Factors associated with psychological distress in health-care workers during an infectious disease outbreak: A rapid living systematic review

Fuschia M. Sirois, PhD[1]

Janine Owens, PhD[2]

[1]Department of Psychology, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

[2]School of Clinical Dentistry, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Fuschia M. Sirois, PhD, Department of Psychology, University of Sheffield, Cathedral Court, 1 Vicar Lane, Sheffield, S1 2LT, UK; tel: +44 (0) 114 222 6552; Email: f.sirois@sheffield.ac.uk

Word count: 4515

Funding Statement: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of Interest: None

Abstract

Background: Health-care workers (HCW) are at risk for psychological distress during an infectious disease outbreak due to the demands of dealing with a public health emergency.

Aims: To examine the factors associated with psychological distress among HCW during an outbreak.

Method: We systematically reviewed literature on the factors associated with psychological distress (demographic characteristics, occupational, social, psychological, and infection-related factors) in HCW during an outbreak (COVID-19, SARS, MERS, H1N1, H7N9, Ebola). Four electronic databases were searched (2000 to 10 July 2020) for relevant peer-reviewed research according to a pre-registered protocol. A narrative synthesis was conducted to identify fixed, modifiable, and infection-related factors.

Results: From the 3335 records identified, 52 with data from 54,800 HCW were included. All but two studies were cross-sectional. Consistent evidence indicated that being female, a nurse, experiencing stigma, maladaptive coping, having contact or risk for contact with infected patients, and being quarantined, were risk factors for psychological distress among HCW. Personal and organisational social support, perceiving control, positive work attitudes, sufficient information about the outbreak and proper protection, training and resources, were associated with less psychological distress.

Conclusions: HCW who may be most at risk for psychological distress during an outbreak require early intervention and ongoing monitoring as there is some evidence that HCW distress can persist for years after an outbreak. Further research is needed to track the associations of risk factors with distress over time and the extent to which certain factors are inter-related and linked to sustained or transient distress.

Introduction

Several outbreaks of viral diseases have posed significant public health threats since 2000. These include SARS, H1N1, H7N9, MERS, EBOLA, and more recently, COVID-19 (See Supplementary Table 1). Such outbreaks place a serious strain on the health-care systems that try to contain and manage them, including health-care workers (HCW) who are at increased risk for nosocomial infections (1). In addition to the threat to their own physical health, HCW can experience psychological distress as a collateral cost of the risk of infection and the demands of dealing with a public health emergency (2).

Psychological distress refers to a state of emotional suffering, resulting from being exposed to a stressful event that poses a threat to one's physical or mental health (3). Inability to cope effectively with the stressor results in psychological distress that can manifest as a range of adverse mental health and psychiatric outcomes including depression, anxiety, acute stress, post-traumatic stress, burnout, and psychiatric morbidity. Although psychological distress is often viewed as a transient state that negatively impacts day-to-day and social functioning, it can persist and have longer-term negative effects on mental health (4).

Under normal circumstances, work-related psychological distress in HCW is associated with several short and long-term adverse outcomes. Psychological distress is linked to adverse occupational outcomes including include decreased quality of patient care (5), irritability with colleagues (6), cognitive impairments that negatively impact patient care (7), and intentions to leave one's job (8). HCW who experience psychological distress are also at risk of experiencing adverse personal outcomes including substance misuse (6), and suicide (9). In the context of an infectious disease outbreak, such consequences are likely amplified to the extent that psychological distress is heightened. HCW who reported elevated levels of psychological distress during the COVID-19 outbreak also experienced sleep disturbances (10), poorer physical health (11), and a greater number of physical symptoms, including

headaches (12). Similarly, HCW during the SARS outbreak disclosed a greater number of somatic symptoms and sleep problems (13), substance misuse and more days off work (14).

HCW serve a vital role in treating and managing infected individuals during an outbreak. Given the ongoing coronavirus outbreak, there is an urgent need to understand the factors that create or heighten risk for distress for HCW and impact their immediate and long-term mental health, as well as those that are protective and may reduce psychological distress. Such knowledge is important for identifying HCW most at risk, and informing strategies and treatments needed to support HCW resilience during and after an outbreak.

This rapid review synthesised the evidence on the factors associated with psychological distress among health-care workers (HCW) during an infectious disease outbreak. It also identified and classified the factors that contributed to risk or provided resilience for psychological distress. The key questions were:

1) What are the risk factors for psychological distress among HCW during an infectious outbreak?
2) What are the factors associated with reduced risk for psychological distress among HCW during an infectious outbreak?

Methods

Evidence was summarised using a rapid, living review approach because of the urgent need to support the mental health of HCW during and after the ongoing novel coronavirus pandemic. Rapid Reviews provide an expedient and useful means of synthesising the available evidence during times of health crises to inform evidence-based decision making for health policy and practice (15, 16). To accomplish this, rapid reviews take a streamlined approach to systematically reviewing evidence. Modified methods in the current review included: 1) search limited to English language studies; 2) grey literature limited to one

search source; 3) no formal critical appraisal of the research. Living reviews feature continual updating of the review as new evidence is released (17).

Data Sources and Searches

The search strategy for this pre-registered rapid review involved searching Medline, PsychInfo, Web of Science, and the first 10 pages of Google Scholar, as well as hand searching references. Search terms included a combination of terms related to health-care workers (e.g., "physicians", "nurses"), and distress (e.g., "stress", "anxiety"). The full search term list is available on PROSPERO (CRD42020178185). We conducted searches in a rolling manner, starting on April 6, 2020, then with updates on June 7, July 2, and July 10, 2020 to capture and integrate the most up-to-date evidence given the ongoing COVID-19 outbreak and the associated rapid release of research. Searches for new studies is ongoing and will use the same search methods described above Should new evidence be found that substantially changes the conclusions, a major update will be performed. Otherwise, new evidence will be updated monthly for a 6-month period.

Study selection and data extraction

A predefined search strategy was used (see full details on PROSPERO, https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/; registration ID: CRD42020178185). Studies were included in this Review if they were empirical research; published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals; written in English; included participants who were HCW in a hospital environment during a major infectious outbreak (COVID19, SARS, MERS, H1N1, H7N9, Ebola); had a sample size of greater than 80, and included data on factors associated with psychological distress during an outbreak. One investigator screened citations for potential full-text review, and a second investigator conducted the full-text review of each study for inclusion. Exclusions were verified by another reviewer, and disagreements

resolved through discussion. Data was extracted by one reviewer, entered into a table, and verified by a second reviewer.

As this was a rapid review, a formal assessment of study quality and risk for bias was not conducted (15, 16). In lieu of a formal assessment, we only included studies that reported findings for a sample size of greater than 80, which allows enough power to detect a medium effect size with an alpha of 0.05 (18, 19).

Data Synthesis and Analysis

We conceptually organised the factors in this Review identified as contributing to or mitigating psychological distress into three broad categories: 1) fixed or unchangeable factors (sociodemographic and occupational factors), 2) potentially modifiable factors (social and psychological factors), and 3) factors related to infection exposure. Fixed factors identify which HCW might be most vulnerable or resilient to distress, whereas modifiable factors identify potential targets for interventions to reduce risk and increase resilience. Infection-related factors are those that can directly inform hospital procedures and operating policy regarding ways to address and mitigate risk.

Results

The search yielded 3334 records, with 52 papers reporting 53 studies (Total N = 54,800 HCW) that met inclusion criteria for this Review. Figure 1 presents the complete screening process. Characteristics of the studies are in Table 1. The average sample size was 1,033 (range 82 – 14,825). The studies included HCW working across 15 countries during SARS (21), MERS (7), H1N1 (2), COVID-19 (21), Ebola (1), and H7N9 (1), outbreaks. The rates of psychological distress in HCW varied depending on how distress was measured (Table 1).

Sociodemographic factors

Twenty studies examined age as a predictor of psychological distress among HCW during an epidemic (see Table 2). Of these, ten found that age was a significant risk factor for distress. In two studies of HCW during the SARS outbreak, staff who were younger than 33 experienced greater stress, but not greater psychiatric morbidity, compared to older staff (20), and staff under 35 were more likely to report severe depressive symptoms three years after the outbreak (21). In another study, medical staff who were between 20 and 30 years old and exposed to patients with H7N9 had elevated post-traumatic stress disorder scores compared to older staff (22). Similarly, general practitioners in working during the SARS outbreak who met psychiatric caseness for PTSD were more likely to be younger (23). In a study during the H1N1 outbreak, hospital staff who were in their 20's had greater anxiety about becoming infected than did older staff (24). During COVID-19, HCW who were younger were more likely to experience higher levels of post-traumatic stress symptoms, depression, anxiety, and acute stress (25-29). In contrast, ten studies found that age was not a significant predictor of distress in HCW during the SARS, MERS or during the COVID-19 outbreaks (Table 2).

Twenty-five studies tested sex as a possible risk factor for distress among HCW during an outbreak (Table 2), with all but nine finding that being female was associated with higher risk for psychological distress. Notably, the fifteen studies that found that female sex was a significant risk factor spanned six different infectious diseases (MERS, SARS, COVID-19, H1N1, H7N9, and SARS), suggesting that being a female HCW increases vulnerability for distress more generally when working during an infectious outbreak.

Of the fifteen studies that examined marital status as a risk or resilience factor for psychological distress, only five found evidence to suggest this as a risk factor (Table 2). Two studies of HCW during the SARS outbreak found that HCW who were single were 1.4 times more likely to experience psychological distress than married HCW (30), and more likely to have sever depressive symptoms three years later (21). Similarly, HCW during the

COVID-19 outbreak who were single experienced higher levels of distress than those who were married (27, 31, 32). Conversely, two studies found that married HCW with children reported greater stress than single HCW or those who were married without children (33, 34). Ten other studies conducted during the SARS, MERS, and COVID-19 outbreaks found no associations between HCW marital status and distress.

Nine studies examined education levels in association with distress. Only two studies, conducted during the Ebola outbreak (35), and the MERS outbreak (36) found that HCW with higher educational levels reported significantly lower psychological distress. Education level was not predictive of psychological distress among HCW working during the MERS or the COVID-19 outbreaks (Table 2).

Occupational factors

Twenty-one studies examined and found evidence that the HCW occupational role created risk for psychological distress while working during the SARS, H1N1, MERS, and COVID-19 outbreaks (Table 2). In all but five studies, being a nurse was associated with a range of mental health issues, including higher stress, burnout, anxiety, depression, PTSD symptoms, psychiatric morbidity, and psychological distress compared to being a physician or other HCW (see Tables 1-2. The extent to which nurses experienced greater psychological distress whilst working during an outbreak was estimated in four studies; nurses were 1.2 (33), 1.4 (37), 2.2 (38), and 2.8 (39) times more likely to be at risk for poor mental health. In contrast, two studies found that physicians (13) and technicians (30) were more likely to experience distress while working during the SARS outbreak. Three studies conducted during the COVID-19 outbreak did not find that occupational role was a risk factor for distress (Table 2).

Other occupational factors examined included years of work experience, and full-time versus part-time status. Only five of the thirteen studies found evidence to suggest that less work experience may create risk (Table 2). HCW who had worked for less than two years experienced significantly greater stress than those with more work experience in a large sample of HCW during the SARS pandemic (13). In HCW during the SARS outbreak, those with less than 10 years of experience reported higher levels of psychological distress, but not burnout or posttraumatic stress, 13-26 months after the outbreak (14). HCW who had less clinical experience were also more likely to experience stress during the COVID-19 outbreak (Table 2). Years of clinical experience was not associated with PTSD symptoms, acute stress or anxiety, depression, mental health status, or burnout in five other studies (Table 2). Lastly, in one study, part-time worker status was a significant predictor of greater emotional distress in HCW during the SARS outbreak (39).

Social factors

A number of social and interpersonal factors mitigated or contributed to psychological distress. Receiving direct social support from friends, family, colleagues and supervisors was a key protective factor in the eleven studies that examined its association with psychological distress (Table 2). In HCW during the COVID-19 outbreak, higher levels of social support were associated with significantly lower levels of stress, depression, anxiety, depression and PTSD. These findings were consistent with that of a study of frontline medical staff during the COVID-19 outbreak who reported that a positive attitude from co-workers was important for reducing their distress (40). Analogously, emergency nurses working during MERS outbreak who reported poor support from family and friends experienced higher levels of burnout (36). Similarly, studies of HCW during the SARS outbreak found that higher levels of family support was associated with lower depression and anxiety whereas inadequate

support from relatives, lack of gratitude from patients and relatives, and perceiving less of a team spirit at work was associated with higher levels of psychological distress (Table 2).

Organisational support was an important factor in buffering psychological distress of HCW during an outbreak. In nurses working during the SARS outbreak in Canada, higher perceived organisational support in the form of receiving positive performance feedback from doctors and co-workers, was associated with lower perceptions of SARS-related threat and reduced feelings of emotional exhaustion (41). Similarly, nurses, physicians, and HCW working during the MERS, COVID-19 and SARS outbreaks who perceived support from their supervisors and colleagues, experienced better mental health in the form of lower PTSD symptoms, lower distress, and being less likely to develop psychiatric symptoms, respectively (Table 2).

Four studies examined receiving useful information from others (a common form of social support). In one study, HCW who received adequate communication and information about the H1N1 outbreak from their organisation were less likely to experience psychiatric symptoms because it helped them cope better, and worry less about the pandemic (38). Similarly, HCW during the SARS outbreak who had confidence in the information they received from their organisation (42), and who received clear communication about directives and how to take precautionary measures (30), experienced reduced psychological distress. HCW working during the COVID-19 outbreak who felt that they did not receive sufficient information, scored significantly higher on anxiety and acute stress than those who were satisfied with the information provided (43).

Negative social perceptions created risk for poor mental health for HCW in six studies. In nurses during the MERS outbreak, perceived social stigma was associated with higher stress and poorer mental health (44). Similarly, general physicians during the SARS

outbreak (23), who perceived stigma concerning negative public attitudes and disclosing about one's work, or self-stigma, experienced higher psychological distress. During the SARS outbreak, HCW who felt people avoided their family because of their job were twice as likely to have elevated levels of post-traumatic stress symptoms (33). Importantly, experiencing stigma and avoidance from others was significantly associated with higher levels of posttraumatic stress symptoms during the SARS outbreak (45), and 13-26 months later (14).

Psychological factors

The psychological factors examined in the studies included adaptive and maladaptive coping responses, beliefs and attitudes, and personality traits. Six studies examined how perceptions of control were associated with distress among HCW (Table 2). In three studies, higher self-efficacy, was associated with lower anxiety, depression, distress, and lower levels of fear about SARS and post-traumatic stress symptoms during the COVID-19 and SARS outbreaks, respectively. Conversely, feeling a loss of control was associated with greater distress (46) during the SARS outbreak in Hong Kong. Analogously, appraisals of personal risk were linked to higher levels of PTSD symptoms in HCW during the MERS (32) and SARS (42) outbreaks.

Positive attitudes towards one's work were protective against distress in four studies. Higher work satisfaction was associated with less psychological distress among hospital staff during the H1N1 outbreak (38), and lower PTSD among nurses during the COVID-19 outbreak (47). Similarly, HCW during the SARS outbreak who felt their work had become more important were less likely to develop psychiatric symptoms (30), and those who viewed their work altruistically were less likely to have severe symptoms of depression 3 years later (21).

Five studies examined whether coping styles were associated with HCW distress during an outbreak. Emergency physicians and nurses working during the SARS outbreak who used denial, mental disengagement, or venting of emotions to cope were more likely to score higher on psychiatric morbidity (48). Similar results were found in a study of nurses exposed to COVID-19, with use of negative coping associated with higher PTSD and positive coping linked to lower PTSD (47). In HCW during the SARS outbreak, those who used maladaptive coping strategies, such as escape-avoidance, and self-blame coping, reported higher levels of burnout, psychological distress, and post-traumatic stress when surveyed 13-26 months after the outbreak (14). However, the use of adaptive strategies, such as problem-solving and positive reappraisal, were not associated with any of the distress outcomes. This finding was consistent with a study in which coping ability was not significantly associated with PTSD symptoms during the MERS outbreak (32).

Five studies investigated the role of personality in psychological distress. During the SARS outbreak, neuroticism was linked to poorer mental health (49), and HCW who had an anxious attachment style reported experiencing higher burnout, psychological distress, and posttraumatic stress 13-26 months after the outbreak (14). Those with an avoidant attachment style reported greater distress, but not burnout or posttraumatic stress. Two studies examined the role of dispositional resilience. Among nurses working during the MERS outbreak, higher levels of hardiness were associated with lower stress and better mental health (44), and resilience was associated with lower anxiety, depression, and burnout among frontline nurses during COVID-19 (34).

Factors related to infection exposure

Eighteen studies examined the impact of direct contact with infected patients on HCW's psychological distress. Of these, fourteen found that being in direct contact with

and/or treating patients infected with COVID-19, SARS, MERS or H7N9 was a risk factor for psychological distress (Table 2). Only two studies did not find that contact with infected patients increased risk for distress (14, 50). Similarly, eleven studies found that risk of contact with infected patients due to working in high-risk areas (e.g., ICU, isolation areas and infection units) was associated with higher levels of anxiety, stress, and post-traumatic stress symptoms than not working in such areas (Table 2). Notably, one study found that HCW in a high-risk unit during SARS reported higher and sustained perceived stress one year after the outbreak compared to those in low-risk units, with those in low-risk units reporting a decrease in stress over time, but those in high-risk units experiencing an increase in stress post-outbreak (51). Spending time in quarantine due to risk of being infected was associated with higher levels of burnout, depression, and psychological distress in HCW during SARS, but was unrelated to post-traumatic stress symptoms in HCW during the MERS outbreak (Table 2). Lastly, one study found that HCW who had colleagues who became infected, had deceased due to infection, or had been quarantined, also experienced higher levels of post-traumatic stress symptoms and acute stress during the COVID-19 outbreak (25).

Provision of adequate training, protection and other resources to manage and reduce risk of infection was associated with less psychological distress in seven studies. Receiving clear infection control guidelines predicted lower psychological morbidity in frontline HCW during SARS (20), and having sufficient hospital resources for the treatment of MERS was associated with lower MERS-related burnout (36). After the implementation of a SARS protection training program, HCW experienced significant decreases in anxiety and depression two weeks and one month after the starting the program (52). Similarly, medical staff receiving inadequate training related to managing H7N9 had higher PTSD symptoms than those who received appropriate training (36). During COVID-19, HCW who felt that the

protection they were given was insufficient, felt unsafe, and perceived lower logistic support, reported higher levels of depression, anxiety, and acute stress symptoms (Table 2).

Discussion

This rapid living systematic review identified three main categories of factors contributing to increased and reduced risk of psychological distress among HCW during an infectious disease outbreak. For the fixed factors (demographic and occupational), the weight of the evidence indicated that HCW who were female or a nurse were at significant risk for psychological distress (Figure 2). Nurses tend to tend to be predominantly female, have higher workloads (45), and have more patient contact than other HCW. There was also clear and consistent evidence that HCW who had or were at risk for contact with infected patients, were more likely to experience psychological distress (Figure 3). Worry about becoming infected is a key stressor for HCW in the context of an outbreak as risk of infection has implications not only for their own health but also for that of their families (33). Evidence also indicated that being in quarantine contributes to distress, perhaps due to being isolated from the team (53), and that vicariously experiencing these risks can be detrimental for HCW mental health (25).

Although modifiable factors were investigated by fewer studies (Figure 2), the evidence highlighted key areas to target to reduce HCW distress. Stigmatising attitudes from the public towards HCW were associated with greater distress. Public health campaigns that deliver accurate messages and highlight facts to reduce the fears underlying stigma (54), and counteract the fear-mongering cultivated through the media that can promote stigma during an infectious outbreak (55) could address this. Consistent with research on the stress-reducing effects of social support in general (56), and for HCW (57), the evidence indicated that perceiving social support was associated with lower distress. This can come from supervisors

and co-workers (58), and through positive performance feedback (41). Such support can foster positive work attitudes and satisfaction (59), which were associated with lower distress. Evidence also indicated that harmful coping strategies, that may maintain or increase stress, were linked to greater distress. Interventions that target harmful coping are important for reducing distress, and other adverse health consequences, as HCW who experience post-traumatic stress during an outbreak and use harmful coping are at greater risk for substance abuse (60).

Perceptions of control were consistently associated with lower distress in the evidence reviewed. Although feeling a loss of control may be inevitable during an infectious outbreak, as perceptions of risk are inversely related to perceived control (61), efforts focused on increasing a sense of autonomy can be effective for reducing distress in HCW during stressful times (62). The evidence reviewed suggests that this might be accomplished by providing HCW with the resources needed to manage the risk of infection, such as through personal protective equipment, adequate training, and clear guidelines, information, and protocols for infection control, which were each linked to lower distress. This is consistent with research that found that access to information and provision of needed resources increased a sense of empowerment among ICU nurses (63).

Limitations and strengths

There are several limitations of this rapid systematic review. Conducting the review during the ongoing outbreak of COVID-19 imposed time constraints. This meant that a formal quality appraisal was not conducted, though only studies with analytic samples over 80 were included as a proxy measure of quality control. Most study samples were quite large, increasing confidence in the generalisability of the findings. Also, we only included published peer-reviewed literature and did not search more thoroughly through grey literature

or online pre-print repositories. In terms of the evidence base, the majority of the studies were cross-sectional, providing only a snapshot of the factors associated with HCW's psychological distress. This limits conclusions about the direction of causality between the factors and distress, especially for those that are modifiable. Only three studies examined the potential long-term effects of the risk and resilience factors on HCW's mental health by using follow-up and time-lagged designs (14, 21, 51), providing some support for the assumed effect of the factors on distress. More research is needed to track the associations of risk/resilience factors over time with distress and the extent to which certain factors are linked to sustained or transient distress. Although a number of studies investigated fixed factors and infection-related factors, there were relatively fewer studies that examined how modifiable factors were linked to distress (Figures 2-3). More research focusing on these factors is needed to provide a more solid evidence base about potential targets for clinical intervention and treatment. Several studies used unvalidated measures of psychological distress, raising concerns about whether the findings would be the same had validated measures been used. Few studies considered potential confounders in the associations with distress, compared found associations in matched non-HCW samples, or the extent to which the factors were predictive of distress outside of an outbreak. These limitations may have contributed to the equivocal findings noted for several of the factors reviewed.

These limitations are balanced by several strengths of the Review. Conceptually organising the factors according to risk or resilience and further as to whether they were fixed or modifiable provided a framework for identifying who might be at most risk for psychological distress to facilitate appropriate clinical intervention, and for noting which factors would be suitable targets for appropriate interventions. The Review included evidence from across several infectious disease outbreaks, increasing the possibility that the risk and resilience factors identified can be more generally applicable across different outbreaks.

Lastly, conducting a series of search updates ensured integration of the most recent evidence from the ongoing COVID-19 outbreak into the review at the time of submission.

Implications

Whereas other reviews have documented the extent of distress experienced by HCW during an outbreak (2), the current review highlights the profiles of HCW most at risk for psychological distress and psychiatric morbidity during an outbreak and identified modifiable factors that warrant further investigation as possible points of intervention to mitigate distress. Further research focusing on possible interactions among these factors would be useful to gain a better understanding of both the risk profiles and key modifiable factors, as the evidence reviewed did not consistently examine this.

Because there is evidence that the psychological distress from working during an outbreak can persist for two to three years after the outbreak (45, 51, 64), monitoring and providing appropriate support should continue beyond the outbreak period to ensure mental health recovery, especially among HCW who are most at risk. Our findings suggest that particular attention should be paid to female HCW and nurses (regardless of sex), and those who come in contact with infected patients or their environments to ensure that they receive necessary resources and provision of support to manage psychological distress. Proactive approaches at the organisational level can be effective (58) and may be necessary, as a study of HCW during the COVID-19 outbreak in China found that mental health resources and services were mainly used by those experiencing mild and subthreshold levels of psychological distress rather than those who experienced more severe distress (11). Evidence from randomised controlled trials suggests that third-wave cognitive behavioural therapeutic approaches, such as mindfulness (65), gratitude (66), and self-compassion (67), are effective for reducing stress and burnout among healthcare professionals, and could be beneficial. In

low-resource settings, peer-support is one option that has been shown to be effective for reducing occupational distress in HCW (58). Raising awareness of the impact of an infectious outbreak on HCW mental health, providing appropriate treatment and therapy, and fostering proactive approaches such as an organisational culture of support, are suggested as possible approaches that can help prepare HCW for future outbreaks and address any persistent, long-term distress following the outbreak.

Author Contributions

- FS and JO designed and conceived the study. JO and FS searched for evidence. JO and FS screened and analysed the data
- FS drafted the work. JO and FS revised it critically for intellectual content
- FS and JO approved the final piece of work for publication
- FS and JO agree to be accountable for the work

References

1. Chou R, Dana T, Buckley DI, Selph S, Fu R, Totten AM. Epidemiology of and Risk Factors for Coronavirus Infection in Health Care Workers. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2020.

2. Pappa S, Ntella V, Giannakas T, Giannakoulis VG, Papoutsi E, Katsaounou P. Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Brain Behav Immun. 2020:S0889-1591(20)30845-X.

3. Drapeau A, Marchand A, Beaulieu-Prévost D. Epidemiology of Psychological Distress In: LAbate L, editor. Mental Illnesses: Understanding, Prediction and Control: IntechOpen; 2012.

4. Horwitz AV. Distinguishing distress from disorder as psychological outcomes of stressful social arrangements. Health (London). 2007;11(3):273-89.

5. Stansfeld S, Head J, Rasul F. Occupation and mental health: Secondary analyses of the ONS Psychiatric Morbidity Survey of Great Britain. Queen Mary School of Medicine & Dentistry and the Office of National Statistics for the Health and Safety Executive; 2009. Contract No.: 168.

6. Taylor C, Graham J, Potts H, Candy J, Richards M, Ramirez A. Impact of hospital consultants' poor mental health on patient care. Br J Psychiatry. 2007;190:268-9.

7. Isaac CL, Cushway D, Jones GV. Is posttraumatic stress disorder associated with specific deficits in episodic memory? Clin Psychol Rev. 2006;26(8):939-55.

8. Dall'Ora C, Griffiths P, Ball J, Simon M, Aiken LH. Association of 12 h shifts and nurses' job satisfaction, burnout and intention to leave: findings from a cross-sectional study of 12 European countries. BMJ Open. 2015;5(9):e008331.

9. Adler NR, Adler KA, Grant-Kels JM. Doctors' mental health, burnout, and suicidality: Professional and ethical issues in the workplace. J Am Acad Dermatol. 2017;77(6):1191-3.

10. Xiao H, Zhang Y, Kong D, Li S, Yang N. 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. 2020;26:e923549-e.

11. Kang L, Ma S, Chen M, Yang J, Wang Y, Li R, et al. Impact on mental health and perceptions of psychological care among medical and nursing staff in Wuhan during the 2019 novel coronavirus disease outbreak: A cross-sectional study. Brain Behav Immun. 2020;87:11-7.

12. Chew NWS, Lee GKH, Tan BYQ, Jing M, Goh Y, Ngiam NJH, et al. A multinational, multicentre study on the psychological outcomes and associated physical symptoms amongst healthcare workers during COVID-19 outbreak. Brain Behav Immun. 2020:S0889-1591(20)30523-7.

13. Chong MY, Wang WC, Hsieh WC, Lee CY, Chiu NM, Yeh WC, et al. Psychological impact of severe acute respiratory syndrome on health workers in a tertiary hospital. Br J Psychiatry. 2004;185:127-33.

14. Maunder RG, Lancee WJ, Balderson KE, Bennett JP, Borgundvaag B, Evans S, et al. Long-term psychological and occupational effects of providing hospital healthcare during SARS outbreak. Emerg Infect Dis. 2006;12(12):1924-32.

15. Ganann R, Ciliska D, Thomas H. Expediting systematic reviews: methods and implications of rapid reviews. Implement Sci. 2010;5:56-.

16. Haby MM, Chapman E, Clark R, Barreto J, Reveiz L, Lavis JN. 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 Res Policy Syst. 2016;14(1):83.

17. Elliott JH, Turner T, Clavisi O, Thomas J, Higgins JP, Mavergames C, et al. Living systematic reviews: an emerging opportunity to narrow the evidence-practice gap. PLoS Med. 2014;11(2):e1001603.

18. Cohen J. A power primer. Psychol Bull. 1992;112(1):155-9.

19. Baird HM, Webb TL, Martin J, Sirois FM. The relationship between time perspective and self-regulatory processes, abilities and outcomes: a protocol for a meta-analytical review. BMJ Open. 2017;7(6):e017000.

20. Tam CWC, Pang EPF, Lam LCW, Chiu HFK. Severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in Hong Kong in 2003: stress and psychological impact among frontline healthcare workers. Psychological Medicine. 2004;34(7):1197-204.

21. Liu X, Kakade M, Fuller CJ, Fan B, Fang Y, Kong J, et al. Depression after exposure to stressful events: lessons learned from the severe acute respiratory syndrome epidemic. Compr Psychiatry. 2012;53(1):15-23.

22. Tang L, Pan L, Yuan L, Zha L. Prevalence and related factors of post-traumatic stress disorder among medical staff members exposed to H7N9 patients. Int J Nurs Sci. 2016;4(1):63-7.

23. Verma S, Mythily S, Chan YH, Deslypere JP, Teo EK, Chong SA. Post-SARS psychological morbidity and stigma among general practitioners and traditional Chinese medicine practitioners in Singapore. Ann Acad Med Singapore. 2004;33(6):743-8.

24. Matsuishi K, Kawazoe A, Imai H, Ito A, Mouri K, Kitamura N, et al. Psychological impact of the pandemic (H1N1) 2009 on general hospital workers in Kobe. Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences. 2012;66(4):353-60.

25. Rossi R, Socci V, Pacitti F, Di Lorenzo G, Di Marco A, Siracusano A, et al. Mental Health Outcomes Among Frontline and Second-Line Health Care Workers During the

Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic in Italy. JAMA Network Open. 2020;3(5):e2010185-e.

26. Chatterjee S, Bhattacharyya R, Bhattacharyya S, Gupta S, Das S, Banerjee B. Attitude, practice, behavior, and mental health impact of COVID-19 on doctors. Indian Journal of Psychiatry. 2020;62(3):257-65.

27. Elbay RY, Kurtulmuş A, Arpacıoğlu S, Karadere E. Depression, anxiety, stress levels of physicians and associated factors in Covid-19 pandemics. Psychiatry Res. 2020;290:113130.

28. Romero C-S, Catalá J, Delgado C, Ferrer C, Errando C, Iftimi A, et al. COVID-19 Psychological Impact in 3109 Healthcare workers in Spain: The PSIMCOV Group. Psychological Medicine. 2020:1-14.

29. Song X, Fu W, Liu X, Luo Z, Wang R, Zhou N, et al. Mental health status of medical staff in emergency departments during the Coronavirus disease 2019 epidemic in China. Brain Behav Immun. 2020.

30. Chan AO, Huak CY. Psychological impact of the 2003 severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak on health care workers in a medium size regional general hospital in Singapore. Occup Med (Lond). 2004;54(3):190-6.

31. Podder I, Agarwal K, Datta S. Comparative analysis of perceived stress in dermatologists and other physicians during national lock-down and COVID-19 pandemic with exploration of possible risk factors: A web-based cross-sectional study from Eastern India. Dermatologic Therapy.n/a(n/a):e13788.

32. Son H, Lee WJ, Kim HS, Lee KS, You M. Hospital workers' psychological resilience after the 2015 Middle East respiratory syndrome outbreak. Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal. 2019;47(2):1-13.

33. Koh D, Lim MK, Chia SE, Ko SM, Qian F, Ng V, et al. Risk perception and impact of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) on work and personal lives of healthcare workers in Singapore: what can we learn? Med Care. 2005;43(7):676-82.

34. Hu D, Kong Y, Li W, Han Q, Zhang X, Zhu LX, et al. Frontline nurses' burnout, anxiety, depression, and fear statuses and their associated factors during the COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan, China: A large-scale cross-sectional study. EClinicalMedicine. 2020:100424.

35. Ji D, Ji YJ, Duan XZ, Li WG, Sun ZQ, Song XA, et al. Prevalence of psychological symptoms among Ebola survivors and healthcare workers during the 2014-2015 Ebola outbreak in Sierra Leone: a cross-sectional study. Oncotarget. 2017;8(8):12784-91.

36. Kim JS, Choi JS. Factors Influencing Emergency Nurses' Burnout During an Outbreak of Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus in Korea. Asian Nurs Res (Korean Soc Nurs Sci). 2016;10(4):295-9.

37. Shechter A, Diaz F, Moise N, Anstey DE, Ye S, Agarwal S, et al. Psychological distress, coping behaviors, and preferences for support among New York healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. Gen Hosp Psychiatry. 2020;66:1-8.

38. Goulia P, Mantas C, Dimitroula D, Mantis D, Hyphantis T. General hospital staff worries, perceived sufficiency of information and associated psychological distress during the A/H1N1 influenza pandemic. BMC Infect Dis. 2010;10:322-.

39. Nickell LA, Crighton EJ, Tracy CS, Al-Enazy H, Bolaji Y, Hanjrah S, et al. Psychosocial effects of SARS on hospital staff: survey of a large tertiary care institution. CMAJ. 2004;170(5):793-8.

40. Cai H, Tu B, Ma J, Chen L, Fu L, Jiang Y, et al. Psychological Impact and Coping Strategies of Frontline Medical Staff in Hunan Between January and March 2020 During the

Outbreak of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Hubei, China. Med Sci Monit. 2020;26:e924171.

41. Fiksenbaum L, Marjanovic Z, Greenglass ER, Coffey S. 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. 2006;25(2):89-103.

42. Styra R, Hawryluck L, Robinson S, Kasapinovic S, Fones C, Gold WL. Impact on health care workers employed in high-risk areas during the Toronto SARS outbreak. J Psychosom Res. 2008;64(2):177-83.

43. García-Fernández L, Romero-Ferreiro V, López-Roldán PD, Padilla S, Calero-Sierra I, Monzó-García M, et al. Mental health impact of COVID-19 pandemic on Spanish healthcare workers. Psychological medicine. 2020:1-3.

44. Park J-S, Lee E-H, Park N-R, Choi YH. Mental Health of Nurses Working at a Government-designated Hospital During a MERS-CoV Outbreak: A Cross-sectional Study. Archives of Psychiatric Nursing. 2018;32(1):2-6.

45. Maunder RG, Lancee WJ, Rourke S, Hunter JJ, Goldbloom D, Balderson K, et al. Factors Associated With the Psychological Impact of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome on Nurses and Other Hospital Workers in Toronto. Psychosomatic Medicine. 2004;66(6).

46. Wong TW, Yau JK, Chan CL, Kwong RS, Ho SM, Lau CC, et al. The psychological impact of severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak on healthcare workers in emergency departments and how they cope. Eur J Emerg Med. 2005;12(1):13-8.

47. Wang Y-X, Guo H-T, Du X-W, Song W, Lu C, Hao W-N. Factors associated with post-traumatic stress disorder of nurses exposed to corona virus disease 2019 in China. Medicine. 2020;99(26):e20965.

48. Phua DH, Tang HK, Tham KY. Coping responses of emergency physicians and nurses to the 2003 severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak. Acad Emerg Med. 2005;12(4):322-8.

49. Lu YC, Shu BC, Chang YY, Lung FW. The mental health of hospital workers dealing with severe acute respiratory syndrome. Psychother Psychosom. 2006;75(6):370-5.

50. Bukhari EE, Temsah MH, Aleyadhy AA, Alrabiaa AA, Alhboob AA, Jamal AA, et al. Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) outbreak perceptions of risk and stress evaluation in nurses. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2016;10(8):845-50.

51. McAlonan GM, Lee AM, Cheung V, Cheung C, Tsang KW, Sham PC, et al. Immediate and sustained psychological impact of an emerging infectious disease outbreak on health care workers. Can J Psychiatry. 2007;52(4):241-7.

52. Chen R, Chou K-R, Huang Y-J, Wang T-S, Liu S-Y, Ho L-Y. Effects of a SARS prevention programme in Taiwan on nursing staff's anxiety, depression and sleep quality: a longitudinal survey. International journal of nursing studies. 2006;43(2):215-25.

53. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. The Lancet. 2020;395(10227):912-20.

54. Weiss MG, Ramakrishna J, Somma D. Health-related stigma: Rethinking concepts and interventions. Psychology, Health & Medicine. 2006;11(3):277-87.

55. Person B, Sy F, Holton K, Govert B, Liang A, National Center for Inectious Diseases SCOT. Fear and stigma: the epidemic within the SARS outbreak. Emerging infectious diseases. 2004;10(2):358-63.

56. Taylor SE, Sirois FM, Molnar DM. Health Psychology. Fifth Canadian edition ed. Toronto, ON: McGraw-Hill Ryerson; 2020.

57. Bradley JR, Cartwright S. Social Support, Job Stress, Health, and Job Satisfaction Among Nurses in the United Kingdom. International Journal of Stress Management. 2002;9(3):163-82.

58. Ruotsalainen J, Serra C, Marine A, Verbeek J. Systematic review of interventions for reducing occupational stress in health care workers. Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health. 2008;34(3):169-78.

59. Ng TWH, Sorensen KL. Toward a Further Understanding of the Relationships Between Perceptions of Support and Work Attitudes:A Meta-Analysis. Group & Organization Management. 2008;33(3):243-68.

60. Wu P, Liu X, Fang Y, Fan B, Fuller CJ, Guan Z, et al. Alcohol abuse/dependence symptoms among hospital employees exposed to a SARS outbreak. Alcohol Alcohol. 2008;43(6):706-12.

61. Nordgren LF, van der Pligt J, van Harreveld F. Unpacking perceived control in risk perception: the mediating role of anticipated regret. Journal of Behavioral Decision Making. 2007;20(5):533-44.

62. Lavoie-Tremblay M, Bonin J-P, Lesage AD, Bonneville-Roussy A, Lavigne GL, Laroche D. Contribution of the Psychosocial Work Environment to Psychological Distress Among Health Care Professionals Before and During a Major Organizational Change. The Health Care Manager. 2010;29(4).

63. Breau M, Rheaume A. Relationships between empowerment, work environment on job satisfaction, intent to leave, and quality of care among ICU nurses. Dynamics. 2014;25:16-24.

64. Wu P, Fang Y, Guan Z, Fan B, Kong J, Yao Z, et al. The psychological impact of the SARS epidemic on hospital employees in China: exposure, risk perception, and altruistic

acceptance of risk. Canadian journal of psychiatry Revue canadienne de psychiatrie. 2009;54(5):302-11.

65. Shapiro SL, Astin JA, Bishop SR, Cordova M. Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction for Health Care Professionals: Results From a Randomized Trial. International Journal of Stress Management. 2005;12(2):164-76.

66. Cheng S-T, Tsui, Pui Ki,Lam, John H. M. Improving mental health in health care practitioners: Randomized controlled trial of a gratitude intervention. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 2015;83:177-88.

67. Eriksson T, Germundsjö L, Åström E, Rönnlund M. Mindful Self-Compassion Training Reduces Stress and Burnout Symptoms Among Practicing Psychologists: A Randomized Controlled Trial of a Brief Web-Based Intervention. Frontiers in Psychology. 2018;9(2340).

68. Barello S, Palamenghi L, Graffigna G. Burnout and somatic symptoms among frontline healthcare professionals at the peak of the Italian COVID-19 pandemic. Psychiatry Res. 2020;290:113129-.

69. Chen CS, Wu HY, Yang P, Yen CF. Psychological distress of nurses in Taiwan who worked during the outbreak of SARS. Psychiatr Serv. 2005;56(1):76-9.

70. Grace SL, Hershenfield K, Robertson E, Stewart DE. The occupational and psychosocial impact of SARS on academic physicians in three affected hospitals. Psychosomatics. 2005;46(5):385-91.

71. Ho SM, Kwong-Lo RS, Mak CW, Wong JS. Fear of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) among health care workers. J Consult Clin Psychol. 2005;73(2):344-9.

72. Jung H, Jung SY, Lee MH, Kim MS. Assessing the Presence of Post-Traumatic Stress and Turnover Intention Among Nurses Post-Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Outbreak: The Importance of Supervisor Support. Workplace Health Saf. 2020:2165079919897693-.

73. Kim Y, Seo E, Seo Y, Dee V, Hong E. Effects of Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus on post-traumatic stress disorder and burnout among registered nurses in South Korea. International Journal of Healthcare. 2018;4(2).

74. Lai J, Ma S, Wang Y, Cai Z, Hu J, Wei N, et al. Factors Associated With Mental Health Outcomes Among Health Care Workers Exposed to Coronavirus Disease 2019. JAMA Network Open. 2020;3(3):e203976-e.

75. Lee SM, Kang WS, Cho A-R, Kim T, Park JK. Psychological impact of the 2015 MERS outbreak on hospital workers and quarantined hemodialysis patients. Comprehensive Psychiatry. 2018;87:123-7.

76. Liu C-Y, Yang Y-Z, Zhang X-M, Xu X, Dou Q-L, Zhang W-W, et al. The prevalence and influencing factors in anxiety in medical workers fighting COVID-19 in China: a cross-sectional survey. Epidemiol Infect. 2020;148:e98-e.

77. Lu W, Wang H, Lin Y, Li L. Psychological status of medical workforce during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. Psychiatry Res. 2020;288:112936.

78. Poon E, Liu KS, Cheong DL, Lee CK, Yam LY, Tang WN. Impact of severe respiratory syndrome on anxiety levels of front-line health care workers. Hong Kong Med J. 2004;10(5):325-30.

79. Que J, Shi L, Deng J, Liu J, Zhang L, Wu S, et al. Psychological impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare workers: a cross-sectional study in China. Gen Psychiatr. 2020;33(3):e100259.

80. Tu ZH, He JW, Zhou N. Sleep quality and mood symptoms in conscripted frontline nurse in Wuhan, China during COVID-19 outbreak: A cross-sectional study. Medicine (Baltimore). 2020;99(26):e20769.

81. Wilson W, Raj JP, Rao S, Ghiya M, Nedungalaparambil NM, Mundra H, et al. Prevalence and Predictors of Stress, anxiety, and Depression among Healthcare Workers

Managing COVID-19 Pandemic in India: a Nationwide Observational Study. Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine. 2020.

82. Yin Q, Sun Z, Liu T, Ni X, Deng X, Jia Y, et al. Posttraumatic stress symptoms of health care workers during the corona virus disease 2019. Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy. 2020;27(3):384-95.

83. Zhang W, Wang K, Yin L, Zhao W, Xue Q, Peng M, et al. Mental Health and Psychosocial Problems of Medical Health Workers during the COVID-19 Epidemic in China. Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics. 2020.



Figure 1: PRISMA flow diagram for literature screening


30
25
20
15
10
5
0
# of studies
Younger age
Female sex
Single marital status
Married w/children
Higher education level
Nurse
Less work experience
Part-time work status
Personal social support
Professional social support
Informational support
Stigma
Perceived control
Adaptive coping
Maladaptive coping
Psotive work attitudes
Aaptive personality traits
Maladative personality traits
Demographic factors
Occupational factors
Social factors
Psychological factors
Risk
Resilence
Non-significant

Figure 2: Findings from the studies that examined fixed (demographic and occupational) and modifiable (social and psychological) factors and associations with risk and resilience for psychological distress.



Figure 3: Findings from the studies that examined factors related to infection exposure and associations with risk and resilience for psychological distress.

Table 2: *Characteristics of the 53 studies (N = 54,800) included in the rapid review*

Study authors and year	**Country**	**Study design**	**Sample (% female)**	**Infectious disease**	**Study period**	**Psychological distress measures**	**Rates of distress (%)**	**Risk/resilience factors tested**
Barello et al. (2020)	Italy	Cross-sectional	376 Doctors and nurses (73.70)	COVID-19	5 weeks from the beginning of COVID-19 epidemic in Italy	MBI to measure burnout	37.0 (high emotional exhaustion)	Sex, HCW type
Bukhari et al. (2016)	Saudi Arabia	Cross-sectional	386 HCW (86.00)	MERS	NR	Study specific measure of worry about contracting MERS	33.2 (extremely or very worried)	Sex, risk of being in contact with infected cases, direct contact with confirmed infected cases
Cai et al. (2020)	China	Cross-sectional	534 HCW (68.70)	COVID-19	01/2020 – 03/2020	Study specific measure of stress	NR	Social support from family and friends
Chan & Huak (2004)	Singapore	Cross-sectional	661 Doctors and nurses (NR)	SARS	05/2003 2 months after SARS outbreak	IES-R, to measure post-traumatic stress disorder, GHQ-28 to measure distress	27.0 (distress; PTSD)	HCW type, marital status, social support-personal, adequate information, positive work attitude
Chatterjee et al. (2020)	India-West Bengal	Cross-sectional	152 Doctors (21.70)	COVID-19	28/03/2020-06/04/2020	DASS-21 to measure depression, stress and anxiety	34.9 (depression), 39.5 (anxiety), 32.9 (stress)	Age, sex, less work experience, at risk of being in contact with infected patients
Chen et al. (2005)	Taiwan	Cross-sectional	128 nurses (100.00)	SARS	During mid-May 2003, at the peak of the SARS outbreak.	IES to measure PTSD, SCL-90-R to measure psychopathology	11.0 (PTSD)	At risk of being in contact with infected patients

Chen et al. (2006)	Taiwan	Prospective	116 nurses (98.30)	SARS	May 2003	SAS to measure anxiety, SDS to measure depression	NR	Social support from family, Training for dealing with SARS provided
Chong et al. (2004)	China	Cross-sectional	1257 HCW (81.10)	SARS	12/05/2003-27/06/2003 6 weeks during outbreak	IES to measure post-traumatic stress disorder, CHQ to measure psychiatric morbidity	75.3 (psychiatric morbidity)	Age, sex, marital status, HCW type, work experience, exposure to confirmed infected cases
Elbay et al. (2020)	Turkey	Cross-sectional	442 HCW (56.80)	COVID-19	10/03/2020-15/03/2020	DASS-21 to measure depression, stress and anxiety	64.7 (depression), 51.6 (anxiety), 41.2 (stress)	Age, sex, marital status, less work experience, social support-professional/organisational, Hospital resources/protection/training for the treatment of infection, at risk of being in contact with infected patients
Fiskenbaum et al. (2004)	Canada	Cross-sectional	333 nurses (94.59)	SARS	03/2004- 05/2004	Study specific measures on worry about contracting SARS, MBI GS to assess extent of emotional exhaustion	NR	Social support-professional/organisational, direct contact with confirmed infected cases, time spent in quarantine
García-Fernández et al. (2020)	Spain	Cross-sectional	781 HCW (NR)	COVID-19	29/03/2020-05/04/2020 1 week during the peak of the outbreak	HAM-A to measure anxiety, BDI to measure depression, ASDI to measure stress	NR	Work experience, Adequate information, Hospital resources/protection/training for the treatment of infection
Goulia et al. (2010)	Greece	Cross-sectional	469 HCW (68.40)	H1N1	1/09/2009-30/09/2009	GHQ-28 to measure psychological	27.5 (mild to severe	HCW type, stigma, adequate information, positive work

					At the beginning of the second wave of the pandemic	distress, study specific measure of worry about H1N1	psychological distress), 56.7 (worry)	attitudes
Grace et al. (2005)	Canada	Cross-sectional	193 Academic physicians (32.10)	SARS	During the SARS outbreak in 2003	Study specific question about new distressing psychological symptoms	18.1 (new distressing symptoms)	Direct contact with confirmed infected cases
Ho et al. (2005) Sample 1	Hong Kong	Cross-sectional	82 HCW (56.09)	SARS	5/04/03-5/05/03 During height of outbreak	Study specific measures of worry about contracting SARS	NR	Perceived control
Ho et al. (2005) Sample 2	Hong Kong	Cross-sectional	97 HCW (82.50)	SARS	Sample 2 08/ 2003 Staff who had contracted SARS but now recovering	CIES–R to measure posttraumatic stress disorder	NR	Perceived control
Hu et al. (2020)	China	Cross-sectional	2014 nurses (87.10)	COVID-19	13/02/2020-24/02/2020 At the peak of the outbreak	MBI-HSS to measure burnout, SAS to measure anxiety, SDS to measure depression	60.5 (emotional exhaustion), 14.3 (anxiety), 10.7 (depression)	Age, sex, marital status, social support-personal, higher education level, less work experience, social support-personal, perceived control, adaptive personality traits, at risk of being in contact with infected patients, hospital resources/protection/training for the treatment of infection
Ji et al.	Sierra	Cross-	143 medical staff and	Ebola	13/02/2015-	SCL-90-R to measure	NR	Educational level

(2017)	Leone	sectional	students (49.50)	(EVD)	19/03/2015 During Ebola outbreak	psychological symptoms		
Jung et al. (2019)	South Korea	Cross-sectional	147 Nurses (NR)	MERS	1/10/2015-30/11/2015 Shortly after the MERS epidemic ended	IES-RK to measure post-traumatic stress disorder, GHQ-12 to measure mental health, study specific measure of stress	57.1 (PTSD)	Social support-professional/organisational
Kim et al. (2016)	South Korea	Cross-sectional	223 ED nurses (93.50)	MERS	20/07/2015-31/07/2015. 2 months after the outbreak of MERS during uncontrolled disease period	OLBI to assess MERS-related burnout	NR	Age, sex, marital status, level of education, work experience, direct contact with confirmed infected cases, social support-personal, hospital resources/protection/training for the treatment of infection
Kim et al. (2018)	South Korea	Cross-sectional	112 nurses (88.30)	MERS	30/06/2015-10/07/2015	IES to measure post-traumatic stress disorder, MBI-HSS to measure burnout.	50.00 (PTSD)	Age, sex, marital status, higher level of education, less work experience
Koh et al. (2005)	Singapore	Cross-sectional	7614 HCW (82.00)	SARS	05/2003- 07/2003. Towards the tail end of the pandemic	IES to measure post-traumatic stress disorder; single item to measure perceived stress at work	56.00 (stress)	HCW type, marital status, Stigma, exposure to SARS
Lai et al. (2020)	China	Cross-sectional	1257 HCW (76.70)	COVID-19	29/01/20-3/02/20 During pandemic	PHQ-9 to measure depression, GAD-7 to measure anxiety, CIES-R to measure	50.4 (depression), 44.6 (anxiety), 71.5 (PTSD)	Sex, HCW type, direct contact with confirmed infected cases

						post-traumatic stress disorder		
Lee et al. (2018)	South Korea	Cross-sectional	359 HCW (81.90)	MERS	05/32015 – 12/2015 During the outbreak	IES-R to measure post-traumatic stress	51.0 (post-traumatic stress)	Sex, age, HCW type, at risk of being in contact with infected patients, time spent in quarantine
Liu et al. (2012)	China	Cross-sectional	549 HCW (75.2)	SARS	In 2006, 3 years after Beijing's SARS outbreak	CES-D to measure depression	22.8 (moderate or severe depression)	Sex, age, marital status, altruistic perspective towards work, exposure to infection, being quarantined
Liu et al. (2020)	China	Cross-sectional	512 HCW (79.96)	COVID-19	10/02/20-20/02/20 During pandemic	SAS to measure anxiety	12.5 (mild to severe anxiety)	Sex, age, marital status, level of education, HCW type, direct contact with confirmed infected cases
Lu et al. (2006)	Taiwan	Cross-sectional	127 HCW (58.27)	SARS	07/2003 - 03/2004	CHQ to assess psychiatric morbidity	17.3% psychiatric morbidity	Neuroticism
Lu et al. (2020)	China	Cross-sectional	2042 HCW (77.90)	COVID-19	25/02/2020-26/02/2020	HAM-A to measure anxiety, HAM-D to measure depression	NR	Direct contact with confirmed infected cases
Matsuishi et al. (2012)	Japan	Cross-sectional	1625 HCW (75.60)	H1N1	16/03/2009-31/07/2009. Approximately 1month after the peak of outbreak.	IES to measure post-traumatic stress disorder, study specific measures on stress	NR	Age, sex, HCW type, at risk of being in contact with infected patients
Maunder et al. (2004)	Canada	Cross-sectional	1557 HCW (74.60)	SARS	12/05/2003-20/06/2003 During the outbreak	IES to measure psychological stress	NR	Direct contact with confirmed infected cases, stigma

Maunder et al. (2006)	Canada	Cross-sectional	587 HCW (87.80)	SARS	23/10/2004-30/09/2005 13-26 months after outbreak	IES to measure post-traumatic stress disorder, K10 to measure nonspecific psychological distress, MBI-EE to measure burnout	NR	Work experience, stigma, maladaptive coping styles, maladaptive personality traits, direct contact with confirmed infected cases, time spent in quarantine
McAlonan et al. (2007)	Hong Kong	Cross-sectional across 2 time points	T1=176 T2=184 HCW (73.25, T1; 64.50, T2)	SARS	T1: 15/04/2003 – 15/05/2003. During the peak period of hospital admissions for SARS. T2: 2004	PSS-10 to measure stress, DASS-21 to measure depression and anxiety, IES-R to measure post-traumatic stress disorder	NR	At risk of being in contact with infected patients
Nickell et al. (2004)	Canada	Cross-sectional	510 HCW (78.80)	SARS	10/04/2003-22/04/2003. Conducted during the peak of the initial phase of the SARS outbreak	GHQ-12 to measure psychological distress	29.0 (distress)	HCW type, part-time work status
Park et al. (2018)	South Korea	Cross-sectional	187 Nurses (100.00)	MERS	30/08/2015-21/09/2015 Conducted during MERS epidemic	PSS to measure level of perceived stress, SF-36 MH to measure mental health status	NR	Marital status, work experience, stigma, adaptive personality traits
Phua et al. (2005)	Singapore	Cross-sectional	96 Doctors and Nurses (64.60)	SARS	1/11/2003-14/11/2003. 6 months after the end of the outbreak.	IES to measure post-traumatic stress disorder, GHQ-28 to measure psychiatric morbidity	18.8 (psychiatric morbidity), 17.7 (PTSD)	HCW type, maladaptive coping styles

Podder et al. (2020)	India	Cross-sectional	384 Doctors (44.53)	COVID-19	03/04/2020-10/04/2020	PSS-10 to measure stress	85.6 (moderate and high stress)	Age, sex , marital status
Poon et al. (2004)	Hong Kong	Cross-sectional	1926 HCW (NR)	SARS	05/2003-06/2003. Diagnosis of the first case of SARS occurred on 12/03/2003. Hong Kong declared SARS-free on 23/06/2003.	STAI to measure anxiety, MBI-EE to measure emotional burnout	NR	HCW type, contact with infected patients
Que et al. (2020)	China	Cross-sectional	2285 HCW (69.06)	COVID-19	16/02/2020-23/02/2020 Early stage of COVID-19 pandemic	GAD-7 to measure anxiety, PHQ-9 to measure depression	46.0 (anxiety), 44.4 (depression)	Sex, at risk of being in contact with infected patients
Romero et al. (2020)	Spain	Cross-sectional	3109 HCW (NR)	COVID-19	09/04/2020-19/04/2020 10 days during the outbreak	Study specific measure of stress	NR	Age
Rossi et al. (2020)	Italy	Cross-sectional	1379 HCW (77.20)	COVID-19	27/03/2020 – 31/03/2020 Days immediately preceding the peak77.2 of the COVID-19 outbreak in Italy	GAD-7 to measure anxiety, PSS to assess perceived stress, PHQ-9 to measure depression, GPS to assess post-traumatic stress symptoms (PTSS)	49.40 (PTSS)	Sex, age, HCW type, colleagues being infected/quarantined/deceased
Shechter et al. (2020)	USA	Cross-sectional	657 HCW (70.90)	COVID-19	09/04/2020-24/04/2020	GAD-2 to measure anxiety, PHQ-2 to measure depression, PC-PTSD to measure acute stress	57.0 (acute stress), 48.0 (depression, 33.0 (anxiety)	HCW type

Son et al. (2019)	South Korea	Cross-sectional	153 HCW hospital staff (74.30)	MERS	25/08/2015-14/09/2015 Approximately 1month after the end of the outbreak on 28/07/2015	IES-RK to measure post-traumatic stress disorder	18.6 (PTSD)	Loss of control and perceived risk, adaptive coping styles and ability
Song et al. (2020)	China	Cross-sectional	14,825 Doctors and nurses (64.30)	COVID-19	28/02/2020-18/03/2020	CES-D to measure depression, PCL-5 to measure post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)	25.2 (depression), 9.10 (PTSD)	Age, sex, marital status, HCW type, less work experience, social support-personal
Styra et al. (2008)	Canada	Cross-sectional	248 HCW (87.02)	SARS	16/06/2003-9/07/2003	IES-R to measure post-traumatic stress disorder	NR	Age, sex, marital status, work experience, adequate information, at risk of being in contact with infected patients
Tam et al. (2004)	Hong Kong	Cross - sectional	652 front-line Hospital HCW (79.00)	SARS	06/2003-08/2003	GHQ-12 to measure psychological distress, Study specific measure for job-related stress	56.7 (psychological distress), 68.0 (job-related stress)	HCW type, age, sex, social support-personal, direct contact with confirmed infected cases, hospital resources/protection/training for the treatment of infection
Tang et al. (2017)	China	Cross-sectional	102 HCW (66.70)	H7N9	01/2015 and 05China/2016	PCL-C to measure post-traumatic stress disorder	20.6 (PTSD)	Age, sex, HCW type, direct contact with confirmed infected cases, hospital resources/protection/training for the treatment of infection
Tu et al. (2020)	China	Cross-sectional	100 Nurses (100.00)	COVID-19	07/02/2020-25/02/2020 In the initial stage of the outbreak when there was a	GAD-7 to measure anxiety, PHQ-9 to measure depression	40.0 (anxiety), 46.0 (depression)	Age, marital status, level of education, less work experience

					shortage of nurses			
Verma et al. (2004)	Singapore	Cross-sectional	721 Doctors (38.80)	SARS	05/ 2003 2 months after the first case of SARS was reported in Singapore	GHQ-28 to measure psychological distress, IES-R to measure post-traumatic stress disorder	14.1 (psychological distress)	Age, stigma, direct contact with confirmed infected cases
Wang et al. (2020)	China	Cross-sectional	202 Nurses (87.60)	COVID-19	02/2020-03/2020	PCL-C to measure PTSD	16.8 (PTSD)	Sex, marital status, level of education, adaptive coping styles and adaptability, maladaptive coping styles, positive work attitudes
Wilson et al. (2020)	India	Cross-sectional	350 HCW (46.60)	COVID-19	10/04/2020-25/04/2020	GAD-7 to measure anxiety, PHQ-9 to measure depression, PSS-10 to measure distress	17.7 (moderate and severe anxiety), 11.4 (severe depression), 3.7 (high levels of stress)	Sex
Wong et al. (2005)	Hong Kong	Cross-sectional	466 ED Nurses and Doctors (65.70)	SARS	24/06/2003-24/07/2003	Study specific measures on distress caused by SARS	NR	HCW type, loss of control and perceived risk
Xiao et al.(2020)	China	Cross-sectional	180 HCW treating patients with COVID-19 (71.70)	COVID-19	01/2020-02/2020.	SASR to measure perceived stress, SAS to measure anxiety	NR	Social support-personal, perceived control
Yin et al. (2020)	China	Cross-sectional	377 HCW (61.50)	COVID-19	01/02/2020 – 05/02/2020 During the early stages of the	PCL-5 to measure post-traumatic stress symptoms (PTSS)	3.80 (PTSS)	Sex, age, education level, HCW type, direct contact with confirmed infected cases

					pandemic			
Zhang et al. (2020)	China	Cross-sectional	927 HCW (64.96)	COVID-19	19/02/2020-06/03/2020 8 weeks after the outbreak in Wuhan	SCL-90-R to measure psychological symptoms, PHQ-4 to measure anxiety and depressive symptoms	NR	Sex, at risk of being in contact with infected patients

Note: COVID-19: Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2), H1N1: influenza A virus subtype H1N1, MERS: Middle East respiratory syndrome, SARS: severe acute respiratory syndrome, ED: Emergency Department, HCW: A mixture of nurses, doctors and health related staff in a hospital. NR = Not reported.

ASDI: Acute Stress Disorder Inventory, BDI: Beck Depression Inventory, CES-D: Centre for Epidemiology Scale for Depression, CHQ: Chinese Health Questionnaire, CIES-R: Chinese Impact of Event Scale—Revised, DASS-21: Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale 21-item, GAD-2: Generalized Anxiety Disorder Scale 2-item, GAD-7: Generalized Anxiety Disorder scale 7-item, GHQ-12: General Health Questionnaire 12-item, GHQ-28: General Health Questionnaire 28-item, GPS: Global Psychotrauma Screen, HAM-A; Hamilton Anxiety Scale, HAM-D: Hamilton Depression Scale, IES: Impact of Events Scale, IES-R: Impact of Events Scale for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, IES-RK: Impact of Event Scale revised Korean version, K-10: Kessler Psychological Distress Scale, MBI: Maslach Burnout Inventory, MBI-EE: emotional exhaustion scale of the Maslach Burnout Inventory, MBI GS: Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey, MBI HSS: Maslach Burnout Inventory-Human Services Survey, OLBI: Oldenburg Burnout Inventory, PCL-5; Post-traumatic Stress Disorder Check List (for DSM 5), PCL-C: Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Checklist-Civilian Version, PHQ-2: Patient Health Questionnaire 2-item, PHQ-4: Patient Health Questionnaire 4-item, PHQ-9: 9-item Patient Health Questionnaire, PC-PTSD: Primary Care Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Screen for DSMIV, PSS: Perceived Stress Scale, PSS-10: Perceived Stress Scale 10-item, SAS: Self-Rating Anxiety Scale, SASR: Stanford Acute Stress Reaction scale, SCL-90-R: Symptoms Checklist 90-items, Revised, SDS: Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale Chinese version, SF-36 MH: Short Form Survey mental health component, SSRS: Social Support Rate Scale, STAI: State-Trait Anxiety Inventory

Table 2: Overview of the evidence for the factors associated with risk and resilience for psychological distress in HCW

Factor	Evidence of risk	Evidence for resilience	Non-significant findings
Fixed - Demographics			
Younger age	Romero et al. (2020), Chatterjee et al. (2020), Elbay et al. (2020), Liu et al., (2012), Matsuishi et al. (2012), Rossi et al (2020), Song et al. (2020), Tam et al. (2004), Tang et al. (2016), Verma et al. (2004)		Chong et al. (2004), Hu et al. (2020), Kim et al. (2016), Kim et al. (2018), Lee et al. (2018), Liu et al. (2020), Podder et al. (2020), Styra et al. (2008), Tu et al. (2020), Yin et al. (2020)
Female sex	Bukhari et al. (2016), Chong et al. (2004), Elbay et al. (2020), Hu et al. (2020), Lai et al. (2020), Lee et al. (2018), Liu et al. (2020), Matsuishi et al. (2012), Podder et al. (2020), Rossi et al. (2020), Tam et al. (2004), Tang et al. (2016), Wang et al. (2020), Wilson et al. (2020), Yin et al. (2020), Zhang et al. (2020)	Song et al. (2020)	Barello et al. (2020), Chatterjee et al. (2020), Kim et al. (2016), Kim et al. (2018), Lai et al. (2020), Liu et al., (2012), Que et al. (2020), Styra et al. (2008).
Marital status – married with children	Koh et al. (2005), Hu et al. (2020)	Elbay et al. (2020)	
Marital status – single vs. married	Chan & Huak (2004), Elbay et al. (2020), Liu et al., (2012), Podder et al. (2020), Song et al. (2020)		Chong et al. (2004), Hu et al. (2020), Kim et al. (2016), Kim et al. (2018), Koh et al. (2005), Liu et al. (2020), Park et al. (2018), Styra et al. (2008), Tu et al. (2020), Wang et al. (2020)
Higher education level		Ji et al. (2017), Kim et al. (2016)	Hu et al. (2020), Kim et al. (2018), Liu et al. (2020) Liu et al. (2012),

			Tu et al. (2020), Wang et al. (2020), Yin et al. (2020)
Fixed - Occupational			
Nurse vs Physician	Barello et al. (2020), Chong et al. (2004), Goulia et al. (2010), Koh et al. (2005), Lai et al. (2020), Lee et al. (2018), Matsuishi et al. (2012), Maunder et al (2004), Nickell et al. (2004), Phua et al. (2005), Poon et al. (2004), Shechter et al. (2020), Song et al. (2020), Tam et al. (2004), Tang et al. (2016), Wong et al. (2005)	Chan & Huak (2004), Chong et al. (2004)	Liu et al. (2020), Rossi et al. (2020), Yin et al. (2020)
Less work experience	Chatterjee et al. (2020), Chong et al. (2004), Elbay et al. (2020), Maunder et al. (2006), Song et al. (2020)		García-Fernández et al. (2020), Hu et al. (2020), Kim et al. (2016), Kim et al. (2018), Koh et al., (2005), Park et al. (2018), Styra et al. (2008), Tu et al. (2020)
Part-time work status	Nickell et al. (2004)		
Modifiable - Social			
Social support – personal		Cai et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2006), Hu et al. (2020), Kim et al. (2016), Song et al. (2020), Tam et al. (2004), Xiao et al. (2020)	
Social support – professional/organisational		Chan & Huak (2004), Elbay et al. (2020), Fiskenbaum et al. (2004), Jung et al. (2020)	
Adequate information		Chan & Huak (2004), García-Fernández et al. (2020), Goulia et al. (2010), Styra et al. (2008)	

	Stigma	Goulia et al. (2010), Koh et al. (2005), Maunder et al. (2004), Maunder et al. (2006), Park et al. (2018), Verma et al. (2004)		
Modifiable - Psychological				
	Perceived control		Ho et al. (2005), Hu et al. (2020), Xiao et al. (2020)	
	Loss of control and perceived risk	Son et al. (2019), Styra et al.(2008), Wong et al. (2020)		
	Adaptive coping styles and ability		Wang et al. (2020)	Son et al. (2019)
	Maladaptive coping styles	Maunder et al. (2006), Phua et al. (2005), Wang et al. (2020)		
	Positive work attitudes		Chan & Huak (2004), Goulia et al. (2010), Liu et al., (2012), Wang et al. (2020)	
	Adaptive personality traits		Hu et al. (2020), Park et al. (2018)	
	Maladaptive personality traits	Lu et al. (2006), Maunder et al. (2006), Yi-Ching et al. (2006)		
Factors related to infection exposure				
	Exposure to confirmed infected cases	Chong et al. (2004), Fiskenbaum et al. (2004), Grace et al. (2005), Kim et al. (2016), Koh et al., (2005), Lai et al. (2020), Liu et al., (2012), Liu et al. (2020), Lu et al. (2020), Maunder et al. (2004), Poon et al. (2004), Rossi et al (2020), Tam et al. (2004), Tang et al. (2017), Verma et al. (2004), Yin et al. (2020)		Bukhari et al. (2016), Maunder et al. (2006)

	Increased risk of exposure to confirmed infected cases	Bukhari et al. (2016), Chatterjee et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2005), Elbay et al. (2020), Hu et al. (2020), Lee et al. (2018), Matsuishi et al. (2012), McAlonan et al. (2007), Styra et al. (2008), Que et al. (2020), Zhang et al. (2020)		
	Colleagues being infected/quarantined/deceased	Rossi et al. (2020)		
	Being in quarantine	Fiskenbaum et al. (2004), Liu et al., (2012), Maunder et al. (2006)		Lee et al. (2018)
	Hospital resources/protection/training for the treatment of infection		Chen et al. (2006), Elbay et al. (2020), García-Fernández et al. (2020), Hu et al. (2020), Kim et al. (2016), Tam et al. (2004), Tang et al. (2017)	