

1 **The mental health of staff working on Intensive Care Units over the COVID-19 winter**
2 **surge of 2020 in England: a cross sectional survey.**

3 **Word count: 3561**

4
5 Authors: Charlotte Hall^{1,†}, Joanna Milward^{1,†,*}, Cristina Spoiala¹, Jaskiran Kaur Bhogal¹,
6 Dale Weston¹, Henry W. W. Potts², Tristan Caulfield³, Michael Toolan^{4,5}, Kate Kanga⁶,
7 Sarah El-Sheikha⁷, Kevin Fong^{8,9,#}, Neil Greenberg^{10,11#}

8
9 †Indicates joint first author. #Indicates joint last author.

10 *Corresponding author: Joanna Milward. Email: Joanna.Milward@phe.gov.uk

11
12 1: Behavioural Science and Insights Unit, UK Health Security Agency, Salisbury, UK.

13 2: Institute of Health Informatics, University College London, UK.

14 3: Department of Computer Science, University College London, London, UK.

15 4: King's College Hospital, London, UK.

16 5: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, London, UK.

17 6: Department of Anaesthesia, Guy's & St Thomas' NHS Trust, London, UK.

18 7: Department of Anaesthesia, Mersey Deanery, Liverpool, UK

19 8: Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Public Policy (STeAPP), University
20 College London, London, UK,

21 9: Department of Anaesthesia, University College London Hospital, London, UK.

22 10: King's Centre for Military Health Research, Institute of Psychology, Psychiatry and
23 Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK

24 11: Health Protection Research Unit, Institute of Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience,
25 King's College London, London, UK

26

27

28 **Keywords:** COVID-19, Intensive Care, Mental Health, PTSD, Presenteeism, Healthcare
29 worker, Functional impairment.

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

Abstract

53 **Background:** The COVID-19 pandemic generated a surge of critically ill patients greater
54 than the NHS' capacity. Additionally, there have been multiple well-documented impacts
55 associated with the national COVID-19 pandemic surge on ICU workers, including an
56 increased prevalence of mental health disorders on a scale potentially sufficient to impair
57 high-quality care delivery.

58 **Aim:** To identify prevalence of probable mental health disorders and functional impairment.
59 As well as establish demographic and professional predictors of probable mental health
60 disorders and functional impairment in ICU staff between November 2020 to April 2021.

61 **Methods:** English ICU staff were surveyed before, during and after the winter 2020/2021
62 surge using a survey which comprised of validated measures of mental health.

63 **Results:** 6080 surveys were completed, by nurses (57.5%), doctors (27.9%), and other
64 healthcare staff (14.5%). Reporting probable mental health disorders increased from 51%
65 (prior to), to 64% (during) and then dropped to 46% (after). Younger, less experienced and
66 nursing staff were most likely to report probable mental health disorders. Additionally, during
67 and after the winter, over 50% of participants met threshold criteria for functional
68 impairment. Staff who reported probable post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety or depression
69 were more likely to meet threshold criteria for functional impairment.

70 **Conclusions:** The winter of 2020/2021 was associated with an increase in poor mental health
71 outcomes and functional impairment during a period of peak caseload. These effects are
72 likely to impact on patient care outcomes and the longer-term resilience of the healthcare
73 workforce.

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

Introduction

82 Psychological distress has increased in the general population over the course of the COVID-
83 19 pandemic¹ with key workers reporting higher rates of probable mental health disorders
84 than the general population.² Healthcare workers, particularly those working on the frontline,
85 have experienced high rates of mental health challenges such as depression, anxiety, stress,
86 and burnout³⁻⁷. Furthermore, health and social care workers were already reporting high
87 levels of pre-existing mental health disorders that may have increased their risk of
88 experiencing mental health during a public health emergency.⁴

89 During the pandemic, staff working on intensive care units (ICUs), including doctors, nurses,
90 and other healthcare professionals, have arguably been the most directly impacted by the
91 surge in critically ill COVID-19 patients. Nurses appear to have been particularly exposed
92 and have reported higher rates of symptoms consistent with common mental disorders and
93 post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) compared to other ICU staff.⁸ During the pandemic,
94 ICU staff have faced a constellation of specific stressors. These include the perceived risk to
95 their own health from exposure to COVID-19, very high mortality rates among the patients in
96 their care,⁹ reduced staffing ratios, shortages of personal protective equipment and the need to
97 work beyond their level of seniority.¹⁰

98 Poor mental health of ICU staff has the potential to impact the quality and safety of patient
99 care. The phenomenon of presenteeism, in which staff continue to work while functionally
100 impaired by the state of their mental health, may lead to an increased risk of errors and poorer
101 performance, which in turn may impact the quality and safety of patient care.^{11, 12}

102 With COVID-19, and the backlog of care resulting from the pandemic, exerting ongoing
103 pressures on ICU resources, it is important to understand how the mental health of ICU
104 workers has been impacted. This is essential in the identification of risk factors in this
105 population, to help ensure that appropriate support is made available for all,¹³ and to inform
106 future pandemic planning.

107 Building on the initial ICU mental health survey conducted by Greenberg et al.,⁸ which found
108 substantial rates of probable mental health disorders in ICU staff, this study analysed data
109 from three subsequent timepoints of the survey corresponding to before, during and after the
110 peak of the COVID-19 winter 2020/2021 surge in England, to explore the impact of this
111 surge on the mental wellbeing of staff working in ICUs.¹⁴

112 Therefore, the current study aimed to: describe the prevalence of five mental health
113 outcomes: probable depression, probable PTSD, probable general anxiety disorder, and
114 problem drinking, in ICU staff over the winter 2020/2021 surge in England; explore
115 demographic and professional predictors of poorer mental health outcomes in ICU staff over
116 the 2020/2021 winter surge in England; describe the prevalence of functional impairment in
117 ICU staff over the 2020/2021 winter surge in England; and, explore demographic and
118 professional predictors of functional impairment in ICU staff over the 2020/2021 winter
119 surge in England.

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138 **Method**

139 **Study setting**

140 An online cross-sectional survey was designed and run in 56 English ICUs, which
141 experienced a surge in adult patients, above their formally commissioned baseline. Collection
142 occurred across three time points: before the peak - 19th November to 17th December 2020;
143 during the peak - 26th January – 17th February 2021; and after the peak - 14th April – 24th May
144 2021. These data collection points were part of an ongoing service evaluation of ICU staff's
145 mental health which commenced in June 2020.⁸

146 This study was approved by the Psychiatry, Nursing and Midwifery Research Ethics
147 Subcommittee, King's College London reference number: MOD-20/21-18162.

148 The 56 NHS hospitals which provided data comprised of District General Hospitals,
149 Teaching Hospitals and Quaternary Paediatric Hospitals. The selection process reflected
150 hospitals utilising surge capacity and hospitals receiving or making use of interhospital
151 transfers as part of mutual aid support between neighbouring units. Where possible, data for
152 hospital baseline ICU bed number (as declared in 2020, immediately prior to the pandemic)
153 and actual maximum occupancy during COVID-19 was collected. All surveyed units
154 exceeded 100% of their baseline ICU capacity during the winter 2020/2021 surge.

155 **Survey design**

156 Data were collected via an anonymised web-based survey, designed to be completed in less
157 than 5 minutes, comprising validated questionnaires assessing mental health status and
158 psychological well-being. Participants were aware that their participation was voluntary, their
159 data would be anonymised, they were free to stop at any point during the completion of the
160 study and any incomplete surveys would be discarded. The Lime Survey tool
161 (<https://www.limesurvey.org/>) was used to build the survey and hosted on a dedicated secure
162 university server.

163 **Survey distribution**

164 Circulation and completion of the survey was encouraged through engagement with clinical
165 leads in each of the intensive care units. The survey was distributed through departmental
166 email and messaging groups. All staff working in ICUs (doctors, nurses, and other healthcare
167 professionals) were eligible to take part. Due to the recruitment method, the size of the

168 sample was determined by the participants who chose to complete the survey. Individual
169 respondents could not be followed across timepoints as the survey was anonymous in order to
170 reduce barriers to reporting.^{15,16} No participant data were excluded. Figure 1 displays a
171 participant flow chart.

172 **[INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]**

173 **Collected variables and outcome definitions**

174 Demographic data collected included age, gender, job role and seniority. Doctors who were
175 graded FY 1-2, ST 3-4, ST 5-6, ST 6-7 were classed as junior staff (staff still in training) and
176 consultant and senior associate specialists as senior staff. Nurses in Band 5 (i.e. those newly
177 qualified or staff nurses) or Band 6 (i.e. those who are nursing specialists or senior nurses)
178 were classed as junior, with Band 7 (i.e. those who are advanced nurses or nurse
179 practitioners) or higher (e.g. Matrons) classed as seniors.

180 The following measures, for which binary outcomes were set following cut-off scores to
181 indicate a case, were used; the 9-item Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) with a score of
182 >9 indicating probable moderate depression and >19 probable severe depression;¹⁷ the 6-item
183 Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder checklist (PCL-6) with a score of >17 indicating the presence
184 of probable PTSD;¹⁸ AUDIT-C with a score of >7 indicating problem drinking;¹⁹ the 7-item
185 Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD) scale with a score >9 indicating a probable moderate
186 anxiety disorder and >15 indicating probable severe anxiety disorder.²⁰ The primary variable
187 was defined, any mental disorder (AMD), which referred to those meeting the threshold
188 criteria for at least one of the following probable mental disorders: moderate or severe
189 anxiety, moderate or severe depression, problem drinking, or PTSD.

190 The Work and Social Adjustment Scale (WSAS) was added to the survey during the surge,
191 therefore data is only available for the timepoints during and after the peak. The scale is
192 based on how much an individual's ability to carry out day-to-day tasks is impacted by an
193 identified problem in their lives (e.g. "*Because of the way I feel my ability to work is*
194 *impaired*"), and consists of 5 items answered on an 8-point Likert scale. A score of >20
195 indicated severe psychopathology-related functional impairment and a score of >10 indicated
196 moderate functional impairment.¹⁴

197

198 **Statistics**

199 Using SPSS V27, descriptive statistics were plotted using counts and percentages for all
200 mental health outcomes across the entire sample. The various measures of psychological
201 distress were highly correlated, so one multivariable logistic regression was carried out using
202 AMD, with demographic (i.e. gender, age) and professional variables (i.e. role, seniority) as
203 predictors. A second multivariable logistic regression was carried out for Work and Social
204 Adjustment Scale, with all probable mental health disorders, demographic and professional
205 variables entered as predictors. Because of the small sample size of other healthcare
206 professionals, only doctors and nurses were included in the logistic regressions. Comparator
207 groups were chosen based on expected impact (e.g. junior staff would be impacted more
208 senior staff, so senior staff became the reference category). Additionally, senior nurses were
209 compared to all others (junior nurses and all doctors), and senior doctors were compared to
210 all others (junior doctors and all nurses), as we expected that the effect of seniority might be
211 different across the professions. AMD and WSAS were visually compared across timepoints
212 using forest plots with odds ratios and confidence intervals shown. Inferential statistics
213 comparing across waves were not possible due to lack of independence of observations: as
214 the survey was completed anonymously, we could not match responses in different waves
215 that may have been from the same individuals.

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

Results

229 Demographics

230 Table 1 displays the characteristics of the sample used within the current study. Across all
231 three timepoints, most respondents were female, and the modal age group was 30-44 years
232 old. Nurses comprised over 50% of the sample at all timepoints; they were mainly junior
233 (Band 6 or below) and were regular ICU, rather than redeployed, staff. Doctors constituted
234 around 30% of the sample; the majority were anaesthetists and of a senior level (i.e. Senior
235 Associate Specialist or Consultant).

236

237

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

238 Mental Health Measures

239 *Prevalence*

240 Figure 2 shows the percentage of ICU staff meeting the threshold criteria for all tested mental
241 health measures. A clear pattern was observed across the timepoints. The prevalence of all
242 tested mental disorders increased between before and during the peak (e.g. AMD 51.3%
243 [47.8-54.8] vs 64.6 [62.8-66.4]), and then decreased after the peak (e.g. AMD 45.5 [43.6-
244 47.5]).

245 Probable moderate depression was the most common across all time points (before: 40.5%
246 [37.1-44.0]; during 52.3% [50.4-54.2]; after: 33.9% [32.0-35.8]), followed by probable PTSD
247 (before: 31.3% [28.1-34.6]; during 46.5% [44.6-48.4]; after: 28.8% [27.0-30.6]), and
248 moderate anxiety (before: 29.7% [26.5-33.0]; during 43.7% [41.8-45.5]; after: 25.7% [24.0-
249 27.5]).

250

[INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]

251

252 *Adjusted outcomes*

253 A multivariable logistic regression was performed to ascertain the association of age, gender,
254 job role, and seniority with the likelihood that participants experienced AMD at each of the
255 three timepoints. Results were relatively consistent across time. Figure 3 displays a forest plot
256 of effect size and confidence intervals to allow visual comparison across timepoints. Older

257 staff (30+ years old) showed lower rates of AMD at all timepoints, with this result being
258 statistically significantly for some age groups during and after the peak. Nurses were more
259 likely than doctors to have experienced AMD, although this was only statistically
260 significantly during the peak. Junior nurses were more likely than senior nurses or any
261 doctors to have experienced AMD and this was significant during and after the peak. There
262 were no statistically significant differences by gender or doctor seniority at any timepoint.

263

264 **[INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE]**

265 **Functional impairment (Work and Social Adjustment Scale)**

266 *Prevalence*

267 Functional impairment was more prevalent during the peak in comparison to after. During the
268 peak, 69.1% [67.4-70.8] of participants met the threshold criteria for functional impairment
269 (consisting of 27.9% moderate and 41.2% severe). After the peak, 52.8% [50.8-54.7] of
270 participants met the threshold criteria for functional impairment (consisting of 27.3%
271 moderate and 25.5% severe).

272

273 *Adjusted outcomes*

274 A multivariable logistic regression was performed to ascertain the association of age, gender,
275 job role, seniority, and all mental health outcomes, with the likelihood that participants met
276 the threshold criteria for functional impairment at both timepoints. Figure 4 displays a forest
277 plot of effect size and confidence intervals to allow visual comparison across timepoints.
278 Across both timepoints (during and after the peak), those with probable moderate depression
279 (during OR = 4.7, after OR = 4.7), probable moderate anxiety (during OR = 2.4, after OR =
280 3.3), and probable PTSD (during OR = 6.4, after OR = 4.6) were all more likely to
281 experience functional impairment in comparison to those without. There was no statistically
282 significant relationship with problem drinking. While functional impairment was more
283 prevalent overall during the peak, there was little difference in the likelihood of functional
284 impairment between those with and without AMD (OR = 0.95). After the peak, those
285 respondents with AMD were twice as likely as those without to experience functional
286 impairment. Controlling for mental health outcomes, there were no independent, statistically

287 significant differences by age, gender, job role, or job seniority (for both doctors and nurses)
288 at any timepoint.

289

290 **[INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE]**

291 **Discussion**

292 This study examined the mental health of ICU workers between November 2020 to April
293 2021, during the winter COVID-19 surge in England. At the peak of the winter COVID-19
294 patient surge, almost two thirds of ICU staff sampled met the threshold criteria for at least
295 one of the surveyed probable mental health disorders. The likelihood of reporting AMD was
296 particularly high in younger, junior nurses. Over half of sampled ICU staff during and after
297 the winter COVID-19 surge met the threshold criteria for functional impairment, with the
298 likelihood of meeting the threshold criteria for functional impairment being substantially
299 increased by the presence of probable PTSD, anxiety or depression.

300 High rates of probable mental health problems were expected. These findings align with
301 research indicating an increased rate of probable mental health disorders among frontline
302 healthcare staff,² with particular strain during this unprecedented stressful time.^{8,9} General
303 population studies have shown comparable rates of probable, common mental health
304 problems: using the PHQ-4, Smith and colleagues found comparable case rates and patterns
305 over time in an England population survey,²¹ while Fancourt and colleagues, using the PHQ-
306 9 and GAD-7, found probable depression and anxiety to be high, but lower over the
307 comparable period.²²

308 Beyond the common mental health disorders, our study includes a self-report measure of
309 PTSD symptoms, the PCL-6. We identified that a sizeable fraction of respondents met or
310 exceeded the threshold for probable PTSD at all three time points. Whilst there are no robust
311 pre-pandemic data from ICU staff against which to compare this finding, we note these rates
312 of probable PTSD are comparable to that seen in British military veterans deployed in a
313 combat role during the war in Afghanistan.²³

314 Our finding that younger staff were more at risk of reporting AMD was in keeping with
315 previous literature showing similar findings in the general population where younger adults
316 are more likely to report poor wellbeing.^{22, 24-27} However, the risk of reporting AMD was also
317 increased by being a nurse, particularly a junior nurse. This finding matches our previous

318 study, carried out in June/July 2020, which also concluded that nurses were more at risk than
319 other healthcare professionals working in ICU during the COVID-19 pandemic,⁸ as well as
320 other current research.^{28,29} Studies of emergency services³⁰ consistently find that lower
321 grade/ranked staff are more likely to report poorer mental health. This may be because those
322 who remain in lower grades are more vulnerable to develop problems in the first place,
323 possibly due to pre-role life adversity which has also been shown to be linked to worse
324 mental health,³¹ or because they are more likely to be directly exposed to significant trauma
325 at work because of their ‘coalface’ role. Similar results may be found for lower grade nursing
326 staff who are more likely to be directly interacting with patients, and relatives, than more
327 senior staff. However, this paper is the first to show a relationship between seniority and
328 mental health among ICU staff.

329 This study is also the first to examine the relationship between mental health and functional
330 impairment in staff working in ICUs during the COVID-19 pandemic. We found that over
331 half of the participants met the threshold criteria for functional impairment both during and
332 after the peak of the winter 2020/2021 COVID-19 surge. This points to a potential
333 association between poorer staff mental health quality of care and patient outcomes. Indeed a
334 prospective, observational, multicentre study of 31 ICUs reported that depression symptoms
335 were an independent risk factor for medical errors, as were organisational factors such as
336 training and workloads.³²

337 Although not causally measured in the current study, the hypothesised associations between
338 functional impairment and patient safety outcomes, which this research points towards, are
339 highly concerning, since safety critical, vigilance tasks are a core feature in the delivery of
340 critical care and thus staff working in ICU settings must function at a high level to ensure the
341 safety and quality of patient care. Mental health status was associated with functional
342 impairment, with those experiencing probable moderate depression, moderate anxiety, or
343 probable PTSD, more likely to meet the threshold criteria for functional impairment, although
344 it is noted that the direction of this relationship was not tested in the current study.

345 The conduct of a study in the context of ongoing, severe COVID-19 patient surge presented
346 myriad challenges. We drew on the experience of other, clinical research teams operating in
347 this environment, and adopted a pragmatic approach to study design, opting for an agile,
348 scalable tool which allowed the capture of data which has clear limitations but nevertheless
349 provides unique insight into mental health impacts on staff during a unique period of
350 operational stress in the NHS. We identified the following principal limitations: Firstly, due

351 to not collecting identifiable data within the surveys (to ensure anonymity), it was not
352 possible to either link cases to allow for longitudinal analysis at the level of individuals, or
353 establish exclusivity between cases, rendering the data collected effectively cross-sectional.
354 Therefore, time (before, after and during the peak) were not entered together into the
355 statistical analysis. Secondly, we do not have data on the current demographic and
356 professional characteristics of the ICU staff population during the COVID-19 crisis, so we do
357 not know how representative the current study is. Additionally, data on ethnicity was not
358 collected as part of the survey, limiting the generalisability of the findings. Thirdly, the
359 recruitment method leaves open the possibility that those with more severe mental health
360 symptoms might be more - or less - likely to participate, thus leading to bias. Fourthly, this
361 study uses self-report measures which only provide an estimate of prevalence; interview-
362 based studies are required to establish the true prevalence of those who would meet
363 diagnostic criteria. Lastly, we recognise that the reported confidence intervals within the
364 regression models are relatively large, which suggests imprecision of observed results.
365 However, this is expected as there were only a limited number of participants at each time
366 point and the differences across time points remain consistent within the confidence intervals,
367 meaning useful conclusions can still be drawn from the analysis.

368 Future research should explore in further detail the casual relationship between mental health
369 in ICU staff, patient care and outcomes. Such research, into ICU staff's mental health and
370 functional impairment, should seek to collect identifiable information to allow cases to be
371 linked over time, for a more nuanced statistical analysis to be carried out. Additionally, the
372 Work and Social Adjustment Scale, to measure functional impairment was added to the
373 survey during the surge thus, future additional survey timepoints would allow for further
374 developed analysis of functional impairment.

375 Recognising that the pandemic placed extraordinary pressure on the NHS, the results of this
376 paper suggest that employers should ensure that all staff working in ICUs are provided with
377 suitable support and this is especially true for more junior nursing staff. While much has been
378 written about how best to support healthcare staff in the workplace (e.g. ^{33,34}), evidence
379 points to promotion of social cohesion at work and its role in reducing PTSD symptoms, such
380 as in a sample of military personnel,³⁵ organisational level approaches to help reduce burnout
381 in medics,³⁶ such as changes in schedule and reductions in the intensity of workloads and to
382 ensure that clinical team leaders feel confident to speak to staff about their mental
383 wellbeing.³⁷

384 Whilst the causes of poor mental health and functional impairment in ICU staff during the
385 pandemic are likely to be complex and multifactorial, and determining the causal relationship
386 between them was outside the scope of the current study, it is nevertheless important for
387 healthcare managers to consider strategies to improve the psychological and functional
388 health of their workforce. Delivering high quality care requires functional staff and we
389 suggest that wellbeing initiatives should be seen through the prism of improving patient
390 safety, experience and outcomes and reducing adverse events. In addition to ensuring
391 psychologically healthy workplaces, managers should also take account of the need for
392 strategies such as adequate resourcing and staffing of intensive care units such that
393 individuals reporting high levels of distress can be rested or temporarily rotated away from
394 higher intensity clinical roles. This in turn requires that demand for healthcare services are
395 matched appropriately and realistically with the available supply of staff and resources,
396 although we recognise the exceptional nature of the COVID-19 pandemic made planning and
397 resourcing difficult.

398 Ultimately, whilst noting caveats about sample representativeness, the current study provides
399 evidence that ICU staff experienced poorer mental health over the winter 2020/2021 COVID-
400 19 surge with the majority of those surveyed meeting the threshold criteria for poor mental
401 health. Furthermore, this was associated with evidence of high levels of probable functional
402 impairment on a scale that has the potential to negatively impact the safety and quality of
403 patient care. The study also suggests that we should expect staff's mental health to improve if
404 workload intensity decreases. However, there is, correspondingly, a risk of sustained
405 impairment if demand for healthcare in this setting continues to outstrip capacity. Taken
406 together these findings provide a case for the establishment of a coherent and comprehensive
407 recovery strategy, which appropriately matches demand for healthcare with NHS capacity
408 and human resource, with the goal of protecting staff so that they in turn can continue to
409 deliver safe, high quality patient care. It is essential that staff are properly supported by
410 employers who must recognise the association between mental health status and the ability of
411 staff to safely carry out their caring duties.

412

413

414

415

416 **Funding**

417 This study was supported by the National Institute for Health Research Research Unit (NIHR
418 HPRU) in Emergency Preparedness and Response, a partnership between Public Health
419 England, King's College London and the University of East Anglia. The views expressed are
420 those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR, Public Health England, the UK
421 Health Security Agency or the Department of Health and Social Care [Grant number:
422 NIHR20008900].

423 **Collaborators**

424 Lindsay Ayres, Emma, Addie, Angharad Williams, Andrew Lynes, Neil Herbert, Clare
425 Chamberlain-Parr, Paula Clements, Peter Hampshire, Maia Graham, Alison Hall, Phoebe
426 Arrowsmith, Rachael Wain, Nadine Weeks, Rosie Holmes, William McCaig, Jessica Miller,
427 Sachin Prabhu, Rebecca Longmate, Sarah Cooper, Paul Stonelake, Maria Crowley, Islam
428 Abdo, Lawrence Wilson, Peter Bamford, Mike Protopapas, Alex Trimmings, Daniel Lutman,
429 Sanjiv Sharma, Dalijit Hothi, Deborah Lees, Anne MacNiven, Bridget Leavey, Ciara
430 McMullin, Dagmar Gohil, Syed Husain, Hozefa Ebrahim, Anil Kambli, Daniel Moulton, Maria
431 Mcrittenden, Jane Sansom, Paul Hayden, Susannah Johnson, Akuratiyage Desilva, Nichola
432 White, Sarah Hare, Helen Langrick, Richard Lowsby, Julie Love, Jonathan Phillips, Geradine
433 Hardisty, Jagtar Pooni, Gordon French, Tristan McGeorge, Upeka Ranasinghe, Abdul Nazar,
434 George Collins, Fay Gilder, Rajnish Saha, Sara Blakeley, Catherine Snelson, Meriden
435 Cabales, Deidre McFarlane, Janet Lippett, Paul Dean, Amy Scott, Surrah Leifer, Stephen
436 Krueper, Sandra Barrington, Geeta Aggarwal, Ravi Kumar, Jane Dickson, Edward Cetti,
437 Carole Love, Chris Beevers, Abhijoy Chakladar, Caroline Dean, Dominique Melville, James
438 Nicholson, Aditya Kuravi, Karen Rawlings, Catherine Dexter, Allen Hornby, Andy Higgs,
439 Tim Furniss, Lisa Radley, Laura Langton, Andrew Badacsonyi, Mark Snazelle, Jane Kirk-
440 Smith, Julia Cristall, Karl Woods, Jane Unwin, Anna Dennis, Lisa Millin, Debbie Turner,
441 Nitin Arora, Nick Sherwood, Jonathan Hulme, Rebecca O'Dwyer, Omer Lodi, Ned Hobbs,
442 Manjeet Shehmar, Richard Stewart, Ganesh Suntharalingam, Carol Galvin, Tim Cook, Fiona
443 Kelly, Marghanita Jenkins, Debbie Van Der Velden, Thomas Best, Luis Colorado, Andre
444 Vercueil, Chris Langrish, Elaine Thorpe, Mark Paul, Nick McCartney, Noor Mohammed,
445 James Holding, Shameer Gopal, Jamie Smart, Prabhakar Thaventhiran, Richard Breeze, Chris
446 Woolard, Jeremy Wilson, Sinead Hanton, Sean Carroll, Nicholas Barrett, Victoria
447 McCormack, Roopa McCrossan

448 **Declaration of Interests**

449 N.G. runs a consultancy which provides the NHS with active listening and peer support
450 training. KF works at UCLH as a consultant anaesthetist, holds an academic chair at UCL,
451 and is seconded to NHS England as an advisor. HWWP has received funding from Public
452 Health England and from NHS England. HWWP has a PhD student who works at and has
453 fees paid by AstraZeneca. KK works for the Care Quality Commission.

454

455 **Author Contributions**

456 CEH: Performed data analysis, drafted the manuscript, constructed all tables, designed all
457 figures and prepared the manuscript for submission. JM: Study coordinator, developed
458 protocol, supported data analysis, contributed to article revisions. CS: Contributed to
459 protocol, supported data analysis, and contributed to article revisions. JKB: Contributed to
460 protocol, contributed to write-up and article revisions. DW: Provided feedback on protocol
461 and article revisions. HWWP: Supported and guided data analysis, commented on multiple
462 versions of the draft manuscript. TC: Designed the electronic survey tools, supported data
463 analysis and contributed to article revisions. MT: Assisted with recruitment and data
464 collection, contributed to study design and article revisions. KK: Assisted with recruitment
465 and data collection, contributed to study design and article revisions. SES: Assisted with
466 recruitment and data collection, contributed to study design and article revisions. KF:
467 Initiated the concept and formulated the initial design of the study and was a senior advisor to
468 the project. NG: Led study design, study deployment and study team, contributed to serial
469 article revisions. All authors have commented earlier versions of the manuscript and read and
470 approved the final version of the manuscript.

471

472 **Data Sharing**

473 The data used within this study are not publicly available.

474

475

476

477

References

- 478 1. Akinin L, De Neve J-E, Dunn E, et al. A review and response to the early mental
479 health and neurological consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. 2021.
- 480 2. Wilson W, Raj JP, Rao S, et al. Prevalence and predictors of stress, anxiety, and
481 depression among healthcare workers managing COVID-19 pandemic in India: a
482 nationwide observational study. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*.
483 2020;42(4):353-8.
- 484 3. Al-Humadi S, Bronson B, Muhlrad S, et al. Depression, suicidal thoughts, and
485 burnout among physicians during the CoViD-19 pandemic: a survey-based cross-
486 sectional study. *J Academic psychiatry*. 2021:1-9.
- 487 4. De Kock JH, Latham HA, Leslie SJ, et al. A rapid review of the impact of COVID-19
488 on the mental health of healthcare workers: implications for supporting psychological
489 well-being. *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21(1):1-18.
- 490 5. Sahebi A, Nejati B, Moayedi S, et al. The prevalence of anxiety and depression
491 among healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: An umbrella review of
492 meta-analyses. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology Biological Psychiatry*.
493 2021:110247.
- 494 6. Wanigasooriya K, Palimar P, Naumann DN, et al. Mental health symptoms in a
495 cohort of hospital healthcare workers following the first peak of the COVID-19
496 pandemic in the UK. *BJPsych open*. 2021;7(1).
- 497 7. Yamamoto T, Uchiumi C, Suzuki N, Yoshimoto J, Murillo-Rodriguez E. The
498 psychological impact of 'mild lockdown' in Japan during the COVID-19 pandemic: a
499 nationwide survey under a declared state of emergency. *International journal of
500 environmental research public health*. 2020;17(24):9382.
- 501 8. Greenberg N, Weston D, Hall C, et al. Mental health of staff working in intensive care
502 during COVID-19. *Occupational Medicine*. 2021;71(2):62-7.
- 503 9. Greenberg N, Docherty M, Gnanapragasam S, Wessely S. Managing mental health
504 challenges faced by healthcare workers during covid-19 pandemic. *BMJ*. 2020;368.
- 505 10. Roberts T, Daniels J, Hulme W, et al. COVID-19 emergency response assessment
506 study: a prospective longitudinal survey of frontline doctors in the UK and Ireland:
507 study protocol. *BMJ open*. 2020;10(8):e039851.

- 508 11. Salyers MP, Bonfils KA, Luther L, et al. The relationship between professional
509 burnout and quality and safety in healthcare: a meta-analysis. *Journal of general*
510 *internal medicine*. 2017;32(4):475-82.
- 511 12. Tawfik DS, Scheid A, Profit J, et al. Evidence relating health care provider burnout
512 and quality of care: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Annals of internal*
513 *medicine*. 2019;171(8):555-67.
- 514 13. Dolev T, Zubedat S, Brand Z, et al. Physiological parameters of mental health predict
515 the emergence of post-traumatic stress symptoms in physicians treating COVID-19
516 patients. *Translational psychiatry*. 2021;11(1):1-9.
- 517 14. Mundt JC, Marks IM, Shear MK, Greist JM. The Work and Social Adjustment Scale:
518 a simple measure of impairment in functioning. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*.
519 2002;180(5):461-4.
- 520 15. Fear NT, Seddon R, Jones N, Greenberg N, Wessely S. Does anonymity increase the
521 reporting of mental health symptoms? 2012;12(1):1-7.
- 522 16. Wilson ALG, Hoge CW, McGurk D, et al. Application of a new method for linking
523 anonymous survey data in a population of soldiers returning from Iraq.
524 2010;20(12):931-8.
- 525 17. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression
526 severity measure. *Journal of general internal medicine*. 2001;16(9):606-13.
- 527 18. Lang AJ, Stein MB. An abbreviated PTSD checklist for use as a screening instrument
528 in primary care. *Behaviour research therapy*. 2005;43(5):585-94.
- 529 19. Bush K, Kivlahan DR, McDonell MB, et al. The AUDIT alcohol consumption
530 questions (AUDIT-C): an effective brief screening test for problem drinking.
531 1998;158(16):1789-95.
- 532 20. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JB, Löwe B. A brief measure for assessing
533 generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Archives of internal medicine*.
534 2006;166(10):1092-7.
- 535 21. Smith LE, Michie S, Fear NT, Potts H, Rubin J, Amlôt R. Psychological wellbeing in
536 the English population during the COVID-19 pandemic: a series of cross-sectional
537 surveys. 2021.
- 538 22. Fancourt D, Bu F, Mak H, Paul E, Steptoe A. Covid-19 Social Study Results Release
539 32. London: University College London. Health DoBS. 2021.
- 540 23. Stevelink SA, Jones M, Hull Let al. Mental health outcomes at the end of the British
541 involvement in the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts: a cohort study. 2018;213(6):690-7.

- 542 24. Office of National Statistics. Coronavirus and depression in adults, Great Britain:
543 January to March 2021. 2021.
- 544 25. Daly M, Robinson E. Longitudinal changes in psychological distress in the UK from
545 2019 to September 2020 during the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from a large
546 nationally representative study. *Psychiatry Research*. 2021;300:113920.
- 547 26. Dickerson J, Kelly B, Lockyer B, et al. 'When will this end? Will it end?'The impact
548 of the March-June 2020 UK Covid-19 lockdown response on mental health: a
549 longitudinal survey of mothers in the Born in Bradford study. *medRxiv*. 2020.
- 550 27. Moitra M, Rahman M, Collins PY, et al. Mental health consequences for healthcare
551 workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: a scoping review to draw lessons for
552 LMICs. *Frontiers in psychiatry*. 2021;12:22.
- 553 28. Kisely S, Warren N, McMahon L, et al. Occurrence, prevention, and management of
554 the psychological effects of emerging virus outbreaks on healthcare workers: rapid
555 review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2020;369.
- 556 29. Lamb D, Gnanapragasam S, Greenberg N, et al. The psychosocial impact of COVID-
557 19 pandemic on 4,378 UK healthcare workers and ancillary staff: initial baseline data
558 from a cohort study collected during the first wave of the pandemic. *medRxiv preprint*
559 server. 2021.
- 560 30. Fear NT, Rubin GJ, Hatch S, et al. Job strain, rank, and mental health in the UK
561 Armed Forces. 2009;15(3):291-8.
- 562 31. Boullier M, Blair MJP, Health C. Adverse childhood experiences. 2018;28(3):132-7.
- 563 32. Garrouste-Orgeas M, Perrin M, Soufir L, et al. The Iatroref study: medical errors are
564 associated with symptoms of depression in ICU staff but not burnout or safety culture.
565 2015;41(2):273-84.
- 566 33. Tracy DK, Tarn M, Eldridge R, et al. What should be done to support the mental
567 health of healthcare staff treating COVID-19 patients? *The British Journal of*
568 *Psychiatry*. 2020;217(4):537-9.
- 569 34. Chirico F, Nucera G, Magnavita N. Protecting the mental health of healthcare workers
570 during the COVID-19 emergency. *BJPsych International*. 2021;18(1).
- 571 35. Ward RN, Carlson KJ, Erickson AJ, Yalch MM, Brown LM. Associations of humor,
572 morale, and unit cohesion on posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms. 2021:1-10.
- 573 36. De Simone S, Vargas M, Servillo G. Organizational strategies to reduce physician
574 burnout: a systematic review and meta-analysis. 2021;33(4):883-94.

575 37. Akhanemhe R, Wallbank S, Greenberg N. An evaluation of REACTMH mental
576 health training for healthcare supervisors. J Occupational Medicine. 2021;71(3):127-
577 30.

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600 **Table 1**

601 *ICU Participant characteristics.*

Variables	Before the surge (<i>n</i> = 809) <i>n</i> (%)	During the surge (<i>n</i> = 2792) <i>n</i> (%)	After the surge (<i>n</i> = 2479) <i>n</i> (%)
Gender			
Male	266 (32.9)	719 (25.8)	667 (26.9)
Female	536 (66.3)	2053 (73.5)	1790 (72.2)
Other ^a	7 (0.9)	20 (0.7)	22 (0.9)
Age			
16-29	141 (17.4)	550 (19.7)	426 (17.2)
30-44	374 (46.2)	1320 (47.3)	1216 (49.1)
45-56	268 (33.1)	849 (30.4)	756 (30.5)
60+	26 (3.2)	73 (2.6)	81 (3.3)
Role			
Doctor	258 (31.9)	791 (28.3)	649 (26.2)
Type			
<i>Anaesthesia</i>	157 (60.9)	401 (50.7)	322 (49.6)
<i>ICU</i>	89 (34.5)	317 (40.1)	280 (43.1)
<i>Other</i>	12 (4.7)	73 (9.2)	47 (7.2)
Grade			
<i>Junior</i> ^b	93 (36.0)	300 (37.9)	197 (30.4)
<i>Senior</i> ^c	165 (64.0)	491 (62.1)	452 (69.6)
Nurse	428 (52.9)	1615 (57.8)	1455 (58.7)
Type			
<i>ICU</i>	351 (82)	1334 (82.6)	1260 (86.6)
<i>Other</i>	16 (3.7)	171 (10.6)	115 (7.9)
<i>Theatres</i>	61 (14.3)	110 (6.8)	80 (5.5)
Grade			
<i>Junior</i> ^d	329 (76.9)	1264 (78.3)	1113 (76.5)
<i>Senior</i> ^e	99 (23.1)	351 (21.7)	342 (23.5)

Other ^f	123 (15.2)	386 (13.8)	375 (15.1)
--------------------	------------	------------	------------

602 **Note:** ^a: indicates both, those who chose to not disclose their gender, and those who selected
603 'other'. ^b: refers to those who chose the following grading categories: FY 1-2, ST 3-4, ST 5-6,
604 ST 6-7. ^c: refers to those who chose the following grading categories: consultant or senior
605 associate specialist. ^d: refers to those who chose the following grading categories: Band 5 or
606 Band 6. ^e: refers to those who chose the following grading categories Band 7, Band 8 or Band
607 9. ^f: encompasses the following job roles: Healthcare assistant, Occupational therapist,
608 Operating Department Practitioner (ODP), Pharmacist, Physiotherapist and 'Other'.

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629 **Figure 1**

630 *CONSORT 2020 Participant Flow Diagram*

631

632

633



634

CONSORT 2010 Flow Diagram

635

Enrollment

636

Before the surge (n=809)

During the surge (n =2792)

After the surge (n=2479)

637

638

639

640

Assessed for eligibility (n=6080)

641

642

643

Excluded (n= 0)

644

645

646

Analysis

647

Analysed (n= 6080)
◆ Excluded from analysis (n=0)

648

649

650


651

652

653

654 **Figure 2**

655 *Percentage prevalence and confidence intervals of participants meeting the threshold criteria*
656 *for depression, anxiety, PTSD and problem drinking across the COVID-19 2020/2021 winter*
657 *surge.*



658

659 *Note.* Before, after and during samples are independent. The joining lines act as a visual aid.
660 Before surge represents 19th November to 17th December 2020; during the surge represents -
661 26th January – 17th February 2021; and after the surge represents - 14th April – 24th May
662 2021.

663

664

665


666

667

668

669 **Figure 3**

670 *Forest plot displaying confidence intervals and effect sizes for each variable's effect on AMD over each timepoint*




671

672 *Note:* Blue markers indicate before the surge, black markers indicate during the surge, and green markers indicates after the surge. Reference
673 group italicised under each variable. Analysis was only carried out for doctors and nurses, senior nurses were compared to all others
674 (junior nurses and all doctors); senior doctors were compared to all others (junior doctors and all nurses).

675 **Figure 4**

676 *Forest plot displaying confidence intervals and effect sizes for each variable's effect on functional impairment over each timepoint.*



677

678 *Note:* Reference group italicised under each variable. Analysis was only carried out for doctors and nurses, senior nurses were compared to all
679 others (junior nurses and all doctors); senior doctors were compared to all others (junior doctors and all nurses).