Protocol: A two-wave cross-sectional study in England investigating suicidal behaviour and self-harm amongst healthcare workers during the Covid-19 pandemic

Prianka Padmanathan*[1], Danielle Lamb[2], Hannah Scott[3], Simon Wessely[3], Paul Moran[1,4,5]

[1] Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
[2] The National Institute for Health Research Applied Research Collaboration North Thames (NIHR ARC North Thames), University College London, London, UK
[3] Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
[4] National Institute of Health Research Biomedical Research Centre at the University Hospitals, Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
[5] The National Institute for Health Research Applied Research Collaboration West (NIHR ARC West), Bristol, UK
*Corresponding author: prianka.padmanathan@bristol.ac.uk

Changes in this protocol compared with the original version:

1. All variables describing workplace factors will be analysed as binary variables for consistency.
2. The responses to two questions on raising, and the management of, safety concerns will be analysed separately rather than combined to minimise loss of information.
3. Binary suicide-related outcomes will be used in the logistic regression analyses, where the presence of an outcome represents its occurrence within the previous one (wave 2) or two months (wave 1), specifically. This was previously not specified.

Abstract

Introduction

There have been longstanding concerns regarding an increased risk of suicide amongst healthcare workers. The Covid-19 pandemic has placed an additional burden on staff, yet few studies have investigated the impact of the pandemic on their risk of suicide and self-harm. We aimed to investigate the cumulative incidence, prevalence, and correlates of suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and non-suicidal self-injury amongst healthcare workers during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Methods and Analysis

NHS Check is an online survey that was distributed to all staff (clinical and non-clinical), students, and volunteers in 18 NHS Trusts across England during the Covid-19 pandemic. Data collected in wave 1 (collected between April 2020 and January 2021) and wave 2 (collected 6 months after wave 1) will be analysed. The full cohort of wave 1 participants will be weighted to represent the age, sex, ethnicity, and roles profile of the workforce at each Trust, and the weighted prevalence and cumulative incidence of suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and non-suicidal self-injury will be described. Two-level random effects logistic regression models will be used to investigate the relationship between suicidal behaviour and self-harm, and demographic characteristics (age, sex, ethnicity) and workplace factors (concerns regarding access to personal protective equipment, re-deployment status, moral injury, confidence around raising and the management of safety concerns, support by supervisors or managers, satisfaction with standard of care provided). Results will be stratified by role (clinical/non-clinical).

Introduction

There have been longstanding concerns regarding an increased risk of suicide amongst healthcare workers [1,2]. The Covid-19 pandemic has placed an additional burden on healthcare staff, yet while several studies have investigated the impact of the pandemic on their mental health [3-7], few have investigated their risk of suicide and self-harm [8]. Provisional Office of National Statistics data indicate that there has been an increase in the absolute number of suicides, and the proportion of total deaths that were due to suicide, amongst health workers in England and Wales in the first six months of 2020 compared to the same period in 2019 [9]. Occupational exposures such as inadequate support from colleagues and moral injury have previously been linked with suicidal ideation and suicide attempts[10], although, to date, the latter has only been investigated in a small number of studies of military personnel [11]. Amongst healthcare workers working in epidemics, several modifiable occupational risk factors, such as a lack of specialised training or personal protective equipment, have been associated with worse mental health [6,12].

Aims & objectives

To investigate the cumulative incidence, prevalence, and correlates of non-fatal suicidal behaviour (i.e. suicidal ideation and suicide attempts) and self-harm (i.e. non-suicidal self-injury) amongst healthcare workers during the Covid-19 pandemic.

1) Describe the prevalence of suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and non-suicidal self-injury at baseline and 6 months follow-up
2) Describe the cumulative incidence of suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and non-suicidal self-injury at 6 months follow-up
3) Investigate the relationship between demographic characteristics and workplace factors reported at baseline and suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and self-harm at baseline and at 6 months follow-up.

Methods

NHS Check is a multi-wave online survey that was distributed to all staff (clinical and non-clinical), students, and volunteers in 18 NHS Trusts across England during the Covid-19 pandemic [13]. Data from the 17 Trusts (those with a response rate of over 5%) will be included in this analysis. Data for wave 1 were collected between April 2020 and January 2021. Data for wave 2 were collected six months after each participant's completion of the wave 1 survey. Both waves included a "short" survey and a "long" survey. Participants could choose to complete either the "short" survey alone or complete the "long" survey in addition. In wave 1, the "short" survey collected demographic information, whilst the "long" survey included questions relating to the workforce factors and the suicide and self-harm outcomes described in this study. In wave 2, questions relating to suicide and self-harm were included in the "short" survey. Further details regarding data collection can be found elsewhere [13].

Outcomes

Suicidal ideation, suicide attempts and non-suicidal self-injury were assessed using the following items from the Clinical Interview Schedule (CIS-R)[14]: "Have you ever thought of taking your life, even though you would not actually do it?"; "Have you ever made an attempt to take your life, by taking an overdose of tablets or in some other way?"; and "Have you ever deliberately harmed yourself in any way but not with the intention of killing yourself?". In the baseline survey, participants could select from the following options: "Yes, in the past 2 months", "Yes, but not in the past 2 months", or "No". In the 6-month follow-up survey, participants could select from the same options but a one-month, rather than two-month, time frame was specified.

In the logistic regression analyses described below, binary suicide-related outcomes will be used, where the presence of an outcome represents its occurrence within the previous one (wave 2) or two months (wave 1), specifically.

Explanatory factors

Demographic characteristics

Variables will be defined as follows based on previous NHS Check analyses [8]:

- Age
- Sex (Female, male – options are limited by survey design)
- Ethnicity (ONS top-level categories: White, Black, Asian, Mixed ethnicity, Other ethnicity)
- Role (Doctor, nurse, other clinical, non-clinical)

Individual-level workplace factors

All factors will be analysed as binary exposures (see Appendix for questions and responses):

- Access to personal protective equipment (Q85 short survey: exposure=never/sometimes)
- Re-deployment status (Q69 short survey: exposure=yes)
- Moral injury (Q50 long survey: exposure=moderately agree/strongly agree to any of the sub-questions)
- Raising safety concerns (Q19 long survey: exposure=strongly disagree/disagree)
- Management of safety concerns (Q19 long survey: exposure=strongly disagree/disagree)
- Support by supervisors or managers (Q87b short survey: exposure=not at all/a little bit)
- Satisfaction with standard of care provided - worse care than usual (Q11b long survey: exposure=often/always) – clinical staff only

Statistical analysis

The full cohort (i.e. those completing the short survey at wave 1) will be weighted using a ranking algorithm based on the age, sex, ethnicity, and roles profile of the workforce at each Trust to maximise representativeness. To complete the weighting, missing demographic data will be imputed using multiple imputation. The imputed data will only be used for the

purposes of completing weighting and will not be used in any other analyses related to the aims and objectives, which will only include participants with complete data on the included variables. Some participants completed the baseline survey more than once. The weighting includes an average of these participants' responses.

We will describe the demographic and occupational characteristics of the full cohort, our wave 1 sub-sample (i.e. those who completed the suicide and self-harm questions in the wave 1 long survey), and our wave 2 sub-sample (i.e. those who completed the suicide and self-harm questions in the wave 2 short survey) (Table 1). We will compare our sub-samples to the full cohort, using Chi^2 tests for each binary or categorical variable, to assess any statistically significant differences between the groups.

We will describe the weighted prevalence of our outcomes for participants at wave 1 and at wave 2 (Table 2). Due to the discrepancy in the time frames specified by the suicide and self-harm questions between waves, a 2-month period prevalence will be calculated for wave 1, whilst a 1-month period prevalence will be calculated for wave 2. We will also describe the weighted cumulative incidence of our outcomes at wave 2 i.e. the number and percentage of participants who responded "no" to previous self-harm and suicidal behaviour at wave 1, but "yes" at wave 2 (Table 2).

Given the clustered nature of the data, we will then use two-level random effects logistic regression models, to investigate the relationship between each demographic characteristic and workplace factor reported at wave 1 and suicidal behaviour and self-harm at wave 1 and wave 2 (Tables 3 and 4). Data will be stratified by role (clinical/non-clinical). Participants (level 1) will be clustered within each Trust (level 2), and we will adjust for age, sex, ethnicity and date of survey completion as level 1 covariates. When analysing the outcomes at wave 2, in addition, we will also adjust for the corresponding outcome at wave 1 (level 1). For example, when analysing suicidal ideation at wave 2, we will adjust for suicidal ideation at wave 1. In each model, we will only include participants with complete data on all included variables. We will use the "subpop" command in Stata to ensure that the standard errors of the estimates are calculated correctly [16].

Ethics

Ethics and Dissemination Ethical approval for the NHS Check study was granted by the Health Research Authority (reference: 20/HRA/210, IRAS: 282686) and local Trust Research and Development approval. See elsewhere for further details [13].

Table 1: Survey sample characteristics

Variable	Category	No. (%) unless otherwise specified		
		Full cohort (n=)	Wave 1 cohort (n=)	Wave 2 cohort (n=)
Age in years[α]	*≤30*			
	31-40			
	41-50			
	51-60			
	≥61			
	Missing			
Sex[α]	*Female*			
	Male			
	Missing			
Ethnicity[α]	*White*			
	Black			
	Asian			
	Mixed/Multiple racial & ethnic groups			
	Other racial & ethnic minority groups			
	Missing			
Role[α]	*Doctor*			
	Nurse			
	Other clinical			
	Non-clinical			
	Missing			
Redeployment[α]	*No*			
	Yes			
	Missing			
Concerns about access to PPE[αγ]	*No*			
	Yes			
	Missing			

Concerns about support from managers[α]	*No*			
	Yes			
	Missing			
Concerns about raising safety concerns [βγ]	*No*			
	Yes			
	Missing			
Concerns about the management of safety concerns[βγ]	*No*			
	Yes			
	Missing			
Dissatisfaction with standard of care provided[βγ]	*No*			
	Yes			
	Missing			
Moral injury[βγ]	*No*			
	Yes			
	Missing			

n=frequencies (unweighted raw data), percentages are weighted.
α: Question asked in wave 1 survey, short questionnaire; β: Question asked in wave 1 survey, long questionnaire; γ: Question asked in wave 2 survey (See Figure 1 for more details)

Table 2: Prevalence and incidence of suicidal-related outcomes

			Prevalence*			Cumulative incidence		
	Response		Suicidal ideation	Suicidal attempts	Non-suicidal self-injury	Suicidal ideation	Suicidal attempts	Non-suicidal self-injury
Wave 1	No	n (%) [95%CI]				N/a	N/a	N/a
	Yes, but not in the 2 months prior to wave 1 survey completion	n (%) [95%CI]				N/a	N/a	N/a
	Yes, in the 2 months prior to wave 1 survey completion	n (%) [95%CI]				N/a	N/a	N/a
Wave 2	No	n (%) [95%CI]						
	Yes, but not in the month prior to wave 2 survey completion	n (%) [95%CI]						
	Yes, in the month prior to wave 2 survey completion	n (%) [95%CI]						

n=frequency (unweighted raw data); percentages are weighted
*Wave 1=2-month period prevalence; Wave 2=1-month period prevalence

Table 3: Association between demographic characteristics and suicide-related outcomes at wave 1 and wave 2

		Wave 1						Wave 2					
Variable	Category	Suicidal ideation (aOR; 95% CI)		Suicide attempts (aOR; 95% CI)		Non-suicidal self-injury (aOR; 95% CI)		Suicidal ideation (aOR; 95% CI)		Suicide attempts (aOR; 95% CI)		Non-suicidal self-injury (aOR; 95% CI)	
		Clinical	Non-clinical	Clinical	Non-clinical	Clinical	Non-clinical	Clinical	Non-clinical	Clinical	Non-clinical	Clinical	Non-clinical
Age in years													
Sex	Female (Ref)												
	Male												
Ethnicity	White (Ref)												
	Black/African/Caribbean/Black British												
	Asian/Asian British												
	Mixed/Multiple racial and ethnic groups												
	Other racial and ethnic minority groups												

aOR: adjusted odds ratios: adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, and date of survey completion (6-month data also adjusted for corresponding outcome measured at baseline); CI: confidence intervals

Table 4: Association between baseline workplace factors and suicide-related outcomes at wave 1 and wave 2

		Wave 1 survey						Wave 2 survey					
Variable	Category	Suicidal ideation (aOR; 95% CI)		Suicide attempts (aOR; 95% CI)		Non-suicidal self-injury (aOR; 95% CI)		Suicidal ideation (aOR; 95% CI)		Suicide attempts (aOR; 95% CI)		Non-suicidal self-injury (aOR; 95% CI)	
		Clinical	Non-clinical	Clinical	Non-clinical	Clinical	Non-clinical	Clinical	Non-clinical	Clinical	Non-clinical	Clinical	Non-clinical
Redeployment	No (Ref)												
	Yes												
Concerns around raising safety issues	No (Ref)												
	Yes												
Concerns around management of safety issues	No (Ref)												
	Yes												
Concerns about access to PPE	No (Ref)												
	Yes												
Concerns about support from managers	No (Ref)												
	Yes												
Concerns about standard of care provided	No (Ref)												
	Yes												
Moral injury	No (Ref)												
	Yes												

*aOR: adjusted odds ratios – adjusted for age, sex & ethnicity, and date of survey completion (6-month data also adjusted for corresponding outcome measured at wave 1); CI: confidence intervals

References

1. Dutheil F, Aubert C, Pereira B, et al. Suicide among physicians and health-care workers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2019; **14**(12): e0226361-e.
2. The Lancet. Suicide among health-care workers: time to act. *The Lancet* 2017; **389**(10064): 2.
3. González-Sanguino C, Ausín B, Castellanos MÁ, et al. Mental health consequences during the initial stage of the 2020 Coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19) in Spain. *Brain Behav Immun* 2020; **87**: 172-6.
4. González-Sanguino C, Ausín B, Castellanos MÁ, et al. Mental Health Consequences of the Coronavirus 2020 Pandemic (COVID-19) in Spain. A Longitudinal Study. *Frontiers in Psychiatry* 2020; **11**(1256).
5. Liu Y, Chen H, Zhang N, et al. Anxiety and depression symptoms of medical staff under COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 2021; **278**: 144-8.
6. Serrano-Ripoll MJ, Meneses-Echavez JF, Ricci-Cabello I, et al. Impact of viral epidemic outbreaks on mental health of healthcare workers: a rapid systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of affective disorders* 2020; **277**: 347-57.
7. Bell V, Wade D. Mental health of clinical staff working in high-risk epidemic and pandemic health emergencies a rapid review of the evidence and living meta-analysis. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 2021; **56**(1): 1-11.
8. Lamb D, Gnanapragasam S, Greenberg N, et al. Psychosocial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on 4378 UK healthcare workers and ancillary staff: initial baseline data from a cohort study collected during the first wave of the pandemic. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 2021.
9. Office for National Statistics. Number of suicides among healthcare workers (persons aged 18 to 64 years) registered in England and Wales during the first six months of 2019 and 2020. 2020.
10. Milner A, Witt K, LaMontagne AD, Niedhammer I. Psychosocial job stressors and suicidality: a meta-analysis and systematic review. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 2018; **75**(4): 245.
11. Williamson V, Stevelink SAM, Greenberg N. Occupational moral injury and mental health: systematic review and meta-analysis. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 2018; **212**(6): 339-46.
12. Arnetz JE, Goetz CM, Sudan S, Arble E, Janisse J, Arnetz BB. Personal Protective Equipment and Mental Health Symptoms Among Nurses During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 2020; **62**(11).
13. Lamb D, Greenberg N, Hotopf M, et al. NHS CHECK: protocol for a cohort study investigating the psychosocial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare workers. *BMJ Open* 2021; **11**(6): e051687.
14. Lewis G, Pelosi AJ, Araya R, Dunn G. Measuring psychiatric disorder in the community: a standardized assessment for use by lay interviewers. *Psychol Med* 1992; **22**(2): 465-86.
15. Nash WP, Marino Carper TL, Mills MA, Au T, Goldsmith A, Litz BT. Psychometric evaluation of the Moral Injury Events Scale. *Mil Med* 2013; **178**(6): 646-52.
16. West B, Berglund P, Heeringa S. A Closer Examination of Subpopulation Analysis of Complex-Sample Survey Data. *The Stata Journal* 2008; **8**: 520 - 31.

Funding

Funding for NHS CHECK has been received from the following sources: Medical Research Council (MR/V034405/1); UCL/Wellcome (ISSF3/ H17RCO/C3); Rosetrees (M952); Economic and Social Research Council (ES/V009931/1); as well as seed funding from National Institute for Health Research Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre, King's College London, National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit in Emergency Preparedness and Response at King's College London.

PP's PhD Clinical Fellowship was funded by the MRC Addiction Research Clinical Training programme [MR/N00616X/1] during the conduct of this study. PM is part-funded by the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol and also receives salary support from Avon & Wiltshire Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust. DL is supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaborative North Thames (NIHR ARC North Thames). This funder had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Acknowledgements

We wish to acknowledge the National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration (ARC) National NHS and Social Care Workforce Group, with the following ARCs: East Midlands, East of England, South West Peninsula, South London, West, North West Coast, Yorkshire and Humber, and North East and North Cumbria. They enabled the set-up of the national network of participating hospital sites and aided the research team to recruit effectively during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The NHS CHECK consortium includes the following site leads: Sean Cross, Amy Dewar, Chris Dickens, Mary Docherty, Frances Farnworth, Adam Gordon, Charles Goss, Jessica Harvey, Nusrat Husain, Peter Jones, Damien Longson, Richard Morriss, Jesus Perez, Mark Pietroni, Ian Smith, Tayyeb Tahir, Peter Trigwell, Jeremy Turner, Julian Walker, Scott Weich, Ashley Wilkie.

The NHS CHECK consortium includes the following co-investigators and collaborators: Peter Aitken, Anthony David, Sarah Dorrington, Rosie Duncan, Cerisse Gunasinghe, Stephani Hatch, Daniel Leightley, Ira Madan, Isabel McMullen, Martin Parsons, Paul Moran, Dominic Murphy, Catherine Polling, Alexandra Pollitt, Danai Serfioti, Chloe Simela, Charlotte Wilson Jones.

Competing interests

SW is an Emeritus NIHR Senior Investigator, and Director of the NIHR PHE Health Protection Research Unit into Emergency Preparedness and Response. This paper represents independent research part-funded by the NIHR Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre Trust and King's College London. SW acknowledges receiving speaker fees for two seminars on "Mental health impacts of COVID-19" for employees of Swiss Re.

The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the funders.