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<td>VA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHSC</td>
<td>Women’s Health Specialty Clinic</td>
</tr>
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Currently, between 21.9 and 23 million veterans have served in the United States armed forces. Of those, 2 million are women, and of those, only 6.5% use the Veterans Health Administration system. These females often suffer from physical and mental health disorders, and overall impaired quality of life (QOL), rendering their healthcare needs complex. Seeking, and providing care in this specialty area may become overwhelming not only for the women seeking the care, but also for healthcare systems that are unfamiliar with the specific needs of this population.

A retrospective medical records review was completed of 51 female veterans between the ages of 40 and 60 years, and who attended a women’s health specialty clinic in a women’s health center in the VA healthcare system. This center provides comprehensive women’s health services to female veterans. By attending this center, female veterans are having most if not all of their healthcare needs met in one location. Some of the services provided at the center include: primary care; gynecology; other gender specific health care needs; mental health care; and social assistance among other issues that may be associated with the overall QOL and depression.

Despite this study having a small sample size ($n = 51$), the participants were ethnically diverse: White (52.9%); African American (29.4%); Hispanic/Latino (15.7%); and Asian/Pacific Islander (2%). The overall results of this study reveal that female veterans who attend this clinic, have significantly lower baseline scores for QOL when compared to a North American population reference value. Means and standard deviation for total Menopause Rating Scale (MRS) score were; ($n = 51$, $M = 21.2$, $SD = 9.2$) compared to the North American women
population reference values \((n = 1,376, M = 9.1, SD = 7.6), z = 9.41, p < .0001, \text{ cohens } d = 1.31.\)

These results were significantly lower for all MRS subsets. The higher the means and standard deviation, the lower the QOL. A paired sample \textit{t-test} indicated significant improvement in QOL after treatment in QOL \((t = 7.80, p < .0001)\), and depression levels \((t = 3.74, p < .0001)\) among female veterans attending the women’s health specialty clinic. Forward stepwise multiple linear regression models were fit to explore the association between the following variables and the outcomes of QOL and depression levels: low socioeconomic status (SES); number of deliveries; years of service; and military sexual trauma (MST). The only predictor that appeared to be significantly associated with higher MRS scores at baseline was a history of MST \((\beta = .363; t = 2.44; p = 0.02)\). Higher MRS scores can be interpreted as lower QOL among female veterans.

Despite the complexities and unique needs of female veterans, the findings of this study suggest that timely, comprehensive and gender specific healthcare can significantly improve overall QOL and depression levels. In addition, further studies are need to assess what other variables may have a direct association with QOL, depression levels, and overall health of female veterans.
CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION

Currently, between 21.9 and 23 million veterans have served in the United States armed forces. Of those, 2 million are women, and of those, roughly 6.5% use the Veterans Health Administration system (VA; deKleijn, Lagro-Janssen, Canelo, & Yano, 2015). These females often suffer from physical and mental health disorders, and overall impaired quality of life (QOL), rendering their healthcare needs complex (; National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics, 2016). Regardless of current advances in medicine, technology, and research, in the VA system, gender disparities persist and the female veteran population remains a minority in its own healthcare system (Katon et al., 2016; Washington, Farmer, Mor, Cunning, & Yano, 2015; Yano, 2015). Providing healthcare to women who have served in the Armed Forces can be a major challenge, due to the nature of the special needs of the gender. The unique needs of female veterans include issues of depression, decreased QOL, trauma, and pain; thus it becomes clear why this specialty area may be overwhelming, not only for the women seeking care, but also for healthcare systems that are unfamiliar with the specific needs of this population (Bergman, Frankel, Hamilton, & Yano, 2015).

The number of male veterans is expected to decrease from 90.4% in 2010 to 87.6% by the year 2020, with the complementary number of female veterans expected to increase from 9.6% in 2010 to 12.4% in 2020 (Department of Veterans Affairs, 2014). The expected increase in female veterans and the recent controversies regarding healthcare in the VA system, make women’s health a matter of urgency. Additional studies and innovative methods of providing
comprehensive and gender-specific care are needed to decrease the gap between genders and increase the number of female veterans seeking and receiving healthcare in this system (Atkins & Lipson, 2015; Gray, Katon, Callegari, Cordasco, & Zephyrin, 2015; Yano, 2015).

**Problem**

Although the number of female veterans in the VA healthcare system has increased over time, comprehensive healthcare continues to be fragmented (Yano, 2015). The number of female veterans using the VA healthcare system was approximately 160,000 in FY 2000, and rose to approximately 292,000 in FY 2009 (Department of Veterans Affairs, Women Veterans Task Force, 2012). Despite this increase, the disproportionate number of female veterans seeking medical care through the VA system remains about 30% less than their male counterparts. Often it is assumed that female veterans are receiving healthcare outside the VA healthcare system.

The overall health of female veterans differs greatly from that of women who are not veterans, due to military experiences and exposure to combat-related operations. Some female veterans have suffered from military sexual trauma, along with other types of military related traumas and or injuries. These experiences are often associated with mental, physical and emotional health disorders associated with QOL (Yano & Frayne, 2011). These experiences make providing healthcare to this population more complex. Thus, those who provide care to female veterans must be more in tune with the uniqueness of female veterans’ needs and make every attempt to improve the overall QOL of women who have served.

Comprehensive healthcare must facilitate the overall health of female veterans, especially those suffering from depression and impaired QOL. Depression is a devastating chronic illness that severely impacts female veterans’ QOL, causing functional decline and behavioral problems. Because of the complexity of depression, as well as the complex needs of female
veterans, this population requires prompt accessibility to multiple services during the same visit, in a location where they can feel safe and able to build trust, and work with same-gender providers or someone highly specialized in assessing the needs of this special group of women. Often, when specific care is unavailable or denied, female veterans do not seek needed medical attention, compromising their overall well-being (deKleijn et al., 2015).

Recently, researchers identified areas of concern regarding female veterans’ health. In 2008, the VA began working to improve services for female veterans. To meet the specific healthcare needs of this vulnerable population, VA healthcare workers aimed to address their needs without requiring them to seek basic women’s healthcare in other departments or facilities. In 2010, the VA mandated that primary care providers be specifically trained and current as Comprehensive Women’s Healthcare Providers (CWHP) and be available to address women’s specific healthcare concerns at one location, without inconveniencing the patient (Bergman et al., 2015; Maisel et al., 2015). Patients receiving care from CWHP tend to be happier with the care received than those not trained as CWHPs (Bastian et al., 2014) In addition, to CWHP, the VA has also designated a Women Veterans Program Manager at each VA healthcare system (N = 140) to facilitate the care and proficiency of the new initiative and future endeavors (Maisel et al, 2015). A specific need being addressed by the VA is the need for centers for female veterans in the system in the hope of increasing access to care for female veterans and decreasing the health disparity of this group (Bastian et al., 2015; Di Leone, Wang, Kressin, & Vogt, 2016; Mattocks, 2015; O’Hanlon et al., 2016; Whitehead, Czarnogorski, Wright, Hayes, & Haskell, 2014; Yano, 2015). Due to the disparity in female veterans’ health, it is crucial to assess the effect of care for female veterans in women’s centers in the VA healthcare system.
The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the health effects conferred among female veterans through attendance at a VA women’s health specialty clinic (WHSC). This included assessment of QOL and depression before and after receipt of treatment services. The study also investigated presenting symptom status of female veterans who attended the clinic in relation to the general population, and explored factors that may be associated with better treatment response at the clinic. To this end, the following specific aims were developed and investigated.

**Specific Aims and Hypothesis**

**Specific Aim 1:** To compare baseline levels of QOL among female veterans aged 40 to 60 years who use a WHSC at one of the VA’s women’s centers to normal reference values of women in the North American population, provided by the original developers of the Menopause Rating Scale (MRS; Berlin Center for Epidemiology and Health Research, 2008; Heinemann et al., 2004).

**Hypothesis 1:** The mean level of QOL among female veterans 40 to 60 years of age attending a WHSC in the VA will be significantly lower at baseline when compared to the normal reference values of a North American population provided by the original developers of the MRS (Berlin Center for Epidemiology and Health Research, 2008; Heinemann et al., 2004).

**Specific Aim 2:** To compare scores on the outcome measures (depression and QOL), over time (before and after receipt of treatment services), of female veterans 40 to 60 years of age who attend the WHSC at one of the VA’s women’s centers.

**Hypothesis 2:** Mean levels of depression and QOL among female veterans 40 to 60 years of age who attend the WHSC will improve significantly from baseline to post treatment.
**Specific Aim 3:** to investigate the extent to which socioeconomic status, length of service, military sexual trauma, and number of deliveries relate to baseline levels and treatment-related changes in measures of QOL and depression among female veterans attending the WHSC.

**Hypothesis 3:** Socioeconomics, length of service, military sexual trauma, and number of deliveries will be associated with levels of QOL and depression at baseline and after treatment completion among women veterans attending a WHSC.

**Definitions of Terms**

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined:

*Depression:* Depression (major depressive disorder or clinical depression) is a common but serious mood disorder. It causes severe symptoms that affect how you feel, think, and handle daily activities, such as sleeping, eating, or working. To be diagnosed with depression, the symptoms must be present for at least two weeks. Some forms of depression are slightly different, or they may develop under unique circumstances (The National Institute of Mental Health, 2016, p. 1).

*Quality of life:* “A multidimensional phenomenon composed of core domains that constitute personal well-being. These domains are influenced by personal characteristics and environmental factors” (Schalock, Verdugo, Gomez, & Reinders, 2016, p. 4).

*Women’s health:* “The general practice management of women’s health involves a holistic patient centered approach to the physical, mental and emotional health of women, their families, and their relationships” (The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, 2011, p. 199).
Limitations

This study presents QOL and depression levels data of female veterans using a specific WHSC in a VA women’s center. Limitations of the study are as follows:

1. Participants will be recruited specifically from a VA WHSC; thus, the population may have specific demographic and clinical characteristics that may prevent generalization of findings to other healthcare locations.

2. Due to policies of the VA system, the scales completed by the participants are entered directly into the electronic health records with summary scores. This does not permit the ability to conduct individual-item analysis.

3. The study design is an uncontrolled case series of modest size that does not permit estimation of treatment response in relation to a control condition, such as usual care.

Significance of the Study

The goal of this study is to increase the knowledge base about an underrepresented population of veterans. As the number of female veterans searching for and receiving healthcare from the VA system continues to grow, it is vital that all stakeholders prepare for the complex needs of this vulnerable population. Navigating the difficulties of the VA system and specialty requires the commitment of a multilevel and multisystem team, if the overall health and QOL of female veterans is to improve. This study will contribute to the current agenda of the VA health services research and development VA Women’s Health Research Network and may increase collaboration between clinical providers and researchers, creating opportunities for translational research on female veterans (Yano, 2015). In addition, this study will add to the database of female veteran health research, as well as that of nursing science.
CHAPTER TWO:

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Note to Reader


This chapter presents the conceptual framework, which provides guidance for review of empirical literature. This review of literature that follows includes the overall healthcare needs of female veterans, depression, and QOL among female veterans.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual model for health-related QOL hypothesizes that QOL depends highly on the interactions and levels of interactions between five major functions of an individual—biological, symptoms, functional status, general health perceptions, and overall QOL—as well as individual and environmental features that can be applied to female veterans (Ferrans et al., 2005; Katon et al., 2016). Based on prior studies, including literature about female veterans, this model facilitates understanding of the assessment, diagnosing, and treatment processes of depression among female veterans while improving their overall health and QOL (Chedraui et al., 2008).
Veterans Health Administration

Due to the overall healthcare needs of female veterans, the VA developed VHA Handbook 1330.02 (Department of Veterans Affairs, 2015) in 2010 to set forth guidelines on clinical components necessary to provide comprehensive women’s health care. Although the mandatory changes are already in place for male veterans, a discrepancy persists in the availability of the same services available for women in the VA healthcare system. Although the system has been equipped to handle high volumes of male veterans and their medical demands, it lacks some of the knowledge, resources, and ability to provide the same for its female populace (deKleijn et al., 2015; Katon et al., 2016; Whitehead et al., 2014). Despite the many advances in medicine, and the dedication by the VA to facilitate female veterans’ quality comprehensive care, the VA has been unable to meet its goals and meet the needs of female veterans.

Comprehensive care is the backbone of female veterans’ health. The fragmented care currently provided at the VA for women prompted the VA to put women’s health at the forefront of their agenda to increase knowledge among all stakeholders and improve accessibility to obtain better outcomes (Bergman et al., 2015; Department of Veterans Affairs, 2015; Wagner, Dichter, & Mattocks, 2015).
Understanding what constitutes comprehensive care for women veterans is often challenging because each individual has specific needs that differ among this vulnerable population. Healthcare providers need to consider the perceptions of these women about their needs as an integral part of their health care. Female veterans believe that access to medical care should include communication, coordination, continuity of care, and personalized care; Women consider these to be important factors in comprehensive care (Wagner et al., 2015). For example, an inability to speak to the correct individual during a perceived moment of crisis, physical or psychological, might lead to devastating outcome not only for female veterans but for all stakeholders. Women in general prefer to have all care at one facility and perhaps with one provider who is trained in caring for women’s specific issues.

Although it seems that women veterans suffer from the same physical and psychological problems (gynecological, family planning, pregnancy, depression, mental health disorders, chronic pelvic pain or pain in general, domestic violence, alcohol/drug abuse, and other comorbid illnesses and diseases) as females who are not veterans, their healthcare needs are quite different. Female veterans present differently and are often more difficult to diagnose, treat, and follow-up. Often the inability to properly care or render comprehensive care to female veteran stems from multiple variables such as providers’ lack of unfamiliarity specific to female veterans’ care, trust and mental health issues of female veterans, physical disabilities, and unique military experiences encountered by female veterans (Bergman et al., 2015).

To assist in providing gender and veteran-specific care to women, Gray et al. (2015), reviewed data from 120 emergency rooms in the VA and found that having a gynecologist available in the emergency room facilitated accessibility to gender- and veteran-specific care not only at the time of a crisis, but also for future medical needs. To date, the challenge remains in
the ability to assess the extent of policy implementation regarding women’s health in the complexities of the VA system. What remains a priority for this minority population is access to timely, quality, individualized medical care, better outcomes from depression, and the highest possible overall QOL.

The growing number of female veterans indicates a higher need for women to seek care in the VA system. If the goal is to improve the overall health outcomes of female veterans, the VA must do a better job of providing access to individualized comprehensive care in as many locations as possible but preferably in gender specific healthcare centers (deKleijn et al., 2015). When female veterans have access to their own unique comprehensive care, depression decreases, QOL improves, and overall health outcomes are better (Bastian et al., 2015; deKleijn et al., 2015; Di Leone et al., 2016).

**Depression**

Depression is one of the most prevalent diagnoses and often occurs with other mental health disorders and chronic diseases in veterans overall, with women having a higher rate of depression than male veterans. When compared to the 24% of their male counterparts, 31% of female veterans are plagued with multiple diagnoses (Department of Veterans Affairs, Women Veterans Task Force, 2012). Disparities are significant in regards to the female veteran populations and the need for early depression screening. Advances have been made in years past but the disparities are still present. For example; in 2008, 12,516 women compared to 30,644 men screened for depression. In 2009, depression screening improved and 16,619 females were screened but male screening also improved (41,176) which still represents a difference in depression screening between gender. (Whitehead et al., 2014). While depression screening has improved over the years, female veterans continue to be a minority among those receiving care at
the VA, they are a majority when referring to the diagnosis of depression among their own population (MacGregor, Hamilton, Oishi, & Yano, 2011; Oishi et al., 2011; Whitehead et al., 2014).

In 2011 and 2012, it was reported that over 200,000 women serving in the military were serving as active duty members of the Armed Forces, and approximately 113,000 were serving in the reserves and national guards, constituting a significant increase from those serving in the 1950s (Department of Veterans Affair, 2012; Bean-Mayberry et al., 2011). This increase in service and recent wars such as Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi has made women more susceptible to physical and mental health disorders in greater numbers. Gender differences often add to the difficulties and complexities of assessing and treating female veterans in a system that has been mostly male driven (Bean-Mayberry et al., 2011; Gerber, Iverson, Dichter, Klap, & Latta, 2014). By 2020, the actual percentage of women veterans will be approximately 12.4% of the Armed Forces (Department of Veterans Affairs, 2014). As years pass, and the absolute number of female veterans with depression is likely to continue to rise; thus, it is imperative that individualized care be based whenever possible on the causes of depression. In 2014, between 25 and 49% of military women were sexually abused prior to joining the military, whereas only 1 to 15% of men report the same type of abuse (Kelly, Boyd, Valente, & Czekanski, 2014).

Having been physically and or sexually abused prior to and during military service puts women at greater risk for further abuse, thereby increasing the risk for depression and other preventable diseases due to lack of care (Gerber et al., 2014; Lee, Westrup, Ruzek, Keller, & Weitlauf, 2007). For this reason, once the potential for mental illness (e.g., depression and posttraumatic stress disorder) has been identified, continual monitoring and screening is essential.
in this population. Literature shows that depression among female veterans is higher today, based on previous history of violence, higher incidence of military trauma, and combat exposure, among other causes. Those providing care to women who have served must become aware of the specific needs of these women. Increasing training of VA women’s health providers, location of care, and methods of assessment is essential to decrease distress among these women and increase participation of care in the VA (Gerber et al., 2014; Kelly et al., 2014; Lehavot, O’Hara, Washington, Yano, & Simpson, 2015). To take it a step further, the VA has begun a “gender-specific care” policy in which a veteran may choose the gender of provider for whom they would like to be treated. Choosing a gender specific provider facilitates ease in treatment and trust for female veterans who have suffered from military trauma especially sexual in nature (McGregor et al. 2011).

The Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) instrument provides a simple method to screen, diagnose, and monitor depression among female veterans. Because the PHQ-9 has been used in numerous settings, countries, and populations, it has been successfully used in the VA system and the veteran population. What remains a challenge for the VA system is identifying the providers who will actually screen, diagnose, and provide the necessary mental health services female veterans need. Although recommendations are to improve women’s health among veterans, a lack of agreement continues regarding who, where, and when such services will be provided for female veterans, including mental health services (MacGregor et al., 2011). Despite the number of women veterans seeking care in the VA, and the VA’s continual effort to provide equal care, the gap in knowledge on how to best to care for female veterans’ complicated life-altering issues remains an important concern (Kroenke, Spitzer, Williams, & Lowe, 2010; Oishi et al., 2011; Wittkampf et al., 2009). As military service, combat exposure, and depression
symptoms increase among women, it is crucial that discussion and effort remain a priority, determining how, when, and where to best provide comprehensive women’s healthcare that includes mental health services (Creech, Swift, Zlotnick, Taft, & Street, 2016). Female veterans have a higher rate of depression, which hinders multiple systems at different functional levels, and ultimately impairs QOL (Katon et al., 2016; Bastian et al., 2015).

Quality of Life

Although many researchers and healthcare providers have defined QOL differently, the assessment of QOL continues to grow across disciplines and populations. Research literature and conceptual models postulate that QOL includes all aspects of life and not just one or some aspects: individual, environmental, biological, symptomatic, functional, and general health perceptions (Ferrans et al., 2005; Schalock et al., 2016). Although this concept may be difficult to understand, assessment data about QOL allows for better understanding when assisting female veterans to improve their QOL. Challenges may arise while attempting to assess and assist women veterans with their QOL. QOL is quite subjective; thus, levels may change quickly and QOL should be continually assessed and reassessed to consider improvement or decline so appropriate measures may be taken when necessary (Schalock et al., 2016).

Current literature implies that, on average, QOL for female veterans is typically lower than that of women who are not veterans (Katon et al., 2016). Every component of a female veteran’s life has the potential to be in some type of distress or imbalance. As the numbers of female veteran continues to grow, efficient methods of assessing QOL need to be incorporated into the comprehensive model. The MRS scale has been shown to be an effective scale to evaluate all components of a women’s life in order to evaluate QOL and make necessary treatment adjustments in a timely manner (Heinemann, Potthoff, & Schneider, 2003; Schneider,
Heinemann, Rosemeier, Potthoff, & Behre, 2000). QOL and factors that play a role on its impairment have been well defined throughout the literature and concept models. For this population, a significant factor that may hinder improvement of QOL is the VA healthcare system’s lack of information and education regarding resources for women veterans.
CHAPTER THREE:

METHODS

This chapter summarizes the investigational approach and techniques that were used to address the specific aims and hypotheses. First, the design is described. This is followed by a description of: sample and setting; inclusion and exclusion criteria; instruments; procedures; and data analysis. The study was completed using a retrospective medical records review.

Sample and Setting

The sample consisted of 51 female veterans who attended a WHSC at a women’s center in the VA health care system. For Aim 1, a sample of 47 subjects detects a medium effect size of 0.50 with a significant level (alpha) of .01, achieving 80% power when comparing the baseline mean value of the study population to an external norm-based sample (Machin, Campbell, Fayers, & Pino, 1997; Zar, 1984). For Aim 2, a sample size of 51 detects a medium within-subject effect size of 0.50 with a significance level (alpha) of .01 using a two-sided paired t test achieving 81% power (Machin et al., 1997; Zar, 1984).

This study, included medical record information of (a) female veterans who were 40 to 60 years of age (b) attended the WHSC in a women’s health center in the VA system and (c) completed the MRS, and the PHQ-9 before and after treatment completion. Records reviewed for this study were strictly from a women’s only center, thus excluding record information of men and children.
Instrumentation

This investigation retrospectively reviewed the results of the MRS (Appendix B) and the PHQ-9 (Appendix C), which are included in the medical records of patients who meet the inclusion criteria. In addition, selected demographic and clinical information was extracted from the medical records.

**Menopause Rating Scale (MRS).** The MRS was developed by Heinemann et al., (2004) from the Berlin Center for Epidemiology and Health Research (2008). The MRS was validated as a health-related QOL instrument following the guidelines for QOL instruments (Heinemann et al., 2003). The MRS was developed as a self-administered instrument to assess: (a) QOL, (b) fluctuations occurring to women over time, (c) variations prior to and after therapy, (d) and to have a method from which to uniformly assess symptoms. The levels of QOL of female veterans 40 to 60 years of age were compared to a North American population’s reference values (Appendix A) provided by the Berlin Center for Epidemiology and Health Research (2008). In addition, the levels of QOL of female veterans were appraised as they changed over time.

The MRS contains a total of 11 symptoms with the severity of each symptom rated as: no symptom (0), mild (1), moderate (2), severe (3), and very severe (4). In these 11 symptom categories, three subscales were recognized as autonomous: psychological, somato-vegetative, and urogenital. These subscales account for a 58.8% total variance. The total score on the MRS may vary from 0 (no symptoms) to 44 (severe symptoms). A variation in score depends on the severity of symptoms on each subscale. Instrument validity and reliability have been studied extensively. Validity of this instrument was completed after comparing the means of 9,300 women from different clinic types and nine different countries who self-administered the MRS; despite a small difference among religious groups and cultures, the symptoms appeared to be
quite similar (Berlin Center for Epidemiology and Health Research, 2008; Heinemann, et al., 2004).

In addition, criterion validity was also evaluated. Correlation with the Kupperman Index, and the SF 36 were found to be closely related. When compared to the Kupperman Index, the Kendall’s tau-$b$ coefficient was 0.75 (95% CI 0.71–0.80), and a Pearson correlation coefficient was found to be $r = 0.91$ (95% CI 0.89–0.93; and $r = 0.48$ 95% CI 0.58–0.37; Berlin Center for Epidemiology and Health Research, 2008; Heinemann et al., 2004). The SF 36 was also found to have a significantly related Kendall’s tau-$b$ = 0.43 (95% CI 0.52–0.35) for the somatic domains; a Kendall’s tau-$b$ = 0.49 (95% CI 0.56–0.41) for the psychological domain; and a Pearson correlation coefficient $r = 0.73$ (95% CI 0.81–0.65; Berlin Center for Epidemiology and Health Research, 2008; Heinemann et al., 2004). Researchers assessed the reliability of the instrument through Cronbach’s alphas which ranged between .83 and .86. Test–retest correlation across four continents was strong (0.8–0.9; Berlin Center for Epidemiology and Health Research, 2008; Heinemann et al., 2004).

The Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9). The PHQ-9 questionnaire is designed to monitor, identify, observe, and evaluate the severity of depression (Kroenke, Spitzer, & Williams, 2001). This questionnaire is self-administered and integrates nine questions that meet the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th ed.) depression standards. The PHQ-9 may be used repeatedly to assess if a client is improving or deteriorating over time. The total score on the PHQ-9 fluctuates between 0 and 27. Every question can be answered as 0 (not at all) to 3 (nearly every day) with higher numbers indicating worse depression. The total score for gravity of depression may range from 5 (mild) to 10 (moderate), 15 (moderately severe), and 20 (severe depression).
Kroenke et al. (2001), assessed validity by comparing the results of 3,000 primary care patients from eight offices to those of 3,000 obstetrics–gynecology patients from seven offices. After comparing the results of the primary care group and those of the obstetrics–gynecology group, the researchers established the following: the correlation between the severity of depression and functional status were the same between the two groups, the level of functioning highly correlated with the level of depression (mental health issues) rather than to pain or other variables, and “most pairwise comparisons within each SF-20 scale between successive PHQ-9 levels were highly significant” (Kroenke et al. p. 609). The researchers evaluated criterion validity through interviews conducted by mental health professionals. The final evaluation concluded that the “the area under the curve for PHQ-9 in diagnosing major depression was 0.95 suggesting a test that discriminates well between persons with and without major depression.” Kroenke et al. (2001), estimated internal-consistency reliability using Cronbach’s alpha. The resulting alphas varied only slightly between primary care clinics (.89), and the obstetrics–gynecology clinics (.86).

**Demographic Data**

Demographic data was collected to describe the sample. Data included age, ethnicity, marital status, medical insurance, employment status, years of service, number of deliveries, history of sexually transmitted infection, sexually active, location of deployment or era served, trauma experiences encountered while in the military, and military branch served. Low socioeconomic status was derived from the medical insurance and employment status variables. Data was accrued on all qualified participants using a chart audit form (Appendix D). Variables in the instrument are those identified in previous studies with a similar population and assisted in addressing the aims and hypotheses of this study.
Procedures

Approvals

To extract data from electronic medical records, approval for this study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the University of South Florida (Appendix E), as well as from the James A. Haley Veterans Hospital Research and Development Committee (Appendix F) prior to initiating any data collection. Because this was a retrospective medical-record investigation, a waiver of informed consent and a waiver of Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act authorization was granted.

Data Collection Procedures

The Computer Patient Record System using a VA-approved password to the firewall-protected computer system was entered to access patient data. Electronic health records reviewed were specifically of patients who attended the WHSC at one of the women’s centers in the VA. The collaborating physician previewed potential participants from January 1, 2014 to October 1, 2016. Records were reviewed and data was collected until the need sample size of 51 was achieved. A master list was not created, and all data collected was completely de-identified. None of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act 18 identifiers were collected as part of this study. Data collected was from entry to clinic (baseline) until end of treatment (3 to 12 months depending on patient’s needs). Participants completed the MRS and PHQ9 at every visit.
Data Analysis

First data was analyzed to describe the sample using frequencies and percentages.

**Hypothesis 1:** The mean level of QOL among female veterans 40 to 60 years of age attending a WHSC in the VA will be significantly lower at baseline when compared to that of the non-veteran North American population’s reference values. This hypothesis was evaluated by use of a one-sample z-test comparing mean values from the WHSC in the VA to reference values in the general population.

**Hypothesis 2:** Mean levels of depression and QOL among female veterans 40 to 60 years of age attending the WHSC in a women’s center in the VA system will improve significantly from baseline to post-treatment. Means scores on the outcome measures (depression and QOL) were collected over time where subjects served as their own controls. Mean baseline levels of depression and QOL were compared to mean values at follow-up assessment by use of paired t tests.

**Hypothesis 3:** Low socioeconomic status, length of service, military sexual trauma, and number of deliveries will be associated with levels of QOL and depression at baseline and after treatment completion among women veterans attending a WHSC. To investigate the manner in which socioeconomic status, length of service, military sexual trauma, and number of deliveries are associated to QOL and depression levels among female veterans attending a WHSC in a women’s center in the VA system, forward stepwise multiple linear regression was used.
Data Management

To ensure confidentiality and privacy, all data were collected through the use of password, firewall, a VA-secured computers and systems. The Computer Patient Record System facilitated review and collection of data. All study data were stored on the secured drive which is only on VA-approved computers and in the VA system. The current VA policy does not allow data destruction. De-identified data was collected in compliance with strict management procedures and in accordance with the policies and procedures set forth by the VA Research and Development Office Research Data Security and Privacy Policy. All data were stored and maintained on a Microsoft SQL server or Microsoft Access back-end database. The server is managed by the VAs Office of Information and Technology and data are backed up nightly. A password-protected file using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 23 data-analysis system was used for data entry, management, and analysis. Each participant was de-identified by assigning a number beginning with one and ending with 51. Outcomes from the investigation are shown for group data, not by individual.
CHAPTER FOUR:

RESULTS

This chapter includes the results of this study as they relate to the sample of female veterans who attended a WHSC in the VA. Specifically, it describes the sample and includes results pertaining to each of the research aims and hypotheses.

Sample

Participants were selected from those who attended a WHSC in the VA. All participants completed the MRS and PHQ-9 at baseline and the end of treatment. Aligned with the study inclusion criteria, all participants in the study were between the ages of 40 and 60.

Frequency and percentage of demographic factors of age, ethnicity, and marital status of participants appear in Table 1. Nearly half of participants were between 51 and 55 (41.2%) years of age, more than half identified as White (52.9%), and nearly three-quarters of the participants were listed as married (74.3%).

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage of the number of children by participants. Participants in this category had a mean of number of children of 2.10 (SD = 1.47). Frequencies and percentages of medical insurance and work status reported by the participants appear in Table 3. The highest frequencies of work status reported by participants were disabled (33.3%) and unemployed (27.1%).
### Table 1

**Demographic Characteristics (Frequency and Percentage) by Age, Ethnicity, and Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56–60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eskimo/Native American Indian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

**Frequency and Percentage of Number of Deliveries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of deliveries</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Frequency and Percentage of Medical Insurance and Work Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical insurance</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tricare</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Cross/Blue Shield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Cigna, Optium Health)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work status</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Military branch served and years of service by participants are displayed in Table 4. Most commonly served were the Army with (47.5%) and Air Force with (30%). The most frequent length of service was 5 to 9 years (32.5%).

The majority of participants had served principally during the Vietnam era (43.1%) or the Persian Gulf era (47.1%). Table 5 shows the results. Principal type(s) of traumatic experiences encountered by participants while in the military appear in Table 6. The most frequent types of traumas included witnessing nonlethal major injuries (14.7%), sexual assault (13.7%), and other types of traumas (18.4%).
### Table 4

*Frequency and Percentage of Participants Service by Military Branch and Years of Service*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military branch</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Guard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+ years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

*Frequency and Percentage of Location of Deployment or Era of Service*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persian Gulf</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Not specified in records)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Locations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian Gulf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Frequency and Percentage of Principal Type(s) of Traumatic Experiences Encountered While in the Military*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traumatic experiences</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed death or execution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IED blast or combat explosion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed major injuries (nonlethal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical assault</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Trauma/Verbal/Harassment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* IED = improvised explosive device. Number of participants varies by experience.

**Hypothesis 1**

To address Hypothesis 1, “The levels of QOL among women veterans 40 to 60 years of age attending a WHSC within the VA will be lower at baseline when compared to those of the North American population’s reference values,” descriptive statistics were calculated to identify the baseline means of the MRS scale for female veterans. Female veterans had higher mean scores on all components of the MRS at baseline than those of the North American population reference value. Results of this analysis appear in Table 7.
Table 7

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Z score of Quality of Life (MRS Score) for Female Veterans and North American Populations Women Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female veterans</th>
<th>North American women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total score</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych score</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somato-vegetative score</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urogenital score</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 2**

To investigate whether a significant improvement emerged between QOL and depression levels at baseline and after receipt of treatment services, a paired sample *t*-test was conducted.

Results of the analysis indicated a significant improvement in QOL and depression levels among female veterans attending the WHSC in the VA system. Table 8 shows the results.

Table 8

*Paired Sample *t*-Test of Quality of Life and Depression at Baseline and After Treatment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Treatment</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 3

To address Hypothesis 3, multiple linear regression models were fit to explore the association between the following variables and the outcomes of QOL and depression levels: low socioeconomic status (SES), number of children, years of service, and military sexual trauma.

After fitting a multiple linear regression model of baseline MRS scores (dependent variable) and the four predictors of interest—low SES, number of children, years of service, and military sexual trauma (MST)—the only predictor that appeared to be significantly associated with higher MRS scores at baseline was a history of MST ($\beta = .363; t = 2.44; p = 0.02$). Higher MRS scores can be interpreted as lower QOL among female veterans. From the full model, results of this analysis do not completely support Hypothesis 3, in which all four predictive variables were postulated to be associated with a higher MRS score at baseline. These results appear in Table 9.

Table 9

Model 1. Multiple Linear Regression Model of Baseline MRS Score and Four Predictors of Interest Forced in the Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.70729</td>
<td>3.20007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.46116</td>
<td>2.90846</td>
<td>0.12349</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.4020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.61434</td>
<td>3.14090</td>
<td>-0.03303</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.8458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.32353</td>
<td>3.51384</td>
<td>0.01590</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.9271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military sexual trauma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.58109</td>
<td>3.92726</td>
<td>0.36305</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.0188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military sexual trauma missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.17509</td>
<td>3.17650</td>
<td>0.05775</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.7132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Deliveries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13317</td>
<td>0.88042</td>
<td>0.02139</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.8805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 51; R^2 = .139; Adj. R^2 = .0217; MRS = Quality of Life; Dependent Variable = Baseline MRS.

For the multiple linear regression model of baseline depression score as the outcome of interest in relation to the four predictors—low SES, number of deliveries, years of service, and
MST—the only predictor that appeared to significantly associate with baseline depression scores was MST ($\beta = .285; t = 1.94; \text{ and } p = 0.06$). Therefore, a history of MST appeared to be associated with higher depression scores among female veterans prior to treatment. Overall, the results of this analysis did not fully support Hypothesis 3, postulating that all four predictor variables would be associated with higher depression scores at baseline. These results appear in Table 10.

Table 10

### Model 2. Multiple Linear Regression Model Baseline Depression Score and Four Predictors of Interest Forced in the Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.02193</td>
<td>2.26884</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.73148</td>
<td>2.06209</td>
<td>0.19148</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82424</td>
<td>2.22688</td>
<td>0.13702</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.4171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.10862</td>
<td>2.49130</td>
<td>0.28209</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.1062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military sexual trauma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.39649</td>
<td>2.78441</td>
<td>0.28570</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.0590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military sexual trauma missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.27252</td>
<td>2.25212</td>
<td>-0.01871</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.9042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of deliveries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09293</td>
<td>0.62422</td>
<td>0.02085</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.8823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 51; R^2 = .155; \text{ Adj. } R = .040; \text{ Dependent Variable = Baseline Depression; SES = Socioeconomic status.}$

For the multiple linear regression model with change in MRS scores as the outcome of interest in relation to the four predictors—low SES, number of deliveries, years of service, and MST, the only predictor that appeared to significantly associate with change in MRS scores was low SES ($\beta = -0.298; t = -2.30; \text{ and } p = 0.03$). Because this association was negative in direction, female veterans with low SES experienced less change (improvement) in MRS scores. This occurred after adjustment for baseline MRS scores. Table 11 reflects these results.
### Model 3. Multiple Linear Regression Model of Change in MRS Score Four Predictors of Interest

Forced in the Model Includes Adjustment for Baseline MRS Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39336</td>
<td>3.14005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.6595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4.96382</td>
<td>2.15844</td>
<td>-0.29882</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td>0.0264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3.42480</td>
<td>2.31320</td>
<td>-0.22092</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>0.1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.84167</td>
<td>2.58699</td>
<td>0.10859</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.4804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military sexual trauma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.75423</td>
<td>3.08042</td>
<td>-0.12522</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>0.3762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military sexual trauma missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.95881</td>
<td>2.34204</td>
<td>-0.11549</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.4076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.59319</td>
<td>0.64830</td>
<td>0.11432</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.3653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline MRS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.42122</td>
<td>0.11098</td>
<td>0.50540</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 51; R² = .343; Adj. R = .236; Dependent Variable = Change in MRS Score; SES = socioeconomic status.*

For the multiple linear regression model with change in depression scores as the outcome of interest in relation to the four predictors—low SES, number of children, years of service, and MST, none of the predictors of interest were associated with change in depression scores (*p* > .10). Table 12 reflects these results.

### Table 12

**Model 4. Multiple Linear Regression Model of Change in Depression Score Four Predictors of Interest Forced in the Model Includes Adjustment for Baseline Depression Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38117</td>
<td>1.54206</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.8059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.49769</td>
<td>1.32693</td>
<td>-0.15215</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>0.2653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.98910</td>
<td>1.41591</td>
<td>-0.10767</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.4886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.43657</td>
<td>1.61994</td>
<td>0.34194</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.0397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military sexual trauma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.40681</td>
<td>1.83051</td>
<td>0.10794</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.4464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military sexual trauma missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.38819</td>
<td>1.42139</td>
<td>-0.23762</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>0.1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02668</td>
<td>0.39400</td>
<td>0.00868</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.9463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline depression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23956</td>
<td>0.09513</td>
<td>0.34718</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.0156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 51; R² = .309; Adj. R = .197; p = > .10; Dependent Variable = Change in Depression Score; SES = socioeconomic status.*
Two additional multiple linear regression models were fit in an attempt to explore other variables that may be linked with change in MRS and change in depression. The first regression model fit included change in MRS scores as the outcome of interest, low SES (as previously identified), and a history of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) as predictors of interest. This analysis showed that some negative relationships between low SES and change in MRS were attenuated after adjustment for a history of STIs. For this analysis, a history of STIs appeared to negatively associate with change in MRS ($\beta = -0.234; t = -1.75, p = 0.09$). These findings appear in Table 13.

Table 13

Model 5. Multiple Linear Regression Model of Change in MRS Score One Predictors of Interest (Low SES) Included in the Model. Includes adjustment for Baseline MRS Score and History of Sexually Transmitted Infection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.74883</td>
<td>2.75035</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.71248</td>
<td>2.15758</td>
<td>-0.16329</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>0.2149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline MRS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31938</td>
<td>0.10985</td>
<td>0.38321</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of STI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3.67143</td>
<td>2.09239</td>
<td>-0.23452</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>0.0858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 51$; $R^2 = .276$; Adj. $R = .230$; Dependent Variable Change in MRS; STI = sexually transmitted infection; SES = socioeconomic status.

The second regression model fit in this series of analyses included change in depression score as the outcome of interest, with no predictors of interest forced into the model. Using a forward stepwise regression approach, the following variables were selected (at $p < .20$) in the model: White; sexually active; and vaginal delivery. The coefficients for these variables were as follows: White ($\beta = .317; t = 2.51, p = .02$), being sexually active ($\beta = .246; p = .06$), and having had a vaginal delivery ($\beta = -.239; t = -1.88; p = .07$). This can be interpreted as greater change (reductions) in depression scores among Whites and women who were sexually active, and
conversely, less improvement among women with a history of vaginal delivery. Table 14 shows these results.

Table 14

*Model 6. Multiple Linear Regression Model of Change in Depression Score One. No Predictors of Interest Forced in the Model. Includes Adjustment for Baseline Depression Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.59767</td>
<td>1.67583</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>0.3455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Depression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30398</td>
<td>0.08753</td>
<td>0.44632</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.83687</td>
<td>1.12995</td>
<td>0.31671</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.0157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually Active</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.20661</td>
<td>1.13199</td>
<td>0.24635</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.0575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaginal Delivery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.29106</td>
<td>1.22148</td>
<td>-0.23940</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>0.0672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 51; R² = .326; Adj. R = .266; Dependent Variable: Change in Depression Score*
CHAPTER FIVE:
DISCUSSION

This final chapter of this dissertation includes a synthesis of the study results, with discussion of the findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations for future research. The goal of this study was to increase the knowledge base about an underrepresented population of veterans. As the number of female veterans searching for and receiving healthcare from the VA system continues to grow, it is vital that all stakeholders prepare for the complex needs of this vulnerable population. Navigating the difficulties of the VA system and specialty requires the commitment of a multilevel and multisystem team, if the overall health and QOL of female veterans is to improve.

Sample

The data for this study consisted of information gathered during a retrospective medical records review of female veterans who use a WHSC at one of the VA’s centers. The sample included 51 female veterans aged 40 to 60 years who completed the MRS and the PHQ-9 scales at baseline and throughout their treatment. Although this group of participants was heterogeneous, it is recognized that there might have been other variables that were not examined during this investigation which may have affected the results of the study. Due to the study design of this study, predicting exactly which variables might have been overlooked might be an assumption at best. Data collected was at entry to clinic (Baseline) and at the end of treatment (3 to 12 months, depending on the needs of the participants).
Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 was that the levels of QOL among female veterans 40 to 60 years of age attending a WHSC in the VA would be lower at baseline when compared to the normal reference values of a North American population provided by the original developers of the MRS (Berlin Center for Epidemiology and Health Research, 2008). As hypothesized, results of the one-sample z-test analysis indicated that baseline MSR scores were significantly higher for female veterans attending the clinic compared to North American population reference values. Higher scores indicate lower QOL. This analysis validates Katon, et al., (2016) theory in that QOL for female veterans tends to typically be lower than that of women who are not veterans. Although a significant difference in QOL was observed, it is wise to remember that many factors may have contributed to these differences especially in such a complex population. Female veterans are often plagued with a multitude of multifactorial problems that may impact and cause fluctuation in QOL over time (Heinemann et al., 2013). These complexities often contribute not only to the levels of QOL, but to the manner in which female veterans seek and acquire healthcare. For these reasons, it is important that healthcare needs of female veterans be specifically addressed on an individual basis, comprehensively and in a timely manner, and continual assessment of QOL needs to occur with this population (Bergman et al., 2015; Schalock et al., 2016).

Hypothesis 2

For Hypothesis 2, as hypothesized, QOL and depression levels among female veterans 40 to 60 years of age who attended the WHSC improved significant from pre-treatment to post-treatment. The significance of the improvement was confirmed by paired sample t-tests where the change in depression between baseline and after treatment was found to be statistically
significant ($p < .001$). Female veterans attending this WHSC experienced a decrease in depression symptoms with an overall improvement in QOL.

Notwithstanding the significance found in the levels of change overtime, it is important to keep in mind the multifactorial facets that may contribute to these changes in both levels of depression and QOL. It is very likely that QOL and depression are strongly related; thus, it is to be expected that if depression improves, QOL would also. But the change in QOL was relatively much greater than the change in depression scores, thus other factors must have also influenced QOL scores.

These results support the Gerber et al., (2016) recommendation of future studies, and program development. A continual effort must be made to provide specialized healthcare to female veterans. Specialized comprehensive care can and does contribute to the improvement in QOL, depression and additional outcomes in this population. This analysis further reflects on previous findings concerning the lack of comprehension, negative views, of female veterans in regards to healthcare. What needs to be noted is that female veterans have a need and prefer comprehensive and timely care within a gender specific facility in the VA. Comprehensive care provided by the VA facilitates improvement of the overall health status and QOL, of this vulnerable population (Gerber et al., 2014; Kelly et al., 2014; Lehavot, O’Hara, Washington, Yano, & Simpson, 2015; Wagner et al., 2015).

**Hypothesis 3**

Hypothesis 3 was that low socioeconomic status length of service, military sexual trauma, and number of deliveries would predict QOL and depression levels among women veterans attending a WHSC. The results did not support all chosen variables were significant predictors of QOL and depression. This result might have occurred because of the small sample size ($n = 51$).
Further investigation to identify other predictor variables are needed. A forward multilinear regression did find that a history of military sexual trauma was significantly associated with both baseline QOL and depression scores. This analysis supports Kelly, et al., (2014) and their findings, that military sexual trauma is highly associated with the overall QOL and depression of female veterans. In addition, it is important to realize that many other variables may also contribute to QOL and depression of this population. Female veterans are afflicted by multiple conditions simultaneously. As previously stated, QOL and depression status will vary (Heinemann et al., 2013). Frequent monitoring of QOL and depression is needed in order to better assess the need for immediate intervention and facilitation of resource that will provide safety and improvement in the overall well-being of female veterans Bergmann et al., 2015; Schalock et al., 2016).

Two additional multiple linear regression models were fit in an attempt to explore other variables that may be associated with change in MRS and change in depression. The first regression model fit included change in MRS scores as the outcome of interest, and low SES (as previously identified) and a history of STIs as predictors of interest. A history of STIs appeared to be negatively associated with change in MRS score. While the association was negative, having a history of STIs was significantly associated with change in MRS score, thus confirming the need to further investigate other predictor variables when examining QOL.

The second regression model fit in this series of analyses included change in depression score as the outcome of interest, and no predictors of interest forced into the model. Using a forward stepwise regression approach, the following variables were selected (at $p < .20$) in the model: white; sexually active; and vaginal delivery. The results of this analysis can be interpreted as greater change (reductions) in depression scores among whites and women who
were sexually active, and conversely, less improvement among women with a history of vaginal delivery. Thus substantiating the need to further investigate other predictor variables when examining depression scores.

**Implications for Nursing**

Study findings demonstrated that women veterans attending a WHSC report low QOL scores compared to the North American population reference values. They also showed that the women had significantly improved QOL and depression from baseline to after treatment. This is a very encouraging finding. However, before system-wide recommendations can be implemented, additional studies are needed. A clinical trial in which women veterans who do and do not attend a WHSC should be conducted to compare their QOL and depression scores over time. Replicating the study to include a larger sample in different VA locations may prove to be of benefit in further assessing levels of distress among female veterans and the impact healthcare services being rendered in the VA have on the overall health and QOL of this population.

There is a need to for development of reliable, valid, gender, and veteran population specific instruments that assess or measure constructs and behaviors related to specific issues associated with female veterans and overall wellbeing. The results of this study may assist researchers, providers, the VA, and female veterans to find answers on how to: innovatively provide individualized quality comprehensive care to this population; create effective methods of training veteran specific women’s health providers; assist female veterans with self-advocacy; and create dialogue and collaboration among all stakeholders.

Nurses are at the forefront of patient care, and education is an area in which they possess expertise. Educating providers involved in the care of female veterans is of utmost importance given the number of women expected to become veterans in the near future. It cannot be
assumed that the relationship between the word veteran and everything that encompasses the care of female veterans is understood by all associated with this population. Whether it is in providing appropriate veteran’s women’s health care, being aware of the available services, or understanding the necessity of providing adequate amount of properly trained staff, and allocation of time, resources and gender specific centers, nurses have the potential and ability to further assist and make a difference in the overall well-being of female veterans.

The results of this study further support the findings of previous studies. The importance of providing individualized healthcare to this population cannot be underestimated. Not only is a focus needed on how to care for female veterans, but on all of the facets connected to each individual, patient, provider and system.

Recommendations for Future Study

Based on the review of relevant studies and results of this study, the following are recommendations for future study:

1. A study should be completed to include a larger sample, and wider age range along with use of experimental research design.
2. Because this study represents a very small sample of female veterans seeking care at in the VA system, research to evaluate whether results may be generalized to other female veterans in other VA centers should be completed.
3. Instruments that address specific populations’ needs, should be developed and validated.
4. Exploration of other predictors’ variables for QOL and depression, and a more detailed medical and social history are needed to examine what other factors may be significantly associated with the overall wellbeing of female veterans. A qualitative
inquiry may be useful when attempting to find more predictor variables that may be significantly associated with QOL and depression of female veterans.

5. Seeking funding will provide the necessary support of future female veterans’ studies: different methods; participants incentives; providers and staff; researcher.

6. Exploring other outcomes that contribute to QOL and depression such as sexual dysfunction may be useful when investigating gender specific differences.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: International Mean Standard Deviation Reference Values

Note to Reader


International Mean Standard Deviation Reference Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Psychological score</th>
<th>Somato-vegetative score</th>
<th>Urogenital score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>4,246</td>
<td>8.8 (7.1)</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>3.4 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America (US)</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>9.1 (7.6)</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>3.4 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>10.4 (8.8)</td>
<td>3,002</td>
<td>4.9 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>7.2 (6.0)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2.9 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Menopause Rating Scale (MRS)

Note to Reader


Reprinted with permission.

### Menopause Rating Scale (MRS)

Which of the following symptoms apply to you at this time? Please, mark the appropriate box for each symptom. For symptoms that do not apply, please mark ‘none’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptoms</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>mild</th>
<th>moderate</th>
<th>severe</th>
<th>very severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hot flushes, sweating (episodes of sweating)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Heart discomfort (unusual awareness of heart beat, heart skipping, heart racing, tightness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sleep problems (difficulty in falling asleep, difficulty in sleeping through, waking up early)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Depressive mood (feeling down, sad, on the verge of tears, lack of drive, mood swings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Irritability (feeling nervous, inner tension, feeling aggressive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Anxiety (inner restlessness, feeling panicky)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Physical and mental exhaustion (general decrease in performance, impaired memory, decrease in concentration, forgetfulness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sexual problems (change in sexual desire, in sexual activity and satisfaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bladder problems (difficulty in urinating, increased need to urinate, bladder incontinence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dryness of vagina (sensation of dryness or burning in the vagina, difficulty with sexual intercourse)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Joint and muscular discomfort (pain in the joints, rheumatoid complaints)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score = 0 1 2 3 4
## Appendix C: Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)

### Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9)

Over the **last 2 weeks**, how often have you been bothered by any of the following problems? *(Use '✓' to indicate your answer)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Several days</th>
<th>More than half the days</th>
<th>Nearly every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Little interest or pleasure in doing things</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trouble falling or staying asleep, or sleeping too much</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feeling tired or having little energy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Poor appetite or overeating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Feeling bad about yourself — or that you are a failure or have let yourself or your family down</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trouble concentrating on things, such as reading the newspaper or watching television</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have noticed? Or the opposite — being so fidgety or restless that you have been moving around a lot more than usual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Thoughts that you would be better off dead or of hurting yourself in some way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For office coding ___ + ___ + ___ + ___

Total Score: ___

If you checked off any problems, how **difficult** have these problems made it for you to do your work, take care of things at home, or get along with other people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not difficult at all</th>
<th>Somewhat difficult</th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
<th>Extremely difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Developed by Drs. Robert L. Spitzer, Janet B.W. Williams, Kurt Kroenke and colleagues, with an educational grant from Pfizer Inc. No permission required to reproduce, translate, display or distribute.
Appendix D: Chart Audit Form

Levels of Distress Chart Audit Form (page 1 of 6)

Date of Data Collection: _______________ Study ID#: _______

Demographics

1. **Age:** _______

2. **Gender:** Female

3. **Ethnic Background**
   1) Caucasian
   2) African American
   3) Asian/Pacific Islander
   4) Eskimo/Native American Indian
   5) Mixed (specify)
   6) Other (specify)

4. **Hispanic**
   1) Yes
   2) No

5. **Marital Status**
   1) Never Married
   2) Married
   3) Not married but living with a partner
   4) Divorced or separated
   5) Widowed

6. **Lives with ____________**

7. **Employment Status**
   1) Unemployed: [ ] disabled [ ] retired [ ] supported by other
   2) Employed Full-time Hours/week _______
   3) Employed Part-time Hours/week _______
   4) On leave [ ] with pay [ ] without pay
   5) Retired
   6) Other (specify)
Appendix D Continued

Levels of Distress Chart Audit Form (Page 2 of 6)

Date of Data Collection: _______________  Study ID#: _________

8.  Level of Education
   1)  Less than high school
   2)  High school graduate/GED
   3)  Vocational/Technical degree beyond High School
   4)  Some College
   5)  Community College Degree (AA/AS)
   6)  College/University degree (BA/BS)
   7)  Master’s Degree
   8)  Doctoral Degree

9.  Household Income
   1)  Under $4,999
   2)  $5,000 – 14,999
   3)  $15,000 – 24,999
   4)  $25,000 – 39,999
   5)  $40,000 – 69,999
   6)  70,000+

10. Insurance – ALL that apply
    1)  ___Tricare
    2)  ___Blue Cross/Shields
    3)  ___Humana
    4)  ___Aetna
    5)  ___Medicaid
    6)  ___Medicare
    7)  ___None

Military History

11. Branch of Military Service
    1)  Army
    2)  Marine Corps
    3)  Coast Guard
    4)  Navy
    5)  Air Force
    6)  National Guard

12. Total Years of Service _________

13. Highest Rank Achieved ____________________
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Date of Data Collection: ________________  Study ID#: _________

14. Any Deployments?
   1) Yes
   2) No

15. Any combat zone deployments?
   1) Yes
   2) No

16. Tours of Duty
   1) 1
   2) 2
   3) 3
   4) 4 or more

17. Location of Deployment all that apply
   1) Vietnam
   2) Kosovo
   3) Persian Gulf
   4) Iraq
   5) Afghanistan
   6) Other

18. Principal type(s) of traumatic experiences encountered while in the military

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Witness death or execution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IED blast or combat explosion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness major injuries (nonlethal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Use of Medications
   Categories of any prescription medications taking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Medication</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Depression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Seizure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Date of Data Collection: ______________ Study ID#: ________

Social History

20. Do they smoke?
   1) Yes
   2) No

21. How much they smoke? __________

22. Any alcohol use?
   1) Yes
   2) No

23. How much alcohol do they drink? __________

24. Any recreational drug use?
   1) Yes
   2) No

25. Which recreational drugs? __________

Gynecological History

26. History of abnormal pap smears
   1) Yes
   2) No

27. If yes, when was the last abnormal Pap smear? ________

28. History of abnormal mammograms?
   1) Yes
   2) No

29. Surgical procedures on female organs?
   1) Yes
   2) No

30. Hysterectomy? Date? ________
   1) Yes
   2) No

31. Reason for Hysterectomy __________
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Date of Data Collection: _______________  Study ID#: __________

32.  Abdominal or vaginal hysterectomy? _______________

33.  Ovaries removed?
   1) Yes
   2) No

36.  Frequency of menstrual periods __________

37.  Length of menstrual periods __________

38.  Sexually active?
   1) Yes
   2) No

39.  If not, how long since last sexual activity? ________

40.  Is sexual partner
   1) Male
   2) Female
   3) Both

41.  History of sexually transmitted infections?
   1) Yes
   2) No

42.  If yes, which sexually transmitted infection? __________

43.  History of sexual trauma not related to military experience
   1) Yes
   2) No

44.  Number of pregnancies ________

45.  Number of deliveries ________
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Date of Data Collection: ________________  Study ID#: __________

46. Full term deliveries?
   1) Yes
   2) No

47. Type of deliveries
   1) Vaginal ______
   2) Cesarean Section ______

48. Weight of largest baby born vaginally ______

49. Reason for being at the women’s health specialty clinic ______

50. Goals of Therapy in the women’s health specialty clinic ______

51. Referred to the clinic by _____________

Results of MRS

52. Psychological Subscale ________________

53. Somatic Subscale ________________

54. Urogenital Subscale ________________

55. Total of MRS _______________________

Results of PHQ-9

56. Column 1 Several Days ________________

57. Column 2 More Than Half the Days ______

58. Column 3 Nearly Every Day ________________

59. Total of PHQ – 9 ________________

60. Question 10 of PHQ – 9 _____ Not difficult at all ___ somewhat difficult
    ____ Very difficult ___ extremely difficult
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