

## Evidence Profile

**Recommendation Question:** Should safe spaces in health-care organizations for 2SLGBTQI+ persons be recommended?

**Population:** 2SLGBTQI+ persons, across the lifespan

**Intervention:** Safe spaces in health-care organizations (can include safe processes, presence of forms, signs and policies that reflect a safe space)

**Comparator:** Standard practice in health-care organizations

**Outcomes:** Patient experience [Critical, qualitative evidence only], Perceived safety of patients [Important], Retention/return of patients [Important], Representation of patients and providers (diverse cultural groups, gender, race, class, orientation, etc.) [Important; not found within this quantitative literature]

**Recommendation 2.0:** The expert panel recommends health service organizations create safer spaces for 2SLGBTQI+ people through a multi-component approach.

**Setting:** All health care settings (the question was expanded to included school settings)

**Bibliography:** 457, 704, 733, 814, , 3061, 3821, 3863, 5232, 6172, 6303, 6381, 6970, 8861, 2436, 6008, 3293

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings Reported effects/outcomes	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space			
<p><b>Retention/return of patients</b> (Assessed using: fear-based absenteeism, as measured by the number of days in the prior month they had missed school because of feeling uncomfortable or unsafe, truancy, missing school)  <b>Follow-up:</b> Previous month, previous 30 days, previous 4 weeks</p>													
4	Cross-sectional	Very Serious <sup>a</sup>	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	Not serious	None	704: USA	704: Presence or absence of state anti-bullying laws (ABL) or enumerated anti-bullying laws.	704: Fear-based absenteeism for LGB youth (N = 251,556)  Estimated Coefficient (SD) LGB youth ABL .026 (.009) Enum. ABL -.005 (.007) LGB or not sure .108*** (.018) LGB .106*** (.018) ABL x LGB/not sure -.030 (.020) Enum.	NA	Overall findings suggest that creating a safer space through a multi-component approach may improve return of persons as measured by missing class.  704: The estimation results yielded a small reduction in fear-based absenteeism for youth overall in states with a general anti-bullying law (a reduction of 1.4% absenteeism for LGBQ students).	⊕○○○  Very low	704: Selman and Walker, 2018

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space	Reported effects/outcomes		
							<p><u>3061:</u> USA</p>	<p><u>3061:</u> Presence or absence of Gay-Straight or Gender Sexuality Alliance (GSA) in middle and high schools.</p>	<p>ABL x LGB -.027 (.020)</p> <p><u>3061:</u> Missing school</p> <p>GSA Interaction term NR (p&gt;0.05)</p> <p>ANTI-BULLYING POLICIES Interaction term NR (p&gt;0.05)</p>		<p>3061: GSA and anti-bullying policies had null effect on missing school.</p>		<p><u>3061:</u> Kosciw, Palmer, Kull, et al., 2013</p>
							<p><u>5232:</u> USA</p>	<p><u>5232:</u> Inclusive policies that attend to sexual orientation and genderidentity.</p>	<p><u>5232:</u> The number of sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI)-focused policies was associated with lower truancy. LGB youth (adjusted OR [AOR]=1.51, 95% CI [1.42–1.60]) and transgender youth (AOR=1.64, 95% [1.42–1.91]) were also more likely to be truant (b=-.39, p≤.001).</p>		<p>5232: SOGI-focused policies in schools were associated with lower truancy in LGB and transgender youth.</p>		<p><u>5232:</u> Day, Ioverno, Russell, 2019</p>

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings Reported effects/outcomes	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space			
							6970: USA	6970: Two types of school supports related to safe spaces: 1. GSA: Participants were asked whether or not their school had a gay-straight alliance or similar club addressing LGBT student issues (0 = school did not have a GSA; 1 = school had a GSA). 2. Comprehensive antibullying/harassment policy: Students were asked whether or not their school or district had an antibullying or harassment policy and, if so, whether the policy specifically included protections based on sexual orientation or gender identity or gender expression.	6970: Final Coefficient Estimates and Standard Errors: Truancy: GSA and sexual orientation: -.08** (.03) **p < .01 Estimated Means for Simple Main Effects GSA X Sexual Orientation: LGBTQ: No GSA: 0.27 GSA: 0.16		6970: There was a GSA and sexual orientation interaction for truancy. These simple main effects indicated a pattern in which LGBTQ youth in schools with GSAs reported lower truancy		6970: Poteat, Sinclair, DiGiovanni, et al., 2012
<p><b>Perceived safety of patients</b> (Assessed using: sexual assault, homophobic discrimination, self-reported victimization, homophobic bullying and school safety, homophobic victimization, fear for safety, homophobic remarks, perceived school safety, general victimization, threatened or injured with a weapon, bias-based bullying )</p> <p><b>Follow-up:</b> 1 year (prospective study), Previous year, past school year, past 30 days (cross-sectional studies)</p>													
16	Cross-sectional (15) Prospective (1)	Serious <sup>a</sup>	Not serious <sup>a</sup>	Serious <sup>f</sup>	Not serious	None	457: USA		457: Sexual assault RR		Overall, 16 studies examined perceived safety through a variety of outcome measures including bullying or victimization, fear for safety and assault. In the majority of studies, the presence of safer spaces in schools was associated with an increase in perceived safety.	⊕⊕○○  Low	

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space	Reported effects/outcomes		
							<p><u>704: USA</u></p> <p><u>704:</u> Presence or absence of state anti-bullying laws (ABL) or enumerated anti-bullying laws.</p>	<p><u>457:</u> The exposure of interest was being denied access to identity-congruent school restrooms and/or locker rooms by school staff.</p> <p>1.26 (95% CI: 1.02–1.52; P = .042)</p> <p>nonbinary assigned female at birth (AFAB) youth 1.42 (95% CI: 1.10–1.78; P = .012)</p> <p>transgender girls 2.49 (95% CI: 1.11–4.28; P = .027)</p> <p>Nonbinary assigned male at birth youth (P = .673).</p> <p><u>704:</u> Bullying victimization for LGB youth (N = 242,827)</p> <p>Estimated coefficient (SD)</p> <p>ABL -.009 (.019)</p> <p>Enum. ABL .005 (.013)</p> <p>LGB .222*** (.023)</p> <p>LGB .222*** (.023)</p> <p>ABL x LGB -.055* (.023)</p> <p>Enum. ABL x LGB -.056* (.023)</p>	<p>unrestricted vs restricted transgender boys</p> <p>NA</p>	<p><u>457:</u> Access to a safer space (unrestricted bathroom and locker room) was associated with decreased sexual assault among transgender boys, transgender girls and non-binary AFAB.</p>		<p><u>457:</u> Murchison, Agenor, Reiser, et al., 2019</p>	
							<p><u>733: USA</u></p> <p><u>733:</u> Intervention was LGBTQ affirming school climate defined by LGBTQ support, the presence of a gay-straight alliance (GSA), the presence of LGBTQ issues in the curriculum, the presence of enumerated</p>	<p><u>733:</u> Within the LGBTQ subsample, independent samples t-test results indicated a higher mean LGBTQ victimization score among students</p>			<p><u>704:</u> The existence of a general anti-bullying law meant that roughly 6.4% fewer LGB students were bullied in a given year.</p> <p><u>733:</u> Victimization was decreased with when a GSA was present. Anti-bullying policies had a null effect on victimization.</p>		<p><u>704:</u> Seelman and Walker, 2018</p> <p><u>733:</u> De Pedro, Lynch, et al., 2018</p>

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings	Certainty	Reference	
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space	Reported effects/outcomes			
							<p><u>814</u>: USA</p> <p><u>814</u>: Six practices that are thought to contribute to a supportive/welcoming climate for LGBT students. Climate indicators included (1) having a point person in the school for LGBT student issues, (2) displaying content specific to sexual orientation where students can see it (e.g., bulletin boards, posters, LGBT figures in history), (3) having a gay-straight alliance (GSA) or similar club, (4) providing professional development about LGBT student issues, (5) providing professional development around LGBT inclusion in curriculum and school climate, and (6) discussing bullying based on sexual orientation with students.</p>	<p>anti-bullying policies, peer intervention, and teacher intervention.</p>	<p>who reported a GSA (M = 1.61, SD= .95), when compared to students who did not report a GSA (M = 1.25, SD = .66); t(146) D 2.51, p &lt; .05).</p>		<p><u>814</u>: Students attending schools with more supportive LGBT climate had lower odds of relational bullying victimization (OR = .96; CI: .92-.99), physical bullying perpetration (OR = .93; CI: .89-.98), and sexual orientation-based harassment (OR = .95; CI: .91-.998) when compared to students attending schools with less supportive LGBT climate.</p>	<p><u>814</u>: Students attending schools with more supportive climates had higher perceived safety on relational and physical bullying and sexual-based harassment.</p>		<p><u>814</u>: Gower, Forster, Gloppen, et al., 2018</p>
							<p><u>3061</u>: USA</p>	<p><u>3061</u>: Two types of school supports relevant to safe spaces:</p>	<p><u>3061</u>: GSA: Interaction term - 0.04 (p&lt;0.05) ANTI-BULLYING</p>		<p><u>3061</u>: Having a GSA in school was related to a decreased incidence of</p>		<p><u>3061</u>: Kosciw, Palmer,</p>	

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space	Reported effects/outcomes		
							<p><u>3821:</u> Canada</p>	<p>1. GSA: Participants were asked whether or not their school had a gay-straight alliance or similar club addressing LGBT student issues (0 = school did not have a GSA; 1 = school had a GSA).</p> <p>4. Comprehensive antibullying/ harassment policy: Students were asked whether or not their school or district had an antibullying or harassment policy and, if so, whether the policy specifically included protections based on sexual orientation or gender identity or gender expression.</p> <p><u>3821:</u> "Out in Schools" programs delivered at various schools across British Columbia since 2004. A program designed to reduce sexual orientation prejudice and foster inclusive school attitudes. This is a LGBTQ film-based intervention that presents the film and then hosts facilitated dialogues about the film afterwards, discussing themes of gender, sexuality and LGBTQ lived experiences.</p>	<p>POLICIES: Interaction term NR (p&gt;0.05)</p> <p><u>3821:</u> Relationships between BCAHS health outcome measure and the # of Interventions offered from 2009-2013 for LGB students. Odds Ratios (95% CI): * p &lt; 0.5 1. Discrimination LGB students: Unadjusted: Boys: 0.87 (0.72, 1.06) Girls: 0.88 (0.77, 1.01) Adjusted: Boys: 0.89 (0.73, 1.08) Girls: 0.92 (0.80, 1.06) 2. Bullying</p>		<p>anti-LGBT victimization. Anti-bullying policies had a null effect.</p> <p><u>3821:</u> Out in Schools appears to have an additive contribution to reducing orientation prejudice and improving LGB student wellbeing within schools. Out in Schools presentations were associated with reduced odds of LGB students experiencing discrimination, and LGB girl students being bullied.</p>		<p>Kull, et al., 2013</p> <p><u>3821:</u> Burk, Park &amp; Saewyc, 2018</p>

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space	Reported effects/outcomes		
							<p><u>3863</u>: Canada</p>	<p><u>3863</u>: Researchers conducted multiple group, multiple level (MG-ML) analysis to examine the relation between GSA length and school-level perceived safety among LGB students, within and across the three survey cycles</p>	<p>Teased/Harassed in last year: Unadjusted: Boys: 0.82 (0.67, 1.00)* Girls: 0.89 (0.80, 0.99)* Adjusted: Boys: 0.84 (0.68, 1.02) Girls: 0.92 (0.82, 1.03)</p> <p><u>3863</u>: Increased GSA length predicted increased school-level perceived safety among LGB students (b = 1.57, SE = 0.21, p&lt;.001).</p> <p>When school-level perceived safety was standardized, the corresponding estimate was 0.32; that is, for every one more year since the GSA was established, there was a 0.32 SD increase in standardized school-level perceived safety among LGB students.</p>		<p>3863: Perceived school safety increased as GSA length increased.</p>		<p><u>3863</u>: Li, Wu, Marshall, et al., 2019</p>
							<p><u>5232</u>: USA</p>	<p><u>5232</u>: Presence or absence of GSA in middle and high schools.</p>	<p><u>5232</u>: Sexual orientation moderated the relationship between SOGI-focused policies in schools and: 1.</p>		<p>5232: SOGI-focused policies were associated with less victimization and, to a modest extent, with less SOG-bullying for LGB youth.</p>		<p><u>5232</u>: Day, Ioverno, Russell, 2019</p>

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space	Reported effects/outcomes		
							6172: USA	6172: GSAs and LGBTQ-focused policies	Victimization (b=-.12, p=.002) 2. Bullying: SOG bullying (AOR=.93, CI [.87-.99]) 3. School climate: (b=.03, p<.001)		6172: Youth were less likely to report experiencing frequent homophobic and gender-based bullying in schools with GSA's and/or LGBTQ-focused policies. LGBTQ-focused policies may be particularly effective for addressing homophobic bullying, and GSA's for gender-based bullying.		6172: Day, Fish, Grossman, et al., 2019



Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings Reported effects/outcomes	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space			
							<p><u>6303:</u> Canada</p>	<p><u>6303:</u> GSA's in high schools and anti-homophobic bullying policies (existence and length of time since implementation)</p>	<p>(OR 0.62, [(95% CI 0.31–1.23)]) <b>GSA &amp; LGBTQ-focused policies:</b> Homophobic bullying: (OR 0.55, [95% CI 0.36–0.83]) p&lt;.01 Gender-Based bullying: (OR 0.53, [95% CI 0.33–0.86]) p&lt;.05</p> <p><u>6303:</u> Relationship between presence of GSAs or explicit school district policy and sexual orientation discrimination outcome among LGB youth: GSAs AOR, (95% CI) LGB Boys 0.47 (0.26-0.84) p&lt; .05 LGB Girls 0.61 (0.40-0.93) p&lt; .05</p> <p>Explicit SD Policy LGB Boys 0.59 (0.31-1.13) LGB Girls 0.75 (0.46-1.21)</p>		<p>6303: GSAs in schools were associated with lower odds of sexual orientation discrimination for both LGB boys and girls. LGB boys and girls in schools having both a GSA and an anti-homophobic bullying policy reported lower odds of discrimination.</p>		<p><u>6303:</u> Saewyc, Konishi, Rose, et al., 2014</p>
							<p><u>6381:</u> USA</p>	<p><u>6381:</u> Prospective study examining the influence of the presence of and participation in a GSA (Gay Straight Alliance) on school experiences.</p>	<p><u>6381:</u> N= 327 Mean homophobic bullying: year 1: 1.44 (0.86) year 2: 1.25 (0.57) p &lt; 0.001 perceived safety: at school:</p>		<p>6381: Participants reported slight improvements over time related to the experiences at school including fewer experiences of homophobic bullying, and more perceived safety at school.</p>		<p><u>6381:</u> loverno, Belser, Baiocco, et al., 2016</p>

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space	Reported effects/outcomes		
							6970: USA	6970: Two types of school supports related to safe spaces: 1. GSA: Participants were asked whether or not their school had a gay-straight alliance or similar club addressing LGBT student issues (0 = school did not have a GSA; 1 = school had a GSA). 2. Comprehensive antibullying/harassment policy: Students were asked whether or not their school or district had an antibullying or harassment policy and, if so, whether the policy specifically included protections based on sexual orientation or gender identity or gender expression	year 1: 3.24 (0.77) year 2: 3.36 (0.69) p= 0.023  6970: Final coefficient estimates and (SE) General victimization: GSA: .16* (.08) p < .05 Sexual Orientation: .37 (.05) p < .001 Gender: .12 (.06) Gender X S.O.: .02 (.07) GSA X S.O.: .13 (.07) GSA X Gender: .02 (.03)  Homophobic victimization: GSA: .03 (.06) SO: .90 (.04) p < .001 Gender: .02 (.06) Gender and S.O.: GSA X S.O.: .14 (.06) p < .05 GSA and S.O.: .04 (.06) GSA and Gender: .03 (.02)  Estimated means for simple main effects: Homophobic victimization:		6970: There were no GSA main or interactive effects for general or homophobic victimization.		6970: Poteat, Sinclair, DiGiovanni, et al., 2012

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings Reported effects/outcomes	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space			
							8861: USA	8861: Sexual orientation, gender identity and expression (SOGIE)-inclusive anti-bullying policies	Sexual Orientation and Gender: Heterosexual: Male: 0.37 Female: 0.20 LGBTQ: Male: 1.15 Female: .12  8861: Differences in LGBT students' feelings of safety and victimization: Mean (SE) Feelings of safety: <b>No/unidentified policy:</b> Sexual orientation: .68 (.02) Gender expression: .48 (.02) <b>Generic policy:</b> Sexual orientation: .66 (.01) Gender expression: .45 (.01) <b>SOGIE-inclusive policy:</b> Sexual orientation: .62 (.01) Gender expression: .43 (.01) Victimization based on sexual orientation: <b>No/unidentified policy:</b>		8861: Policy type had main effects on LGBT students' feelings of safety based on sexual orientation and feelings of safety based on gender expression. Policy type also had main effects on all 3 types of victimization based upon students' sexual orientation and gender expression		8861: Kull, Greytak, Kosciw, et al., 2016

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings Reported effects/outcomes	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space			
									Verbal harassment 3.10 (.05) Physical harassment: 1.88 (.04) Physical assault: 1.44 (.03) <b>Generic policy:</b> Verbal harassment 3.07 (.02) Physical harassment: 1.87 (.02) Physical assault: 1.40 (.02) <b>SOGIE-inclusive policy:</b> Verbal harassment 2.88 (.02) Physical harassment: 1.71 (.02) Physical assault: 1.32 (.02) Victimization based on gender expression: <b>No/unidentified policy:</b> Verbal harassment 2.59 (.05) Physical harassment: 1.63 (.04) Physical assault: 1.30 (.03) <b>Generic policy:</b> Verbal harassment 2.53 (.03)				

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space	Reported effects/outcomes		
							2436: USA	2436: a supportive school climate is measured with multiple items; one item is the presence of a Gay–Straight Alliance (GSA), an organized group promoting social identification among gay youth and positive support of gay identification by members of the straight community.	Physical harassment: 1.60 (.02) Physical assault: 1.26 (.01) <b>SOIGIE-inclusive policy:</b> Verbal harassment 2.41 (.03) Physical harassment: 1.53 (.02) Physical assault: 2.59 (.02)		2436: Hedges' g for homophobic victimization: 0.04 (-0.06- 0.13)	2436: There was no difference of homophobic victimization with or without a GSA	2436: Davis, Stafford and Pullig, 2014
							6008: USA	6008: participation in Gay–Straight Alliance (GSA)–related social justice activities, GSA presence, and GSA membership.	6008: Hedges' g fear for safety: -0.20 (-0.49- 0.10)		6008: Fear for safety is negatively associated with presence of a GSA (favours presence of a GSA) though the confidence interval is wide.	6008: Toomey and Russell, 2013	
							3293: USA	3293: Presence of a GSA	3293: Hedges' g fear for safety: -0.12 (-0.26- 0.02)		3293: Fear for safety is negatively associated with presence of a GSA (favours presence of a GSA).	3293: Toomey, McGuire	

Quality assessment							Study details		No. of participants/events		Summary of Findings Reported effects/outcomes	Certainty	Reference
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Country	Intervention	Safe space	No safe space			
									Hedges' g homophobic victimization: 0.08 (-0.06- 0.22)		Homophobic victimization is slightly associated with a GSA (favours no presence of a GSA) however the confidence interval is wide.		and Russell, 2012

- <sup>a</sup> Studies were assessed using the ROBINS-I risk of bias tool. Two studies were rated as serious risk of bias, two were rated as moderate risk of bias. Reasons for downgraded including inadequate controlling for confounding and missing data. We downgraded by 1.
- <sup>b</sup> Majority of studies had a positive direction of effect. Studies used a variety of outcome measures for attendance of students or return and retention of patients. We downgraded by 0.5.
- <sup>c</sup> All studies were from an indirect school setting. We downgraded by 1.0.
- <sup>d</sup> Studies were assessed using the ROBINS-I risk of bias tool. Eight studies were rated as serious risk of bias, six were rated as moderate risk of bias and two were rated as critical risk of bias. Reasons for downgraded including inadequate controlling for confounding variables and missing data. We downgraded by 1.
- <sup>e</sup> Majority of studies had a positive direction of effect. Studies used a variety of outcome measures for perceived safety included varying definitions of bullying, harassment and victimization as well as variable likert scales and timeframes. We downgraded by 0.5.
- <sup>f</sup> All studies included were from an indirect school setting. We downgraded by 1.

**CERQual Evidence Profile**

**Recommendation Question:** Should the creation of safe spaces in health-care organizations for 2SLGBTQI+ be recommended?

**Recommendation 2.0:** The expert panel recommends health service organizations create safer spaces for 2SLGBTQI+ people through a multi-component approach.

**Aim:** To explore the perceived benefits of safe spaces for 2SLGBTQI+ persons on retention and return of patients, perceived safety, patient experience and representation of patients and providers.

**Bibliography:** 22136, 24230, 22126, 24942, 65096, 23450, 1325, 1435, 2040, 2317, 2318, 2656, 5012

<b>Finding: Finding: Safe spaces facilitated engagement and retention of participants in health and education settings (retention or return of participants).</b>							
Studies contributing to the Finding	Included study designs	CERQual Assessment				Overall CERQual Assessment of Confidence	Explanation of Judgement
		Assessment of Methodological Limitations	Assessment of Relevance	Assessment of Coherence	Assessment of Adequacy of Data		
22136: Garcia et al., 2015  24230: Pitcher, Camacho, Renn, et al., 2018	22136: participant observation and interviews with ethnographic analysis  24230: semi-structured interviews with thematic analysis	Minor concerns (One study had some concerns due to reflexivity, recruitment strategy, and data collection and analysis)	Moderate concerns (The review included studies from an indirect school setting)	No concerns (The patterns in the data were relatively clear)	Serious concerns (The data contributing to this finding was very thin)	⊕○○○  <b>Very low confidence</b>	The finding was graded as very low confidence due to serious concerns over adequacy of data, moderate concerns over relevance and minor concerns over methodological limitations of the individual studies.
<b>Finding: LGBTQ participants in safer spaces [demonstrated through anti-discrimination policy, diverse representation of staff, inclusive intake forms, 2SLGBTQI+ events, referrals to support or written materials and signs] experienced an environment where persons feel safe and comfortable (perceived safety).</b>							
5012: Fetner, Elafros, Bortolin, et al., 2012  22126: Gamarel, Walker, Rivera, et al., 2014	5012: semi-structured interviews with thematic analysis  22126: focus groups with grounded	Minor Concerns (Four studies had some concerns due to reflexivity, ethical issues, participant selection or data analysis; two had low risk of bias)	Minor Concerns (The review included some studies from an indirect school setting)	No Concerns (The patterns in the data were relatively clear)	Minor Concerns (6 studies offering moderate data richness)	⊕⊕○○  <b>Low confidence</b>	The finding was graded as low confidence due to minor concerns over methodological limitations of the individual studies, relevance and concerns of data adequacy.

22136: Garcia et al., 2015	theory analysis						
24230: Pitcher, Camacho, Renn, et al., 2018	22136: participant observation and interviews with ethnographic analysis						
65096 Leyerapf, Visse, De Beers, et al., 2018							
1325: Porta et al., 2017a	24230: semi-structured interviews with thematic analysis						
	65096: semi-structured interviews, focus groups and observation with thematic analysis						
	1325: go-along interviews with thematic analysis						

**Finding:** Safe spaces represent diverse identities beyond 2SLGBTQI+ including race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status by being inclusive and affirming. Participants also stressed the importance of LGBTQ representation in staff, at all levels of leadership (representation of patients and providers).



<p>23450: MacDonnell &amp; Davey, 2015</p> <p>24942: Sullivan, 2014</p> <p>22126; Gamarel, Walker, Rivera, et al., 2014</p>	<p>23450: semi-structured interviews with content analysis</p> <p>24942: focus groups with grounded theory analysis</p> <p>22126: focus group with grounded theory analysis</p>	<p>Moderate (Two studies had concerns related to participant recruitment and researcher reflexivity)</p>	<p>Minor (The review included one study from an indirect school setting)</p>	<p>Minor (The patterns in the data were relatively clear)</p>	<p>Serious (Only three studies offering thin data)</p>	<p>⊕○○○ <b>Very low confidence</b></p>	<p>The finding was graded as very low confidence due to serious concerns over data adequacy, moderate concerns over methodological limitations of the individual studies and minor concerns over coherence and relevance.</p>
---	---	--	--	---	--	--	---