTSD (PTSD Checklist): 18 months β= - 0.305, p<0.001; 24 months β= - 0.123, p<0.001 [42]		10.3. PTSD (Posttraumatic Symptom Scale): 6-month 95% CI crosses 0 [40]; 12-month 0.414 (95% CI 0.081 to 0.747) [46]	
11. Substance abuse	11.1. Alcohol use problem severity (Addiction Severity Index alcohol composite score): 6-	None	None	None	None	None

Outcomes/phenomena of interest domain	Nil effect		Improvement		Mixed effect	
	Quantitative	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**	**Quantitative**	**Qualitative**
	month 95% CI crosses 0 [40]; 12-month 0.017 (95% CI 0.073 to 0.107) [46] 11.2. Drug use problem severity (Addiction Severity Index drug composite score): 6-month 95% CI crosses 0 [40]; 12-month 0.004 (95% CI -0.086 to 0.094) [46]					

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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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, and patient and provider perceived safety. However, the evidence for the effect on provider behaviour and patient satisfaction was conflicting.

Provider readiness. Four studies reported improvement in organisational readiness to provide trauma-informed care through promoting provider awareness, attitudes, confidence, and skills in the topic [34, 35, 38, 41]. Two qualitative evaluations reported that staff felt supported and valued [34, 41].

Provider behaviour. In contrast, the evidence for change in collective behaviour and practices was conflicting. While the ARISE programme reported a 22% increase in screening rates for depression, substance abuse, and interpersonal violence [43], Dubay et al [41] 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 [34] found that staff used and appreciated well-being activities, Dubay et al [41] 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)".

Patient psychological readiness for disease management. Two qualitative studies reported that patients felt in control of treatment [35, 41]. Four studies consistently reported improvement in patients' confidence in managing health conditions and self-confidence [34, 35, 38, 41].

Patient satisfaction with services. Two studies found qualitative evidence for improved satisfaction with services [34, 35], while Dubay et al [41] reported that "some patients felt frustrated by high staff turnover and by the lack of staff diversity in some practices (p.33)".

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Patient access to services. Three qualitative studies reported improved access to care through on-site provision or referrals to external organisations [34, 35, 41].

Provider and patient safety. Two qualitative studies reported improvement in perceived safety among patients and staff [34, 35] suggesting that the interventions created safe environments.

Long-term patient health outcomes

We found limited conflicting evidence suggesting that some interventions may contribute to improvement in some patient health outcomes. 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 [38, 42] 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 [35] 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 [40, 45, 46].

Programme theories explaining intervention effects

We found varied theoretical development behind four out of eight intervention models. The EQUIP intervention [38] and Sanctuary Model [41] were grounded in high-level psycho-social and implementation theories. EQUIP was informed by complexity theory [39]. The Sanctuary Model was grounded in constructivist self-development theory, burnout theory, and systems theory [47]. The Trauma-informed Service System was informed by the trauma theory [7]. The Trauma-informed Primary Care framework [41] 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 [48].

Proposed intervention mechanisms

Authors proposed eight mechanisms to explain the link between intervention components and outcomes with limited evidence from five studies [34, 35, 38, 41, 45] (Table 3).

1. Intervention as a whole was proposed in four studies [34, 35, 38, 41, 44]. Two studies reported qualitative evidence explaining the challenging process of changing organisational

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

readiness to provide trauma-informed care [38, 41, 44]. In the EQUIP study [38], 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 [41] 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 [38, 44]. Bradley [34] found qualitative evidence for the link between trauma-informed service and patients satisfaction and provider sense of community.

Brooks et al [35-37] reported some qualitative evidence suggesting that all components of the Trauma-informed Young Women's Clinic contributed to patient satisfaction with services through improving access to healthcare for young women from deprived communities.

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) [46]. After using the Trauma-informed Women's Clinic, some participants reported increased self-confidence, confidence in care, perceived safety and support, and improved mental health [35].

2. Women-only space, when services are provided by women for women, increased patient satisfaction with services through improving access to care, perceived safety and support, and self-confidence [34, 35]. However, Brooks et al [35] reported that "sometimes people get the wrong idea of the place, they think it's for people that are man-haters (p.15)".

3. EQUIP care dose was proposed as an indirect mechanism to patient health outcomes [42]. 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, and chronic pain.

4. Staff education was proposed as a mechanism for change in provider readiness. Two qualitative evaluations found that educating all staff about trauma-informed approach and self-care led to improvement in provider knowledge, skills [34, 41], and relationships [41].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

5. Tailoring staff education to organisational and wider context was the EQUIP mechanism for unifying staff and identifying clinic-specific priorities for increasing readiness for providing trauma-informed care [44].

6. Staff self-care activities contributed to staff perceived safety [34].

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 [34] and increasing patient safety [35].

8. Shared decision making led to patient safety and satisfaction through education, feeling of control over treatment, and empowerment [35].

Moderators

We developed two themes with eight subthemes summarising factors that facilitated or hindered intervention effects: (i) contextual factors at the levels of wider political and economic environments, organisation (culture, resources), and individual patient (social determinants of health); (ii) intervention factors at the organisation level (intervention components, implementation process) (Table 6, Figure 2).

Table 6. 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.	[34, 38, 41, 42, 44]	
1.1. Political and economic environments	Governance, financial, payment regulations and health system values.	[34, 38, 41]	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." [41] 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]." [38]
1.2. Wider trauma-informed movement	Parallel trauma-informed initiatives in the community, health system.	[44]	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

Factor theme	Definition	Discussed by	Supporting quote
			just like us and I think that it's making a difference in how we work. (601, Counselor)" [44]
1.3. Organisational culture	Organisational values, psychological environment, leadership style, receptiveness to principles of trauma-informed care.	[38, 41, 44]	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]?" [38] 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." [41] 6. "organizational hierarchy was a barrier to becoming trauma-informed. Hierarchy challenges varied across respondents and organizations and included lack of racial diversity in leadership roles and hiring practices;

Factor theme	Definition	Discussed by	Supporting quote
			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." [41] 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)" [44]
1.4. Organisational resources	Facility characteristics and material conditions for trauma-informed organisational changes.	[34]	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." [34].
1.5 Patient characteristics	Individual patient characteristics that hindered or facilitated intervention effects.	[42]	9. Patient "financial strain and experiences of discrimination had significant negative effects on all health outcomes." [42]
2. Intervention factors	Hindering or enabling factors in the intervention design and implementation process.	[34, 35, 41, 44, 46]	

Factor theme	Definition	Discussed by	Supporting quote
2.1. Implementation process	Barriers and enablers to intervention implementation: staff engagement in intervention activities, funding for organisational change.	[34, 35, 41, 44]	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." [41] 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." [41]
2.2. Staff education	Barriers and enablers for staff education: interactive learning, buy-in from leadership, all staff, accessibility	[41, 44]	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 that was unprecedented." [44] 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." [41]

Factor theme	Definition	Discussed by	Supporting quote
2.1. Intervention components	Intervention components that modified intervention effect: integrated services, varied services, equal attention to supporting patients and staff.	[34, 46]	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." [46] 17. "One member of staff emphasised the importance of prioritising staff well-being as equal to the support provided to women." [34]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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 [34, 38, 41, 44]. 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 [38, 41, 44]. Canadian and US providers acknowledged differing values between their organisations and the wider health system that acted as a barrier [38, 41]. Bradley [34] 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" [44] (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 [38, 41, 44]. In contrast, a supportive work environment and organisational values aligned with the principles of trauma-informed approach were described as positive moderators [44]. One study reported that their facility had limited capacity for changes in the physical environment [34].

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) [42].

Intervention moderators. Barriers to the intervention implementation were reported most frequently. Four studies described poor engagement of some members of staff in intervention activities [41, 44], inadequate funding and dependence on project grants [34, 35, 44] 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 methods [44]. Second, they highlighted the importance of the leadership buy-in [41]. Third, providers emphasised the importance of involving all staff in educational activities [41].

Two studies of services for women with a history of interpersonal violence found some evidence that components of the organisational 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

better patient health outcomes, receiving more study services resulted in less improvement [46]. Bradley [34] quoted "one member of staff emphasised the importance of prioritising staff well-being as equal to the support provided to women (p.16)".

Discussion

Principle findings

This mixed methods systematic review of six non-randomised studies which assessed eight models of trauma-informed organisational 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 to provide trauma-informed care and in their 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 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, and sustainable funding.

Meaning of the study

Our first important finding is the very limited empirical evidence base for the effectiveness of trauma-informed organisational change interventions in primary care and community mental health care. Despite exhaustive searches, we only identified three non-randomised

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

quantitative 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 complex organisational/system-level interventions. However, the literature offers varied tools and guidance on how to monitor and evaluate the implementation of a trauma-informed approach [27, 29, 49]. 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 [8], 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 [6, 17]. Both reviews found conflicting effects on provider readiness and practices regarding provision of trauma-informed care, and service user perception of care. None of our studies used validated measures for evaluating organisational readiness, culture, and performance identified by Melz et al [6]. The overlapping mechanism for increased provider readiness was staff education and ongoing support [6].

Our third important finding raises question about the contribution of screening for trauma to the effects of trauma-informed organisational 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 contributed to 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

This finding is in line with the recent systematic reviews [6, 17]. No studies explored the mechanisms linking screening to health outcomes or harm among patients and staff.

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 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

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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Conclusions

Limited conflicting evidence from non-randomised studies suggests that some trauma-informed organisational change interventions in primary care and community mental health care may change organisational culture and create safe environments for patients and staff, potentially leading to improvement in patient disease management and satisfaction, access to services, quality of life and chronic pain. Intervention effects can be moderated by contextual factors at the level of the health system and patient, and by intervention implementation factors. We need more methodologically robust evaluations of the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of trauma-informed organisational change interventions which measure adverse events/harm and patients' and providers' health.

Data availability

The quantitative and qualitative data supporting this systematic review were extracted from previously reported studies, which have been cited. The processed data are included within the article and supplementary material file.

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declare(s) that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper

Funding

This study was funded by the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol [grant number BRC-1215-20011]. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Supplementary material

Table S1. Example search strategy

Table S2. Methodological qualities of included studies

Table S3 Methodological quality for the overall study design, data collection and analysis

References

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

2. Ruglass, L.M. and K. Kendall-Tackett, *What Is Psychological Trauma?*, in *Psychology of trauma 101*, L. Ruglass and K. Kendall-Tackett, Editors. 2014, Springer Publishing Company: New York. p. 1-24.
3. Rylko-Bauer, B. and P. Farmer, *Structural Violence, Poverty, and Social Suffering*, in *The Oxford handbook of the social science of poverty*, D. Brady and L. Burton, Editors. 2016, Oxford University Press: New York, NY. p. xiv, 915 pages.
4. DHSC, *The Women's Mental Health Taskforce. Final report*. 2018, Department of Health and Social Care: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-womens-mental-health-taskforce-report. p. 73.
5. Figley, C.R. and R.J. Kleber, *Beyond the "Victim"*, in *Beyond Trauma. The Plenum Series on Stress and Coping.* , R.J. Kleber, C.R. Figley, and B.P.R. Gersons, Editors. 1995, Springer: Boston, MA.
6. Melz, H., et al., *Review of trauma-informed initiatives at the systems level. Trauma-informed approaches: connecting research, policy, and practice to build resilience in children and families*. 2019: https://aspe.hhs.gov/system/files/pdf/262051/TI_Approaches_Research_Review.pdf. p. 37.
7. Harris, M. and R. Fallot, *Using trauma theory to design service systems*. New directions for mental health services, no.89. 2001, San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass.
8. SAMHSA, *SAMHSA's concept of trauma and guidance for a trauma-informed approach*. 2017: https://store.samhsa.gov/system/files/sma14-4884.pdf. p. 27.
9. *NHS Education for Scotland. Transforming psychological trauma: a knowledge and skills framework for the Scottish workforce*. 2017: https://www.nes.scot.nhs.uk/media/3971582/nationaltraumatrainingframework.pdf https://www.nes.scot.nhs.uk/media/3983113/NationalTraumaTrainingFramework.
10. *Centre for Health Care Strategies. What is trauma-informed care?* 2021 [cited 2021 20 December].
11. *Government of Canada. Trauma and violence-informed approaches to policy and practice*. 2018 2 February 2018 [cited 2021 20 December].
12. Kimberg, L. and M. Wheeler, *Trauma and trauma-informed care*, in *Trauma-informed healthcare approaches : a guide for primary care*, M. Gerber, Editor. 2019, Springer Berlin Heidelberg: New York, NY. p. 25-56.
13. Law, C., et al., *Trauma-informed care in the perinatal period* 2021: https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/a-good-practice-guide-to-support-implementation-of-trauma-informed-care-in-the-perinatal-period/.
14. Raja, S., E.P. Rabinowitz, and M.J. Gray, *Universal screening and trauma informed care: Current concerns and future directions*. Fam Syst Health, 2021.
15. Birnbaum, S., *Confronting the Social Determinants of Health: Has the Language of Trauma Informed Care Become a Defense Mechanism?* Issues Ment Health Nurs, 2019. **40**(6): p. 476-481.
16. Sweeney, A. and D. Taggart, *(Mis)understanding trauma-informed approaches in mental health.* J Ment Health, 2018. **27**(5): p. 383-387.
17. Purtle, J., *Systematic Review of Evaluations of Trauma-Informed Organizational Interventions That Include Staff Trainings.* Trauma Violence Abuse, 2020. **21**(4): p. 725-740.
18. Sweeney, A., et al., *Trauma-informed mental healthcare in the UK: what is it and how can we further its development?* Mental Health Review Journal, 2016. **21**(3): p. 174-192.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

19. Bendall, S., et al., *A Systematic Review and Synthesis of Trauma-Informed Care Within Outpatient and Counseling Health Settings for Young People.* Child Maltreat, 2020: p. 1077559520927468.
20. Bryson, S.A., et al., *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, 2017. **11**: p. 36.
21. WHO and UNICEF, *A vision for primary health care in the 21st century: towards universal health coverage and the Sustainable Development Goals.* . 2018: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/primary-health/vision.pdf.
22. Sandelowski, M., C.I. Voils, and J. Barroso, *Defining and Designing Mixed Research Synthesis Studies.* Res Sch, 2006. **13**(1): p. 29.
23. Rohwer, A., et al., *Guidance on the use of logic models in health technology assessments of complex interventions [Online].* 2016: http://www.integrate-hta.eu/downloads/.
24. Ferlie, E.B. and S.M. Shortell, *Improving the quality of health care in the United Kingdom and the United States: a framework for change.* Milbank Q, 2001. **79**(2): p. 281-315.
25. Page, M.J., et al., *Updating guidance for reporting systematic reviews: development of the PRISMA 2020 statement.* J Clin Epidemiol, 2021. **134**: p. 103-112.
26. Dawson, S., et al., *Trauma-informed approaches to primary and community mental health care: protocol for a mixed-methods systematic review.* BMJ Open, 2021. **11**(2): p. e042112.
27. Germán, M., D. Crawford, and K. Dumpert, *Measuring the impact of trauma-informed primary care: are we missing the forest for the trees?* 2020, Montefiore Medical Group: https://www.chcs.org/resource/measuring-the-impact-of-trauma-informed-primary-care-are-we-missing-the-forest-for-the-trees/. p. 15.
28. Branson, C.E., et al., *Trauma-informed juvenile justice systems: A systematic review of definitions and core components.* Psychol Trauma, 2017. **9**(6): p. 635-646.
29. Champine, R.B., et al., *Systems Measures of a Trauma-Informed Approach: A Systematic Review.* Am J Community Psychol, 2019. **64**(3-4): p. 418-437.
30. WHO, *Strengthening health systems to respond to women subjected to intimate partner violence or sexual violence: a manual for health managers*. 2017, World Health Organisation: Geneva, Switzerland.
31. Ouzzani, M., et al., *Rayyan-a web and mobile app for systematic reviews.* Syst Rev, 2016. **5**(1): p. 210.
32. Dixon-Woods, M., *Using framework-based synthesis for conducting reviews of qualitative studies.* BMC Med, 2011. **9**: p. 39.
33. Hong, Q., et al., *Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), version 2018. Registration of Copyright (#1148552), Canadian Intellectual Property Office, Industry Canada.* 2018: http://mixedmethodsappraisaltoolpublic.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/127916259/MMAT_2018_criteria-manual_2018-08-01_ENG.pdf.
34. Bradley, A., *A qualitative evaluation of the Nelson Trust Bridgwater Women's Centre. Final report*. 2020, Leeds Beckett University, The Nelson Trust. p. 26.
35. Brooks, M., L. Barclay, and C. Hooker, *Young Women's Clinic evaluation. Blue Mountains Women's Health and Resourse Centre*. 2017. p. 19.
36. Brooks, M., L. Barclay, and C. Hooker, *Trauma-informed care in general practice: Findings from a women's health centre evaluation.* Aust J Gen Pract, 2018. **47**(6): p. 370-375.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.09.22277443; this version posted September 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

37. Brooks, M., C. Hooker, and L. Barclay, *Artspace: Enabling young women's recovery through visual arts: A qualitative study.* Health Promot J Austr, 2020. **31**(3): p. 391-401.
38. Browne, A.J., et al., *Disruption as opportunity: Impacts of an organizational health equity intervention in primary care clinics.* Int J Equity Health, 2018. **17**(1): p. 154.
39. Browne, A.J., et al., *EQUIP Healthcare: An overview of a multi-component intervention to enhance equity-oriented care in primary health care settings.* Int J Equity Health, 2015. **14**: p. 152.
40. Cocozza, J.J., et al., *Outcomes for women with co-occurring disorders and trauma: Program-level effects.* Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 2005. **28**(2): p. 109-119.
41. Dubay, L., R.A. Burton, and M. Epstein, *Early adopters of trauma-informed care. An implementation analysis of the advancing trauma-informed care grantees. Research report.* 2018, Urban Institute: Washington, DC. p. 61.
42. Ford-Gilboe, M., et al., *How Equity-Oriented Health Care Affects Health: Key Mechanisms and Implications for Primary Health Care Practice and Policy.* Milbank Quarterly, 2018. **96**(4): p. 635-671.
43. Kimberg, L., et al. *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, 2019.
44. Levine, S., C. Varcoe, and A.J. Browne, *"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, 2021. **35**(1): p. 46-54.
45. McHugo, G.J., et al., *Women, Co-occurring Disorders, and Violence Study: evaluation design and study population.* J Subst Abuse Treat, 2005. **28**(2): p. 91-107.
46. Morrissey, J.P., et al., *Twelve-month outcomes of trauma-informed interventions for women with co-occurring disorders.* Psychiatr Serv, 2005. **56**(10): p. 1213-22.
47. Esaki, N., et al., *The Sanctuary Model: theoretical framework.* Families in Society, 2013. **94**(2): p. 87-95.
48. Machtinger, E.L., et al., *From treatment to healing: the promise of trauma-informed primary care.* Womens Health Issues, 2015. **25**(3): p. 193-7.
49. Thirkle, S., A. Kennedy, and P. Sice, *Instruments for Exploring Trauma-Informed Care.* Journal of Health and Human Services Administration, 2021. **44**(1): p. 30-44.



Figure 1. PRISMA 2020 flow diagram



Figure 2. Logic model