

1 **Impact of SARS-Cov-2 on Clinical Trial Unit workforce in the United Kingdom;** 2 **An observational study**

3
4 ¹Gayathri Delanerolle, ²Jintong Hu*, ⁴Heitor Cavallini*, ³Lucy Yardley*, ⁴Katharine Barnard-Kelly,
5 ⁴Katheryn Elliot, ⁵Vanessa Raymont, ⁴Shanaya Rathod, ^{2,4,6}Jian Qing Shi**, ^{3,4}Peter Phiri**

6 7 8 9 **Affiliations**

10
11 ¹Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, OX3 7JX, Oxford, UK

12 ²Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, 518055, China

13 ³Psychology Department, Faculty of Environmental and Life Sciences, University of Southampton,
14 SO17 1BJ, Southampton, UK

15 ⁴Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust, SO40 2RZ, UK

16 ⁵Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford, OX3 7JX, Oxford, UK

17 ⁶The Alan Turing Institute, NW1 2DB, London, UK

18
19
20
21 **Corresponding author: Dr Peter Phiri, BSc, PhD, RN,**

22 **Director of Research & Innovation/ Visiting Fellow,**

23 Research & Innovation Department, Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust, Clinical Trials Facility,

24 Tom Rudd Unit Moorgreen Hospital,

25 Botley Road, West End, Southampton SO30 3JB,

26 United Kingdom

27 peter.phiri@southernhealth.nhs.uk

28
29
30 **Shared last author

31 *Shared second author

32 33 **Declarations**

34 35 **Funding**

36 This work is funded by the NIHR.

37 38 **Conflicts of interest**

39 PP has received research grant from Novo Nordisk, and other, educational from Queen Mary
40 University of London, other from John Wiley & Sons, other from Otsuka, outside the submitted work.
41 SR reports other from Janssen, Lundbeck and Otsuka outside the submitted work. All other authors
42 report no conflict of interest. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those
43 of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research, the Department of Health and Social Care or
44 the Academic institutions.

45 46 47 **Availability of data and material**

48 The authors will consider sharing the dataset gathered upon receipt of reasonable requests.

49 50 **Code availability**

51 The authors will consider sharing the dataset gathered upon receipt of reasonable requests.

52 53 **Author contributions**

54 GD and PP developed the study protocol and embedded this within the EPIC project's work-package
55 3. The Chief Investigator of this study is PP and Principal Investigator GD. GD, JT and JQS designed
56 and completed the statistical analysis. The qualitative analysis was completed by KBK, PP and GD.
57 All authors critically appraised and commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors
58 read and approved the final manuscript.

60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115

Ethics approval

HRA REC approval (21/HRA/2348) was obtained prior to the study initiation.

Consent to participate

All participants consented to take part in this study.

Consent for publication

All authors consented to publish this manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge support from Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust.

Words:3970

Abstract

Objective: The clinical trial unit (CTU) workforce in the UK have been delivering COVID-19 research since the inception of the pandemic. Challenges associated with COVID-19 research have impacted the global healthcare communities differently. Thus, the overall objective of the study was to determine the mental health impact among CTU staff working during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Design: A mixed-methods based observational study was designed using a new workforce impact questionnaire using validated mental health assessments of Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA), Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), Insomnia Severity Index (ISI), Pandemic Stress Index (PSI), Burnout Assessment Too-12 (BAT-12), General Self Efficacy Scale (GSE) and The Everyday Discrimination Scale (EDS).

Setting: The Qualtrics platform was used to deploy the questionnaire where a quantitative analysis was conducted. The qualitative part of the study used the Microsoft Teams digital application to complete the interviews.

Participants All participants were CTU staff within the United Kingdom.

116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165

Introduction

The World Health Organization (WHO) declared the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic on the 11th of March 2020 which impacted the clinical and clinical research workforce significantly. [1] Lockdown, using masks, social distancing and various other measures were used to manage the spread of the virus. [2] While much of the spotlight was on incidence and prevalence of COVID-19, the impact on conducting scientific research was significant. Existing clinical trials were paused especially within the UK and COVID-19 research was prioritised.[3] The clinical trial profession as a whole has a number of staffing groups with a variety of job titles within the UK. Industry, academia and the NHS struggle to recruit and retain clinical trial staff and many leave the profession. In April 2022, jobs.ac.uk indicated over 150 unfilled clinical trial positions nationally. Whilst this could be due to a variety of reasons including short term contracts, workload acumen, issues with salaries for the expected job specification and lack of flexibility for hybrid working a higher vacancy rate impacts on the existing clinical trial workforce as they would be required to cover a larger volume of work.

According to the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), new clinical trials even for complex and urgent areas such as cancer, [5] were suspended in the UK, and staff were redeployed [6]. Clinical trials units (CTUs) are specialist units that play a key role in study design, conduct, analysis and subsequent publication. CTUs house expert clinical research staff, including clinical trialists, statisticians, epidemiologists, methodologists, quality assurance and trial management staff that have experience to setup, manage and deliver clinical trials. Some CTUs deliver a diverse array of studies, whilst others specialise in either a specific clinical area or a type of intervention such as investigational medicinal products (IMPs), medical devices and complex interventions. CTUs are legally responsible for maintaining adherence to all compliance procedures regardless of their embodiment within an academic or NHS organisation. The CTUs played an essential role during the pandemic in the UK. The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations (1999 as amended) that requires employers to ensure the work environment is, as far as reasonably practicable, safe and without risks to health. The COVID-19 pandemic introduced an unforeseen risk that had not been considered previously.

Some countries have reported challenges to manage their research during the pandemic, facing challenges what include physical violence perpetrated towards members of the medical staff,[8] unreliable therapies, [3] and prejudice amongst ethnic minorities health workers in frontlines against de virus.[9] However, the impact on the CTU workforce has not been explored. Hence, this study explores the COVID-19 impact with an aim to report the challenges and develop strategies to better develop pandemic frameworks in the future.

166

167

168 **Methods**

169

170 The CTU workforce in the UK is approximated around 25,000 although some staff
171 have shared roles with multiple departments spanning across academic and NHS
172 organisations. We designed a mixed methods observational-digital study to explore
173 the experiences of CTU staff within the UK. The survey was deployed digitally via the
174 NIHR, UKTMN, social media and the UK CRC.

175

176 *Aims*

177

178 The primary aim of the study was to determine the mental health impact due to the
179 challenges endeavoured by the clinical trial workforce whilst delivering clinical
180 research during the COVID-19 pandemic. The secondary aim of the study was to
181 determine the impact on the wellbeing on staff that would aid to propose a suitable
182 pandemic preparedness framework for clinical trial units and staff conducting studies
183 during a pandemic.

184

185 *Eligibility criteria*

186

187 All participants that were 18 years and above, employed within a CTU in the UK
188 were included in the study. Participants also required to have access to a
189 smartphone, tablet, or computer to complete the survey online, and willing to provide
190 informed e-consent.

191

192 *Data collection and extraction*

193

194 Quantitative data was collected through an online questionnaire using the Qualtrics
195 XM platform. The sample size comprised of 485 participants.

196

197 A subgroup of the sample was randomly invited to take part in semi-structured
198 interviews. All interviews were conducted via a secure online facility (password
199 protected teams teleconference), audio-recorded and transcribed in full. Data
200 collection and analysis was integrated with a process based on framework
201 methodology used to analyse the data including development of a coding frame
202 based on identified key themes and detailed coding of transcripts.

203

204 *Outcome measures*

205

206 Quantitative measures were used to evaluate mental health impact byway of
207 validated questionnaires. For the purpose of this study, we used Vancouver Index of
208 Acculturation (VIA), Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), Insomnia
209 Severity Index (ISI), Pandemic Stress Index (PSI), Burnout Assessment Too-12
210 (BAT-12), General Self Efficacy Scale (GSE) and The Everyday Discrimination Scale
211 (EDS). Cut-off scores were used to ensure the erroneous decisions for each mental
212 health assessment completed by all study participants could be unified for the
213 purpose of the analysis.

214

215 [Table 9]

216

217

218 *Analysis plan*

219

220 *Quantitative*

221

222 The analysis focused on 9 questionnaires with 14 dimensions. Participants were
223 divided into several subgroups based on age, gender, ethnicity, role and length of
224 service. Mean and standard deviation scores on 14 dimensions were calculated.
225 ANOVA and t-tests were applied to check the difference in means between different
226 subgroups.

227

228 A correlation heat-map was used to demonstrate the correlation between each
229 questionnaire based on Spearman correlation. An item-total correlation was
230 calculated to focus on the core items. Total item correlation in this instance refers to
231 the correlation coefficient summarised between each specific item and other items,
232 which is the quantification of the importance of specific item.

233

234 Linear regression was used to investigate the mental health impact during the
235 pandemic.

236

237 *Qualitative*

238

239 Transcripts were analysed using thematic and content analysis. Two experienced
240 qualitative researchers independently reviewed transcripts and conduct analyses. A
241 coding framework was developed to capture key themes with each coded theme
242 subjected to detailed analyses to identify subthemes and illustrative quotes.

243

244

245 **Results**

246

247 *Quantitative*

248

249 A sample of 485 patients completed the questionnaire. Key characteristics of the
250 sample are indicated in Table 1 comprising of all sexes, ages and geographies.
251 Of 485, 257 did not disclose their professional category and job title, whilst 60 and
252 228 participants reported these, respectively.

253

254 *Age*

255

256 Of 485 respondents, more than half (50.7%) were aged between 35-54 years. The
257 sample included 2.3% of young adults aged between 18-24 years. Cognitive
258 impairment, one of the four dimensions measured by BAT-12, showed significant
259 differences between age groups. People aged between 18-24 and 35-54 years
260 scored higher compared with other groups. The young adult group scored the
261 highest scores for cognitive impairment, depression and daily discrimination. The
262 elderly group, aged over 65 years of age had the highest scores for heritage and
263 mainstream, GSE and lowest everyday discrimination score. T-tests showed anxiety
264 level of white British were significantly lower than of ethnic minorities. People aged
265 45-54 years have the highest anxiety with a score of 11 or over (proportion of 45.1%),

266 while people aged 25-34 years have the lowest anxiety proportion of 39.6%. The
267 anxiety proportion for people aged 18-24, 25-34, 35- 44, 45-54, 55-64, 65 years and
268 over were 40.0%, 39.6%, 40.0%, 45.1%, 44.4%, and 43.8%, respectively. However,
269 the p-value (0.8092) indicated the anxiety level is independent with length of service.

270

271 *Gender*

272

273 Approximately 73.4% of the participants were female and 15.5% were male. Anxiety
274 level was measured by anxiety score, which is the summation of the odds items
275 within the HADS questionnaire. Male participants had a lower averaged anxiety
276 score of 9.2 in comparison to female, 10.4. Of the total 356 female respondents, 237
277 completed the anxiety questionnaire, thus there was a 33.4% of missingness. Of the
278 237 women, 110 (46.4%) had an anxiety score of 11 or higher and, 92 (38.8%)
279 reported an anxiety score of 8 to 10. In comparison, of the total 75 male respondents,
280 48 completed anxiety questionnaires. Of the 48 participants, 9 (18.8%) had an
281 anxiety score of 11 or higher and, 29 (60.4%) had a score of 8-10. The Chi-square
282 test indicated a p-value of 0.001808 suggesting levels of anxiety appears to be
283 similar across the genders.

284

285 Men scored significantly lower than women on the dimension of exhaustion (7.8 and
286 8.7, respectively). Women appear to be less influenced by mainstream and heritage
287 cultures in comparison to men as per the low scores observed from the VIA
288 questionnaire.

289

290 In terms of ethnicity and race, 70.1% of the respondents were white British and 30.9%
291 were of ethnic minorities of African, Asian, Bangladeshi and Indian. Ethnic minorities
292 were groups for the purpose of conducting a meaningful analysis to evaluate their
293 mental health outcomes.

294

295 [Table 1, Table 2, Table11, and Table 12]

296

297 *Mental health assessment*

298

299 *Length of service*

300

301 The BAT-12 scores appear to increase with the length of service as indicated in
302 Table 2. Thus, elevated exposure to exhaustion, mental distance, cognitive and
303 emotional impairment appear to be common observations within this group. The
304 ANOVA test showed statistically significant scores between cognitive impairment
305 and mental distance among different age groups (less than 1 year, 1 to 5 years, 6 to
306 ten years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 20 years, over 21 years) with p-values of 0.008 and
307 less than 0.001 respectively. P-values were not significant within the exhaustion and
308 emotional impairment dimensions with 0.329 and 0.363, respectively. A trend
309 analysis indicates the overall exhaustion and emotional impairment levels increased
310 with the length of service ranges from less than a year to 20 years. There appears to
311 be a large variation within the data. We excluded the data for the group of over 21
312 years since the sample size is rather small and it is treated as an outlier.

313

314 [Table 2]

315

316

317

318

319

320 *Well-being*

321

322 The pooled data indicated 25.8% of respondents suffered from long-term conditions
323 and 3.9% from disabilities. Participants (28.2%) who had an existing mental health
324 condition prior to the pandemic, believed their disease did not worsen, thus a lack of
325 a notable change in their wellbeing was reported. Approximately, 10.9% of
326 participants with mental health conditions felt better since the pandemic began.
327 Participants that were mental health naive (43.1%) their wellbeing worsened since
328 the pandemic began. In 36.3% of participants, physical health conditions did not
329 change since the beginning of the pandemic began whilst 13.4% of participants felt
330 there were improvements. Approximately 32.8% of participants reported their
331 physical condition worsened since the pandemic began.

332

333 [Table 1]

334

335 Of the trial management participants, 28.3% suffered from long-term conditions
336 which is slightly higher. Clinical trials reported their mental health and physical health
337 conditions worsened since the pandemic began, in comparison to other professional
338 groups with 49.6% and 35.4%, respectively. These participants also the use of
339 medications for their mental and physical conditions; 15.7% and 25.2%, respectively.

340

341 In comparison, the remaining participants had a lower percentage of medication use
342 for mental and physical health with 12.6% and 19.8, respectively. The cognitive
343 impairment level is relatively high with an average impairment score of 8.40 among
344 the clinical trialist group compared with the rest of study participants (7.93).

345

346 [Table 1 and Table 5]

347

348 *Professional group outcomes*

349

350 Five different professional groups with acceptable sample size (ranging from 8 to
351 127, mean 46.4) were considered into analysis (trial management, quality assurance,
352 database management, doctor/nurse, statistician). Statisticians had the highest level
353 of exhaustion, mental distance, and depression whilst Quality assurance staff had
354 the highest level of cognitive impairment. Nurses and doctors appear to have the
355 highest anxiety and emotional impairment. An overall statistical significance cannot
356 be determined based on the professional group sample sizes. Although, this has
357 clinical significance in relation to the wellbeing of staff. The demographic
358 characteristics and its association with burnout, HADS, everyday discrimination, ISI
359 and GSE is indicated in Table 2.

360

361 Approximately, 28.3% of participants working in trial management suffered from
362 long-term conditions and is slightly higher than that of the study population. On the
363 other hand, clinical trialists felt their mental and physical health had worsened since
364 the pandemic began in comparison to other professional groups, 49.6% and 35.4%,
365 respectively.

366

367 [Table 5]

368

369 *Heat-map correlation*

370

371 Based on the heatmap, heritage and mainstream scores were highly associated with
372 each other based on the spearman correlation score of 0.8. Anxiety level showed a
373 strong correlation with levels of depression, insomnia, exhaustion, emotional
374 impairment and cognitive impairment where the spearman correlation greater than
375 0.4. GSE and everyday discrimination showed a correlation with the four dimensions
376 of BAT-12 although the spearman correlation was less than -0.4 and over 0.3,
377 respectively.

378

379 [Figure 1]

380

381 *Linear regression*

382

383 To investigate whether long term exposure to high level stressful environment has
384 influence to their mental health, we combined anxiety, depression and burn out
385 scores (denoted by y) and plot it against the length of service (using the mid-point for
386 each group, denoted by x) in Figure 2. We found that the overall score is increasing
387 along the length of service except the group of over 21.

388

389 *Item-total correlations of ISI*

390

391 Means and standard deviations for the ISI and sleep diary measures are reported in
392 Table 3. The ISI average total score was 7.8 8 (SD 5.86). The internal consistency of
393 the ISI was estimated with a Cronbach alpha coefficient and by the item-total
394 correlations. The internal consistency, (i.e. degree of consistency or homogeneity of
395 the items within a scale) of the ISI was 0.74. The item-total correlations varied from a
396 low of 0.55 (initial) to a high of 0.78 (interference) with an average of 0.70 (see Table
397 3).

398

399 *Geographical*

400

401 Of the 485 respondents, 137 disclosed their longitude and latitude, accounting for
402 about 59%. Vast majority of respondents were from England, concentrated to the
403 central and southern parts of England, including Southampton, Bristol, London,
404 Oxford and Birmingham. Scotland had the second largest number of respondents
405 primarily from Edinburgh, Glasgow and Dundee.

406

407 [Table 10]

408

409 *Qualitative*

410

411 For the qualitative part of the study, 6 participants (4 women and 2 men) consented
412 and completed interviews (supplementary document). Interview duration ranged
413 from twenty-six to fifty-four minutes. Interview participants included a senior
414 statistician, research nurses and trials managers. Participants described their work-
415 related stress levels between a 3 and a 6. Two participants felt things were worse

416 since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, whilst one said there have been
417 improvements and the other claimed things had returned to pre-COVID-19 levels.
418 There was a general sense that the job came with periods of high pressure that
419 created stress, however this was unrelated to COVID-19.

420

421 Participants reported pre-COVID-19 related daily work issues associated with the
422 clinical trials they were working on, office environment and the commute. Different
423 views were reported on the perceived effectiveness of open plan offices in terms of
424 noise, distractions and challenges associated with some processes required for
425 clinical trials management.

426

427 There were also tasks that could no longer be completed as before due to changes
428 to the workforce availability. Research nurses transferred to support COVID-19
429 patients meant recruitment had to be halted for most studies and others transitioned
430 to an 'on-line' or 'telephone' mode of delivery where possible

431

432 Views diverged on contributors to stress, for example,

433

434 *'now you have a bit more spare time and are not being pestered by colleagues all of*
435 *the time on the office, it helps' [participant 002]; compared to 'things went very scary,*
436 *very high for every area of life for everybody This is how we operate now, there's*
437 *certainly an acceptance so not very high but the bar is set a lot lower now'*
438 *[participant 003]. One participant stated that they needed a certain level of stress to*
439 *be effective 'I reckon if my work-related stress was below a five, I probably wouldn't*
440 *have any impetus to do anything' [participant 004].*

441

442 At the height of COVID, however, there was an overwhelming sense of things being
443 beyond individual control for example;

444

445 *'it was awful..... in terms of your day, your day wasn't your own ... the adrenalin*
446 *kicked in because everyone was going into survival mode ...' [003]. Similarly,*
447 *'mostly things that are out of my control things that are out of my hand that are*
448 *stressful ... such as recruitment levels, trying to get that sorted' [001]; '... the whole*
449 *situation was intensely stressful' [006].*

450

451 Participants reported challenges with balancing personal and professional that
452 caused additional stress. Lack of dedicated or appropriate workspace was
453 problematic, as was sharing dining table space with partners who were also trying to
454 work from home. Similarly, one participant was having building works done which
455 had been suspended due to COVID-19, thus had only one usable room in the house
456 for long periods of time during the first lockdown. One participant's husband worked
457 in A&E and said;

458

459 *'had a hell of a time He's lost so many people' [005]*

460

461 Another participant's husband worked away and was doing so due to COVID.
462 During the initial lockdown she was unable to get a childcare place for her five year-
463 old son *'so I was home-schooling on my own, trying to work at home. That was the*
464 *most stressful point I think because it's virtually impossible with a five year-old to*
465 *home school and work at the same time, so I was working evenings and weekends*

466 *and it was just constant and then, because we were in lockdown we didn't see*
467 *anyone, we didn't go anywhere, we were totally isolated., So it was pretty awful.'*
468 *[006].*

469

470 There was a consistent theme of the sudden disappearance of a traditional 'working
471 day' where working extended often unsociable hours. This change was perceived
472 differently by the participants;

473

474 *'... so nobody had an escape plan, nobody had down time but 10, 11 o'clock at night*
475 *emailing isn't ideal' [003]. 'I respond to emails any time eg at 11pm I can give a quick*
476 *answer and it's done. It's good and bad. I'm quite responsive with people, I'm not a*
477 *stickler with hours. [004]. 'There is an expectation to work more from one person*
478 *who wants to have meetings at 6-7 in the evening. As such as lockdown was done I*
479 *didn't want to do that anymore' [002].*

480

481 The transition from face-to-face meetings to online zoom meetings came with its own
482 technical challenges including frequent back-to-back meetings without a break or IT
483 failures.

484

485 *'I used to have two meetings a week on zoom and there was a time when there were*
486 *7 a day' [003]. 'You bounce from meeting to meeting rather than doing it physically'*
487 *[001]. There were positives, however with one participant saying 'I do think your true*
488 *self comes out, everyone's much more relaxed in a zoom environment than we were*
489 *before because you have to be. That's the norm and it's taken the pressure off.'*
490 *[003].*

491

492 The hybrid approach to work also changed the future working requirements.

493

494 *'There aren't many people showing up to work in the office, it feels pointless to go in'*
495 *[001]. 'It was quite hard because it's a big open plan office which is why we're not*
496 *sort of back in the office yet because they're trying to work out ventilation and hot*
497 *desking and stuff..... a key part of what helps me do my work is a big pair of noise-*
498 *cancelling headphones because it's too loud and I get distracted really easily' [004].*
499 *'Technically we're back but not everyone is yet. All the desks have moved. Having*
500 *to travel again is weird. There are no face-to-face meetings, just getting back to*
501 *being back close to people on the commute again'. [005] There were also positive*
502 *experiences however 'I didn't realise till I started to go back in just how refreshing it*
503 *is to have, like, even a laugh with someone in your office. Just to have that two*
504 *minutes' [005]*

505

506 Communication became very difficult for some participants;

507

508 *'The biggest problem was in the communication We realised no-one's coming*
509 *back full-time and had to adapt to different ways of working and communicating'*
510 *[005].*

511 *'In the early days, the doors were just closed. That was it, just closed' [003].*

512

513 One participant felt there was added workload in terms of administration 'there's a lot
514 more applications we have to fill in;

515

516 *'Basically you've got to apply to work, to use anywhere and get approval, use the*
517 *clinic rooms for studies' [006].*

518

519 Overall, there was sense of uncertainty despite the pandemic status in the UK
520 changing. There were mixed views on the desirability of office working and returning
521 to a pre-COVID-19 working style.

522

523 **Discussion**

524

525 Based on the collective findings are evident of a negative mental health impact on
526 the CTU workforce due to the COVID-19 pandemic. There are varying degrees of
527 experiences of stress and burnout when comparing those with and without a mental
528 illness or a physical condition. A clinical review would be beneficial for these
529 patients.

530

531 COVID-19 has demonstrated the importance of diversity and the disproportionate
532 impact minority populations endeavour. Based on our study participant pool, there
533 appears to be under representation of ethnic minorities. Adequate representation
534 could have allowed us to have more meaningful conclusions about their impact of
535 COVID-19 on their mental health.

536

537 The mental health impact identified may result in increased sickness absences. This
538 would also have a negative impact on performance and efficiency. Whilst this study
539 cannot determine the precise medium and long-term effects of increased sickness
540 absences at an individual and organisational level, a negative impact can be
541 determined if the overall wellbeing remains the same.

542

543 It appears, there is significant variability in experiences and opinions around *lived*
544 *experience* professionally and personally during the pandemic. Participants reflected
545 powerful insights into the impact of COVID-19 whilst working to deliver COVID-19
546 research in a CTU environment.

547

548 **Limitations**

549

550 Enrolment of participants could have been increased if there was less pressure on
551 the CTU workforce. Cultural adaptations could have been considered when
552 conducting further work based on the evidence gathered within this study if there
553 ethnic minorities were better represented.

554

555 There were considerable challenges to increase participants for the qualitative
556 component of the study. Longitudinal data collection could be a useful step to
557 continue to assess these findings that could aid employees and employers alike to
558 make quality improvements.

559

560 **Conclusion**

561

562 Our study indicates the substantial personal impact the CTU workforce has
563 endeavoured during the pandemic. Viability of sustainable clinical trial conduct is
564 based on multi-professional involvement in CTU settings thus, it would be in the

565 interest of all healthcare professionals to improve the support systems available to
566 better manage working conditions especially as part of pandemic preparedness.

567

568 Recommendations to inform Future Preparedness in supporting the CTU workforce
569 in delivering pandemic and non-pandemic research include ensuring continuity and
570 clarity of communication via different media, providing opportunities for flexibility in
571 working hours, within reasonable constraints to ensure staff are not pressured to
572 work during times they would not usually do so. Providing opportunities for
573 collaborative problem-solving via different media as per the needs of individual team
574 member. Maintaining consistency, where possible, in frequency and content of
575 contact so that staff feel supported in different aspects of their working roles.
576 Contingency planning supplies of necessary equipment for effective home working,
577 with consideration of all relevant health and safety legislation to ensure the wellbeing
578 of staff.

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667

References

1. The World Health Organization. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19: 11 March 2020, 2020, <https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19%2D%2D11-march-2020>. [Accessed April 15, 2022].
2. Mitchell, E.J., Ahmed, K., Breeman, S. et al. It is unprecedented: trial management during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond. *Trials* 21, 784 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-020-04711-6>
3. Bhatt A. Clinical trials during the COVID-19 pandemic: Challenges of putting scientific and ethical principles into practice. *Perspect Clin Res.* 2020 Apr-Jun;11(2):59-63. doi: 10.4103/picr.PICR_77_20. Epub 2020 May 6. PMID: 32670829; PMCID: PMC7342332.
4. National Institute for Health Research. Urgent public health COVID-19 a. studies 2020 <https://www.nihr.ac.uk/covid-studies/>. [Accessed April 15, 2022].
5. Cancer Research UK. A trial looking at 2 new tests to help select chemotherapy before surgery for breast cancer (ROSCO). https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/about-cancer/find-a-clinical-trial/a-trial-looking-at-2-new-tests-to-help-select-chemotherapy-before-surgery-for-breast-cancer-roscos?_ga=2.203128529.1315225976.1584640787-1540015531.1584640787 [Accessed April 23rd, 2022].
6. Thornton J. Clinical trials suspended in UK to prioritise covid-19 studies and free up staff *BMJ* 2020; 368 :m1172 doi:10.1136/bmj.m1172.
7. <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/medicines-and-healthcare-products-regulatory-agency> [Accessed in April 23rd].
8. Predictors of violence against health professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic in Brazil: A cross-sectional study Bitencourt MR, Alarcão ACJ, Silva LL, Dutra AdC, Caruzzo NM, et al. (2021) Predictors of violence against health professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic in Brazil: A cross-sectional study. *PLOS ONE* 16(6): e0253398. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253398>.
9. We weren't checked in on, nobody spoke to us': an exploratory qualitative analysis of two focus groups on the concerns of ethnic minority NHS staff during COVID-19 Jehanita Jesuthasan ,1 Richard A Powell ,2 Victoria Burmester , 1Dasha Nicholls
10. Lee, S.M., Kang, W.S., Cho, A-R., Kim, T., & Park, J.K. (2018). Psychological impact of the 2015 MERS outbreak on hospital workers and quarantined haemodialysis patients. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*. 87, 123-127.
11. Tam, C.W.C., Pang, E.P.F., Lam, L.C.W & Chiu, H.F.K. (2004). Severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in Hong Kong in 2003: stress and psychological impact among frontline healthcare workers. *Psychological Medicine*. 34 (7), 1197-1204.
12. Lai, J., Ma, S., Wang, Y., Cai, Z., Hu, J., Wei, N., Wu, J., Du, H., Chen, T., Li, R., Tan, H., Kang, J., Yao, L., Huang, M., Wang, H., Wang, G., Liu, Z & Hu, S. (2020).

668 Factors associated with mental health outcomes among health care workers exposed
669 to coronavirus disease 2019. JAMA Network Open. 3 (3), e2033976.
670 Doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.3976
671 13. Chong, M-Y., Wang, W., Hsieh, W., Lee, C., Chiu, N-M., Yeh, W-C., Huang, T-L.,
672 Wen, J-K & Chen, C-L. (2004). Psychological impact of severe acute respiratory
673 syndrome on health workers in a tertiary hospital. British Journal of Psychiatry,
674 185(2), 127-133. Doi:10.1192/bjp.185.2.127