

Evidence Profile 2.1: *Promoting 2SLGBTQI+ Health Equity*

Evidence Profile

Recommendation Question: Should the creation of safe spaces in health-care organizations (including schools) 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 2.1: The expert panel recommends schools create safer spaces for students that include gender and sexuality alliances (GSAs).

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>Retention/return of patients (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) Follow-up: Previous month, previous 30 days, previous 4 weeks</p>													
4	Cross-sectional	Very Serious ^a	Serious ^b	Serious ^c	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 yet significant 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

Evidence Profile 2.1: Promoting 2SLGBTQI+ Health Equity

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		
							3061: USA	3061: Presence or absence of a Gender Sexuality Alliance (GSA) in middle and high schools.	ABL x LGB -.027 (.020) 3061: Missing school GSA Interaction term NR (p>0.05) ANTI-BULLYING POLICIES Interaction term NR (p>0.05)		3061: GSA and anti-bullying policies had null effect on missing school.		3061: Kosciw, Palmer, Kull, et al., 2013
							5232: USA	5232: Inclusive policies that attend to sexual orientation and gender identity	5232: 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).		5232: SOGI-focused policies in schools were associated with lower truancy in LGB and transgender youth.		5232: Day, Ioverno, Russell, 2019
							6970: USA	6970: Two types of school supports related to safe spaces:	6970: Final Coefficient Estimates and Standard Errors:		6970: There was a significant GSA and sexual orientation interaction for truancy. These simple main effects indicated a pattern in which LGBTQ		6970: Poteat, Sinclair, DiGiovanni

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				
								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	Truancy: GSA and sexual orientation: -.08** (.03) **p < .01 Estimated Means for Simple Main Effects GSA and Sexual Orientation: LGBTQ: No GSA: 0.27 GSA: 0.16		youth in schools with GSAs reported lower truancy.		, et al., 2012	
<p>Perceived safety of patients (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) Follow-up: 1 year (prospective study), Previous year, past school year, past 30 days (cross-sectional studies)</p>														
16	Cross-sectional (15) Prospective (1)	Serious ^d	Not serious ^e	Serious ^f	Not serious	None						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 presences of safer spaces in schools was associated with an increase in perceived safety.	⊕⊕○○ Low	
							457: USA	457: The exposure of interest was being denied access to identity-congruent school restrooms and/or locker rooms by school staff.	457: Sexual assault RR unrestricted vs restricted transgender boys 1.26 (95% CI: 1.02–1.52; P = .042)	NA	457: Unrestricted bathroom and locker room access was associated with decreased sexual assault among transgender boys, transgender girls and non-binary AFAB.		457: Murchison, Agenor, Reisner, 2019	

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</u>: USA</p> <p><u>704</u>: Presence or absence of state anti-bullying laws (ABL) or enumerated anti-bullying laws.</p>	<p>nonbinary AFAB youth 1.42 (95% CI: 1.10–1.78; P = .012) transgender girls 2.49 (95% CI: 1.11–4.28; P = .027) nonbinary AMAB (P = .673).</p> <p><u>704</u>: Bullying victimization for LGB youth (N = 242,827) Estimated coefficient (SD) ABL -.009 (.019) Enum. ABL .005 (.013) LGB .222*** (.023) LGB .222*** (.023) ABL x LGB -.055* (.023) Enum. ABL x LGB -.056* (.023)</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>704</u>: Seelman and Walker, 2018</p>
							<p><u>733</u>: USA</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 anti-bullying policies, peer intervention, and teacher intervention.</p>	<p><u>733</u>: Within the LGBTQ subsample, independent samples t-test results indicated a significantly higher mean LGBTQ victimization score among students who reported a GSA (M = 1.61, SD= .95), when compared to students who did not report a GSA (M = 1.25, SD =</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>733</u>: De Pedro, Lynch & Esqueda, 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>3061</u>: USA</p>	<p><u>814</u>: Six practices that are thought to contribute to a supportive/welcoming climate for LGBT students.</p> <p>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><u>3061</u>: Two types of school supports relevant 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). 4. Comprehensive antibullying/ harassment</p>	<p>.66); t(146) D 2.51, p < .05).</p> <p><u>814</u>: Students attending schools with more supportive LGBT climate had significantly 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>3061</u>: GSA: Interaction term - 0.04 (p<0.05) ANTI-BULLYING POLICIES: Interaction term NR (p>0.05)</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>3061</u>: Having a GSA in school was related to a decreased incidence of anti-LGBT victimization. Anti-bullying policies had a null effect.</p>		<p><u>814</u>: Gower, Forster, Gloppen, et al., 2018</p> <p><u>3061</u>: Kosciw, Palmer, Kull, et al., 2013</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>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>Safe space</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 < 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 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>	No safe space	<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><u>3821:</u> Burk, Park & Saewyc, 2018</p> <p><u>3863:</u> Li, Wu,</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>5232</u>: USA</p> <p><u>6172</u>: USA</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><u>5232</u>: Presence or absence of GSA in middle and high schools.</p>	<p><u>3863</u>: Increased GSA length significantly predicted increased school-level perceived safety among LGB students (b = 1.57, SE = 0.21, p<.001). 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><u>5232</u>: Sexual orientation moderated the relationship between SOGI-focused policies in schools and: 1. Victimization (b=-.12, p=.002) 2. Bullying: SOG bullying (AOR=.93, CI [.87-.99]) 3. School climate: (b=.03, p≤.001)</p>		<p><u>3863</u>: Perceived school safety increased as GSA length increased.</p> <p><u>5232</u>: SOGI-focused policies were associated with less victimization and, to a modest extent, with less SOG-bullying for LGB youth.</p> <p><u>6172</u>: Youth were less likely to report experiencing frequent homophobic and gender-based bullying in schools with GSA's and/or LGBTQ-focused</p>		<p>Marshall, et al., 2019</p> <p><u>5232</u>: Day, Ioverno, Russell, 2019</p> <p><u>6172</u>: Day, Fish, Grossman, et al., 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: GSAs and LGBTQ-focused policies	6172: Logistic Regression Analysis GSA only (no policy) Homophobic bullying: (OR 1.33, [95% CI 0.76-2.33]) Gender-Based Bullying: (OR 1.12, [95% CI 0.59-2.15]) GSA, LGBTQ-focused policies unsure Homophobic bullying: (OR 0.45, [95% CI 0.28-0.70]) p<.001 Gender-Based Bullying: (OR 0.50, [95% CI 0.30-0.84]) p=<.01 LGBTQ-focused Policies only (no GSA) Homophobic bullying: (OR 0.37, [95% CI 0.19-0.71]) p=<.01 Gender-Based bullying: (OR 0.62, [(95% CI 0.31-1.23)]) GSA & LGBTQ-focused policies: Homophobic bullying: (OR 0.55, [95% CI 0.36-0.83]) p=<.01 Gender-Based bullying:		policies. LGBTQ-focused policies may be particularly effective for addressing homophobic bullying, and GSA's for gender-based bullying.		6303: Saewyc, Konishi,

Evidence Profile 2.1: Promoting 2SLGBTQI+ Health Equity

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>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><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< .05 LGB Girls 0.61 (0.40-0.93) p< .05</p> <p>Explicit SD Policy LGB Boys 0.59 (0.31-1.13) LGB Girls 0.75 (0.46-1.21)</p>	<p>(OR 0.53, [95% CI 0.33–0.86]) p< .05</p>		<p><u>6303</u>: 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 significantly lower odds of discrimination.</p>		Rose, et al., 2014
							<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 < 0.001 perceived safety: at school: year 1: 3.24 (0.77) year 2: 3.36 (0.69) p= 0.023</p>			<p><u>6381</u>: 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>: Ioverno, Belser, Baiocco, et al, 2016</p>
							<p><u>6970</u>: USA</p> <p><u>6970</u>: Two types of school supports related to safe spaces:</p>	<p><u>6970</u>: Final coefficient estimates and (SE) General victimization:</p>			<p><u>6970</u>: There were no GSA main or interactive effects for general or homophobic victimization.</p>		<p><u>6970</u>: Poteat, Sinclair, DiGiovanni, et al., 2012</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			
								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	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 X S.O.: GSA X S.O.: .14 (.06) p < .05 GSA X S.O.: .04 (.06) GSA X Gender: .03 (.02) Estimated means for simple main effects: Homophobic victimization: Sexual Orientation X Gender: Heterosexual: Male: 0.37 Female: 0.20 LGBTQ: Male: 1.15 Female: .12				

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		
							8861: USA	8861: SOGIE-inclusive anti-bullying policies	8861: Differences in LGBT students' feelings of safety and victimization: Mean (SE) Feelings of safety: No/unidentified policy: Sexual orientation: .68 (.02) Gender expression: .48 (.02) Generic policy: Sexual orientation: .66 (.01) Gender expression: .45 (.01) SOGIE-inclusive policy: Sexual orientation: .62 (.01) Gender expression: .43 (.01) Victimization based on sexual orientation: No/unidentified policy: Verbal harassment: 3.10 (.05) Physical harassment: 1.88 (.04) Physical assault: 1.44 (.03) Generic policy:		8861: Policy type had significant main effects on LGBT students' feelings of safety based on sexual orientation and feelings of safety based on gender expression. Policy type also had significant main effects on all 3 types of victimization based upon students' sexual orientation and gender expression		8861: Kull, Greytak, Kosciw, et al., 2016

Evidence Profile 2.1: Promoting 2SLGBTQI+ Health Equity

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		
									Verbal harassment 3.07 (.02) Physical harassment: 1.87 (.02) Physical assault: 1.40 (.02) SOGIE-inclusive policy: Verbal harassment 2.88 (.02) Physical harassment: 1.71 (.02) Physical assault: 1.32 (.02) Victimization based on gender expression: No/unidentified policy: Verbal harassment 2.59 (.05) Physical harassment: 1.63 (.04) Physical assault: 1.30 (.03) Generic policy: Verbal harassment 2.53 (.03) Physical harassment: 1.60 (.02) Physical assault: 1.26 (.01) SOGIE-inclusive policy: Verbal harassment 2.41 (.03)				

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			
							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: 1.53 (.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) Hedges' g homophobic victimization: 0.08 (-0.06- 0.22)		3293: Fear for safety is negatively associated with presence of a GSA (favours presence of a GSA). Homophobic victimization is slightly associated with a GSA (favours no presence of a GSA) however the confidence interval is wide.		3293: Toomey, McGuire and Russell. 2012

^a 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.

^b 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.

^c All studies were from an indirect school setting. We downgraded by 1.0.

^d Studies were assessed using the ROBINS-I risk of bias tool. 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.

^e 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.

^f 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 (including schools) for 2SLGBTQI+ persons be recommended?

Recommendation 2.1: The expert panel recommends schools create safer spaces for students that include gender and sexuality alliances (GSAs).

Aim: To explore the perceived benefits of safe spaces for 2SLGBTQI+ persons on perceived safety and patient experience.

Bibliography: 1325, 1435, 2040, 2317, 2318, 2656, 5012

Findings: Findings: GSAs: LGBTQ participants described the important role GSAs had in creating a sense of community, peer support and LGBTQ advocacy. Bathrooms: Participants expressed a need for gender-neutral bathrooms (1325, 1435, 2040)							
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		
1325: Porta et al., 2017a 1435: Porta et al., 2017b 2040: Elliott, 2016 2317: McCormick et al., 2015 2318: Roe, 2015 2656: St John et al., 2014	1325: In-depth interviews (go along interviews) thematic analysis 1435: In-depth interviews (go along interviews) thematic analysis 2040: participant observations, short interviews, informal conversations, in-depth	Moderate concerns (3 studies with some concerns and 3 with high risk of bias)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	⊕⊕⊕○ Moderate confidence	The finding was graded as moderate confidence due to moderate concerns over methodological limitations of the individual studies.

	<p>interviews and Ethnography</p> <p>2317: semi-structured in-depth interviews and Grounded theory</p> <p>2318: In-depth interviews and Phenomenology</p> <p>2656: Semi-structured interviews and modified grounded theory</p>						
<p>Finding: LGBTQ participants in high school GSAs experienced feelings of safety not only within these groups but also across the greater school context.</p>							
<p>1325: Porta et al., 2017a</p> <p>5012: Fetner, Elafros, Bortolin, et al., 2012</p>	<p>1325: In-depth interviews (go along interviews) thematic analysis</p> <p>5012: semi-structured interviews with thematic analysis</p>	<p>Minor concerns (2 studies rated with some concerns for risk of bias. Risk of bias issues related to reflexivity and ethical issues)</p>	<p>No concerns</p>	<p>No concerns</p>	<p>Moderate concerns (only 2 studies contributed to this finding, so data richness is lacking)</p>	<p>⊕⊕○○ Low confidence</p>	<p>The finding was graded as low confidence due to moderate concerns over data richness and minor concerns about the methodological limitations of the individual studies.</p>