1 **Title:**

2 Prepared and highly committed despite the risk of COVID-19 infection: A cross-sectional
3 survey of primary care physicians' concerns and coping strategies in Singapore

4
5 **Short Title:**

6 Primary care physicians' concerns and coping strategies during COVID-19

7
8 **Authorship order, with highest academic qualification:**

- 9 1. Jerrald LAU^{1,9}, *MPH* (ephxj@nus.edu.sg)
- 10 2. David Hsien-Yung TAN^{3,4}, *FCFP(S)* (David_hy_tan@nuhs.edu.sg)
- 11 3. Gretel Jianlin WONG^{1,9}, *BSc(Biomed Sc)* (gretelwong@nus.edu.sg)
- 12 4. Yii-Jen LEW³, *MMed(FM)* (yii_jen_lew@nuhs.edu.sg)
- 13 5. Ying-Xian CHUA³, *MMed(FM)* (ying_xian_chua@nuhs.edu.sg)
- 14 6. Lian-Leng LOW^{4,5,6}, *FCFP(S)* (lianleng.low@gmail.com)
- 15 7. Han-Kwee HO⁷, *PhD* (ho_han_kwee@nuhs.edu.sg)
- 16 8. Thiam-Soo KWEK⁸, *GDFM* (prismark69@yahoo.com)
- 17 9. Sue-Anne Ee-Shiow TOH^{2,9}, *MD* (mdcsates@nus.edu.sg)
- 18 10. Ker-Kan TAN^{2,9}, *PhD* (surtkk@nus.edu.sg)

19
20 **Organisational affiliations:**

- 21 1. Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of Singapore
- 22 2. Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore
- 23 3. National University Polyclinics
- 24 4. College of Family Physicians Singapore

- 25 5. Family Medicine and Continuing Care, Singapore General Hospital
- 26 6. Outram Community Hospital, SingHealth Community Hospitals
- 27 7. Regional Health System Office, National University Health System
- 28 8. Primary Care Network, National University Health System
- 29 9. Singapore Population Health Improvement Centre (SPHERiC), National University
- 30 Health System

31

32 **Corresponding author:**

33 Ker-Kan Tan

34 National University of Singapore

35 Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine

36 NUHS Tower Block

37 Level 8

38 1E Kent Ridge Road

39 Singapore 119228

40 surtkk@nus.edu.sg

41

42 **Author contributions:**

- 43 1. Jerrald LAU – Conceptualisation, project administration, methodology, formal
- 44 analysis, writing (original draft, review & editing)
- 45 2. David Hsien-Yung TAN – Conceptualisation, project administration, methodology,
- 46 resources, writing (review & editing)
- 47 3. Gretel Jianlin WONG – Project administration, methodology, data curation, writing
- 48 (review & editing)

- 49 4. Yii-Jen LEW – Conceptualisation, methodology, resources, writing (review &
50 editing)
- 51 5. Ying-Xian CHUA – Methodology, resources, writing (review & editing)
- 52 6. Lian-Leng LOW – Methodology, resources, writing (review & editing)
- 53 7. Han-Kwee HO – Conceptualisation, resources, writing (review & editing)
- 54 8. Thiam-Soo KWEK – Resources, writing (review & editing)
- 55 9. Sue-Anne Ee-Shiow TOH – Funding acquisition, writing (review & editing)
- 56 10. Ker-Kan TAN – Conceptualisation, funding acquisition, supervision, writing (review
57 & editing)

58 **Abstract:**

59 **BACKGROUND**

60 Primary care physicians (PCPs) play a crucial role as first points-of-contact between
61 suspected cases and the healthcare system in the current Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-
62 19) pandemic. An overlooked angle is the potential psychosocial impact on PCPs as they
63 place themselves at increased risk of infection. This study examines PCPs' concerns, impact
64 on personal lives and work, and level of pandemic preparedness in the context of COVID-19
65 in Singapore. We also examine factors and coping strategies that PCPs have used to manage
66 stress during the outbreak.

67

68 **METHODS**

69 216 PCPs actively practicing in either a public or private clinic were convenience sampled
70 from three primary care organizations in Singapore. Participants completed an online
71 questionnaire consisting of items on work- and non-work-related concerns, impact on
72 personal and work life, perceived pandemic preparedness, stress-reduction factors, and
73 personal coping strategies related to COVID-19.

74

75 **RESULTS**

76 A total of 158 questionnaires were usable for analyses. PCPs perceived themselves to be at
77 high risk of COVID-19 infection, and a source of risk and concern to loved ones. PCPs
78 reported acceptance of these risks and the need to care for COVID-19 patients. Overall
79 perceived pandemic preparedness was extremely high. PCPs prioritized availability of
80 personal protective equipment, strict infection prevention guidelines, accessible information
81 about COVID-19, and well-being of their colleagues and family as the most effective stress
82 management factors.

83

84 CONCLUSIONS

85 Primary care will continue to be crucial in outbreak management efforts. Healthcare
86 organizations should continue to support PCPs by managing their psychosocial and
87 professional needs.

88

89 **Keywords:**

90 COVID-19; Primary care; Psychosocial impact; Pandemic preparedness; Cross-sectional

91 INTRODUCTION

92

93 The World Health Organisation (WHO) has characterized the novel Coronavirus Disease

94 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak as a pandemic, with 750,890 confirmed cases and 36,405 deaths

95 globally as of 31st March 2020 (1). Much academic and media coverage on healthcare

96 workers has rightly focused on the rigours faced by frontline hospital staff. However, it is

97 often easy to forget the critical role played by primary care physicians (PCP) during this

98 health crisis, as individuals who develop a febrile illness or respiratory symptoms are likely

99 to first seek treatment from a PCP. This means that PCPs are often the first medical

100 professionals to encounter suspected COVID-19 cases and will need to make crucial

101 decisions on how to manage these cases appropriately in order to limit community spread.

102 PCPs in Singapore generally fall under two models of practice. Public clinics (i.e.

103 polyclinics) operate in a group practice setting and provide subsidized primary care,

104 accounting for approximately 21% of all primary care outpatient visits in the country (2, 3).

105 Private clinics (i.e. general practitioners, family medicine clinics) may be operated by PCPs

106 as either a single-individual practice or a group practice, and account for the remaining 79%

107 of outpatient visits (2, 3). With 20 polyclinics and approximately 1,700 private clinics,

108 including eight family medicine clinics, the crucial role of primary care in managing the

109 COVID-19 outbreak in Singapore is underscored by the Public Health Preparedness Clinic

110 (PHPC) scheme, which provides government assistance to approximately 940 private practice

111 PCPs with financial subventions, personal protective equipment (PPEs) and medical supplies

112 from the national stockpile during public health emergencies, as well as continued

113 professional training to build outbreak management capacity (4, 5). This support has not been

114 misplaced; as of 17th March 2020, 108 of the 158 locally transmitted COVID-19 cases

115 (68.4%) had visited a PCP before being diagnosed (6). The role of primary care in this

pandemic is also highlighted elsewhere across the world in guidelines and literature that acknowledge how PCPs are often first points-of-contact between suspected cases and the healthcare system (7-10).

A commonly overlooked angle is the potential psychosocial impact of the outbreak on PCPs as they place themselves at increased infection risk. For example, while the efforts of healthcare professionals were publicly lauded during the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) outbreak, these same professionals were treated with a degree of fear and prejudice by laypeople in social spaces and on public transport (11-13). PCPs serving the community in Hong Kong during this period also reported high levels of anxiety about their own wellbeing and the safety of their immediate families (14). In addition, potentially detrimental deviations to PCPs' standard clinical practice in order to prevent infection (e.g. avoiding physical examination of patients) were observed (14). Studies conducted to understand the pandemic preparedness of PCPs and other healthcare professionals during the H5N1 avian influenza outbreak also found that the majority (80 – 95%) of PCPs were concerned that their profession would put their own health at risk; over half felt that family, friends or the general public would avoid them due to possible contact with H5N1 cases during the outbreak (2, 15). Similarly, studies conducted to examine the emotional impact, concerns and coping strategies of healthcare professionals regarding Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome (MERS-CoV) suggested that the majority felt at risk of being infected in their workplace but ethically obligated to continue caring for patients during the outbreak (16, 17) When asked to share about what would motivate them in future pandemics, healthcare professionals reported that 1) organizational support to increase outbreak preparedness, 2) an assurance of financial and emotional support for their family members while they worked overtime to care for

patients, and 3) appreciation from health authorities, supervisors and the public were the most important factors (17).

To our understanding, no prior study has yet examined the social and psychological impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on PCPs. Given the critical role that primary care must perform in containing and mitigating this global public health crisis, the current research seeks to understand the concerns and perceived pandemic preparedness of PCPs in Singapore in the context of the COVID-19 situation. We also examine PCPs' personal coping strategies and perceived impact of the outbreak on their personal and professional lives.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Ethics approval

Ethical approval to conduct this study was provided by the National University of Singapore's Institutional Review Board (Reference Code S-20-071) in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Informed consent to participate was obtained from all participants.

Study design and setting

As the exigencies of COVID-19 outbreak control measures in Singapore discouraged face-to-face interaction between research teams and potential participants, the present research utilized a cross-sectional online design. Participants were convenience sampled via email invitation disseminated by three organizations: the National University Health System (NUHS) Primary Care Network (PCN), National University Polyclinics (NUP), and the College of Family Physicians Singapore (CFPS). NUHS is one of the three integrated public healthcare systems in Singapore, with a catchment area approximating 1.1 million residents

in the western region of the island (18). The PCN and NUP are member organizations that coordinate and manage private and public primary care clinics respectively within the NUHS catchment area (19, 20). The CFPS is a professional society that provides vocational and continued professional development for PCPs and other family medicine practitioners in Singapore (21).

The sampling frame comprised of all medical doctors who were *either* 1) a PCP practicing within an NUP polyclinic, *or* 2) a PCP practicing within an NUHS PCN private clinic, *or* 3) a Member or Fellow of the CFPS, *and* 4) had a registered email address within the respective organizations. This resulted in a total of 2,866 viable email addresses, although there was the possibility of overlap as potential participants could have been part of either NUP or NUHS PCN and also a member of the CFPS. To protect the confidentiality of PCPs, individual email addresses were not released to the study team. The data collection period lasted from 6th March 2020 to 29th March 2020.

To put this study in perspective, Singapore began implementing its COVID-19 outbreak response upon diagnosing the first confirmed case on 23rd January 2020. The country raised its Disease Outbreak Response System Condition (DORSCON) to “Orange” (i.e. the same level of severity as during the SARS period) on 7th February 2020.

Measures

The anonymous self-administered online questionnaire was adapted from prior studies on PCPs and healthcare workers during the H5N1 avian influenza and MERS-CoV outbreaks (2, 15, 17).

The first three sections consisted of statements adapted from Wong and colleagues' H5N1 study, grouped into work- and non-work-related concerns (16 items), perceived impact on personal life and work (10 items), and outbreak preparedness (six items), all with reference to COVID-19 (2). The questionnaire also included statements from Khalid and colleagues' study on MERS-CoV; these were grouped into two sections on factors that might help PCPs reduce stress (13 items), and personal coping strategies to alleviate stress (13 items), during the COVID-19 outbreak (17). Participants responded to these items using 4-point Likert-type scales (e.g. strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree).

In addition, participants also provided demographic data consisting of gender, broad age band, ethnicity, marital status, number of children (if married, divorced, or widowed), whether residing with family or alone, number of people living in the same household, type of primary care practice, years of experience in medical practice, and highest professional or academic medical qualification.

Statistical analyses

All statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 22.0(22). Frequencies and proportions were used to present participant demographic data. Frequencies and proportions were used to present data for the statements on work-related and non-work-related concerns, perceived impact on personal life and work, and outbreak preparedness. We dichotomized participant responses for the 4-point Likert-type scales into "agreement" (i.e. strongly agree, agree) and "disagreement" (i.e. strongly disagree, disagree) responses. Cronbach's alpha was used to assess internal consistency for the items within each of these three sections.

Participant responses on the statements about factors that might help reduce stress were converted into a point-based system (i.e. “extremely effective” being worth four points, to “not at all effective” being worth one point). Similarly, responses for the statements on personal coping strategies were converted into a point-based system (i.e. “always used” being worth four points, to “never used” being worth one point). Points per item were summarised across the sample and the items ranked accordingly.

Data availability

All data utilised for analysis in this study can be found in S1 Dataset. Descriptions and coded values used for each variable can be found in S2 Data Dictionary.

RESULTS

Sample demographics

A total of 216 PCPs provided informed consent to participate in the online questionnaire. Of these, 58 questionnaires were unusable (defined as having at least two sections incomplete), leaving a final sample of 158 participants. The sample was predominantly of Chinese ethnicity (80.4%), married (84.2%) and residing with family (91.8%). There were more private than public practice PCPs (61.5%). A full description of sample demographics can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the sample.

Characteristic	PCPs (N = 158)
Gender, Male – no. (%)	83 (52.5)
Age – no. (%)	

20 – 29 years	10 (6.3)
30 – 39 years	63 (39.9)
40 – 49 years	45 (28.5)
50 years and above	40 (25.3)
Ethnicity – no. (%)	
Chinese	127 (80.4)
Malay	3 (1.9)
Indian	19 (12.0)
Other	9 (5.7)
Marital status – no. (%)	
Single	21 (13.3)
Married	133 (84.2)
Divorced	4 (2.5)
Living with – no. (%)	
Family	145 (91.8)
Alone	9 (5.7)
Others (e.g. roommate)	4 (2.5)
Type of medical practice – no. (%)	
General practitioner	78 (49.4)
In a Public Health Preparedness Clinic – no. (%)	65 (83.3)*
Family medicine clinic	11 (7.0)
Polyclinic	53 (33.5)
Restructured hospital	8 (5.1)
Others (e.g. locum)	8 (5.1)

Years of medical experience – no. (%)

1 – 5 years	23 (14.6)
6 – 10 years	38 (24.1)
11 – 15 years	23 (14.6)
16 – 20 years	26 (16.5)
More than 20 years	48 (30.4)

Highest medical qualification – no. (%)

Bachelor of Medicine, Bachelor of Surgery (MBBS)	50 (31.6)
Graduate Diploma in Family Medicine	55 (34.8)
Master of Medicine (Family Medicine)	17 (10.8)
Member of the College of Family Physicians	11 (7.0)
Fellow of the College of Family Physicians	14 (8.9)
Others	11 (7.0)

*Proportion calculated using general practitioners (n = 78) as denominator.

234 *Work- and non-work-related concerns*

235 Nearly all PCPs felt that their job would put them at high risk of exposure to COVID-19
 236 (89.9%), and the majority agreed or strongly agreed that they were worried about falling ill
 237 with the disease (69.0%). Most PCPs were also concerned about the risks that they posed to
 238 loved ones because of their job (74.7%) and the majority felt that their loved ones would
 239 likewise be worried about being infected by them (71.5%). However, PCPs disagreed that
 240 they should not be looking after COVID-19 patients (85.4%) and did not feel that the risk
 241 they were exposed to was unacceptable (89.9%); almost all agreed that they accepted the risk
 242 of COVID-19 infection as part of the job (91.1%). Similarly, PCPs disagreed that they would

243 leave their profession because of these risks (93.0%). The Cronbach's α for work- and non-
244 work-related concerns was 0.85, suggesting acceptable reliability (23). Response frequencies
245 and proportions for each statement are presented in Table 2.

246

Table 2. Frequencies and proportions for work- and non-work-related concerns (N = 158)*.

Statement	Disagreement		Agreement	
	SD	D	A	SA
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Work-related concerns				
My job would put me at great exposure risk	1	15	94	48
	(0.6)	(9.5)	(59.5)	(30.4)
I am afraid of falling ill with COVID-19	7	42	83	26
	(4.4)	(26.6)	(52.5)	(16.5)
I should not be looking after COVID-19 patients	54	81	18	5
	(34.2)	(51.3)	(11.4)	(3.2)
The risk I am exposed to is not acceptable	35	107	10	6
	(22.2)	(67.7)	(6.3)	(3.8)
I accept that the risk of contracting COVID-19 is part of my job	1	13	100	44
	(0.6)	(8.2)	(63.3)	(27.8)
I might look for another job because of the risks	92	55	9	2
	(58.2)	(34.8)	(5.7)	(1.3)
It is acceptable if my colleagues resign because of their fears	19	53	74	12
	(12.0)	(33.5)	(46.8)	(7.6)
I am confident my employer would look after my needs	11	22	104	21
	(7.0)	(13.9)	(65.8)	(13.3)

Non-work-related concerns

People close to me would be at high risk of getting	4	36	89	29
COVID-19 because of my job	(2.5)	(22.8)	(56.3)	(18.4)
In particular, I would be concerned for my spouse/ partner	5	27	83	43
	(3.2)	(17.1)	(52.5)	(27.2)
In particular, I would be concerned for my parents	7	29	78	44
	(4.4)	(18.4)	(49.4)	(27.8)
In particular, I would be concerned for my children	7	30	74	47
	(4.4)	(19.0)	(46.8)	(29.7)
In particular, I would be concerned for my close friends	8	61	73	16
	(5.1)	(38.6)	(46.2)	(10.1)
In particular, I would be concerned for my work	9	32	96	21
colleagues	(5.7)	(20.3)	(60.8)	(13.3)
People close to me would be worried for my health	5	22	97	34
	(3.2)	(13.9)	(61.4)	(21.5)
People close to me would be worried as they may get	5	40	97	16
infected by me	(3.2)	(25.3)	(61.4)	(10.1)

*SD = “strongly disagree”; D = “disagree”; A = “agree”; SA = “strongly agree”.

247

248 *Perceived impact on personal life and work*

249 The majority of PCPs perceived that they would feel more stressed at work (73.4%),

250 experience an increase in workload (67.1%) and would have to engage in work not usually

251 done by them (70.3%). Most PCPs disagreed that they would avoid telling their loved ones

252 about the risks they were exposed to (78.5%) or the nature of their job (81.6%). Most PCPs

253 also did not think that there would be more intra-workplace conflict during this COVID-19
 254 period (71.5%). The Cronbach's α for perceived impact on personal life and work was 0.75.
 255 Response frequencies and proportions for each statement are presented in Table 3.
 256

Table 3. Frequencies and proportions for perceived impact on personal life and work (N = 158)*.

Statement	Disagreement		Agreement	
	SD	D	A	SA
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
I would be afraid of telling my family about the risks I am exposed to	31 (19.6)	93 (58.9)	28 (17.7)	6 (3.8)
People would avoid me because of my job	12 (7.6)	86 (54.4)	54 (34.2)	6 (3.8)
People would avoid my family members because of my job	26 (16.5)	92 (58.2)	36 (22.8)	4 (2.5)
I would avoid telling other people about the nature of my job	36 (22.8)	93 (58.9)	26 (16.5)	3 (1.9)
There would be adequate staff at my workplace to handle the increased demand	18 (11.4)	66 (41.8)	70 (44.3)	4 (2.5)
There would be more conflict amongst colleagues at work	17 (10.8)	96 (60.8)	40 (25.3)	5 (3.2)
I would feel more stressed at work	6 (3.8)	36 (22.8)	93 (58.9)	23 (14.6)
I would have an increase in workload	6 (3.8)	46 (29.1)	88 (55.7)	18 (11.4)
I would have to work overtime	6	74	59	19

	(3.8)	(46.8)	(37.3)	(12.0)
I would have to do work not normally done by me	4	43	83	28
	(2.5)	(27.2)	(52.5)	(17.7)

*SD = “strongly disagree”; D = “disagree”; A = “agree”; SA = “strongly agree”.

257

258 *Outbreak preparedness*

259 The agreement was high (75.9% to 89.9%) for every item in this section. Notably, the top
 260 three statements were that PCPs felt personally prepared for the COVID-19 outbreak
 261 (89.9%), that they had received adequate PPE training (88.6%), and they had someone to turn
 262 to if they were unsure of the use of PPEs (86.1%). The Cronbach’s α for outbreak
 263 preparedness was 0.85. Response frequencies and proportions for each statement are
 264 presented in Table 4.

265

Table 4. Frequencies and proportions for perceived outbreak preparedness (N = 158)*.

Statement	Disagreement		Agreement	
	SD	D	A	SA
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
I have received training for infection control at my workplace	9	29	93	27
	(5.7)	(18.4)	(58.9)	(17.1)
I have received adequate personal protective equipment training	6	12	104	36
	(3.8)	(7.6)	(65.8)	(22.8)
I have someone to turn to if unsure of the use of personal protective equipment	5	17	98	38
	(3.2)	(10.8)	(62.0)	(24.1)
My workplace has a preparedness plan for a COVID-19 outbreak	3	24	89	42
	(1.9)	(15.2)	(56.3)	(26.6)

My workplace is prepared for a COVID-19 outbreak	6	19	96	37
	(3.8)	(12.0)	(60.8)	(23.4)
I am personally prepared for a COVID-19 outbreak	5	11	112	30
	(3.2)	(7.0)	(70.9)	(19.0)
The is sufficient supply of personal protective equipment for use	4	22	101	31
in my workplace	(2.5)	(13.9)	(63.9)	(19.6)
I have received training for infection control at my workplace	9	29	93	27
	(5.7)	(18.4)	(58.9)	(17.1)
I have received adequate personal protective equipment training	6	12	104	36
	(3.8)	(7.6)	(65.8)	(22.8)
I have someone to turn to if unsure of the use of personal	5	17	98	38
protective equipment	(3.2)	(10.8)	(62.0)	(24.1)

*SD = “strongly disagree”; D = “disagree”; A = “agree”; SA = “strongly agree”.

266

267 *Factors that might help reduce stress and personal coping strategies*

268 The five most effective stress-reduction factors were 1) PPEs being provided to PCPs by their
269 workplace, 2) clear guidelines for infection prevention, 3) no COVID-19 infections among
270 colleagues after implementing protective measures, 4) loved ones not being infected, and 5)
271 confidence in fellow medical colleagues should the PCPs themselves be infected with
272 COVID-19. The five most often utilized coping strategies by PCPs during this COVID-19
273 outbreak were 1) following strict personal protective measures, 2) reading about COVID-19,
274 its transmission mechanisms and prevention, 3) engaging in relaxation activities such as
275 exercise and prayers, 4) avoiding public spaces to minimize exposure risk, and 5)
276 communicating with loved ones for stress relief and emotional support. Scores and
277 subsequent rankings for each statement are presented in Table 5.

278

Table 5. Response frequencies and summed scores for stress reduction factors and personal coping strategies.

Statement	Not at all effective* (%)	Mildly effective* (%)	Moderately effective* (%)	Extremely effective* (%)	Summed Score
Factors that might help reduce stress (N = 158)					
Positive attitude from colleagues in your workplace	1 (0.6)	15 (9.5)	70 (44.3)	72 (45.6)	529
None of your colleagues getting COVID-19 after starting strict protective measures	2 (1.3)	8 (5.1)	59 (37.3)	89 (56.3)	551
Improvement in COVID-19 patients' condition	5 (3.2)	24 (15.2)	78 (49.4)	51 (32.3)	491
Clear guidelines from workplace for infection prevention	0 (0.0)	8 (5.1)	63 (39.9)	87 (55.1)	553
Personal protective equipment provided to you by workplace	1 (0.6)	5 (3.2)	50 (31.6)	102 (64.6)	569
Your family members or friends not getting COVID-19	2 (1.3)	10 (6.3)	56 (35.4)	90 (57.0)	550
Decrease in COVID-19 cases reported in the news	8 (5.1)	22 (13.9)	56 (35.4)	72 (45.6)	508
Likelihood that you would get extra compensation for your exposure to COVID-19	20 (12.7)	38 (24.1)	51 (32.3)	49 (31.0)	445

All healthcare professionals	2	20	56	80	530
working together on the front line	(1.3)	(12.7)	(35.4)	(50.6)	
Confidence in fellow medical staff	4	10	64	80	536
in case you got sick from COVID-19	(2.5)	(6.3)	(40.5)	(50.6)	
Not having to do overtime	11	37	57	53	468
	(7.0)	(23.4)	(36.1)	(33.5)	
Sharing jokes or humour among colleagues	12	26	67	53	477
	(7.6)	(16.5)	(42.4)	(33.5)	
Getting free meals at your workplace	30	43	50	35	406
	(19.0)	(27.2)	(31.6)	(22.2)	
Statement	Never used** (%)	Sometimes used** (%)	Often used** (%)	Always used** (%)	Summed Score
Personal coping strategies					
(N = 157)					
Followed strict personal protective measures	0	14	59	84	541
	(0.0)	(8.9)	(37.3)	(53.2)	
Kept separate clothes for work or used scrubs to minimize risk of transmission	41	29	36	51	411
	(25.9)	(18.4)	(22.8)	(32.3)	
Considered every patient encountered as COVID-19 case and using full protective gear even if patient was COVID-19 negative	43	44	34	36	377
	(27.2)	(27.8)	(21.5)	(22.8)	

Read about COVID-19, its prevention and mechanisms of transmission	1 (0.6)	15 (9.5)	70 (44.3)	71 (44.9)	525
Avoided going out to public places to minimize COVID-19 exposure	14 (8.9)	48 (30.4)	64 (40.5)	31 (19.6)	426
Did relaxation activities (e.g. involved in prayers, sports, exercise etc.)	15 (9.5)	41 (25.9)	66 (41.8)	35 (22.2)	435
Talked to family and friends to relieve stress and obtain support	13 (8.2)	54 (34.2)	61 (38.6)	29 (18.4)	420
Motivational self-talk to face COVID-19 outbreak with positive attitude	60 (38.0)	50 (31.6)	29 (18.4)	18 (11.4)	319
Talked to fellow colleagues or other doctors to relieve stress and obtain support	14 (8.9)	64 (40.5)	57 (36.1)	22 (13.9)	401
Tried to be busy at home in activities that would keep your mind away from COVID-19	43 (27.2)	56 (35.4)	39 (24.7)	19 (12.0)	348
Avoided doing overtime to reduce exposure to COVID-19 patients	81 (51.3)	41 (25.9)	26 (16.5)	9 (5.7)	277
Avoided media news about COVID-19 and related fatalities	123 (77.8)	23 (14.6)	8 (5.1)	3 (1.9)	205
Vented emotions by crying, screaming etc.	139 (88.0)	13 (8.2)	3 (1.9)	2 (1.3)	182

*For scoring purposes, "not at all effective" = 1 point; "mildly effective" = 2 points; "moderately effective" = 3 points; "extremely effective" = 4 points.

** For scoring purposes, "never used" = 1 point; "sometimes used" = 2 points; "often used" = 3 points; "always used" = 4 points.

279

280 DISCUSSION

281

282 *PCPs' concerns, impact on work and personal life, and outbreak preparedness*

283 The majority of PCPs perceived themselves as being at risk of COVID-19 infection and were
 284 concerned about the risks that they could be bringing to their loved ones. Interestingly, unlike
 285 findings from similar studies conducted in Singapore during the SARS and H5N1 outbreaks,
 286 most PCPs did not feel that they or their loved ones would face social stigmatisation (2, 24).
 287 Moreover, the majority did not feel the need to hide the nature of their work or the risks that
 288 they could potentially face from loved ones and the public. Only a very small proportion of
 289 PCPs had considered resigning from their jobs, and the acceptance and readiness to provide
 290 medical care for COVID-19 patients was very high. PCPs differed in their opinions on
 291 colleagues resigning due to their fears, although a higher proportion (54.4%) responded with
 292 acceptance. Most seemed to feel that the COVID-19 outbreak would increase their workload
 293 and work-related stress, but would not otherwise be a cause of workplace conflict. These
 294 findings suggest a high level of ethical obligation and medical professionalism in our sample
 295 of PCPs to continue serving their communities, despite the personal and family risks
 296 incurred.

297

298 Perceived preparedness for the COVID-19 outbreak was extremely high amongst the sample.

299 There are two possible reasons for this encouraging finding. Firstly, the Singapore Ministry

of Health has gradually strengthened overall pandemic preparedness within the healthcare system since the national experiences of SARS and H1N1, which has resulted in readily available outbreak response frameworks, guidelines and protocols for both healthcare professionals and the lay public (25). The second possibility is that nearly two-thirds of the private practice PCPs in our sample were members of PHPCs. Under this scheme, their medical practices would specifically have been prepared for outbreak management with three months' worth of PPEs provided at no cost, priority medical supplies, and standardized training on infection prevention measures (4, 26).

Stress management and coping strategies among PCPs

Clear infection prevention guidelines and personal protective measures, access to information about COVID-19 and a reliable supply of PPEs were the most important factors for PCPs in coping with stress during the outbreak. This corroborates with what has been reported in SARS and MERS-CoV, where safety precautions and prompt knowledge about the disease were key motivators in incentivizing healthcare professionals to continue providing medical care through an outbreak (17, 27, 28). PCPs also rated the prevention of their medical colleagues and loved ones from being infected with COVID-19 as the next most important factor in their own stress management. This is perhaps expected given the aforementioned finding that PCPs perceived themselves as being a source of infection risk and concern to their family members due to the nature of caring for COVID-19 patients.

As it was with healthcare professionals during the SARS, H1N1 and MERS-CoV outbreaks, PCPs are likely to suffer immense emotional pressure should their colleagues and loved ones fall victim to COVID-19; considerable research has also highlighted the tendency for healthcare professionals to disregard their own physical and mental wellbeing, especially

during crises (17, 27, 29). Health authorities and healthcare institutions should continue to ensure that PCPs are well provisioned not only with PPEs, but also accurate and timely information on COVID-19's disease characteristics, transmission mechanics, as well as best practices to protect themselves, fellow medical colleagues, and – indirectly – their loved ones during this pandemic. Healthcare institutions should also seek to monitor their PCPs' mental health and provide stress management services; studies post-SARS have cautioned that PCPs and other healthcare professionals directly involved with outbreak management are at heightened risk of psychological distress or post-traumatic stress disorder (30, 31). Stress management strategies could take the form of both formal and informal peer support groups, crisis counselling hotlines, or provisions for personal as well as group mindfulness exercises (29, 32).

Limitations and implications for future research

As this study was designed to meet the expediencies of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, several key limitations must be taken into consideration. Most significantly, the generalisability of our findings is limited by the non-random sampling strategy employed and the low response rate. This was perhaps expected due to the frontline and high intensity nature of PCPs' roles as outbreak control efforts continue to implemented in Singapore, and we recognize that our findings may only represent PCPs who were able to find the time to respond amidst their hectic schedules.

We also recognize that the quantitative descriptive nature of the present study could mean that PCPs may have had other concerns that were not included in our questionnaire. We were also unable to qualitatively probe the stress-reduction and coping strategies to understand the

opinions of PCPs on how the government or healthcare institutions might be able to better support their needs.

Future studies could seek to overcome some of these limitations by implementing a more rigorous, probabilistic sampling strategy and utilizing mixed-methods designs to include qualitative interviews with PCPs. Nonetheless, the feasibility of these suggestions will inevitably depend on the progress of the COVID-19 pandemic in Singapore and around the world; social distancing measures and overwhelmed healthcare systems, for example, may prove to be immense challenges in conducting research with PCPs or other healthcare professionals.

CONCLUSIONS

The COVID-19 pandemic seems to show no signs of any return to normalcy in healthcare within the near future, and primary care must – by necessity – remain on the frontlines of any national outbreak control strategy. We conclude by reiterating the Commission on a Global Health Risk Framework for the Future’s recommendation that primary care is inseparable with public health efforts in any pandemic, for a health system without effective and resilient primary care capabilities will lack the critical ability to quickly identify cases and mount a suitable infection prevention response (10). While PCPs continue to profess a steadfast commitment to pandemic preparedness and medical professionalism during such trying times, health systems should strive to ensure that their psychosocial and professional needs are well taken care of holistically.

373

References

- 374 1. World Health Organization. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation
375 Reports - 58. 2020.
- 376 2. Wong TY, Koh GC, Cheong SK, Sundram M, Koh K, Chia SE, et al. A cross-
377 sectional study of primary-care physicians in Singapore on their concerns and preparedness
378 for an avian influenza outbreak. *Annals of the Academy of Medicine, Singapore*.
379 2008;37(6):458-64.
- 380 3. Ministry of Health Singapore. Primary Care Survey 2014. 2014.
- 381 4. Primary Care Pages. MOH National Schemes: Public Health Preparedness Clinic
382 (PHPC) 2019 [Available from: [https://www.primarycarepages.sg/practice-management/moh-](https://www.primarycarepages.sg/practice-management/moh-national-schemes/public-health-preparedness-clinic-phpc)
383 [national-schemes/public-health-preparedness-clinic-phpc](https://www.primarycarepages.sg/practice-management/moh-national-schemes/public-health-preparedness-clinic-phpc)].
- 384 5. Ministry of Health Singapore. Primary Healthcare Services 2019 [Available from:
385 [https://www.moh.gov.sg/home/our-healthcare-system/healthcare-services-and-](https://www.moh.gov.sg/home/our-healthcare-system/healthcare-services-and-facilities/primary-healthcare-services)
386 [facilities/primary-healthcare-services](https://www.moh.gov.sg/home/our-healthcare-system/healthcare-services-and-facilities/primary-healthcare-services)].
- 387 6. Ministry of Health Singapore. Past Updates on COVID-19 Local Situation 2020
388 [Available from: <https://www.moh.gov.sg/covid-19/past-updates>].
- 389 7. Ministry of Health Ontario. COVID-19 Guidance: Primary Care Providers in a
390 Community Setting. 2020.
- 391 8. Public Health England. COVID-19: Interim guidance for primary care 2020
392 [Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wn-cov-guidance-for-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wn-cov-guidance-for-primary-care/wn-cov-interim-guidance-for-primary-care)
393 [primary-care/wn-cov-interim-guidance-for-primary-care](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wn-cov-guidance-for-primary-care/wn-cov-interim-guidance-for-primary-care)].
- 394 9. Razai MS, Doerholt K, Ladhani S, Oakeshott P. Coronavirus disease 2019 (covid-19):
395 a guide for UK GPs. *BMJ*. 2020;368.
- 396 10. The National Academy of Medicine. The Neglected Dimension of Global Security: A
397 Framework to Counter Infectious Disease Crises. Washington, DC: The National Academies
398 Press; 2016. 142 p.
- 399 11. Chee Y. Heroes and heroines of the war on SARS. *Singapore medical journal*.
400 2003;44(5):221-8.
- 401 12. Wong JE, Leo YS, Tan CC. COVID-19 in Singapore—current experience: critical
402 global issues that require attention and action. *Jama*. 2020.
- 403 13. Bai Y, Lin C-C, Lin C-Y, Chen J-Y, Chue C-M, Chou P. Survey of stress reactions
404 among health care workers involved with the SARS outbreak. *Psychiatric Services*.
405 2004;55(9):1055-7.
- 406 14. Wong W, Lee A, Tsang K, Wong S. How did general practitioners protect
407 themselves, their family, and staff during the SARS epidemic in Hong Kong? *Journal of*
408 *Epidemiology & Community Health*. 2004;58(3):180-5.
- 409 15. Wong TY, Koh GC, Cheong SK, Lee HY, Fong YT, Sundram M, et al. Concerns,
410 perceived impact and preparedness in an avian influenza pandemic--a comparative study
411 between healthcare workers in primary and tertiary care. *Annals-Academy Of Medicine*
412 *Singapore*. 2008;37(2):96.
- 413 16. Abolfotouh MA, AlQarni AA, Al-Ghamdi SM, Salam M, Al-Assiri MH, Balkhy HH.
414 An assessment of the level of concern among hospital-based health-care workers regarding
415 MERS outbreaks in Saudi Arabia. *BMC infectious diseases*. 2017;17(1):4.
- 416 17. Khalid I, Khalid TJ, Qabajah MR, Barnard AG, Qushmaq IA. Healthcare workers
417 emotions, perceived stressors and coping strategies during a MERS-CoV outbreak. *Clinical*
418 *medicine & research*. 2016;14(1):7-14.
- 419 18. National University Health System. About NUHS: Corporate Profile 2020 [Available
420 from: <https://www.nuhs.edu.sg/About-NUHS/Pages/corporate-profile.aspx>].

19. National University Health System. Care in the Community: Primary Care Network 2020 [Available from: <https://www.nuhs.edu.sg/Care-in-the-Community/Living-Well/Pages/Primary-Care-Network.aspx>.]
20. National University Polyclinics. Corporate Profile. 2019.
21. College of Family Physicians Singapore. Professional Development of the Family Physician n.d. [Available from: <https://www.cfps.org.sg/programmes/professional-development-of-the-family-physician/>.]
22. IBM Corp. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 22.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.; 2013.
23. Tavakol M, Dennick R. Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *Int J Med Educ*. 2011;2:53-5.
24. Koh D, Lim MK, Chia SE, Ko SM, Qian F, Ng V, et al. Risk Perception and Impact of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) on Work and Personal Lives of Healthcare Workers in Singapore What Can We Learn? *Medical Care*. 2005;676-82.
25. Ministry of Health Singapore. MOH Pandemic Readiness and Response Plan for Influenza and Other Acute Respiratory Diseases. 2014.
26. Min AH. COVID-19 outbreak: What you need to know about the Public Health Preparedness Clinics. *Channel News Asia*. 2020.
27. Lee S-H, Juang Y-Y, Su Y-J, Lee H-L, Lin Y-H, Chao C-C. Facing SARS: psychological impacts on SARS team nurses and psychiatric services in a Taiwan general hospital. *General hospital psychiatry*. 2005;27(5):352-8.
28. Simonds A, Sokol D. Lives on the line? Ethics and practicalities of duty of care in pandemics and disasters. *European Respiratory Journal*. 2009;34(2):303-9.
29. Chan AO, Huak CY. Psychological impact of the 2003 severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak on health care workers in a medium size regional general hospital in Singapore. *Occupational Medicine*. 2004;54(3):190-6.
30. Chan KL, Chau WW, Kuriansky J, Dow E, Zinsou JC, Leung J, et al. The psychosocial and interpersonal impact of the SARS epidemic on Chinese health professionals: Implications for epidemics, including Ebola. *The Psychosocial Aspects of a Deadly Epidemic: What Ebola Has Taught Us about Holistic Healing: What Ebola Has Taught Us about Holistic Healing*. 2016:287.
31. Verma S, Mythily S, Chan Y, Deslypere J, Teo E, Chong S. Post-SARS psychological morbidity and stigma among general practitioners and traditional Chinese medicine practitioners in Singapore. *Annals of the Academy of Medicine, Singapore*. 2004;33(6):743-8.
32. Krasner MS, Epstein RM, Beckman H, Suchman AL, Chapman B, Mooney CJ, et al. Association of an educational program in mindful communication with burnout, empathy, and attitudes among primary care physicians. *Jama*. 2009;302(12):1284-93.