

Ethical and psychosocial considerations for hospital personnel in the Covid-19 crisis: Moral injury and resilience

Moral injury and resilience in the COVID-19 crisis

Alexander Kreh^{1*}, Rachele Brancaleoni², Sabina Chiara Magalini³, Daniela Pia Rosaria Chieffo², Barbara Flad⁴, Nils Ellebrecht⁵, Barbara Juen¹

¹University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

²Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli IRCCS, Rome, Italy

³Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Rome, Italy

⁴A.ö. Krankenhaus St. Vinzenz, Zams, Austria

⁵Albert-Ludwigs-University, Freiburg, Germany

* Corresponding author

e-mail: alexander.kreh@uibk.ac.at

The authors contributed equally to this work.

The authors whose names are listed above declare that they have no conflict of interests.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 786670.

1 **Abstract**

2 This study aims at investigating the nature of resilience and stress experience of
3 health care workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. Thirteen healthcare workers from Italian
4 and Austrian hospitals specifically dealing with COVID-19 patients during the first phase of
5 the pandemic were interviewed. Data was analysed using grounded theory methodology.
6 Psychosocial effects on stress experience, stressors and resilience factors were identified.
7 We generated three hypotheses. Hypothesis one is that moral distress and moral injury are
8 main stressors experienced by healthcare workers. Hypothesis two states that organisational
9 resilience plays an important part in how healthcare workers experience the crisis.
10 Organisational justice and decentralized decision making are essential elements of staff
11 wellbeing. Hypothesis three refers to effective psychosocial support: Basic on scene
12 psychosocial support based on the Hobfoll principles given by trusted and well-known mental
13 health professionals and peers in an integrated approach works best during the pandemic.

14 **Introduction**

15 **Psychosocial Aspects in the COVID-19 Response**

16 The COVID-19 pandemic has spread rapidly and has since become a severe mental
17 health crisis. Measures aiming at the containment of the virus, protection of the risk
18 population as well as mitigation changed the life and routines of many around the globe.
19 Measures required during the response, such as quarantine, can have a severe impact on
20 the mental health state of the population [1].

21 **Higher stress in healthcare workers during pandemics**

22 By caring for patients infected by COVID-19, health care professionals all around the
23 world are involved in the acute response to the crisis. Based on the experiences made during
24 the COVID-19 pandemic, the high exposure to stressors as well as the need for
25 Psychosocial Support for health care workers has been well communicated [2–4]. According
26 to findings from the SARS outbreaks in 2003, H1N1 outbreak in 2009, as well as after
27 several outbreaks of Ebola, healthcare personnel working on the front-line might be at risk of

28 experiencing higher levels of stress immediately after the response. Working on the front-line
29 in pandemics can also negatively impact the development of mental health problems in the
30 long-term which can include higher levels of PTSD symptoms, burnout and other mental
31 health problems [5–14].

32 Similar results can now be found in COVID-19 [15–19]. Tan et al. [19] analysed data
33 from 1257 Healthcare workers in 34 different hospitals from January 29th to February 3rd,
34 2020. Participants were aged between 26 und 40, 764 (60,8%) were nurses, 493 (39,2%)
35 doctors. Many showed heightened signs of depression (50,4%), anxiety (44,6%), insomnia
36 (34%) and feelings of distress (71,5%). Pappa et al. [18] did a meta analysis and found
37 increased values for depression (23,2%) and anxiety (22,8%). Especially sex and type of job
38 (women and nurses versus men and doctors) showed more affective symptoms. Insomnia
39 was rated 38,9%.

40 **Stressors**

41 Several factors that caused stress among health care professionals during earlier
42 pandemics have been identified. Many of those stressors could also be verified in first
43 studies on the COVID-19 outbreak. Dai et al. [20] did a study on concerns of 4357 healthcare
44 workers. According to the data, their main concerns were the infection of colleagues (72,5%),
45 infection of family members (63,9%), protection measures (52,3%) and ethical concerns
46 (48,5%). 39,1% of the participants showed clinically relevant psychological problems,
47 especially those who were based in Wuhan or those who were in quarantine and/or had
48 infected a colleague or family member.

49 **High Exposure**

50 Generally, concerns about infecting family members and friends are central, as
51 responders during pandemics are being exposed to infected patients at work [10,13,21–23].
52 In a study conducted by Goulia et al. [13] on the H1N1 influenza outbreak, the most frequent
53 concern of health care workers was the possibility of infecting family and friends and the
54 health consequences of the disease. The same concern among health care workers is

55 prevailing during the current COVID-19 pandemic and might be especially true for staff living
56 with people considered to belong to a risk group. Cai and colleagues [21] show that staff
57 between 31 – 40 years of age had the greatest concern regarding viral transmission to their
58 families. A possible explanation is that more people in this age group are living together with
59 older people and children. Also Dong et al. [17] found that healthcare workers who had fears
60 about their own physical health and who had friends or relatives tested positive for COVID-
61 19, had a higher probability of anxiety and depression. Concerns of spreading the virus are
62 also fuelled where there is limited access to testing and/or personal protective equipment
63 (PPE), which makes the own risk assessment of health care personnel somewhat more
64 difficult (Shanafelt, Ripp, & Trockel, 2020). Not being rapidly tested when developing
65 symptoms may not only lead to fear of spreading the disease among friends and relatives but
66 also among patients and colleagues at work. [24]

67 **Decreased feeling of safety and loss of trust**

68 Furthermore, a decreased feeling of safety due to limited access to appropriate
69 personal protective equipment seems prevailing [3,22]. A feeling of unsafety is also grounded
70 in often not having access to up-to-date information and if clear guidance is not
71 communicated accordingly. During the H1N1 outbreak, personnel with better access to
72 information scored lower on stress symptoms than those with limited access [14].

73 **Social stressors**

74 Social factors inherent in the everyday private life of health care workers cause
75 difficulties during pandemics. Not being able to access childcare or to provide support for
76 other personal and family needs might be a barrier to working [25]. Furthermore, in many
77 cases health care workers feel stigmatized, as they are avoided or treated differently due to
78 high exposure to infected patients [12,13,26].

79 **Quarantine Experience**

80 Studies suggest that being quarantined may have a more severe impact on the group
81 of health care workers than other population groups. However, the authors argue that this

82 effect may not be unique to their health care workers status but may be influenced by their
83 job-related experiences, which results in recognition of higher personal risk or more
84 knowledge regarding the severe end of SARS on the clinical spectrum. In their study, health
85 care workers also had a better understanding for the rationale for quarantine and showed
86 more compliance with quarantine behaviors [27]. Several studies on health care workers
87 affected by the SARS outbreaks in Canada, China and Taiwan found quarantining
88 experience to be predictive of subsequent general psychological distress [9,11,28,29].
89 However, in a study by Hawryluck et al. [30] on the psychological effects of quarantine in
90 Toronto during the SARS outbreak, health care worker status was not correlated with
91 negative effects such as PTSD or depressive symptoms.

92 **Moral injury and ethical dilemma**

93 Several researchers state that moral injury is one of the mental health challenges
94 faced by health care workers during the COVID-19 outbreak [31–33]. According to Shay [34]
95 the term moral injury “has been used in two related, but distinct, senses; differing mainly in
96 the ‘who’ of moral agency”. According to Shays own definition, moral injury is present when
97 there has been (a) a betrayal of ‘what’s right’; (b) by a person in legitimate authority (e.g. a
98 leader) and, (c) in a high stakes situation. The definition of Litz et al. [35] also entails
99 participation by one’s self in acts that transgress such moral beliefs.

100 Both forms affect trust and lead to psychological distress. Moral injury has mainly
101 been described in victims and perpetrators of violence such as child soldiers. However, not
102 only intentional interpersonal disasters may involve moral injury, also other disasters like
103 pandemics include these types of trauma. In the COVID-19 pandemic, health personnel
104 faced a variety of those injuries in both of the above mentioned meanings.

105 In a global pandemic, a different set of rules has to be applied to healthcare delivery
106 as complex dilemmas in care may evolve. Understanding general principles of collective
107 ethics may help, nevertheless clinicians still have to take decisions for their specific patients,
108 which can lead to significant distress [31]. The ethical bitterness of triage decisions is well-

109 known and medical organisations and professionals have found different ways to deal with it
110 [36,37]. Some of the most common ethical challenges in the response to COVID-19 can be
111 conceptualized in triage, shortage of personal protective equipment and non-pharmaceutical
112 interventions. The following strategies can be identified to deal with the dilemmata [38–40].

113

114 *Triage:* While cost benefit analysis in the utilitarian model of resource distribution is
115 based on criteria such as numbers of lives saved, number of years of life saved or quality of
116 life that might not be compatible with human rights regulations, other criteria have to be
117 found to allocate resources such as the criteria of medical need and efficacy of treatment.

118 *PPE shortage:* Regarding the protection of EMS clinicians [41] and of health care
119 workers, a balance between duty to care and protection of health care workers has to be
120 found. Especially in a situation in which the availability of health care workers is crucial, they
121 should have priority in the distribution of resources.

122 *Non-pharmaceutical interventions:* All non-pharmaceutical interventions that are
123 critical (with regards to e.g. data protection), need to be appropriate with regard to necessity,
124 proportionality and minimization (of e.g. data use).

125 **Effective Support**

126 Several factors that are specific to the pandemic context have been found to help in
127 reducing stress among health care workers. Strengthening individual as well as
128 organizational resilience can help in mitigating the negative long-term influence of stressful
129 experiences among health care professionals [26].

130 **Altruism**

131 While being at risk, studies show that moral and social responsibilities as well as
132 altruistic attitudes drive health care workers to continue working in an environment that might
133 be extremely stressful [9,21,23,25]. Data showed, that altruistic risk-acceptance during the
134 SARS outbreak could decrease the odds of higher levels of depression-symptoms three
135 years after the outbreak [9]. Wu et al. also identified altruism as a protective factor against

136 negative impacts. Underlining the valuable altruistic attitude can reduce psychological
137 distress especially in those who are quarantined [10]. Altruism being a protective factor,
138 elements that reduce altruism and endanger one's self view as a helper may do a lot of
139 damage for health care personnel.

140 **Guidance and shared decision making in ethical dilemma** 141 **situations**

142 Receiving good guidance and not having to take decisions on their own as well as
143 good leadership may minimize the impact of moral injury. Shared decision making and tools
144 may thus be very helpful to mitigate negative impact [31,32].

145 **Information**

146 Information and efficient and fast communication are essential elements in order to
147 decrease worry and promote a feeling of safety among staff [13]. This includes information
148 about the virus, routes of infection, possibilities and practical guidance for treatment or
149 protection measures, but also factual information on the situation within the given hospital,
150 such as capacities or number of infected people among staff [18].

151 **Training**

152 Another stress-reducing factor is training and support in using PPE. The provision of
153 equipment, including masks and suits as well as infection control guidance by the hospital
154 leadership have been reported to promote a feeling of safety in the MERS-Cov outbreak [23]
155 as well as SARS [29] and other outbreaks. Marjanovic et al. [11] showed that trust in
156 infection control initiatives as well as protective equipment predicted lower levels in
157 correlates of burnout and stress among nurses engaged in the SARS outbreak in Canada.
158 Raising awareness of the effects of disease prevention measures among staff with reduced
159 numbers of reported cases can reduce staff stress [21].

160 **Psychosocial interventions**

161 Furthermore, psychosocial interventions may be more helpful than support that is too
162 much focused on clinical psychological interventions [22]. Psychosocial services among

163 health care workers provided either by peers or by well-known and trusted mental health
164 professionals - such as psychologists, clergy or psychiatrists - have been shown to be
165 especially helpful [10]. Signalling in-group messages that all staff are in this together and
166 nobody has to carry decisions alone are considered as very stress relieving [9,10,21].

167 Opportunities for psychoeducation and psychosocial counselling are essential for the
168 protection of personnel. However, during the pandemic the provision of psychosocial support
169 has been reported to be most effective when including hospital management and leadership
170 and focusing on pragmatic support based on the actual needs of the staff. This can be done
171 by taking care of basic needs, such as break and resting areas, food, daily living supplies
172 and ways to be in contact with their families [22].

173 Pre-job-trainings on identification and responding to psychological problems in
174 oneself and others, as well as on coping with stress have been reported as helpful during the
175 SARS outbreak as well as the COVID-19 situation in China [22,42]. The acceptance and use
176 of psychological support might be higher when provided low-threshold access. Counsellors
177 visiting break and resting areas where stories and difficulties are shared, and providing
178 support accordingly is one way of providing low-threshold access [22].

179 In many cases, anonymous helplines and counselling have been established in order
180 to reach highly affected staff in the hospitals. However, considering the access to
181 psychological services, it should be taken into account, that staff with subthreshold and mild
182 levels of mental health disturbances might actually be more likely to take action and be
183 motivated to acquire skills to help others, than those with more severe disturbances who
184 have more motivation to learn self-help techniques [3].

185 **Resilience**

186 If we look at the concept of resilience in the context of natural hazards we can identify
187 three core elements: resistance, recovery and adaptive capacity [41,43]. Resistance is the
188 ability of a system to withstand a threat, which is mostly a consequence of strength and
189 preparedness. Recovery is the ability to bounce back and be able to come back to a state of

190 normal functioning after a disaster has hit and adaptive capacity refers to the ability to learn
191 and change due to the experience made [41].

192 After the SARS outbreak in Canada, Maunder et al. [42] did a study on resilience in
193 healthcare workers. Although the authors recommend special trainings for healthcare
194 workers, evidence points in the way that resilience building on the organisational level is of
195 utmost relevance for pandemics. This goes way beyond the development of adequate
196 training and psychosocial interventions, although these are also very important to have.

197 According to the authors, two constructs have been relevant for organizational
198 resilience in a pandemic: Organizational justice and “magnet hospitals”. Organisational
199 justice refers to the amount to which leadership and management take the opinions of
200 healthcare staff into account and take their concerns seriously. The first element of
201 organizational justice is relational justice, the ability of team leaders and managers to
202 suppress their own prejudice and treat their staff in an honest and just manner. The second
203 element is decisional justice, which mainly refers to fair decision making. Organisational
204 aims, which are based on the needs of patients as well as the needs of healthcare workers,
205 lead to more (crisis) resources.

206 Another relevant construct for organisational resilience was found in so called “magnet
207 hospitals”. These were characterized by decentralized decision-making and nurses being
208 amongst administrative staff and management, a flexible approach to shifts and continuous
209 effort in training and self-administration of units.

210 These results confirm other findings from organizational psychology that have shown
211 that a high amount of demands mixed with low control (low decision making capacity and low
212 influence in staff) and an imbalance between effort and reward has negative effects on staff
213 health and wellbeing [44,45].

214 **Methods**

215 In this study, we are trying to identify the subjective experience, stressors and
216 collective coping strategies used in hospital care to relieve stress from a psychosocial
217 perspective and manage the challenging situation of the pandemic. The objective of the
218 study was to find out what the main stressors as well as the main stress reducing factors
219 were during the first phase of this pandemic for healthcare workers in the hospital sector. As
220 many of the psychosocial challenges during the pandemic have to be considered from an
221 ethical perspective, we were also interested in ethical questions in COVID-19. Amongst
222 others, these included resource distribution when there is shortage in supplies as well as the
223 duty to help while risking one's own health and health of relatives considered vulnerable. We
224 assumed to find indicators of moral injury in healthcare workers to be of importance during
225 this first phase of the pandemic. However, we were not only interested in the negative effects
226 of the pandemic on healthcare workers. We were especially interested in (organizational and
227 team) resilience, namely indicators for resistance, recovery and adaptive capacity of
228 healthcare workers themselves as well as the systems and organisations they work in.

229 The data presented in this article is part of a larger study done in the course of an EU
230 Project (NO-FEAR) where we use a mixed methods approach alternating between
231 quantitative (online) surveys and qualitative interviews and focus groups. As a first step, we
232 chose to conduct expert interviews. The reason for this choice was the fact that we expected
233 an explorative approach to be the best way to gain more detailed insights in both, the
234 positive and negative subjective experiences of healthcare workers during this first and very
235 stressful phase of the disaster. As we did our study very early in the crisis we knew that
236 healthcare workers were still in the middle of a very stressful job and expected them not to
237 be willing to do long interviews or fill out questionnaires. We thus focused on a small number
238 of experts working in the field including mental health professionals as well as experts from
239 the medical area. According to the principle of Grounded Theory [46], we aimed at maximum
240 contrast and thus tried to get interviews from rather different contexts and backgrounds. Our
241 main factors for the choice of experts was that they were very experienced, working in the

242 field and in a leading position or a position that allowed to speak for their colleague
243 healthcare workers from an expert position.

244 Our aim was to develop some basic hypotheses regarding resilience and stress
245 experience of healthcare workers in the first phase of the COVID-19 pandemic. These
246 hypotheses shall be a basis for the interpretation of data from questionnaires and interviews
247 gained in later phases of the pandemic. We are well aware that these data are far from
248 generalizable, but expect our hypotheses to be a good basis for further research as well as
249 practical conclusions.

250 In total, 13 experts were interviewed by two teams. Participation of experts was
251 requested via telephone calls. Eligible experts included in the study sample had to be health
252 care workers involved in the current COVID-19 response either in hospital settings. Health
253 care staff had to have more than 5 years of experience. Psychologists and intensive care
254 physicians had to have more than 10 years of experience. This included doctors, nurses and
255 psychologists in leading positions in Italian and Austrian hospitals. All professionals
256 interviewed were informed about the scope of the interview and their rights. They
257 subsequently signed an informed consent that was previously reviewed by the NO-FEAR
258 Project External Ethics Advisory Board.

259 The Austrian team consisting of male and female scientifically experienced
260 psychologists conducted two semi-structured interviews with mental health experts from
261 hospitals in Italy and one Focus group discussion with four psychologists involved in the
262 hospital response in Austria. The Italian team, consisting of female scientifically experienced
263 researchers in the medical field conducted 7 semi structured interviews with healthcare
264 professionals from the hospital, revising the questions based on the experience and the role
265 of each interviewee. Questions focused on the main challenges that health care workers
266 experienced in the acute phase of the COVID-19 response as well as the needs they have.
267 Additionally, we focused on strategies that health care workers experienced as helpful or
268 stress relieving to identify possibilities for psychosocial support measures.

269 One additional interview was conducted on challenges from the ethical and legal
270 perspective in hospital care with Laura Palazzani [40].

271 Data was collected from the beginning of March, when the virus began to rapidly
272 spread in Italy and Europe until the end of May.

273 Table 1 is giving an overview on basic demographic data of the study sample.

274 **Table 1. Study sample including information on function, gender and country of origin**
275 **of interviewees as well as the method used to gather information.**

Occupation/function	Gender	Country	Method
ED intensive care physician	m	Italy	interview
Head nurse of ED	f	Italy	interview
Psychologist	f	Italy	interview
Psychologist	f	Italy	interview
Psychologist, Head of unit	f	Italy	interview
Director of intensive care unit	m	Italy	interview
Trainer for HCW protection and PPE, chief registered nurse	f	Italy	interview
Psychologist	f	Italy	interview
Psychologist	m	Italy	interview
Four Psychologists	m/f	Austria	Focus group

m = male; f = female; ED = Emergency Department

276

277 The interviews were transcribed and eventually analysed using Grounded Theory
278 methodology. Data was discussed with participants to allow for comments and correction.
279 We coded data into several concepts and subcategories to identify psychosocial and ethical
280 challenges during the COVID-19 response. Codes were subsequently related to each other
281 using Axial Coding. We created a basic explanatory framework on psychosocial effects of
282 COVID-19 consisting of subjective stress experience, causal factors, stressors and resilience
283 factors during the response.

284 **Results**

285 **Psychosocial Effects of COVID-19**

286 The following paradigmatic model shall give an overview of the main categories and
287 their links. Causes, intervening stressful and stress reducing factors and coping strategies
288 are gathered around the phenomenon of interest namely the subjective stress experience of
289 healthcare personnel.

290 **Key category 1: Fear, guilt feelings, frustration, loss of trust and** 291 **exhaustion**

292 Emotionally, fear of getting infected and subsequently infecting families and friends
293 are common feelings. Experts point out the prevalence of feelings of guilt and shame as
294 employees feel like being “plague spreaders”.

295 *.....staff is scared because they live with kids or elderly/immunodepressed people. They are*
296 *concerned to take the COVID home. Normally they avoid to bring home problems or issues*
297 *related to their job but now they feel they can bring home COVID but also their feelings. ED*
298 *staff also try to avoid to send mothers or fathers of kids to the infected patients” (Interview*
299 *partner 1, Italy).*

300 This resulted in many health care workers not returning home as they did not want to
301 put their own families at risk. Some staff have been reported to be sleeping with masks at
302 home. Many health care workers feel unsafe and experience a loss of control, as well as a
303 loss of trust in the system, as they do not feel sufficiently protected.

304 Frustration and powerlessness are prevailing. Among nurses, rage and demands for
305 appropriate compensation is central. Among doctors, more silent reactions seem common
306 which has been described by one interview partner as a “*paralysis of thought*”.

307 *“Nursing staff is reacting with rage to the stress the COVID 19 is generating, while doctors*
308 *are reacting with silence, stunned silence (it has been defined by some as a “paralysis of*
309 *thought”)” (Interview partner 3, Italy)*

310

311 One other interview partner points out *“that fear of infection among health care*
312 *workers is higher after the shifts when resting at home” (Interview partner 1, Italy).*

313 Socially, stress reactions included increased lack of trust in external or newly hired
314 workers, as more experienced staff are afraid that unexperienced workers might make
315 mistakes. But also a loss of trust in the hospital and in oneself as well as a need for a caring
316 leadership was observed.

317 *“Hospital staff is suffering from a sense of abandonment from the institution (which*
318 *includes medical direction of the Hospital and in some cases also by the chief physician as*
319 *well as the chief nurse). They are looking for someone (above mentioned) that nurture them*
320 *and would like to have a deeper recognition of the work they are performing and more*
321 *gratifications. One aspect that is frequently mentioned is the “sharing of moments”, be they*
322 *for discussion of clinical cases to decision-making and especially directives on how to relate*
323 *to the patient and the relatives. The relationship the personnel is looking for is more similar to*
324 *a child-parent scheme than subordinate-superior scheme.” (Interview partner 3, Italy).*

325

326 Physically, exhaustion and fatigue are prevailing. This is also true for staff in the
327 laboratories due to high amounts of positive blood test results. Psychologists report about
328 insomnia as a common issue of health care workers according to the experts that were
329 interviewed.

330 Cognitive stress reactions include confusion and unrest as well as high levels of
331 dissociation among health care workers involved in the COVID-19 response. One expert
332 points out signs of dissociation among health care workers, stating *„It’s like a film scene from*
333 *a war, just without visible destruction“ (Interview partner 5, Italy).*

334 Also positive emotions were reported. Pride of having managed a difficult situation
335 together as well as a feeling of high team cohesion and solidarity among the healthcare
336 personnel and a deep commitment to their job as a healthcare worker have been mentioned

337 by many experts. This also led to a feeling of “us” versus “them” meaning “us frontline
338 workers” versus “them in the background”.

339 **Key category 2: Causal factors: rapidly evolving situation with** 340 **high uncertainty**

341 The COVID-19 pandemic is a rapidly evolving situation in which the protection of the
342 population, but especially of people with high exposure to positively tested patients, such as
343 health care workers in the hospitals, is central. The situation in the first wave of this
344 pandemic was characterized by the uncertainty of information and lack of knowledge about
345 the virus and its characteristics. Additionally, the rapidity of change in information as well as
346 the rapidity with which patients tested positive came into hospitals and/or the rapidity of
347 change in their medical conditions is pivotal. A further characteristic is the fact that one may
348 infect others also when not (yet) having symptoms. This increases insecurity. Factual or
349 anticipated lack of resources such as unsafe or damaged PPE, as well as lack of knowledge
350 when the first wave or pandemic as a whole will end, increased stress for healthcare
351 workers.

352 *“One main stressor was the communication and information of colleagues, the permanent and*
353 *fast changes were very challenging, often the overview was lost what is or is not the present procedure*
354 *lead to different ways of action in some cases...” (Focus group member 4, Italy)*

355

356 **Key category 3: Stressors**

357 **Stressor 3.1: New roles/tasks and broken routines**

358 Healthcare workers often had to work in newly formed teams that consisted of staff
359 that did not know each other well. A feeling of powerlessness was often grounded in the fact
360 that new roles had to be carried out, many of which health care workers did not feel
361 appropriately prepared for. Broken routines and lack of opportunities for social exchange
362 were another common stressor. Normal social exchange during breaks as well as common
363 routines could not be used during the shifts. Stress is also grounded in the unavailability of

364 “safe places”. In many cases there was no space for social support or to share experiences
365 such as in common rest areas. One expert pointed out that

366 *“...all the small relieving things that staff are used to were missing, such as sitting and eating*
367 *together”.*

368 **Stressor 3.2. Working with PPE**

369 Usage of PPE in itself is a stressor. High temperature, uncomfortable usage, resulting
370 skin and other health problems are some of the distressing factors. Additionally, health care
371 workers did not drink during work and did not use the toilet often for 12 hours and more
372 because PPE has to be exchanged when taking a break. Many workers were working
373 voluntarily overtime, leading to less time for adaptive processing of emotions.

374 **Stressor 3.3. Loss of professional distance, changed relationship with** 375 **patients and relatives, moral injury**

376 Moral injury has been expressed by almost all experts. As expected, Triage and PPE
377 shortage were the most prominent stressors. In many cases, staff complained about
378 shortage in supplies, PPE, medications or replacement parts of instruments. This increased
379 the feeling of insecurity among health care personnel. In some cases, scared staff hoarded
380 material for personal protection, which aggravated in further imbalance between demand and
381 supply of equipment. In other cases, lack of resources has not been a major issue. However,
382 even then the anticipated lack of resources created a lot of anxiety and stress. Triage
383 decisions, as well as decisions regarding the distribution of PPE were experienced as
384 extremely stressful especially by the medical doctors involved.

385 Further indicators of moral injury were mentioned such as lack of being protected,
386 missing or damaged PPE, authorities and leaders knowingly endangering staff, fear of staff
387 to infect others, dealing with dead bodies without the religious rituals normally used or
388 isolation of dying patients from their relatives. All these stressors together created a climate
389 where trust in the system as well as the self-image as a good person were endangered.

390 The situation was enhanced by a loss of professional distance: Many workers were
391 mediating between families and patients, as relatives were not allowed to visit. These tasks
392 differed significantly from the daily routines that staff were used to and forced the healthcare
393 workers into an unusual intimacy towards patients and relatives that endangered their
394 professional distance. Many healthcare workers were providing psychosocial support to
395 patients who were dying alone in the hospitals. In these cases, part of their professional
396 distance got lost, as they were not able to use the protective strategies they normally use.
397 Due to protective measures, the relationship to patients was experienced differently.
398 Healthcare workers experienced PPE as limiting communication and trust building especially
399 in relationships with “strangers”.

400 *„...patients are dying alone. Few members of the staff enter in the patient room and*
401 *say "this patient is going to die, what should I do for him/her?" Clearly this is totally different*
402 *from what they learnt and what is normally happening. They feel like they have the role of*
403 *mediation and communication between the patient and the family (staff help patients in*
404 *talking on the phone with relatives)“ (Interview partner 1, Italy)*

405 *Nurses had to care for dying patients without their routines (having relatives and*
406 *friends present). Often they were the last ones to see the dying patient and relatives often*
407 *want to talk to them as they have been the last ones who have talked to their dead relative”*
408 *(Interview partner, 10, Italy)*

409 Many health care workers experienced stigma as they were avoided or treated
410 differently because of their high exposure to COVID-19 patients. They were perceived as
411 dangerous in their private environment, whilst at the same time being treated as heroes in
412 their professional environment and in the public opinion.

413 *“they felt like virus spreaders”(Interview partner 3, Italy)*

414 For many health care workers appropriate risk assessment was difficult, as staff was
415 not tested regularly in the beginning because of test shortage. Many workers were worried of
416 infecting relatives they considered as vulnerable such as children and older relatives living

417 with them at home. As a reaction, many healthcare workers did not go home to sleep and
418 avoided their families. This strategy of prevention robbed them of the most important
419 resource for recovery.

420 **Key category 4: Resilience factors**

421 According to the experts, health care workers have proved to be a very resilient
422 group. Despite major stressors such as being in new teams and having to deal with dying
423 patients and their families as well as the many experienced threats and moral dilemmas,
424 healthcare personnel adjusted to the new situation and roles and found new routines. Many
425 expressed their pride to have managed a difficult situation together as a team. Regarding
426 social exchange, healthcare workers found new ways to interact with and support each other
427 during the beginning or end of the shifts or during training sessions as well as during shifts
428 when working in pairs.

429 **4.1 Organisational resilience: leadership, dialogue, protection and guidance**

430 Nevertheless, “external” support by leadership, peers and mental health professionals
431 have proven once more to be of utmost importance. From an organizational point of view, a
432 strong and trusted operational leadership, backed up by multi-professional crisis
433 management staff in the background providing support and strategic guidance, was
434 experienced as the most valuable support.

435 Leadership takes a central role in how challenges are experienced by health
436 personnel. Several experts pointed out, that clear guidance provided by the management led
437 to more stable routines and therefore was experienced as stress relieving. There was a need
438 for regularly updated guidelines for protection of health care workers as well as accurate
439 information and training e.g. on the use of protective equipment. The better the
440 communication worked and the more the messages were experienced as clear, the better
441 they were received by the personnel. One expert pointed out, that

442 *“written information wasn’t read and thus did not reach all health care workers, while*
443 *recorded videos by the management were much more efficient with hundreds of employees*
444 *watching (Interview partner 5, Austria).*

445 Another strategy that was well received was holding regular meetings of team leaders
446 on the balcony in order to exchange important information. Pre job trainings for everybody
447 held face to face in small groups and visits by a mixed team of hygiene experts and mental
448 health professionals directly at the units before shifts in order to support them with PPE use
449 were experienced as very helpful.

450 Enabling a dialogue between management and staff was very much appreciated. In
451 some hospitals, feedback mechanisms were established. For example, one person from the
452 management was made responsible for “listening to staff” and to take care that reported
453 needs and problems were addressed in a timely manner. These were often just “little things”,
454 but of a high importance to health care worker’s wellbeing. Possibilities to ask questions
455 online were established, so that leadership could react e.g. with information provision via
456 videos. Having hygiene teams sometimes mixed with psychologists available in the wards at
457 the beginning of shifts also seemed to be helpful to reassure personnel in the usage of PPE
458 and provide a sense of safety and appreciation.

459 Protection of health care workers including sufficient materials, as well as clear
460 guidance and training on how to use equipment has been reported as one of the most
461 important strategies in order to relieve stress for health care workers. In some hospitals,
462 workers with children at home were not sent to work in Emergency Departments. When
463 possible, working in pairs promoted reassurance and thus reduced feelings of insecurity in
464 difficult tasks also because there is mutual help in donning and doffing PPE. Clear directions
465 on how to relate to severely ill patients and relatives were experienced as helpful.
466 Additionally, possibilities to exchange among peers on clinical cases and decision making as
467 well as sharing of special moments has been pointed out as helpful to promote peer support
468 and relief stress among staff. This often asked for an adaptation of areas where people can

469 meet and exchange while keeping the necessary distance, like outside areas or larger
470 rooms.

471 Guidance and joint decision making regarding triage has reduced a lot of stress. One
472 example is a pro forma “validation” of each patient before a shortage appeared in a medical
473 team according to criteria that have been developed by a mixed team of medical, ethical and
474 psychosocial experts and approved by the management. Thus, in situations when a rapid
475 decision had to be made, for example during a nightshift, the person taking the triage
476 decision had a basis from which to start and did not feel completely left alone.

477 **4.2 Mental health and low threshold psychosocial support**

478 Mental health support was described as most successful when medical leadership
479 and mental health leadership were working openly together. However, mental health support
480 was directly requested from the healthcare workers mainly for patients and relatives.

481 In many cases, Psychosocial Support did not only include psychologists but also
482 hospital clergy was directly requested when help was needed in mediation between patients
483 and families or in supporting severely ill or dying patients. Direct face to face support as well
484 as coaching of healthcare staff how to deal with families and patients given by clergy,
485 psychiatrists or psychologists, was very well received and reduced stress in healthcare staff.
486 Group interventions for staff were often not possible as staff was too overworked to attend.
487 However, free and anonymous service for staff is essential in providing low threshold support
488 for all staff in the hospitals and also in pre-hospital settings in which anonymous helplines
489 have been well received. Proactive contact to healthcare personnel who had to stay at home
490 in quarantine has also been reported as well received but only when done by someone
491 known and trusted.

492 Focus on the actual and practical needs of health care workers in the acute phase
493 has been reported to be interventions that are more successful than classical clinical
494 approaches. For example meeting the need for social gatherings (e.g. meeting once a week
495 on the balcony or during trainings in a big room) as well as support in providing small islands

496 of normalcy and common rituals (e.g. Easter) were experienced as extremely helpful.
497 Another example was setting up a piano in the ward for certain hours in order to confront
498 silence.

499 Psychologists and/or clergy visiting the wards in an outreaching manner was
500 described as much more effective as remote forms of support. Direct contact by mental
501 health professionals and management has been highly appreciated by staff. One expert
502 even spoke of a “knight blow” for the psychosocial staff and several experts pointed out that
503 medical staff did not take it well if mental health professionals stayed in the background only.

504 **Discussion**

505 The output of this article is directly related to the first one and a half months of the
506 COVID-19 pandemic and healthcare crisis in Italy and Austria. The evolving situation will
507 probably lead to different conclusions that will be drawn during the „lesson learning process“,
508 that will take place at different levels in all the healthcare domain.

509 However, this output has to be viewed as a gathering of first level immediate
510 impressions and experiences from healthcare staff involved in this massive healthcare crisis.
511 Like a ship’s logbook it contains the day to day evolution and perception of the healthcare
512 personnel through the lens of mental health and medical experts who themselves were
513 deeply involved into the mission of “fighting corona”.

514 In knowledge management, lesson learning is a process that is usually done after the
515 crisis with a debriefing mechanism and having players of multiple roles sitting at the table to
516 draw common conclusions. Lesson learning is usually defective in the part that deals with
517 retrieving and analysing first-hand experiences. We do not want this to happen for the
518 COVID-19 crisis for what pertains to the in-hospital personnel psychosocial response.

519 The importance of this work can be summarized in the following three points:

520 1) Gathering of first-line experiences and impressions

521 2) Steering the steps of a future lesson learning process

522 3) Precociously identifying issues that due to the long timeline of the COVID-19 crisis

523 might be of help to countries whose response will be postponed in time as well as to

524 all those who are faced with further waves of the pandemic.

525 One of the main hypotheses that we derived from our data is that moral injury seems to

526 be a common and central outcome of this crisis in many healthcare workers, be it in areas

527 where the virus has had an extreme negative impact on the healthcare system or in areas

528 where the pandemic had not so much negative impact (yet). Even though extreme measures

529 like triage did not have to be applied in all areas, other challenges to healthcare workers'

530 ethical self-image and worldview have been badly shaken by this crisis. To be forced to

531 separate dying patients and their families, to have to handle a dead body without the usual

532 rituals, to be not only a helper but at the same time a possible threat to your own colleagues

533 and family have been experiences shared by many healthcare workers during this pandemic.

534 Our second main hypothesis is based on the findings that organizational justice as well

535 as a flexible decentralized approach to leadership lead to more collective and organizational

536 resilience during this pandemic. Our findings support the assumptions of Greenberg et al.

537 [32] or Williams et al. [33]. Loss of trust in oneself as a helper as well as loss of trust in the

538 system or in the leadership are common effects of moral injury. From a practical point of

539 view, the challenge that we are facing now after the first phase of the pandemic is to rebuild

540 trust in ourselves as helpers as well as in the systems that we are working in. As Maunder et

541 al. have stated in 2008, those hospitals that have a structure of flexibility, decentralized

542 decision making as well as continuous training and self-administration of units fared better

543 during this crisis as highly centralized organisations with an administration that did not

544 understand the needs and concerns of the staff "on the ground" [42]. Furthermore, as Lancee

545 et al. [26] also stated, leadership and organisational justice played an important role in

546 counter balancing moral injury. Being taken seriously in their concerns as well as visible

547 efforts to take just and well-grounded decisions were main resilience factors also in our
548 experts' view.

549 Our third hypothesis is that psychosocial support of healthcare workers during this
550 pandemic only works if it is given by trusted mental health professionals or peers in a very
551 basic manner integrated into the overall support by the management (trainings, information,
552 frameworks provided). The best support given during the first phase of a disaster response is
553 on scene support guided by the motto 'to act with the people and not for the people' [47].
554 Thus, mental health professionals who acted with the healthcare personnel and not for them
555 (from an external safe position) and who acknowledged and appreciated the resilience that
556 this group already has and did not treat them as potential patients were the only ones whose
557 support was accepted.

558 Williams et al. [33] recommend several strategies to deal with moral distress and moral
559 injury faced during COVID-19. They base their recommendations on the well-known
560 elements of effective psychosocial support: safety, connectedness, self and collective
561 efficacy, calm and hope [48]. Authors such as Juen and Warger [49] as well as Dückers et al.
562 [50] totally agree with this. Hobfoll et al. [48] mention the need to translate the elements into
563 the given context of each disaster.

564 **Conclusions**

565 According to our data, safety refers to good, honest and timely information given most
566 directly by trusted leaders. Sufficient PPE but also visible efforts to support and protect staff
567 by the management as well as interest in how they manage the situation leads to a feeling of
568 safety in a situation where many healthcare workers had the feeling that there is no safe
569 place left. Paradoxically, those who worked in the COVID units often mentioned to feel safer
570 than those in other units where no one knew when a patient could be tested positive. This
571 was especially true during the very first phases when PPE was not available for everybody.
572 Connectedness refers to efforts of staff themselves and their leadership as well as mental
573 health professionals and peers to enhance group cohesion and allow for social exchange in

574 spite of difficult circumstances. Examples were meetings on the balcony after the shift for a
575 quick exchange. Connectedness also was expressed by proactive contact to those who had
576 to stay at home because of infection or quarantine. Calm was reached by providing enough
577 space for rest and recovery (e.g. accommodation when staff does not want to go home).
578 Calm was also reached by re-establishing normalcy including common rituals during holidays
579 or other efforts to establish a normal working environment. Self and collective efficacy has
580 been reached by preparing staff for their new tasks, taking joint decisions for example by
581 discussing ethical guidelines together and trying to find joint solutions. Caring for dying
582 patients and connecting with their families have been main stressors, but also sources of
583 self-efficacy and pride. The element of hope refers to the fact, that healthcare staff, despite
584 their distress, exhaustion and many sacrifices, went through this crisis together and
585 managed the task successfully. From what we have learned, we can conclude that many of
586 the healthcare workers have shown an extraordinary resistance. They have been able to
587 work together and function well as teams in very challenging circumstances (new tasks, new
588 teams, new challenges, rapidly changing environment). They have often overworked
589 themselves until they were completely exhausted. Many of them took damage to their health
590 or lost their lives due to the pandemic. Faced with extremely distressing ethical dilemmas,
591 they have been able to take decisions based upon rational models and guidelines while at
592 the same time providing the best care possible for their patients in these difficult times.

593

594 **References**

- 595 **1.** Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The
596 psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence.
597 *The Lancet*. 2020; 395:912–20. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8.
- 598 **2.** Bao Y, Sun Y, Meng S, Shi J, Lu L. 2019-nCoV epidemic: address mental health care to
599 empower society. *The Lancet*. 2020; 395:e37-e38. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30309-
600 **3.**

- 601 **3.** Kang L, Ma S, Chen M, Yang J, Wang Y, Li R, et al. Impact on mental health and
602 perceptions of psychological care among medical and nursing staff in Wuhan during the
603 2019 novel coronavirus disease outbreak: A cross-sectional study. *Brain Behav Immun.*
604 2020; 87:11–7. doi: 10.1016/j.bbi.2020.03.028 PMID: 32240764.
- 605 **4.** Xiang Y-T, Yang Y, Li W, Zhang L, Zhang Q, Cheung T, et al. Timely mental health care
606 for the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak is urgently needed. *The Lancet Psychiatry.*
607 2020; 7:228–9. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30046-8.
- 608 **5.** Maunder RG, Lancee WJ, Balderson KE, Bennett JP, Borgundvaag B, Evans S, et al.
609 Long-term Psychological and Occupational Effects of Providing Hospital Healthcare
610 during SARS Outbreak. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2006; 12:1924–32.
611 doi: 10.3201/eid1212.060584 PMID: 17326946.
- 612 **6.** Rubin GJ, Harper S, Williams PD, Öström S, Bredbere S, Amlôt R, et al. How to support
613 staff deploying on overseas humanitarian work: a qualitative analysis of responder
614 views about the 2014/15 West African Ebola outbreak. *Eur J Psychotraumatol.* 2016;
615 7:30933. doi: 10.3402/ejpt.v7.30933 PMID: 27863536.
- 616 **7.** Lai J, Ma S, Wang Y, Cai Z, Hu J, Wei N, et al. Factors Associated With Mental Health
617 Outcomes Among Health Care Workers Exposed to Coronavirus Disease 2019. *JAMA*
618 *Netw Open.* 2020; 3:e203976. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.3976 PMID:
619 32202646.
- 620 **8.** Bohlken J, Schömig F, Lemke MR, Pumberger M, Riedel-Heller SG. COVID-19-
621 Pandemie: Belastungen des medizinischen Personals. *Psychiatr Prax.* 2020; 47:190–7.
622 doi: 10.1055/a-1159-5551 PMID: 32340048.
- 623 **9.** Liu X, Kakade M, Fuller CJ, Fan B, Fang Y, Kong J, et al. Depression after exposure to
624 stressful events: lessons learned from the severe acute respiratory syndrome epidemic.
625 *Compr Psychiatry.* 2012; 53:15–23. doi: 10.1016/j.comppsy.2011.02.003 PMID:
626 21489421.
- 627 **10.** Wu P, Fang Y, Guan Z, Fan B, Kong J, Yao Z, et al. The psychological impact of the
628 SARS epidemic on hospital employees in China: exposure, risk perception, and

- 629 altruistic acceptance of risk. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2009; 54:302–11.
- 630 doi: 10.1177/070674370905400504 PMID: 19497162.
- 631 **11.** Marjanovic Z, Greenglass ER, Coffey S. The relevance of psychosocial variables and
632 working conditions in predicting nurses' coping strategies during the SARS crisis: an
633 online questionnaire survey. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2007; 44:991–8.
634 doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.02.012 PMID: 16618485.
- 635 **12.** Nickell LA, Crighton EJ, Tracy CS, Al-Enazy H, Bolaji Y, Hanjrah S, et al. Psychosocial
636 effects of SARS on hospital staff: survey of a large tertiary care institution. *CMAJ*. 2004;
637 170:793–8. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.1031077 PMID: 14993174.
- 638 **13.** Goulia P, Mantas C, Dimitroula D, Mantis D, Hyphantis T. General hospital staff worries,
639 perceived sufficiency of information and associated psychological distress during the
640 A/H1N1 influenza pandemic. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2010; 10:322. doi: 10.1186/1471-2334-10-
641 322 PMID: 21062471.
- 642 **14.** Matsuishi K, Kawazoe A, Imai H, Ito A, Mouri K, Kitamura N, et al. Psychological impact
643 of the pandemic (H1N1) 2009 on general hospital workers in Kobe. *Psychiatry Clin
644 Neurosci*. 2012; 66:353–60. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-1819.2012.02336.x PMID: 22624741.
- 645 **15.** Huang Y, Zhao N. Generalized anxiety disorder, depressive symptoms and sleep
646 quality during COVID-19 epidemic in China: a web-based cross-sectional survey. ;
647 2020.
- 648 **16.** Rossi R, Soggi V, Pacitti F, Di Lorenzo G, Di Marco A, Siracusano A, et al. Mental
649 Health Outcomes Among Frontline and Second-Line Health Care Workers During the
650 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic in Italy. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;
651 3:e2010185. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.10185 PMID: 32463467.
- 652 **17.** Dong Z-Q, Ma J, Hao Y-N, Shen X-L, Liu F, Gao Y, et al. The social psychological
653 impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on medical staff in China: A cross-sectional study.
654 *Eur Psychiatry*. 2020; 63:e65. doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2020.59 PMID: 32476633.
- 655 **18.** Pappa S, Ntella V, Giannakas T, Giannakoulis VG, Papoutsis E, Katsaounou P.
656 Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during the

- 657 COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav Immun.*
658 2020; 88:901–7. doi: 10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.026 PMID: 32437915.
- 659 **19.** Tan BYQ, Chew NWS, Lee GKH, Jing M, Goh Y, Yeo LLL, et al. Psychological Impact
660 of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Health Care Workers in Singapore. *Ann Intern Med.*
661 2020; 173:317–20. doi: 10.7326/M20-1083 PMID: 32251513.
- 662 **20.** Dai Y, Hu G, Xiong H, Qiu H, Yuan X. Psychological impact of the coronavirus disease
663 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak on healthcare workers in China. 2020.
664 doi: 10.1101/2020.03.03.20030874.
- 665 **21.** Cai H, Tu B, Ma J, Chen L, Fu L, Jiang Y, et al. Psychological Impact and Coping
666 Strategies of Frontline Medical Staff in Hunan Between January and March 2020 During
667 the Outbreak of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Hubei, China. *Med Sci*
668 *Monit.* 2020; 26:e924171. doi: 10.12659/MSM.924171 PMID: 32291383.
- 669 **22.** Chen Q, Liang M, Li Y, Guo J, Fei D, Wang L, et al. Mental health care for medical staff
670 in China during the COVID-19 outbreak. *The Lancet Psychiatry.* 2020; 7:e15-e16.
671 doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30078-X.
- 672 **23.** Khalid I, Khalid TJ, Qabajah MR, Barnard AG, Qushmaq IA. Healthcare Workers
673 Emotions, Perceived Stressors and Coping Strategies During a MERS-CoV Outbreak.
674 *Clin Med Res.* 2016; 14:7–14. doi: 10.3121/cmr.2016.1303 PMID: 26847480.
- 675 **24.** Shanafelt T, Ripp J, Trockel M. Understanding and Addressing Sources of Anxiety
676 Among Health Care Professionals During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA.* 2020;
677 323:2133–4. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.5893 PMID: 32259193.
- 678 **25.** Ives J, Greenfield S, Parry JM, Draper H, Gratus C, Petts JI, et al. Healthcare workers'
679 attitudes to working during pandemic influenza: a qualitative study. *BMC Public Health.*
680 2009; 9:56. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-9-56 PMID: 19216738.
- 681 **26.** Lancee WJ, Maunder RG, Goldbloom DS. Prevalence of psychiatric disorders among
682 Toronto hospital workers one to two years after the SARS outbreak. *Psychiatr Serv.*
683 2008; 59:91–5. doi: 10.1176/ps.2008.59.1.91 PMID: 18182545.

- 684 **27.** Reynolds DL, Garay JR, Deamond SL, Moran MK, Gold W, Styra R. Understanding,
685 compliance and psychological impact of the SARS quarantine experience. *Epidemiol*
686 *Infect.* 2008; 136:997–1007. doi: 10.1017/S0950268807009156 PMID: 17662167.
- 687 **28.** Bai Y, Lin C-C, Lin C-Y, Chen J-Y, Chue C-M, Chou P. Survey of stress reactions
688 among health care workers involved with the SARS outbreak. *Psychiatr Serv.* 2004;
689 55:1055–7. doi: 10.1176/appi.ps.55.9.1055 PMID: 15345768.
- 690 **29.** Robertson E, Hershenfield K, Grace SL, Stewart DE. The psychosocial effects of being
691 quarantined following exposure to SARS: a qualitative study of Toronto health care
692 workers. *Can J Psychiatry.* 2004; 49:403–7. doi: 10.1177/070674370404900612 PMID:
693 15283537.
- 694 **30.** Hawryluck L, Gold WL, Robinson S, Pogorski S, Galea S, Styra R. SARS control and
695 psychological effects of quarantine, Toronto, Canada. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2004; 10:1206–
696 12. doi: 10.3201/eid1007.030703 PMID: 15324539.
- 697 **31.** Dunham AM, Rieder TN, Humbyrd CJ. A Bioethical Perspective for Navigating Moral
698 Dilemmas Amidst the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg.* 2020; 28:471–6.
699 doi: 10.5435/JAAOS-D-20-00371 PMID: 32282442.
- 700 **32.** Greenberg N, Docherty M, Gnanapragasam S, Wessely S. Managing mental health
701 challenges faced by healthcare workers during covid-19 pandemic. *BMJ.* 2020;
702 368:m1211. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1211 PMID: 32217624.
- 703 **33.** Williams RD, Brundage JA, Williams EB. Moral Injury in Times of COVID-19. *J Health*
704 *Serv Psychol.* 2020:1–5. doi: 10.1007/s42843-020-00011-4 PMID: 32363349.
- 705 **34.** Shay J. Moral injury. *Psychoanalytic Psychology.* 2014; 31:182–91.
706 doi: 10.1037/a0036090.
- 707 **35.** Litz BT, Stein N, Delaney E, Lebowitz L, Nash WP, Silva C, et al. Moral injury and moral
708 repair in war veterans: a preliminary model and intervention strategy. *Clin Psychol Rev.*
709 2009; 29:695–706. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2009.07.003 PMID: 19683376.
- 710 **36.** Calabresi G, Bobbitt P. *Tragic choices.* 1st ed. New York: Norton; 1978.

- 711 **37.** Ellebrecht N. Why Is Treatment Urgency Often Overestimated? An Experimental Study
712 on the Phenomenon of Over-triage. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep.* 2019:1–5.
713 doi: 10.1017/dmp.2019.74 PMID: 31416493.
- 714 **38.** Comitato Nazionale per la Bioetica. Covid 19: Clinical decision-making in the condition
715 of resource shortage and the “pandemic emergency triage” criterion. 2020. Available
716 from: [http://bioetica.governo.it/media/4008/p136_2020_covid-19-clinical-decision-](http://bioetica.governo.it/media/4008/p136_2020_covid-19-clinical-decision-making-in-conditions-of-resource-shortage-and-the-pandemic-emergency-triage-criterion_en.pdf)
717 [making-in-conditions-of-resource-shortage-and-the-pandemic-emergency-triage-](http://bioetica.governo.it/media/4008/p136_2020_covid-19-clinical-decision-making-in-conditions-of-resource-shortage-and-the-pandemic-emergency-triage-criterion_en.pdf)
718 [criterion_en.pdf](http://bioetica.governo.it/media/4008/p136_2020_covid-19-clinical-decision-making-in-conditions-of-resource-shortage-and-the-pandemic-emergency-triage-criterion_en.pdf).
- 719 **39.** Palazzani L. The pandemic and the ethical dilemma of limited resources: Who to treat.
720 *Bioethics Update.* 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.bioet.2020.09.003.
- 721 **40.** Palazzani L. Interview about ethical Challenges in the COVID-19 crisis. In COVID-19:
722 Ethical implications and psychosocial support in hospital care [Webinar]. NO-FEAR
723 project. ; 2020.
- 724 **41.** Maguire B, Hagan P. Disasters and Communities: Understanding Social Resilience.
725 *Australian Journal of Emergency Management.* 2007; 22. Available from:
726 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/27257187_Disasters_and_Communities_Und](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/27257187_Disasters_and_Communities_Understanding_Social_Resilience)
727 [erstanding_Social_Resilience](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/27257187_Disasters_and_Communities_Understanding_Social_Resilience).
- 728 **42.** Maunder RG, Leszcz M, Savage D, Adam MA, Peladeau N, Romano D, et al. Applying
729 the Lessons of SARS to Pandemic Influenza. *Can J Public Health.* 2008; 99:486–8.
730 doi: 10.1007/BF03403782.
- 731 **43.** Thieken AH, Mariani S, Longfield S, Vanneuville W. Preface: Flood resilient
732 communities – managing the consequences of flooding. *Nat Hazards Earth Syst Sci.*
733 2014; 14:33–9. doi: 10.5194/nhess-14-33-2014.
- 734 **44.** Johnson JV, Hall EM. Job strain, work place social support, and cardiovascular disease:
735 a cross-sectional study of a random sample of the Swedish working population. *Am J*
736 *Public Health.* 1988; 78:1336–42. doi: 10.2105/ajph.78.10.1336 PMID: 3421392.
- 737 **45.** Siegrist J. Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *Journal of*
738 *Occupational Health Psychology.* 1996; 1:27–41. doi: 10.1037//1076-8998.1.1.27.

- 739 **46.** Glaser BG, Strauss AL. The discovery of grounded theory. Strategies for qualitative
740 research. 4th ed. New Brunswick: Aldine; 2009.
- 741 **47.** IFRC reference center for Psychosocial support. Community Based Psychosocial
742 Support. A training kit. Participants Handbook. 2009. Available from:
743 https://pscentre.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/CBPS_ENParticipant.pdf.
- 744 **48.** Hobfoll SE, Watson P, Bell CC, Bryant RA, Brymer MJ, Friedman MJ, et al. Five
745 essential elements of immediate and mid-term mass trauma intervention: empirical
746 evidence. *Psychiatry*. 2007; 70:283-315; discussion 316-69.
747 doi: 10.1521/psyc.2007.70.4.283 PMID: 18181708.
- 748 **49.** Juen B, Warger R. Psychosoziale Interventionen in der peritraumatischen Phase und
749 ihre Wirksamkeit [Psychosocial Interventions in the peritraumatic phase and its
750 efficacy]. In: Gahleitner SB, Frank C, Leitner A, editors. Ein Trauma ist mehr als ein
751 Trauma. Biopsychosoziale Traumakonzepte in Psychotherapie, Beratung, Supervision
752 und Traumapädagogik. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz Juventa; 2015. pp. 163–71.
- 753 **50.** Dückers MLA, Thormar SB, Juen B, Ajdukovic D, Newlove-Eriksson L, Olf M.
754 Measuring and modelling the quality of 40 post-disaster mental health and psychosocial
755 support programmes. *PLoS One*. 2018; 13:e0193285.
756 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0193285 PMID: 29489888.
757