

1 **The prevalence of probable mental health disorders among hospital healthcare workers**
2 **during COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis**

3

4

5 **Brian En Chyi Lee¹, Mathew Ling^{1,2}, Leanne Boyd³, Craig Olsson¹, Jade Sheen¹**

6

7

8 **¹School of Psychology, Deakin University, Burwood, VIC, Australia**

9 **²Neami National, Preston, VIC, Australia**

10 **³Eastern Health, Box Hill, VIC, Australia**

11

12

13 ***Corresponding author at: School of Psychology, Deakin University, Burwood, VIC,**
14 **Australia. Email address: lbri@deakin.edu.au (Brian En Chyi Lee)**

15

16 **Conflict of interest**

17 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

18

19

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

20 **Abstract**

21 **Objectives**

22 The mental health impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic continue to be documented
23 worldwide with systematic reviews playing a pivotal role. Here we present updated findings
24 from our systematic review and meta-analysis on the mental health impacts among hospital
25 healthcare workers during COVID-19.

26 **Methods**

27 We searched MEDLINE, CINAHL, PsycINFO, Embase and Web Of Science Core
28 Collection between 1st January 2000 to 17th February 2022 for studies using validated
29 methods and reporting on the prevalence of diagnosed or probable mental health disorders in
30 hospital healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. A meta-analysis of proportions
31 and odds ratio was performed using a random effects model. Heterogeneity was investigated
32 using test of subgroup differences and 95% prediction intervals.

33 **Results**

34 The meta-analysis included 401 studies, representing 458 754 participants across 58
35 countries. Pooled prevalence of depression was 28.5% (95%CI: 26.3-30.7), anxiety was
36 28.7% (95%CI: 26.5-31.0), PTSD was 25.5% (95%CI: 22.5-28.5), alcohol and substance use
37 disorder was 25.3% (95%CI: 13.3-39.6) and insomnia was 24.4% (95%CI: 19.4-29.9).
38 Prevalence rates were stratified by physicians, nurses, allied health, support staff and
39 healthcare students, which varied considerably. There were significantly higher odds of
40 probable mental health disorders in women, those working in high-risk units and those
41 providing direct care.

42 **Limitations**

43 Majority of studies used self-report measures which reflected probable mental health
44 disorders rather than actual diagnosis.

45 **Conclusions**

46 These updated findings have enhanced our understanding of at-risk groups working in
47 hospitals. Targeted support and research towards these differences in mental health risks are
48 recommended to mitigate any long-term consequences.

49 **Keywords: Mental health disorders, Hospital Healthcare**
50 **Workers, COVID-19, Anxiety, Depression, Post-traumatic Stress**
51 **Disorder (PTSD)**

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60 Introduction

61 Despite stringent public health measures, the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)
62 pandemic has continued to persist worldwide, with currently more than 600 million people
63 infected and 6.5 million deaths across 233 countries (World Health Organisation, 2021). As
64 different COVID-19 variants (World Health Organisation, 2022) continue to trigger multiple
65 waves of outbreaks worldwide (Hale et al., 2021; Hassan and Mahmoud, 2021), many are
66 concerned that its extended nature and impacts may leave long-lasting mental health
67 consequences (Holmes et al., 2020; Pfefferbaum and North, 2020)

68 More specifically, there are concerns that hospital healthcare workers' (HCW) mental
69 health may be disproportionately affected as they continue to work in high-risk settings that
70 are constantly overwhelmed with COVID-19 patients. Studies have shown that working in
71 these settings early on during the pandemic have led to feelings of threat, uncertainty and
72 fatigue among hospital HCWs as they face high infection risks, inadequate protective
73 equipment, inconsistent communications, and increased workload (Digby et al., 2021; Ding
74 et al., 2021; Hennein and Lowe, 2020; Joo and Liu, 2021; Liu et al., 2020). It is thus
75 unsurprising that a number of early reviews have documented a wide range of mental health
76 issues among hospital HCWs during the pandemic, such as depression (Salari et al., 2020b;
77 Yan et al., 2021), anxiety (Raooifi et al., 2021; Salari et al., 2020b; Yan et al., 2021), post-
78 traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)(Yan et al., 2021) and insomnia (Salari et al., 2020a; Salari
79 et al., 2020b; Yan et al., 2021).

80 In view of these findings and the continuing spread of COVID-19, supporting hospital
81 HCWs' mental health is of the utmost importance to prevent long lasting consequences that
82 may lead to chronic mental health disorders. To do so effectively, we need to better
83 understand the mental health impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on hospital HCWs and

84 identify groups that may be at a risk of mental health disorders during the COVID-19
85 pandemic. This is, however, challenging given that prevalence estimates from previous
86 reviews (Li et al., 2021a; Raoofi et al., 2021; Salari et al., 2020a; Salari et al., 2020b) have
87 varied widely, with some reviews finding similar rates between HCWs and the general public
88 (Cénat et al., 2021; Phiri et al., 2021; Raoofi et al., 2021), making it unclear to what extent
89 working in hospitals during the pandemic have affected hospital HCWs' mental health. There
90 have also been inconsistent findings on at risk groups, with varied findings on whether
91 mental health issues varies between profession (Olaya et al., 2021; Pappa et al., 2020;
92 Santabárbara et al., 2021; Varghese et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2021), gender (Ching et al., 2021;
93 Li et al., 2021b; Raoofi et al., 2021; Serrano-Ripoll et al., 2020; Varghese et al., 2021; Yuan
94 et al., 2021b; Zhao et al., 2021) and frontline status (frontline HCWs defined as those
95 providing direct care or working in high risk settings) (Bell and Wade, 2020; Carmassi et al.,
96 2020; De Brier et al., 2020; Galli et al., 2020; Muller et al., 2020). The dynamic progression
97 of the COVID-19 pandemic has also made it more important to consistently update findings
98 and provide understanding on longitudinal trends to provide effective recommendations.
99 Particularly for hospital HCWs, given that recent impacts of COVID-19 on hospitals have
100 likely put them at high risk of mental health disorders, targeted recommendations are
101 important to help focus and design effective interventions and strategies to protect their
102 mental health.

103

104 **Aims and objectives**

105 This systematic review and meta-analysis aim to provide updated findings and
106 prevalence estimates on current mental health disorders experienced by all hospital HCWs
107 and each professional group, as well as investigating whether prevalence of mental health
108 disorders differed by gender and frontline status.

109 **Methods**

110

111 This systematic review followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review
112 and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines when conducting this study (Moher et al., 2009)
113 (S1 Appendix). The protocol for this systematic review and meta-analysis was pre-registered
114 and submitted to PROSPERO (ID:CRD42020219174). Due to the rapid publication of
115 studies, the research questions and systematic review went through several iterations (detailed
116 in PROSPERO) to ensure its relevance and avoid duplication of efforts.

117 **Search strategy**

118 A systematic search of the following database was conducted: MEDLINE, CINAHL,
119 PsycINFO via EBSCOhost, Embase via Emabase.com, and Web Of Science Core Collection
120 via webofknowledge.com. Searches were restricted to peer review articles, from 1st January
121 2000 to 17th February 2022, and English publications.

122 Search terms were derived from previous reviews and in consultation with a specialist
123 librarian using the PRESS checklist (McGowan et al., 2016). Key concepts included
124 healthcare workers, mental health, and coronavirus. Related terms, database specific MESH
125 terms, truncation and proximity commands were used in the search. (A sample search
126 strategy is shown in S2 Appendix). Endnote X9 was used to retrieve searches and remove
127 duplicated citations.

128 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

129 Prior to any screening, inclusion and exclusion criteria were pre-defined. Studies were
130 included if they: (1) reported prevalence rates of any outcome related a mental health disorder
131 defined by the diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders 5th edition (DSM-

132 V)(American Psychiatric Association, 2013) , (2) reported data on any HCWs who have
133 worked in a tertiary or secondary level hospital during the COVID-19 pandemic, (3) and used
134 validated methods (self-report measurement tools or diagnostic interviews) to identify the
135 presence of a mental health disorder. Studies were excluded if they: (1) were not published in
136 the English language, (2) were not a primary study, (3) was published as an editorial,
137 communication or brief report, (4) full-text were unobtainable (5) did not report the use of
138 valid cut offs or scoring methods or (6) were not peer-reviewed.

139 **Operational definition- Presence of a mental health disorder**

140 The presence of a mental health disorder in this systematic review is defined as those
141 meeting the validated criteria on diagnostic interviews for mental health disorders as defined
142 by the DSM-V(American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Where diagnostic interviews are
143 not used, the presence of clinically significant symptoms that are likely to indicate a probable
144 mental health disorder will be applied instead. This is defined as those meeting optimal cut-
145 offs on measurement tools that have been validated against diagnostic interviews and using
146 validated methods when estimating the likelihood of mental health disorder present in an
147 individual.

148 **Study selection**

149 The first author BL screened all studies' title and abstract using the pre-defined
150 criteria. When title and abstract were not clear, studies were reviewed at full text by BL. A
151 random 10% of studies at the title and abstract stage and full text stage were screened
152 independently by a second reviewer from the research team (DG, HS, CH, AJ, or BD).
153 Conflicts were resolved by an independent third reviewer. After resolving conflicts, the first

154 author's inter-rater agreement with second reviewers was at 98.7% at the title and abstract
155 and 98% at the full text stage.

156 **Data extraction**

157 Following full-text screening, BL independently completed the risk of bias
158 assessment and data extraction. Data extracted from the included studies are as follows: (1)
159 author details, (2) study design, (3) coronavirus outbreak setting, (4) outcomes measured, (5)
160 measurement tools, (6) recruitment dates, (7) mean or median age, (8) country of study, (9)
161 overall sample size of hospital HCWs, (10) subgroup sample size (i.e., physicians, nurses,
162 allied health staff, support staff, non-medical staff, healthcare students, hospital HCWs
163 working in high risk or low risk units, hospital HCWs providing direct care or do not provide
164 direct care, male and female), and the number of hospital HCWs overall and in subgroups
165 who meet the criteria for a mental health disorder. Total and stratified prevalence rates were
166 calculated as number of sample meeting criteria for a mental health disorder divided by total
167 sample size. When only percentage was reported for prevalence rates, the number of
168 participants with a mental health disorder was recalculated by multiplying point prevalence
169 rates with total sample size. When multiple reports of the same dataset were found, they were
170 merged and reported as one dataset to avoid double counting studies. When studies used both
171 interviews and self-report measures, only prevalence data measured by interviews were
172 extracted for analysis due to their increased validity and reliability. When studies reported
173 incomplete or inconsistent data, authors were contacted for more information. All data
174 extraction went through a second check by a second reviewer.

175 **Quality assessment**

176 The checklist for prevalence studies (Munn et al., 2015) from the Joanna Briggs
177 institute (JBI) was used to assess a study's risk of bias to sampling, precision, reporting,
178 reliability, validity, response, and coverage (S2B Appendix). When there were
179 disagreements, they were resolved through discussions between reviewers until there was a
180 consensus.

181 **Data synthesis**

182 A meta-analysis of proportions was conducted using R (R Core Team, 2013), and the
183 packages meta, metafor and dmetar (Balduzzi S et al., 2019; Harrer et al., 2019a; Harrer et
184 al., 2019b; Viechtbauer, 2010; Wang, 2018). Due to the variability between studies, it is
185 assumed that there is no one true effect size and thus a random effects model, using the
186 restricted maximum likelihood method (REML) was used to pool prevalence rates
187 (Borenstein and Higgins, 2013). Prevalence rates were transformed using the Freeman-Tukey
188 Double arcsine transformation and back transformed for ease of interpretation, as
189 recommended by Barendregt et al (Barendregt et al., 2013) to address, if any, imbalanced
190 weighting from extreme estimates and non-normal distribution of prevalence rates in the
191 meta-analysis. The variability in prevalence estimates that was due to heterogeneity was
192 assessed using standard χ^2 to test for significant heterogeneity and I^2 to determine low (<
193 25%), moderate (25%-50%), and high (> 75%) heterogeneity among studies (Higgins et al.,
194 2003).

195 **Subgroup analyses**

196 *Subgroup analyses by study level characteristics.* Subgroup analyses were conducted on
197 overall pooled prevalence rates when there were four or more studies (Fu et al., 2011), with
198 test of subgroup differences using Q tests for categorical predictors (i.e. measurement tools,

199 region and risk of bias). Test of subgroup difference between countries was considered
200 inappropriate as there was insufficient studies (less than 4 studies) in the majority of
201 countries. As such, the studies were categorised post-hoc according to regions categorised by
202 the World Health Organisation regions (i.e., Africa, Americas, South-East Asia, Europe,
203 Eastern Mediterranean, Western Pacific), as these regions have been shown to have
204 significantly different prevalence of mental health issues when estimated for the general
205 public (Nochaiwong et al., 2021).

206 ***Subgroup analyses by sub-populations.*** Stratified prevalence rates were estimated in
207 individual professions to compare differences between prevalence rates among the different
208 professions. To avoid false positives common in subgroup analyses where there is high
209 heterogeneity (Higgins and Thompson, 2004), as well as to quantify the effect of working in
210 high-risk units, providing direct care to COVID-19 patients and gender on prevalence rates,
211 pooled odds ratios (OR) were estimated for these sub-populations. Studies were only
212 included in the OR analyses if they reported prevalence rates for both groups of interest (e.g.,
213 prevalence rates for both male and females). To estimate pooled ORs, log odds ratios were
214 calculated and derived from prevalence rates reported by individual studies, pooled using a
215 random effects model (REML method) and then back transformed for ease of interpretation
216 (Borenstein and Higgins, 2013). To reduce type 1 error from having low numbers of studies
217 and heterogenous findings, the Hartung-Knapp method was used to estimate confidence
218 intervals for ORs (Hartung and Knapp, 2001a, b; IntHout et al., 2014). HCWs in low-risk
219 units, HCWs who do not provide direct care (referred as no direct care henceforth) and men
220 were used as the reference group in their respective OR analyses. Significance thresholds of p
221 <0.05 was used in all analysis.

222 **Sensitivity analysis**

223 Sensitivity analysis was performed by excluding each included study to identify any
224 influential outliers that have significant influence on overall estimates and heterogeneity by
225 assessing externally standardised residuals, difference in fits values (DFFITS), Cook's
226 distance, covariance ratios, DFBETAS, leave one out statistics, hat values and weights
227 (Viechtbauer and Cheung, 2010). Prediction intervals (PI) were estimated when there were
228 four or more studies to predict where 95% of future estimates would lie (Borenstein et al.,
229 2017).

230 **Publication bias**

231 Publication bias was assessed by visually inspecting funnel plots in conjunction with
232 Egger test of asymmetry. A p -value <0.05 in Egger's test indicated significant publication
233 bias.

234 **Results**

235 **COVID-19- Overall**

236 In total there were 401 included studies from 392 unique datasets, with 18
237 longitudinal studies that reported on the prevalence rates across different timepoints. The
238 included studies represented a total of 458 754 hospital HCWs across 58 countries (refer to
239 S3A and S3B Appendix for study characteristics). Overall, five DSM-V mental health
240 disorder were identified and reported by the included studies: depression, anxiety, PTSD,
241 insomnia, and alcohol or substance use disorder (A/SUD). Two studies used diagnostic
242 interviews, and the rest used validated self-report measurement tools and validated cut-offs
243 that reflected a probable mental health disorder (refer to S3C Appendix for details on
244 measurement tools used by studies and the corresponding cut-offs, sensitivity and
245 specificity).

246 **Insert Figure 1 about here**

247 A summary of overall pooled estimates is displayed in Figure 2 (details in S4A to
248 S8A Appendix). Overall meta-analytic pooling of individual estimates yielded an overall
249 summary estimate of 28.5% for depression (95%CI: 26.3%-30.7%), 28.7% for anxiety
250 (95%CI: 26.5%-31.0%), 25.5% for PTSD (95%CI: 22.5%-28.6%), 24.4% for insomnia
251 (95%CI: 19.4%-29.9%) and 25.3 % for A/SUD (95%CI: 13.3%-39.6%). In all estimates
252 heterogeneity was high ($I^2 = 99\%-100\%$) and significant ($p < 0.001$), and prediction intervals
253 were wide. Studies conducted in China accounted for the most weight in all the estimates
254 (24.3% to 25.4%), followed by studies conducted in the United States (5.6% to 16.9%) (S4B
255 to S8B Appendix).

256 **Insert Figure 2 about here**

257 **Subgroup analysis by study level characteristics**

258 Subgroup analyses was conducted by measurement tools and WHO regions when
259 there were more than four studies in each subgroup (Fig 3). Due to the lack of studies,
260 subgroup analysis by measurement tools and region could not be conducted for A/SUD
261 pooled rates. The test for subgroup differences showed statistically significant differences
262 between estimates produced by the different measurement tools used for depression
263 ($\chi^2=56.7$, $df = 6$, $p < 0.001$), anxiety ($\chi^2=95.7$, $df = 5$, $p < 0.001$), PTSD ($\chi^2=21.7$, $df = 5$, p
264 < 0.001) and insomnia ($\chi^2=47.9$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$).

265 **Insert Figure 3 about here**

266 In terms of WHO regions, results showed statistically significant differences between
267 the WHO regions' overall pooled prevalence rates for depression ($\chi^2=29.1$, $df = 5$, $p <$
268 0.0001), anxiety ($\chi^2=43.8$, $df = 5$, $p < 0.0001$) and PTSD ($\chi^2=11.3$, $df = 3$, $p = 0.01$).

269 **Subgroup analysis by risk of bias**

270 A summary of the overall risk of bias is displayed in Figure 4. There was low risk of
271 bias in the sample frames used by 174 datasets (44%), sampling methods used by 140
272 datasets (36%), study's sample size in 259 datasets (66%), study details reported in 342
273 datasets (87%), subgroup coverage in 14 datasets (4%), consistency in measurement across
274 participants in 392 datasets (100%), statistical calculation of prevalence rates in 350 datasets
275 (89%) and for response rate in 61 datasets (16%) (details in S3 Appendix). Overall, the
276 studies show a mixed risk of bias across the results, with low risk of bias to accuracy and
277 precision of the results but higher risk towards generalisability and representation of overall
278 hospital HCW population. In the subgroup analysis, test of subgroup differences found no
279 significant differences between estimates by JBI risk of bias criteria except for sample size,
280 which significantly influenced depression ($\chi^2=11.6$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$), anxiety ($\chi^2=14.5$, df
281 $= 1$, $p = 0.0001$), PTSD ($\chi^2=7.41$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.01$) and insomnia ($\chi^2=5.1$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.02$)
282 rates (Fig5).

283 **Insert Figure 4 about here**

284 **Insert Figure 5 about here**

285 **Prevalence estimates stratified by professional characteristics**

286 A summary of pooled prevalence rates for all outcomes among individual professions
287 are displayed in Figure 2. Results show that the pooled prevalence rates of depression was
288 similar among nurses (28.0%, 95%CI: 24.5%-31.7%) and support staff (30.2%, 95%CI:
289 24.3%-36.5%), which was higher than physicians (25.3%, 95%CI: 21.8%-29.0%), allied
290 health (23.5%, 95%CI: 17.9%-39.5%) and non-medical staff (22.9%, 95%CI: 17.4%-28.9%),
291 but was lower than healthcare students (35.7%, 95%CI: 3.1%-78.9%) (S4C to S4H
292 Appendix).

293 In terms of pooled anxiety rates, it was most prevalent among healthcare students
294 (56.7%, 95%CI: 22.8%-87.5%), followed respectively by support staff (37.7%, 95%CI:
295 24.9%-51.4%), nurses (31.5%, 95%CI: 26.9%-36.3%), physicians (26.9%, 95%CI: 23.0%-
296 31.0%), non-medical staff (28.6%, 95%CI: 20.4%-37.5%) and allied health (23.3%, 95%CI:
297 16.5%-30.7%) (S5C to S5H Appendix).

298 PTSD was most prevalent in support staff (37.9%, 95%CI: 23.4%-53.5%), followed
299 by allied health (29.4%, 95%CI: 16.7%-43.9%), nurses (27.4%, 95%CI: 22.5%-32.5%), non-
300 medical staff (26.7%, 95%CI: 16.4 %-38.3%), physicians (22.4%, 95%CI: 16.4%-29.1%) and
301 healthcare students (22.2%, 95%CI: 5.5%-44.8%) (details in S6C to S6H Appendix).

302 Insomnia pooled prevalence rate was highest in support staff (36.4%, 95%CI: 17.3%-
303 57.8%), followed by nurses (26.0%, 95%CI: 16.0%-37.3%), physicians (16.0%, 95%CI:
304 10.2%-22.7%) and lowest in allied health (7.6%, 95%CI: 1.6%-17.3%) (details in S7C to
305 S7H Appendix).

306 No studies reported A/SUD rates by different professions.

307 Heterogeneity was high and significant for all estimates ($I^2 = 84\%-99\%$, $p < 0.001$).
308 Prediction intervals were all wide and predicted wide ranges of pooled rates, indicating
309 highly varied predicted rates.

310 **Odds ratio comparing prevalence rates of probable mental health disorders** 311 **in Hospital HCWs working in high and low risk units**

312 When comparing prevalence rates between hospital HCWs working in high risk and
313 low risk department, high risk units had significantly higher pooled ORs for depression
314 (OR=1.35, No. studies = 19 , 95%CI:1.04-1.76, $t = 2.39$, $p = 0.03$), anxiety (OR=1.38, No.
315 studies = 17, 95%CI:1.11-1.73, $t = 3.12$, $p < 0.01$), PTSD (OR= 1.59, No. studies = 12,

316 95%CI:1.26- 2.02, $t= 4.32$, $p < 0.01$), and insomnia (OR= 1.33, No. studies =4, 95%CI=1.06-
317 1.66, $t= 3.99$, $p = 0.03$) (Fig 6). There were no study reporting AUD rates by high or low risk
318 units.

319 **Insert Figure 6 about here**

320 Heterogeneity was high ($I^2 >75\%$) and significant ($p <0.001$) for depression and
321 anxiety estimates comparing high and low risk units. Heterogeneity was moderate but
322 significant for PTSD ($I^2= 62\%$, $p < 0.01$), whereas it was low and not significant for insomnia
323 OR ($I^2= 0\%$, $p=0.68$). All prediction intervals predicted wide ranges of ORs and predicted
324 non-significant effects in future estimates.

325 **Odds ratio comparing prevalence rates of probable mental health disorders**
326 **in Hospital HCWs providing direct care to COVID-19 patients and those**
327 **who do not**

328 When comparing prevalence rates between Hospital HCWs who provide direct care
329 and those who do not, those who provided direct care had significantly higher pooled ORs for
330 depression (OR=1.48, No. studies = 36, 95%CI:1.24-1.77, $t = 4.55$, $p < 0.0001$), anxiety
331 (OR=1.34, No. studies = 37, 95%CI:1.12-1.59, $t = 3.38$, $p < 0.01$), PTSD (OR=1.34, No.
332 studies = 14, 95%CI:1.05-1.73, $t = 2.56$, $p = 0.02$) and insomnia (OR=2.17, No. studies = 10,
333 95%CI:1.74- 2.71, $t = 7.90$, $p = < 0.0001$) (Figure 7). There was significant and high
334 heterogeneity in OR estimates for depression and anxiety ($I^2 = 78\%-79\%$, $p <0.001$).
335 Heterogeneity was moderate but significant for PTSD ($I^2= 68\%$, $p < 0.001$), while insomnia
336 pooled OR was not significantly heterogeneous and moderate ($p = 0.12$, $I^2= 37\%$). Prediction
337 intervals for all OR estimates predicted non-significant effects, with the exception of
338 insomnia, which had prediction intervals between 1.38 to 3.41

339 **Insert Figure 7 about here**

340 **Odds ratio comparing prevalence rates of probable mental health disorders**
341 **in men and women**

342 When evaluating the OR for gender, pooled estimates show that women had
343 significantly higher prevalence of depression (OR = 1.40, No. studies=79, 95%CI:1.26-1.56, t
344 = 6.34, $p < 0.0001$), anxiety (OR = 1.50, No. studies=70, 95%CI:1.29-1.74, $t = 5.47$, $p <$
345 0.0001), PTSD (OR = 1.50, No. studies=40, 95%CI:1.30-1.74, $t = 5.55$, $p < 0.0001$), and
346 insomnia (OR = 1.40, No. studies=15, 95%CI:1.23-1.60, $t = 5.54$, $p < 0.0001$).

347 As seen in Figure 8, there was significant heterogeneity and high ($p < 0.01$, $I^2 > 77\%$)
348 between studies in all estimates except insomnia OR, where it was low and not significant (p
349 = 0.54, $I^2 = 0\%$). Prediction intervals did not predict significantly higher rates of depression,
350 anxiety and PTSD but predicted significantly higher rates of insomnia for women in future
351 estimates.

352 **Sensitivity analysis**

353 In the overall pooled estimates, removal of influential outliers did not change any
354 estimates by 4.7% and heterogeneity remained high ($I^2 = 99\%$) and significant ($p < 0.001$).

355 In the stratified analysis for individual professions, with the exception of healthcare
356 students' pooled depression rates, removing outliers had no substantial or significant
357 influence on pooled rates or their heterogeneity, with estimates differing by 3.1% at most and
358 heterogeneity remaining high and significant ($I^2 = 85.0\% - 99.2\%$, $p < 0.001$). With regards
359 to healthcare students, removing the one outlier decreased pooled depression rates by 19.3%.
360 The remaining three studies had a combined pooled rate of 16.4% (95%CI 6.6%-29.3%) but

361 heterogeneity remained high and significant ($I^2 = 82.3\%$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the high
362 original pooled rates may be dependent on one study.

363 In the odds ratio analysis comparing prevalence rates between high risk and low risk
364 units, one influential outlier was detected for insomnia OR but when removed did not change
365 the significance of the effect, the overall effect size and heterogeneity (OR= 1.40, No. studies
366 =3, 95%CI=1.14- 1.72, $t = 6.95$, $p = 0.02$). No influential outliers were detected in depression,
367 anxiety, and PTSD OR estimates.

368 No influential outliers were detected for any direct care OR estimates.

369 When influential outliers were removed in the OR estimates for gender, significance,
370 effect size and prediction intervals were not affected substantially in depression (OR = 1.43,
371 No. studies=78, 95%CI:1.31-1.56, $t = 8.20$, $p < 0.0001$), anxiety (OR = 1.53, No. studies=68,
372 95%CI:1.38-1.69, $t = 8.24$, $p < 0.0001$) and insomnia (OR = 1.42, No. studies=14,
373 95%CI:1.21-1.65, $t = 4.82$, $p < 0.001$). Heterogeneity remained significant but was reduced
374 to a moderate level in depression ($p < 0.0001$, $I^2 = 73.5\%$) and anxiety estimates ($p <$
375 0.0001 , $I^2 = 71.3\%$), which suggests that the high heterogeneity in the original estimate may
376 be a result of extreme outliers. Heterogeneity in insomnia OR estimates remained low and
377 non-significant ($p = 0.47$, $I^2 = 0\%$).

378 **Publication bias**

379 There was significant publication bias detected in the overall prevalence estimates for
380 depression (Egger's test: $p < 0.001$), anxiety (Egger's test: $p < 0.001$) and PTSD (Egger's
381 test: $p < 0.001$) (funnel plots displayed in S9 Appendix), with smaller studies producing
382 higher prevalence rates. No publication bias was detected for insomnia (Egger's test: $p =$
383 0.40) and AUD/SUD (Egger's test: $p = 0.12$).

384 **Insert Figure 8 about here**

385 **Longitudinal COVID-19 studies**

386 18 datasets conducted in 11 countries during COVID-19 reported the prevalence of
387 probable mental health disorders across different timepoints (details in S10 Appendix)
388 (Algattas et al., 2021; Baumann et al., 2021; Cai et al., 2020; Castioni et al., 2021; Chene et
389 al., 2021; De Kock et al., 2022; Doulias et al., 2021; Gündoğmuş et al., 2021; Katsuta et al.,
390 2021; Lasalvia et al., 2021; Lasalvia et al., 2020; Li et al.; Magnavita et al., 2021a, b;
391 Magnavita et al., 2020; Moore et al., 2021; Mosolova et al., 2021; Noaimi et al., 2021;
392 Schmid et al., 2021; Shechter et al., 2021; Th'ng et al., 2021). Due to the variation in
393 timepoints, differences in context, and the small number of studies, the temporal relationship
394 between prevalence rates of mental health outcomes and the COVID-19 pandemic were
395 narratively synthesised to avoid combining quantitative data inappropriately.

396 Two studies (Katsuta et al., 2021; Moore et al., 2021) compared pre-pandemic rates
397 with COVID-19 rates in hospital HCWs. One study (Katsuta et al., 2021) (n- T1=2529, n-
398 T2=2501) found no significant difference in the prevalence of depression pre-pandemic and
399 during the COVID-19 pandemic among hospital HCWs. Similar results were found for the
400 prevalence of anxiety in Moore et al. (2021) study among medical students (n- T1=3775, n-
401 T2=836), which found no significant difference in both timepoints.

402 Eight datasets from 11 studies (Baumann et al., 2021; De Kock et al., 2022; Lasalvia
403 et al., 2021; Lasalvia et al., 2020; Magnavita et al., 2021a, b; Magnavita et al., 2020; Noaimi
404 et al., 2021; Schmid et al., 2021; Shechter et al., 2021; Th'ng et al., 2021), investigated the
405 progression of mental health outcomes across different timepoints as part of follow up
406 assessments. One study (Shechter et al., 2021) followed participants (T1 to T6-n= 230) over
407 six timepoints over 10 weeks. They found that the high prevalence of PTSD found during

408 baseline decreased by 34.9% over the first five timepoints but did not decrease further in the
409 last timepoint. In another study (Baumann et al., 2021) with ED physicians (n- T1=262, n-
410 T2=252), PTSD also decreased after two months but at a lower rate of 7%. With regards to
411 depression, the prevalence of depression significantly increased by 11.4% over 8 months in
412 one dataset (Magnavita et al., 2021a, b; Magnavita et al., 2020) (n- T1=180, n-T2=152, n-
413 T3=120), and 14% over 12 months in another (Lasalvia et al., 2021; Lasalvia et al., 2020) (n-
414 T1=2195, n-T2=917). In four other datasets (De Kock et al., 2022; Noaimi et al., 2021;
415 Schmid et al., 2021; Th'ng et al., 2021), with an average follow up duration of 8.5 months (2-
416 13 months), the prevalence of depression did not significantly change from baseline and
417 remained high. In terms of the prevalence of anxiety, five datasets (De Kock et al., 2022;
418 Magnavita et al., 2021a, b; Magnavita et al., 2020; Noaimi et al., 2021; Schmid et al., 2021;
419 Th'ng et al., 2021) with an average follow up duration of 8 months (2-13 months), showed
420 that it remained similar to baseline rates. Only one dataset (Magnavita et al., 2021a, b;
421 Magnavita et al., 2020) reported on the prevalence of insomnia (n- T1=180, n-T2=152, n-
422 T3=120), which showed significantly lower prevalence of insomnia after eight months.

423 Two studies reported prevalence rates of probable mental health disorders before and
424 one month after COVID-19 outbreaks in their local area (Cai et al., 2020; Doulias et al.,
425 2021). In Cai et al. (2020) study, they investigated two separate samples of nurses (n-
426 T1=709, n-T2=621) recruited from the same sample frame during the two different
427 timepoints. Their results shows that the prevalence of depression, anxiety, PTSD had a
428 significant decrease after the outbreaks, but insomnia remained similar to baseline rates.
429 Doulias et al. (2021) had similar results in their repeated measures study (n- T1:93, n-T2:103)
430 with regards to the prevalence of depression and anxiety, showing a large decrease in
431 prevalence rates of both outcomes.

432 One study (Li et al.) looked at hospital nurses' (T1 & T2-n=356) levels of PTSD
433 symptoms assessed before and after they worked in the COVID-19 units. Results showed that
434 there was a significant and large increase in the prevalence of clinically significant PTSD
435 symptoms after they have worked in COVID-19 units.

436 One study (Algattas et al., 2021) with a small sample of neuropsychology residents
437 (n=17) found that the prevalence of depression during a COVID-19 outbreak was
438 significantly lower than rates found before the outbreak.

439 Two repeated measures study (Gündoğmuş et al., 2021; Mosolova et al., 2021)
440 compared prevalence rates during the peaks of the first and second COVID-19 outbreak in
441 their local area. One study (Gündoğmuş et al., 2021) (n- T1:1051, n-T2:1409) reported that
442 depression and anxiety prevalence rates among hospital HCWs was significantly higher
443 during the second wave of COVID-19 outbreak compared to the first wave. This was
444 consistent with Mosolova et al. (2021) study (n- T1:1090, n-T2:1105), which showed a
445 significant increase in the prevalence of anxiety in the second wave of COVID-19.

446 Two studies (Castioni et al., 2021; Chene et al., 2021) compared prevalence rates
447 before and after lockdown measures were implemented in their local area. Chene et al. (2021)
448 results (n- T1:1565, n-T2:1109) showed that after lockdown, no significant changes were
449 observed in the prevalence of depression and anxiety. Consistent with this, Castioni et al.
450 (2021)'s result (n=272) showed that the prevalence of anxiety remained the same but the
451 prevalence of depression significantly increased after lockdown.

452 **Discussion**

453 To estimate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on hospital HCWs mental health,
454 this study systematically reviewed the literature and conducted a meta-analysis of studies

455 reporting on probable mental health disorders in hospital HCWs. The results from this study's
456 meta-analysis of 392 datasets during the COVID-19 pandemic suggest that a substantial
457 proportion of hospital HCWs working during COVID-19 experienced clinically significant
458 symptoms of depression (28.5%), anxiety (28.7%), PTSD (25.5%), insomnia (24.4%), and
459 AUD (25.3%). With regards to published findings, preliminary estimates from early reviews
460 on hospital HCWs have widely varied (Li et al., 2021a; Raoofi et al., 2021; Salari et al.,
461 2020a; Salari et al., 2020b), likely due to the differences in the number of studies, sample size
462 and methodology. Nonetheless, overall findings from this study echo those from these
463 previous reviews, that the prevalence of mental health issues in hospital HCWs is high and
464 concerning. In addition, findings from this study have provided an updated and more precise
465 estimate of the overall estimated prevalence of mental health issues being experienced by
466 hospital HCWs during COVID-19, which has remained high even with newer studies,
467 additional countries, a substantially larger sample size and the addition of clinically
468 significant thresholds. Given these findings and the ongoing nature of the COVID-19
469 pandemic, it is evident that support is imminently needed to prevent, reduce, and treat these
470 clinically significant symptoms of mental health disorders found in hospital HCWs working
471 during COVID-19.

472 When compared to the most recent estimates for the general public (GP) during
473 COVID-19, our findings indicate that hospital HCWs overall had a higher prevalence of
474 depression (HCWS: 28.5.0% vs GP: 22.6%) and anxiety (HCWS: 28.7% vs GP: 22.4%)
475 (Phiri et al., 2021). This is not surprising given the increases in workloads, infection risks,
476 uncertainty, and feelings of threat during the pandemic (Ding et al., 2021; Joo and Liu, 2021;
477 Liu et al., 2020), which may have increased the likelihood of developing depression and
478 anxiety in hospital HCWs during this time. The same, however, could not be said about the
479 prevalence rates of PTSD (HCWs: 25.5% vs GP: 23.2%) and insomnia (HCWS: 24.4% vs

480 GP: 22.9) in hospital HCWs, which have been comparable to the general public (Phiri et al.,
481 2021). Given these findings it cannot be disregarded that the prevalence of mental health
482 issues in hospital HCWs, such as PTSD and insomnia, may be explained partly, if not fully,
483 by distressing experiences in the community that have been associated with mental health
484 issues during the COVID-19 pandemic, such as the risk of infections in the community,
485 lockdowns, quarantines, impacts on families and social distancing (Brooks et al., 2020; Sheen
486 et al., 2022; Yuan et al., 2021a). Thus, when developing mental health support strategies for
487 hospital HCWs it is important to consider the impact of a pandemic across the different
488 domains of their lives as well as the direct impacts of their healthcare roles.

489 When interpreting findings, it is also important to recognise there was high
490 heterogeneity in the overall estimates, which is common to meta-analyses of prevalence and
491 consistent with previous reviews (Li et al., 2021a; Raoofi et al., 2021; Salari et al., 2020a;
492 Salari et al., 2020b). To further investigate the extent of this heterogeneity, prediction
493 intervals were estimated, providing insight into the distribution and predicted range of future
494 estimates (Barker et al., 2021; Borenstein et al., 2017). Our analysis identified wide ranges of
495 predicted prevalence rates that indicate, while on average there may be a high prevalence of
496 probable mental health disorders in hospital HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic, it is
497 likely that prevalence rates vary substantially between different settings, groups, or study
498 design. In our findings, sample size was found to significantly affect all effect sizes, with
499 lower risk studies and smaller studies showing a lower average in prevalence rates.

500 Prevalence estimates were also found to significantly differ between different WHO regions
501 and measurement tools, which is likely explained by the considerable differences in optimal
502 specificity and sensitivity in the measurement tools used (S2 Appendix) as well as national
503 differences in COVID-19's spread and responses. As such, it is important to consider these
504 factors when interpreting findings. However, while these factors may impact findings, there

505 is low certainty they had a large and significant impact as there were still large amounts of
506 unexplained heterogeneity. Another important factor to consider when interpreting findings is
507 clinical heterogeneity, (e.g., participant characteristics) which our findings indicate could also
508 explain differences in outcomes given consistent findings in specific estimates.

509 When analysed by healthcare professions, findings demonstrate that clinical
510 symptoms of depression, anxiety, PTSD, and insomnia were highly prevalent across all
511 studied healthcare professions. There was, however, variations in prevalence rates of different
512 mental health outcomes among different professions, suggesting that different professions
513 may be susceptible to different mental health impacts. In terms of depression only physicians,
514 nurses, support staff and healthcare students had higher rates than estimates for the general
515 public (Phiri et al., 2021). With regards to physicians, hospital nurses and healthcare students,
516 pre-pandemic studies largely supports that mental health issues have been evident in this
517 cohort since pre-pandemic (Chen and Meier, 2021; Dyrbye et al., 2006; Gheshlagh et al.,
518 2017; Rotenstein et al., 2016; Tung et al., 2018; Xie et al., 2020), due to their high workload,
519 work-related stress and high levels of burnout associated with their work (Almutairi et al.,
520 2022; Chen and Meier, 2021; Koutsimani et al., 2019). This makes it unclear to what extent
521 pandemic factors alone have affected their rates of depression symptoms while working in
522 hospitals during this time. Nevertheless, it is likely that pandemic factors exacerbated their
523 existing vulnerabilities, placing them at a higher risk of developing depression symptoms
524 during the COVID-19 pandemic. In contrast, support staff and other healthcare professionals
525 have largely been left out of pre-pandemic research. This is concerning given that translating
526 evidence from other professions may not be effective due to the differences in work related
527 stress, roles, and tasks. Based on these findings it is recommended that further research
528 examine profession specific factors that may be influencing the prevalence of depression

529 symptoms in hospital HCWs to support further development of targeted mental health
530 support strategies within hospital systems.

531 With regards to findings on anxiety, there is little pre-pandemic research indicating
532 this was a pre-existing issue for hospital HCWs overall, suggesting that the high rates of
533 anxiety found in this study may be explained by pandemic factors. This is affirmed by the
534 literature showing that sources of anxiety in hospital HCWs during coronavirus outbreaks,
535 including COVID-19, largely revolves around nosocomial infection risks, such as fear of
536 being infected (De Brier et al., 2020; Serrano-Ripoll et al., 2020), fear of infecting others
537 (i.e., family and community members) (Barello et al., 2020; Kisely et al., 2020), and PPE
538 adequacy (Kisely et al., 2020; Troglia Da Silva and Neto, 2021). The trends in our findings
539 also support this pattern of anxiety, showing the highest rates of anxiety in nurses, physicians,
540 support staff and healthcare students, all of whom have patient facing intensive roles and thus
541 more risks of infection. In contrast, allied health staff who have less patient contact, such as
542 pharmacists and lab technicians, were found to have the lowest rates of anxiety, comparable
543 to the general public (Phiri et al., 2021). Of note, non-medical staff had higher rates of
544 anxiety than the general public even though they were likely to have little patient contact.
545 This could be a reflection of their lack of specialised training and experience, which have
546 been suggested to increase worries of infections and mental health issues during coronavirus
547 outbreak (De Brier et al., 2020; Kisely et al., 2020). This re-emphasises the need for
548 healthcare organisations to incorporate strategies that help all hospital HCWs feel safe during
549 this time. Though, it is important to note that concerns around high infection risks among
550 HCWs were raised in the early stages of COVID-19 (Erdem and Lucey, 2021) and infection
551 risks may have reduced with improvements in the healthcare system over the course of the
552 COVID-19 pandemic. Early evidence from the United States have demonstrated that HCWs’
553 risk of infection in the workplace have reduced as hospitals improve their infection control

554 procedures, PPE use and vaccination rates (Braun et al., 2021; Damluji et al., 2021; Dunbar et
555 al., 2021; Jacob et al., 2021; Moghadas et al., 2021). While new variants of COVID-19 may
556 create a resurgence of infections again, it is not certain whether these high anxiety rates
557 persist, and if they do, whether nosocomial infection risks still play a significant role.
558 Nevertheless, given that anxiety symptoms can be a precursor to depression (Batterham et al.,
559 2013), support strategies will still benefit from focusing on reducing anxiety symptoms in
560 addition to depression symptoms to reduce the overall high rates of mental health issues in
561 hospital HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic and future infectious disease outbreaks.

562 With PTSD findings, interpretation needs to consider that findings may not be
563 reflective of post-traumatic stress reactions but rather hospital HCWs' ongoing and acute
564 experiences with traumatic stress as assessment of symptoms largely occurred during
565 outbreaks, suggesting that delayed onset of PTSD symptoms may yet occur. In the findings,
566 while overall rates of PTSD in hospital HCWs were similar to those in the general public,
567 nurses, allied health, non-medical staff and support staff were more likely to experience
568 PTSD symptoms than the general public (Phiri et al., 2021). Again, infection risks may be
569 playing an important role here, however, indirectly. Due to increased infection risks, rates of
570 quarantine have been significantly higher in hospitals HCWs compared to the general public
571 (Kumar et al., 2020) and have been found to be associated with PTSD symptoms (Brooks et
572 al., 2020; Brophy et al., 2020; Carmassi et al., 2020). While an effective measure to reduce
573 nosocomial outbreaks of COVID-19 in hospitals (Grzelakowska and Kryś, 2021; Huang et
574 al., 2021), studies have demonstrated that quarantine procedures can have severe
575 psychological impact due to feelings of threat, restrain and social isolation (Basso et al.,
576 2021; Brooks et al., 2020; Gómez-Durán et al., 2020), which were likely intensified as
577 hospital HCWs face repeated quarantine and its' consequences due to their work in hospitals.
578 Another contributing factor could be the social stigma and social rejection (Ding et al., 2021;

579 Gómez-Durán et al., 2020; Schubert et al., 2021; Yuan et al., 2021b) faced by these
580 professional groups due to their work, which have been found to increase experiences of
581 PTSD symptoms (Yuan et al., 2021a). Nurses, allied health, non-medical staff and support
582 staff may have been exposed more frequently to these negative social experiences given their
583 increased contact with patients and the public outside of clinical activities.

584 In addition to professional differences, it is also important to consider the impacts of
585 occupational factors on hospital HCWs' mental health, such as working in high-risk units and
586 providing direct care to infected patients. Our findings suggest that both these factors have
587 led to significantly higher odds of developing depression, anxiety, PTSD and insomnia
588 symptoms compared to their counterparts, with highly consistent evidence for insomnia and
589 moderately consistent for PTSD. Overall, these findings re-enforce that proximity to risk is
590 likely to be a determinant of distress during traumatic events (May and Wisco, 2016) and
591 highlights the need for strategies and interventions to support these at-risk groups during the
592 COVID-19 pandemic and in future infectious disease outbreaks. However, while these
593 findings affirm those from previous coronavirus outbreaks (De Brier et al., 2020; Kisely et
594 al., 2020; Preti et al., 2020; Serrano-Ripoll et al., 2020), it has contradicted recent results
595 from a living meta-analysis (Bell and Wade, 2020) that have shown exposure to COVID-19
596 patients do not significantly increase risk of PTSD. This could likely be a result of conflating
597 hospital HCWs with general HCWs and severe symptoms with mild in their meta-analysis
598 (Bell and Wade, 2020) and thus increasing the rates of PTSD symptoms in their non-exposed
599 group, leading to a non-significant effect. This suggests that the effect found in our meta-
600 analysis may only be reflective of those working in hospitals and PTSD symptoms that are at
601 a clinically significant threshold. Nevertheless, our overall findings still echoes Bell and
602 Wade's (Bell and Wade, 2020) recommendations that trauma focused support may not be a
603 pertinent focus in pandemic responses in the overarching healthcare system. When we look at

604 the overall impact on PTSD symptoms in hospital HCWs, there is some basis to their
605 recommendations as overall rates are comparable to the general public, which may mean that
606 reducing traumatic stress during COVID-19 would be more effective on a national level and
607 will likely have a significant cascading effect in reducing traumatic stress in hospital HCWs
608 overall. Within the healthcare system our findings suggest that trauma focused support, such
609 as psychological first aid (Ruzek et al., 2007), may instead be more appropriate for specific
610 groups at-risk due to their profession or proximity to infection risks, as opposed to a macro
611 level response from healthcare organisations.

612 Attention should also be given to hospital HCWs who are women. Our findings
613 clearly indicate they have been impacted more than men across multiple outcomes, with
614 consistent evidence in regard to insomnia and with the exception of extreme cases,
615 depression, and anxiety. However, while this supports evidence from previous coronavirus
616 outbreaks (Carmassi et al., 2020; Kisely et al., 2020; Serrano-Ripoll et al., 2020), and the
617 COVID-19 pandemic (Batra et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2021), it is again unclear to what extent
618 working in hospitals and pandemic factors are impacting their mental health. For instance,
619 women make up a large proportion of the healthcare workforce, such as nurses (World Health
620 Organisation, 2020) who have been implicated to have higher rates of mental health issues in
621 this study's findings and may explain women's higher likelihood of experiencing mental
622 health issues. In addition, the mental health of women has also been found to be impacted
623 more in the general public during pandemics (Xiong et al., 2020) and out of pandemics
624 (Wang et al., 2016). Nonetheless, while it is not certain that the hospital system or pandemic
625 factors are the main causal factor, pandemic factors likely played a significant role in
626 exacerbating existing mental health vulnerabilities among hospital HCWs who are women. It
627 is also important to note that findings have rejected that biological vulnerabilities, such as
628 hormones, explain the gender differences in mental health outcomes (Wang et al., 2016),

629 which underscores the importance of examining and addressing social factors that are
630 influencing disparities in mental health outcomes between men and women working in
631 hospitals.

632 Turning to longitudinal trends, findings were weak due to paucity of research, but
633 they suggested that probable mental health disorders were most prevalent in hospital HCWs
634 leading into and during an outbreak but decreased after outbreaks. Similar findings have been
635 identified amongst the general public during COVID-19 (Bourmistrova et al., 2022;
636 Robinson et al., 2022), showing rates of mental health issues decreasing as the COVID-19
637 pandemic progressed, implying that acute mental health responses are likely to be more
638 severe than long-term mental health responses. Though, despite the decrease, prevalence rates
639 remained at concerning rates and persisted among hospital HCWs over time. Previous
640 findings suggest that this particularly occurs for those working in high-risk settings that may
641 be at risk of long-term mental health issues after infectious disease outbreaks (Chau et al.,
642 2021). Given these findings, mental health strategies should consider strategies to mitigate
643 any long-term impacts. Longitudinal findings from a small number of studies, also supports
644 that pre-pandemic mental health issues were likely present and translated into higher mental
645 health risks during the COVID-19 pandemic. This highlights the importance of long-term
646 strategies to address systemic issues that leave hospital HCWs vulnerable to mental health
647 issues during traumatic events such as infectious disease outbreaks. Given these findings and
648 the low certainty in findings due to a paucity in longitudinal research, follow-up research is
649 recommended, specifically on those who are at higher risk, such as those providing direct
650 care to COVID-19 patients and HCWs working high risk departments.

651 **Limitations**

652 While this review has attempted to strengthen confidence when interpreting findings
653 using conservative methodology, it is not without its limitations. First, the findings are only
654 as robust as the studies included, which have mostly used self-report measures, reducing the
655 certainty that estimates truly reflect mental health diagnoses. However, we have minimised
656 uncertainty with this by only including studies that use measurement tools and cut offs that
657 have been validated against diagnostic interviews. While not reflective of actual mental
658 health diagnoses, our findings still show for the first time the proportion of hospital HCWs
659 experiencing mental health issues at a clinical level that have a high probability to lead to a
660 mental health disorder, if not present already, and requires immediate clinical assessment
661 (Bressler et al., 2018; Kroenke et al., 2007; Nieuwenhuijsen et al., 2003).

662 It also cannot be rejected that studies were missed in the selection process. Due to the
663 lack of multilingual reviewers in this study, non-English studies were not included. In
664 addition, not all studies were screened twice, however, evidence suggests that partial dual
665 screening can still be an acceptable procedure (Taylor-Phillips et al., 2017; Waffenschmidt et
666 al., 2019). Despite these limitations, our review with 401 studies is the most comprehensive
667 to date on mental health outcomes of hospital HCWs during COVID-19. As such, there is
668 very low risk of missing studies significantly impacting results.

669 **Conclusion**

670 In sum, findings are overall still emerging and there is growing certainty in the
671 evidence to suggest that there are specific groups of hospital HCWs at higher risk of mental
672 health issues. Thus, it is certain that further research is needed to inform the development of
673 mental health support strategies that are targeted. This is especially true for those outside of
674 the nursing and physician professions, such as allied health, non-medical and support staff in
675 hospital settings, where there is a lack of evidence to effectively rely on. At this time,

676 findings also highlight that those working in direct proximity of COVID-19 patients, working
677 in high-risk units and women hospital HCWs are at significant risk of mental health issues
678 and should be a priority in staff support within hospitals. More importantly, with re-occurring
679 outbreaks from new COVID-19 variants, mental health issues in hospital HCWs may
680 continue to persist and should not be neglected. As such, we echo the many previous calls for
681 further research, development of effective interventions and initiatives to support hospital
682 HCWs as they continue to support their communities while facing the many challenges of the
683 COVID-19 pandemic.

684 **Contribution**

685 Formal analysis, data curation, investigation, writing – Original Draft Preparation: Brian Lee
686 En Chyi

687 Methodology: Brian Lee En Chyi, Mathew Ling, Leanne Boyd, Jade Sheen

688 Conceptualisation, supervision, writing – review & editing: Mathew Ling, Leanne Boyd,
689 Craig Olsson, Jade Sheen

690 All authors have contributed and approved the final manuscript

691 **Acknowledgements**

692 The authors would like to acknowledge and thank Dawson Peter Grace, Mikhayl von Riebon,
693 Gayatri Kumar, Caitlyn Ann Herrick, Hiba Siddiqui, Anuradhi Jayasinghe and Britney Dellios
694 for their assistance with screening, data extraction and data checking.

695 **Funding source**

696 Preparation of this paper was supported by using award money from the Victorian

697 COVID-19 Research Fund-Stream B, State Government of Victoria. The funders of this
698 study had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or
699 preparation of the manuscript.

700 **References**

- 701 Algattas, H., Roy, S., Agarwal, N., Maroon, J., 2021. COVID-19 Impact in Neurosurgery
702 Residency: Grit During Pandemic. *World neurosurgery* 151, e395-e398.
- 703 Almutairi, H., Alsubaiei, A., Abduljawad, S., Alshatti, A., Fekih-Romdhane, F., Husni, M.,
704 Jahrami, H., 2022. Prevalence of burnout in medical students: A systematic review
705 and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 00207640221106691.
- 706 American Psychiatric Association, D.-T.F., 2013. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental
707 disorders: DSM-5™, 5th ed. American Psychiatric Publishing, Inc., Arlington, VA,
708 US.
- 709 Balduzzi S, Rucker G, G, S., 2019. “How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical
710 tutorial.”. *Evidence-Based Mental Health* 153–160.
- 711 Barello, S., Falcó-Pegueroles, A., Rosa, D., Tolotti, A., Graffigna, G., Bonetti, L., 2020. The
712 psychosocial impact of flu influenza pandemics on healthcare workers and lessons
713 learnt for the COVID-19 emergency: a rapid review. *International Journal of Public
714 Health* 65, 1205-1216.
- 715 Barendregt, J.J., Doi, S.A., Lee, Y.Y., Norman, R.E., Vos, T., 2013. Meta-analysis of
716 prevalence. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 67, 974-978.
- 717 Barker, T.H., Migliavaca, C.B., Stein, C., Colpani, V., Falavigna, M., Aromataris, E., Munn,
718 Z., 2021. Conducting proportional meta-analysis in different types of systematic

- 719 reviews: a guide for synthesisers of evidence. BMC Medical Research Methodology
720 21, 1-9.
- 721 Basso, M., Visintini, E., Achil, I., Fabris, S., Mattiussi, E., Danielis, M., Palese, A., 2021.
722 The experience of individuals placed in quarantine: A systematic review, meta-
723 summary, and meta-synthesis. Public Health Nursing 38, 627-636.
- 724 Batra, K., Singh, T.P., Sharma, M., Batra, R., Schvaneveldt, N., 2020. Investigating the
725 Psychological Impact of COVID-19 among Healthcare Workers: A Meta-Analysis.
726 International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 17.
- 727 Batterham, P.J., Christensen, H., Calear, A.L., 2013. ANXIETY SYMPTOMS AS
728 PRECURSORS OF MAJOR DEPRESSION AND SUICIDAL IDEATION.
729 Depression and Anxiety 30, 908-916.
- 730 Baumann, B.M., Cooper, R.J., Medak, A.J., Lim, S., Chinnock, B., Frazier, R., Roberts,
731 B.W., Epel, E.S., Rodriguez, R.M., Mycyk, M.B., 2021. Emergency physician
732 stressors, concerns, and behavioral changes during COVID-19: A longitudinal study.
733 Academic Emergency Medicine 28, 314-324.
- 734 Bell, V., Wade, D., 2020. Live meta-analysis: Mental Health of Clinical Staff Working in
735 High Exposure Compared to Low Exposure Roles in High-Risk Epidemic and
736 Pandemic Health Emergencies (Updated 2020.10.04), Open Science Framework.
- 737 Borenstein, M., Higgins, J.P., Hedges, L.V., Rothstein, H.R., 2017. Basics of meta-analysis:
738 I^2 is not an absolute measure of heterogeneity. Res Synth Methods 8, 5-18.
- 739 Borenstein, M., Higgins, J.P.T., 2013. Meta-Analysis and Subgroups. Prevention Science 14,
740 134-143.
- 741 Bourmistrova, N.W., Solomon, T., Braude, P., Strawbridge, R., Carter, B., 2022. Long-term
742 effects of COVID-19 on mental health: A systematic review. Journal of Affective
743 Disorders 299, 118-125.

- 744 Braun, K.M., Moreno, G.K., Buys, A., Somsen, E.D., Bobholz, M., Accola, M.A., Anderson,
745 L., Rehrauer, W.M., Baker, D.A., Safdar, N., Lepak, A.J., O'Connor, D.H., Friedrich,
746 T.C., 2021. Viral Sequencing to Investigate Sources of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in US
747 Healthcare Personnel. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 73, e1329-e1336.
- 748 Bressler, R., Erford, B.T., Dean, S., 2018. A Systematic Review of the Posttraumatic Stress
749 Disorder Checklist (PCL). *Journal of Counseling & Development* 96, 167-186.
- 750 Brooks, S.K., Webster, R.K., Smith, L.E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., Rubin,
751 G.J., 2020. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review
752 of the evidence. *The Lancet* 395, 912-920.
- 753 Brophy, J.T., Keith, M.M., Hurley, M., McArthur, J.E., 2020. Sacrificed: Ontario Healthcare
754 Workers in the Time of COVID-19. *NEW SOLUTIONS: A Journal of Environmental
755 and Occupational Health Policy* 30, 267-281.
- 756 Cai, Z., Cui, Q., Liu, Z., Li, J., Gong, X., Liu, J., Wan, Z., Yuan, X., Li, X., Chen, C., Wang,
757 G., 2020. Nurses endured high risks of psychological problems under the epidemic of
758 COVID-19 in a longitudinal study in Wuhan China. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*
759 131, 132-137.
- 760 Carmassi, C., Foghi, C., Dell'Oste, V., Cordone, A., Bertelloni, C.A., Bui, E., Dell'Osso, L.,
761 2020. PTSD symptoms in healthcare workers facing the three coronavirus outbreaks:
762 What can we expect after the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychiatry research* 292, 113312-
763 113312.
- 764 Castioni, D., Galasso, O., Rava, A., Massè, A., Gasparini, G., Mercurio, M., 2021. Has the
765 COVID-19 Pandemic Changed the Daily Practices and Psychological State of
766 Orthopaedic Residents? *Clinical Orthopaedics & Related Research®*, 1947-1954.
- 767 Cénat, J.M., Blais-Rochette, C., Kokou-Kpolou, C.K., Noorishad, P.-G., Mukunzi, J.N.,
768 McIntee, S.-E., Dalexis, R.D., Goulet, M.-A., Labelle, P.R., 2021. Prevalence of

769 symptoms of depression, anxiety, insomnia, posttraumatic stress disorder, and
770 psychological distress among populations affected by the COVID-19 pandemic: A
771 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychiatry Research* 295, 113599.

772 Chau, S.W.H., Wong, O.W.H., Ramakrishnan, R., Chan, S.S.M., Wong, E.K.Y., Li, P.Y.T.,
773 Raymont, V., Elliot, K., Rathod, S., Delanerolle, G., Phiri, P., 2021. History for some
774 or lesson for all? A systematic review and meta-analysis on the immediate and long-
775 term mental health impact of the 2002-2003 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
776 (SARS) outbreak. *BMC Public Health* 21, 670.

777 Chen, C., Meier, S.T., 2021. Burnout and depression in nurses: A systematic review and
778 meta-analysis. *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 124, 104099.

779 Chene, G., Nohuz, E., Cerruto, E., Moret, S., Atallah, A., Saoud, M., 2021. Psychological
780 impact on healthcare workers in obstetrics and gynecology in France in 18 French
781 University Hospitals during the first Covid-19 lockdown: a prospective observational
782 study. *Journal of psychosomatic obstetrics and gynaecology*, 1-8.

783 Ching, S.M., Ng, K.Y., Lee, K.W., Yee, A., Lim, P.Y., Ranita, H., Devaraj, N.K., Ooi, P.B.,
784 Cheong, A.T., 2021. Psychological distress among healthcare providers during
785 COVID-19 in Asia: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS ONE* 16, e0257983.

786 Damluji, A.A., Wei, S., Bruce, S.A., Haymond, A., Petricoin, E.F., Liotta, L., Maxwell, G.L.,
787 Moore, B.C., Bell, R., Garofalo, S., Houpt, E.R., Trump, D., deFilippi, C.R., 2021.
788 Seropositivity of COVID-19 among asymptomatic healthcare workers: A multi-site
789 prospective cohort study from Northern Virginia, United States. *The Lancet Regional*
790 *Health - Americas* 2, 100030.

791 De Brier, N., Stroobants, S., Vandekerckhove, P., De Buck, E., 2020. Factors affecting
792 mental health of health care workers during coronavirus disease outbreaks (SARS,
793 MERS & COVID-19): A rapid systematic review. *PLOS ONE* 15, e0244052.

- 794 De Kock, J.H., Latham, H.A., Cowden, R.G., Cullen, B., Narzisi, K., Jerdan, S., Munoz, S.-
795 A., Leslie, S.J., McNamara, N., Boggon, A., Humphry, R.W., 2022. The mental
796 health of NHS staff during the COVID-19 pandemic: two-wave Scottish cohort study.
797 BJPSYCH OPEN 8.
- 798 Digby, R., Winton-Brown, T., Finlayson, F., Dobson, H., Bucknall, T., 2021. Hospital staff
799 well-being during the first wave of COVID-19: Staff perspectives. International
800 Journal of Mental Health Nursing 30, 440-450.
- 801 Ding, S., Deng, S., Zhang, Y., Wang, Q., Yang, X., 2021. Experiences of Front-Line Medical
802 Staffs Fighting Against Coronavirus Disease 2019: A Meta-Synthesis of Qualitative
803 Studies.
- 804 Doulias, T., Thrikandiyur, A.A., Titus, N., Soundararasha, K., Coxon, A., Amarantidis, E.,
805 Arulampalam, T., 2021. Junior doctors' wellbeing at peak and post-peak pandemic: a
806 repeated cross-sectional study. Annals of the Royal College of Surgeons of England.
- 807 Dunbar, E., Godbout, E., Pryor, R., Rozycki, H.J., Bearman, G., 2021. Impact of coronavirus
808 disease 2019 (COVID-19) vaccination program on healthcare worker infections in an
809 academic hospital. Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology, 1-2.
- 810 Dyrbye, L.N., Thomas, M.R., Shanafelt, T.D., 2006. Systematic Review of Depression,
811 Anxiety, and Other Indicators of Psychological Distress Among U.S. and Canadian
812 Medical Students. Academic Medicine 81.
- 813 Erdem, H., Lucey, D.R., 2021. Healthcare worker infections and deaths due to COVID-19: A
814 survey from 37 nations and a call for WHO to post national data on their website. Int J
815 Infect Dis 102, 239-241.
- 816 Fu, R., Gartlehner, G., Grant, M., Shamliyan, T., Sedrakyan, A., Wilt, T.J., Griffith, L.,
817 Oremus, M., Raina, P., Ismaila, A., Santaguida, P., Lau, J., Trikalinos, T.A., 2011.

- 818 Conducting quantitative synthesis when comparing medical interventions: AHRQ and
819 the Effective Health Care Program. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 64, 1187-1197.
- 820 Galli, F., Pozzi, G., Ruggiero, F., Mameli, F., Cavicchioli, M., Barbieri, S., Canevini, M.P.,
821 Priori, A., Pravettoni, G., Sani, G., Ferrucci, R., 2020. A Systematic Review and
822 Provisional Metanalysis on Psychopathologic Burden on Health Care Workers of
823 Coronavirus Outbreaks. *Frontiers in Psychiatry* 11, 1001.
- 824 Gheshlagh, R., Parizad, N., Dalvand, S., Zarei, M., Farajzadeh, M., Karami, M., Sayehmiri,
825 K., 2017. The prevalence of job stress among nurses in Iran: A meta-analysis study.
826 *Nursing and Midwifery Studies* 6, 143-148.
- 827 Gómez-Durán, E.L., Martín-Fumadó, C., Forero, C.G., 2020. Psychological impact of
828 quarantine on healthcare workers. *Occup Environ Med* 77, 666-674.
- 829 Grzelakowska, K., Kryś, J., 2021. The impact of COVID-19 on healthcare workers'
830 absenteeism: infections, quarantines, sick leave — a database analysis of the Antoni
831 Jurasz University Hospital No. 1. in Bydgoszcz, Poland. *Medical Research Journal* 6,
832 47-52.
- 833 Gündoğmuş, İ., Ünsal, C., Bolu, A., Takmaz, T., Ökten, S.B., Aydın, M.B., Uçar, H.,
834 Gündüz, A., Kul, A.T., 2021. The comparison of anxiety, depression and stress
835 symptoms levels of healthcare workers between the first and second COVID-19
836 peaks. *Psychiatry research* 301, 113976.
- 837 Hale, T., Angrist, N., Hale, A.J., Kira, B., Majumdar, S., Petherick, A., Phillips, T., Sridhar,
838 D., Thompson, R.N., Webster, S., Zhang, Y., 2021. Government responses and
839 COVID-19 deaths: Global evidence across multiple pandemic waves. *PLOS ONE* 16,
840 e0253116.
- 841 Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T., Ebert, D., 2019a. *Doing Meta-Analysis in R: A*
842 *Hands-On Guide*.

- 843 Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T., Ebert, D.D., 2019b. dmetar: Companion R package
844 for the Guide'Doing Meta-Analysis in R', R package version 0.0.
- 845 Hartung, J., Knapp, G., 2001a. On tests of the overall treatment effect in meta-analysis with
846 normally distributed responses. *Stat Med* 20, 1771-1782.
- 847 Hartung, J., Knapp, G., 2001b. A refined method for the meta-analysis of controlled clinical
848 trials with binary outcome. *Stat Med* 20, 3875-3889.
- 849 Hassan, E.M., Mahmoud, H.N., 2021. Impact of multiple waves of COVID-19 on healthcare
850 networks in the United States. *PLOS ONE* 16, e0247463.
- 851 Hennein, R., Lowe, S., 2020. A hybrid inductive-abductive analysis of health workers'
852 experiences and wellbeing during the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States.
853 *PLOS ONE* 15, e0240646.
- 854 Higgins, J., Thompson, S., 2004. Higgins JP, Thompson SGControlling the risk of spurious
855 findings from meta-regression. *Stat Med* 23(11): 1663-1682. *Statistics in medicine* 23,
856 1663-1682.
- 857 Higgins, J.P.T., Thompson, S.G., Deeks, J.J., Altman, D.G., 2003. Measuring inconsistency
858 in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 327, 557.
- 859 Holmes, E.A., O'Connor, R.C., Perry, V.H., Tracey, I., Wessely, S., Arseneault, L., Ballard,
860 C., Christensen, H., Cohen Silver, R., Everall, I., Ford, T., John, A., Kabir, T., King,
861 K., Madan, I., Michie, S., Przybylski, A.K., Shafran, R., Sweeney, A., Worthman,
862 C.M., Yardley, L., Cowan, K., Cope, C., Hotopf, M., Bullmore, E., 2020.
863 Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for
864 mental health science. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 7, 547-560.
- 865 Huang, Q., Mondal, A., Jiang, X., Horn, M.A., Fan, F., Fu, P., Wang, X., Zhao, H., Ndeffo-
866 Mbah, M., Gurarie, D., 2021. SARS-CoV-2 transmission and control in a hospital
867 setting: an individual-based modelling study. *Royal Society Open Science* 8.

- 868 IntHout, J., Ioannidis, J.P.A., Borm, G.F., 2014. The Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman method
869 for random effects meta-analysis is straightforward and considerably outperforms the
870 standard DerSimonian-Laird method. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 14, 25.
- 871 Jacob, J.T., Baker, J.M., Fridkin, S.K., Lopman, B.A., Steinberg, J.P., Christenson, R.H.,
872 King, B., Leekha, S., O'Hara, L.M., Rock, P., Schrank, G.M., Hayden, M.K., Hota,
873 B., Lin, M.Y., Stein, B.D., Caturegli, P., Milstone, A.M., Rock, C., Voskertchian, A.,
874 Reddy, S.C., Harris, A.D., 2021. Risk Factors Associated With SARS-CoV-2
875 Seropositivity Among US Health Care Personnel. *JAMA Network Open* 4, e211283-
876 e211283.
- 877 Joo, J.Y., Liu, M.F., 2021. Nurses' barriers to caring for patients with COVID-19: a
878 qualitative systematic review. *International Nursing Review* 68, 202-213.
- 879 Katsuta, N., Ito, K., Fukuda, H., Seyama, K., Hori, S., Shida, Y., Nagura, R., Nojiri, S., Sato,
880 H., 2021. Elevated depressive symptoms among newer and younger healthcare
881 workers in Japan during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Neuropsychopharmacology reports*
882 41, 544-547.
- 883 Kisely, S., Warren, N., McMahon, L., Dalais, C., Henry, I., Siskind, D., 2020. Occurrence,
884 prevention, and management of the psychological effects of emerging virus outbreaks
885 on healthcare workers: rapid review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 369, m1642.
- 886 Koutsimani, P., Montgomery, A., Georganta, K., 2019. The Relationship Between Burnout,
887 Depression, and Anxiety: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in*
888 *Psychology* 10.
- 889 Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R.L., Williams, J.B.W., Monahan, P.O., Löwe, B., 2007. Anxiety
890 Disorders in Primary Care: Prevalence, Impairment, Comorbidity, and Detection. *Ann*
891 *Intern Med* 146, 317-325.

- 892 Kumar, S.S., Kumar, A., Kirtana, J., Singh, A.K., Shankar, S.H., Khan, M.A., Srivastava,
893 A.K., Kaur, R., Wig, N., 2020. Risk factors and outcome among COVID-19 exposed
894 and quarantined healthcare workers: A study on the status of existing practices of
895 standard precautions. *J Family Med Prim Care* 9, 5355-5359.
- 896 Lasalvia, A., Bodini, L., Amaddeo, F., Porru, S., Carta, A., Poli, R., Bonetto, C., 2021. The
897 Sustained Psychological Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Health Care Workers
898 One Year after the Outbreak-A Repeated Cross-Sectional Survey in a Tertiary
899 Hospital of North-East Italy. *International journal of environmental research and*
900 *public health* 18.
- 901 Lasalvia, A., Bonetto, C., Porru, S., Carta, A., Tardivo, S., Bovo, C., Ruggeri, M., Amaddeo,
902 F., 2020. Psychological impact of COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare workers in a
903 highly burdened area of north-east Italy. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences* 30.
- 904 Li, X., Yu, H., Yang, W., Mo, Q., Yang, Z., Wen, S., Zhao, F., Zhao, W., Tang, Y., Ma, L.,
905 Zeng, R., Zou, X., Lin, H., 2021a. Depression and Anxiety Among Quarantined
906 People, Community Workers, Medical Staff, and General Population in the Early
907 Stage of COVID-19 Epidemic. *Frontiers in psychology* 12, 638985.
- 908 Li, X.C., Zhou, Y., Xu, X.Y., Factors associated with the psychological well-being among
909 front-line nurses exposed to COVID-2019 in China: A predictive study. *Journal of*
910 *Nursing Management*.
- 911 Li, Y., Scherer, N., Felix, L., Kuper, H., 2021b. Prevalence of depression, anxiety and post-
912 traumatic stress disorder in health care workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A
913 systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS ONE* 16, e0246454.
- 914 Liu, M., Zhang, N., Wang, W., Chen, Q., Chen, W., Lin, Q., 2020. Experiences of Nurses
915 Fighting Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Qualitative Meta-Integration.
916 *American Journal of Nursing Science* Vol. 9, No. 6, 2020, pp. 394-401.

- 917 Magnavita, N., Soave, P.M., Antonelli, M., 2021a. A One-Year Prospective Study of Work-
918 Related Mental Health in the Intensivists of a COVID-19 Hub Hospital. *International*
919 *journal of environmental research and public health* 18.
- 920 Magnavita, N., Soave, P.M., Antonelli, M., 2021b. Prolonged Stress Causes Depression in
921 Frontline Workers Facing the COVID-19 Pandemic-A Repeated Cross-Sectional
922 Study in a COVID-19 Hub-Hospital in Central Italy. *International journal of*
923 *environmental research and public health* 18.
- 924 Magnavita, N., Soave, P.M., Ricciardi, W., Antonelli, M., 2020. Occupational Stress and
925 Mental Health among Anesthetists during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International*
926 *journal of environmental research and public health* 17.
- 927 May, C.L., Wisco, B.E., 2016. Defining trauma: How level of exposure and proximity affect
928 risk for posttraumatic stress disorder. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research,*
929 *Practice, and Policy* 8, 233-240.
- 930 McGowan, J., Sampson, M., Salzwedel, D.M., Cogo, E., Foerster, V., Lefebvre, C., 2016.
931 PRESS Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 Guideline Statement.
932 *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 75, 40-46.
- 933 Moghadas, S.M., Vilches, T.N., Zhang, K., Wells, C.R., Shoukat, A., Singer, B.H., Meyers,
934 L.A., Neuzil, K.M., Langley, J.M., Fitzpatrick, M.C., Galvani, A.P., 2021. The impact
935 of vaccination on COVID-19 outbreaks in the United States. *medRxiv : the preprint*
936 *server for health sciences*, 2020.2011.2027.20240051.
- 937 Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D.G., The, P.G., 2009. Preferred Reporting
938 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLOS*
939 *Medicine* 6, e1000097.

- 940 Moore, C.J.S., Blencowe, N.S., Hollén, L., van Hamel, C., 2021. Interim Foundation Year
941 One (FiY1) and preparedness for foundation year 1: A national survey of UK
942 foundation doctors. *Medical teacher*, 1-7.
- 943 Mosolova, E., Sosin, D., Mosolov, S., 2021. Stress, anxiety, depression and burnout in
944 frontline healthcare workers during two peaks of COVID-19 pandemic in Russia.
945 *Psychiatry research* 306, 114226.
- 946 Muller, A.E., Hafstad, E.V., Himmels, J.P.W., Smedslund, G., Flottorp, S., Stensland, S.Ø.,
947 Stroobants, S., Van de Velde, S., Vist, G.E., 2020. The mental health impact of the
948 covid-19 pandemic on healthcare workers, and interventions to help them: A rapid
949 systematic review. *Psychiatry Research* 293, 113441.
- 950 Munn, Z., Moola, S., Lisy, K., Riitano, D., Tufanaru, C., 2015. Methodological guidance for
951 systematic reviews of observational epidemiological studies reporting prevalence and
952 cumulative incidence data. *Int J Evid Based Healthc* 13, 147-153.
- 953 Nieuwenhuijsen, K., de Boer, A.G.E.M., Verbeek, J.H.A.M., Blonk, R.W.B., van Dijk,
954 F.J.H., 2003. The Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS): detecting anxiety
955 disorder and depression in employees absent from work because of mental health
956 problems. *Occup Environ Med* 60 Suppl 1, i77-i82.
- 957 Noaimi, H.M.A., Noaimi, M.M.A., Fayez, F.M.A., Mushkhes, H.Q.A., Al Ani, W., 2021.
958 The Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Mental Health of Health Care Workers of
959 Bahrain Defence Force Royal Medical Services. *BAHRAIN MEDICAL BULLETIN*
960 43, 580-587.
- 961 Nochaiwong, S., Ruengorn, C., Thavorn, K., Hutton, B., Awiphan, R., Phosuya, C., Ruanta,
962 Y., Wongpakaran, N., Wongpakaran, T., 2021. Global prevalence of mental health
963 issues among the general population during the coronavirus disease-2019 pandemic: a
964 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scientific reports* 11, 10173.

- 965 Olaya, B., Pérez-Moreno, M., Bueno-Notivol, J., Gracia-García, P., Lasheras, I.,
966 Santabárbara, J., 2021. Prevalence of Depression among Healthcare Workers during
967 the COVID-19 Outbreak: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of*
968 *Clinical Medicine* 10.
- 969 Pappa, S., Ntella, V., Giannakas, T., Giannakoulis, V.G., Papoutsis, E., Katsaounou, P., 2020.
970 Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during the
971 COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav Immun*
972 88, 901-907.
- 973 Pfefferbaum, B., North, C.S., 2020. Mental Health and the Covid-19 Pandemic. *New England*
974 *Journal of Medicine* 383, 510-512.
- 975 Phiri, P., Ramakrishnan, R., Rathod, S., Elliot, K., Thayanandan, T., Sandle, N., Haque, N.,
976 Chau, S.W.H., Wong, O.W.H., Chan, S.S.M., Wong, E.K.Y., Raymont, V., Au-
977 Yeung, S.K., Kingdon, D., Delanerolle, G., 2021. An evaluation of the mental health
978 impact of SARS-CoV-2 on patients, general public and healthcare professionals: A
979 systematic review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine* 34, 100806.
- 980 Preti, E., Di Mattei, V., Perego, G., Ferrari, F., Mazzetti, M., Taranto, P., Di Pierro, R.,
981 Madeddu, F., Calati, R., 2020. The Psychological Impact of Epidemic and Pandemic
982 Outbreaks on Healthcare Workers: Rapid Review of the Evidence. *Current Psychiatry*
983 *Reports* 22, 43.
- 984 R Core Team, 2013. R: A language and environment for statistical computing, Vienna,
985 Austria.
- 986 Raoofi, S., Pashazadeh Kan, F., Rafiei, S., Khani, S., Hosseinifard, H., Tajik, F., Masoumi,
987 M., Raoofi, N., Ahmadi, S., Aghalou, S., Torabi, F., Dehnad, A., Hoseinipalangi, Z.,
988 Rezaei, S., Shabaninejad, H., Ghashghaee, A., 2021. Anxiety during the COVID-19

- 989 pandemic in hospital staff: systematic review plus meta-analysis. *BMJ Supportive*
990 *& Palliative Care*, *bmjspcare-2021-003125*.
- 991 Robinson, E., Sutin, A.R., Daly, M., Jones, A., 2022. A systematic review and meta-analysis
992 of longitudinal cohort studies comparing mental health before versus during the
993 COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 296, 567-576.
- 994 Rotenstein, L.S., Ramos, M.A., Torre, M., Segal, J.B., Peluso, M.J., Guille, C., Sen, S., Mata,
995 D.A., 2016. Prevalence of Depression, Depressive Symptoms, and Suicidal Ideation
996 Among Medical Students: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *JAMA* 316,
997 2214-2236.
- 998 Ruzek, J.I., Brymer, M.J., Jacobs, A.K., Layne, C.M., Vernberg, E.M., Watson, P.J., 2007.
999 Psychological first aid. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling* 29, 17-49.
- 1000 Salari, N., Khazaie, H., Hosseini-Far, A., Ghasemi, H., Mohammadi, M., Shohaimi, S.,
1001 Daneshkhan, A., Khaledi-Paveh, B., Hosseini-Far, M., 2020a. The prevalence of
1002 sleep disturbances among physicians and nurses facing the COVID-19 patients: a
1003 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Globalization and Health* 16, 92.
- 1004 Salari, N., Khazaie, H., Hosseini-Far, A., Khaledi-Paveh, B., Kazemian, M., Mohammadi,
1005 M., Shohaimi, S., Daneshkhan, A., Eskandari, S., 2020b. The prevalence of stress,
1006 anxiety and depression within front-line healthcare workers caring for COVID-19
1007 patients: a systematic review and meta-regression. *Human Resources for Health* 18,
1008 100.
- 1009 Santabárbara, J., Bueno-Notivol, J., Lipnicki, D.M., Olaya, B., Pérez-Moreno, M., Gracia-
1010 García, P., Idoiaga-Mondragon, N., Ozamiz-Etxebarria, N., 2021. Prevalence of
1011 anxiety in health care professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic: A rapid
1012 systematic review (on published articles in Medline) with meta-analysis. *Progress in*
1013 *Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry* 107, 110244.

- 1014 Schmid, B., Schulz, S.M., Schuler, M., Göpfert, D., Hein, G., Heuschmann, P., Wurmb, T.,
1015 Pauli, P., Meybohm, P., Rittner, H.L., 2021. Impaired psychological well-being of
1016 healthcare workers in a German department of anesthesiology is independent of
1017 immediate SARS-CoV-2 exposure - a longitudinal observational study. *German*
1018 *medical science : GMS e-journal* 19, Doc11.
- 1019 Schubert, M., Ludwig, J., Freiberg, A., Hahne, T.M., Romero Starke, K., Girbig, M., Faller,
1020 G., Apfelbacher, C., Von Dem Knesebeck, O., Seidler, A., 2021. Stigmatization from
1021 Work-Related COVID-19 Exposure: A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis.
1022 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18, 6183.
- 1023 Serrano-Ripoll, M.J., Meneses-Echavez, J.F., Ricci-Cabello, I., Fraile-Navarro, D., Fiol-
1024 deRoque, M.A., Pastor-Moreno, G., Castro, A., Ruiz-Pérez, I., Zamanillo Campos, R.,
1025 Gonçalves-Bradley, D.C., 2020. Impact of viral epidemic outbreaks on mental health
1026 of healthcare workers: a rapid systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of*
1027 *affective disorders* 277, 347-357.
- 1028 Shechter, A., Chiuzan, C., Shang, Y., Ko, G., Diaz, F., Venner, H.K., Shaw, K., Cannone,
1029 D.E., McMurry, C.L., Sullivan, A.M., Rivera, R.R., Vose, C., Shapiro, P.A., Abdalla,
1030 M., 2021. Prevalence, Incidence, and Factors Associated with Posttraumatic Stress at
1031 Three-Month Follow-Up among New York City Healthcare Workers after the First
1032 Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International journal of environmental research*
1033 *and public health* 19.
- 1034 Sheen, J., Clancy, E.M., Considine, J., Dwyer, A., Tchernegovski, P., Aridas, A., Lee, B.E.,
1035 Reupert, A., Boyd, L., 2022. "Did You Bring It Home with You?"; A
1036 Qualitative Investigation of the Impacts of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Victorian
1037 Frontline Healthcare Workers and Their Families. *International Journal of*
1038 *Environmental Research and Public Health* 19.

- 1039 Taylor-Phillips, S., Geppert, J., Stinton, C., Freeman, K., Johnson, S., Fraser, H., Sutcliffe, P.,
1040 Clarke, A., 2017. Comparison of a full systematic review versus rapid review
1041 approaches to assess a newborn screening test for tyrosinemia type 1. *Research*
1042 *Synthesis Methods* 8, 475-484.
- 1043 Th'ng, F., Rao, K.A., Ge, L., Mao, D., Neo, H.N., Molina, J.A.D., Seow, E., 2021. A One-
1044 Year Longitudinal Study: Changes in Depression and Anxiety in Frontline Emergency
1045 Department Healthcare Workers in the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International journal of*
1046 *environmental research and public health* 18.
- 1047 Troglio Da Silva, F.C., Neto, M.L.R., 2021. Psychiatric disorders in health professionals
1048 during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *J Psychiatr*
1049 *Res* 140, 474-487.
- 1050 Tung, Y.J., Lo, K.K.H., Ho, R.C.M., Tam, W.S.W., 2018. Prevalence of depression among
1051 nursing students: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nurse Educ Today* 63, 119-
1052 129.
- 1053 Varghese, A., George, G., Kondaguli, S.V., Naser, A.Y., Khakha, D.C., Chatterji, R., 2021.
1054 Decline in the mental health of nurses across the globe during COVID-19: A
1055 systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Glob Health* 11, 05009-05009.
- 1056 Viechtbauer, W., 2010. Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. *Journal of*
1057 *Statistical Software*; Vol 1, Issue 3 (2010).
- 1058 Viechtbauer, W., Cheung, M.W.L., 2010. Outlier and influence diagnostics for meta-analysis.
1059 *Research synthesis methods* 1, 112-125.
- 1060 Waffenschmidt, S., Knellingen, M., Sieben, W., Bühn, S., Pieper, D., 2019. Single screening
1061 versus conventional double screening for study selection in systematic reviews: a
1062 methodological systematic review. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 19, 132.

- 1063 Wang, K., Lu, H., Cheung, E.F.C., Neumann, D.L., Shum, D.H.K., Chan, R.C.K., 2016.
1064 “Female Preponderance” of Depression in Non-clinical Populations: A Meta-Analytic
1065 Study. *Frontiers in Psychology* 7.
- 1066 Wang, N., 2018. How to Conduct a Meta-Analysis of Proportions in R: A Comprehensive
1067 Tutorial.
- 1068 World Health Organisation, 2020. State of the world's nursing 2020: investing in education,
1069 jobs and leadership. World Health Organisation, Geneva.
- 1070 World Health Organisation, 2021. WHO Coronavirus Disease (Covid-19) Dashboard.
- 1071 World Health Organisation, 2022. Tracking SARS-CoV-2 variants.
- 1072 Wu, T., Jia, X., Shi, H., Niu, J., Yin, X., Xie, J., Wang, X., 2021. Prevalence of mental health
1073 problems during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
1074 *Journal of Affective Disorders* 281, 91-98.
- 1075 Xie, N., Qin, Y., Wang, T., Zeng, Y., Deng, X., Guan, L., 2020. Prevalence of depressive
1076 symptoms among nurses in China: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS*
1077 *ONE* 15, e0235448.
- 1078 Xiong, J., Lipsitz, O., Nasri, F., Lui, L.M.W., Gill, H., Phan, L., Chen-Li, D., Iacobucci, M.,
1079 Ho, R., Majeed, A., McIntyre, R.S., 2020. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental
1080 health in the general population: A systematic review. *Journal of Affective Disorders*
1081 277, 55-64.
- 1082 Yan, H., Ding, Y., Guo, W., 2021. Mental Health of Medical Staff During the Coronavirus
1083 Disease 2019 Pandemic: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Psychosom Med*
1084 83, 387-396.
- 1085 Yuan, K., Gong, Y.-M., Liu, L., Sun, Y.-K., Tian, S.-S., Wang, Y.-J., Zhong, Y., Zhang, A.-
1086 Y., Su, S.-Z., Liu, X.-X., Zhang, Y.-X., Lin, X., Shi, L., Yan, W., Fazel, S., Vitiello,
1087 M.V., Bryant, R.A., Zhou, X.-Y., Ran, M.-S., Bao, Y.-P., Shi, J., Lu, L., 2021a.

1088 Prevalence of posttraumatic stress disorder after infectious disease pandemics in the
1089 twenty-first century, including COVID-19: a meta-analysis and systematic review.
1090 *Molecular Psychiatry* 26, 4982-4998.

1091 Yuan, K., Huang, X.-L., Yan, W., Zhang, Y.-X., Gong, Y.-M., Su, S.-Z., Huang, Y.-T.,
1092 Zhong, Y., Wang, Y.-J., Yuan, Z., Tian, S.-S., Zheng, Y.-B., Fan, T.-T., Zhang, Y.-J.,
1093 Meng, S.-Q., Sun, Y.-K., Lin, X., Zhang, T.-M., Ran, M.-S., Wong, S.-Y.-S., Rüschi,
1094 N., Shi, L., Bao, Y.-P., Lu, L., 2021b. A systematic review and meta-analysis on the
1095 prevalence of stigma in infectious diseases, including COVID-19: a call to action.
1096 *Molecular Psychiatry*.

1097 Zhao, Y.-J., Jin, Y., Rao, W.-W., Li, W., Zhao, N., Cheung, T., Ng, C.H., Wang, Y.-Y.,
1098 Zhang, Q.-E., Xiang, Y.-T., 2021. The prevalence of psychiatric comorbidities during
1099 the SARS and COVID-19 epidemics: a systematic review and meta-analysis of
1100 observational studies. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 287, 145-157.

1101 **Supporting information**

1102 **S1 Appendix. Prisma checklist**

1103 **S2 Appendix. Methods supplement**

1104 **S3A Appendix. Summary table of study characteristics**

1105 **S3B Appendix. Included studies references**

1106 **S3C Appendix. Measurement tools and cut off scores**

1107 **S4 Appendix. Depression forest plots**

1108 **S5 Appendix. Anxiety forest plots**

1109 **S6 Appendix. PTSD forest plots**

1110 **S7 Appendix. Insomnia forest plots**

1111 **S8 Appendix. AUD forest plot**

1112 **S9 Appendix. Funnel plots**

1113 **S10 Appendix. COVID-19 longitudinal studies summary table**

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133


1134

1135

1136

1137

1138 **Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart**



1139

1140

1141

1142


1143

1144

1145

1146

1147 **Figure 2. Forest plot of overall and stratified pooled prevalence estimates by individual**
 1148 **professions**




1149

1150

1151


1152 **Figure 3. Forest plot of subgroup analysis by study level characteristics**



1153

1154

1155 **Figure 4. Risk of bias summary**



1156

1157

1158

1159

1160

1161

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171


1172

1173


1174

1175

1176 **Figure 5. Forest plot of subgroup analysis by JBI risk of bias criteria**



1178 **Figure 6. Forest plot of odds ratio comparing the prevalence of probable mental health**
1179 **disorders in Hospital HCWs working in high risk and low risk units**







1180



1181

1182

1183 **Figure 7. Forest plot of prevalence odds ratio comparing the prevalence of probable**
 1184 **mental health disorders in Hospital HCWs providing direct care and no direct care**



1186 **Figure 8. Forest plot of prevalence odds ratio comparing the prevalence of probable**
 1187 **mental health disorders in females and males**



1189 **Figure 8. Continued**

