PROSPERO will not be available from 08:00 BST on Friday 4th October until 08:00 BST on Monday 7th October for essential maintenance. We apologise for any inconvenience.

Systematic review

1. * Review title.

Give the working title of the review, for example the one used for obtaining funding. Ideally the title should state succinctly the interventions or exposures being reviewed and the associated health or social problems. Where appropriate, the title should use the PI(E)COS structure to contain information on the Participants, Intervention (or Exposure) and Comparison groups, the Outcomes to be measured and Study designs to be included.

What are the experiences of women and girls in South Africa who access healthcare facilities as a result of sexual assault or sexual violence?

2. Original language title.

For reviews in languages other than English, this field should be used to enter the title in the language of the review. This will be displayed together with the English language title.

3. * Anticipated or actual start date.

Give the date when the systematic review commenced, or is expected to commence.
03/12/2018

4. * Anticipated completion date.

Give the date by which the review is expected to be completed.
22/12/2019

5. * Stage of review at time of this submission.

Indicate the stage of progress of the review by ticking the relevant Started and Completed boxes. Additional information may be added in the free text box provided.
Please note: Reviews that have progressed beyond the point of completing data extraction at the time of initial registration are not eligible for inclusion in PROSPERO. Should evidence of incorrect status and/or completion date being supplied at the time of submission come to light, the content of the PROSPERO record will be removed leaving only the title and named contact details and a statement that inaccuracies in the stage of the review date had been identified.
This field should be updated when any amendments are made to a published record and on completion and publication of the review. If this field was pre-populated from the initial screening questions then you are not able to edit it until the record is published.

The review has not yet started: No

Review stage	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	Yes	No
Piloting of the study selection process	Yes	No
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	Yes	No
Data extraction	No	No
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	No	No
Data analysis	No	No

Provide any other relevant information about the stage of the review here (e.g. Funded proposal, protocol not yet finalised).

6. * Named contact.

The named contact acts as the guarantor for the accuracy of the information presented in the register record.

Kathryn Hinsliff-Smith

Email salutation (e.g. "Dr Smith" or "Joanne") for correspondence:

Dr Hinsliff-Smith

7. * Named contact email.

Give the electronic mail address of the named contact.

kathryn.hinsliff-smith@dmu.ac.uk

8. Named contact address

Give the full postal address for the named contact.

De Montfort University Edith Murphy Building, Room 3.09 Leicester LE1 2BH

9. Named contact phone number.

Give the telephone number for the named contact, including international dialling code.

#4407883032441

10. * Organisational affiliation of the review.

Full title of the organisational affiliations for this review and website address if available. This field may be completed as 'None' if the review is not affiliated to any organisation.

De Montfort University

Organisation web address:

www.dmu.ac.uk

11. * Review team members and their organisational affiliations.

Give the title, first name, last name and the organisational affiliations of each member of the review team. Affiliation refers to groups or organisations to which review team members belong.

Dr Kathryn Hinsliff-Smith. De Montfort University
Dr Julie McGarry. The University of Nottingham
Moreoagae Randa. Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University

12. * Funding sources/sponsors.

Give details of the individuals, organizations, groups or other legal entities who take responsibility for initiating, managing, sponsoring and/or financing the review. Include any unique identification numbers assigned to the review by the individuals or bodies listed.

Global Challenges Research Fund, The University of Nottingham

13. * Conflicts of interest.

List any conditions that could lead to actual or perceived undue influence on judgements concerning the main topic investigated in the review.

None

14. Collaborators.

Give the name and affiliation of any individuals or organisations who are working on the review but who are not listed as review team members.

15. * Review question.

State the question(s) to be addressed by the review, clearly and precisely. Review questions may be specific or broad. It may be appropriate to break very broad questions down into a series of related more specific questions. Questions may be framed or refined using PI(E)COS where relevant.

1) What are the experiences of women and girls who experience sexual violence when attending a South African healthcare facility?

2) What reported support is available for survivors of sexual violence when attending a healthcare facility in South Africa and how is this signposted?

3) What are the reported types of sexual violence relating to women and girls when attending a SA health care facility?

4) What are the reported interventions used by healthcare professionals (nurses, doctors) to support survivors of sexual violence within healthcare facilities in SA

5) What interventions do healthcare professionals (nurses, doctors) use when proving clinical care for victims of sexual violence in SA.

16. * Searches.

State the sources that will be searched. Give the search dates, and any restrictions (e.g. language or publication period). Do NOT enter the full search strategy (it may be provided as a link or attachment.)

The search will be conducted in English by the review team (KHS/JM/MR). The sources of the information will be identified by searching electronic databases such as MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO, CINAHL, Cochrane Library, PubMed and other methods like contacting experts, checking articles, reference lists and Additionally, reference lists of articles will be consulted as well as a group of experts in the field of violence against women and girls. The list of websites is included in the attachment containing the full search strategy search terms.

An initial search including various forms of violence against women and girls has been conducted to provide the breath of search terms and MeSH terms.

For inclusion, studies had to be (a) based on empirical data, (b) written in English, (c) published in a peer reviewed journal, (d) published up to 2018. Scholarly or theoretical papers, editorials, commentaries, and articles published in any language other than English were excluded from the review.

Full search strategy search terms: The following terms were searched with Boolean operator and wildcard variants depending on the databases' demands:
sexual violence violence against girls OR sexual violence against women OR VAW* OR domestic violence OR GBV OR gender violence OR gender-based violence OR partner violence OR abuse of women OR wife abuse OR abuse of wives OR wife battering OR battering of wives OR battering of women OR spouse abuse OR family violence OR murdering of women OR homicides of women OR honor killing OR rape OR sexual violence OR sexual abuse OR sexual assault OR sexual harassment OR coerced sex OR unwanted sex OR unwanted fondling OR unwanted touching OR harmful traditional practices OR sexual slavery AND empirical OR review OR meta-analysis OR overview OR summary OR synthesis
AND
prevent* or intervention* or program* or approaches or trial* or evaluation* or response* or evidence or impact* or effect* or efficacy OR what works

17. URL to search strategy.

Give a link to a published pdf/word document detailing either the search strategy or an example of a search strategy for a specific database if available (including the keywords that will be used in the search strategies), or upload your search strategy.Do NOT provide links to your search results.

Alternatively, upload your search strategy to CRD in pdf format. Please note that by doing so you are consenting to the file being made publicly accessible.

Do not make this file publicly available until the review is complete

18. * Condition or domain being studied.

Give a short description of the disease, condition or healthcare domain being studied. This could include health and wellbeing outcomes.

Sexual assault or sexual violence (SV) perpetrated against women and girls in South Africa The outcomes are self-reported experience of incident SV or sexual assault when seeking medical attention.

19. * Participants/population.

Give summary criteria for the participants or populations being studied by the review. The preferred format

includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Inclusion: Women and girls who report as victims of sexual violence over the age of 15 and seek medical attention in a recognised healthcare facility

Exclusion:

- where the report of sexual violence/assault does not relate to seeking medical attention in stated clinical setting

- participants who are reported as female but are children or babies

20. * Intervention(s), exposure(s).

Give full and clear descriptions or definitions of the nature of the interventions or the exposures to be reviewed.

Any methods or approaches stated as providing support to women and girls who experience sexual assault or sexual violence when seeking medical attention. This may include referral pathways, voluntary organisations or safe houses.

21. * Comparator(s)/control.

Where relevant, give details of the alternatives against which the main subject/topic of the review will be compared (e.g. another intervention or a non-exposed control group). The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Not applicable

22. * Types of study to be included.

Give details of the types of study (study designs) eligible for inclusion in the review. If there are no restrictions on the types of study design eligible for inclusion, or certain study types are excluded, this should be stated. The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Only empirical studies that investigated sexual violence/assault will be included. If the study uses mixed methods, only the qualitative part of it will be extracted. Inclusion will not be restricted by ascertainment of sexual violence, as long as sexual violence events are reported separately from other types of violence or abuse (for example financial or psychological violence).

Inclusion criteria:

• Population are female victims of sexual violence

• Study population are residents of South Africa

• Sample are recruited that report accessing healthcare in any clinical setting

• Studies reporting primary data

• Published in English and peer reviewed

• Time Period: No date restriction will be applied

Exclusion criteria:

• Study population that may be reported as South African but the study setting is not in South Africa

• Study type: experimental studies, studies testing interventions, studies reporting quantitative results only

23. Context.

Give summary details of the setting and other relevant characteristics which help define the inclusion or exclusion criteria.

In this context healthcare facilities will include acute hospitals, primary community hospitals, local clinics or community based healthcare clinics. Any clinical setting where patients will seek medical attention relating to a sexual assault or sexual violence.

24. * Main outcome(s).

Give the pre-specified main (most important) outcomes of the review, including details of how the outcome is defined and measured and when these measurement are made, if these are part of the review inclusion criteria.

This paper sets out to identify the scope and quality of academic research that has been conducted to understand the experiences of victims of sexual violence or sexual assault who seek medical attention in any healthcare facilities in South Africa. South Africa has a high prevalence of sexual violence/assault against women and girls compared to other African countries.

Timing and effect measures

25. * Additional outcome(s).

List the pre-specified additional outcomes of the review, with a similar level of detail to that required for main outcomes. Where there are no additional outcomes please state ‘None’ or ‘Not applicable’ as appropriate to the review

None

Timing and effect measures

26. * Data extraction (selection and coding).

Describe how studies will be selected for inclusion. State what data will be extracted or obtained. State how this will be done and recorded.

Data selection: The relevance of the topic, objective and methods of the study will be checked="checked" value="1". In the first stage duplication will be checked="checked" value="1". In the second stage, the title of study will be screened for exclusion. In the third stage, abstracts of the studies will be screened. Lastly, the contents of remaining articles will be accessed and included based on the inclusion criteria. The review authors will independently screen the titles and abstracts retrieved by the searches against the inclusion/exclusion criteria, to determine which records are relevant and should be included within the review. We will obtain the full reports of all titles which appear to meet the inclusion criteria, or over which there is uncertainty. The review team will then screen the full text reports to determine whether they meet the inclusion criteria.

Reasons for review exclusion will be noted and included in a PRISMA diagram (using the Eppi-Reviewer).

The study authors will not be blinded to the journal authors, titles or review institutions.

Data extraction: Basic data to be extracted: study authors or agency, year; location of health care facility, type of health care facility, age groups. In addition we well record study design; the quality of the evidence on specific support interventions; research strengths based on the literature; research gaps based on the literature.

To ensure collaborative and synergistic abstraction, the reviewer team will compare their results after assessing articles in order to determine whether the crib sheet, theory and also the initial review and extraction results are providing useful information which will aid in addressing the aims and objectives of this review. Reviewers will resolve disagreements by discussion, and advisory panel who will act as a reviewer in the event that there are any unresolved issues during the data collection and abstraction processes.

27. * Risk of bias (quality) assessment.

Describe the method of assessing risk of bias or quality assessment. State which characteristics of the studies will be assessed and any formal risk of bias tools that will be used.

All papers are reviewed by two members of the review team using CASP and a system developed by Schuermans (2013) to measure truth value applicability, consistency and neutrality. Both qualitative and quantitative studies are graded for bias and limitations.

28. * Strategy for data synthesis.

Provide details of the planned synthesis including a rationale for the methods selected. This **must not be generic text** but should be **specific to your review** and describe how the proposed analysis will be applied to your data.

A descriptive synthesis will be utilised to firstly identify common themes from the reported experiences of women and girls. Secondly the synthesis will group the typology of sexual violence and sexual assault and describe any interventions for support provided when working with victims and survivors of sexual violence and sexual assault.

29. * Analysis of subgroups or subsets.

State any planned investigation of 'subgroups'. Be clear and specific about which type of study or participant will be included in each group or covariate investigated. State the planned analytic approach.

It is anticipated that due to the complexity of reporting sexual violence there will be limited analysis of sub groups within this review.

30. * Type and method of review.

Select the type of review and the review method from the lists below. Select the health area(s) of interest for your review.

Type of review

Cost effectiveness
No

Diagnostic
No

Epidemiologic
No

Individual patient data (IPD) meta-analysis
No

Intervention
No

Meta-analysis
No

Methodology
No

Narrative synthesis
Yes

Network meta-analysis
No

Pre-clinical
No

Prevention
No

Prognostic
No

Prospective meta-analysis (PMA)
No

Review of reviews
No

Service delivery
No

Synthesis of qualitative studies
No

Systematic review
Yes

Other
No

Health area of the review

Alcohol/substance misuse/abuse
No

Blood and immune system
No

Cancer
No

Cardiovascular
No

Care of the elderly
No

Child health
No

Complementary therapies
No

Crime and justice

No

Dental
No

Digestive system
No

Ear, nose and throat
No

Education
No

Endocrine and metabolic disorders
No

Eye disorders
No

General interest
No

Genetics
No

Health inequalities/health equity
No

Infections and infestations
No

International development
No

Mental health and behavioural conditions
No

Musculoskeletal
No

Neurological
No

Nursing
No

Obstetrics and gynaecology
No

Oral health
No

Palliative care
No

Perioperative care
No

Physiotherapy
No

Pregnancy and childbirth
No

Public health (including social determinants of health)
No

Rehabilitation
No

Respiratory disorders
No

Service delivery
No

Skin disorders
No

Social care
No

Surgery
No

Tropical Medicine

No

Urological
No

Wounds, injuries and accidents
No

Violence and abuse
Yes

31. Language.

Select each language individually to add it to the list below, use the bin icon to remove any added in error.
English

There is an English language summary.

32. Country.

Select the country in which the review is being carried out from the drop down list. For multi-national collaborations select all the countries involved.
England

33. Other registration details.

Give the name of any organisation where the systematic review title or protocol is registered (such as with The Campbell Collaboration, or The Joanna Briggs Institute) together with any unique identification number assigned. (N.B. Registration details for Cochrane protocols will be automatically entered). If extracted data will be stored and made available through a repository such as the Systematic Review Data Repository (SRDR), details and a link should be included here. If none, leave blank.

34. Reference and/or URL for published protocol.

Give the citation and link for the published protocol, if there is one

Give the link to the published protocol.

Alternatively, upload your published protocol to CRD in pdf format. Please note that by doing so you are consenting to the file being made publicly accessible.

No I do not make this file publicly available until the review is complete

Please note that the information required in the PROSPERO registration form must be completed in full even if access to a protocol is given.

35. Dissemination plans.

Give brief details of plans for communicating essential messages from the review to the appropriate audiences.

In addition to producing a report for the funders of this review, which will be made available free of charge on their website, a paper will be submitted to a leading journal in the field of sexual and gender-based violence.

The advisory group for this review are drawn from South African policy and voluntary sector organisations who will receive details about the review findings to affect change in policy and recommendations for future direction.

Do you intend to publish the review on completion?

Yes

36. Keywords.

Give words or phrases that best describe the review. Separate keywords with a semicolon or new line. Keywords will help users find the review in the Register (the words do not appear in the public record but are

included in searches). Be as specific and precise as possible. Avoid acronyms and abbreviations unless these are in wide use.

sexual violence, women and girls, South Africa, healthcare facilities, nurses, doctors,

37. Details of any existing review of the same topic by the same authors.

Give details of earlier versions of the systematic review if an update of an existing review is being registered, including full bibliographic reference if possible.

38. * Current review status.

Review status should be updated when the review is completed and when it is published. For newregistrations the review must be Ongoing.
Please provide anticipated publication date

Review_Ongoing

39. Any additional information.

Provide any other information the review team feel is relevant to the registration of the review.

40. Details of final report/publication(s).

This field should be left empty until details of the completed review are available.

Give the link to the published review.