

# Making sexual and reproductive healthcare environments safe and supportive for disclosure of sexual violence

Caswell, Rachel J; Ross, Jonathan DC; Bradbury-Jones, Caroline

DOI:

[10.1136/sextrans-2024-056140](https://doi.org/10.1136/sextrans-2024-056140)

## Document Version

Peer reviewed version

## Citation for published version (Harvard):

Caswell, RJ, Ross, JDC & Bradbury-Jones, C 2024, 'Making sexual and reproductive healthcare environments safe and supportive for disclosure of sexual violence: interview findings from patients and healthcare professionals using a realist approach', *Sexually Transmitted Infections*. <https://doi.org/10.1136/sextrans-2024-056140>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

## Publisher Rights Statement:

This article has been accepted for publication in *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, 2024, following peer review, and the Version of Record can be accessed online at: <https://doi.org/10.1136/sextrans-2024-056140>

© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2024

## General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

## Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

## Sexually Transmitted Infections

**Making sexual and reproductive healthcare environments  
safe and supportive for disclosure of sexual violence:  
Interview findings from patients and healthcare  
professionals**

Journal:	<i>Sexually Transmitted Infections</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Caswell, Rachel; University Hospital Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Sexual Health and HIV Medicine Ross, Jonathan; University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Sexual Health and HIV Medicine Bradbury-Jones, Caroline ; University of Birmingham, School of Nursing and Midwifery
Keywords:	QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, SEXUAL HEALTH, Delivery of Health Care

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 WHAT IS ALREADY KNOWN ON THIS TOPIC  
4

5 Sexual and Reproductive Health Services (SRHS) have previously been identified as places  
6  
7 where disclosure of sexual violence (SV) occurs.  
8

9  
10 WHAT THIS STUDY ADDS  
11

12 This is the first time that data has been collected from both service users and healthcare  
13  
14 professionals to identify mechanisms needed to create an environment for safe and supportive  
15  
16 disclosure of SV.  
17

18  
19 HOW THIS STUDY MIGHT AFFECT RESEARCH, PRACTICE OR POLICY  
20

21 For those practicing in SRHS the findings will help to create a safe and supportive environment  
22  
23 for disclosure of SV with an emphasises on ensuring appropriate mechanisms (for example,  
24  
25 service users feeling in control during the consultation) are promoted. Our findings provide  
26  
27 valuable insights into the essential components required to improve service delivery for those  
28  
29 who have experienced SV. The major implications are for healthcare planners, providers and  
30  
31 educators in service commissioning and delivery.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Title

Making sexual and reproductive healthcare environments safe and supportive for disclosure of sexual violence: Interview findings from patients and healthcare professionals

## Introduction

Sexual violence (SV) remains highly stigmatized and considerable barriers persist for individuals to seek help and redress which are exacerbated by widespread myths about what defines ‘real rape’ and the concept of a ‘legitimate victim’ (1,2).

Healthcare input after SV addresses the associated risks to health, including pregnancy; sexually acquired infections (STIs) such as *Chlamydia trachomatis*, hepatitis B and HIV; genital and other physical injury; acute and chronic pelvic pain; as well as psychological morbidity. Healthcare settings can also act as a conduit to access further care and support such as counseling, safeguarding, social and legal advice, collection of forensic evidence and police reporting. STI and blood borne virus testing, treatment and management, contraceptive provision, and health promotion/disease prevention are provided through healthcare services such as the national network of Sexual and Reproductive Health Services (SRHS) in the United Kingdom.

Barriers to accessing this support vary but can include a fear not being believed, of being blamed, and of not having control of what happens next (3). Furthermore, the accessing of healthcare can in itself be challenging. People can fear specific aspects of the medical check-up, like the taking of genital swabs, as they may trigger traumatic memories of the SV (4). Although disclosure seems to be desirable for many individuals who have experienced SV and has a role to play in recovery (5,6), the relationship between disclosure and benefit (or harm) to the individual is not straightforward (7,8). Disclosure outcomes vary, for example according to

1  
2  
3 the responses to disclosure, the characteristics of the SV and to whom the disclosure is made  
4  
5 (see summary by <sup>9</sup>). Disclosure may also be a process rather than a single event and attempts to  
6  
7 correlate outcomes to a single and partial disclosure may not be possible <sup>(10)</sup>. Despite these  
8  
9 complexities, most people choose to disclose SV at some point <sup>(11, 12)</sup>.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 This study is part of a larger project, which includes a realist review, on resolving the gap  
15  
16 between the challenges faced when seeking support and having a safe healthcare environment  
17  
18 to disclose SV [reference held for peer review]. The review provided the basis for this study  
19  
20 where we used a qualitative realist approach to further investigate what key changes are needed  
21  
22 within health services to ensure they are safe and acceptable for survivors of SV.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 **Methods**

### 29 *Choice of realist approach*

30  
31  
32  
33 Achieving the outcome of a safe and supportive environment for disclosure of SV is  
34  
35 challenging, as potential barriers exist at personal, interpersonal, institutional and societal  
36  
37 levels <sup>(13)</sup>. A realist approach acknowledges the complexity of the ‘messy’ healthcare  
38  
39 intervention required to stimulate change in such contexts <sup>(14)</sup>. Not only does it consider  
40  
41 interventions, but a realist approach also looks at why they work and in what context. The ‘why  
42  
43 they work’ or mechanism element is central to realism. Mechanisms are often hidden but real,  
44  
45 and can be viewed as the reasoning and reactions to interventions.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 *Recruitment and participants*

52  
53  
54 A purposive sampling strategy was used to identify study participants including service users,  
55  
56 healthcare professionals and a third sector organization worker. The service users were  
57  
58 interviewed 1-1 and had all previously disclosed SV within a SRHS setting. Healthcare  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 professionals and a third sector organization worker participated in focus groups. They were  
4 recruited through two SRHS UK National Health Service sites and through one UK based third  
5 sector organization specialising in advocacy and support after SV.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

### 11 *Data collection*

12  
13  
14 The interviews were semi-structured and conducted face-to-face, via Zoom videoconference,  
15 by telephone or by email communication as requested by the service user. Interviews lasted  
16 approximately one hour. RJC carried out all interviews. A qualitative realist approach was  
17 used for the interviews. This involved the ‘teacher-learner cycle’ realist technique in which  
18 ‘theories are placed before the respondents for them to comment on, with a view to confirming,  
19 denying and refining the theory’<sup>(15)</sup>. The focus group interviews with healthcare staff and other  
20 professionals promoted the generation of ideas and theory development using discussion  
21 between group members.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 *Data analysis and synthesis*

36  
37 Interviews were audio recorded, transcribed verbatim and uploaded to the NVivo qualitative  
38 data analysis software. Recurrent themes relating to the creation of a safe setting for SV  
39 disclosure were identified in the transcripts. Each transcript was also analysed retroductively  
40 which is consistent with a scientific realism approach<sup>(16)</sup>. Retroduction is ‘the identification of  
41 hidden causal forces [mechanisms] that lie behind identified patterns or changes in those  
42 patterns’<sup>(17)</sup>. A second member of the research team (CB-J) reviewed the analysis of a random  
43 selection of interview transcripts. Any inter-reviewer disagreement was resolved by discussion  
44 between the three authors.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Results

There were three focus groups (made up of 6, 4 and 5 people) incorporating a range of healthcare professionals, including two doctors, five nurses, seven health advisors and a counsellor. There was also representation from a third sector organisation specialising in advocacy after SV. Eighteen service users were interviewed, 12 by Zoom videoconference, four face-to-face, one by telephone and one by email (table 1).

**Table 1 Background characteristics of service users (n=18)**

Characteristics	N (%)
Age (years)	
18-24	7 (39%)
25-34	5 (28%)
35-44	4 (22%)
>45	2 (11%)
Sex assigned at birth	
Male	3 (17%)
Female	15 (83%)
Ethnicity	
White British	7 (39%)
White other	1 (5%)
Asian British	4 (22%)
Black	4 (22%)
Mixed race	1 (5%)
Other	1 (5%)
Gender identity	
Man	2 (11%)
Woman	15 (83%)
Transwoman	1 (5%)
Sexuality	
Heterosexual	13 (72%)
Homosexual	2 (11%)
Pansexual	2 (11%)
No label	1 (5%)
Religion	
Christian	5 (28%)
Muslim	3 (17%)
Other	2 (11%)

None	7 (39%)
Disability (self-identified)	
Yes	11 (61%)
No	7 (39%)

Findings were organised around the mechanisms that users and healthcare professionals reported to be important in creating a safe and supportive healthcare environment for disclosure of SV.

*Service users feeling empowered to seek help and believing they will be viewed as candidates for care on disclosure of SV.*

Those interviewed expressed a wish to have been given information about sexual health services, such as location and opening hours.

I definitely don't think it's advertised enough because like I had to go out of my way to try and find a clinic. Participant 18

The interviews not only highlighted the need to promote detailed and accurate information about the service on offer but also the need to challenge widely held harmful stereotypes regarding SV, also known as rape myths. Examples of rape myths include 'men don't get raped', 'disabled people don't get raped' and 'she wanted it as she didn't fight back' were alluded to in the interviews. The importance of promotional material where these myths are challenged, where individuals recognise themselves as candidates for healthcare and assume their disclosure will be validated irrespective of presentation was noted.

I'm a partial wheelchair user but I don't see anyone in a wheelchair on a rape poster. So, it's trying to like, you know, you need to feel you're represented. Participant 08

I mean it sounds really obvious but kind of, no kind of judgment. Participant 05

The silence surrounding SV also creates a barrier to a safe and supportive environment for disclosure. Using promotional material to inform people that they will be listened to, and their



1  
2  
3 disclosure validated by healthcare professionals, irrespective of ethnicity, disability status,  
4  
5 gender, age or clinical presentation was found to be important.  
6

7  
8 I think I mentioned earlier, just about the concept of being silenced, so...I think  
9 healthcare, particularly sexual health clinics, should be the place where you're  
10 heard and believed. Participant 03  
11

12  
13 *Healthcare professionals being confident and competent in their role and supporting a healing*  
14 *relationship alongside service users having choice, feeling listened to and in control.*  
15

16  
17 The interviews described support for a trauma informed approach and helped to explain why  
18 aspects of this approach resulted in the desired outcome of a safe and supportive environment.  
19  
20 For example, the importance of providing choice and giving control back to service users was  
21 emphasised.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 You have to always come back to the fact that once you've been abused, raped,  
28 violated, choice was gone, choice was taken, urr... options were taken, you were  
29 forced into it, you weren't free, someone controlled you, [...] and you've always  
30 got to kind of [think], how can I give that back to somebody? Participant 02  
31  
32

33 The interviews provided examples of specific service interventions felt to be important to  
34 implement during the care process.  
35

36  
37 And we do of course offer choice of gender of health care professional. Focus  
38 group #3 (Doctor)  
39

40  
41 However, even with the use of routine enquiry (asking all who attend about potential exposure  
42 to SV in order to provide support) the mechanism for ensuring the service user still has choice  
43 and control was seen as central.  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 Give people a choice, again that's, that I think is being quite trauma informed, it's  
49 giving them choices and options but not insisting that they respond in anyway, they  
50 may just shrug their shoulders and say, "I don't want to answer," or they may think,  
51 "okay, the door is open." Focus group (SV Advocate)  
52  
53

54 The relationship between healthcare professional and service user was viewed as  
55 essential for creating a safe and supportive environment for disclosure. Service users  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 appear dissatisfied with the medical model of disease approach to care and they spoke of  
4  
5 the importance of demonstrating compassion and of building a nurturing relationship.  
6  
7

8 You can't have that 'doctor front' all the time. Participant 10  
9

10 I mean, you can, you can talk to me all day long about what AIDS means, what  
11 syphilis means, chlamydia means, medically, but my life's falling to pieces. [...]   
12 You know you *need* to go, "hang on a minute, this is a human being that I am  
13 [speaking to]" Participant 02  
14

15 Also, it's the trust...trust is such a hard thing. Participant 02  
16  
17

18 Part of responding well to disclosure and building a therapeutic relationship between healthcare  
19 professional and service user was to have well-trained professionals, who are confident and  
20 competent during this consultation.  
21  
22

23 I think it's the clinician being comfortable to flex [the guidelines] and that's where  
24 training would come in really. Because if somebody feels that they've got to do  
25 everything in the guideline, that patient isn't going to get their trauma managed and  
26 their patient centred care addressed. It's just going to be a tick box exercise which  
27 sometimes it can be unfortunately if clinicians aren't comfortable. Focus group #1  
28 (Specialist nurse)  
29  
30  
31

32 To be competent in responding safely to SV requires a significant level of understanding  
33 of the value of a therapeutic relationship:  
34  
35

36 I think it can be hard because sometimes we're so solution based and we want to  
37 feel like we can do everything for that person and we want to feel like they've left  
38 here and we've felt like we've done something for them and sometimes you know  
39 they just don't want anything and we just have to accept that, which can be hard.  
40 Focus group #1 (Nurse)  
41  
42  
43

44 The interviews did elicit some potential unintended outcomes. For example, even with choice,  
45 some service users felt that rather than empowering people to speak out by using routine  
46 enquiry it had the potential to be a negative experience:  
47  
48  
49

50 But for me, like even like the word [rape], I've not been able to like even *say* the  
51 word or read the word since what happened to me, like I avoid any article, any  
52 news anything, in relation to that because it's really triggering to me. [...] Even  
53 though I know that's not a constant reminder but like if I'm not ready to speak  
54 about it I don't want to be reminded about it [with use of routine enquiry].  
55 Participant 18  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Discussion

To create a safe and supportive healthcare setting where people can disclose SV and access medical care this study has identified specific mechanisms which are needed to overcome the considerable barriers survivors face. Our findings recognise the diversity of people affected by SV and calls for services to incorporate this knowledge into the promotion of services to help individuals who have experienced SV to see themselves as potential service users, feel able to seek help, know that their disclosure will be listened to and feel validated irrespective of their clinical presentation or background. Another way to empower potential service users is to confront the silence that surrounds SV. The conspiracy of silence, described as 'an agreement to say nothing about an issue that should be generally known' has been recognised within this research field since Butler's early work on the conspiracy of silence surrounding incest<sup>(18, 19)</sup>. Evidence from the 1-1 interview sources described a fear of reprisal, fear of disbelief, fear of victim blaming, and cultural related fears e.g., family shame if/when sexual violence and abuse was out in the open. However, despite these fears the majority of the same interviewees still wished to have it more openly spoken about. It was felt that if SV was more widely discussed then this may 'normalise' disclosure and make accessing support easier. If sexual health services are not using promotional material which tackles these barriers to care then there is an associated risk of perpetuating the silence and limiting access to healthcare.

SRHS health care delivery using a trauma informed approach, with a focus on the relationship between service user and healthcare provider, can create a context for the mechanisms of having choice, feeling in control and being listened to. The principles of a trauma informed approach have been widely published and include those of safety, trustworthiness, collaboration, empowerment and choice<sup>(20)</sup>. A trauma informed approach aims to make services more accessible for those who have experienced trauma and is not about delivering

1  
2  
3 treatment for specific trauma or traumas. A specific practice which can promote disclosure,  
4 and is considered acceptable in this setting, is routine enquiry about SV <sup>(21)</sup>. Within some  
5  
6 healthcare settings we theorise that routine enquiry for SV promotes a safe and supportive  
7  
8 environment and is in keeping with a trauma informed approach as it normalises discourse  
9  
10 about SV, removes stereotypic barriers because the enquiry is non-selective, and minimises the  
11  
12 risk of re-traumatisation by offering a choice as to whether to answer or not.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 During the interviews we found the context of a biomedical approach to healthcare created  
20  
21 barriers and could block mechanisms important within trauma informed practice such as  
22  
23 feeling empowered and of having choice during the healthcare consultation. This is especially  
24  
25 relevant because the biomedical approach, with its focus on biological factors of disease, can  
26  
27 result in the patient becoming a passive participant. Some interviewees explained how the focus  
28  
29 on diseases such as ‘AIDS or *Chlamydia*’ became a barrier to experiencing a supportive  
30  
31 consultation. This highlights the importance of identifying service user priorities, ensuring they  
32  
33 have choice over their health plan and the important role of the relationship between the  
34  
35 individual and the healthcare provider, which support a move away from historical models of  
36  
37 healthcare. Rocca and Anjum argue that a more holistic approach with an ‘ecological shift in  
38  
39 medicine’ is ‘not only necessary but also unavoidable, if we acknowledge that human biology  
40  
41 is genuinely complex and we truly reflect on the meaning and implications of this’ <sup>(22)</sup>.  
42  
43 Delivering trauma-informed care embraces this holistic approach and results in a model where  
44  
45 services, provided for and used by all, become more accessible for those who have experienced  
46  
47 trauma.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 The implementation of a trauma informed approach will involve healthcare professional  
57  
58 training. This training ensures healthcare professionals are aware of the impact of trauma, have  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 a focus on the importance of building rapport and trust, and address the power imbalance in  
4 the consultation. We concur with Rocca and others that this change in practice should start  
5 from a change in ontology, in how we view the world and what medical models we adhere to,  
6 rather than focus only on specific interventions <sup>(22, 23)</sup>. In practice, if this fundamental change  
7 in the approach to care is to be considered <sup>(4, 24, 25)</sup>, changes to the teaching at an undergraduate  
8 level will also be needed <sup>(26)</sup>.  
9

10  
11  
12 Potentially negative outcomes associated with potential SV disclosure were identified in the  
13 interviews, e.g., retraumatising by the seeing of posters about SV or through a reminder of the  
14 SV through use of routine enquiry, are important to note. Through increased awareness of the  
15 potential impact on service users whilst promoting SV disclosure, retraumatisation can be  
16 minimised though not fully eliminated by those working in this setting <sup>(9)</sup>. For example, when  
17 a service employs routine enquiry, service users must feel they have choice and control over  
18 whether they answer or not. During focus group interviews adhering strictly to guidelines was  
19 not always seen as a creating an optimal environment for service users: 'if somebody  
20 [healthcare professional] feels that they've got to do everything in the guideline, that patient  
21 isn't going to get their trauma managed and their patient centred care addressed'. Copeland, in  
22 her chapter *The Guidelines Challenge*, acknowledges there is a 'tension between clinical  
23 guidelines, based on general medical knowledge and aimed toward standardisation, and their  
24 use in the clinical encounter, based on local knowledge about the patient and aimed toward  
25 tailored interventions' <sup>(22)</sup>. In the implementation of changes in service delivery, training and  
26 service promotion to improve the care of those who have experienced SV, our findings  
27 emphasise that sensitive and nuanced approaches are needed so that negative outcomes are  
28 minimised.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Limitations

We were unable to include non-English speaking participants due to study resource constraints, and these individuals are likely to face additional barriers to safe and supportive disclosure in SRHS. Another challenge was in ensuring the emphasis was on creating a safe and supportive environment for disclosure rather than on always promoting disclosure. Although evidence points to the benefits of disclosure, a positive outcome is not guaranteed. One of the most important factors as to whether disclosing is beneficial or not, is the response of the disclosure recipient (27-30). To this end our study focuses on creating and ensuring a safe and supportive environment within healthcare, ready to receive and respond to SV disclosures. Finally, the interpretative nature of the baseline review and of this study's findings makes it possible that others might arrive at different conclusions. However, we believe that the transparency of our methodology will allow our approach to be followed by others and permit transferability. The conclusions drawn are also consistent with our extensive knowledge of the field as clinicians and researchers. We know that safe and supported disclosure following SV are important, but until now, the mechanisms that need to be enacted to facilitate this have been poorly understood. Our findings therefore make an important contribution to better meeting the healthcare needs of survivors of SV.

## References

1. AbiNader MA. Talking (or Not) About Sexual Violence: Newspaper Coverage of the Confirmation Hearings of Justices Thomas and Kavanaugh. *Journal of interpersonal violence*. 2021;36(23/24):NP13337.
2. Armstrong EA, Gleckman-Krut M, Johnson L. Silence, power, and inequality: An intersectional approach to sexual violence. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2018;44(1):99-122.
3. Lanthier S, Du Mont J, Mason R. Responding to Delayed Disclosure of Sexual Assault in Health Settings: A Systematic Review. *Trauma, violence & abuse*. 2018;19(3):251-65.
4. Ades V, Wu SX, Rabinowitz E, et al. An Integrated, Trauma-Informed Care Model for Female Survivors of Sexual Violence: The Engage, Motivate, Protect, Organize, Self-Worth, Educate, Respect (EMPOWER) Clinic. *Obstetrics and gynecology*. 2019;133(4):803-9.
5. Scoglio AAJ, Lincoln A, Kraus SW, et al. Chipped or Whole? Listening to Survivors' Experiences With Disclosure Following Sexual Violence. *Journal of interpersonal violence*. 2022;37(9-10):Np6903-np28.
6. Littleton HL. The impact of social support and negative disclosure reactions on sexual assault victims: a cross-sectional and longitudinal investigation. *Journal of trauma & dissociation : the official journal of the International Society for the Study of Dissociation (ISSD)*. 2010;11(2):210-27.
7. Ullman SE, Foynes MM, Tang SS. Benefits and barriers to disclosing sexual trauma: a contextual approach. *J Trauma Dissociation*. 2010;11(2):127-33.
8. Ullman SE. Is Disclosure of Sexual Traumas Helpful? Comparing Experimental Laboratory Versus Field Study Results. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*. 2011;20:2:148-62.
9. Ullman SE. Correlates of Social Reactions to Victims' Disclosures of Sexual Assault and Intimate Partner Violence: A Systematic Review. *Trauma, violence & abuse*. 2023;24(1):29-43.
10. Alaggia R, Collin-Vézina D, Lateef R. Facilitators and Barriers to Child Sexual Abuse (CSA) Disclosures: A Research Update (2000-2016). *Trauma, violence & abuse*. 2019;20(2):260-83.
11. Filipas HH, Ullman SE. Social reactions to sexual assault victims from various support sources. *Violence Vict*. 2001;16(6):673-92.
12. Fisher BS, Daigle LE, Cullen FT, et al. Reporting Sexual Victimization To The Police And Others: Results From a National-Level Study of College Women. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 2003;30(1):6-38.
13. [REDACTED]
14. Shearn K, Allmark, M., Piercy, H., Hirst, J. Building Realist Program Theory for Large Complex and Messy Interventions. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 2017;16:1-11.
15. The RAMESES II Project. The Realist Interview [http://www.ramesesproject.org/media/RAMESES\\_II\\_Realist\\_interviewing.pdf](http://www.ramesesproject.org/media/RAMESES_II_Realist_interviewing.pdf) (last accessed 13 May 2023) [http://www.ramesesproject.org/media/RAMESES\\_II\\_Realist\\_interviewing.pdf2017](http://www.ramesesproject.org/media/RAMESES_II_Realist_interviewing.pdf2017) [
16. The RAMESES II Project. Retrodution in Realist Evaluation [https://www.ramesesproject.org/media/RAMESES\\_II\\_Retrodution.pdf](https://www.ramesesproject.org/media/RAMESES_II_Retrodution.pdf) (last accessed 13 May 2023)2017 17 May 2023.
17. Greenhalgh PR, Wong G, Westhorp G, Greenhalgh J, Manzano A, Jagosh J. Retrodution in Realist Evaluation. The RAMSES II Project

1  
2  
3 [http://www.ramesesproject.org/media/RAMESES\\_II\\_Retroductionpdf](http://www.ramesesproject.org/media/RAMESES_II_Retroductionpdf) Accessed 18 October  
4 2019. 2017.

5  
6 18. Oxford Dictionary. a conspiracy of silence. Oxford Reference. Retrieved 5 Jul. 2023,  
7 from <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803095633567>. 2003  
8 [Available from:  
9 <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803095633567>.

10  
11 19. Butler S. Conspiracy of silence : the trauma of incest / by Sandra Butler. San Francisco:  
12 New Glide Publications; 1978.

13 20. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). SAMHSA's  
14 Concept of Trauma and Guidance for a Trauma-Informed Approach 2014. Available from:  
15 <http://store.samhsa.gov>.

16 21. [REDACTED]

17  
18  
19 22. Rocca E, Anjum RL. Complexity, Reductionism and the Biomedical Model. In: Anjum  
20 RL, Copeland S, Rocca E, editors. Rethinking Causality, Complexity and Evidence for the  
21 Unique Patient: A CauseHealth Resource for Healthcare Professionals and the Clinical  
22 Encounter. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2020. p. 75-94.

23 23. van Teijlingen E. A Critical Analysis of the Medical Model as used in the Study of  
24 Pregnancy and Childbirth. Sociological Research Online. 2005;10(2):63-77.

25 24. Elisseou S, Puranam S, Nandi M. A Novel, Trauma-Informed Physical Examination  
26 Curriculum for First-Year Medical Students. MedEdPORTAL. 2019;15:10799.

27 25. Kirkner A, Lorenz K, Ullman SE. Recommendations for Responding to Survivors of  
28 Sexual Assault: A Qualitative Study of Survivors and Support Providers. Journal of  
29 interpersonal violence. 2017;886260517739285.

30 26. Sharma M. Applying feminist theory to medical education. Lancet (London, England).  
31 2019;393(10171):570-8.

32 27. Ahrens CE CG, Abeling S. . Healing or hurtful: Sexual assault survivors'  
33 interpretations of social reactions from different support providers. Psychology of Women  
34 Quarterly. 2009;33:81-94.

35 28. Campbell R, Wasco SM, Ahrens CE, et al. Preventing the 'second rape': rape survivors'  
36 experiences with community service providers. Journal of interpersonal violence.  
37 2001;16(12):1239-59.

38 29. Koon-Magnin S, Schulze C. Providing and Receiving Sexual Assault Disclosures:  
39 Findings From a Sexually Diverse Sample of Young Adults. Journal of interpersonal violence.  
40 2019;34(2):416-41.

41 30. Starzynski LL, Ullman SE, Filipas HH, et al. Correlates of women's sexual assault  
42 disclosure to informal and formal support sources. Violence Vict. 2005;20(4):417-32.

#### 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 Funding award

50 Doctoral funding from Umbrella, University Hospitals Birmingham.

#### 51 52 53 Competing Interests

54 JDR reports personal fees from GSK Pharma, Hologic Diagnostics, Mycovia and Janssen  
55 Pharma as well as ownership of shares in GSK Pharma and AstraZeneca Pharma; and is  
56 author of the UK and European Guidelines on Pelvic Inflammatory Disease; is a Member of  
57 the European Sexually Transmitted Infections Guidelines Editorial Board; is a Member of the  
58 National Institute for Health Research Funding Committee (Health Technology Assessment  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 programme). He is an NIHR Journals Editor and associate editor of Sexually Transmitted  
4 Infections journal. He is an officer of International Union against Sexually Transmitted  
5 Infections (treasurer), and a charity trustee of the Sexually Transmitted Infections Research  
6 Foundation.  
7  
8

#### 9 Ethics

10 Ethical approval for the study was granted by Health Research Authority (REC reference  
11 19/WM/0297 IRAS project ID 266583). Informed consent was obtained for all interviews  
12 either written, or verbal when interviews were not face to face.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60