medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC 4.0 International license .

Title:

Mental Health of Clinical Staff Working in High-Risk Epidemic and Pandemic Health Emergencies: A Rapid Review of the Evidence and Meta-Analysis

Authors:

Vaughan Bell[1,2]
Dorothy Wade[3,4]

Affiliations:

1. Research Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology, University College London
2. South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust
3. University College London Hospitals Critical Care Department
4. Research Department of Behavioural Science and Health, University College London

Declarations of interest:
The authors have no competing interests to declare

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC 4.0 International license .

Abstract

The global pandemic of SARS-CoV-2 / COVID-19 has raised concerns about the potential mental health impact on frontline clinical staff. However, given that poor mental health is common in staff working in acute medicine, we aimed to estimate the additional burden of working directly with infected patients during epidemic and pandemic health emergencies. We completed a rapid review of the evidence and identified 74 relevant studies from outbreaks of COVID-19, Ebola, H1N1 influenza, Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS), and severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS). Due to varying caseness criteria, a meta-analysis of prevalence was not possible. However, it was clear that levels of self-reported depression, anxiety and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) related symptoms were high, and somewhat higher in clinical staff working in high exposure roles. To assess the impact of high- versus low-exposure healthcare work more formally, we estimated the standardised mean difference (SMD) of scale means using a random effects meta-analysis. High exposure work was associated with only a small additional burden of acute mental health problems compared to low exposure work (anxiety: SMD=0.22, 95% CI 0.06 – 0.38; PTSD symptoms: SMD=0.21, 95% CI 0.01 – 0.4; depression: SMD=0.20, -0.07 – 0.47). This effect was potentially inflated by publication bias and there was a moderate risk of bias in the studies in the meta-analysis. A narrative review of candidate risk factors identified being a nurse, seeing colleagues infected, experiencing quarantine, non-voluntary role assignment, and experiencing stigma, as associated with particularly poor mental health outcomes. Protective factors included team and institutional support, use and faith in infection prevention measures, and a sense of professional duty and altruistic acceptance of risk. Notably, formal psychological support services were valued by frontline staff, although those with the highest burden of mental health difficulties were the least likely to request or receive support.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Introduction

The recent SARS-CoV-2 / COVID-19 pandemic has seen an increased demand on clinical staff, who need to treat large numbers of patients, often in newly-purposed wards, with little disease-specific evidence to guide treatment. Many clinical staff have been moved into new roles and may be managing acutely unwell patients using unfamiliar equipment. Stresses caused by high patient mortality rates, staffing shortages, concerns about infecting self or family members, and changing guidance on personal protective equipment can add to work pressure. This has raised concerns about the potential impact on the mental health of epidemic and pandemic responders (Chen et al., 2020; Greenberg et al., 2020).

However, high rates of poor mental health are common in clinical staff working in acute medicine generally (Carrieri et al., 2018; He et al., 2020; Su et al., 2009) and so estimating the additional impact of epidemic and pandemic response, not solely the extent of poor mental health, is also important in guiding decisions to protect staff's mental health during times of increased demand on clinical services. In doing so, identifying risk and protective factors for mental health outcomes is key.

Consequently, we review and meta-analyse studies on the mental health of clinical staff dealing with epidemics and pandemics of high-risk infectious diseases, including studies from coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), Ebola virus disease, H1N1 influenza, severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), and middle east respiratory syndrome (MERS) to understand the potential impact on mental health and to inform policy on supporting staff during the current COVID-19 pandemic.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Methods

There is no standardised procedure for conducting rapid reviews, although several approaches have been used to reduce the complexity of the review process (Haby et al., 2016). We used an iterative rapid review procedure that selected search terms with a high sensitivity for relevant articles and then used the reference lists to identify further articles. We searched PubMed, Medline, PsychInfo and Embase for articles including 'mental health' or 'psychosocial' or 'emotional' and 'staff' and a number of disease specific key words (epidemic, epidemics, pandemic, flu, SARS, MERS, COVID-19, Ebola, Marburg, H1N1, H7N6) in the title. We also searched pre-print servers MedRXviv and SSRN for pre-prints relating to COVID-19.




Figure 1. Study screening process

Duplicate articles were removed and titles and abstracts were screened for relevance. The full text of the remaining articles was read. Reference lists were searched for additional relevant articles and these were reviewed for inclusion using the same method as articles found through database searches. Articles were included if they were peer-reviewed articles

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

published in English or Spanish (the languages of the authors) that reported mental health outcomes in clinical staff managing high-risk infectious disease outbreaks. One article in Chinese with numeric results reported in the English-language abstract was also included. Studies of all methodologies reporting original results were included (including qualitative and quantitative studies).

The final count of articles included by condition were: COVID-19: 14, Ebola: 11, H1N1: 4, MERS: 6, SARS: 39. No relevant studies on Marburg or H7N6 flu were found. Studies were conducted in China (16), Hong Kong (12), Taiwan (11), Canada (8), Singapore (6), Sierra Leone (4), Saudi Arabia (3), South Korea (3), Germany (1), Greece (1), Israel (1), Japan (1), Liberia (1), Mexico (1), Uganda and the Republic of Congo (1), United States (2), and two studies that recruited aid workers who had worked in various West African countries.

Numeric data from studies reporting i) above-cut off prevalence or, ii) means and standard deviations from validated anxiety, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and depression symptom scales were collated. Due to studies using differing cut-offs for determining caseness even when using the same scale, meta-analysis for prevalence was not possible and so a narrative review of prevalence was conducted. However, meta-analysis for differences in mean scale scores between high and low exposure roles was possible and was used to help determine the mental health impact of work involving high exposure to infected patients in epidemic and pandemic health emergencies. We defined high and low exposure as direct contact with infected patients, or work in wards where direct contact was considered highly likely (e.g. critical care, designated treatment wards, emergency departments) compared to clinicians working without direct contact or work in hospital areas where direct contact was unlikely. A narrative review of risk factors was conducted across all studies regardless of methodology.

We conducted a power analysis for meta-analysis (Valentine et al., 2010) to determine the minimum number of studies required to detect a statistically significant difference in standardised mean difference between high and low exposure groups. We calculated power to detect a small effect size and based on results of the Brooks et al. (2018) systematic review of SARS response studies, assumed medium study heterogeneity and an average group size of N=150. This indicated that a minimum study count of 5 was needed. Effect sizes were calculated as standardised mean differences and we used a random effects model to estimate pooled effect sizes. The possibility of publication bias was assessed using trim and fill (Duval and Tweedie, 2000), rank correlation test of funnel plot asymmetry (Begg and Mazumdar, 1994), and Egger's test (Egger and Smith, 1998). All analysis was conducted with *R* (version 3.6.1) using the 'meta' package (version 4.11.0) and was conducted on a Linux x86_64 platform.

A risk of bias assessment was conducted for all studies reporting prevalences or included in the meta-analysis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Following recommendations for research responding to the COVID-19 pandemic (Holmes et al., 2020) all data, and Jupyter notebooks including analysis code and output, used in this study have been made freely available at the Open Science Framework archive: https://osf.io/tkeh2

Results

Prevalence of poor mental health of epidemic and pandemic response healthcare workers

All studies except one (Lancee et al., 2008) used self-report scales to measure symptoms. As can be seen from Tables 1-3, there was considerable variation in the cut-offs used to determine caseness with lower cut-offs understandably producing higher prevalence estimates. Because of this, a meta-analysis of prevalence was not possible.

However, a narrative analysis indicates that the majority of healthcare workers involved in the treatment of patients during high-risk epidemics and pandemics do not report mental health problems, and those that do typically report symptoms in the mild to moderate range with a smaller percentage of responders reporting severe psychopathology. There were only two studies in which the majority of healthcare workers reported symptoms of poor mental health on any measure (COVID-19: Lai et al., 2020; MERS: Lee et al., 2018), and one of these (Lai et al., 2020) used a particularly low cut-off for reporting prevalence (mild range and above).

Although direct statistical comparison between studies is prevented by the use of different cut-off criteria, inspection of the differences in prevalence rates for high and low exposure groups within studies show that high exposure working is associated with higher rates of above cut-off scoring across all measures (mean 29.86%, SD=18.83%) compared to low exposure working (mean 22.82%, SD = 17.01%) with an average additional prevalence of 7.57% in high exposure groups. However, because these are means of above cut-off prevalences where studies have used different cut-offs it is not clear what an additional 7.57% of prevalence represents in terms of severity.

Table 1. Above cut-off anxiety symptom prevalence in studies of healthcare responders working in high-risk epidemic and pandemic health emergencies

					Prevalence			
Study	*Condition*	*Measure*	*Cut-off*	*Sample*	*Overall*	*High exposure*	*Low exposure*	*Timing*
C. Liu et al 2020	COVID-19	ZSRAS	>59*	HE and LE	12.5%	Not given	Not given	During
Z. Liu et al 2020	COVID-19	ZSRAS	>49	HE and LE	16.0%	18.6%	14.0%	During
J. Z. Huang et al 2020	COVID-19	ZSRAS	Not given	HE only	Not relevant	23.04%	Not relevant	During
Lai et al 2020	COVID-19	GAD-7	>4	HE and LE	44.6%	51.3%	39.4%	During
Zhu et al 2020	COVID-19	GAD-7	>7	HE and LE	24.36%	23.66%	24.83%	During

HE = High Exposure; LE = Low Exposure; ZSRAS = Zung Self-rating Anxiety Scale; GAD-7 = General Anxiety Disorder-7 scale.

Table 2. Above cut-off PTSD symptom prevalence in studies of healthcare responders working in high-risk epidemic and pandemic health emergencies

					Prevalence			
Study	*Condition*	*Measure*	*Cut-off used*	*Sample*	*Overall*	*High exposure*	*Low exposure*	*Timing*
J. Z. Huang et al 2020	COVID-19	PTSD-SS	Not given	HE only	Not relevant	27.39%	Not relevant	During
Lai et al 2020	COVID-19	IES-R	>8	HE and LE	71.5%	76.0%	68.0%	During
Zhu et al 2020	COVID-19	IES-R	>33	HE and LE	30.56%	33.43%	28.65%	During
Lee et al 2018	MERS	IES-R	>24	HE and LE	51.5%	Not given	Not given	During
Chan & Huak 2004 (doctors)	SARS	IES	>29	HE and LE	Not given	18.8%	19.8%	During
Chan & Huak 2004 (nurses)	SARS	IES	>29	HE and LE	Not given	19.4%	19.5%	During
Chen et al 2005	SARS	IES-R	>36	HE and LE	11%	17%	2%	During
Su et al 2007	SARS	DTS-C	>22	HE and LE	28.43%	32.86%	18.75%	During
Lin et al 2007	SARS	DTS-C	>40	HE and LE	19.3%	21.7%	13.0%	During
Sim et al 2004	SARS	IES	Idiosyncratic	HE and LE	9.4%	7.2%	10.6%	During
Tham et al 2004	SARS	IES	>25	Undifferentiated	17.7%	Not relevant	Not relevant	6 months after
Maunder et al 2006	SARS	IES	>25	HE and LE	Not given	13.8%	8.4%	1-2 years after
Lancee et al 2008	SARS	CAPS	DX	HE only	Not relevant	2%	Not relevant	1-2 years after
Wu et al 2008	SARS	IES-R	>19	HE and LE	10.1%	Not given	Not given	3 years after

HE = High Exposure; LE = Low Exposure; PTSD-SS = PTSD Self Report Scale; IES = Impact of Events Scale; IES-R = Impact of Events Scale – Revised; SASR = Stanford Acute Stress Reaction; CIES-R = Chinese Impact of Event Scale-Revised; CAPS = Clinician Administered PTSD Scale; DX = diagnosis.

Table 3. Above cut-off depression symptom prevalence in studies of healthcare responders working in high-risk epidemic and pandemic health emergencies

					Prevalence			
Study	*Condition*	*Measure*	*Cut-off used*	*Sample*	*Overall*	*High exposure*	*Low exposure*	*Timing*
Zhu et al 2020	COVID-19	PHQ-9	>9	HE and LE	13.55%	13.73%	13.43%	During
Lai et al 2020	COVID-19	PHQ-9	>4	HE and LE	50.4%	58.4%	44.6%	During
Chung & Yeung, 2020	COVID-19	PHQ-9	>9	Undifferentiated	34.8%	Not given	Not given	During
Z. Liu et al 2020	COVID-19	ZSRAD	>49	HE and LE	34.6%	37.2%	32.5%	During
Su et al 2007	SARS	BDI	>9	HE and LE	27.45%	38.57%	3.13%	During
Wu et al 2008	SARS	CES-D	>15	HE and LE	22.8%	Not given	Not given	3 years after

HE = High Exposure; LE = Low Exposure; PHQ-9 = Patient Health Questionnaire 9; ZSRAD = Zung Self-rating Depression Scale; BDI = Beck Depression Inventory; CES-D = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Meta-analytic estimate of the effect of exposure on acute mental health outcomes

Given that high rates of poor mental health are common in staff working in acute medicine (Carrieri et al., 2018; He et al., 2020; Su et al., 2009) we attempted to estimate the additional impact of working in high exposure roles. Meta-analytic estimates of impact of working in high exposure roles are presented in Figure 2 (anxiety symptom measures), Figure 3 (PTSD symptom measures) and Figure 4 (depression symptom measures).

All analyses show that the difference between working in high and low exposure roles was small (effect sizes of 0.22 and below). The confidence intervals for estimates did not cross zero for anxiety and PTSD symptom measures, but they did cross zero in the case of the meta-analysis for depression measures. However, study heterogeneity was larger than we assumed during the power calculation and there were the fewest number of studies included for the depression meta-analysis (k=6), meaning it was likely under-powered to detect small effects.

Inspection of the funnel plot suggested evidence of publication bias but the statistical tests of funnel plot asymmetry were not interpreted as the minimum criteria of 10 included studies was not met (Ioannidis and Trikalinos, 2007).




Figure 2. Standardised mean differences in anxiety measures between health care workers with high and low levels of exposure to high-risk epidemic and pandemic diseases

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .




Figure 3. Standardised mean differences in PTSD symptom measures between health care workers with high and low levels of exposure to high-risk epidemic and pandemic diseases




Figure 4. Standardised mean differences in depression measures between health care workers with high and low levels of exposure to high-risk epidemic and pandemic diseases

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Risk and protective factors

Although it was not possible to examine risk and protective factors meta-analytically, a narrative review was conducted to identify likely candidates.

Nurses typically reported higher levels of symptoms and distress than doctors (Goulia et al., 2010; Huang et al., 2020; Lai et al., 2020; C. Liu et al., 2020; Matsuishi et al., 2012; Nickell et al., 2004; Poon et al., 2004; Tham et al., 2004; Zhu et al., 2020) with a few studies reporting no difference (Dai et al., 2020; Maunder et al., 2006; Sun et al., 2020) and one study reporting higher rates in doctors (Chan and Huak, 2004).

Several studies noted that seeing colleagues infected was a particular source of distress (Dai et al., 2020; Khalid et al., 2016; Raven et al., 2018). Furthermore, being quarantined after infection was reported as a predictor of psychological distress and poor mental health (Bai et al., 2004; Dai et al., 2020; Fiksenbaum et al., 2006; Liu et al., 2012; Marjanovic et al., 2007; Styra et al., 2008; Wu et al., 2009, 2008) which was also reflected in one qualitative study (Robertson et al., 2004) although three studies found no negative impact of quarantine (Chong et al., 2004; Lee et al., 2018; Styra et al., 2008).

Notably, numerous studies reported that clinical staff dealing with high-risk infectious disease experienced stigma from friends, family and the public (Bai et al., 2004; Goulia et al., 2010; Grace et al., 2005; Hewlett and Hewlett, 2005; Khee et al., 2004; Koh et al., 2005; Maunder et al., 2006; McMahon et al., 2016; Meyer et al., 2018; Nickell et al., 2004; Park et al., 2018; Poon et al., 2004; Smith et al., 2017; Styra et al., 2008; von Strauss et al., 2017) and perceived stigma was found to be a predictor of poor mental health in the three studies that looked at this association statistically (Koh et al., 2005; Maunder et al., 2006; Park et al., 2018).

Three studies found that clinical staff who were conscripted, were not willing, or had not volunteered for high exposure roles reported particularly poor mental health outcomes (Chen et al., 2005, 2006; Dai et al., 2020; Tam et al., 2004).

Although small in number, longitudinal studies tended to suggest that symptoms of poor mental health tend to peak early during outbreaks but resolve for the majority of responders as time goes on (Chen et al., 2006; Su et al., 2009). This pattern of initially high levels of anxiety and distress that reduce over time was also reflected in some of the qualitative studies (Chung et al., 2005; Shih et al., 2009). One cross-sectional study conducted at two time points and sampling from the same clinical teams found high levels of self-reported poor mental health for high exposure workers one year after high-exposure work (Maunder et al., 2006) although a study on a subsample of participants using a structured interview assessment found the incidence of new onset mental health problems was essentially no different to that found in the general population (Lancee et al., 2008).

In terms of protective factors that reduced the chance of poor mental health or psychological distress, social support, team cohesion or organisational support were identified by numerous

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

studies (Chan and Huak, 2004; Chang et al., 2006; Fiksenbaum et al., 2006; Khalid et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2005; Marjanovic et al., 2007; Sun et al., 2020; von Strauss et al., 2017; Xiao et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2020). This theme was reflected in several qualitative studies (Meyer et al., 2018; Raven et al., 2018).

Furthermore, the use, availability, training with, and faith in, infection prevention measures were identified as reducing distress (Chua et al., 2004; Khalid et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2005, 2005; Marjanovic et al., 2007; Maunder et al., 2006; Nickell et al., 2004; Sim et al., 2004; Zhu et al., 2020)

A sense of professional duty and altruistic acceptance of risk were found to be a protective factor in several studies (Goulia et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2012; Oh et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2009) which was a theme that was strongly reflected in qualitative studies (Chung et al., 2005; Hewlett and Hewlett, 2005; Raven et al., 2018; Wong et al., 2012) although one study found accepting the risk of SARS infection as part of the job was not associated with reduced psychopathology (Koh et al., 2005).

Notably, all studies that asked about positive aspects of working in epidemic and pandemic response reported that participants described several factors related to learning and development as an individual and a team (Chua et al., 2004; Grace et al., 2005; Nickell et al., 2004).

Role of formal psychological support services

Although a recent anecdotal report noted clinicians did not find mental health support particularly useful during COVID-19 response (Chen et al., 2020) several studies found that participants reported formal psychological support services to be a useful source of support (Goulia et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2005; Meyer et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2017; von Strauss et al., 2017). One study specifically asked whether staff needed 'psychological treatment' and 8.6% of healthcare workers dealing with COVID-19 reported they did (C. Liu et al., 2020). Conversely, however, Chung and Yeung (2020) reported that only 2% of staff responding to COVID-19 requested psychological support and all "were reassured after a single phone contact by the psychiatric nurse" although this was a notably small study with just 69 participants.

Notably, two large COVID-19 studies suggest that the staff who are most in need of psychological support are the least likely to request or receive it. One study found that high exposure staff were likely to say they needed psychological treatment at half the rate of low exposure staff despite reporting higher levels of psychopathology (C. Liu et al., 2020). In another, clinicians with mental health problems were less likely to receive psychological support than clinicians without (Z. Liu et al., 2020).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Discussion

To estimate the impact of high exposure work in epidemic and pandemic health emergencies, we completed a rapid review and meta-analysis of studies reporting on the mental health of clinical staff working in high-risk epidemic and pandemic health emergencies, including studies from the recent COVID-19 pandemic. Both of these comparisons suggest that the impact of epidemic and pandemic response work on mental health is small, but in the case of meta-analytic assessment, statistically detectable. However, this is in addition to already high levels of poor mental health that are common in acute medical staff. A narrative review of potential risk factors for poor mental health in epidemic and pandemic response identified being a nurse, experiencing stigma from others, seeing colleagues infected, and being personally quarantined as predictors of worse outcomes. Protective factors included social and occupational support, effectiveness and faith in infection control measures, a sense of professional duty and altruistic acceptance of risk. Formal psychological support services were identified as a valuable form of support.

It is worth noting some of the shortcomings of the evidence used to inform this review. More studies reported results from the analysis of mental health measures than reported sufficient detail (prevalence, mean scores etc) to allow them to be included in the numeric assessment of results in this review. Study quality was moderate at best and there was a suggestion of publication bias. Furthermore, studies almost exclusively used self-report measures rather than structured interview assessments.

The results of this review and meta-analysis raise several issues with regard to provide ongoing and long-term support for clinical staff responding to such health emergencies. One is the extent to which epidemic and pandemic response is uniquely 'traumatising' and might lead to high levels of posttraumatic stress disorder, thereby implying that a trauma-focus for staff support should be the dominant approach to addressing outcomes of poor mental health. With regard to the published studies, although there are seemingly high rates of staff who score above cut-off on measures of PTSD symptoms, some significant caveats need to be born in mind. As can be seen from Table 3, cut-off values used for defining a positive 'case' varied considerably even between studies using the same measure. The most widely used scale in these studies is the Impact of Events Scale-Revised for which a cut-off of 33-34 has been found to be the most predictive of diagnosable PTSD (Creamer et al., 2003; Morina et al., 2013) and yet most studies use a cut-off of considerably less. This suggests that an important proportion of those reported under the prevalence figures are likely to have transitory, sub-syndromal PTSD symptoms, or non-specific distress, that may be a risk for PTSD but are unlikely to reach the level of a diagnosable case. Indeed, the prevalences reported here are comparable to prevalences found in clinical staff more widely. For example, the reported prevalence of >33 scoring on the IES-R is 15% in acute medical staff (Naumann et al., 2017), 16% in surgical trainees (Thompson et al., 2017), and 17% in cancer physicians (McFarland and Roth, 2017). Studies included in this review using similar IES-R cut-offs tended to report lower prevalence rates with only one study (Zhu et al., 2020) reporting higher.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Furthermore, studies often did not differentiate between PTSD symptoms arising from pandemic and epidemic response work and those from other events meaning it is not clear to what extent epidemic or pandemic response work was the key causal factor. Finally, symptoms were almost exclusively measured by self-report measures which are known to inflate the rate of true cases (Bonanno et al., 2010). Indeed, high rates on self-report measures but low rates on structured interview assessments have been found in SARS responders (Lancee et al., 2008).

This suggests that although there is potential for trauma and this should be included in considerations for staff support, it is currently not clear that PTSD is an outcome particularly associated with epidemic and pandemic response meaning support efforts should be 'trauma ready' rather than 'trauma focused'. However, we note here the importance of contextual factors. The capacity of the healthcare system, and indeed the population, are key factors in determining the impact of the medical response on the staff responsible for delivering it.

Indeed, some of the contextual factors were reflected in the risk and protective factors identified in the review. These chime with previous work on epidemic response work (Brooks et al., 2018b) and the wider literature on mental health outcomes in high-risk work (Brooks et al., 2019) and suggest similar measures to support staff, namely promoting good leadership and team cohesion, maintaining high standards of infection control and training. In addition, this review highlights that additional attention should be given to nurses, those affected by seeing colleagues infected, where staff are quarantined after being infected, and where individuals experience stigma from others.

It is worth highlighting that formal psychological support was considered useful by clinical staff but that it was least requested and less frequently received by those with higher levels of mental health difficulties. Although voluntary engagement with mental health services is considered the ideal model to avoid potential iatrogenic effects (Brooks et al., 2018a), particular attention should be paid to pathways to formal support to make these as accessible as possible for those who need them. This is particularly important as staff working in acute medicine may already have high levels of poor mental health and access to effective treatment during health emergencies should be a priority.

Priorities for research

The majority of studies are cross-sectional measuring mental health in staff working in epidemic and pandemic response. These studies typically have large sample sizes and good response rates. However, there remains a need for: i) standardisation of measures, reporting, and criteria for prevalence; ii) adequately sampled case-control studies that compare epidemic and pandemic response staff to control groups of other staff in acute medicine; and iii) longitudinal studies to examine the course of psychological distress over time. We also note that i) would effectively be solved if open data was available from the relevant studies, and we strongly encourage researchers to make this data available, particularly when researching infectious disease health emergencies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

References

Bai, Y., Lin, C.-C., Lin, C.-Y., Chen, J.-Y., Chue, C.-M., Chou, P., 2004. Survey of stress reactions among health care workers involved with the SARS outbreak. Psychiatric Services 55, 1055–1057. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.55.9.1055

Begg, C.B., Mazumdar, M., 1994. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. Biometrics 1088–1101.

Bonanno, G.A., Brewin, C.R., Kaniasty, K., Greca, A.M.L., 2010. Weighing the Costs of Disaster: Consequences, Risks, and Resilience in Individuals, Families, and Communities. Psychol Sci Public Interest 11, 1–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100610387086

Brooks, S.K., Dunn, R., Amlôt, R., Greenberg, N., Rubin, G.J., 2018a. Training and post-disaster interventions for the psychological impacts on disaster-exposed employees: a systematic review. Journal of Mental Health 0, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638237.2018.1437610

Brooks, S.K., Dunn, R., Amlôt, R., Rubin, G.J., Greenberg, N., 2018b. A Systematic, Thematic Review of Social and Occupational Factors Associated With Psychological Outcomes in Healthcare Employees During an Infectious Disease Outbreak [WWW Document]. https://doi.org/info:doi/10.1097/JOM.0000000000001235

Brooks, S.K., Rubin, G.J., Greenberg, N., 2019. Traumatic stress within disaster-exposed occupations: overview of the literature and suggestions for the management of traumatic stress in the workplace. Br Med Bull 129, 25–34. https://doi.org/10.1093/bmb/ldy040

Carrieri, D., Briscoe, S., Jackson, M., Mattick, K., Papoutsi, C., Pearson, M., Wong, G., 2018. 'Care Under Pressure': a realist review of interventions to tackle doctors' mental ill-health and its impacts on the clinical workforce and patient care. BMJ Open 8, e021273. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-021273

Chan, A.O.M., Huak, C.Y., 2004. Psychological impact of the 2003 severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak on health care workers in a medium size regional general hospital in Singapore. Occup Med (Lond) 54, 190–196. https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqh027

Chang, K., Gotcher, D.F., Chan, M., 2006. Does Social Capital Matter When Medical Professionals Encounter the SARS Crisis in a Hospital Setting. Health Care Management Review 31, 26–33.

Chen, C.-S., Wu, H.-Y., Yang, P., Yen, C.-F., 2005. Psychological Distress of Nurses in Taiwan Who Worked During the Outbreak of SARS. Psychiatric Services 56, 76–79. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.56.1.76

Chen, Q., Liang, M., Li, Y., Guo, J., Fei, D., Wang, L., He, L., Sheng, C., Cai, Y., Li, X., Wang, J., Zhang, Z., 2020. Mental health care for medical staff in China during the COVID-19 outbreak. Lancet Psychiatry 7, e15–e16. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2215-0366(20)30078-x

Chen, R., Chou, K.-R., Huang, Y.-J., Wang, T.-S., Liu, S.-Y., Ho, L.-Y., 2006. Effects of a SARS prevention programme in Taiwan on nursing staff's anxiety, depression and sleep quality: A longitudinal survey. Journal of Nursing Studies 43, 215–225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2005.03.006

Chong, M.-Y., Wang, W.-C., Hsieh, W.-C., Lee, C.-Y., Chiu, N.-M., Yeh, W.-C., Huang, T.-L., Wen, J.-K., Chen, C.-L., 2004. Psychological impact of severe acute respiratory syndrome on health workers in a tertiary hospital. The British Journal of Psychiatry 185, 127–133. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.185.2.127

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Chua, S.E., Cheung, V., Cheung, C., McAlonan, G.M., Wong, J.W., Cheung, E.P., Chan, M.T., Wong, M.M., Tang, S.W., Choy, K.M., Wong, M.K., Chu, C.M., Tsang, K.W., 2004. Psychological Effects of the SARS Outbreak in Hong Kong on High-Risk Health Care Workers. Can J Psychiatry 49, 391–393. https://doi.org/10.1177/070674370404900609

Chung, B.P., Wong, T.K., Suen, E.S., Chung, J.W., 2005. SARS: caring for patients in Hong Kong. J Clin Nurs 14, 510–7. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2004.01072.x

Chung, J., Yeung, W., 2020. Staff Mental Health Self-Assessment During the COVID-19 Outbreak. East Asian Arch Psychiatry 30, 34.

Creamer, M., Bell, R., Failla, S., 2003. Psychometric properties of the Impact of Event Scale—Revised. Behaviour Research and Therapy 41, 1489–1496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2003.07.010

Dai, Y., Hu, G., Xiong, H., Qiu, H., Yuan, X., 2020. Psychological impact of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak on healthcare workers in China. medRxiv 2020.03.03.20030874. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.03.20030874

Duval, S., Tweedie, R., 2000. Trim and fill: a simple funnel-plot–based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. Biometrics 56, 455–463.

Egger, M., Smith, G.D., 1998. Meta-analysis bias in location and selection of studies. Bmj 316, 61–66.

Fiksenbaum, L., Marjanovic, Z., Greenglass, E.R., Coffey, S., 2006. Emotional Exhaustion and State Anger in Nurses Who Worked During the Sars Outbreak: The Role of Perceived Threat and Organizational Support. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health 25, 89–103. https://doi.org/10.7870/cjcmh-2006-0015

Goulia, P., Mantas, C., Dimitroula, D., Mantis, D., Hyphantis, T., 2010. General hospital staff worries, perceived sufficiency of information and associated psychological distress during the A/H1N1 influenza pandemic. BMC Infectious Diseases 10, 322. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2334-10-322

Grace, S.L., Hershenfield, K., Robertson, E., Stewart, D.E., 2005. The Occupational and Psychosocial Impact of SARS on Academic Physicians in Three Affected Hospitals. Psychosomatics 46, 385–391. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psy.46.5.385

Greenberg, N., Docherty, M., Gnanapragasam, S., Wessely, S., 2020. Managing mental health challenges faced by healthcare workers during covid-19 pandemic. BMJ 368. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1211

Haby, M.M., Chapman, E., Clark, R., Barreto, J., Reveiz, L., Lavis, J.N., 2016. What are the best methodologies for rapid reviews of the research evidence for evidence-informed decision making in health policy and practice: a rapid review. Health Research Policy and Systems 14, 83. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-016-0155-7

He, J., Liao, R., Yang, Y., Li, J., Weng, N., Luo, Y., Zhang, Y., Varela-Ramirez, A., Bi, F., Zhang, W., Zhu, Q., 2020. The Research of Mental Health Status Among Medical Personnel in China: A Cross-Sectional Study (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 3555260). Social Science Research Network, Rochester, NY. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3555260

Hewlett, B.L., Hewlett, B.S., 2005. Providing Care and Facing Death: Nursing During Ebola Outbreaks in Central Africa. J Transcult Nurs 16, 289–297. https://doi.org/10.1177/1043659605278935

Holmes, E.A., O'Connor, R.C., Perry, V.H., Tracey, I., Wessely, S., Arseneault, L., Ballard, C., Christensen, H., Silver, R.C., Everall, I., Ford, T., John, A., Kabir, T., King, K., Madan, I., Michie, S., Przybylski, A.K., Shafran, R., Sweeney, A., Worthman, C.M., Yardley, L., Cowan, K., Cope, C., Hotopf, M., Bullmore, E., 2020. Multidisciplinary

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science. The Lancet Psychiatry 0. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30168-1

Huang, J.Z., Han, M.F., Luo, T.D., Ren, A.K., Zhou, X.P., 2020. Mental health survey of 230 medical staff in a tertiary infectious disease hospital for COVID-19. [Chinese]. Zhonghua lao dong wei sheng zhi ye bing za zhi = Zhonghua laodong weisheng zhiyebing zazhi = Chinese journal of industrial hygiene and occupational diseases 38, E001. http://dx.doi.org/10.3760/cma.j.cn121094-20200219-00063

Ioannidis, J.P.A., Trikalinos, T.A., 2007. The appropriateness of asymmetry tests for publication bias in meta-analyses: a large survey. CMAJ 176, 1091–1096. https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.060410

Ji, D., Ji, Y.J., Duan, X.Z., Li, W.G., Sun, Z.Q., Song, X.A., Meng, Y.H., Tang, H.M., Chu, F., Niu, X.X., Chen, G.F., Li, J., Duan, H.J., 2017. Prevalence of psychological symptoms among Ebola survivors and healthcare workers during the 2014-2015 Ebola outbreak in Sierra Leone: a cross-sectional study. Oncotarget 8, 12784–12791. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.14498

Khalid, I., Khalid, T.J., Qabajah, M.R., Barnard, A.G., Qushmaq, I.A., 2016. Healthcare Workers Emotions, Perceived Stressors and Coping Strategies During a MERS-CoV Outbreak. Clin Med Res 14, 7–14. https://doi.org/10.3121/cmr.2016.1303

Khee, K.S., Lee, L.B., Chai, O.T., Loong, C.K., Ming, C.W., Kheng, T.H., 2004. The psychological impact of SARS on health care providers. Critical Care and Shock 100–106.

Koh, D., Lim, M.K., Chia, S.E., Ko, S.M., Qian, F., Ng, V., Tan, B.H., Wong, K.S., Chew, W.M., Tang, H.K., Ng, W., Muttakin, Z., Emmanuel, S., Fong, N.P., Koh, G., Kwa, C.T., Tan, K.B.-C., Fones, C., 2005. 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 43, 676–682.

Lai, J., Ma, S., Wang, Y., Cai, Z., Hu, J., Wei, N., Wu, J., Du, H., Chen, T., Li, R., Tan, H., Kang, L., Yao, L., Huang, M., Wang, H., Wang, G., Liu, Z., Hu, S., 2020. Factors Associated With Mental Health Outcomes Among Health Care Workers Exposed to Coronavirus Disease 2019. JAMA Netw Open 3, e203976–e203976. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.3976

Lancee, W.J., Maunder, R.G., Goldbloom, D.S., 2008. Prevalence of Psychiatric Disorders Among Toronto Hospital Workers One to Two Years After the SARS Outbreak. PS 59, 91–95. https://doi.org/10.1176/ps.2008.59.1.91

Lee, S.-H., Juang, Y.-Y., Su, Y.-J., Lee, H.-L., Lin, Y.-H., Chao, C.-C., 2005. Facing SARS: Psychological impacts on SARS team nurses and psychiatric services in a Taiwan general hospital. General Hospital Psychiatry 27, 352–358. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2005.04.007

Lee, S.M., Kang, W.S., Cho, A.R., Kim, T., Park, J.K., 2018. Psychological impact of the 2015 MERS outbreak on hospital workers and quarantined hemodialysis patients. Compr Psychiatry 87, 123–127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsych.2018.10.003

Li, L., Wan, C., Ding, R., Liu, Y., Chen, J., Wu, Z., Liang, C., He, Z., Li, C., 2015. Mental distress among Liberian medical staff working at the China Ebola Treatment Unit: a cross sectional study. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes 13, 156. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-015-0341-2

Lin, C.-Y., Peng, Y.-C., Wu, Y.-H., Chang, J., Chan, C.-H., Yang, D.-Y., 2007. The psychological effect of severe acute respiratory syndrome on emergency department staff. Emergency Medicine Journal 24, 12–17. https://doi.org/10.1136/emj.2006.035089

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Liu, C., Yang, Y., Zhang, X.M., Xu, X., Dou, Q.-L., Zhang, W.-W., 2020. The prevalence and influencing factors for anxiety in medical workers fighting COVID-19 in China: A cross-sectional survey (preprint). Psychiatry and Clinical Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.05.20032003

Liu, X., Kakade, M., Fuller, C.J., Fan, B., Fang, Y., Kong, J., Guan, Z., Wu, P., 2012. Depression after exposure to stressful events: Lessons learned from the severe acute respiratory syndrome epidemic. Comprehensive Psychiatry 53, 15–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsych.2011.02.003

Liu, Z., Han, B., Jiang, R., Huang, Y., Ma, C., Wen, J., Zhang, T., Wang, Y., Chen, H., Ma, Y., 2020. Mental Health Status of Doctors and Nurses During COVID-19 Epidemic in China (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 3551329). Social Science Research Network, Rochester, NY.

Marjanovic, Z., Greenglass, E.R., Coffey, S., 2007. The relevance of psychosocial variables and working conditions in predicting nurses' coping strategies during the SARS crisis: An online questionnaire survey. International Journal of Nursing Studies 44, 991–998. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.02.012

Matsuishi, K., Kawazoe, A., Imai, H., Ito, A., Mouri, K., Kitamura, N., Miyake, K., Mino, K., Isobe, M., Takamiya, S., Hitokoto, H., Mita, T., 2012. Psychological impact of the pandemic (H1N1) 2009 on general hospital workers in Kobe. Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences 66, 353–360. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1819.2012.02336.x

Maunder, R.G., Lancee, W.J., Balderson, K.E., Bennett, J.P., Borgundvaag, B., Evans, S., Fernandes, C.M.B., Goldbloom, D.S., Gupta, M., Hunter, J.J., Hall, L.M., Nagle, L.M., Pain, C., Peczeniuk, S.S., Raymond, G., Read, N., Rourke, S.B., Steinberg, R.J., Stewart, T.E., Coke, S.V., Veldhorst, G.G., Wasylenki, D.A., 2006. Long-term Psychological and Occupational Effects of Providing Hospital Healthcare during SARS Outbreak. Emerg Infect Dis 12, 1924–1932. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1212.060584

McAlonan, G.M., Lee, A.M., Cheung, V., Cheung, C., Tsang, K.W., Sham, P.C., Chua, S.E., Wong, J.G., 2007. Immediate and Sustained Psychological Impact of an Emerging Infectious Disease Outbreak on Health Care Workers: The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry. https://doi.org/10.1177/070674370705200406

McFarland, D.C., Roth, A., 2017. Resilience of internal medicine house staff and its association with distress and empathy in an oncology setting. Psycho-Oncology 26, 1519–1525. https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.4165

McMahon, S.A., Ho, L.S., Brown, H., Miller, L., Ansumana, R., Kennedy, C.E., 2016. Healthcare providers on the frontlines: a qualitative investigation of the social and emotional impact of delivering health services during Sierra Leone's Ebola epidemic. Health Policy Plan 31, 1232–1239. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czw055

Meyer, D., Kirk Sell, T., Schoch-Spana, M., Shearer, M.P., Chandler, H., Thomas, E., Rose, D.A., Carbone, E.G., Toner, E., 2018. Lessons from the domestic Ebola response: Improving health care system resilience to high consequence infectious diseases. American Journal of Infection Control 46, 533–537. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2017.11.001

Morina, N., Ehring, T., Priebe, S., 2013. Diagnostic Utility of the Impact of Event Scale–Revised in Two Samples of Survivors of War. PLOS ONE 8, e83916. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0083916

Naumann, D.N., McLaughlin, A., Thompson, C.V., Hardy, E., Fellows, J.L., Crombie, N.C., 2017. Acute stress and frontline healthcare providers. Journal of Paramedic Practice 9, 516–521. https://doi.org/10.12968/jpar.2017.9.12.516

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Nickell, L.A., Crighton, E.J., Tracy, C.S., Al-Enazy, H., Bolaji, Y., Hanjrah, S., Hussain, A., Makhlouf, S., Upshur, R.E.G., 2004. Psychosocial effects of SARS on hospital staff: survey of a large tertiary care institution. CMAJ 170, 793–798. https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.1031077

Oh, N., Hong, N., Ryu, D.H., Bae, S.G., Kam, S., Kim, K.-Y., 2017. Exploring Nursing Intention, Stress, and Professionalism in Response to Infectious Disease Emergencies: The Experience of Local Public Hospital Nurses During the 2015 MERS Outbreak in South Korea. Asian Nursing Research 11, 230–236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anr.2017.08.005

Park, J.-S., Lee, E.-H., Park, N.-R., Choi, Y.H., 2018. Mental health of nurses working at a government-designated hospital during a MERS-CoV outbreak: A cross-sectional study. Archives of Psychiatric Nursing 32, 2–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2017.09.006

Poon, E., Liu, K.S., Cheong, D.L., Lee, C.K., Yam, L.Y.C., Tang, W.N., 2004. Impact of severe respiratory syndrome on anxiety levels of front-line health care workers. Hong Kong Med J 10, 325–330.

Raven, J., Wurie, H., Witter, S., 2018. Health workers' experiences of coping with the Ebola epidemic in Sierra Leone's health system: a qualitative study. BMC Health Services Research 18, 251. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-018-3072-3

Robertson, E., Hershenfield, K., Grace, S.L., Stewart, D.E., 2004. The Psychosocial Effects of Being Quarantined following Exposure to SARS: A Qualitative Study of Toronto Health Care Workers. Can J Psychiatry 49, 403–407. https://doi.org/10.1177/070674370404900612

Shih, F.-J., Turale, S., Lin, Y.-S., Gau, M.-L., Kao, C.-C., Yang, C.-Y., Liao, Y.-C., 2009. Surviving a life-threatening crisis: Taiwan's nurse leaders' reflections and difficulties fighting the SARS epidemic. Journal of Clinical Nursing 18, 3391–3400. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2008.02521.x

Sim, K., Chong, P.N., Chan, Y.H., Soon, W.S.W., 2004. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome-Related Psychiatric and Posttraumatic Morbidities and Coping Responses in Medical Staff Within a Primary Health Care Setting in Singapore. Journal of Clinical Psychiatry 65, 1120–1127. https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.v65n0815

Smith, M.W., Smith, P.W., Kratochvil, C.J., Schwedhelm, S., 2017. The Psychosocial Challenges of Caring for Patients with Ebola Virus Disease. Health Secur 15, 104–109. https://doi.org/10.1089/hs.2016.0068

Styra, R., Hawryluck, L., Robinson, S., Kasapinovic, S., Fones, C., Gold, W.L., 2008. Impact on health care workers employed in high-risk areas during the Toronto SARS outbreak. Journal of Psychosomatic Research 64, 177–183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2007.07.015

Su, J.-A., Weng, H.-H., Tsang, H.-Y., Wu, J.-L., 2009. Mental health and quality of life among doctors, nurses and other hospital staff. Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress 25, 423–430. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.1261

Su, T.-P., Lien, T.-C., Yang, C.-Y., Su, Y.L., Wang, J.-H., Tsai, S.-L., Yin, J.-C., 2007. Prevalence of psychiatric morbidity and psychological adaptation of the nurses in a structured SARS caring unit during outbreak: A prospective and periodic assessment study in Taiwan. Journal of Psychiatric Research 41, 119–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2005.12.006

Sun, N., Xing, J., Xu, J., Geng, L.S., Li, Q.Y., 2020. Study of the mental health status of medical personnel dealing with new coronavirus pneumonia. medRxiv 2020.03.04.20030973. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.04.20030973

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.28.20082669; this version posted May 2, 2020. 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Tam, C.W.C., Pang, E.P.F., Lam, L.C.W., Chiu, H.F.K., 2004. Severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in Hong Kong in 2003: stress and psychological impact among frontline healthcare workers. Psychological Medicine 34, 1197–1204. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291704002247

Tham, K.-Y., Tan, Y., Loh, O., Tan, W., Ong, M., Tang, H., 2004. Psychiatric morbidity among emergency department doctors and nurses after the SARS outbreak. Annals of the Academy of Medicine, Singapore 33, S78-9. https://doi.org/10.1177/102490790501200404

Thompson, C.V., Naumann, D.N., Fellows, J.L., Bowley, D.M., Suggett, N., 2017. Post-traumatic stress disorder amongst surgical trainees: An unrecognised risk? The Surgeon 15, 123–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surge.2015.09.002

Valentine, J.C., Pigott, T.D., Rothstein, H.R., 2010. How Many Studies Do You Need?: A Primer on Statistical Power for Meta-Analysis. Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics 35, 215–247. https://doi.org/10.3102/1076998609346961

von Strauss, E., Paillard-Borg, S., Holmgren, J., Saaristo, P., 2017. Global nursing in an Ebola viral haemorrhagic fever outbreak: before, during and after deployment. Glob Health Action 10, 1371427. https://doi.org/10.1080/16549716.2017.1371427

Wong, E.L.Y., Wong, S.Y.S., Lee, N., Cheung, A., Griffiths, S., 2012. Healthcare workers' duty concerns of working in the isolation ward during the novel H1N1 pandemic. Journal of Clinical Nursing 21, 1466–1475. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2011.03783.x

Wu, P., Fang, Y., Guan, Z., Fan, B., Kong, J., Yao, Z., Liu, X., Fuller, C.J., Susser, E., Lu, J., Hoven, C.W., 2009. The psychological impact of the SARS epidemic on hospital employees in China: Exposure, risk perception, and altruistic acceptance of risk. Journal of Psychiatry 54, 302–311.

Wu, P., Liu, X., Fang, Y., Fan, B., Fuller, C.J., Guan, Z., Yao, Z., Kong, J., Lu, J., Litvak, I.J., 2008. Alcohol Abuse/Dependence Symptoms Among Hospital Employees Exposed to a SARS Outbreak. Alcohol Alcohol 43, 706–712. https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agn073

Xiao, H., Zhang, Y., Kong, D., Li, S., Yang, N., 2020. The Effects of Social Support on Sleep Quality of Medical Staff Treating Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in January and February 2020 in China. Med Sci Monit 26, e923549-1-e923549-8. https://doi.org/10.12659/MSM.923549

Zhu, Z., Xu, S., Wang, H., Liu, Z., Wu, J., Li, G., Miao, J., Zhang, C., Yang, Y., Sun, W., Zhu, S., Fan, Y., Hu, J., Liu, J., Wang, W., 2020. COVID-19 in Wuhan: Immediate Psychological Impact on 5062 Health Workers. medRxiv 2020.02.20.20025338. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.20.20025338