# Supplementary file S2:

## Dichotomization, relationships with the type or timing of the complaint, and sensitivity analysis

**Dichotomization**

Depression was assessed through use of the *Physical Health Questionnaire* (PHQ-9) and respondents with a score greater than or equal to 10 were considered depressed. The *Generalized Anxiety Disorder* scale (GAD-7) assessed anxiety and respondents were considered to be anxious if had a score greater than or equal to 10. Avoidance was dichotomized as never displaying avoidance behavior and displaying at least some avoidance behavior. By dichotomizing avoidance, respondents were equally distributed among the two groups. That is, approximately 50% never displayed avoidance behavior and the other 50% of the respondents displayed at least some avoidance behavior. We therefore decided to use a median split to dichotomize hedging, since there were very few respondents (16.85%) that never displayed hedging behavior. Respondents with a score greater than or equal to 10 were part of the upper 50% with regard to hedging behavior and hence, this score was used to dichotomize hedging. In this manner, the respondents were also equally distributed among the two groups for hedging.

## Relationships with the type or timing of the complaint

Similar to the other analyses, relative risks for the outcome were estimated by Poisson regression with robust error variance (Zou, 2014). To assess the effect of type/time of the complaint, a model was fitted with the item and the time/type of complaint as well as the interaction between item and time/type of complaint. Hedging, avoidance, anxiety or depression were used as the outcome. The p-values for the interactions were computed and the dependent false discovery rate procedure (Benjamini and Yekateuli, 2001) was applied, yielding the adjusted p-values depicted in supplementary tables 1-2.

## Supplementary table 1. Adjusted p-values of interaction item with type of complaint

| Item | Adjusted p-value of interaction item with type of complaint | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anxiety | Depression | Hedging | Avoidance |
| **Actual support:** | | | | |
| -spoke to family/friends | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -spoke to colleagues | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -represented yourself | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -medical professional support | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -independent solicitor | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -BMA employment advice service | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -BMA counselling | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **Perceived support:** | | | | |
| -management | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -colleagues | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -medical professional support | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -defense organisation | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **Process related issues:** | | | | |
| -normal process not followed | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -documentary record was fair and accurate | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -time scale was needlessly protracted | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -informed of rights regardng representation | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -inappropriate or vexacious use of risk process | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -complaint due to dysfunctional team relationships | 1 | 1 | 0.425 | 1 |
| -felt victimised as a whistleblower | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -clinical issues raised against me after the initial complaint | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -felt bullied during the investigation | 0.793 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -managers used complaints processes to undermine my position | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -colleagues used process to take advantage financially or professionally | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **Worrying about the complaint:** | | | | |
| -loss of livelihood | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -public humiliation | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -professional humiliation | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -aspects of clinical practice restricted | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -family problems | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| -marked record in the future | 1 | 1 | 0.337 | 1 |
| -financial costs | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

**Supplementary table 2. Adjusted p-values of interaction item with time of complaint**

| Item | Adjusted p-value of interaction item with time of complaint | |
|---|---|---|
| | Hedging | Avoidance |
| **Actual support:** | | |
| -spoke to family/friends | 1 | 0.325 |
| -spoke to colleagues | 1 | 1 |
| -represented yourself | 1 | 1 |
| -medical professional support | 0.261 | 1 |
| -independent solicitor | 0.618 | 1 |
| -BMA employment advice service | 0.261 | 1 |
| -BMA counselling | 0.773 | 1 |
| **Perceived support:** | | |
| -management | 0.997 | 1 |
| -colleagues | 0.26 | 1 |
| -medical professional support | 1 | 1 |
| -defense organisation | 0.773 | 1 |
| **Process related issues:** | | |
| -normal process not followed | 0.775 | 1 |
| -documentary record was fair and accurate | 0.997 | 0.923 |
| -time scale was needlessly protracted | 0.073 | 0.127 |
| -informed of rights regardng representation | 1 | 0.127 |
| -inappropriate or vexacious use of risk process | 0.26 | 1 |
| -complaint due to dysfunctional team relationships | 0.073 | 0.207 |
| -felt victimised as a whistleblower | 0.26 | 0.304 |
| -clinical issues raised against me after the initial complaint | 0.637 | 1 |
| -felt bullied during the investigation | 0.455 | 0.127 |
| -managers used complaints processes to undermine my position | 0.997 | 0.127 |
| -colleagues used process to take advantage financially or professionally | 0.26 | 0.127 |
| **Worrying about the complaint:** | | |
| -loss of livelihood | 0.073 | 0.244 |
| -public humiliation | 0.346 | 0.943 |
| -professional humiliation | 0.311 | 0.434 |
| -aspects of clinical practice restricted | 0.26 | 0.084 |
| -family problems | 0.073 | 0.693 |
| -marked record in the future | 0.26 | 0.923 |
| -financial costs | 0.073 | 0.207 |

**Imputation**

In accordance with the analysis of Bourne et al. (2015), a two-step approach to imputation was used for composite scales (depression, anxiety and hedging). First, the respondent's mean of non-missing items was imputed if at least 80% of the items of the composite scale were nonmissing. Second, multiple imputation at the scale level was performed for the remaining respondents. The missing values for avoidance were imputed by imputing the three items of avoidance separately. Multiple imputation was performed by using the fully conditional specification approach, in which a separate imputation model is specified for every variable where missing values are to be imputed. Logistic regression was used for variables with categorical values and predictive mean matching regression for variables with integer values (i.e. hedging, depression and anxiety). All imputation models were performed with 50 iterations and the number of imputations was set to 100. Hence, this resulted in a total of 100 completed datasets. After the imputations, convergence plots were inspected. In addition, in order to see whether the imputed values of the continuous variables were reasonable, density plots of the observed and the imputed data are checked. When the latter yielded no problematic findings, the completed datasets were analysed separately and their results combined using Rubin's Rules (Rubin, 1987).

**Sensitivity analysis**

As in the previous paper, the last analysis consisted out of a sensitivity analysis to assess the impact of item non-response. For the sensitivity analysis a not missing at random assumption is set for key variables hedging, avoidance, anxiety and depression. We assumed that hedging, avoidance, depression and anxiety were worse when the value was missing.

For anxiety (GAD-7) and depression (PHQ-9), we increased each imputed value by a certain number $d$. This number was obtained in a manner similar-though slightly different-to the method used in the previous paper. A random number $\delta$ was first sampled from a normal distribution with mean half of the standard deviation of the distribution of PHQ-9/GAD-7, and the standard deviation the square root of this value. Thereafter, $d=\max(\delta,1)$, which restricts $d$ to imply an increase in PHQ-9/GAD-7. Consequently, $d$ is added to the imputed value under the missingness at random instead of $\delta$. The newly imputed value is then rounded and bound at the maximum possible value. In that way, an integer number on the original scale is obtained.

For avoidance, missings were assumed to have displayed at least some avoiding behavior. Since the scale is dichotomized prior to the analysis, the actual score on the scale is irrelevant.

Finally, a different method for hedging was used than the one in the previous paper. We opted for a new approach considering that, for this analysis, we used a median split to dichotomize hedging. First, we specified a binomial logistic regression model with hedging as the outcome. The predictors in this model were the same as those used in the imputation model for hedging during MI. This model was fitted using respondents with no missing values for hedging and the linear predictor was calculated for each of the respondents. Thereafter, a random number $\delta$ was sampled from a normal distribution with mean half the standard deviation of the distribution of the linear predictor scores and standard deviation the square root of this value. The number $d$ was specified in a similar way as in the sensitivity of anxiety in depression, that is $d=\max(\delta,0.2\left(\frac{e^{lp}}{1+e^{lp}}\right))$. Consequently, there is a minimum increase of 20% in the predicted probability on hedging. The logistic model was then fitted using respondents with a missing value for hedging, the linear predictor was calculated and $d$ was added to the value of the linear predictor. The inverse logit of the new value of the linear predictor was then calculated to obtain the predicted probability for each of the non-responders. Then, the predicted probability was used in a Bernoulli trial to decide whether the respondent was classified as the lower 50% of hedging or the upper 50%.

The results of the analyses using the complete case dataset and multiply imputed datasets under the MAR and MNAR assumption can be found in supplementary tables 3-10.

**Supplementary table 3. Descriptives hedging**

|  | Complete cases N (%) | Imputations | Sens Anal |
|---|---|---|---|
| No hedging | 2278 (49.18%) | 2939 (47.84%) | 2736 (44.53%) |
| Hedging | 2354 (50.82%) | 3204 (52.16%) | 3408 (55.47%) |

**Supplementary table 4. RRs, hedging**

| Item | RRcc[a] (95% CI) | RRmar[b] (95% CI) | RRmnar[c] (95% CI) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Actual support: | | | |
| -spoke to family/friends | 1.32 (1.19-1.46) | 1.28 (1.17-1.41) | 1,23 (1,12-1,36) |
| -spoke to colleagues | 1.20 (1.05-1.36) | 1.23 (1.09-1.40) | 1,22 (1,07-1,39) |
| -represented yourself | 0.98 (0.92-1.04) | 0.99 (0.93-1.05) | 0,99 (0,93-1,05) |
| -medical professional support | 1.24 (1.17-1.33) | 1.22 (1.15-1.30) | 1,20 (1,13-1,28) |
| -independent solicitor | 1.01 (0.90-1.12) | 0.98 (0.89-1.09) | 0,98 (0,88-1,10) |
| -BMA employment advice service | 0.79 (0.71-0.88) | 0.81 (0.74-0.90) | 0,82 (0,73-0,91) |
| -BMA counselling | 0.99 (0.89-1.11) | 0.96 (0.86-1.07) | 0,95 (0,85-1,07) |
| Perceived support: | | | |
| -management | 0.98 (0.96-1.00) | 0.98 (0.96-1.00) | 0,98 (0,96-1,01) |
| -colleagues | 0.95 (0.93-0.98) | 0.96 (0.94-0.98) | 0,96 (0,94-0,99) |
| -medical professional support | 0.98 (0.95-1.01) | 0.98 (0.95-1.01) | 0,99 (0,95-1,02) |
| -defense organisation | 1.03 (1.00-1.06) | 1.03 (1.00-1.06) | 1,03 (1,00-1,06) |
| Process related issues: | | | |
| -normal process not followed | 1.01 (0.99-1.03) | 1.01 (0.99-1.03) | 1,01 (0,99-1,03) |
| -documentary record was fair | 0.98 (0.95-1.00) | 0.98 (0.96-1.00) | 0,98 (0,96-1,00) |
| -time scale was protracted | 1.05 (1.03-1.07) | 1.05 (1.03-1.07) | 1,04 (1,02-1,06) |
| -informed of bringing representation | 0.96 (0.94-0.98) | 0.97 (0.95-0.99) | 0,97 (0,95-0,99) |
| -inappropriate use of risk process | 1.03 (1.00-1.05) | 1.02 (1.00-1.04) | 1,01 (1,00-1,03) |
| -complaint due to dysfunctional team | 0.99 (0.97-1.01) | 0.99 (0.97-1.01) | 0,99 (0,97-1,01) |
| -felt victimised | 0.99 (0.96-1.02) | 0.99 (0.97-1.01) | 0,99 (0,97-1,01) |
| -clinical issues after complaint | 1.05 (1.02-1.07) | 1.04 (1.01-1.06) | 1,03 (1,01-1,06) |
| -felt bullied | 1.03 (1.01-1.05) | 1.03 (1.01-1.05) | 1,02 (1,00-1,04) |
| -managers undermined position | 1.01 (0.99-1.04) | 1.01 (0.99-1.03) | 1,01 (0,99-1,03) |
| -colleagues took advantage | 1.02 (1.00-1.05) | 1.02 (1.00-1.04) | 1,02 (1,00-1,04) |
| Worrying about the complaint: | | | |
| -loss of livelihood | 1.11 (1.09-1.13) | 1.11 (1.09-1.13) | 1,10 (1,08-1,12) |
| -public humiliation | 1.14 (1.12-1.16) | 1.13 (1.12-1.15) | 1,12 (1,10-1,14) |
| -professional humiliation | 1.15 (1.12-1.17) | 1.14 (1.12-1.16) | 1,12 (1,10-1,15) |
| -practice restricted | 1.10 (1.08-1.12) | 1.10 (1.08-1.12) | 1,09 (1,07-1,11) |
| -family problems | 1.12 (1.10-1.14) | 1.11 (1.09-1.13) | 1,10 (1,08-1,12) |
| -marked record | 1.14 (1.12-1.17) | 1.13 (1.11-1.16) | 1,12 (1,10-1,14) |
| -financial costs | 1.11 (1.09-1.14) | 1.11 (1.09-1.13) | 1,10 (1,08-1,12) |

[a] RRcc = risk ratios when only using complete cases
[b] RRmar = risk ratios when imputed datasets are used
[c] RRmnar = risk ratios under the not missing at random assumption

**Supplementary table 5. Descriptives avoidance**

|  | Complete cases N (%) | Imputations | Sens Anal |
|---|---|---|---|
| No avoidance | 2535 (54.32%) | 3221 (52.43%) | 2535 (41.26%) |
| Avoidance | 2132 (45.68%) | 2923 (47.57%) | 3609 (58.74%) |

**Supplementary table 6. RR's, avoidance**

| Item | RRcc[a] (95% CI) | RRmar[b] (95% CI) | RRmnar[c] (95% CI) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Actual support: | | | |
| -spoke to family/friends | 1.13 (1.02-1.24) | 1.15 (1.05-1.27) | 1.08 (1.01-1.15) |
| -spoke to colleagues | 0.97 (0.86-1.09) | 1.01 (0.90-1.13) | 1.00 (0.92-1.09) |
| -represented yourself | 1.08 (1.01-1.15) | 1.07 (1.01-1.15) | 1.03 (0.98-1.08) |
| -medical professional support | 1.19 (1.11-1.28) | 1.19 (1.12-1.27) | 1.13 (1.07-1.18) |
| -independent solicitor | 1.20 (1.08-1.33) | 1.19 (1.08-1.30) | 1.13 (1.05-1.22) |
| -BMA employment advice service | 1.25 (1.15-1.36) | 1.24 (1.14-1.34) | 1.12 (1.05-1.19) |
| -BMA counselling | 1.29 (1.17-1.43) | 1.25 (1.14-1.38) | 1.15 (1.07-1.24) |
| Perceived support: | | | |
| -management | 0.91 (0.89-0.94) | 0.91 (0.89-0.93) | 0.95 (0.93-0.96) |
| -colleagues | 0.90 (0.88-0.92) | 0.90 (0.89-0.92) | 0.94 (0.93-0.96) |
| -medical professional support | 0.98 (0.95-1.01) | 0.98 (0.95-1.01) | 0.99 (0.97-1.01) |
| -defense organisation | 0.96 (0.93-0.99) | 0.96 (0.93-0.99) | 0.98 (0.96-1.00) |
| Process related issues: | | | |
| -normal process not followed | 1.08 (1.06-1.11) | 1.07 (1.05-1.09) | 1.04 (1.03-1.06) |
| -documentary record was fair | 0.93 (0.91-0.95) | 0.94 (0.92-0.96) | 0.96 (0.94-0.98) |
| -time scale was protracted | 1.11 (1.09-1.14) | 1.10 (1.07-1.12) | 1.06 (1.04-1.07) |
| -informed of bringing representation | 0.95 (0.93-0.98) | 0.96 (0.94-0.98) | 0.97 (0.96-0.99) |
| -inappropriate use of risk process | 1.11 (1.09-1.13) | 1.10 (1.08-1.12) | 1.06 (1.04-1.07) |
| -complaint due to dysfunctional team | 1.09 (1.07-1.11) | 1.08 (1.06-1.10) | 1.05 (1.03-1.06) |
| -felt victimised | 1.10 (1.08-1.13) | 1.09 (1.07-1.11) | 1.06 (1.04-1.07) |
| -clinical issues after complaint | 1.14 (1.11-1.16) | 1.11 (1.08-1.13) | 1.07 (1.06-1.09) |
| -felt bullied | 1.13 (1.11-1.15) | 1.11 (1.09-1.13) | 1.07 (1.06-1.09) |
| -managers undermined position | 1.13 (1.11-1.15) | 1.11 (1.09-1.13) | 1.07 (1.06-1.08) |
| -colleagues took advantage | 1.13 (1.11-1.16) | 1.11 (1.09-1.14) | 1.07 (1.06-1.09) |
| Worrying about the complaint: | | | |
| -loss of livelihood | 1.15 (1.13-1.17) | 1.14 (1.12-1.16) | 1.09 (1.07-1.10) |
| -public humiliation | 1.15 (1.13-1.18) | 1.15 (1.12-1.17) | 1.09 (1.08-1.11) |
| -professional humiliation | 1.16 (1.13-1.19) | 1.15 (1.13-1.18) | 1.09 (1.07-1.11) |
| -practice restricted | 1.14 (1.12-1.16) | 1.14 (1.11-1.16) | 1.08 (1.07-1.10) |
| -family problems | 1.15 (1.13-1.17) | 1.14 (1.12-1.16) | 1.08 (1.07-1.10) |
| -marked record | 1.14 (1.12-1.17) | 1.14 (1.11-1.16) | 1.08 (1.06-1.10) |
| -financial costs | 1.16 (1.14-1.18) | 1.15 (1.13-1.17) | 1.09 (1.08-1.11) |

[a] RRcc = risk ratios when only using complete cases
[b] RRmar = risk ratios when imputed datasets are used
[c] RRmnar = risk ratios under the not missing at random assumption

**Supplementary table 7. Descriptives depression**

|  | Complete cases N (%) | Imputations | Sens Anal |
|---|---|---|---|
| No depression | 1710 (81.96%) | 1846 (81.80%) | 1818(80.55%) |
| Depression | 376 (18.02%) | 411 (18.20%) | 439 (19.45%) |

**Supplementary table 8. RRs, depression**

| Item | RRcc[a] (95% CI) | RRmar[b] (95% CI) | RRmnar[c] (95% CI) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Actual support: | | | |
| -spoke to family/friends | 1.54 (1.10-2.16) | 1.46 (1.06-2.02) | 1.42 (1.04-1.96) |
| -spoke to colleagues | 0.58 (0.44-0.76) | 0.64 (0.48-0.84) | 0.64 (0.49-0.84) |
| -represented yourself | 1.31 (1.07-1.60) | 1.29 (1.06-1.57) | 1.27 (1.05-1.54) |
| -medical professional support | 1.34 (1.09-1.64) | 1.31 (1.07-1.60) | 1.29 (1.06-1.57) |
| -independent solicitor | 1.91 (1.50-2.44) | 1.85 (1.45-2.36) | 1.82 (1.44-2.30) |
| -BMA employment advice service | 2.14 (1.74-2.64) | 2.06 (1.68-2.52) | 1.99 (1.62-2.43) |
| -BMA counselling | 2.06 (1.62-2.62) | 1.91 (1.50-2.44) | 1.87 (1.47-2.37) |
| Perceived support: | | | |
| -management | 0.74 (0.68-0.81) | 0.77 (0.71-0.83) | 0.77 (0.72-0.83) |
| -colleagues | 0.75 (0.70-0.80) | 0.77 (0.72-0.83) | 0.78 (0.73-0.83) |
| -medical professional support | 0.84 (0.76-0.92) | 0.84 (0.77-0.93) | 0.84 (0.77-0.92) |
| -defense organisation | 0.82 (0.76-0.90) | 0.84 (0.77-0.91) | 0.84 (0.77-0.91) |
| Process related issues: | | | |
| -normal process not followed | 1.16 (1.09-1.24) | 1.15 (1.08-1.23) | 1.15 (1.08-1.22) |
| -documentary record was fair | 0.77 (0.72-0.83) | 0.80 (0.75-0.86) | 0.80 (0.75-0.86) |
| -time scale was protracted | 1.20 (1.12-1.29) | 1.20 (1.12-1.29) | 1.19 (1.11-1.28) |
| -informed of bringing representation | 0.95 (0.88-1.02) | 0.96 (0.89-1.03) | 0.95 (0.89-1.02) |
| -inappropriate use of risk process | 1.20 (1.13-1.28) | 1.18 (1.11-1.26) | 1.18 (1.11-1.25) |
| -complaint due to dysfunctional team | 1.23 (1.16-1.30) | 1.19 (1.12-1.25) | 1.18 (1.12-1.25) |
| -felt victimised | 1.28 (1.21-1.35) | 1.23 (1.17-1.30) | 1.23 (1.16-1.29) |
| -clinical issues after complaint | 1.30 (1.23-1.37) | 1.22 (1.15-1.29) | 1.22 (1.15-1.28) |
| -felt bullied | 1.32 (1.25-1.40) | 1.28 (1.22-1.35) | 1.27 (1.21-1.34) |
| -managers undermined position | 1.32 (1.25-1.39) | 1.27 (1.20-1.34) | 1.26 (1.20-1.32) |
| -colleagues took advantage | 1.27 (1.21-1.34) | 1.22 (1.16-1.29) | 1.22 (1.15-1.28) |
| Worrying about the complaint: | | | |
| -loss of livelihood | 1.43 (1.34-1.53) | 1.43 (1.34-1.53) | 1.40 (1.31-1.50) |
| -public humiliation | 1.40 (1.30-1.50) | 1.38 (1.29-1.48) | 1.36 (1.27-1.45) |
| -professional humiliation | 1.58 (1.44-1.72) | 1.53 (1.40-1.66) | 1.48 (1.37-1.61) |
| -practice restricted | 1.40 (1.31-1.49) | 1.39 (1.31-1.47) | 1.35 (1.28-1.44) |
| -family problems | 1.48 (1.39-1.57) | 1.46 (1.38-1.55) | 1.43 (1.35-1.52) |
| -marked record | 1.56 (1.42-1.72) | 1.53 (1.40-1.67) | 1.47 (1.35-1.61) |
| -financial costs | 1.45 (1.36-1.55) | 1.43 (1.34-1.52) | 1.40 (1.31-1.48) |

[a] RRcc = risk ratios when only using complete cases
[b] RRmar = risk ratios when imputed datasets are used
[c] RRmnar = risk ratios under the not missing at random assumption

**Supplementary table 9. Descriptives anxiety**

|  | Complete cases N (%) | Imputations | Sens Anal |
|---|---|---|---|
| No anxiety | 1726 (83.95%) | 1891 (83.76%) | 1872 (82.93%) |
| Anxiety | 330 (16.05%) | 366 (16.24%) | 385 (17.07%) |

**Supplementary table 10. RRs, anxiety**

| Item | RRcc[a] (95% CI) | RRmar[b] (95% CI) | RRmnar[c] (95% CI) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Actual support: | | | |
| -spoke to family/friends | 1.57 (1.09-2.24) | 1.58 (1.11-2.26) | 1.56 (1.09-2.22) |
| -spoke to colleagues | 0.62 (0.46-0.84) | 0.69 (0.51-0.94) | 0.70 (0.52-0.95) |
| -represented yourself | 1.20 (0.97-1.50) | 1.19 (0.96-1.47) | 1.18 (0.95-1.46) |
| -medical professional support | 1.08 (0.88-1.34) | 1.15 (0.93-1.42) | 1.14 (0.93-1.41) |
| -independent solicitor | 1.88 (1.44-2.45) | 1.70 (1.29-2.23) | 1.70 (1.31-2.21) |
| -BMA employment advice service | 1.75 (1.38-2.22) | 1.71 (1.35-2.17) | 1.69 (1.33-2.13) |
| -BMA counselling | 1.88 (1.42-2.47) | 1.74 (1.33-2.29) | 1.71 (1.31-2.25) |
| Perceived support: | | | |
| -management | 0.78 (0.72-0.85) | 0.80 (0.74-0.87) | 0.80 (0.74-0.87) |
| -colleagues | 0.76 (0.71-0.82) | 0.78 (0.73-0.84) | 0.79 (0.73-0.84) |
| -medical professional support | 0.87 (0.78-0.96) | 0.87 (0.79-0.96) | 0.87 (0.79-0.96) |
| -defense organisation | 0.87 (0.79-0.95) | 0.87 (0.79-0.95) | 0.87 (0.80-0.95) |
| Process related issues: | | | |
| -normal process not followed | 1.20 (1.13-1.29) | 1.18 (1.10-1.26) | 1.17 (1.10-1.25) |
| -documentary record was fair | 0.78 (0.72-0.85) | 0.81 (0.75-0.87) | 0.81 (0.76-0.88) |
| -time scale was protracted | 1.19 (1.10-1.28) | 1.16 (1.08-1.26) | 1.16 (1.08-1.25) |
| -informed of bringing representation | 0.94 (0.86-1.02) | 0.94 (0.87-1.02) | 0.94 (0.87-1.01) |
| -inappropriate use of risk process | 1.19 (1.11-1.28) | 1.17 (1.10-1.25) | 1.17 (1.10-1.25) |
| -complaint due to dysfunctional team | 1.22 (1.15-1.30) | 1.19 (1.12-1.26) | 1.18 (1.11-1.25) |
| -felt victimised | 1.27 (1.19-1.35) | 1.22 (1.15-1.30) | 1.22 (1.15-1.29) |
| -clinical issues after complaint | 1.27 (1.19-1.35) | 1.20 (1.13-1.28) | 1.20 (1.13-1.27) |
| -felt bullied | 1.33 (1.25-1.42) | 1.30 (1.22-1.38) | 1.29 (1.22-1.36) |
| -managers undermined position | 1.30 (1.23-1.38) | 1.25 (1.18-1.33) | 1.25 (1.18-1.32) |
| -colleagues took advantage | 1.26 (1.19-1.34) | 1.22 (1.15-1.30) | 1.22 (1.15-1.29) |
| Worrying about the complaint: | | | |
| -loss of livelihood | 1.40 (1.30-1.50) | 1.40 (1.30-1.50) | 1.38 (1.29-1.48) |
| -public humiliation | 1.45 (1.34-1.56) | 1.43 (1.33-1.54) | 1.40 (1.30-1.51) |
| -professional humiliation | 1.53 (1.39-1.68) | 1.52 (1.38-1.66) | 1.48 (1.36-1.62) |
| -practice restricted | 1.33 (1.24-1.42) | 1.33 (1.25-1.42) | 1.32 (1.23-1.40) |
| -family problems | 1.44 (1.35-1.54) | 1.44 (1.35-1.53) | 1.42 (1.34-1.51) |
| -marked record | 1.50 (1.36-1.66) | 1.49 (1.36-1.64) | 1.46 (1.33-1.61) |
| -financial costs | 1.40 (1.31-1.50) | 1.38 (1.29-1.47) | 1.36 (1.28-1.45) |

[a] RRcc = risk ratios when only using complete cases
[b] RRmar = risk ratios when imputed datasets are used
[c] RRmnar = risk ratios under the not missing at random assumption