medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Title The mental health of critical care and anaesthetic staff during COVID-19

Authors: Neil Greenberg[a,f], Dale Weston[g], Charlotte Hall[g], Tristan Caulfield[d], Victoria Williamson[a,b] and Kevin Fong[c, e]

Affiliations:

[a] King's Centre for Military Health Research, Institute of Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience, King's College London, 10 Cutcombe Road, London, UK SE5 9RJ

[b] Department of Experimental Psychology, Anna Watts Building, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX2 6 GG

[c] Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Public Policy (STEaPP), University College London, WC1E 6BT

[d] Department of Computer Science, University College London, WC1E 6BT

[e] Department of Anaesthesia, University College London Hospital, 235 Euston Road, WC1E 6BT

[f] Health Protection Research Unit, Institute of Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience, King's College London, 10 Cutcombe Road, London, UK SE5 9RJ

[g] Behavioural Science Team, Emergency Response Department Science & Technology, Public Health England, Porton Down, Salisbury, SP4 0JG

Corresponding author: Neil Greenberg. Neil.Greenberg@kcl.ac.uk @profngreenberg

Funding: The research was funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Emergency Preparedness and Response at King's College London in partnership with Public Health England (PHE), in collaboration with the University of East Anglia and Newcastle University. The views expressed are those of the

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, the Department of Health or Public Health England.

Competing interests: KF works for NHS England. NG runs a consultancy which provides the NHS with active listening and peer support training.

Ethical approval: No ethical approval was asked for as the survey was a quality improvement measure which did not collect any identifiable data

Wordcount: 2720

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background. Intensive Care Unit (ICU), anaesthetic and theatres staff have faced significant challenges during the COVID-19 pandemic which have the potential to adversely affect their mental health

Aims. To identify the rates of probable mental health disorder in ICU and anaesthetic staff in six hospitals during June and July 2020

Methods. An anonymised brief web-based survey comprising standardised questionnaires examining depression, anxiety symptoms, symptoms of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), wellbeing and alcohol use was administered to staff.

Results. 709 participants completed the surveys comprising 291 (41%) Doctors, 344 (48.5%) Nurses, and 74 (10.4%) as other clinicians. Over half (58.8%) reported good wellbeing, however 45.4% met the threshold for probable clinical significance on at least one of the following measures: severe depression (6.3%), PTSD (39.5%), severe anxiety (11.3%) or problem drinking (7.2%). 13.4% of respondents reported frequent thoughts of being better off dead, or of hurting themselves in the past two weeks. We found that doctors consistently reported better mental health than nurses.

Conclusions. We found substantial rates of probable mental health disorders, and thoughts of self-harm, amongst ICU staff; these difficulties were especially prevalent in ICU nurses. Our results a pressing need for a national strategy should be designed to protect the mental health of ICU staff whilst they carry out their essential work during COVID-19. This should target preventative actions, including reducing exposure of staff to psychological harm, as well as ensuring that staff who need formal treatment are able to access it in a timely manner.

Keywords:

COVID-19, mental health, intensive care, PTSD, self-harm, nurses

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

This paper describes a service evaluation exercise which involved surveys of critical care, theatres and anaesthetic staff in an effort to understand the effects of heavily modified working patterns on their mental health and wellbeing, during the first COVID-19 surge in the UK. We believe these results have substantial implications for the planning of responses to subsequent COVID-19 surge, patient safety and the protection of the NHS workforce.

The COVID-19 virus outbreak was declared a pandemic on March 12, 2020 by the World Health Organisation [1]. Across the globe healthcare workers have been at the frontline of each nation's response, labouring to meet a sudden and dramatic increase in demand and workload across the full spectrum of healthcare. Among those most directly impacted have been intensive care and anaesthetic teams who together augmented and expanded critical care provision.

Frontline healthcare staff experience myriad psychological stressors, including fears of contracting the virus and endangering their loved ones, concerns over the lack of personal protective equipment (PPE), and distress relating to adverse patient outcomes and loss of patient lives despite their best efforts [2,3].

Within the UK more than 10,000 patients, confirmed positive for COVID-19, have so far been admitted for critical care in acute hospitals. To accommodate this unprecedented surge hospitals were forced to create ad hoc intensive care units (ICUs) with heavily modified staffing models; reducing the usual 1:1 ICU nurse patient ratio to as low as 1:6 in some cases. [4]**.** Pre-existing shortages of experienced ICU staff have been greatly exacerbated by high levels of staff sickness and quarantine during the first COVID-19 surge.

Consequently, ICU staff have faced a particularly challenging time, working in high-risk environments with COVID-19 patients for long periods in PPE, and managing staff and equipment shortages on a daily basis, making it difficult to meet normal standards of care.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The high rate of mortality amongst COVID-19 patients admitted to ICU, coupled with difficulty in providing adequate end-of-life support to patients and their next of kin, because of visiting restrictions, has been a specific stressor for ICU nursing staff.

These working conditions have the potential to adversely impact the mental health of ICU staff, including the experience of psychological distress, moral injury, [5] and the development of mental health difficulties such as depression and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD).

While little or no comparable pre-COVID-19 baseline assessment of the mental health of ICU staff exists, other studies have shown that ICU staff in the UK who experience work-related issues (e.g. end of life care, limited staffing and resources, communication problems between staff and families) can experience high levels of moral distress [6,7], which may lead on to the development of PTSD and burnout [7]. Also, within the general UK population, compared to pre-COVID-19 rates, significantly higher levels of mental ill health have been found in females, younger adults (25-34 years old) and those with dependent children during the pandemic [8].

A thorough understanding of the psychological implications of working in the critical care setting, during COVID-19 pandemic, is imperative to ensure that adequate support is provisioned by employers who have a moral and legal duty to appropriately safeguard staff wellbeing. Furthermore, unless employers properly protect the mental health of ICU staff, then they are more likely to function poorly with a consequential impact on their ability to deliver high quality patient care [9].

Thus, to shed light on the provision of psychological support that may be necessary, the aim of this service evaluation was to examine the impact of working in ICU settings during COVID-19, on the mental health and wellbeing of UK frontline staff, at two separate time points in June and July 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods

Procedure

Intensive care units, across six NHS hospitals with peak ICU bed occupancy figures ranging between 10 and 75 critically ill COVID-19 patients, were identified from ICNARC (Intensive Care National Audit and Research Centre) data and local ICU reporting systems. The hospitals were drawn from a range of NHS acute trusts including two metropolitan teaching hospitals with, and four district general hospitals. The data were gathered as part of a service evaluation exercise, in an attempt to monitor the effect of heavily modified working patterns on intensive care and anaesthetic staff during the UK's first COVID-19 surge.

Participants

We engaged with clinical leads from participating ICUs and encouraged the circulation and completion of the on-line survey. The survey was distributed via departmental email mailing lists and cascaded through departmental SMS contact groups. Our goal was to achieve a minimum completion rate of 10 – 15% of the workforce in ICU, Theatres and Anaesthesia.

Assessments

A brief online survey tool – designed to be completed in less than 5 minutes - was compiled, comprising a number of validated questions assessing the mental health status and psychological well-being of frontline anaesthetic, operating theatre and intensive care staff working in ICU's during the COVID-19 response.

The survey comprised the following measures for which binary outcomes variables were defined using the following cut-off scores for to indicate a case; the 7-item Generalised Anxiety Disorder (GAD) scale to measure probable moderate anxiety disorder with a cut-off score of more than 10 for caseness and a score of 16 or more to indicate a probable severe anxiety disorder (Spitzer et al., 2006); the 9-item Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

measure probable moderate depression with a cut-off score of 10 or more for caseness and a cut-off score of 20 or more to measure probable severe depression (Kroenke et al., 2001); the 6-item Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder checklist (PCL-6) civilian version to measure PTSD (Lang & Stein, 2005) with a score of 14 or more indicating the presence of probable PTSD and the AUDIT-C with a score of 8 or more indicating problem drinking (Bush K, Kivlahan DR, McDonell MB, et al, 1998). As well as looking at caseness we also examined participants' responses as to whether they had had "thoughts that [they] would be better off dead, or of hurting [themselves] in some way [in the past two weeks]" which is a single item within the PHQ9 questionnaire. We also included the Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale [10] which is a 14 item scale where all items are worded positively which cover both feelings and functioning aspects of mental wellbeing. These questionnaires were incorporated into an online survey form, which could be accessed from a hyperlink embedded within an email or SMS message.

The brief online survey was anonymous at the point of collection and the resultant data was uncoupled from identifying detail from the originating device. Participants completed the survey voluntarily, with the knowledge that the data would be anonymised, and were free to stop at any point during their completion of the survey. If the survey was only partially completed no information was recorded.

The survey was built using the LimeSurvey tool (https://www.limesurvey.org/) and hosted on a dedicated secure university server. No registration was needed to participate in the survey and no individually-identifying details were collected from participants.

The survey was embarked upon strictly as a service evaluation; undertaken to benefit the workforce and designed and conducted solely to define the current state of the service and those who deliver it. The survey itself does not represent an intervention, or a change to the standard service being delivered. As a service evaluation exercise, we deemed that written

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

consent and ethical approval were not required in line with exemptions provided by UCL's Research Ethics Committee[1].

Analysis

Descriptive analyses were conducted to provide an overview of the sample characteristics. Bivariate correlations were used to examine the relationship between mental health measure scores. We examined differences in scores across both: a) the two waves of data collection (wave 1 (June) and wave 2 (July)), and; b) the different professions (Doctors, Nurses, and other clinicians working in ICU). Logistic regression analyses were conducted to examine differences in clinical presentation (i.e., whether scores met the clinical threshold) for both: wave (wave 1 and 2) and profession (for Doctors and Nurses only, due to small sample size of 'other clinicians').

[1] https://ethics.grad.ucl.ac.uk/exemptions.php.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Results

Overall, 709 participants took part in the study. Of these, 291 (41%) identified themselves as being Doctors, 344 (48.5%), Nurses, and 74 (10.4%) as being in other clinical roles.

The majority of participants reported good wellbeing on the WEMWBS (n= 418, 58.8%), although almost half of participants (n=322, 45.4%) met the threshold for clinical significance on at least one of the following measures: severe depression, PTSD, severe anxiety or problem drinking (see Table 1).

We found that 13.4% of respondents reported having thoughts that [they] would be better off dead, or of hurting [themselves] in some way several days or more frequently in the past two weeks. Broken down by role, this comprised of 19.2% of nurses, 7.6% of doctors and 9.5% of other staff.

Logistic regression analyses conducted on the number of respondents who met the threshold for each measure revealed two significant effects of the wave of response on outcome with respondents being more likely to endorse both probable PTSD and severe anxiety at wave 1 than wave 2.

Logistic regression analyses examining the relationship between role and the number of respondents who met caseness showed that Doctors were more likely to report good wellbeing and nurses were more likely to meet the threshold for depression (moderate and severe), probable PTSD, and anxiety (moderate and severe) (see Table 1).

Lastly, we examined the correlations between measures and found that greater scores on the WEMWBS were significantly associated with lower scores on all the other outcomes measures (depression, PTSD, anxiety and alcohol use). Measure of anxiety, depression and PTSD symptoms were significantly correlated with each other. No significant associations

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

were found between any measure of poor mental health and alcohol consumption (see Table 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

The aim of this service evaluation was to examine the mental health of impact of working in ICU settings during COVID-19 for NHS staff at two separate time points in June and July 2020. We report four key findings. First, we identified high rates of probable mental ill health. Overall, more than half the sample self-reported symptoms suggestive of probable PTSD, severe depression or a severe anxiety disorder. Second, more than 1 in 7 ICU staff reported thoughts that they would be better off dead, or of hurting themselves in some way several days over the past two weeks. Third, although around 8% of the sample appeared to be at risk of alcohol related difficulties, this level of drinking was not significantly associated with poorer mental health outcomes. Fourth, we found that nurses were more likely to report poor mental health than doctors or other clinical staff and were more likely to report thoughts that they would be better off dead, or of hurting themselves.

Our finding that ICU staff self-report high rates of probable mental ill health, such as likely PTSD, severe depression and anxiety difficulties, highlights the potential profound impact that COVID-19 has had on frontline UK staff to date. For example, the recent APMS [11] found rates of probable PTSD in the UK general public to be approximately 4.4% and other studies have reported an overall PTSD prevalence in UK military personnel of around 6.5% with the highest rate, of 17%, being found in veterans who had recently served in a combat role [12]. Thus, the rate of probable PTSD we found (39.5%) was around nine times that found within the general population and more than double the rate found in recent combat veterans. Whilst further validation studies are required to better understand what proportion of the 39.5% would actually meet diagnostic criteria for PTSD if they attended a clinical assessment, our data suggests that a substantial proportion of NHS staff working in a frontline role are likely to have trauma-related mental ill-health.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

During the time of this study (June-July 2020), ICU staff faced a number of issues which are likely to have negatively impacted on their mental health including a lack of personal protective equipment (PPE) [13], long shifts, caring for dependent children and other household responsibilities [14]and regular exposure to ethical dilemmas with the consequential risk of moral injury [15]. Moreover, we found nurses were more likely to report experiencing mental health difficulties than doctors or other ICU staff. Whether this occupational group is more vulnerable to mental ill health by virtue of demographic risk factors, or whether other factors are unduly affecting this group, remains unclear. However, we note that UK ICU nurses are more likely to be younger adults and female [16] and this demographic has been shown to be at increased risk of suffering with poor mental health during the pandemic [17]. Also of relevance is a recent report by the Royal College of Nursing, and Society of Occupational Medicine which highlighted nurses as being at considerable risk of burnout and that poor mental health within the nursing profession was likely to affect retention rates [18]. It is also important to recognise that staff who are experiencing significant mental health difficulties are likely to function less well which will increase the risk of patient safety incidents [9].

Our finding that more than 1 in 7 ICU staff reported thoughts that they would be better off dead, or of hurting themselves in some way several days over the past two weeks is also highly concerning. When we looked at this by profession, we found that nearly 1 in 5 nursing staff reported these thoughts although the single question from the PHQ9 which asks about these thoughts does not give us any insight into whether such thoughts would lead to a substantial rate of self-injurious or suicidal behaviours. It is also unclear how common such thoughts might be in people who join the nursing profession although a 2014 paper found that around 14% of nursing students reported thoughts that made them a substantial suicide risk [19]. Whatever, the cause of such thoughts, it is important that healthcare managers are aware

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

of them and that measures to compassionately support any staff member at risk of suicide are put in place in a timely manner.

This study has several strengths and limitations. Amongst the strengths are the inclusion of a number of hospitals across the UK, the completion of study assessments anonymously, and the use of a longitudinal design. A weakness of this study is the lack of participant demographic details collected which was done both for brevity and to preserve anonymity. As females, younger adults and those with dependent children are more likely to experience psychological difficulties, this information would be valuable in future investigations. Second, this study utilised self-report measures of mental illness rather than the gold-standard diagnostic interviews. Finally, it is possible that response biased occurred and those who participated had especially salient mental health difficulties they wanted to report.

Despite these limitations, the results of this study allow for several recommendations. First, our results suggest that NHS managers should prioritise provision of evidence based staff support which is likely both to improve psychological wellbeing and decrease the likelihood of psychologically unwell staff delivering substandard care. It is important, however, that support processes are based on good evidence [20] and not on the application of ill-founded techniques such as psychological debriefing which has been shown to have the potential to worsen staff distress [21]. Second, as well as ensuring that adequate evidence-based support is available to ICU staff, it is also necessary to ensure that rapid access to formal treatment is available given its long term positive benefits (e.g. reduced staff absence, improved quality of life). Third, peer support has been found to be particularly beneficial post-trauma in other circumstances (e.g. combat exposure) and ensuring that a proportion of ICU staff receive training in delivering peer support (e.g. TRIM [22]) may also be beneficial. Fourth, NHS managers should be ensure they consistently monitor the wellbeing of frontline

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

employees, such as ICU staff, so that the impact of workload changes is properly understood. This would allow for staffing and other support measures to be implemented in a dynamic fashion ensuring the provision of high quality care whilst protecting the mental health of critical staff without whom the UK response to the pandemic would have been considerably less effective.

In addition to the above secondary preventive initiatives, such as increased support for staff at risk of developing psychological injuries, and tertiary prevention approaches, such as early treatment of unwell staff, the NHS should also focus on implementing better primary prevention measures. We suggest there would be considerable psychological benefit for ICU staff, during future COVID-19 waves, by limiting their exposure to sudden surges in the admission of critically ill patients. Specifically, national strategy should minimise, as far as possible, the duration for which any individual intensive care unit is required to increase its bed occupancy to a level above its existing formal ICU bed capacity.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Contributions to the work

NG and KF designed the study and compiled the survey tool used. TC built the survey tool and extracted and coded the data provided by participants. NG, DW and CH analysed the data and built the results section which was also contributed to and interpreted by VW and KF. VW led on the introduction and discussion sections of the paper and all authors contributed to the methods section and edited the final manuscript and agreed to the final draft being submitted and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

/

References

1. World Health Organisation. Coronavirus (COVID-19) events as they happen [Internet]. *World Heal. Organ.* 2020 [cited 2020 Mar 24]. Available from: https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen

2. Greenberg N, Tracy D. What healthcare leaders need to do to protect the psychological well-being of frontline staff in the COVID-19 pandemic [Internet]. *BMJ Lead.* BMJ Publishing Group; 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 3]. p. leader-2020-000273. Available from: https://www.

3. Williamson V, Greenberg N, Bowden G, Rothenfluh D, Nnadi C, Reynolds J. The mental health impact of providing spine care during COVID-19. *Spine J. [Internet]* Elsevier BV; 2020 Jun 1 [cited 2020 Sep 21];**20**(9):1363–6. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2020.04.019

4. Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre. ICNARC – Reports [Internet]. *COVID-19 Rep.* 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. Available from: https://www.icnarc.org/Our-Audit/Audits/Cmp/Reports

5. Williamson V, Murphy D, Greenberg N. COVID-19 and experiences of moral injury in front-line key workers | Occupational Medicine | Oxford Academic. *Occup. Med. (Chic. Ill). [Internet]* 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 7]; Available from: https://academic.oup.com/occmed/advance-article/doi/10.1093/occmed/kqaa052/5814939

6. Colville GA, Dawson D, Rabinthiran S, Chaudry-Daley Z, Perkins-Porras L. A survey of moral distress in staff working in intensive care in the UK.

7. Jones GAL, Colville GA, Ramnarayan P, Woolfall K, Heward Y, Morrison R, et al.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Psychological impact of working in paediatric intensive care. A UK-wide prevalence study. *Arch Dis Child [Internet]* 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 3];**105**:470–5. Available from: http://adc.bmj.com/

8. Pierce M, Hope H, Ford T, Hatch S, Hotopf M, John A, et al. Mental health before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal probability sample survey of the UK population. *The Lancet Psychiatry [Internet]* Elsevier; 2020 Jul [cited 2020 Aug 3];**0**(0). Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2215036620303084
9. Hobson J, Smedley J. Fitness for Work. *Fit. Work* Oxford University Press; 2019.
10. Stewart-Brown S, Tennant A, Tennant R, Platt S, Parkinson J, Weich S. Internal construct validity of the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS): A Rasch analysis using data from the Scottish Health Education Population Survey. *Health Qual. Life Outcomes [Internet]* BioMed Central; 2009 Feb 19 [cited 2020 Sep 21];**7**(1):15. Available from: https://hqlo.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1477-7525-7-15
11. NHS Digital. Adult Psychiatric Morbidity Survey: Survey of Mental Health and Wellbeing, England, 2014 - NHS Digital [Internet]. *NHS Digit.* 2016 [cited 2020 Sep 21]. Available from: https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20180328140249/http://digital.nhs.uk/catalogue/PUB21748
12. Stevelink SAM, Jones M, Hull L, Pernet D, MacCrimmon S, Goodwin L, et al. Mental health outcomes at the end of the British involvement in the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts: a cohort study. *Br. J. Psychiatry [Internet]* Cambridge University Press; 2018 Dec 8 [cited 2019 Jul 25];**213**(6):690–7. Available from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0007125018001757/type/journal_

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

article

13. Simms A, Fear NT, Greenberg N. The impact of having inadequate safety equipment on mental health. *Occup. Med. (Lond). [Internet]* NLM (Medline); 2020 Jun 20 [cited 2020 Sep 28];**70**(4):278–81. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/occmed/article/70/4/278/5843741

14. Kisely S, Warren N, McMahon L, Dalais C, Henry I, Siskind D. Occurrence, prevention, and management of the psychological effects of emerging virus outbreaks on healthcare workers: rapid review and meta-analysis. *BMJ [Internet]* NLM (Medline); 2020 May 5 [cited 2020 Sep 28];**369**:m1642. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1642

15. Greenberg N, Docherty M, Gnanapragasam S, Wessely S. Managing mental health challenges faced by healthcare workers during covid-19 pandemic [Internet]. *BMJ* BMJ Publishing Group; 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. p. m1211. Available from: https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.m1211

16. May 2019: Gender bias in Critical Care nursing | The Faculty of Intensive Care Medicine [Internet]. [cited 2020 Sep 21]. Available from: https://www.ficm.ac.uk/wicm-blog-archive/may-2019-gender-bias-critical-care-nursing#_edn2

17. Pierce M, Hope H, Ford T, Hatch S, Hotopf M, John A, et al. Mental health before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal probability sample survey of the UK population. *The Lancet Psychiatry [Internet]* Elsevier Ltd; 2020 Oct 1 [cited 2020 Sep 28];**7**(10):883–92. Available from: www.thelancet.com/psychiatry

18. Kinman G, Teoh K, Harriss A. The Mental Health and Wellbeing of Nurses and Midwives in the United Kingdom. 2020.

19. Aradilla-Herrero A, Tomás-Sábado J, Gómez-Benito J. Associations between

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

emotional intelligence, depression and suicide risk in nursing students. *Nurse Educ. Today [Internet]* Nurse Educ Today; 2014 Apr [cited 2020 Sep 28];**34**(4):520–5. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23886906/

20. Tracy DK, Tarn M, Eldridge R, Cooke J, Calder JDF, Greenberg N. What should be done to support the mental health of healthcare staff treating COVID-19 patients? *Br. J. Psychiatry [Internet]* Royal College of Psychiatrists; 2020 May 19 [cited 2020 Sep 28];1–3. Available from: https://www.nihr.ac.

21. Kenardy J. The current status of psychological debriefing [Internet]. *BMJ* BMJ Publishing Group; 2000 [cited 2020 Sep 21]. p. 1032–3. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1118833/

22. Whybrow D, Jones N, Greenberg N. Promoting organizational well-being: a comprehensive review of Trauma Risk Management. *Occup. Med. (Chic. Ill). [Internet]* 2015 [cited 2020 Apr 13];**65**:331–6. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/occmed/article-abstract/65/4/331/1377565

Table 1: *Frequencies of participants (split by both role and wave) which met psychological measures thresholds; Logistic regressions carried out on each psychological measure threshold to examine effect of role (excluding individuals who identified as fulfilling an 'other' role) and wave are also presented.*

		Role							Wave					
					Logistic Regression						Logistic Regression			
		Counts			95% CI for Odds Ratio				Counts		95% CI for Odds Ratio			
	N (% of sample)	Doctor (% of sample)	Nurse (% of sample)	Other (% of sample)	*B (SE)*	Lower	Odds Ratio	Upper	Wave 1 (% of sample)	Wave 2 (% of sample)	*B (SE)*	Lower	Odds Ratio	Upper
Good Wellbeing	417 (58.8)	185 (63.6)	186 (54.1)	46 (62.16)	.39* (.16)	1.08	1.48	2.04	145 (58.9)	272 (58.8)	.01 (.16)	0.74	1.01	1.38
Moderate Depression	262 (36.9)	76 (26.1)	167 (48.5)	19 (25.7)	-0.98* (0.17)	0.27	0.38	0.52	95 (38.6)	167 (36.1)	.11 (.16)	0.81	1.12	1.53
Probable PTSD	280 (39.5)	92 (31.6)	168 (48.8)	20 (27.0)	-0.73* (0.16)	0.35	0.48	0.67	111 (45.1)	169 (36.5)	.36* (.16)	1.04	1.43	1.96
Severe Depression	45 (6.3)	13 (4.5)	30 (8.7)	2 (2.7)	-0.71* (0.34)	0.25	0.49	0.96	18 (7.3)	27 (5.8)	.24 (.32)	0.69	1.28	2.36
Moderate Anxiety	189 (26.7)	58 (19.9)	115 (33.4)	16 (21.6)	-0.70* (0.19)	0.34	0.49	0.71	74 (30.1)	115 (24.8)	.26 (.18)	0.92	1.3	1.84
Severe Anxiety	80 (11.3)	23 (7.9)	52 (15.1)	5 (6.8)	-0.73* (.26)	0.29	0.48	0.81	37 (15.0)	43 (9.3)	.55* (.24)	1.09	1.73	2.77
Problem Drinking	51 (7.2)	20 (6.9)	28 (8.1)	3 (4.1)	-.18 (.30)	0.46	0.83	1.51	14 (5.7)	37 (8.0)	-.36 (.32)	0.37	0.7	1.31
AMD	322 (45.4%)													

Note. AMD = Any Mental Disorder (consisting of at least one of the following: Severe Depression, Severe Anxiety, Probable PTSD or Problem Drinking. Good Wellbeing is indicative of a score of ≥43 on WEMWBS; Moderate Depression equates to a score of ≥10, and Severe Depression equates to a score of ≥20 on the PHQ9; Probable PTSD equates to a score of ≥15 on PCL6; Moderate Anxiety equates to a score of ≥11, and Severe Depression equates to a score of ≥16 on the GAD7; Problem drinking equates to a score of ≥8 on AUDITC The negative beta coefficient and odds ratio of less than 1 is due to coding of the Role predictor with Nurses as the reference category (thus Doctors = 1, Nurses = 0). The negative beta coefficient and odds ratio of greater than 1 is due to coding of the wave predictor with wave 2 as the reference category (thus wave 1 = 1, wave 2 = 0).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Table 2

Bivariate correlations carried out between psychological measures.

	WEMWBS Su	PHQ9	PCL6	GAD7	AUDITC
WEMWBS	-	-.708**	-.601**	-.659**	-.135**
PHQ9	-.708**	-	.730**	.784**	0.047
PCL6	-.601**	.730**	-	.701**	-0.013
GAD7	-.659**	.784**	.701**	-	0.039
AUDITC	-.135**	0.047	-0.013	0.039	-

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.03.20208322; this version posted November 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .