

21 **ABSTRACT (250/250 words)**

22 **Objective:** The scale of burnout in UK gastroenterology trainees and the feasibility to
23 determine its prevalence using the validated Maslach Burnout Inventory Human
24 Services Survey (MBI-HSS) tool are unknown. A region-wide pilot study was
25 conducted to determine the uptake of a 31-item questionnaire and estimate the
26 prevalence of burnout in gastroenterology trainees within the East of England deanery
27 (EoE). Symptom severity across the three domains of burnout (emotional exhaustion,
28 depersonalisation, and low personal accomplishment), and frequently experienced
29 stressors by gastroenterology trainees were also studied.

30 **Design:** This was a cross-sectional study involving gastroenterology trainees from 16
31 hospitals across EoE using a 31-item questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of the
32 22-item MBI-HSS and 9 additional free-text questions. All gastroenterology trainees in
33 EoE were invited to complete the anonymized survey online. Data were analysed
34 quantitatively and qualitatively.

35 **Results:** Uptake of the survey was above-average; 44.0% (40/91) response rate. 57.5%
36 (23/40) of gastroenterology trainees suffered emotional exhaustion. 23.5% (8/34) had
37 depersonalisation and 63.9% (23/36) experienced low professional accomplishment.
38 Burnout prevalence was 35.3% (12/34). Only 48.4% (15/31) of gastroenterology
39 trainees were aware of professional support services within EoE. Stressors related to
40 service requirements and professional relationships were commonly reported; 65.6%
41 and 25.0% respectively.

42 **Conclusions:** It is feasible to use a 31-item questionnaire to detect and study burnout in
43 a national cohort of gastroenterology trainees. Burnout in EoE gastroenterology trainees
44 was high and this may reflect the national prevalence within the specialty. Larger

45 studies, greater awareness of burnout, and better access to professional support services

46 are needed.

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64 **Summary Box**

65 **What is already known about the subject?**

- 66 • Burnout in physicians is a growing problem worldwide which can lead to
67 personal ill-health and suboptimal patient care.
- 68 • Burnout in young gastroenterology fellows in the US are reported as high as
69 50% but the prevalence in UK gastroenterology trainees is unknown.
- 70 • The Maslach Burnout Inventory - Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS) is the
71 most validated tool to determine physician burnout but survey length may affect
72 uptake by UK gastroenterology trainees and the feasibility of future studies.

73 **What are the new findings?**

- 74 • This pilot study demonstrated the feasibility of a 31-item questionnaire which
75 included the MBI-HSS in studying burnout in UK gastroenterology trainees.
- 76 • Emotional exhaustion and a sense of low personal accomplishment affect more
77 than half of gastroenterology trainees within the East of England.
- 78 • The prevalence of burnout in UK gastroenterology trainees is estimated to be
79 high (35.3%) but larger studies are needed.
- 80 • Approximately half of gastroenterology trainees in the East of England were not
81 aware of existing support services to help them cope with burnout.

82 **How might it impact on clinical practice in the foreseeable future?**

- 83 • This pilot study may increase the awareness of burnout among UK trainees and
84 trainers in gastroenterology.
- 85 • An estimate of burnout prevalence in UK gastroenterology trainees is provided
86 so future research and remediation measures in the specialty can be justified.

87 INTRODUCTION

88 Burnout is an increasingly recognised occupational hazard among clinicians worldwide.
89 It recently has been recognized as an “occupational phenomenon” in the 11th revision
90 of the International Classification of Disease (ICD-11), and globally 30-50% of
91 clinicians are estimated to have symptoms of burnout.[1] It is typically characterized by
92 symptoms across three domains: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and a sense of
93 low personal accomplishment (self-worth); the latter two domains have recently been
94 referred to as "cynicism" and "reduced professional efficacy" respectively.[2] These
95 symptoms exist on a scale of varying severity and the lack of awareness of its nature can
96 lead to its under-recognition.[3] Unaddressed, clinician burnout can have a negative
97 impact on patient outcomes through impaired professionalism, poor communication,
98 decreased patient satisfaction, professional errors, near misses and even patient harm.[1]
99 To clinicians, burnout may also cause depression and suicidal ideations, sleep
100 disturbances, alcoholism, musculoskeletal disorders, hypertension and ischaemic heart
101 disease.[4-7] Nonetheless, burnout is reversible and well placed support mechanisms
102 are vital in the timely intervention and preservation of mental well being of clinicians in
103 distress, especially those in the early stages of their careers.

104 Gastroenterology is a busy speciality often involving high workloads and large patient
105 volumes, especially in the public sector. Unsurprisingly, the prevalence of burnout in
106 gastroenterology fellows and young gastroenterologists have been reported as high as
107 54% in the US.[3,8] In the UK, gastroenterology training is equally demanding;
108 trainees often hold many responsibilities involving general medical on calls, patient care
109 in 30-40 bedded speciality wards, inpatient consults, outpatient clinics, endoscopy lists,
110 speciality licensing exams, and for some, research commitments. Importantly, the

111 prevalence of burnout in UK gastroenterology trainees has not been previously
112 determined and the scale of the problem remains unknown.

113 Several tools have been developed to detect burnout. These include, but are not limited
114 to the 22-item Maslach Burnout Inventory Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS), the 19-
115 item Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, and the 16-item Oldenburg Burnout Inventory.
116 The MBI-HSS is by far the most extensively validated and widely used tool in medical
117 professionals.[9,10] However, when the 22-item MBI-HSS is supplemented with
118 additional questions (e.g. demographic data collection) as is often the case, resulting
119 questionnaires are usually extensive and yield low response rates.[11] We designed a
120 31-item questionnaire which contained both the 22-item MBI-HSS and 9 free-text
121 questions. It was unknown if the response rate from UK gastroenterology trainees to
122 this long questionnaire would be adequate for meaningful data analysis; typical
123 response rates for US-based studies of gastroenterology fellows and gastroenterologists
124 range from 8.1% to 12%.[8,12,13] Furthermore, a recent 64-item survey on stress in UK
125 gastroenterologists yielded a response rate of only 29%.[14]

126 We hypothesized that burnout could be accurately detected using the MBI-HSS and
127 survey response rates could be optimised by using streamlined questions. The objectives
128 of this pilot study were to: (i) evaluate the uptake of a burnout questionnaire by
129 response rates in a local trainee cohort before extending this study nationally, (ii) obtain
130 an estimate of burnout prevalence within the East of England deanery (EoE), and (iii)
131 understand common stressors that UK gastroenterology trainees face. A response rate of
132 >30% was defined as acceptable since this is higher than typical response rates reported
133 in un-incentivised studies of burnout.[15]

134 For the benefit of readers not familiar with the UK gastroenterology training system,
135 we use the terms "gastroenterology registrars" and "gastroenterology trainees"
136 interchangeably for better clarity. Standard specialty training in gastroenterology within
137 the UK spans 5 years of fulltime clinical training (ST3, ST4, ST5, ST6 and ST7).

138

139 **METHODS**

140 *Design and administration of the questionnaire*

141 A two-part questionnaire was designed to detect the presence of burnout and collect
142 qualitative data for further analysis. The first part comprised of the 22-question MBI-
143 HSS which assessed burnout symptoms in the three domains of emotional exhaustion,
144 depersonalisation (or cynicism) and a sense of low personal achievements (or
145 professional efficacy). The second part comprised of 9 free-text questions.

146 For the 22 questions that related to the MBI-HSS, each question was graded on a seven-
147 point Likert scale according to the frequency of symptoms, ranging from "never" (0) to
148 "every day" (6). The Cronbach alpha in each domain was greater than 0.7. Scores from
149 questions within each domain were summated and the average score was calculated for
150 each respondent. Respondent scores were assessed for abnormal values which were
151 provided in the proprietary MBI Manual 4th Edition (Method 2).[16] Abnormal values
152 (proprietary) were derived from a population of 6,269 healthcare workers using the
153 following formulae: Abnormal EE = Mean + (SD*0.5), Abnormal DP = Mean +
154 (SD*1.25), and Abnormal LPA = Mean + (SD*0.1).[16] The higher the summated score
155 or average score in the emotional exhaustion (EE) and depersonalisation (DP) subscales,
156 the more frequent and severe the symptoms. Conversely, in the subscale measuring low

157 personal accomplishment (LPA), the lower the summated score or average score, the
158 more severe the symptoms. Individual summated scores were used to determine burnout
159 (Method 1).[16] Clinical burnout was defined using the Maslach recommended criteria
160 as the presence of either a high summated EE score with a high summated DP score, or
161 a high summated EE score with a low summated LPA score (summated $EE \geq 27$ and
162 summated $DP \geq 13$, or summated $EE \geq 27$ and summated $LPA \leq 31$).[17]

163 The 9 free-text questions (Supplementary Table 1) in the second part of the
164 questionnaire gathered demographic data as well as information on the most significant
165 stressors that trainees perceived. One question on General Internal Medical (GIM) on
166 calls was included because it is widely accepted that the acute medical registrar role is a
167 highly demanding and stressful responsibility within the UK [18], and therefore may
168 have had an effect on burnout rates.

169 A license to reproduce the MBI-HSS was obtained (www.mindgarden.com) and the
170 MBI-HSS questions, together with the supplementary questions, were transcribed to an
171 online platform (www.surveymonkey.co.uk). For the ease of processing raw data, the
172 entire questionnaire was divided into four pages; page 1 contained 9 questions on EE,
173 page 2 contained 8 questions on LPA, page 3 contained 5 questions on DP, and page 4
174 contained the 9 free-text questions. An electronic link to the questionnaire was then
175 circulated to all 91 gastroenterology trainees within EoE via work and personal email,
176 and data was collected between 15 January 2020 and 15 February 2020. A reminder
177 email was sent on 29 Jan 2020. All responses were anonymised. Phone reminders were
178 not utilised to preserve respondent anonymity.

179 Data from the MBI-HSS and parts of supplementary questions were analysed
180 quantitatively. The remaining questions in the second part of the questionnaire were

181 analysed qualitatively. Trainees were asked for the most significant job-related factor
182 that contributed to their stress levels, and their responses were grouped under the most
183 appropriate of the four themes: service requirements (workload, staffing levels etc),
184 professional relationships (with colleagues and patients), training (e.g. exams, length of
185 training, program requirements) and others.

186 *Statistical analyses*

187 MedCalc 19.1.5 was used to perform the statistical analyses. Trainee variables were
188 tested for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk method where applicable.[19] Parametric
189 results were reported as mean \pm standard deviation and non-parametric results were
190 reported as median and inter-quartile range (IQR). Age of trainees between burnt out
191 and non-burnt out groups were compared using the Mann-Whitney U test. When
192 numbers were greater than five in a contingency table, the chi-squared test was used to
193 test for differences in burnout proportions between groups; training grades and training
194 centres (tertiary centre, district general hospital and research centre). When trainee
195 numbers were small ($n \leq 5$) in a contingency table, Fisher's exact test was used to
196 calculate p-values for better accuracy; employment status (full-time vs. less than full-
197 time), gender (male vs. female), and GIM on calls (yes vs. no).

198 Two-tailed p values were reported for all tests and the significance level was set at 95%.
199 Bonferroni correction was applied for multiple hypothesis testing if a significant p-value
200 was obtained. Regression models were not used because the small sample size would
201 not provide accurate results for meaningful interpretation.[20] A logistic regression
202 model to identify relationships between trainee associated variables and burnout will be
203 used in a planned national study where sample size would be considerably larger.

204 *Ethics*

205 Prior to designing the survey, the authors completed the Medical Research Council and
206 NHS Health Research Authority decision tool (www.hra-decisiontools.org.uk) which
207 determined ethical approval from a local research ethics committee (REC) was not
208 required (Appendix 1). All participants were automatically anonymised by the online
209 survey platform and trainees were made aware of this in their invitation email. Trainees
210 were also informed the survey was for research purposes and participation was
211 voluntary. Completion of the survey conferred implied consent and the authors only
212 received anonymised responses with no trainee identifiable information. There were no
213 risks posed to participants and participation in the survey was not incentivised.

214 *Patient and Public Involvement*

215 This study did not involve any members of the public or patients.

216 *Exclusion Criteria And Missing Data*

217 Missing data from incomplete DP and LPA questions were not used in the calculation
218 of burnout rates. Average DP and LPA scores were calculated from incomplete DP and
219 LPA questions, as permissible and advised by product literature. Missing data from the
220 second part of the survey were not included in the respective fields of analysis. All
221 authors in this paper were excluded from this study.

222 **RESULTS**

223 *Response rates*

224 The uptake of the questionnaire was good, achieving a response rate of 44.0% (41/90).
225 62.5% (25/40) of all responses were received within the first 2 weeks of the survey,
226 35% (14/40) of responses were received within 1 week of the reminder email being sent
227 and 2.5% (1/40) responded in the last week of the survey. There was a 100% (40/40)

228 completion rate for questions on EE, 90.0% (36/40) completion rate for questions on
229 LPA, and 85.0% (34/40) completion rate for questions on DP. For the second part of the
230 questionnaire, 65.0% (26/40) of respondents completed all 9 questions.

231 *Demographics of respondents*

232 Most gastroenterology trainees that responded to the survey were aged between 30-35
233 years old with the mode of respondents being ST6 (i.e. the fourth year out of five years
234 of standard gastroenterology training). There were more male than female respondents
235 however this is reflective of the number of female gastroenterologists including
236 gastroenterology trainees within the UK (21-39%)[21]. There were slightly more
237 gastroenterology trainees who were working in district general hospitals (DGHs) than
238 tertiary centres: 43.8% vs. 53.1%. Most of the gastroenterology trainees were involved
239 in GIM on calls. A summary of the demographic data is displayed in Table 1.

240 **Table 1:** Demographic data of EoE gastroenterology trainees who responded in the
241 survey.

Trainee Demographics	Results	Footnotes
1. Age (median); IQR	32 yrs; IQR 30-35yrs	<i>Mean = 33.1yrs</i>
2. Training grade (mode)	ST6	<i>ST3=16.7%, ST4=23.3%, ST5=16.7%, ST6=30.0%, ST7=13.3%</i>
3. Full-time training	87.9%	<i>LTFT trainees = 12.1%</i>
4. Gender	Male = 71.0%, Female = 29.0%	
5. Training centres	Tertiary = 43.8%, DGH = 53.1%	<i>Research centre = 3.1%</i>
6. GIM oncalls	Yes = 87.5%, No = 12.5%	

242 *LTFT = Less than full-time training (part-time). DGH = District general hospital. GIM = General*
243 *Internal Medicine.*

244 *The estimated prevalence of burnout and burnout related symptoms were high in*
245 *gastroenterology trainees.*

246 Symptoms of burnout were high in gastroenterology trainees (Figure 1). Emotional
247 exhaustion was present in 57.5% (23/40) of all respondents (EE mean 3.9 ± 0.8). Of
248 these, 43.5% (10/23) experienced symptoms once a week or more frequently.
249 Depersonalisation was detected in 23.5% (8/34) of all trainees (DP mean 3.9 ± 0.6), of
250 these, 62.5% (5/8) experienced symptoms once a week or more frequently. 63.9%
251 (23/36) of all respondents experienced a sense of low personal accomplishment (LPA
252 mean 3.8 ± 0.7), of these, 52.2% (12/23) felt some sort of job satisfaction or fulfilment
253 once a week or less. Overall, burnout was present in 35.3% (12/34) of gastroenterology
254 trainees. Despite the high prevalence of burnout symptoms, only 48.4% (15/31) of
255 gastroenterology trainees were aware that there were professional support services
256 within the deanery to help trainees in distress.

257 *Characteristics of burnt-out gastroenterology trainees*

258 A summary of the characteristics between burnt out and non-burnt out gastroenterology
259 trainees is displayed in Table 2. Briefly, burnt out gastroenterology trainees were
260 observed to be slightly older, in later stages of training (ST5 and ST6 training grades),
261 in full-time employment, working in tertiary centres, and did GIM on calls, however,
262 none of these differences had any statistical significance when tested. For research
263 purposes, the summated sub-scale scores were calculated and the results for the burnt-
264 out group were as follow: EE=34.0 (median: 32, IQR 29-40), DP= 16.3 ± 7.4 , and
265 LPA= 28.2 ± 7.2 . For the non-burnt group, the average of summated sub-scale scores
266 were EE= 21.2 ± 10.8 , DP=7.6 (median: 6, IQR 5-10), and LPA = 38.0 ± 5.4 .

267 **Table 2:** Characteristics of burnt out and non-burnt out gastroenterology trainees.

Trainee variable	Burnt out (a)	Non-burnt out (b)	(a) vs. (b)
Age (mean)	34.1 yrs	32.6yrs	$p = 0.11$
Grade			$p = 0.12$
ST3	20.0% (1/5)	80.0% (4/5)	
ST4	14.3% (1/7)	85.7% (6/7)	
ST5	80.0% (4/5)	20.0% (1/5)	
ST6	55.6% (5/9)	44.4% (4/9)	
ST7	25.0% (1/4)	75.0% (3/4)	
Employment status			$p = 0.27$
Full-time	41.4% (12/29)	58.6% (17/29)	
LTFT	0% (0)	100% (4/4)	
Gender			$p = 0.70$
Male	40.9% (9/22)	59.1% (13/22)	
Female	33.3% (3/9)	66.7% (6/9)	
Training Centre			$p = 0.27$
Tertiary	42.9% (6/14)	57.1% (8/14)	
DGH	29.4% (5/17)	70.6% (12/17)	
Research centre	100% (1/1)	0% (0/0)	
GIM on calls			$p = 0.49$
Yes	32.1% (9/28)	67.9% (19/28)	
No	50.0% (2/4)	50.0% (2/4)	

268

269 ***Common stressors in UK gastroenterology trainees***

270 87.1% (27/31) of gastroenterology trainees stated that job-related factors contributed to
271 the most amount of stress in their lives, 12.9% (4/31) reported personal factors - family
272 relationships and personal finances. Figure 2 illustrates the frequency of job-related
273 stressors reported by gastroenterology trainees according to the themes. 65.6% (21/32)
274 of trainees reported stressors related to service requirements, these comprised of
275 workload (56.2%) and inadequate staffing levels (9.4%). Professional relationships
276 were the second most frequently reported theme at 25.0% (8/32); these consisted of
277 difficult and unsupportive colleagues (9.4%), expectations by seniors (9.4%), difficult
278 patients (3.1%), and expectations of patients (3.1%). Stressors relating to training
279 requirements were reported at a frequency of 12.5% (4/32) which comprised speciality

280 exams (6.3%), length of training (3.1%) and curriculum requirements (3.1%). Other
281 stressors that were reported include long commuting times between home and work
282 (6.3%) and length of speciality training (3.1%).

283 **DISCUSSION**

284 This study has used the 22-item MBI-HSS to detect burnout although abbreviated
285 versions (aMBI) of the tool exist. These include the 2-item, 9-item MBI or 12-item
286 aMBI which are favoured by some researchers because they are easier to administer and
287 can yield better response rates. However, we have chosen not to use an abbreviated
288 version of the MBI because these can be unreliable; we have previously demonstrated
289 that the 12-question MBI had a poor positive predictive value of 33.3% (95%
290 confidence interval:27.5-39.8%) and could overestimate the prevalence of burnout.[22]
291 The study period was also capped at 1 month because given our experience in burnout
292 studies of similar sample size, most of the responses were usually obtained within the
293 first two weeks of the survey.[22] This is clearly evidenced in our observations of the
294 current study as shown in the results. For the planned nationwide study, the study period
295 will be extended to 3 months since the cohort size would be exponentially larger.

296 Even though the MBI-HSS is a well established tool, many researchers have adopted
297 different criteria as well as numerical cut-off values to define burnout. Such
298 heterogeneity in burnout definitions, as well as burnout tools, has precluded the accurate
299 estimation of burnout in systematic reviews and meta-analyses.[9,23] In this study,
300 burnout was defined by the Maslach-recommended criteria of “high EE and high DP” or
301 “high EE and low PA” since this is the only definition that has been shown to have a
302 clinical correlation; researchers have established that the combination of high scores in
303 these domains correlate closely to work-related neurasthenia as defined by ICD-

304 10.[16,17,24] Using this definition, the prevalence of clinical burnout was determined to
305 be 35.3% but this is possibly an underestimation because burnt out trainees may not
306 have engaged in this study.

307 Nonetheless, this study has demonstrated that the uptake of the 22-item MBI-HSS
308 within gastroenterology trainees was good, achieving a response rate of 44.0% which is
309 higher than commonly reported response rates in burnout studies. Interestingly,
310 although a 100% completion rate was achieved in the emotional exhaustion questions
311 (page 1 of 4 on the online survey), the completion rate gradually declined as the
312 questionnaire progressed: 90% for LPA questions (page 2), 85.0% for DP questions
313 (page 3) and 65.0% for free-text questions (page 4). In a planned nationwide study, the
314 authors will consolidate all questions onto 2 pages to improve the completion rate; the
315 first page to contain the 22-item MBI-HSS and the second page to contain free-text
316 questions.

317 In our results, burnt out trainees were observed to be slightly older (34.1yrs vs. 32.6yrs),
318 in ST5 and ST6 training grades, in fulltime employment, working in tertiary centres,
319 and did GIM on calls. However, these differences did not have any statistical
320 significance when tested. The lack of statistical significance, however, does not imply
321 the lack of association but rather could be a result of the small sample size. In the
322 planned nationwide study, these factors could be analysed more meaningfully in a larger
323 sample size with regression methods to test for associations. Also, it was unexpected
324 that difficult and unsupportive colleagues would be the second most frequently reported
325 stressor (9.4%), jointly ranked with expectations by seniors (9.4%) and poor staffing
326 levels (9.4%). The two former stressors may be addressed by interventions such as
327 mentoring and mindfulness-based exercises [25-28], however the latter may prove to be
328 more difficult for reasons discussed below.

329 Within the UK, the demand for gastroenterology services is gradually increasing but
330 almost half of advertised gastroenterology consultant posts remain unfilled.[21] Several
331 years are needed to train or recruit manpower to fill these vacancies and it is therefore
332 unsurprising that current gastroenterology consultants and trainees face heavy
333 workloads, and as a result, may experience high levels of stress and burnout. Recently, a
334 survey on stress among UK gastroenterologists found that 48% considered leaving their
335 current hospital of work, 44% had lost their temper at work and 6% had contemplated
336 suicide.[14] These strongly suggest further studies in burnout are needed, especially in
337 gastroenterology trainees and young consultants since early stage burnout can diminish
338 the size of the future workforce, negatively impacting its sustainability, and have
339 detrimental effects on the health of both patients and clinicians. More importantly, we
340 have found that only 48.4% of all gastroenterology trainees were aware of existing
341 professional support services within EoE deanery to help trainees in distress. As a
342 result, bespoke lectures on well being and wider advertisement of support services have
343 been planned for gastroenterology trainees within EoE since the completion of the
344 study.

345 Nonetheless, the scale of burnout within gastroenterology in the UK remains unknown
346 and must first be understood before any meaningful interventions can be designed. Once
347 a nationwide study of gastroenterology trainees has been completed, the authors intend
348 to conduct similar studies involving gastroenterology consultants, nurses and allied
349 health professionals that constitute the rest of the UK gastroenterology workforce. In so
350 doing, burnout prevalence amongst the workforce, awareness of, and access to support
351 services across the country could also be studied.

352 This pilot study has several limitations. Being a voluntary survey, this study may have
353 been affected by response bias and non-response bias although these are inherent

354 problems of survey-based burnout studies. Also, the small sample size may not be fully
355 representative of the gastroenterology trainees throughout the UK therefore a larger
356 study is needed to accurately determine the prevalence of burnout. Although the MBI-
357 HSS is the most reliable and validated tool to detect burnout to date, its limitation
358 should be recognised because burnout syndrome itself is poorly characterized. Lastly,
359 working hours and rota patterns in gastroenterology and GIM were not studied and
360 therefore limited insight can be gained into the working environment of
361 gastroenterology trainees. The authors acknowledge this was a compromise to achieve
362 better response rates. Even though associations between longer working hours and
363 burnout are known, the relationship is non-linear, often complex, and is influenced by
364 many other factors such as personality traits (resilience) which are difficult to measure.

365

366 **Conclusion**

367 It is feasible to use a 31-item questionnaire comprising the MBI-HSS to determine the
368 prevalence of burnout in gastroenterology trainees in a larger cohort study. Most
369 gastroenterology trainees within EoE have symptoms of burnout and the prevalence of
370 burnout was estimated at 35.3%, however, larger scale studies are needed. Service
371 requirements and professional relationships contribute the most stress to
372 gastroenterology trainees in EoE. Greater awareness of burnout and better access to
373 professional support services are needed.

374

375 **Acknowledgements:** This research was not funded however communications and
376 access to literature were provided by the University of Cambridge. JO is funded by the

377 W.D. Armstrong Doctoral Research Training Fellowship and a talent development grant
378 from the National University of Singapore.

379

380 **Funding:** None - this research received no specific grant from any funding agency in
381 the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

382

383 **Competing interests:** None to declare

384

385 **Author's contributions:** Conceptualisation: JO, design: JO and CS, data curation JO
386 and CS, statistical analysis: JO, manuscript preparation: JO, CS, LWY, revisions: SO,
387 YAN, critical edits and supervision: AS.

388

389 **Data sharing:** No additional data is available

390

391 **REFERENCES**

392 1. West CP, Dyrbye LN, Erwin PJ, et al. Interventions to prevent and reduce physician
393 burnout: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2016;388:2272–81

394 2. Maslach C, Leiter MP. Understanding the burnout experience: recent research and its
395 implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry* 2016;15(2):103-11.

- 396 3. Barnes EL, Ketwaroo GA, Shields HM. Scope of Burnout Among Young
397 Gastroenterologists and Practical Solutions from Gastroenterology and Other
398 Disciplines. *Dig Dis Sci* 2019;64:302–306.
- 399 4. Madsen IEH, Lange T, Borritz M, et al. Burnout as a risk factor for antidepressant
400 treatment - a repeated measures time-to-event analysis of 2936 Danish human service
401 workers. *J Psychiatr Res* 2015;65:47–52.
- 402 5. Peterson U, Demerouti E, Bergstrom G, et al. Burnout and physical and mental
403 health among Swedish healthcare workers. *J Adv Nurs* 2008;62:84–95.
- 404 6. Shanafelt TD, Sloan JA, Habermann TM. The well-being of physicians. *Am J Med*
405 2003;114:513–519.
- 406 7. Sorour AS, El-Maksoud MMA. Relationship between musculoskeletal disorders,
407 job demands, and burnout among emergency nurses. *Adv Emerg Nurs J* 2012;34:272–
408 282.
- 409 8. DeCross AJ. The Current State of Professional Burnout in Gastroenterology. *AGA*
410 *Perspect* 2017;13:22–23
- 411 9. Rotenstein LS, Torre M, Ramos MA, et al. Prevalence of Burnout Among Physicians.
412 *JAMA* 2018;320:1131–1150.
- 413 10. Shi Y, Gugiu PC, Crowe RP, et al. A Rasch Analysis Validation of the Maslach
414 Burnout Inventory-Student Survey with Preclinical Medical Students. *Teach Learn Med*
415 2019;31:154–169.

- 416 11. West CP, Dyrbye LN, Satele DV, et al. Concurrent Validity of Single-Item
417 Measures of Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization in Burnout Assessment. *J*
418 *Gen Intern Med* 2012;27,1445–1452.
- 419 12. Keswani RN, Taft TH, Coté GA, et al. Increased levels of stress and burnout are
420 related to decreased physician experience and to interventional gastroenterology career
421 choice: findings from a US survey of endoscopists. *Am J Gastroenterol.*
422 2011;106:1734–1740.
- 423 13. Burke C, Surawicz CM, Oxentenko AS, et al. A national survey of burnout in
424 gastroenterologists. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2017;112:S593.
- 425 14. Gleeson D, O'Shea C, Ellison H, et al. Stress and its causes in UK
426 gastroenterologists: results of a national survey by the British Society of
427 Gastroenterology. *Frontline Gastroenterol* 2019;10(1),43–49.
- 428 15. Roberts DL, Shanafelt TD, Dyrbye LN, et al. A national comparison of burnout and
429 work-life balance among internal medicine hospitalists and outpatient general internists.
430 *J HospMed.* 2014;9(3):176–81.
- 431 16. Maslach C, Jackson S, Leiter M. Maslach burnout inventory 4th Edition. Menlo
432 Park, CA: Mind Garden 2018:10-74
- 433 17. Dyrbye LN, West CP, Shanafelt TD. Defining Burnout as a Dichotomous Variable.
434 *J Gen Intern Med* 2009; 24:440.
- 435 18. Blayney S, Crowe A, Bray D. Survival as medical registrar on call: remember the
436 doughnut. *Clin Med (Lond)* 2014;14,506–509.
- 437 19. Shapiro SS, Wilk MB. An analysis of variance test for normality (complete
438 samples). *Biometrika* 1965;52(3–4):591–611. DOI:[10.1093/biomet/52.3-4.591](https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/52.3-4.591).

- 439 20. Hart RA, Clark DH. Does size matter? Exploring the small sample properties of
440 maximum likelihood estimation. Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science
441 Association Chicago, IL: Midwest Political Science Association 1999:1-32.
- 442 21. The British Society of Gastroenterology. British Society of Gastroenterology
443 Workforce Report. 2019. Available at: [https://www.bsg.org.uk/workforce-](https://www.bsg.org.uk/workforce-reports/workforce-report-2019/)
444 [reports/workforce-report-2019/](https://www.bsg.org.uk/workforce-reports/workforce-report-2019/). [last accessed 14 Feb 2020].
- 445 22. Lim WY, Ong J, Ong S, et al. The Abbreviated Maslach Burnout Inventory Can
446 Overestimate Burnout: A Study of Anesthesiology Residents. *J Clin Med* 2020;9,61:1-
447 14. DOI:10.3390/jcm9010061
- 448 23. Sanfilippo F, Noto A, Foresta G, et al. Incidence and Factors Associated with
449 Burnout in Anesthesiology: A Systematic Review. *Biomed Res Int* 2017; Article ID:
450 8648925 DOI: 10.1155/2017/8648925
- 451 24. Schaufeli WB, Bakker A, Schaap C, et al. On the clinical validity of the Maslach
452 Burnout Inventory and the Burnout Measure. *Psychol Health* 2001;16:565-82.
- 453 25. Keswani RN, Keefer L, Surawicz CM. Burnout in Gastroenterologists and How to
454 Prevent it. *Gastroenterology* 2014;147,11–14.
- 455 26. Herring M, Forbes Kaufman R, Bogue R. Mentoring to help prevent physician
456 burnout. *Health Prog.* 2016;97:74–77.
- 457 27. Harrison R, Hunter AJ, Sharpe B, et al. Survey of US academic hospitalist leaders
458 about mentorship and academic activities in hospitalist groups. *J Hosp Med.* 2011;6:5–.
- 459 28. Ong J, Swift C, Magill N, et al. The association between mentoring and training
460 outcomes in junior doctors in medicine: an observational study. *BMJ Open*
461 2018;8:e020721.

% of respondents




Figure 1 - Frequency of burnout symptoms among gastroenterology trainees in the EoE




Figure 2: The frequency of significant stressors in gastroenterology trainees grouped by common themes.

Supplementary Table 1: Burnout Questionnaire Part 2 - Free text questions

<i>Please fill in the blanks</i>		
S/N	Question	Response
1	Age:	
2	Gender:	
3	Grade (e.g. ST3, clinical research fellow etc.):	
4	Are you in fulltime or less than full time training?:	
5	Do you work in a district hospital, tertiary centre or research centre?:	
6	Do you do General Internal Medicine oncalls?:	
7	Which area of your life contributes most to your stress levels (e.g. job, personal life, finances etc)?:	
8	Which job-related factor contributes most to your stress levels (e.g. exams, workload etc)?:	
9	Are you aware of any professional support services for trainees in the deanery?:	

Go straight to content.



Do I need NHS REC approval?

 To print your result with title and IRAS Project ID please enter your details below:

Title of your research:

Burnout in Gastroenterology Registrars

IRAS Project ID (if available):

N/A

Your answers to the following questions indicate that **you do not need NHS REC approval for sites in England**. However, you may need other approvals.

You have answered **'YES'** to: Is your study research?

You answered **'NO'** to all of these questions:

Question Set 1

- Is your study a clinical trial of an investigational medicinal product?
- Is your study one or more of the following: A non-CE marked medical device, or a device which has been modified or is being used outside of its CE mark intended purpose, and the study is conducted by or with the support of the manufacturer or another commercial company (including university spin-out company) to provide data for CE marking purposes?
- Does your study involve exposure to any ionising radiation?
- Does your study involve the processing of disclosable protected information on the Register of the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority by researchers, without consent?

Question Set 2

- Will your study involve potential research participants identified in the context of, or in connection with, their past or present use of services (adult and children's healthcare within the NHS and adult social care), including participants recruited through these services as healthy

controls?

- Will your research involve collection of tissue or information from any users of these services (adult and children's healthcare within the NHS and adult social care)? This may include users who have died within the last 100 years.
- Will your research involve the use of previously collected tissue or information from which the research team could identify individual past or present users of these services (adult and children's healthcare within the NHS and adult social care), either directly from that tissue or information, or from its combination with other tissue or information likely to come into their possession?
- Will your research involve potential research participants identified because of their status as relatives or carers of past or present users of these services (adult and children's healthcare within the NHS and adult social care)?

Question Set 3

- Will your research involve the storage of relevant material from the living or deceased on premises in the UK, but not Scotland, without an appropriate licence from the Human Tissue Authority (HTA)? This includes storage of imported material.
- Will your research involve storage or use of relevant material from the living, collected on or after 1st September 2006, and the research is not within the terms of consent from the donors, and the research does not come under another NHS REC approval?
- Will your research involve the analysis of DNA from bodily material, collected on or after 1st September 2006, and this analysis is not within the terms of consent for research from the donor? And/or: Will your research involve the analysis of DNA from materials that do not contain cells (for example: serum or processed bodily fluids such as plasma and semen) and this analysis is not within the terms of consent for research from the donor?

Question Set 4

- Will your research involve at any stage intrusive procedures with adults who lack capacity to consent for themselves, including participants retained in study following the loss of capacity?
- Is your research health-related and involving prisoners?
- Does your research involve xenotransplantation?
- Is your research a social care project funded by the Department of Health and Social Care (England)?

If your research extends beyond **England** find out if you need NHS REC approval by selecting the '*OTHER UK COUNTRIES*' button below.

OTHER UK COUNTRIES

If, after visiting all relevant UK countries, this decision tool

It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/) .

suggests that you do not require NHS REC approval follow this link for final confirmation and further information.

Print This Page

NOTE: If using Internet Explorer please use browser print function.

[About this tool](#) [Feedback](#) [Contact](#) [Glossary](#)

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2,3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5 ,6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	8
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	8
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7,8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	8,9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	8
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	8,9
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	8-10
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8,9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	8,9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	10
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8, 10
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	NA
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	11,12,Table 1
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	10,11
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	10-14, Fig 1, Fig 2
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	10-14
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	11,12
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	12,13, Table 2
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	14,15,16
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	15,16
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15,16
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	14,15,16
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	18

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.