

Women in Health Care Experiencing Occupational Stress and Burnout during COVID-19: A Review

Abi Sriharan, MSc, D.Phil (Corresponding Author)
Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation,
Dalla Lana School of Public Health,
University of Toronto
Abi.sriharan@utoronto.ca

Savithiri Ratnapalan, MD, PhD
Department of Pediatrics and Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto. Hospital for
Sick Children, Toronto
Savithiri.ratnapalan@sickkids.ca

Andrea C. Tricco, PhD
Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, Unity Health Toronto; Epidemiology Division
and Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, Dalla Lana School of Public Health,
University of Toronto, Queen's Collaboration for Health Care Quality Joanna Briggs Institute Centre of
Excellence, Queen's University
Andrea.tricco@unityhealth.to

Doina Lupea, MD
Ontario Medical Association, Physician Health Program
Dlupea2019@gmail.com

Corresponding Author

Abi Sriharan, MSc, D.Phil (Corresponding Author)
Assistant Professor and Program Director, Systems Leadership and Innovation
Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation,
Dalla Lana School of Public Health,
University of Toronto
Phone: 1-416-946-0911
Email: abi.sriharan@utoronto.ca

Word Count: 2855

List of Abbreviation

PROSPERO International database of prospectively registered systematic reviews

HCWs Health care workers

PRISMA Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses

PPE Personal Protective Equipment

Declaration Page

Ethical Approval and consent to participate: Not required. This study used published data.

Patients or public: Patients were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research. The study involved women in health care in the design, conduct, dissemination of our research.

Consent for publication Authors give full consent to publish this article. This manuscript has not been published elsewhere.

Availability of data and materials: This review is registered with the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/y8fdh/?view_only=1d943ec3ddb4f5c8f6a9290eca2ece7).

Competing interests None declared.

Funding This research was supported through a grant from the Canadian Institute for Health Research Operating Grant: Knowledge Synthesis: COVID-19 in Mental Health & Substance Use. AT is funded by a Tier 2 Canada Research Chair in Knowledge Synthesis.

Author Contributors AS, SR, AT, and DL conceptualised and designed the review. AS, APA, SC, HP and DDL reviewed titles, abstracts and full-text papers for eligibility. AS, HP, SC, and DDL were responsible for extracting data and all data extraction was verified by AS prepared the initial draft manuscript. SR, AT, DL reviewed and edited the manuscript.

Acknowledgement Authors acknowledge the contribution by Hilary Pang, Ana Patricia Ayala, Dongjoo Lee, Sabine Caleja who helped with article retrieval and screening.

Women in Health Care Experiencing Occupational Stress and Burnout during COVID-19: A Review

Abstract

Context: COVID-19 has had an unprecedented impact on physicians, nurses, and other health professionals around the world, and a serious health care burnout crisis is emerging as a result of this pandemic.

Objectives: We aim to identify the causes of occupational stress and burnout in women in medicine, nursing, and other health professions during the COVID-19 pandemic and interventions that can support female health professionals deal with this crisis through a rapid review.

Methods: We searched MEDLINE, Embase, CINAHL, PsycINFO, and ERIC from December 2019 through September 30, 2020. The review protocol was registered in PROSPERO and is available online. We selected all empirical studies that discussed stress and burnout in women health care workers during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Results: The literature search identified 6148 citations. A review of abstracts led to the retrieval of 721 full-text articles for assessment, of which 47 articles were included for review. Our findings show that concerns of safety (65%), staff and resource adequacy (43%), workload and compensation (37%), job roles and security (41%) appeared as common triggers of stress in the literature.

Conclusions and Relevance: The current literature primarily focuses on self-focused initiatives such as wellness activities, coping strategies, reliance of family, friends and work colleagues to organizational led initiatives such as access to psychological support and training. Very limited

evidence exists about the organizational interventions such as work modification, financial security, and systems improvement.

Keywords: Coronavirus, COVID-19, women in health care, stress, burnout, depression

Introduction

The health sector is facing an unprecedented burden due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Health care workers (HCWs) are at the frontline providing essential services, and they are experiencing increased harassment, stigmatization, physical violence, and psychological trauma, including increased rates of burnout, depression, anxiety, substance abuse, and suicide due to COVID-19^{1,2,3,4}. Amnesty International has recorded the deaths of over 7000 health workers worldwide due to COVID-19. In the United States alone, over 250,000 health workers have been infected, and nearly 1000 deaths have occurred^{5,6}.

Women in health care experience specific challenges with adapting to COVID-19–related public health measures, in addition to the preexisting systemic challenges related to workplace gender bias, discrimination, sexual harassment, and inequities⁷. The pandemic has taken a disproportionate toll on women in the workplace⁸. Women make up 75% of HCWs globally⁹. Female physicians are already more likely than male physicians to experience depression, burnout, and suicidal ideation^{10,11}. On average, women performed 2.5 times of unpaid work per day compared to men as parents and primary caregivers to family members¹².

In this review, we explore factors that may influence stress and burnout in women health professionals and describe how different type of intervention organizations can offer to support women health professionals.

METHODS

Overall Objectives

The overall objectives of this review are to (a) explore the triggers of occupational stress, and burnout faced by women in health care during the COVID-19 pandemic and (b) identify interventions that can support their well-being through a systematic review.

Materials and Methods

We conducted a rapid review in accordance with the WHO Rapid Review Guide¹³ and reported using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA). The review protocol was registered in PROSPERO and is available online (CRD42020189750).

Ethical Considerations

This study used secondary data analysis using published research; therefore, it did not require submission to the Research Ethics Committee.

Theoretical Model

The WHO classified burnout and occupation stress as an occupational phenomenon¹⁴. In this context, we used Bolman and Deal's (2017) four-frame model of leadership to understand the stress and burnout experienced by women health professionals¹⁵. The four-frame model provides an approach to describe organizational issues through four perspectives: structural, human resource, symbolic and political. The structural frame focuses on rules, roles, strategy, policies, technology, and work environment. The human resource frame considers individual

needs, skills, and relationships. The political frame examines power, conflict, competition, and organizational politics, and the symbolic frame includes culture, meaning, rituals, and stories.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the rapid review: What are the triggers of stress and burnout in women in health care? What interventions are effective in preventing occupational stress and burnout?

Eligibility Criteria

The eligibility criteria are included in Table 1. First, we were only interested in articles published from December 2019 to September 30, 2020 (the last day of the literature search). We chose this timeframe to include research related to experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic. Our study specifically focused on the experiences of women in health care, encompassing a broad array of health professionals including doctors, nurses, pharmacists, midwives, paramedics, physical therapists, technicians, personnel support workers, and community health workers. We only included articles that focused primarily on women in health care or that provided a breakdown of data according to sex/gender. Given the transboundary nature of the COVID-19 pandemic, we included articles published globally. We defined occupational stress as the degree to which one feels overwhelmed and unable to cope as a result of unmanageable work-related pressures, and we defined burnout as the experience of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, or cynicism, along with feelings of diminished personal efficacy or accomplishment in the context of the work environment¹⁶. We included primary where data were

collected and analyzed using objective quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods. We excluded editorials and opinion pieces.

[INSERT TABLE 1]

Search Methods and Information Sources

We conducted comprehensive literature search strategies in the following electronic databases: MEDLINE (via Ovid), Embase (via Ovid), CINAHL (via EBSCOhost), PsycINFO (via Ovid), and ERIC (via ProQuest). We developed our search strategies via an academic health sciences librarian with input from the research team. The search was originally built in MEDLINE Ovid and peer-reviewed using the Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies tool¹⁷. We limited our searches to articles published in English no later than September 30, 2020. The final search results were exported into Covidence, review management software, where duplicates were identified and removed.

Screening Process

To minimize selection bias, we piloted 20 citations against *a priori* inclusion and exclusion criteria. After high agreement was achieved, two reviewers independently screened all citations. Conflicts were resolved by discussion or via a third reviewer. The same process was used for full-text screening of potentially eligible studies.

Rating of the Quality of Evidence

The strength of data and subsequent recommendations for interventions were graded according to the Quality Rating Scheme for Studies and Other Evidence by two reviewers independently, with discrepancies resolved after joint review and discussion¹⁸.

Data Extraction

We used a predefined data extraction form to extract data from the papers included in the rapid review. To ensure the integrity of the assessment, we piloted the data extraction form on 3 studies. We extracted the following information from the studies: the first author, year of publication, health professionals enrolled in the study, geographic location, study methods, quality of evidence, triggers of stress and burnout, interventions, and outcomes.

Data Synthesis

Due to heterogeneity of data collected in the included studies, meta-analysis was not appropriate. Instead, we thematically synthesized the data using the thematic analysis process described in Clarke et al. (2012) and grouped the triggers using Bolman and Deal's (1991) four frame model of leadership¹⁹.

Results

Search Results

The literature search resulted in a total of 6148 records. After 1606 duplicates were removed, 4542 records remained to be screened. We assessed 721 full-text articles and found 47 published studies with 18,668 female health workers met our inclusion criteria. The PRISMA flowchart presents the selection of publications (see Figure 1).

[insert Figure 1]

Characteristics of Studies

Our search identified 47 eligible studies. Of these, 39 (83%) were cross-sectional studies and 8 (17%) were qualitative studies. Studies came from Asia (34%), Europe (27.6%), Middle East (14.9%), North America (19.1%) and Latin America (2%) (see Table 1). These studies

focused on physicians (74%), nurses (57%), and other health professionals (45%; including dentists, personal support workers, pharmacists, and administrative professionals). The study samples often included both male and women health professionals; however, these studies also provided gender-based breakdowns. In all, 62% of the total 29,398 study population focused on female health professionals.

[INSERT TABLE 1 here]

Triggers of Stress and Burnout Faced by Women in Health Care

Primary forces of stress and burnout in women in health care during COVID-19 were related to structural factors (i.e., organizational resources, work related policies, and roles). Resource adequacy (43%), related to lack of appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) and staffing shortages, was discussed as a major driver of stress and burnout in the included studies. Stress and burnout intensity differed between health professionals who had indirect patient care and direct clinical care of COVID-19 patients. A total of 43% of the studies reported that caring for COVID-19 patients increased stress and burnout; 38% of the studies reported HCWs faced an increased workload due increased number of COVID-19 patients under their care, and they were not appropriately compensated for the workload.

Regarding the human resource perspective, safety concerns and fears of getting infected with COVID-19 and putting family members at risk (66%) appeared to be the primary causes of stress and burnout. Female gender (34%) and age and family status (19%) also emerged as determinants of risk of stress and burnout. Specifically, being young with no family or being a mother with young children influenced emotional stress and burnout in women. Similarly, less

work experience and self-perception about lack of competency to care for COVID-19 patients was associated with increased prevalence of stress and burnout (26%).

In terms of the symbolic frame, concerns about organizational culture (26%), patient care protocols (17%), and societal experiences of health professionals (26%) emerged as common triggers of stress. More specifically, issues related to ambiguous patient care protocols and perceived lack of infection control guidelines influenced stress and burnout. Similarly, the organizational culture, including lack of support and recognition by peers, supervisors, and hospital leadership, were triggers of stress and burnout in women health professionals. From a macro cultural perspective, the societal and media portrayal of health care workers as “heroes” increased moral responsibility and caused increased stress to meet these expectations, yet health professionals faced increased social isolation and stigma as they were considered as contagious by the general population.

From the political perspective, the government-level social distancing protocols increased social isolation (15%). Further, lack of pandemic preparedness (2%), poor public health guidance on screening and treatment (4%), and measures related to infrastructure such as delayed testing and lack of treatment for COVID-19 patients (4%) exacerbated to stress and burnout in women HCWs.

[INSERT TABLE 2 here]

Interventions That Can Support the Well-Being of Women HCWs during a Pandemic

Only 38.3% studies have examined potential interventions to support women in health care with COVID-19–related stress and burnout. We grouped the interventions on a spectrum ranging from self-focused intervention to systems-focused interventions (see Table 3). 29.7%

included studies primarily focused on addressing well-being and resiliency at the individual level. The current literature discussed self-initiated interventions such as regular exercise, wellness activities such as yoga and meditation, faith-based activities, self-help resources, hobbies, psychological services such as therapists, hotlines, and talk therapy as treatment strategies and other adaptive coping mechanisms as useful preventative strategies for women. From a structural perspective, 21.5% of included studies recommended systems-level interventions such as work modifications, ensuring clear communication about policies, providing access to PPE, offering training related to managing COVID-19, instituting measures to support health professionals financially, providing rest areas for sleep and recovery, offering basic physical needs such as food, and including training programs to improve resiliency were considered potential strategies to support women in healthcare during the pandemic.

[insert TABLE 3 here]

However, these studies did not provide evidence on the effectiveness and utility of these interventions in helping women in health care. There was, however, emerging evidence on the use of maladaptive coping mechanisms such as avoidant coping and substance use^{26,47,52}.

Discussion

In this rapid review, we examined the triggering factors of occupational stress and burnout in women in health care in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and potential interventions to mitigate these factors. We provided an overview of the evidence and identification of potential variables that influence the mental health well-being of women in healthcare. The current research literature primarily focuses on prevalence of stress, burnout, depression, and anxiety using a cross-sectional approach to show the presence of these elements

at a particular point in time. Further, it looks at burnout as an individual issue that can be mitigated by self-help solutions such as coping, yoga, mindfulness, and practicing resilience. However, very weak evidence exists on the effectiveness of these interventions on women in health care (see figure 2).

[INSERT FIGURE 2 here]

In health care, there is limited understanding about burnout as an occupational phenomenon⁶⁵. First, there is a gap in the literature regarding how organizations can shape the structures, cultures, and processes to address the elements that triggers of stress and burnout. Similarly, there is a limited understanding of how race, culture, leadership, and profession impact occupational stress and burnout during COVID-19. For example, 1 in 3 nurses who have died of COVID-19 in the United States are from the Filipino community⁶⁶. Similarly, there is a lack of understanding of burnout by occupation type. Physician burnout has received a lot of attention over the past decade, but very limited evidence exists regarding the burnout experienced by other health professionals, including support staff such as personal support workers who are at the frontlines of caring for patients in long-term care and nursing homes.

Similarly, there is very little evidence on how political factors such as policies and public health measures influence individual level burnout. For example, the US Families First Coronavirus Response Act, which required employers to provide up to 80 hours of paid sick leave for reasons related to COVID-19, allowed a provision to exclude health care workers (HCWs) from these benefits. A scan of social media discussions of this showed a significant stress and anxiety among HCWs. Future studies should move beyond cross-sectional studies and explore the contexts, factors, organizational and systems variables, and mechanisms that

influence stress and burnout variables to better understand the determinants of stress and burnout in women.

Further, there is very limited evidence on the impact of stress and burnout on quality of care, patient safety, employee engagement, and staff attrition and absenteeism during COVID-19. Future studies on stress and burnout among HCWs should look at the short-, medium-, and long-term impact to health care systems. Specifically, research is needed to understand how COVID-19 will affect women health professional's decisions about work.

There are several strengths to the current rapid review. To our knowledge, this is the first review that attempted to look at stress and burnout experienced by women in health care as an occupation phenomenon and that explored common triggers of stress and burnout during the COVID-19 pandemic. Our rapid review was guided by the Boleman and Deal's four-frames theoretical organizational theoretical framework to understand the contextual factors through the lens of structural, human resources, politics, and symbolism. Our methodology was guided by the WHO guidelines on Rapid Reviews and reported using the PRISMA guidelines. The studies included in the review represent a global perspective of the issues. We highlighted the important gap in current understanding related to occupational stress and burnout in Women in Health Care.

The current literature on stress and burnout related to COVID-19 includes both male and female health professionals. Although the studies included in this review provided gender breakdowns in the sample framework and discussed gender related factors, it lacked gender-based subgroup analysis of what interventions are specifically effective for women in health care. Further, our data analysis was limited by the variability of measurement instruments and lack of reporting on structural, political and cultural context of stress and burnout.

There is a significant data gap on the impact of COVID-19 on women in health care. We recommend that national health professional organizations develop comprehensive data gathering and monitoring strategies to improve the science of health professional burnout research.

Conclusion

Organizational leaders and research scholars should consider occupational stress and burnout as an organizational phenomenon and provide organizational-level support for HCWs. To improve occupational wellness for women in health care, organizations should attempt to engage their health care workforce to listen to their concerns, consider the specific context of the workforce, and design targeted interventions based on their identified needs.

References

1. Bagcchi S. Stigma during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet. Infectious Diseases*. 2020;20(7):782.
2. Mock J. Psychological trauma is the next crisis for coronavirus health workers. *Scientific American*. 2020, Jun 1; <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/psychological-trauma-is-the-next-crisis-for-coronavirus-health-workers>.
3. Orr C. “COVID-19 kills in many ways”: The suicide crisis facing health-care workers. *Canada’s National Observer*. 2020, Apr 29. <https://www.nationalobserver.com/2020/04/29/analysis/covid-19-kills-many-ways-suicide-crisis-facing-health-care-workers>.
4. Roycroft M, Wilkes D, Fleming S, Pattani S, Olsson-Brown A. Preventing psychological injury during the covid-19 pandemic. *BMJ*. 2020 May 4;369:m1702. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1702. PMID: 32366504.
5. Amnesty International. Global: Amnesty analysis reveals over 7,000 health workers have died from COVID-19. 2020, Sep 3. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2020/09/amnesty-analysis-7000-health-workers-have-died-from-covid19>.
6. CDC. Cases & deaths among healthcare personnel. <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#health-care-personnel>.
7. Ghebreyesus T. Female health workers drive global health. 2019. <https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/female-health-workers-drive-global-healthMarch2019>.
8. Brubaker L. Women physicians and the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA*. 2020;324(9):835-836. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.14797.
9. World Health Organization. *Gender and health workforce statistics*. Geneva: Human Resources for Health; 2008. <https://www.who.int/hrh/statistics/spotlight2/en/>.
10. Gold KJ, Andrew LB, Goldman EB, Schwenk TL. “I would never want to have a mental health diagnosis on my record”: A survey of female physicians on mental health diagnosis, treatment, and reporting. *General Hospital Psychiatry*. 2016;43:51-57.
11. Guille C, Frank E, Zhao Z, et al. Work-family conflict and the sex difference in depression among training physicians. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2017;177(12):1766-1772.

12. UN Women. Redistribute unpaid work. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/news/in-focus/csw61/redistribute-unpaid-work>. Accessed Dec 6 2020.
13. Tricco AC, Langlois EV, Straus SE (eds.). *Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: A practical guide*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2017. <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/258698/9789241512763-eng.pdf?sequence=1>.
14. World Health Organization. *International statistical classification of diseases and related health problems* (11th ed.). Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020.
15. Bolman LG, Deal TE. *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. John Wiley & Sons; 2017.
16. Templeton K, Bernstein CA, Sukhera J, et al. Gender-based differences in burnout: Issues faced by women physicians. *NAM Perspectives*. 2019.
17. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, Cogo E, Foerster V, Lefebvre C. (2016). Peer review of electronic search strategies: 2015 guideline statement. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2016;75:40-46.
18. JAMA. Quality Rating Scheme for Studies and Other Evidence. <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/pages/instructions-for-authors#SecRatingsofQuality>
19. Clarke, Victoria, Virginia Braun, and Nikki Hayfield. "Thematic analysis." *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods* (2015): 222-248.
20. Cai H, Tu B, Ma J, et al. Psychological impact and coping strategies of frontline medical staff in Hunan between January and March 2020 during the outbreak of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Hubei, China. *Medical Science Monitor*. 2020;26:e924171-1.
21. De Stefani A, Bruno G, Mutinelli S, Gracco A. (2020). COVID-19 outbreak perception in Italian dentists. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17(11):3867.
22. Elbay RY, Kurtulmuş A, Arpacioğlu S, Karadere E. Depression, anxiety, stress levels of physicians and associated factors in Covid-19 Pandemics. *Psychiatry Research*. 2020,113130.
23. Fargen KM, Leslie-Mazwi TM, Klucznik RP, et al.. The professional and personal impact of the coronavirus pandemic on US neurointerventional practices: A nationwide survey. *Journal of NeuroInterventional Surgery*. 2020;12(10):927-931. <https://doi.org/10.1136/neurintsurg-2020-016513>.
24. Gao X, Jiang L, Hu Y, Li L, Hou L. (2020). Nurses' experiences regarding shift patterns in isolation wards during the COVID-19 pandemic in China: A qualitative study. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*. 2020;29(21-22):4270-4280. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15464>.
25. Hoffman KE, Garner D, Koong AC, Woodward WA. Understanding the intersection of working from home and burnout to optimize post-COVID19 work arrangements in radiation oncology. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology*Biophysics*Physics*. 2020;108(2):370-373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2020.06.062>
26. Kackin O, Ciydem E, Aci OS, Kutlu FY. (2020). Experiences and psychosocial problems of nurses caring for patients diagnosed with COVID-19 in Turkey: A qualitative study. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764020942788>.
27. Kang L, Ma S, Chen M, et al.. (2020). Impact on mental health and perceptions of psychological care among medical and nursing staff in Wuhan during the 2019 novel coronavirus disease outbreak: A cross-sectional study. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity*.
28. Karimi Z, Fereidouni Z, Behnammoghadam M., et al.. (2020). The lived experience of nurses caring for patients with COVID-19 in Iran: A phenomenological study. *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy*. 2020;13:1271-1278. <https://doi.org/10.2147/RMHP.S258785>.
29. Khalafallah AM, Lam S, Gami A, et al. Burnout and career satisfaction among attending neurosurgeons during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Clinical Neurology and Neurosurgery*. 2020;198:106193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clineuro.2020.106193>.
30. Lai J, Ma S, Wang Y, et al. Factors associated with mental health outcomes among health care workers exposed to coronavirus disease 2019. *JAMA Network Open*. 2020;3(3):e203976-e203976.
31. Li G, Miao J, Wang H, et al. Psychological impact on women health workers involved in COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*. 2020.
32. Liu CY, Yang YZ, Zhang XM, et al. The prevalence and influencing factors in anxiety in medical workers fighting COVID-19 in China: A cross-sectional survey. *Epidemiology & Infection*. 2020; 1-17.
33. Martínez-López JÁ, Lázaro-Pérez C, Gómez-Galán J, Fernández-Martínez M. Psychological impact of COVID-19 emergency on health professionals: Burnout incidence at the most critical period in Spain. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*. 2020;9(9):3029. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm9093029>.
34. Moorthy A, Sankar TK. Emerging public health challenge in UK: Perception and belief on increased

- COVID19 death among BAME health care workers. *Journal of Public Health*. 2020;42(3):486-492. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdaa096>.
35. Mosheva M, Hertz-Palmor N, Dorman Ilan S, et al. Anxiety, pandemic-related stress and resilience among physicians during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Depression and Anxiety*. 2020.
 36. Ng BH, Nuratiqah NA, Faisal AH, et al. A descriptive study of the psychological experience of health care workers in close contact with a person with COVID-19. *The Medical Journal of Malaysia*. 2020;75(5):485-489.
 37. Nowicki GJ, Ślusarska B, Tucholska K, Naylor K, Chrzan-Rodak A, Niedorys B. The severity of traumatic stress associated with COVID-19 pandemic, perception of support, sense of security, and sense of meaning in life among nurses: Research protocol and preliminary results from Poland. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17(18):6491. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17186491>.
 38. Nyashanu M, Pfende F, Ekpenyong M. Exploring the challenges faced by frontline workers in health and social care amid the COVID-19 pandemic: Experiences of frontline workers in the English Midlands region, UK. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*. 2020;34(5):655-661. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13561820.2020.1792425>.
 39. Osama M, Zaheer F, Saeed H, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on surgical residency programs in Pakistan; A residents' T perspective. Do programs need formal restructuring to adjust with the "new normal"? A cross-sectional survey study. *International Journal of Surgery*. 2020;6.
 40. Prasad A, Civantos AM, Byrnes Y, et al. Snapshot impact of COVID-19 on mental wellness in nonphysician otolaryngology health care workers: A national study. *OTO Open*. 2020;4(3):2473974X2094883. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2473974X20948835>
 41. Rabbani U, Saigul AMA. Knowledge, attitude and practices of health care workers about coronavirus disease 2019 in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Epidemiology and Global Health*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.2991/jegh.k.200819.002>.
 42. Rodriguez RM, Medak AJ, Baumann BM, et al. Academic emergency medicine physicians' anxiety levels, stressors, and potential stress mitigation measures during the acceleration phase of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Academic Emergency Medicine*. 2020;27(8):700-707. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.14065>
 43. Ruiz-Fernández MD, Ramos-Pichardo JD, Ibáñez-Masero O, Cabrera-Troya J, Carmona-Rega MI, Ortega-Galán ÁM. Compassion fatigue, burnout, compassion satisfaction and perceived stress in health care professionals during the COVID-19 health crisis in Spain. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*. 2020;29(21-22):4321-4330. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15469>.
 44. Rymarowicz J, Stefura T, Major P, et al. General surgeons' attitudes towards COVID-19: A national survey during the SARS-CoV-2 virus outbreak. *European Surgery*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10353-020-00649-w>.
 45. Sandesh R, Shahid W, Dev K, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on the mental health of healthcare professionals in Pakistan. *Cureus*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.8974>.
 46. Shah N, Raheem A, Sideris M, Velauthar L, Saeed F. Mental health amongst obstetrics and gynaecology doctors during the COVID-19 pandemic: Results of a UK-wide study. *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*. 2020;253:90-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2020.07.060>.
 47. Shalhoub S, Mouawad NJ, Malgor RD, et al. Global vascular surgeons' experience, stressors, and coping during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. *Journal of Vascular Surgery*. 2020;15.
 48. Sharma M, Creutzfeldt CJ, Lewis A, et al. Healthcare professionals' perceptions of critical care resource availability and factors associated with mental well-being during COVID-19: Results from a US survey. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1311>.
 49. Shechter A, Diaz F., Moise, N., et al. New York health care workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *General Hospital Psychiatry*. 2020;9.
 50. Si MY, Su XY, Jiang Y, et al. (2020). Psychological impact of COVID-19 on medical care workers in China. *Infect Dis Poverty*. 2020;9(113). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40249-020-00724-0>.
 51. Sil A, Das A, Jaiswal S, et al. (2020). Mental health assessment of frontline COVID-19 dermatologists: A pan-Indian multicentric cross-sectional study. *Dermatologic Therapy*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dth.13884>.
 52. Silczuk A. Threatening increase in alcohol consumption in physicians quarantined due to coronavirus outbreak in Poland: The ALCOVID survey. *Journal of Public Health*. 2020;42(3):461-465. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdaa110>.
 53. Smith PM, Oudyk J, Potter G, Mustard C. The association between the perceived adequacy of workplace infection control procedures and personal protective equipment with mental health symptoms: A cross-

- sectional survey of Canadian health-care workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743720961729>
54. Spiller TR, Méan M, Ernst J, et al. Development of health care workers' mental health during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in Switzerland: Two cross-sectional studies. *Psychological Medicine*. 2020;1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291720003128>.
 55. Stojanov J, Malobabic M, Stanojevic G, Stevic M, Milosevic V, Stojanov A. Quality of sleep and health-related quality of life among health care professionals treating patients with coronavirus disease-19. *The International Journal of Social Psychiatry*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764020942800>.
 56. Suryavanshi N, Kadam A, Dhumal G, et al. Mental health and quality of life among health care professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic in India. *Brain and Behavior*. 2020;10(11). <https://doi.org/10.1002/brb3.1837>.
 57. Tan R, Yu T, Luo K, et al. Experiences of clinical first-line nurses treating patients with COVID-19: A qualitative study. *Journal of Nursing Management*. 2020;28(6):1381-1390.
 58. Tamsah MH, Alhuzaimi AN, Alamro N, et al. (2020). Knowledge, attitudes and practices of health care workers during the early COVID-19 pandemic in a main, academic tertiary care centre in Saudi Arabia. *Epidemiology and Infection*. 2020;148:e203. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268820001958>.
 59. Thomaier L, Teoh D, Jewett P, et al. Emotional health concerns of oncology physicians in the United States: Fallout during the COVID-19 pandemic. *MedRxiv*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.11.20128702>
 60. Tsan SEH, Kamalanathan A., Lee CK, Zakaria SA, Wang CY. A survey on burnout and depression risk among anaesthetists during COVID-19: The tip of an iceberg? *Anaesthesia*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anae.15231>.
 61. Uvais NA, Shihabudheen P, Hafi NB. Perceived stress and stigma among doctors working in COVID-19-designated hospitals in India. *The primary care companion for CNS disorders*. 2020;22(4):20br02724.
 62. Xiao, X., et al. (2020). Psychological impact of health care workers in China during COVID-19 pneumonia epidemic: A multi-center cross-sectional survey investigation. *Journal of Affective Disorders*. 2020;274:405-410.
 63. Zhang SX, Liu J, Jahanshahi AA, et al. At the height of the storm: Healthcare staff's health conditions and job satisfaction and their associated predictors during the epidemic peak of COVID-19. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity*. 2020.
 64. Zhang SX, Sun S, Afshar Jahanshahi A, et al. Developing and testing a measure of COVID-19 organizational support of health care workers—Results from Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia. *Psychiatry Research*. 2020;291:113174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113174>.
 65. Shanafelt T, Ripp J, Trockel M. Understanding and addressing sources of anxiety among health care professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA*. 2020;323(21):2133-2134. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.5893.
 66. Shoichet. Covid-19 is taking a devastating toll on Filipino American nurses. 2020. <https://www.cnn.com/2020/11/24/health/filipino-nurse-deaths/index.html>.

Table 1: Study Characteristics

Authors (Last Name of first Author)	Year	Country	Research Design	Health Professionals			Sample Size	Female Participants
				Physicians	Nurses	Other		
Algunmeeyn	2020	Jordan	Qualitative	ü	ü	ü	30	23%
Alsulais	2020	Saudi Arabia	Cross-sectional survey	ü			529	40%
Cai	2020	China	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü	ü	534	69%
De Stefani	2020	Italy	Cross-sectional survey			ü	1500	56%
Elbay	2020	Turkey	Cross-sectional survey	ü			442	57%
Fargen	2020	USA	Cross-sectional survey	ü			151	14%
Gao	2020	China	Qualitative		ü		14	93%
Hoffman	2020	USA	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü	ü	365	69%
Kackin	2020	Turkey	Qualitative		ü		10	80%
Kang	2020	China	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü		994	86%
Karimi	2020	Iran	Qualitative		ü		12	67%
Khalafallah	2020	USA	Cross-sectional survey			ü	407	11%
Lai	2020	China	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü		1257	77%
Li	2020	China	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü	ü	4369	100%
Liu	2020	China	Qualitative	ü	ü		13	62%
Martinez-Lopez	2020	Spain	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü		157	79%
Moorthy	2020	UK	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü		200	50%
Mosheva	2020	Israel	Cross-sectional survey	ü			1106	49%
Ng	2020	Malaysia	Cross-sectional survey	ü		ü	22	77%
Nowicki	2020	Poland	Qualitative		ü		325	96%
Nyashanu	2020	UK	Qualitative		ü	ü	40	53%
Osama	2020	Pakistan	Cross-sectional survey	ü			112	40%
Prasad	2020	USA	Cross-sectional survey		ü	ü	347	91%
Rabbani	2020	Saudi Arabia	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü	ü	398	40%
Rodriguez	2020	USA	Cross-sectional survey	ü			426	45%
Ruiz-Fernandez	2020	Spain	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü		506	77%
Rymarowicz	2020	Poland	Cross-sectional survey	ü		ü	304	31%

Sandesh	2020	Pakistan	Cross-sectional survey			ü	112	43%
Shah	2020	UK	Cross-sectional survey	ü			207	81%
Shalhub	2020	International	Cross-sectional survey	ü			1609	29%
Sharma	2020	USA	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü	ü	1651	74%
Shechter	2020	USA	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü	ü	657	77%
Si	2020	China	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü	ü	863	71%
Sil	2020	India	Cross-sectional survey	ü		ü	23	70%
Silczuk	2020	Poland	Cross-sectional survey	ü			117	53%
Smith	2020	Canada	Cross-sectional survey			ü	5988	91%
Spiller	2020	Switzerland	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü		812	71%
Stojanov	2020	Serbia	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü		201	65%
Suryavanshi	2020	India	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü		197	51%
Tan,R	2020	China	Qualitative		ü		30	80%
Temsah	2020	Saudi Arabia	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü	ü	582	75%
Thomaier	2020	USA	Cross-sectional survey	ü			374	63%
Tsan	2020	Malaysia	Cross-sectional survey	ü			85	64%
Uvais	2020	India	Cross-sectional survey	ü			58	40%
Xiao X.;	2020	China	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü	ü	958	67%
Zhang, S	2020 a	Iran	Cross-sectional survey			ü	304	59%
Zhang, S	2020b	Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia	Cross-sectional survey	ü	ü	ü	712	68%

Table 2: Triggers of Stress and Burnout during COVID-19

Author	Year	TRIGGERS													
		STRUCTURAL			HUMAN RESOURCES				SYMBOLIC			POLITICAL			
		Staff and Resource Adequacy	Workload and Compensation	Job Roles and Job Security	Female Gender	Age/Family Status	Safety	Experience	Patient Care Protocols	Societal Expectations	Organization Culture	Public Health Guidance	Infrastructure	Pandemic preparedness	Social Isolation
Algunmeeyn	2020	✓				.	✓	✓							
AlSulais	2020	.			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓					
Cai	2020	.	✓	✓	.	✓	✓	.					✓		
DeStefani	2020	.	.	✓	.	.	✓	.	✓			✓	.		
Elbay	2020	.	✓		✓	✓	.	✓							✓
Fargen	2020		✓	✓		.	✓								
Gao	2020	✓		✓	.	.	✓								
Hoffman	2020						✓				
Kackin	2020	✓	✓	✓	.		✓			✓					✓
Kang	2020		✓								
Karimi	2020	✓	✓			.	✓		✓						✓
Khalafallah	2020		✓	✓	.										
Lai	2020	.	.	✓	✓					
Li	2020	.	.	.	✓	.	✓	✓	.	.					
Liu	2020	✓	✓	✓	.	.	✓	✓	.	.	✓	.			

Martinez-Lopez	2020	✓				.	✓								
Matthewson	2020			✓											
Moorthy	2020	✓		✓	.										✓
Mosheva	2020					.	✓								
Hau Ng	2020		✓			.	✓			✓	✓				
Nowicki	2020					✓		✓							
Nyashanu	2020	✓			✓		✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	
Osama	2020						✓								
Prasad	2020			✓	.	✓				✓					
Rabbani	2020	✓					✓								
Rodriguez	2020	✓		✓	✓			✓							
Rymarowicz	2020					.	✓								
Sandesh	2020	✓	✓	✓	✓	.	✓			✓					
Shah	2020	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓					
Shalhub	2020	✓	✓		✓		✓			✓					
Sharma	2020	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓					
Shechter	2020	✓	✓			.	✓		✓						✓
Si	2020			✓	.	.	✓								
Sil	2020				✓										
Silczuk	2020				✓										
Smith	2020	✓			✓				✓						
Spiller	2020		✓												
Stojanov	2020				✓	✓	✓			✓					
Suryavanshi	2020		✓	✓	.	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓
Tan, R	2020	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓							
Temsah	2020	✓				.	✓	✓			✓				


Thomaier	2020	✓			✓	.	✓	✓		✓					
Tsan	2020		✓												
Uvais	2020				✓					✓					✓
Xiao	2020	✓		✓		✓	✓								
Zhang, S	2020 a					✓	.								
Zhang, S	2020 b		✓	✓		✓	✓				✓				

Table 3: Interventions to Support Stress and Burnout

Intervention Spectrum	Intervention Type	Example	Evidence Source	Quality of Evidence Strength
Self-focused	Self-Coping	Normalization	26	4
		Techniques	50	
	Recovery and Resiliency	Yoga, Meditation	32	4
		Relaxation Techniques	46	
		Proper Nutrition	49	
		Time off	56	
		Rest		
	Physical Activities	Sports	26	4
		Exercise	49	
	Hobbies	Sports, Cooking,	26	4
		Movies,	32	
		Music	56	
		Reading		
	Faith based Activities	Religion	47	4
49				
Social Networks	Family	20	4	
		Friends		32
		Work Colleagues		37
		Virtual Networks		46
				47
				50
Psychological Support	Psychologists	20	4	
		Psychiatrist		24
		Group Counselling		26
		Talk therapy		27
				42
				46
				49
				55
	56			

			57	
Systems-focused	Training	PPE use	20	4
		SARS COV2 virus	24	
		Patient Care Protocols	44	
		Resiliency	53	
			56	
	Communication	Transparent	24	4
		communication between	42	
		management and	47	
		frontline	64	
	Workplace Resources	Access to proper PPE	20	4
		Work coverage	42	
		Isolation units	47	
		Places for rest and sleep	53	
Childcare		56		
		64		
Workplace Incentives	Flexible work policies	20	4	
	Compensation			24
		25		
		26		
		42		
		56		
Process Improvement	Rapid testing for patients	42	4	
	Improved infection	53		
	control protocols			

Figure 1: Women in Health Care PRISMA 2009 Flow Diagram






Figure 2: Triggers of Stress and Burnout during COVID-19