medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

STRESSORS AND LESSONS FOR FUTURE SUPPORT FOR HEALTHCARE STAFF FACING ADVERSE CHALLENGES: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH CONDUCTED IN THE UK DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

AUTHORS

Dr Evangelos Ntontis PhD
Lecturer in Social Psychology
School of Psychology and Counselling
The Open University
evangelos.ntontis@open.ac.uk
ORCID: 0000-0001-8284-6015

Professor Richard Williams OBE, TD, FRCPsych, FRCPCH, MRSPH, DPM, DMCC
Emeritus Professor of Mental Health Strategy
Welsh Institute for Health and Social Care
University of South Wales
richard.williams@southwales.ac.uk
ORCID: 0000-0003-1230-0222

Ms Katarzyna Luzynska MSc
Research Assistant
School of Psychology and Counselling
The Open University
luzynska.k@gmail.com

Dr Abigail Wright PhD
Research Scientist
Institute for Clinical and Economic Review
abigailchristinewright@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0001-7046-2049

Dr Anastasia Rousaki PhD
Post-doctoral Research Associate
Social Sciences Research Institute
University of Sheffield
a.rousaki@sheffield.ac.uk
ORCID: 0000-0002-9640-8240

Corresponding Author
Dr Evangelos Ntontis
Lecturer in Social Psychology, School of Psychology and Counselling, The Open University,
evangelos.ntontis@open.ac.uk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

The Roles of the Authors

EN: Led the research, worked with RW on designing the research, conducted the analysis of the papers and was instrumental in writing this paper.
RW: Worked with EN in designing the research, critically reviewed the themes and sub-themes that emerged from the qualitative analyses and contributed to designing and writing this paper.
KL: Worked with EN on obtaining and analysing the papers.
AW: Conducted the literature search.
AR: Worked with EN and KL on obtaining and analysing the papers.
All authors: Have read and approved the final version of this paper.

Potential Conflicts of Interest

AW is employed by the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review (ICER). AW completed this work independent of ICER.

FUNDING

Collection of the 27 articles reported on in this paper was funded by NHS England. NHS England did not commission and had no input into designing the methodology of the systematic review reported in this paper. It made no contribution to the analyses or to interpretation of the findings. The information contained in the report represents the views of the research team and does not represent the views of NHS England or the authors' employing institutions.

Word Count: **6,901**

Number of Tables: **1**

Number of Figures: **1**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Background

Extreme events (e.g., floods, hurricanes) can overwhelm healthcare workers and systems. Similarly, healthcare workers were particularly affected during the COVID-19 pandemic, and high levels of distress and mental ill health have been reported.

Aim

To examine and synthesise qualitative research findings regarding the stressors, and their psychosocial impacts, that healthcare staff faced in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic, and to provide lessons for future support.

Method

A systematic review, pre-registered on PROSPERO (CRD42022304235), was carried out on papers reporting qualitative research published between January 2021 and January 2022 that focused on the impact of COVID-19 on UK healthcare workers. Findings from 27 qualitative papers were integrated using thematic synthesis.

Results

Several types of stressors were identified including the SARS-CoV-2 virus, problems related to personal protective equipment, leadership, and communication processes, high workloads, and issues stemming from uncertainty and a lack of knowledge. These stressors were related to a range of adverse psychosocial outcomes including worrying about oneself and others, fatigue, lack of confidence in oneself and in senior managers, impacts on teamwork, and feeling unappreciated or that one's needs are not recognised.

Conclusions

Apart from COVID-19 itself (the *primary stressor*), healthcare staff experienced distress due to ineffective policies, practices and administrative arrangements that were in place before the pandemic, or from insufficient or ineffective responses to the pandemic (*secondary stressors*). However, secondary stressors can be modified to mitigate their negative effects, thus workforce planning should shift from focusing on individuals towards amending healthcare staff's psychosocial working environments.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Extreme events and mass emergencies such as hurricanes, floods, and earthquakes have the potential to overwhelm healthcare systems. This was the case with the COVID-19 pandemic, caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus and which led to large numbers of people being infected and high death rates across the globe. Healthcare workers were particularly affected as they were exposed to the virus through their work with infected people in addition to their exposure as members of the public. Also, they witnessed other people being severely sick or dying and were working in very demanding environments. Thus, it is not surprising that evidence points to a high prevalence of symptoms of fatigue, distress, depression, anxiety, and reduced wellbeing.[1-3]

Stressors That Affected Staff in The NHS During The COVID-19 Pandemic

In this paper, we present a systematic review of qualitative papers published in the UK in 2021. Our aim is not to reiterate what previous researchers have shown regarding the psychosocial and mental health tolls that the COVID-19 pandemic took on healthcare workers in the UK as in other countries; this point has been well-proven. Rather, we wish to move one step further and consider the antecedents, origins, and psychosocial impacts of the stressors that healthcare staff faced during the pandemic and, to a lesser extent, continue to experience at the time that this article is written (2024). We reflect on lessons for future support for healthcare staff who are experiencing adverse challenges.

Reflecting on lessons for the future is important for at least three reasons. First, it was not the COVID-19 pandemic that first created unsustainable demands in the UK's healthcare system; as we discuss here, the NHS had been under huge strain for a long time before the pandemic emerged and various of the stressors that healthcare workers faced were already prevalent.[4] Second, many of the stressors that healthcare staff experienced resulted from sub-optimal responses to the pandemic by governments and/or healthcare systems at the point when the pandemic emerged and during subsequent waves. Third, considering that the climate crisis is increasing the frequency and intensity of extreme events,[5,6] as well as systemic dismantling of public healthcare services in neoliberal economies,[7,8] healthcare systems and the staff

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

working in them are very likely to face more demands and strain in the future. What all three points share is the fact that the stressors described are not only tractable due to their being rooted in particular systems and practices, but they are also amenable to change.

Next, we put the impacts of COVID-19 on healthcare workforces into context using the NHS in the UK as a coherent example of problems that we now recognise as being worldwide.

The Workforce Context in the UK

The NHS workforce has faced chronic strain over many years. Science and practice have and are continuing to advance. These developments are creating greater potential healthcare capabilities and rising public expectations. While good, these forces have contributed to a chronic imbalance between supply and demand in a setting of severe budgetary limitations. This dynamic continues and if anything, is worsening.[9] Workload pressures are continuing to grow, and the imbalances have become progressively harder to meet in the last decade particularly.

Before the pandemic, retention, recruitment, and mental health challenges were exacerbating long-term problems with working conditions.[10] Yet, it is also evident that some of the causes of pressure were not fiscal but resulted from stressors that were not adequately recognised or dealt with. The COVID-19 pandemic intensified these pressures and the impacts of working during that lengthy emergency on the wellbeing, stress, fatigue, and burnout faced by healthcare staff were huge. Fatigue, for instance, has been shown to be highly associated with staff experiencing problems with coping with the pressures posed by the pandemic.[11]

Lessons stemming from the pandemic for promoting recovery of healthcare professionals during and after the COVID-19 pandemic have been listed.[12] More recently, Oeppen et al. have called for the NHS to do more to prevent fatigue in healthcare staff because the needs of staff have not ended or stopped rising as the additional pressures from COVID-19 have reduced.[13]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Adequately staffing healthcare services, delivering appropriate training, and providing rising volumes of and a carefully determined mix of basic and complicated levels of service are not the only challenges that arise within healthcare. We draw attention to the impacts of persisting demands on the morale of staff and the ways in which, initially, subtle, but now, much clearer alterations to the value-base of our healthcare services have occurred over the years. These changes mirror shifts in society, evolution of methods of communication, shifts in public opinion, populism, and changes in the importance that staff attach to work-life balance.[14]

Much greater attention is now being paid to the impacts of work and stress at work on wellbeing, people's psychosocial needs, and mental healthcare needs.[15] The topic of personal resilience came to the fore early in the COVID-19 pandemic, but was swiftly rebuffed in the UK because many staff came to see focusing on what they could do to support themselves as shifting responsibility onto them and away from the services in which they worked at a time when they were already under pressure. This drew attention to the requirement for an integrated understanding of resilience, which should bring together personal and collective approaches to it that are combined with awareness of attachment, systems and shared identity theories.[16] Recent research points to resilience and social support having different positive impacts on frontline responders to traumatic events.[17] There is much more to be learned in this domain. During the pandemic, it became clear that there were many actions that employers could take to sustain their staff. Thus, the focus moved on to the physical, psychosocial, and moral environments in which staff were, and are working and awareness of the importance of healthcarers empowering each other through peer support has grown.[18,19] As a consequence, there is now a much greater focus on the moral architecture of services.[20]

The Study Reported in This Paper

In 2021, and, again, in 2022, EN, RW and KL were commissioned by NHS England to evaluate the quality of the UK literature published in the preceding year in each case regarding the impacts of COVID-19 on healthcare workers. In 2021, the funder asked us to assess a list of papers published in 2020 that had not been identified systematically. In 2022, we were commissioned to conduct our own literature search regarding publications in 2021. Both

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

projects led to two unpublished reports of raw findings,[21,22] which drew attention to various psychosocial impacts and pressures that COVID-19 was exerting on healthcare workers. Based on these findings, and due to the generally high quality of published qualitative research, we went on to carry out a systematic review of the wider qualitative literature that we report here to better explore our initial observations.

METHOD

Search Strategy and Selection Criteria

Our review was registered with and met the criteria set by PROSPERO, the international prospective register of systematic reviews (CRD42022304235) and its design and reporting were informed by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) statement (http://www.prisma-statement.org/).

AW searched OVID and EMBASE, two major scientific databases in the social, psychological, and health sciences. Our search terms included variations of certain keywords such as: COVID-19; wellbeing; distress; psychological; psychosocial; mental health; staff; doctor; allied health; nurse; NHS; social care; consultant; medical staff; United Kingdom. We only included articles published in English that referred to the United Kingdom published between January 2021 and January 2022. Non-empirical reports, grey literature, or opinions pieces were excluded. The keywords used as search terms in the databases were tailored appropriately for each database. The databases were last searched on 29 January 2022.

Selection Procedure and Processing

The literature search returned 2,277 studies. Of these, 437 were duplicate records and 188 studies were published outside the pre-specified year range (there was some overlap between those two categories). Two authors (KL,EN) screened the titles and abstracts of the remaining 1,669 papers excluding those not relevant to the aims of this project. This led to 1,567 papers being removed. In cases of doubt, the procedure was for the reviewer to discuss with the other

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

reviewer and, if disagreement occurred, a third author (RW) was to be consulted. The latter course was not required.

We sought to retrieve the remaining 102 papers and were able to obtain 83. Upon re-inspection of the papers obtained, 2 further papers were excluded as the studies reported in them were not conducted in the UK and 4 further duplicate studies were identified (3 duplicates and 1 published report summarising results presented in another paper in our list) and were subsequently removed. Our search and selection process is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram of search and selection process



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Our data set comprises 77 papers; 27 qualitative, 35 quantitative, 10 with mixed methods, 1 review, and 4 papers that were neither empirical studies nor summaries were classified as 'other'.

Our responsibility to the original funder of the project (who had no influence in designing, executing, and writing-up the study) was to produce a report that briefly summarised both qualitative and quantitative studies (for internal use but now in the public domain).[22]

This paper follows our initial plan to produce a thematic synthesis that is based exclusively on the 27 qualitative studies. Our decision not to include the 10 mixed-methods studies was intentional due to those studies not reporting in-depth analyses of their qualitative data. Their authors included open-ended questions at the end of their questionnaires and, in some cases, presented isolated quotes, or descriptive summaries of these quotes, without reaching the depth required for a stand-alone qualitative analysis. Nevertheless, we did examine separately the qualitative aspects of these 10 papers and their findings are in line with our report herein. Thus, we have no reason to believe that not including them has altered our findings. Importantly, we observe that the qualitative aspects of these 10 papers would not satisfy the quality criteria that we followed when assessing the 27 qualitative studies.

Data Extraction and Analysis

We used the criteria endorsed by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) to assess the quality of the qualitative papers. NICE has a range of criteria against which it assesses research studies, such as the appropriateness of a qualitative design, clarity of study aims and data collection processes, thorough descriptions of source population, rigour of the analysis and richness of the data presented, reliability of the analysis, appropriateness of conclusions and their grounding on the data, ethical issues, and bias assessment among others. All papers were assessed by three team members (KL,EN,AR), and most were judged as being of very high quality. We identified some limitations in 4 papers (e.g., the discussion section in one paper did not adequately reflect the results; some papers did not adequately discuss the methods used to control for bias in the analysis). When considering whether to disregard these papers, we considered other strengths (e.g., well-written analyses, clear aims and sampling

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

procedures, quotes used to illustrate their points) as well as the findings which were in line with all other studies, and thus decided to keep them in the final synthesis. A list of papers, their aims and characteristics, and the bias prevention measures is in Table 1.

The papers were read by three members of the team (EN,KL,AR). KL and AR manually extracted information on the papers' authors, year of publication, study aims, methodology and/or theoretical frameworks, sample, and bias reduction reporting. These data were imported into an Excel file and became the basis for our analysis. EN re-read the papers independently and cross-checked the analyses against the data extracted by KL and AR to ensure consistency and accuracy.

The authors of the 27 papers used a range of data collection approaches such as interviews, focus groups, and online surveys with open-ended questions. They also used a range of analytical approaches (e.g., thematic analysis, content analysis, interpretative phenomenological analysis [IPA]) and theoretical frameworks. The samples spanned the experiences of a range of health and social care disciplines including doctors, nurses, psychologists, dentists, occupational therapists, for example.

Thematic Synthesis

We followed the approach of Thomas and Harden when conducting the thematic synthesis by, first, coding the findings of the primary studies, then creating descriptive themes, and finally establishing more analytical themes.[23]

The first stage involved going through the dataset and labeling evidence in the themes and their summaries using core keywords that, on the one hand, encapsulated their meaning and, on the other hand, allowed us to find commonalities across the dataset (e.g., personal protective equipment [PPE], or leadership were codes used to label elements identified in the data and to differentiate them from one another). Subsequently, descriptive themes were created which identified commonalities across the various codes (e.g., fear of COVID-19 or lack of PPE) that eventually incorporated the psychosocial impacts of stressors and led to our final analytical themes. All authors had input into the analysis and writing the paper was led by EN and RW.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

RESULTS

The papers that we reviewed in detail are listed in Table 1. In the text, we refer to them by the letter that appears in the left-hand column.

Insert Table 1 about here

Here, we present the five themes that we found upon analysis. The first theme appraises concerns and negative emotions and experiences stemming directly from the virus SARS-CoV-2 and the illness it causes - COVID-19. The second theme describes challenges related to PPE, and the third theme addresses leadership and communication problems. The fourth theme reflects uncertainty and lack of knowledge and how they were outcomes of organisational features of staff members' institutions, and the fifth theme focuses on workload problems and their psychosocial impacts.

Theme 1: The Direct Impact of COVID-19

As expected, in many instances related by the papers we reviewed, participants expressed their fear of contracting COVID-19 due to their being in an environment that exposed them to patients who tested positive for the virus.[c,f,h,i,l,n,o,r,s,t,v,w,y,z] Grailey et al.[i] illustrate this fear through an account from a senior staff nurse who stated that:

> *It was very much felt that the people who were going in could potentially be in harm's way*.

A similar exemplary account from a trainee is provided by Kerins et al.[n]:

> *Worried about spreading it ... or worried about catching it ... or worried about spreading it to their family or bringing it into the hospital*.

Table 1: The papers reporting qualitative studies that were reviewed systematically

Paper	Author [number in reference list] Year	Focus of study reported in the paper	Sample & recruitment	Data collection method	Data analysis approach / methodological orientation	Theoretical perspectives guiding research questions & interpretations of findings	Reporting of bias prevention measures
a	**Al Ghunaim et al. [24] 2021**	Challenges of the pandemic to work and personal life, and personal impacts of stress	141 surgeons working in the NHS voluntarily responded to a survey available to all UK surgeons (apart from those retired)	Qualitative, open-ended questions as part of a wider longitudinal survey	Thematic analysis	Not reported (NR)	Yes
b	**Aughterson et al. [25] 2021**	An examination of the psychosocial well-being of health and social care professionals working during the COVID-19 pandemic	25 participants from various frontline professions in health and social care. Purposive recruited through social media, personal contacts, newsletters, and participants participating in another nationwide survey	Semi-structured, one-to-one, telephone or video interviews	Reflexive thematic analysis	Berkman's social networks framework and Antonovsky's Sense of Coherence theory	Yes
c	**Baldwin & George [26] 2021**	Deeper understanding of experiences of working during the pandemic, the reported impact of this work and the needs of staff and how they could be better supported	Purposive sampling of 19 qualified healthcare professionals (doctors, nurses, allied health)	Semi-structured, one-to-one, face to face or telephone interviews	Thematic analysis informed by Framework analysis	NR	Yes
d	**Billings, Biggs et al. [27] 2021**	Exploration of experiences and needs of mental health professionals working to support front-line HSCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic	28 mental health professionals recruited purposively through Twitter and through snowballing via mental health colleagues	Remote semi-structured interviews	Reflexive thematic analysis	NR	Yes
e	**Billings, Seif et al. [28] 2021**	An examination of frontline health and social care workers' experiences of psychosocial support during the pandemic	25 interviews with frontline workers in health and social care recruited purposively through Twitter and through snowballing via mental health colleagues	Remote semi-structured interviews	Reflexive thematic analysis	NR	Yes
f	**Blake et al. [29] 2021**	An examination of views of Supported Wellbeing Center visitors and operational staff towards COVID-19 workforce wellbeing provision	24 employees of an acute hospital trust in UK with access to Supported Wellbeing Centres could express their interest to participate in the study	Video or telephone semi-structured interviews	Framework analysis	NR	Yes
g	**Daniels et al. [30] 2021**	To use COVID-19 frontline doctors' experiences and psychosocial care needs in order to develop empirically grounded recommendations and a coherent model of psychological care	Purposive sampling of 31 UK frontline doctors specialising in Emergency Medicine, Anaesthetics, or Intensive Care who had consented to be contacted as part of another study	Video or telephone semi-structured interviews	Thematic analysis informed by framework analysis	NR	Yes
h	**French et al. [31] 2022**	An exploration of NHS staff experiences of burnout and betrayal-based moral injury	16 NHS staff members (nurses, doctors, occupational therapists, trainee clinical psychologists, a paramedic, an employment specialist, a member of senior management)	Video semi-structured interviews	Reflexive thematic analysis	Critical realism	No

i	**Grailey et al. [32] 2021**	An exploration of the presence of perceived stressors, psychological safety and teamwork in healthcare professionals.	Purposive sampling of 49 participants (39 critical care staff [24 nurses, 9 doctors, 6 physiotherapists], 10 emergency medicine [2 nurses, 8 doctors]	Online semi-structured interviews	Thematic analysis	NR	Yes
j	**Harris et al. [33] 2021**	To gain insights into the difficulties experienced by frontline doctors across successive COVID-19 pandemic waves	Content analysis of 1379 responses to a single open ended question from a larger survey. Question was: '*Please tell us what aspects of working in the pandemic you found particularly difficult*?'	Open-ended question included in a questionnaire	Content analysis	An interpretivist paradigm	Yes
k	**Hoernke et al. [34] 2021**	To explore frontline workers' experiences with PPE during the pandemic	46 frontline HCWs, media reports (39 newspaper articles & 145,000 social media posts) and 25 government PPE policies	Semi-structured telephone interviews, media reports and government policies	Framework method	Framework derived from anthropological perspectives on the material politics of epidemic responses	Yes
l	**Jesuthasan et al. [35] 2021**	To explore ethnic minority healthcare staff members' lived experiences and impacts of COVID-19	13 healthcare workers from diverse ethnic minority backgrounds (11 clinical, 2 admin)	Two online focus groups	Template analysis	Constructivist qualitative research paradigm	Yes
m	**Kanavaki et al. [36] 2021**	Kidney healthcare professionals' perspectives on impact of healthcare delivery changes on care quality and staff well-being	59 free-text responses to survey and 8 semi-structured interviews. Participants were invited to participate in a survey and consented to be approached for an interview	Free-text survey responses and semi-structured interviews	Thematic analysis	Interpretative epistemology	Yes
n	**Kerins et al. [37] 2021**	Impact of COVID-19 on workplace needs of internal medicine trainees in Scotland.	12 workshops with 72 trainees, and interviews with 10 trainees	Audio-recorded workshops and subsequent semi-structured interviews	Template analysis	ABC framework of doctors' core needs	Yes
o	**Kinsella et al. [38] 2022**	To explore the psychological impact of working in the COVID-19 frontline	38 frontline workers from UK (n=17) and Republic of Ireland (n=21) all employed in "essential" and "frontline" roles in occupational sectors including healthcare, social care, retail, logistics, emergency services and defence forces. Recruited through social and news media to complete a survey and consented to being approached for an interview	Phone, semi-structured interviews	Thematic analysis	Phenomenological approach	Yes
p	**Liberati et al. [39] 2021**	An exploration of experiences of NHS mental healthcare workers during the pandemic	Purposive sampling of 35 members of staff from NHS secondary (inpatient and community) mental health services in England. These included psychiatrists (trainees and consultants), care coordinators, mental health nurses, clinical psychologists and psychotherapists)	Telephone or online semi-structured interviews	Constant comparative method	NR	No
q	**Martin & Hatzidimitriadou [40] 2021**	An exploration of community care staff members' role transitions a s a response to the pandemic	Purposive sampling of 6 community care staff	Narrative correspondence inquiry	Paradigmatic mode	Critical realism	Yes
r	**McGlinchey et al. [41] 2021**	An exploration of healthcare professionals' lived experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic	10 healthcare professionals (nursing, ambulance service, mental health, midwifery and social care) recruited through snowballing and social media	Telephone semi-structured interviews	Interpretative phenomenological analysis	Phenomenological approach	Yes

s	**Montgomery et al. [42] 2021**	To explore staff experiences of working in critical care during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic	40 NHS staff working in critical care (21 nurses, 10 doctor and advanced critical care practitioners, 4 allied health professionals, 3 operating department practitioners and 2 ward clerks)	Telephone semi-structured interviews	Rapid analysis methods	Sociological lens of 'communities of fate'.	Yes
t	**Newman et al. [43] 2021**	To explore the experiences and emotional strain of NHS frontline workers	Survey responses from 395 frontline workers recruited through their willingness to complete the survey	Online survey responses	Inductive qualitative content analysis	NR	No
u	**Olabi et al. [44] 2021**	To explore NHS frontline staff experiences of an in-house psychological support service	5 staff members (4 nurses, 1 allied health) recruited through an advertisement released by the Trust	Online semi-structured interviews	Interpretative phenomenological analysis	Phenomenological approach	Yes
v	**Plessas et al. [45] 2021**	To explore frontline experiences and perceptions of Urgent Dental Care centre staff	29 dentists and 9 dental nurses recruited through purposive sampling and snowballing	Telephone or online semi-structured interviews	Thematic analysis	Phenomenological approach	Yes
w	**Rees et al. [46] 2021**	To explore paramedics' experiences of providing care in Wales (UK)	A purposive sample of 20 paramedics recruited through a poster circulated on social media and by email	Online semi-structured interviews	Grounded theory	NR	Yes
x	**Saleem et al. [47] 2021**	To explore the experiences of frontline Pakistani emigrant physicians working during the COVID-19 pandemic	10 frontline physicians of Pakistani origin involved in the direct care and management of COVID-19 patients, recruited through purposive sampling and snowballing	Semi-structured telephone interviews	Thematic analysis	Phenomenological approach	Yes
y	**Sandhu et al. [48] 2021**	To explore the impact of COVID-19 on the wellbeing of a dental team in a secondary care urgent dental hub	14 focus groups with 40 participants (dental nurses, specialty doctors, specialty registrars, dental core trainees, one consultant) recruited voluntarily via email and written notices on public areas	Focus groups	Thematic analysis	NR	No
z	**Spiers et al. [49] 2021**	To explore challenges faced by junior doctors working during the COVID-19 pandemic	A purposive sample of 15 junior doctors who reported being distressed	Telephone or online semi-structured interviews	Reflexive thematic analysis	NR	Yes
aa	**Walker & Gerakios [50] 2021**	To explore NHS research staff's experiences of redeployment	A purposive sample of 43 clinical research staff from an NHS Trust who were willing to participate in an audit questionnaire	Online survey	Thematic analysis	NR	Yes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

The latter quote provides insights into the multiple layers of concerns that participants experienced and reported. For example, due to the nature of their jobs, participants were afraid not only of contracting COVID-19 themselves, but also of transmitting it to family members and friends, raising concerns about the safety of people other than themselves,[a,b,e,f,l,s,v,w,y] some of whom could have underlying health problems.[b,s,w] Al-Ghunaim et al.[a] provide one such account from a surgeon:

> *fear of bringing the virus home and infecting my family and my mother-in-law with lung cancer*.

The authors of some papers raised concerns regarding the psychosocial toll of healthcare workers witnessing so many patients being critically ill or dying,[f,o,r,s,z] and witnessing other frontline workers dying.[f,s,w] Participants also reported fear of the unknown and a sense of uncertainty stemming from the pandemic,[b,l,n,t] and feelings such as anxiety,[c,m,s,w,y] isolation,[e,i,o,y] despair and grief.[f,t,z] Kanavaki et al.[m] depict the psychosocial toll of the pandemic through a doctor's account which illustrates not only the psychological but also the social impacts of COVID-19 on the lives of health and social care workers:

> *There is anxiety relating to uncertainty and a demoralisation as so many planned activities are cancelled and contact with friends and family is reduced*.

The various elements summarised thus far provide a picture of the ways in which awareness of SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19, brought distress to healthcare workers through a range of negative experiences, feelings and psychosocial impacts. Despite COVID-19 directly causing distress to participants, as is evident from the data and the wider literature, the effects of the virus were exacerbated by their interaction with a range of other stressors rooted in pre-pandemic systemic issues as well as those introduced by certain ineffective responses to the pandemic. We present this matter in the themes that follow.

Theme 2: Problems Related to Personal Protective Equipment and their Negative Psychosocial Outcomes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

One central factor that was commonly reported as contributing to staff members' experiences of distress was lack of access to personal protective equipment (PPE) that raised difficulties in delivering care.[a,c,f,i,k,r,t,v,x] As Baldwin and George [c] quote:

> *… police officers don't go out without a stab vest; firemen don't go out without wearing the full protective gear … why are healthcare staff any different? Why are we not provided with the appropriate* [PPE].

In this case, the lack of PPE does not reflect an issue directly attributable to the pandemic. Rather, it was both a pre-existing deficiency inherent in limitations in preparation and planning of the healthcare system as well as a problematic organisational response to the emergent extreme event. In some cases, participants reported that PPE was available, but they were worried about both its quality and quantity.[j,k,r,w] These concerns were distressing. One reason was cited by participants who acknowledged the limited nature of these resources, and did not take breaks because, by doing so, they would have to discard parts of their equipment. Concerns about PPE led to increased fatigue. We present an extract from a longer quote as it appears in McGlinchey et al.[r]:

> *I basically have a drink of water and then put on the equipment again, because other people are waiting for their breaks, and go back in … Once you are in, you can't really come out just to go to the toilet because it wastes PPE … you are starting to get dehydrated because you can't drink …*

Participants also reported a lack of adoption of fit testing at the early stages of the pandemic,[v,y] and feelings of fear that stemmed from an associated perceived lack of safety due to the absence of fit testing.[c,w] According to a quote presented by Rees et al.[w]:

> *… really worried because I knew the masks didn't fit me properly, so I was anxious and I felt a bit demotivated to be in work, that I didn't want to be there because every day I was going in and it was a permanent risk really*.

Another related issue was the lack of training in how to properly use PPE, even when the latter was available, which made staff feel less confident in carrying out their duties in a manner that was safe for them and safe for patients and colleagues.[k,y] According to a quote presented by Hoernke et al.[k]:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

haven't had any training … some other nurses have been trained to use ventilators but there hasn't been any PPE training or anything else at all.

Overall, many staff did not feel protected against COVID-19,[a,f] and were afraid of transmitting it to their families and friends,[f] revealing one of many potential connections between a stressor rooted in institutional and organisational problems (in this case the lack of PPE) and its interaction with the direct psychosocial effects of the extreme event (the fear of contracting the virus), often being accentuated for members of staff from black and minority ethnic cultures.[f]

PPE was reported as causing personal discomfort and this became a factor that affected staff-patient relationships and staff team dynamics. Lengthy working in PPE caused discomfort and fatigue,[b,i,k,w,y] and frequently having to change used equipment took time, and became a burden.[a] Moreover, necessary use of PPE became a barrier to staff becoming familiar and communicating with other team members,[i,k,s,v] made it harder for them to communicate with patients,[b] and created dilemmas between effective risk infection and human contact,[p] by limiting visual and auditory cues, the ability to recognise and communicate with others, and the coordination and execution of various tasks.[a,i,k,s] Overall, it was reported as having a negative impact on teamwork.[i] As Al-Ghunaim [a] quote:

PPE makes it difficult for patients to hear you and see your non-verbal response.

PPE-related issues were the causes of wider problems in workplaces. Recurrently changing guidance and never-ending changes to levels of PPE required for different healthcare processes did not inspire workers' confidence in safety and more senior managers.[w,y]. According to a quote from Rees et al.[w]:

you have been thrown information constantly, there's updates after updates after updates, things are changing near enough I wouldn't say hourly but frequently changing. Yes, you are probably being suitably informed, but it is overwhelming.

Lack of organisational trust and leadership issues were common enough that are considered next.

Theme 3: Problems With Leadership and Communication Processes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Problems in leadership and in communications were two interconnected matters that were reported frequently by participants as causing significant distress among staff in healthcare settings. For instance, many participants mentioned that they were unclear about rapidly changing guidelines that were leading to confusion.[c,j,k,o,t,v,w,y,aa] Plessas et al.[v], for example, present the following quote:

> *Nationally, I think things could have been done better, especially from the CDO's* [Chief Dental Officer] *office, there were a lot of confusing messages coming out ...*

A similar issue was staff receiving too much information from too many different sources without proper control over what was being disseminated, leading to their inability to trust both the sources as well as the information disseminated or to conflicting information reaching the clinical services.[e,s,t,w,aa]

On other occasions, a common pattern across the papers was that of participants reporting that there was a lack of communication from staff in more senior jobs,[c,g,j,p,r,v,aa] coupled with information often not being disseminated to teams.[c,aa] Walker and Gerakios [aa] present one such quote:

> *Difficult to keep up with changes if they are not communicated effectively*.

Overall, these patterns of findings point us to the distressing experiences that staff faced due to poor communication with senior managers that became an obstacle to the former being able to carry out their jobs in an effective and safe manner.

Leadership issues were more broadly implicated in staff members' negative psychosocial experiences and especially if they were superimposed on problems. For instance, participants reported receiving no support or feeling unsupported due to having no managers on the ground, with more senior people only contacting them through email.[c,f,h,j,l,m,t] Baldwin and George quote a staff member saying:[c]

> *I have never seen any of the management people in the PPE to come in and to see what happens*.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Problems experienced as stemming from managers led to participants feeling unappreciated, undervalued, and misunderstood.[g,n,r,t] McGlinchey et al.[r] illustrate this issue with a quote:

We work in a caring profession, but you don't feel cared for.

A sense of unfairness emerged for some participants because of their having to carry out significantly more tasks and of having to cope with massive workloads while receiving the same salary.[p,v] Disbanding rest areas and removing free parking and meals also led to some participants feeling undervalued.[e,n,p] Many participants felt ignored or forgotten by managers.[b,f,g] They experienced a sense of abandonment and that they were seen as disposable, throwaway resources and purely as numbers despite managers being aware of the dangers that staff were facing.[c,h] French et al.[h] illustrate this with a powerful quote from a nurse:

If I die, they don't care. It doesn't matter if [they] *get like, you know, 600 nurses have died from COVID-19, and, you know, with higher exposure being linked to severity and things like that. And it just felt like* [they] *don't care, they'll just get somebody else in my shoes tomorrow*.

Staff also reported feeling misrecognised, not feeling listened to or involved in any decision-making processes, and on other occasions silenced,[c,e,h,o,q,t,v] which was often the case for members of staff from black and minority ethnic cultures.[l] Together, these findings coupled with a sense of poor decision-making by senior managers,[j,aa] a perceived culture of blame from leaders and government,[b] hierarchies perceived as worsening the working environment,[f] as well as a pressure from managers to continue working on the frontline,[l] led to participants reporting fractured relationships with managers.[g,h] We report a very powerful part of a larger quote from French et al.[h]:

I feel extremely frustrated, I feel powerless, I do not feel listened to, I feel like I have nowhere to go with anything. That's why I feel like I've reached the end of the road. I do feel like that.

Theme 4: Uncertainty and Lack of Knowledge Leading to Distress and Moral Injury

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Staff often reported problems related to their uncertainty and lack of knowledge in carrying out particular tasks. They were distinct but interrelated experiences that caused distress. Staff were responsible for making challenging decisions,[a,d,p,q,v,w,x] which were perceived as distressing. A staff member reported to Liberati et al.[p]:

> *I don't have as much information to make decisions so I'm questioning my decision-making more thoroughly. I'm frightened of making the wrong decision when I'm deciding whether somebody gets a service or doesn't get a service. That's quite problematic*.

This matter is unsurprising and expected from people working in health-related services, as many decisions inherently involve risk. However, there were clear systemic factors contributing to making various decisions particularly challenging. For instance, participants reported being asked to work in areas in or about which they had limited or no training, expertise, or knowledge.[a,d,f,n,p,q,t]

The lack of established programmes, protocols, or sometimes equipment led to anxiety and uncertainty,[d,n,q] and even participants with experience reported a lack of confidence.[s] In general, many participants were worried about harming patients due to mistakes or incorrect decisions,[d,p,q,t,v] especially when caring for people in critical conditions.[f,p,s,w,x] An illustrative quote is presented by Rees et al.[w]:

> *I feel they were pushed out too quickly without adequate training and understanding from frontline crews, and I fear this will lead to risky decisions being made that would not otherwise benefit the patients*.

The participants reported widespread concerns about the quality of care provided for patients,[f,j,m,p,q,s,v,w,x] and staff perceived the human side of their jobs as having been negatively impacted facing dilemmas between protocols that had to be followed vis-a-vis the values of their jobs,[10,16,17,23] which they perceived as violating in some instances. Many informants reported experiencing self-doubt, a perceived lack of control, distress, panic attacks, anxiety, guilt or moral injury due to violating their personal values and moral codes.[f,i,j,l,p,q,s,t] Grailey et al.[i] quote a staff member saying that:

> *we did absolutely the best that we could possibly do, but it just in no way, shape or form was good enough. But we did what we could in the confines of our environment*.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Theme 5: Intense Workloads as A Stressor

The last pattern that appears across the dataset in relation to stressors faced by health and social care workers is associated with workload problems. Many participants quoted in the papers available to us referred to intense and unsustainable workloads in an extremely challenging and understaffed working environment.[a,b,c,d,f,i,j,n,p,q,s,t,v,z,aa] Aughterson et al.[b], for example, present a quote from a participant stating that:

> *My routine was really like … wake up, eat something, go into work, which as shifts as nurses we had to stay in the hospital for 12 and a half hours … go home and eat something, drink something, go to sleep … then wake up and then go to work again … we have been extremely busy compared to the normality*.

Another example comes from Spiers et al.[z] who quote a participant saying:

> *… on a Friday in the middle of the day when there was no consultant around […] I gained 14 new patients who I'd not met before […] that was a really stressful day*.

Across the papers we reviewed, staff from different domains of care and from various specialties mentioned that they were overburdened by a range of additional responsibilities. They opined that their hectic environment did not allow them enough time to care appropriately for critically ill people. They experienced a sense of stagnation due to overload because of very long shifts and reported an inability to take breaks or think about how to best navigate the difficulties inherent in their jobs and especially so because of the new situation they were facing.

Associated with workload problems was the nature of shifting and changing roles and responsibilities that staff had to adopt, as well as the requirement they faced to adapt to redeployment and new work structures.[a,b,f,i,j,r,aa] McGlinchey et al.[r] quote from a staff member regarding her redeployment who said:

> *That was just dropped on us. There was no negotiations, there was no 'these are your options, you might not have to go there'… the thought of moving again to a different hospital almost an hour away is too much for me.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Staff clearly thought that workloads, which they perceived as excessive, also had an impact on team performance. Sometimes, workloads led to divisions and tensions between colleagues and to breakdowns in teamwork.[e,i,j,z] Being understaffed and under-resourced, for instance, led to a negative impact on team morale, which Harris et al.[i] characterise as, 'shortage of staff; decreasing staff morale; cracks in the team.' which, according to the same paper, was the case for the healthcare system as a whole:

> *working in hospitals that run near 100% capacity near 100% of the time (prior to the outbreak) and then expecting and trying to take a service that has little slack and stretching it further. It's been relentless and exhausting, sometimes you are left feeling that, despite doing our best, we should be doing better but can't, given the circumstances/resources*.

The overstretched system made it hard for colleagues to care for others due to the exhaustion they were already facing. A senior doctor quoted by Harris et al.[j] reported that:

> *My own biggest challenges have been the moral distress of watching colleagues struggle, and worrying about their wellbeing - this has been accentuated by the fact that my own world has been too busy in other related matters to be able to directly offload their workload, leading to* [me] *feeling inadequate for prolonged spells.*

DISCUSSION

Our aim for the study was and remains providing a systematic review of qualitative papers related to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on UK healthcare workers' experiences. Our goal was to move beyond summarising previous results and to focus on the psychosocial effects of stressors and their particular origins. We identify five main themes from our thematic synthesis of the relevant literature. Each theme was, mainly, centered around one pattern of stressors and a diverse range of impacts stemming from it.

The first theme concerns the direct effects of COVID-19 on healthcare workers. Due to infection with the SARS-CoV-2 virus in their workplaces or elsewhere, participants were worried about being infected and/or transmitting the virus to family members, friends, and acquaintances. Exposure to the virus was associated with a variable range of psychosocial outcomes. For

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

example, some participants reported a sense of anxiety, fear, uncertainty, demoralisation, and despair. These feelings coexisted with grief and were compounded by a loss of social contacts to prevent contamination and associated feelings of isolation.

Despite the potent direct effects of the virus and the pandemic, other stressors rooted in problematic institutional practices and arrangements were reported much more frequently in the data. Various issues were reported regarding PPE. A lack of protective equipment interacted with the impact of the pandemic to intensify worry. Inability to take sufficiently frequent breaks as a result of limited access to PPE led to fatigue, dehydration, and other health risks. Participants were worried about the quality of the PPE and the variable conduct of fit testing led to anxiety and demotivation. Many participants reported not having training and confidence in using PPE appropriately, which increased fears of exposure to the virus, and the guidance about it changed rapidly. Using PPE also caused problems in communicating with patients and with colleagues in clinical teams.

Problematic leadership and communication processes were frequently reported. Rapidly changing or too much information, which was often not properly checked and was coming from too many sources led to confusion and lack of trust in both messages and sources. Senior managers were reported as largely absent from the shopfloor. Hierarchies, concerns about a perceived culture of blame, and lack of facilities led participants to feel unappreciated, undervalued, misrecognised and misunderstood, ignored, abandoned, and seen as numbers. Moreover, the uncertainty, which can be inherent in relatively novel events of the magnitude of the COVID-19 pandemic, was compounded by uncertainty stemming from challenging decisions and dilemmas in the absence of appropriate training, which could lead to moral distress. Finally, excessive workloads due to chronic understaffing and staff sickness absences that predated the pandemic became unsustainable during the pandemic, and staff had to deal with continually changing roles and structures, stagnation, and, as a result, low morale, demotivation, and an impact on relationships between team members.

Most of the problems reported by participants that are identified in our analysis can be defined as secondary stressors. In contrast to *primary stressors* that are inherent in extreme events themselves, such as viral infections, floodwaters, or fires,[51] *secondary stressors* have been

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

defined as '*1. Social factors and people's life circumstances (that include the policies, practices, and social, organisational, and financial arrangements) that exist prior to and impact them during the major incident; and/or 2. Societal and organisational responses to an incident or emergency*'.[52,53] Examples of secondary stressors in extreme events such as floods, hurricanes, and earthquakes include problems in claiming insurance payments, insufficient housing, miscommunication, poor living and working conditions that persist, and people's disconnection from healthcare and other services on which they rely.[54-57] Apart from fear of exposure to the virus, which we rergard as a primary stressor as it is inherent in the pandemic and poses an existential threat for staff and their close others, all other problems reported in our analysis either existed before the pandemic (e.g., unsustainable workloads, understaffed services, insufficient stockpiles of PPE) or were indicators and outcomes of ineffective responses to the pandemic itself (e.g., lack of training or fit testing for PPE, invisible leaders).

We emphasise two points here. First, the effects of secondary stressors can be compounded since they can co-exist and operate in clusters, and, thereby, increase their impacts on the people affected. Second, secondary stressors can exacerbate the negative impacts of primary stressors or the pathways through which they become potent. For example, concerns regarding exposure to the virus (i.e., the primary stressor) can worsen if staff have insufficient PPE, are not trained to use it effectively, and there is uncertainty regarding its appropriate use. Overall, the notion of secondary stressors is theoretically and practically insightful as it helps us to emphasise the systemic nature of the issues raised by participants and, thus, to our ability to *track* these stressors and *change* them. In other words, most of the negative experiences we report were not inevitable, but rather point to problems in cultures and environments in which healthcare staff work, as well as to problems arising from the wider political decisions.

The theoretical lens of secondary stressors is also practical because it allows us to take an in-depth look into the nature of stressors and their psychosocial impacts. This framework is useful for a number of reasons. First, it helps to establish typologies of stressors as they are identified in the existing literature. Second, many secondary stressors are tractable. This means that their impacts are not inevitable but can be prevented through timely identification and removal of each stressor. Third, this lens offers us transferability of insights. Although the systematic review we report in this paper records some of the lessons learned about meeting the needs of staff

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

during the pandemic and other serious emergencies, it is clear that those lessons are also highly relevant in more ordinary times.

Thus, the usefulness of the notion of secondary stressors extends beyond the field of extreme events,[58] into more ordinary work and workplace settings. Similar findings have come from within healthcare settings, with ambulance staff, for example, not only reporting distressing features of their work such as a lack of downtime, a target culture, and their managers and support services not being very supportive, but also identifying gaps in their training and knowledge that would improve their working conditions and professional conditions and relationships.[58]

In our experience, secondary stressors are prone to occur throughout healthcare and many other systems, and our synthesis of the experiences of staff during the second year of the COVID-19 pandemic serves as an example through which to highlight chronic problems in the NHS that promote damaging outcomes (e.g., low staff retention, problems in recruitment).

In 2018, the NHS was described as being 'at a critical juncture', with the situation being characterised as 'unsustainable' by the General Medical Council (GMC).[59]. During the decade 2010-2020, the NHS struggled with staff recruitment and retention due to chronic extreme pressure caused by inequity, inequality, funding cuts, and high persisting levels of distress and fatigue. In April 2024, the GMC published its research that explores the reasons why doctors have left or may be considering leaving the NHS to practise abroad.[60] The Internet announcement says, 'While some migration is inevitable, the findings suggest that improving workplace conditions could have a positive impact on retaining doctors'.[61] Thus, our opinion is that many of the problems with current NHS staff recruitment and retention are likely to reflect the secondary stressors faced by staff. In parallel, Maben et al. review the evidence for three workplace conditions that matter for improving quality and safety in healthcare. They regard key matters as: staffing; psychological safety, teamwork and speaking up; and staff health and wellbeing at work.[62] We think that these topics have much in common with the experiences we report here regarding working conditions in the NHS during the COVID-19 pandemic. Maben et al. offer helpdul approaches to remedying some of the secondary stressors in healthcare services. Recent research points to the importance of social support and collective

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

resilience in assisting frontline workers.[17] Thus, we think that what we have learned about stressors experienced by healthcare staff during the pandemic has much to teach us about improving retention in the NHS. Considering the dynamics and impacts of secondary stressors can help us to think more strategically about how to best support staff and care for them as well as better prepare for future extreme events.

Furthermore the concept of secondary stressors could also help us to think about limitations in other systems and institutions (e.g., schools, social care and other workplaces) and how their members cope with extreme events in the face of wider ongoing social issues (e.g., poverty, discrimination).

Limitations

Various limitations are evident in our study. First, we only considered papers published between 2021 and 2022 and there is a chance that we might have omitted important research published in the following period. However, even if this is the case, we consider the risks to the present analysis to be minimal. A cursory look at papers published from 2022 onwards shows that the findings in our selection of subsequent studies, are in line with our analysis.[63,64] Thus, it seems to us that including additional papers would not significantly alter the nature of the argument we make in this paper.

Second, the quality of each systematic review depends on the quality of the papers included in it. Despite all the papers we reviewed suffering from various limitations and biases, we have tried to minimise the impact that these matters had on our review. We pre-registered the review with PROSPERO and followed the PRISMA and NICE guidelines on assessing the quality of the papers; the vast majority of which were judged to be of high quality. Those that did not meet this standard showed minor limitations that did not pose a risk in terms of negatively affecting our findings.

Third, during the search phase, we were unable to retrieve 19 papers. This was due to various reasons such as weblinks to the studies not working or pointing to unpublished work, or only abstracts, posters, protocols, or blogs being available. Nevertheless, considering the similarity

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

across the papers reported here as well as of papers published since the end of our search period, we do not consider the unretrievable papers to pose a problem for this review.

Conclusion

A systematic review of qualitative papers published in the UK regarding the effects of COVID-19 on healthcare staff showed that, apart from primary stressors, secondary stressors were very influential in the proliferation of distress. They included inadequate leadership and communications, excessive workloads, lack of personal protective equipment, and uncertainty and lack of knowledge, each of which had a range of negative psychosocial outcomes for those affected. Considering that recruitment and retention are central concerns for the NHS, then mitigation strategies should not focus so much on building individual resilience in staff and rather to try to improve workplace conditions by tracking and tackling secondary stressors so that their effects are removed.

REFERENCES

1. De Kock JH, Latham HA, Cowden RG, Cullen B, Narzisi K, Jerdan S, et al. The mental health of NHS staff during the COVID-19 pandemic: two-wave Scottish cohort study. BJPsych Open 2022; 8(1): e23.
2. Freeman R, Knights J, Beaton L, Araujo M, Yuan S, Clarkson J, et al. Prediction of emotional exhaustion over the course of the COVID-19 pandemic in primary care dental staff: an intensive longitudinal study. BMJ Open 2021; 11(12): e054827.
3. Roberts T, Daniels J, Hulme W, Hirst R, Horner D, Lyttle MD, et al. Psychological distress and trauma in doctors providing frontline care during the COVID-19 pandemic in the United Kingdom and Ireland: a prospective longitudinal survey cohort study. BMJ Open 2021; 11(7): e049680.
4. Brooks SK, Gerada C, Chalder T. Review of literature on the mental health of doctors: are specialist services needed? Journal of Mental Health 2011; 20(2): 146-56.
5. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Summary for policymakers. In: Masson-Delmotte V, Zhai P, Pirani A, et al, eds. Climate change 2021: the physical science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, 2021. (https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGI_SPM_final.pdf (accessed Sept 3, 2021).
6. Van Aalst MK. The impacts of climate change on the risk of natural disasters. Disasters 2006; 30: 5-18.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

7. Rotarou ES, Sakellariou D. Neoliberal reforms in health systems and the construction of long-lasting inequalities in health care: A case study from Chile. Health Policy 2017; 121(5): 495-503.

8. McGregor S. Neoliberalism and health care. International Journal of Consumer Studies. 2001; 25(2): 82-9.

9. Williams R, Kerfoot M. Setting the scene: perspectives on the history of and policy for child and adolescent mental health services in the UK. In: Williams R, Kerfoot M (eds). Child and adolescent mental health services: strategy, planning, delivery, and evaluation. Oxford University Press, 2005, Pp. 3-38.

10. Williams R, Kemp V. Caring for healthcare practitioners . BJPsych Advances 2020; 26(2): 116-28.

11. Serrell J, Williams R, Morris R, Jones S, Neal A. Understanding the psychosocial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the NHS workforce: lessons from a Welsh health board about perceived levels of coping and fatigue. BJPsych Open In review.

12. Murray E, Kaufman KR, Williams R. Let us do better: learning lessons for recovery of healthcare professionals during and after COVID-19. BJPsych Open 2021; 7(5).

13. Oeppen RS, Melville CR, Brennan PA. The NHS should do more to prevent fatigue in healthcare staff. BMJ 2023; 383: 2676.

14. Montgomery J. Public ethics in emergencies: learning from the COVID-19 pandemic. In Williams R, Kemp V, Porter K, Healing T, Drury J (eds). Major incidents, pandemics and mental health: the psychosocial aspects of health emergencies, incidents, disasters and disease outbreaks. Cambridge University Press, 2024, Pp. 388-393.

15. Williams R, Kemp V, Porter K, Healing T, Drury J. Major incidents, pandemics and mental health: the psychosocial aspects of health emergencies, incidents, disasters and disease outbreaks. Cambridge University Press, 2024.

16. Williams R, Kemp V. The nature of resilience: coping with adversity. In Williams R, Kemp V, Haslam SA, Haslam C, Bhui KS, Bailey S (eds). Social scaffolding: applying the lessons of contemporary social science to health and healthcare. CambridgeUniversity Press, 2019, Pp. 87-104.

17. Cheng P, Wang L, Zhou Y, Ma W, Li W. Exploring the differential effects of psychological resilience and social support in mitigating post-traumatic mental symptoms: a real-world network analysis among front-line rescuers. BJPsych Open in press.

18. Maben J, Conolly A. Lessons for structure, workforce planning, and responding to emergencies from nurses in the COVID-19 pandemic In Williams R, Kemp V, Porter K, Healing T, Drury J (eds). Major incidents, pandemics and mental health: the psychosocial aspects of health emergencies, incidents, disasters and disease outbreaks. Cambridge University Press, 2024, Pp. 273-278.

19. Maddock M, Kemp V, Williams R. Case study 4: delivering peer support. In Williams R, Kemp V, Porter K, Healing T, Drury J (eds). Major incidents, pandemics and mental health: the psychosocial aspects of health emergencies, incidents, disasters and disease outbreaks. Cambridge University Press, 2024, Pp. 360-364.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

20. Williams R, Kemp V. The moral architecture of healthcare systems and other organisations. In Williams R, Kemp V, Porter K, Healing T, Drury J (eds). Major incidents, pandemics and mental health: the psychosocial aspects of health emergencies, incidents, disasters and disease outbreaks. Cambridge University Press, 2024, Pp. 273-278.

21. Ntontis E, Luzynska K, Williams R . The impact of COVID-19 on the psychosocial and mental health needs of NHS and social care staff: The final report on literature published to mid-2021. (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357204564_The_impact_of_COVID-19_on_the_psychosocial_and_mental_health_needs_of_NHS_and_social_care_staff_The_final_report_on_literature_published_to_mid-2021)

22. Ntontis E, Williams R, Luzynska K, Wright AC. The impact of COVID-19 on the psychosocial and mental health needs of NHS and social care staff: Final report on literature published between 2021 and 2022. (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/369940919_The_impact_of_COVID-19_on_the_psychosocial_and_mental_health_needs_of_NHS_and_social_care_staff_Final_report_on_literature_published_between_2021_and_2022)

23. Thomas J, Harden A. Methods for the systematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. BMC Medical Research Methodology 2008; 8(45):1-10

24. (a) Al-Ghunaim TA, Johnson J, Biyani CS, O'Connor D. Psychological and occupational impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on UK surgeons: a qualitative investigation. BMJ Open 2021; 11(4): e045699.

25. (b) Aughterson H, McKinlay AR, Fancourt D, Burton A. Psychosocial impact on frontline health and social care professionals in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic: a qualitative interview study. BMJ Open 2021; 11(2): e047353.

26. (c) Baldwin S, George J. Qualitative study of UK health professionals' experiences of working at the point of care during the COVID-19 pandemic. BMJ Open 2021; 11(9): e054377.

27. (d) Billings J, Biggs C, Ching BCF, Gkofa V, Singleton D, Bloomfield M, et al. Experiences of mental health professionals supporting front-line health and social care workers during COVID-19: qualitative study. BJPsych Open 2021; 7(2): e70.

28. (e) Billings J, Seif NA, Hegarty S, Ondruskova T, Soulios E, Bloomfield M, et al. What support do frontline workers want? A qualitative study of health and social care workers' experiences and views of psychosocial support during the COVID-19 pandemic. Plos one 2021; 16(9), p.e0256454

29. (f) Blake H, Gupta A, Javed M, Wood B, Knowles S, Coyne E, et al. COVID-Well study: qualitative evaluation of supported wellbeing centres and psychological first aid for healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. IJERPH 2021; 18(7): 3626.

30. (g) Daniels J, Ingram J, Pease A, Wainwright E, Beckett K, Iyadurai L, et al. The COVID-19 clinician cohort (CoCCo) study: empirically grounded recommendations for forward-facing psychological care of frontline doctors. IJERPH 2021;18(18): 9675.

31. (h) French L, Hanna P, Huckle C. 'If I die, they do not care': U.K. National Health Service staff experiences of betrayal-based moral injury during COVID-19. Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy 2022; 14(3): 516-21.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

32. (i) Grailey K, Lound A, Brett S. Lived experiences of healthcare workers on the front line during the COVID-19 pandemic: a qualitative interview study. BMJ Open 2021; 11(12): e053680.

33. (j) Harris S, Jenkinson E, Carlton E, Roberts T, Daniels J. 'It's Been Ugly': A large-scale qualitative study into the difficulties frontline doctors faced across two waves of the COVID-19 pandemic. IJERPH 2021; 18(24):13067.

34. (k) Hoernke K, Djellouli N, Andrews L, Lewis-Jackson S, Manby L, Martin S, et al. Frontline healthcare workers' experiences with personal protective equipment during the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK: a rapid qualitative appraisal. BMJ Open 2021; 11(1): e046199.

35. (l) Jesuthasan J, Powell RA, Burmester V, Nicholls D. '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. BMJ Open 2021; 11(12): e053396.

36. (m) Kanavaki AM, Lightfoot CJ, Palmer J, Wilkinson TJ, Smith AC, Jones CR. Kidney care during COVID-19 in the UK: perspectives of healthcare professionals on impacts on care quality and staff well-being. IJERPH 2021; 19(1):188.

37. (n) Kerins J, Hamilton AL, Pringle J, Farquhar F, Tallentire VR. Exploring the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on doctors' core workplace needs: a qualitative study of internal medicine trainees in Scotland. BMJ Open 2021; 11(6): e053506.

38. (o) Kinsella EL, Hughes S, Lemon S, Stonebridge N, Sumner RC. 'We shouldn't waste a good crisis': the lived experience of working on the frontline through the first surge (and beyond) of COVID-19 in the UK and Ireland. Psychology & Health 2022 1; 37(2): 151–77.

39. (p) Liberati E, Richards N, Willars J, Scott D, Boydell N, Parker J, et al. A qualitative study of experiences of NHS mental healthcare workers during the Covid-19 pandemic. BMC Psychiatry 2021; 21(1): 250.

40. (q) Martin A, Hatzidimitriadou E. Optimising health system capacity: a case study of community care staff's role transition in response to the coronavirus pandemic. Health Social Care Comm 2022; 30(5): pp.e2147-e2156.

41. (r) McGlinchey E, Hitch C, Butter S, McCaughey L, Berry E, Armour C. Understanding the lived experiences of healthcare professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic: an interpretative phenomenological analysis. European Journal of Psychotraumatology 2021; 12(1): 1904700.

42. (s) Montgomery CM, Humphreys S, McCulloch C, Docherty AB, Sturdy S, Pattison N. Critical care work during COVID-19: a qualitative study of staff experiences in the UK. BMJ Open 2021; 11(5): e048124.

43. (t) Newman KL, Jeve Y, Majumder P. Experiences and emotional strain of NHS frontline workers during the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic. Int J Soc Psychiatry 2022; 68(4): 783-90.

44. (u) Olabi Y, Campbell S, Greenhill B, Morgan A. NHS frontline staff experiences of an in-house psychological support service during the COVID-19 pandemic. Psychology, Health & Medicine 2022; 27(1): 131–8.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

45. (v) Plessas A, Paisi M, Baines R, Wheat H, Delgado MB, Mills I, et al. Frontline experiences and perceptions of urgent dental care centre staff in England during the COVID-19 pandemic: a qualitative study. Br Dent J 2021: 1-10

46. (w) Rees N, Smythe L, Hogan C, Williams J. Paramedic experiences of providing care in Wales (UK) during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic (PECC-19): a qualitative study using evolved grounded theory. BMJ Open 2021; 11(6): e048677.

47. (x) Saleem J, Ishaq M, Zakar R, Suddahazai IHK, Fischer F. Experiences of frontline Pakistani emigrant physicians combating COVID-19 in the United Kingdom: a qualitative phenomenological analysis. BMC Health Serv Res 2021; 21(1): 291.

48. (y) Sandhu BK, Blanchard JR, Koshal S. COVID-19 - the impact on wellbeing of the dental team in a secondary care urgent dental hub. Br Dent J 2021: 1-6.

49. (z) Spiers J, Buszewicz M, Chew-Graham C, Dunning A, Taylor AK, Gopfert A, et al. What challenges did junior doctors face while working during the COVID-19 pandemic? A qualitative study. BMJ Open 2021; 11(12): e056122.

50. (aa) Walker KL, Gerakios F. Redeployment during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic: implications for a clinical research workforce. Br J Nurs 2021; 30(12): 734-41.

51. Department of Health. NHS Emergency Planning Guidance. Planning for the psychosocial and mental health care of people affected by major incidents and disasters: Interim national strategic guidance. Department of Health, 2009.

52. Williams R, Ntontis E, Drury J, Alfadhli K, Amlôt R. Primary and secondary stressors: the ways in which emergencies, incidents, disasters and disease outbreaks and conflicts are stressful. Chapter 9 in: R Williams, V Kemp, K Porter, T Healing, J Drury (eds), Major Incidents, Pandemics and Mental Health. Cambridge University Press, 2024.

53. Williams R, Ntontis E, Alfadhli K, Drury J, Amlôt R. A social model of secondary stressors in relation to disasters, major incidents and conflict: implications for practice. Int J Disaster Risk Reduct 2021; 63: 1-9

54. Picou JS, Hudson K. Hurricane Katrina and mental health: a research note on Mississippi gulf coast residents. Socio Inq 2010; 80(3): 513-524.

55. Mulchandani R, Smith M, Armstrong B, English National Study of Flooding Group, Beck CR, Oliver I. Effect of insurance-related factors on the association between flooding and mental health outcomes. Int. J. Environ. Res. Publ. Health 2019; 16(7): 1-9.

56. Munro A, Kovats RS, Rubin GJ, Waite TD, Bone A, Armstrong B, English National Cohort Study of Flooding and Health Study Group. Effect of evacuation and displacement on the association between flooding and mental health outcomes: a cross-sectional analysis of UK survey data. Lancet Planet Health 2017; 1(4): e134–e141.

57. Tempest EL, Carter B, Beck CR, Rubin GJ, English National Study on Flooding and Health Study Group. Secondary stressors are associated with probable psychological morbidity after flooding: a cross-sectional analysis, Eur. J. Publ. Health 2017; 27(6): 1042-1047.

58. Drury J, Kemp V, Newman J, Novelli D, Doyle C, Walter D, Williams R. Psychosocial care for persons affected by emergencies and major incidents: a Delphi study to determine the needs of professional first responders for education, training and support. Emergency Medicine Journal. 2013; 30(10): 831-6.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.16.24305910; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

59. General Medical Council. The State of Medical Education and Practice in the UK. (https://www.gmc-uk.org/-/media/gmc-site/about/what-we-do-and-why/data-and-research/somep-2018/version-one---0412pm/somep-book-20187.pdf)

60. IFF Research. Identifying groups of migrating doctors research. General Medical Council, 2023.

61. General Medical Council. News for doctors: new research on improving retention of doctors in the UK. (https://gmc-news.org/cr/AQja-wEQ-oDxBhi1gq6EBD8x5D9JZT9QEU5tinSG6tK1im7kLTWPWXT4dDC0PbOu)

62. Maben J, Ball J, Edmondson AC. Cambridge Elements - Improving Quality and Safety in Healthcare: Workplace Conditions. THIS Institute, Cambridge University Press, 2023.

63. Buckle T, Carr P. 'All about the NHS and what about the rest of us?': Exploring how low-paid health and social care workers construct key stakeholders and account for the UK's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology 2024; 34(2): e2780.

64. Kinsella EL, Muldoon OT, Lemon S, Stonebridge N, Hughes S, Sumner RC. In it together? Exploring solidarity with frontline workers in the United Kingdom and Ireland during COVID-19. British Journal of Social Psychology 2023; 62(1): 241-63.