

Secondary traumatic stress and burnout in healthcare workers during COVID-19 outbreak

Marzetti F.¹, Vagheggini G.^{2,3*}, Conversano C.¹, Miccoli M.¹, Gemignani A.¹, Ciacchini R.¹, Panait E.³, Orrù G.¹

¹Department of Surgical, Medical and Molecular Pathology, Critical and Care Medicine, University of Pisa, Italy

²Auxilium Vitae Rehabilitation Centre, Weaning and Cardio-Pulmonary Rehabilitation Unit, Volterra, Italy

³Fondazione Volterra Ricerche ONLUS, Volterra, Italy.

* Corresponding author: Guido Vagheggini, guidovagheggini@libero.it

Aims: To assess the level of professional burnout and secondary traumatic stress, and to identify potential risk or protective factors among health care workers (HCWs) during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak.

Materials and Methods: This cross-sectional study, based on an online survey, collected demographic data and mental distress outcomes from 184 HCWs from May 1st, 2020, to June, 15th, 2020, from 45 different countries. The degree of secondary traumatization was assessed using the Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale (STSS), the degrees of perceived stress and burnout were assessed with Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) and Maslach Burnout Inventory Human Service Survey (MBI-HSS) respectively. Stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed to identify potential risk and protective factors for STS.

Results: 184 HCWs (M=90; Age mean: 46.45; SD:11.02) completed the survey. A considerable proportion of HCWs had symptoms of secondary traumatic stress (41.3%), emotional exhaustion (56.0%), and depersonalization (48.9%). The prevalence of secondary traumatic stress in frontline HCWs was 47.5% while in HCWs working in other units it was 30.3% ($p<.023$); additionally, the prevalence of the same outcome was 67.1% for the HCWs exposed to patients' death and 32.9% for those HCWs which were not exposed to the same condition ($p<.001$). In stepwise multiple regression analysis, perceived stress, emotional exhaustion and exposure to patients' death remained as significant predictors in the final model for secondary traumatic stress (adjusted $R^2 = 0.537$, $p<0.001$).

Conclusions: During the current COVID-19 pandemic, HCWs facing patients' physical pain, psychological suffering, and death are more likely to develop secondary traumatization.

INTRODUCTION

The health emergency due to the COVID-19 outbreak has heavily impacted the psychological and emotional wellbeing of general population^{1,2} and healthcare workers (HCWs). In frontline HCWs, different sources of psychological distress have been reported, such as uncertainty to the disease progression (short and long term effects), and treatment, lack of personal protective equipment (PPE), physical exhaustion and overwhelming workload, concerns about the direct exposure to COVID-19 at work: in particular, the latter is associated to the fear of getting infected or spreading the infection among colleagues and families members³⁻⁸. Additionally, frontline HCWs took care of patients who were both physically and psychologically suffering for the emergency situation (*vicarious traumatization*), and, as a consequence, they're exposed at the risk of developing secondary traumatic stress disorder^{9,10}.

Results emerging from empirical researches, carried out in comparable periods such as the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) or the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) outbreaks, highlighted that HCWs experienced high levels of stress, anxiety and depressive symptoms^{11,12}, psychological distress¹³ and post-traumatic stress symptoms that include avoidance, hyperarousal, and insomnia^{11,14,15}. As expected, frontline HCWs experienced a greater psychological distress compare to HCWs with secondary roles¹¹.

According to recent studies, Chinese HCWs directly caring for COVID-19 patients showed higher levels of distress, anxiety and insomnia while compared to HCWs in secondary roles¹⁶⁻¹⁹. Medical HCWs showed a higher prevalence of insomnia, depressive, anxiety and obsessive-compulsive symptoms compared to nonmedical healthcare workers¹⁸. Two recent systematic reviews and meta-analysis underlined the higher prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among HCWs during the COVID-19 outbreak^{20,21}.

Direct exposure to high level of distress during COVID-19 pandemic, seems to increase the risk for long term consequences such as post-traumatic stress, depressive symptoms²² or professional burnout with adverse outcomes for the whole organization²³. Professional burnout or occupational burnout has been defined by Maslach²⁴ as a "response

to prolonged and chronic stress at the workplace, characterized by three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduction of personal abilities". This condition seems to be predominant within the medical health care professionals than others^{25,26}. Schanafelt et al.²⁷ reported that the overall mean rate of physician burnout rose from 45.5% in 2011 to 54.4% in 2014 ($p < .001$). It is characterized by a gradual development over time accompanied by reduced professional satisfaction which can lead to a worse ability to judge, late or inadequate responses to changes in the clinical context, and lack of patient confidence in HCWs, compromising professional performance^{26,28–31}.

Another consequence of the COVID-19 outbreak may be represented by pathologic secondary traumatic stress (STS). Figley³² defined STS as "the stress deriving from helping others who are suffering or who have been traumatized". Some authors use the term STS or compassion fatigue or vicarious traumatization interchangeably³³. In ordinary situations, because of the implications of their professional sector, HCWs may be at higher risk of developing pathological secondary traumatization and this is particularly true now more than before, considering the present emergency situation. Protective factors such as resilience, self-efficacy and perceived social support may be able to reduce STS and anxiety symptoms³⁴.

Interventions aimed at healthcare professionals should, through the support of psychologists, focusing on the management and containment of maladaptive behaviors and broader range of emotional disorders in order to reduce stress and improve professional performance^{17,35–37}. Even if different kind of psychological interventions have been released, results remain unclear and HCWs often refuse to participate^{17,38,39}.

The aim of the present study is to assess the psychological distress in terms of perceived stress, professional burnout and STS, and to identify potential risk or protective factors, among HCWs during the COVID-19 outbreak all over the world.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study design and participants

A cross-sectional international survey addressed to HCWs was conducted from May 1 to June 15, 2020. The Ethics Committee of the University of Pisa approved our study survey and procedures of informed consent before the formal survey.

A link to the above-mentioned survey was sent directly to HCWs and to the European Respiratory Society (ERS) and was published at the following link: <https://www.ersnet.org/research/covid-19-surveys>. The informed consent was available online and was provided to all participants before enrolment. The survey was anonymous and confidentiality of information was assured.

One-hundred and eighty-four HCWs from 45 Countries and 5 continents completed the online survey. Participants were eligible if the following criteria were met: 1. working in health care during COVID-19 outbreak; 2. give informed consent.

Materials

Socio-demographic data were self-reported by participants and included gender, age, Country, education, occupation, seniority, civil status, number of children and pathologies.

Data related to personal and professional experience during COVID-19 outbreak were also included: actual lockdown policies of the belonging Country, positivity for COVID-19, severity of symptoms of family members or friends infected by COVID-19, direct involvement in the assistance of COVID-19 patients, daily working with COVID-19 patients, exposure to patients' death. Respondents were also asked to evaluate how the emergency situation was managed by the organization/hospital (1 very bad management – 10 very good management) and the perceived degree of emergency (1 COVID-19 is not a real emergency – 10 it's a real emergency).

Perceived Stress Scale (PSS): The PSS is a 10-item questionnaire designed to assess the degree to which external demands seems to exceed the individual perceived ability to cope⁴⁰. Respondents are asked to indicate how frequently they felt or thought certain way in the last month on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). The PSS total score is calculated by summing up the item scores, with a higher score indicating higher perceived stress. Score range between 0 to 40.

Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale (STSS): The STSS is a 17-item questionnaire designed for measure the negative impact of indirect exposure to traumatic events in HCWs caring for suffering or traumatized clients. The traumatic

stressor for HCWs is identified as exposure to patients. Respondents are asked to indicate how frequently the item was true for them in the past seven days on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). The STSS has a global score and three subscales: Intrusion (five items), that refers to recurrent and intrusive distressing recollections of patients, including images, thoughts or perceptions; Avoidance (seven items), that measures the avoidance of stimuli associated with the care of patients and the numbing of general responsiveness; Arousal (five items), that assess symptoms such as irritability, hypervigilance, difficulty concentrating, etc... The STSS global score is calculated by summing up all the item scores, with a higher score indicating a higher frequency of symptoms. The total score ranges from 17 to 85 and is categorized into no/little (17-28), mild (28-37), moderate (38-43), high (44-48), and severe (49-85) levels of secondary trauma ⁴¹.

Maslach Burnout Inventory Human Service Survey (MBI-HSS): The MBI-HSS is a 22-item questionnaire that assesses professional burnout within people involved in the care and social services ^{24,42}. Respondents are asked to indicate the frequency with which they experience certain feelings or attitudes on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (every day). MBI-HSS is composed by three subscales: Emotional Exhaustion (MBI-EE, 9 items), that assess the feelings of being emotionally overextended by one's work; Depersonalization (MBI-D, 5 items), that measures unfeeling and impersonal response to care; Personal Accomplishment (MBI-PA, 8 items), that assess the feelings of competence, the perceived effectiveness on the job. The scores for each subscale are not combined into a global score: they are separated, with different cut-offs points (MBI-EE: low 0-16, moderate 17-26, high 27-54; MBI-D: low 0-6, moderate 7-12, high 13-35; MBI-PA: low 0-31, moderate 32-38, high 39-48).

14-Item Resilience Scale (RS-14): The RS-14 is a 14-item questionnaire to assess the individual ability to withstand or adaptively recover from stressor ⁴³. Items are evaluated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Total score ranges from 14 to 98, with higher scores indicating greater resilience. RS-14 yields reliable scores, coefficient alphas of .90 and greater ⁴³.

General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE): The GSE is a 10-items instrument that measures the perceived self-efficacy, the belief that one can successfully cope with adverse situation or stressor ⁴⁴. GSE explicitly refers to personal agency, that is, the belief that the own actions are responsible for successful outcomes. Each item is evaluated on a 4-point Likert scale, scored from 1 (not at all true) to 4 (completely true). The total score is calculated by finding the sum of all items and ranges between 10 and 40, with a higher score indicating higher self-efficacy.

Statistical Analysis

Data are presented as mean with standard deviation (SD). Comparisons between groups were performed using t-test for independent samples and chi-squared test for categorical variables. Pearson's correlation was computed to evaluate the relationship between psychological distress variables, protective factors, socio-demographic characteristics, and COVID experience. Stepwise multiple linear regression analysis was performed to determine potential risk and protective factors for secondary traumatic stress. P values <0.05 were considered statistically significant. The analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS statistics version 21.

RESULTS

Demographic characteristics and outcomes of psychological distress in total cohort

A total of 184 HCWs (M=90; Age mean: 46.45; SD:11.02) completed the survey questionnaire and the professions were the following: physicians (n=138; 75.0%), nurses (n=10; 5.4%), surgeons (n=3; 1.6%), psychologists (n=2; 1.1%) and other health professionals (n=31; 16.8%). The demographic characteristics of the sample and the Country of origin are summarized in **Table 1 and Table 2**, respectively.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics

n=184		Mean (SD) - range	n (%)
Age		46,45 (11,02) - 24-74	
Gender	F		93 (50,5%)
	M		90 (48,9%)
	Prefer not to say		1 (0,6%)
Education	Bachelor Degree		20 (10,9%)
	Bachelor Degree + Specialization		61 (33,2%)
	Master		35 (19,0%)
	PhD		68 (37,0%)
Occupation	Physician		138 (75,0%)

	Surgeon		3 (1,6%)
	Nurse		10 (5,4%)
	Psychologist		2 (1,1%)
	Other health professional		31 (16,8%)
Seniority		19,90 (11,58) - 0-50	
Civil status	Single		31 (16,8%)
	Married/with partner		142 (77,2%)
	Divorced		11 (6,0%)
Children	None		53 (28,8%)
	One		34 (18,5%)
	Two		70 (38,0%)
	Three or more		27 (14,7%)
Pathologies	None		129 (70,1%)
	Cardiovascular pathology		10 (5,4%)
	Psychiatric condition		1 (0,5%)
	Chronic pain		7 (3,8%)
	Chronic respiratory conditions		18 (9,8%)
	Diabetes		6 (3,3%)
	Other		13 (7,1%)

Table 2: Distribution per Country

n=184							
	n	%	Lock-down policies		n	%	Lock-down policies
Algiers	1	0,5	%	Hard	Latvia	1	0,5 % Hard
Argentina	1	0,5	%	Hard	Lebanon	1	0,5 % Soft
Australia	1	0,5	%	Soft	Macedonia	1	0,5 % -
Austria	2	1,1	%	Hard	Malaysia	4	2,2 % Hard
Belgium	3	1,6	%	Soft	Mexico	1	0,5 % Soft
Brazil	8	4,3	%	Soft	Netherlands	10	5,4 % Hard
Canada	2	1,1	%	Soft	Philippines	2	1,1 % Soft
Chile	1	0,5	%	Hard	Poland	1	0,5 % Soft
Colombia	2	1,1	%	Hard	Portugal	6	3,3 % Hard
Croatia	4	2,2	%	Hard	Romania	3	1,6 % Soft
Czech Republic	2	1,1	%	Hard	Serbia	3	1,6 % Soft
Denmark	2	1,1	%	Soft	South Africa	1	0,5 % Hard
Estonia	1	0,5	%	Soft	Spain	4	2,2 % Hard
Finland	1	0,5	%	Soft	Sri Lanka	1	0,5 % Soft
France	4	2,2	%	Hard	Sweden	3	1,6 % Soft
Germany	5	2,7	%	Hard	Switzerland	2	1,1 % Hard
Greece	3	1,6	%	Hard	Thailand	1	0,5 % Soft
Hungary	1	0,5	%	Soft	Turkey	2	1,1 % Hard
India	3	1,6	%	Hard	Ucraina	1	0,5 % Soft
Indonesia	9	4,9	%	Soft	UK	23	12,5 % Soft
Ireland	7	3,8	%	Soft	Uruguay	1	0,5 % -
Italy	39	21,2	%	Hard	USA	3	1,6 % Soft
Korea	1	0,5	%	Hard	missing	6	3,3 % -

Note: Lockdown policies were classified as hard if a complete lockdown was applied or soft if only partial limitations were established⁴⁷.

118 HCWs (64.1%) were frontline and directly involved in the care of COVID-19 patients while 66 HCWs (35.9%) were involved in different units. Ten out of 184 HCWs (5.6%) were infected by COVID-19 and 57 HCWs (31.0%) had one or more family members infected by COVID-19. The mean of respondents was mainly satisfied with how the organization managed the critical situation (mean=7.73, SD=1.75) and did not perceive COVID-19 outbreak as a severe emergency (mean=4.28, SD=3.15) (Table 3).

Table 3: COVID-19 outbreak individual experience

n=184		Mean (SD) - range	n (%)
Lock-down	Completely		10 (5,4%)
	Phase 2		97 (52,7%)
	Phase 3		51 (27,7%)
Care of COVID-19 patients	All open		26 (14,1%)
	No, involved in other units		66 (35,9%)
	Yes, frontline		118 (64,1%)
Hour per day with COVID-19 patients	0		65 (35,3%)

	1 to 4 hrs per day	56 (30,4%)
	4 to 8 hrs per day	40 (21,7%)
	More than 8 hrs per day	23 (12,5%)
Exposure to COVID-19 patients' death	No	90 (48,9%)
	Yes, sometimes	64 (34,8%)
	Yes, very often	30 (16,3%)
Positivity to COVID-19	No	174 (94,6%)
	Yes	10 (5,6%)
Family or friends infected by COVID-19	No	127 (69,0%)
	Yes, without complications	26 (14,1%)
	Yes, with hospitalization	27 (14,7%)
	Yes, and one or more died	4 (2,2%)
Management of the critical situation	7,73 (1,75) - 1-10	
COVID-19 it's a severe emergency	4,28 (3,15) - 1,10	

A considerable proportion of HCWs had symptoms of secondary traumatic stress (STSS \geq 38, moderate to severe symptoms, 41.3%), emotional exhaustion (MBI-EE \geq 17, moderate to high, 56.0%), and depersonalization (MBI-D \geq 7, moderate to high, 48.9%). The mean (SD) scores on the PSS, STSS and subscales, MBI-HSS subscales, GSE, and RS-14 are shown in **Table 4**.

Table 4: Questionnaire scales and subscales scores and prevalence in total cohort

n=184		
	Mean (SD)	n (%)
<u>PSS</u>	16,80 (6,27)	
<u>STSS</u>	36,41 (12,79)	
No STSS		65 (35,4%)
Mild STSS		43 (23,4%)
Moderate STSS		26 (14,1%)
High STSS		8 (4,3%)
Severe STSS		42 (22,8%)
Intrusion	10,45 (4,08)	
Avoidance	14,50 (5,32)	
Arousal	11,46 (4,50)	
<u>MBI-HSS</u>		
EE	19,66 (11,12)	
Low		81 (44,0%)
Moderate		56 (30,5%)
High		47 (25,5%)
D	7,53 (5,51)	
Low		94 (51,1%)
Moderate		58 (31,5%)
High		32 (17,4%)
PA	32,48 (8,16)	
Low		70 (38,0%)
Moderate		70 (38,0%)
High		44 (24,0%)
<u>GSE</u>	30,75 (5,73)	
<u>RS-14</u>	78,61 (12,71)	

Abbreviations: PSS=Perceived Stress Scale; STSS=Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale; MBI-HSS=Maslach Burnout Inventory Health Services Scale; EE= Emotional Exhaustion; D=Depersonalization; PA= Personal Accomplishment; GSE=General Self-Efficacy Scale; RS-14=14-item Resilience Scale.

Correlation analysis among psychological distress, secondary traumatic stress, professional burnout, protective factors, demographics, and professional experience during COVID-19 outbreak is reported in **Table 5**.

Table 5: Significant Pearson correlation coefficients r: association between perceived stress, secondary traumatic stress, professional burnout, protective factors, demographics and COVID-19 individual experience in total cohort (n=184)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.PSS	-															
2.STSS_	.633**	-														
3.Intrusion	.540**	.893**	-													
4.Avoidance	.591**	.939**	.752**	-												
5.Arousal	.611**	.923**	.742**	.805**	-											
6.MBI-EE	.555**	.645**	.562**	.596**	.621**	-										
7.MBI-D	.416**	.480**	.443**	.472**	.404**	.586**	-									
8.MBI-PA	-.307**	-.034	-.018	-.090	-.006	-.095	-.192**	-								
9.GSE	-.381**	-.244**	-.214**	-.268**	-.182*	-.259**	-.190**	.466**	-							

10.RS-14	-.337**	-.293**	-.234**	-.300**	-.264**	-.374**	-.341**	.498**	.565**	-								
11.Age	-.321**	-.160*	-.135	-.143	-.165*	-.131	-.148*	.202**	.130	.121	-							
12.Gender	.123	.139	.183*	.078	.138	.199**	-.020	.067	-.136	-.049	-.262**	-						
13.Children	-.313**	-.302**	-.268**	-.284**	-.280**	-.259**	-.122	.160**	.158*	.143	.435**	-.321**	-					
14. C19_ff	.201**	.146*	.185*	.072	.163*	.055	.027	.065	.034	.059	-.020	.138	.006	-				
15. C19_hour per day	.177*	.206**	.246**	.161*	.173*	.037	-.009	.022	-.021	.048	-.083	-.092	-.047	.093	-			
16. C19_death	.197**	.261**	.304**	.180**	.254**	.110	-.016	.130	.091	.103	-.078	-.074	.001	.215**	.671**	-		

Abbreviations: PSS=Perceived Stress Scale; STSS=Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale; MBI-EE=Maslach Burnout Inventory Health Services Scale, Emotional Exhaustion; MBI-D=Maslach Burnout Inventory Health Services Scale, Depersonalization; MBI-PA= Maslach Burnout Inventory Health Services Scale, Personal Accomplishment; GSE=General Self-Efficacy Scale; RS-14=14-item Resilience Scale; C19_ff=Family members or friends infected by COVID-19; C19_hour per day= Hour per day with COVID-19 patients; C19_death=Exposed to patients with COVID-19 death. Bold data indicate correlations that are significant. *p < .05; ** p < .01.

Demographic characteristics and outcomes of psychological distress: differences between subgroups

Women HCWs showed significant higher scores than men HCWs on STSS Intrusion subscale (p=.013), and on MBI-EE (p=.007). HCWs without children exhibited significant higher scores on global STSS (p<.001) and all subscales (Intrusion, p=.003; Avoidance, p<.001; Arousal, p=.001), PSS (p=.001), MBI-EE (p=.002) and MBI-D (p=.033), compared to the colleagues with one or more children, and lower GSE (p=.031). HCWs with family members or friends infected by COVID-19 displayed significant higher scores on PSS (p=.013), Intrusion (p=.028) and Arousal subscale (p=.057) (Table 6).

Table 6: Questionnaire scales and subscales scores in subgroups

	Gender		P-value	Children		P-value	Family members or friends infected		P-value	Care of COVID-19 patients		P-value	COVID-19 patients' death		P-value
	Mean (SD)			Mean (SD)			Mean (SD)			Mean (SD)			Mean (SD)		
	Male	Female	None	One or more	None	One or more	Frontline	Other units	Yes	No					
	n=90	n=93	n=53	n=131	n=127	n=57	n=118	n=66	n=94	n=90					
PSS	16,02 (6,07)	17,56 (6,43)	.098	19,19 (6,03)	15,84(6,13)	.001	16,04 (6,31)	18,51 (5,89)	.013	17,00 (6,48)	16,45 (5,90)	.573	17,78 (6,40)	15,79 (6,00)	.031
STSS	34,59 (11,48)	38,15 (13,85)	.060	42,09 (13,80)	34,11(11,66)	<.001	35,25 (12,76)	39,00 (12,61)	.066	37,61 (13,14)	34,27 (11,95)	.090	39,72 (12,95)	32,96 (11,73)	<.001
Intrusion	9,69 (3,50)	11,18 (4,49)	.013	12,04 (4,68)	9,81 (3,64)	.003	10,01 (4,07)	11,44 (3,97)	.028	10,99 (4,14)	9,48 (3,82)	.016	11,51 (4,12)	9,34 (3,76)	<.001
Avoidance	14,07 (5,03)	14,89 (5,60)	.296	16,64 (5,61)	13,63 (4,96)	<.001	14,20 (5,39)	15,16 (5,13)	.262	14,84 (5,35)	13,89 (5,24)	.249	15,66 (5,38)	13,29 (5,00)	.002
Arousal	10,83 (3,96)	12,08 (4,94)	.062	13,42 (4,92)	10,67 (4,08)	.001	11,04 (4,38)	12,40 (4,66)	.057	11,78 (4,75)	10,89 (3,98)	.201	12,55 (4,70)	10,32 (4,01)	.001
MBI-EE	17,43 (9,95)	21,86 (11,85)	.007	23,66 (12,04)	18,05(10,34)	.002	19,24 (10,51)	20,60 (12,43)	.447	19,32 (10,75)	20,27 (11,82)	.579	20,67 (11,17)	18,61 (11,03)	.210
MBI-D	7,66 (5,06)	7,44 (5,96)	.793	8,89 (6,44)	6,98 (5,01)	.033	7,46 (5,65)	7,67 (5,22)	.819	6,86 (5,25)	8,71 (5,80)	.029	7,55 (5,76)	7,50 (5,27)	.948
MBI-PA	31,91 (8,76)	33,01 (7,59)	.365	30,96 (7,88)	33,10 (8,22)	.108	32,28 (8,76)	32,93 (6,69)	.621	32,99 (8,34)	31,58 (7,81)	.260	33,33 (7,56)	31,60 (8,70)	.151
GSE	31,53 (5,43)	29,98 (5,97)	.067	29,32 (6,74)	31,33 (5,19)	.031	30,46 (5,95)	31,40 (5,21)	.302	31,10 (5,55)	30,12 (6,04)	.267	31,15 (5,69)	30,33 (5,79)	.336
RS-14	79,20 (11,76)	77,95(13,64)	.507	76,45 (14,27)	79,48 (11,97)	.144	78,06 (12,69)	79,82 (12,79)	.386	79,26 (12,65)	77,44 (12,82)	.352	79,36 (13,36)	77,82 (12,01)	.413

Abbreviations: same abbreviations as Table 5. P Values from test T. Bold data indicate differences that are significant.

The comparison between HCWs working in Countries with hard lock-down policies (HLD, n=96) and HCWs working in Countries with softer lock-down policies (SLD, n=80) showed that HCWs working in SLD conditions exhibited lower MBI-D (p=.054) scores and higher MBI-PA (p=.019) and RS-14 (p=.005) scores.

Frontline HCWs

The prevalence of STS (STSS≥38, moderate to severe symptoms) in frontline HCWs (F-HCWs, n=118) was 47.5% while a lower rate (30.3%) was detected for the HCWs working in other units (OU-HCWs, n=66) (p<.029). F-HCWs exhibited significant higher scores on STSS Intrusion subscale (p=.016) than OU-HCWs, but significant lower scores on MBI-D (p=.029).

Correlation analysis in F-HCWs subgroup showed that the higher Intrusion scores were significantly and positively associated to PSS (p<.001), MBI-EE (p<.001), MBI-D (p<.001), female gender (p=.004), hours per day spent with patients (p=.020) and exposure to patients' deaths (p=.001). Meanwhile, they were negatively related to age (p=.003), number of children (p=.002), GSE (p=.002), RS-14 (p.036). In OU-HCWs subgroup, a positive significant correlation was found between Intrusion and PSS (p<.001), MBI-EE (p<.001), MBI-D (p<.001), while a negative relation was found with RS-14 (p=.003) and number of children (p=.021) (Table 7).

Table 7: Significant Pearson correlation coefficients r: associations between Intrusion and Depersonalization, in F-HCWs vs OU-HCWs

	F-HCWs	OU-HCWs
	n=118	n=66
<u>STSS Intrusion</u>		
PSS	.559**	.503**
MBI-EE	.632**	.490**

MBI-D	.516**	.437**
GSE	-.279*	-.152
RS-14	-.194*	-.363**
Age	-.268**	.081
Gender	.263**	.119
Children	-.286**	-.284*
C19_hour per day	.214*	.051
C19_death	.303**	.088

MBI-D

PSS	.468**	.362**
STSS	.520**	.501**
MBI-EE	.642**	.506**
MBI-PA	-.253**	-.060
GSE	-.333**	.048
RS-14	-.268**	-.442**
Age	-.197*	-.063
C19_hour per day	.197*	.059

Abbreviations: same abbreviations as Table 5. Bold data indicate correlations that are significant. *p < .05; ** p < .01.

The lower MBI-D scores found in F-HCWs had a significant and positive association with PSS (p<.001), STSS (p<.001), MBI-EE (p<.001) and the number of hours per day spent with patients (p=.033) and a significant negative association with age (p=.033), GSE (p<.001), RS-14 (p=.003), and MBI-PA (p=.006). In OU-HCWs a positive significant correlation was found between MBI-D and PSS (p=.003), STSS (p<.001), MBI-E (p<.001) meanwhile a negative correlation was reported with RS-14 (p<.001).

Exposure to patients' death as a risk factor for secondary traumatic stress

The prevalence of secondary traumatic stress (STSS \geq 38, moderate to severe symptoms) in HCWs exposed to infected patients' death (E-HCWs, n=94) was 54.3% while it was 27.8% in HCWs who were not exposed (NE-HCWs, n=90) (p<.001). E-HCWs also reported significant higher scores on PSS (p=.031), STSS (p<.001), and all subscales (Intrusion, p<.001; Avoidance, p=.002; Arousal, p=.001) than NE-HCWs.

Stepwise multiple linear regression analysis was performed to find out the predictors of STSS in the total cohort. In the final model for STSS, exposure to patients' deaths, PSS, and MBI-EE scores remained as significant predictors, with a good level of fit with the data (adjusted R² =0.537). Significant protective factors, such as resilience or self-efficacy, were not found. With respect to F-HCWs and OU-HCWs subgroups, stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed to identify the predictors of Intrusion symptoms. In F-HCWs the final model for Intrusion had PSS, MBI-EE, MBI-D, female gender, and exposure to patients' deaths as significant predictors, with a good level of fit with the data (adjusted R² =0.486). Meanwhile, in the final regression model for Intrusion in OU-HCWs (adjusted R²=.306), only PSS and MBI-D remained as significant predictors. The results are summarized in **Table 8**.

Table 8: Results of stepwise multiple linear regression analysis predicting secondary traumatic stress (STSS) in total cohort (n=184) and Intrusion in F-HCWs (n=118) vs OU-HCWs (n=66).

Dependent variable	Predictors	β	S.E.	Lim. Inf. (95%)	Lim. Sup. (95%)	P values	Tolerance	VIF
<u>Total cohort</u>								
STSS	Intercept	12.489	1.869	8.800	16.177	<.001**		
	PSS	.754	.125	.507	1.000	<.001**	.674	1.485
	MBI-EE	.489	.070	.352	.626	<.001**	.692	1.445
	C19_death	2.446	.886	.698	4.194	.006**	.961	1.040
<u>F-HCWs</u>								
Intrusion	Intercept	3.671	.822	2.043	5.299	<.001**		
	PSS	.155	.053	.050	.261	.004**	.637	1.569
	MBI-EE	.118	.038	.042	.193	.003**	.454	2.204
	MBI-D	.144	.070	.005	.284	.043*	.559	1.790
	Gender	1.322	.574	.185	2.460	.023*	.930	1.075
	C19 death	.821	.403	.023	1.619	.044*	.928	1.078
<u>OU-HCWs</u>								
Intrusion	Intercept	3.579	1.186	1.209	5.948	.004**		
	PSS	.257	.072	.114	.400	.001**	.869	1.150
	MBI-D	.193	.073	.047	.339	.010**	.869	1.150

DISCUSSION

The aim of the present study was to assess psychological distress in terms of secondary traumatic stress and professional burnout in HCWs during the COVID-19 outbreak. A prevalence of secondary traumatization among HCWs ranging from 4% to 13% was described in studies before COVID-19 outbreak⁹, and during COVID-19 outbreak a considerable proportion of HCWs experienced mood and sleep disturbances^{20,21}. We found symptoms of moderate to severe secondary traumatization in a higher proportion of the total respondents, arising over 40%. Therefore, the actual HCWs situation appears to be critical, with a prevalence even higher in frontline HCWs (47.5%) and in HCWs exposed to infected patients' death (67.1%).

Secondary traumatic stress was positively associated with the amount of time spent with COVID-19 patients, with the exposure to COVID-19 patients' deaths and with the severity of symptoms of family members or friends infected by COVID-19. A significant regression model was obtained and STS was positively predicted by perceived stress, emotional exhaustion, and exposure to patients' death, confirming the central role that the unsuccessful care-taking efforts have in the development of secondary traumatization. In frontline HCWs the relationship between STS, specifically intrusion symptoms, and exposure to patients' death as predictors was confirmed, meanwhile, it was not observed in HCWs working in other units. No significant protective factors were found. In light of these findings, we reasonably hypothesize that the observed high level of STS is consistent with the actual outbreak and therefore its potential long terms consequences should be taken into account.

The prevalence of professional burnout is similar to previous findings and is over 50%^{26,27}. No significant differences in frontline HCWs or in HCWs exposed to patients' death were found for the prevalence of professional burnout, suggesting that it is not so closely related to the COVID-19 outbreak. In fact, even if in our study professional burnout correlates with secondary traumatization, that's may be due to the partial overlapping of constructs⁹. Bellolio et al.⁴⁵ underlined that burnout is a result of the mismatch between the nature of the job and the nature of the person who does the job, it's gradual and it arises from daily life, through continuous negative experience, without a necessarily traumatic character^{26,45,46}. Secondary traumatic stress is instead an acute reaction, secondary to relationship, that arises when rescue care-taking efforts are unsuccessful⁴⁵. Our findings appear to be in accordance with this distinction.

In our study, frontline HCWs had significant higher scores on secondary traumatic stress, intrusion subscale, meanwhile, they exhibited a significant lower score on burnout, depersonalization subscale, when compared to HCWs involved in other units. This may be due to the fact that intrusion symptoms are characteristics of traumatic stress reactions, that particularly emerged during the COVID-19 outbreak in frontline HCWs, and may be distinctive from other symptomatology such as professional burnout. Further investigations are required. It is also possible that, in our respondents, high levels of burnout and perceived stress were already present before the COVID-19 outbreak, as similar levels were reported in HCWs in previous studies^{26,27}. This point needs to be clarified with longitudinal studies.

Our findings suggest that the COVID-19 outbreak had an impact on the more frequent direct exposure to the patients' physical pain, psychological suffering, and death, which increased secondary traumatization in HCWs. Further investigations are required, to better clarify the longitudinal course of the effects of traumatization and the occurrence of long-term pathologic consequences. The high prevalence of STS symptoms we found in this study point out that large scale screening and treatment programs for secondary traumatic stress in HCWs, particularly to prevent long term consequences of COVID-19 outbreak are necessary.

Limitations

The present study has some limitations that should be considered. The complexity of the survey and the time required to fill the questionnaires limited the number of participants, moreover in a period in which the workload was overwhelming and the main part of respondents was directly involved with patients. The limited number of participants, make it difficult to generalize the results to the whole HCWs population. The cross-sectional nature of the study and the lack of longitudinal follow-up, do not allow inferences about the causal relations among the variables, and the long-term consequences of the psychological outcomes found. Further prospective studies could clarify the relation between burnout, secondary traumatic stress, and protective factors. Long-term implications of HCWs mental health and consequences of personal and organizational factors are worth further investigation.

Data Availability Statement

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this manuscript will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation, to any qualified researcher.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank for contributing to the diffusion and realization of the Survey: Hilary Pinnock¹ and Ioannis Vogiatzis² on behalf of Assembly 1 Clinical of European Respiratory Society (ERS); Antonio M Esquinas³.

¹University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK; ²Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK; ³Hospital Morales Meseguer, Murcia, Spain.

REFERENCES

1. Poli A, Gemignani A, Conversano C. The psychological impact of sars-cov-2 quarantine: Observations through the lens of the polyvagal theory. *Clin Neuropsychiatry*. 2020;17(2):112-114. doi:10.36131/CN20200216
2. Muratori P, Ciacchini R. Children and the COVID-19 transition: Psychological reflections and suggestions on adapting to the emergency. *Clin Neuropsychiatry*. 2020;17(2):131-134. doi:10.36131/CN20200219
3. Albott CS, Wozniak JR, McGlinch BP, Wall MH, Gold BS, Vinogradov S. Battle Buddies: Rapid Deployment of a Psychological Resilience Intervention for Healthcare Workers during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Anesth Analg*. 2020:1-12. doi:10.1213/ANE.0000000000004912
4. Shanafelt T, Ripp J, Trockel M. Understanding and Addressing Sources of Anxiety among Health Care Professionals during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA - J Am Med Assoc*. 2020;323(21):2133-2134. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.5893
5. Ayanian JZ. Mental Health Needs of Health Care Workers Providing Frontline COVID-19 Care. *JAMA Heal Forum*. 2020;1(4):e200397-e200397. doi:10.1001/JAMAHEALTHFORUM.2020.0397
6. Bao Y, Sun Y, Meng S, Shi J, Lu L. 2019-nCoV epidemic: address mental health care to empower society. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10224):e37-e38. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30309-3
7. Temsah MH, Al-Sohime F, Alamro N, et al. The psychological impact of COVID-19 pandemic on health care workers in a MERS-CoV endemic country. *J Infect Public Health*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.jiph.2020.05.021
8. Tsamakidis K, Rizos E, Manolis A, et al. [Comment] COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on mental health of healthcare professionals. *Exp Ther Med*. 2020:3451-3453. doi:10.3892/etm.2020.8646
9. Greinacher A, Derezza-Greeven C, Herzog W, Nikendei C. Secondary traumatization in first responders: a systematic review. *Eur J Psychotraumatol*. 2019;10(1). doi:10.1080/20008198.2018.1562840
10. Conversano C, Marchi L, Miniati M. Perspective article Psychological distress among healthcare professionals involved in the Covid-19 emergency: vulnerability and resilience factors *Clin Neuropsychiatry*. 2020;17(2):94-96. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2010.11.023.Di
11. Chan AOM, Huak CY. Psychological impact of the 2003 severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak on health care workers in a medium size regional general hospital in Singapore. *Occup Med (Chic Ill)*. 2004;54(3):190-196. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqh027
12. McAlonan GM, Lee AM, Cheung V, et al. Immediate and sustained psychological impact of an emerging infectious disease outbreak on health care workers. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2007;52(4):241-247. doi:10.1177/070674370705200406
13. Tam CWC, Pang EPF, Lam LCW, Chiu HFK. Severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in Hongkong in 2003: Stress and psychological impact among frontline healthcare workers. *Psychol Med*. 2004;34(7):1197-1204. doi:10.1017/S0033291704002247
14. Wu P, Fang Y, Guan Z, et al. The psychological impact of the SARS epidemic on hospital employees in China: Exposure, risk perception, and altruistic acceptance of risk. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2009;54(5):302-311. doi:10.1177/070674370905400504
15. Lee SM, Kang WS, Cho AR, Kim T, Park JK. Psychological impact of the 2015 MERS outbreak on hospital workers and quarantined hemodialysis patients. *Compr Psychiatry*. 2018;87:123-127. doi:10.1016/j.comppsy.2018.10.003
16. Lai J, Ma S, Wang Y, et al. Factors Associated With Mental Health Outcomes Among Health Care Workers Exposed to Coronavirus Disease 2019. *JAMA Netw open*. 2020;3(3):e203976. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.3976
17. Chen Q, Liang M, Li Y, et al. Mental health care for medical staff in China during the COVID-19 outbreak. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2020;7(4):e15-e16. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30078-X
18. Zhang WR, Wang K, Yin L, et al. Mental Health and Psychosocial Problems of Medical Health Workers during the

COVID-19 Epidemic in China. *Psychother Psychosom.* 2020;89(4). doi:10.1159/000507639

19. Lu W, Wang H, Lin Y, Li L. Psychological status of medical workforce during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. *Psychiatry Res.* 2020;288. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112936
20. Luo M, Guo L, Yu M, Jiang W, Wang H. The psychological and mental impact of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) on medical staff and general public – A systematic review and metaanalysis. *Psychiatry Res.* 2020;291(June).
21. Pappa S, Ntella V, Giannakas T, Giannakoulis VG, Papoutsis E, Katsaounou P. Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav Immun.* 2020. doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.026
22. Bai YM, Lin CC, Lin CY, Chen JY, Chue CM, Chou P. Survey of stress reactions among health care workers involved with the SARS outbreak. *Psychiatr Serv.* 2004;55(9):1055-1057. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.55.9.1055
23. Patel RS, Bachu R, Adikey A, Malik M, Shah M. Factors related to physician burnout and its consequences: A review. *Behav Sci (Basel).* 2018;8(11). doi:10.3390/bs8110098
24. Maslach C, Jackson SE. *The Measurement of Experienced Burnout**. Vol 2.; 1981. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/job.4030020205>. Accessed May 20, 2019.
25. Shanafelt TD, Boone S, Tan L, et al. Burnout and satisfaction with work-life balance among US physicians relative to the general US population. *Arch Intern Med.* 2012;172(18):1377-1385. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2012.3199
26. Rothenberger DA. Physician Burnout and Well-Being: A Systematic Review and Framework for Action. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 2017;60(6):567-576. doi:10.1097/DCR.0000000000000844
27. Shanafelt TD, Hasan O, Dyrbye LN, et al. Changes in Burnout and Satisfaction with Work-Life Balance in Physicians and the General US Working Population between 2011 and 2014. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2015;90(12):1600-1613. doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2015.08.023
28. Scheurer D, McKean S, Miller J, Wetterneck T. U.S. physician satisfaction: A systematic review. *J Hosp Med.* 2009;4(9):560-568. doi:10.1002/jhm.496
29. Balch CM, Shanafelt T. Combating Stress and Burnout in Surgical Practice: A Review. *Adv Surg.* 2010;44(1):29-47. doi:10.1016/j.yasu.2010.05.018
30. Sinha A, Singh A, Tewari A. The fatigued anesthesiologist: A threat to patient safety? *J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol.* 2013;29(2):151-159. doi:10.4103/0970-9185.111657
31. Welp A, Meier LL, Manser T. Emotional exhaustion and workload predict clinician-rated and objective patient safety. *Front Psychol.* 2014;5(OCT). doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01573
32. Figley CR. Catastrophes: An overview of family reactions. In: *Stress and the Family*. Vol II. ; 1983:3-20.
33. Bourke ML, Craun SW. Coping with secondary traumatic stress: Differences between U.K. and U.S. Child Exploitation Personnel. *Traumatology (Tallahass Fla).* 2014;20(1):57-64. doi:10.1037/h0099381
34. Wu PE, Styra R, Gold WL. Mitigating the psychological effects of COVID-19 on health care workers. *Cmaj.* 2020;192(17):E459-E460. doi:10.1503/cmaj.200519
35. Srivatsa S, Stewart KA. How Should Clinicians Integrate Mental Health Into Epidemic Responses? *AMA J ethics.* 2020;22(1):E10-E15. doi:10.1001/amajethics.2020.10
36. Orrù G, Ciacchini R, Gemignani A, Conversano C. Perspective article Psychological intervention measures during the COVID-19 pandemic Graziella Orrù, Rebecca Ciacchini, Angelo Gemignani, Ciro Conversano. *Clin Neuropsychiatry.* 2020:76-79.
37. Di Giuseppe M, Miniati M, Miccoli M, et al. Defensive responses to stressful life events associated with cancer diagnosis. *Mediterr J Clin Psychol.* 2020;8(1):1-22. doi:10.6092/2282-1619/mjcp-2384
38. Kang L, Li Y, Hu S, et al. The mental health of medical workers in Wuhan, China dealing with the 2019 novel coronavirus. *The Lancet Psychiatry.* 2020;7(3):e14. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30047-X
39. Xiang YT, Yang Y, Li W, et al. Timely mental health care for the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak is urgently needed. *The Lancet Psychiatry.* 2020;7(3):228-229. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30046-8
40. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A global measure of perceived stress. *J Health Soc Behav.* 1983;24(4):385-396. doi:10.2307/2136404
41. Bride BE. Prevalence of Secondary Traumatic Stress among Social Workers. *Soc Work.* 2007;52(1):63-70. doi:10.1093/SW/52.1.63
42. Maslach C, Jackson SE. The measurement of experienced burnout. *J Organ Behav.* 1981;2(2):99-113.

doi:10.1002/job.4030020205

43. Wagnild G. A review of the resilience Scale. *J Nurs Meas*. 2009;17(2):105-113. doi:10.1891/1061-3749.17.2.105
44. Schwarzer R, Jerusalem M. Instrument Title: General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE). *Meas Heal Psychol A user's portfolio Causal Control beliefs*. 1995:35-37. <http://cancercontrol.cancer.gov/constructs>. Accessed July 14, 2020.
45. Bellolio MF, Cabrera D, Sadosty AT, et al. Compassion fatigue is similar in emergency medicine residents compared to other medical and surgical specialties. *West J Emerg Med*. 2014;15(6):629-635. doi:10.5811/westjem.2014.5.21624
46. Maslach C, Leiter MP. *The Truth About Burnout: How Organizations Cause Personal Stress and What To Do About It*. Ca Jossey-Bass. 1997.
47. Policy Responses to COVID19. <https://www.imf.org/en/Topics/imf-and-covid19/Policy-Responses-to-COVID-19>. Accessed July 26, 2020.