

Title: Which outcomes should be included in a core outcome set for capturing and measuring doctor well-being? A Delphi study

Authors: Gemma Simons^{1,3,5,6}, Naomi Klepacz^{2,3*}, David S. Baldwin^{1,3,4,7}

¹ University Department of Psychiatry, Clinical and Experimental Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

² School of Health Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

³ NIHR ARC Wessex, UK

⁴ Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust, Southampton, UK

⁵ Solent NHS Trust, Hampshire, UK

⁶ Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust, Salisbury, Wiltshire, UK

⁷ University Department of Psychiatry and Mental Health, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

*Corresponding author: Dr Naomi Klepacz n.klepacz@soton.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To develop a core outcome set (COS) to capture and measure the well-being of doctors working in the NHS.

Design: An online Delphi study.

Setting: United Kingdom National Health Service.

Participants: Participants from four stakeholder groups: i) those who might use the COS in research, ii) organisations that measure/capture NHS staff wellbeing, iii) professionals with experience managing NHS staff wellbeing, and iv) NHS doctors, were identified through authorship of relevant publications, attendee lists of doctor well-being conferences and meetings, professional bodies, participation in a previous study and recommendations from others. They were recruited via email.

Method: A two-stage process: 1) creating a list of 43 wellbeing outcomes informed by a systematic review of wellbeing measurement instruments, a survey of UK doctors and 2 doctor engagement workshops, and 2) an online modified Delphi study (with two rounds) to reach consensus. Outcomes were rated on a 9-point Likert scale; 'consensus' was reached when $\leq 75\%$ agreed that an outcome was critical for inclusion in the COS.

Results: Fifty-two participants completed both Delphi rounds. Seven wellbeing outcomes met the threshold for inclusion in the COS: General wellbeing, Health, Personal safety, Job satisfaction, Morale, Life work balance, and Good clinical practice.

Conclusion: Use of the COS has the potential to reduce heterogeneity and standardise the capture and measurement of doctor well-being and ensure outcomes important to all stakeholders are reported.

Trial registration: This study was prospectively registered with the COMET initiative www.comet-initiative.org

(Registration: 1577)

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

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS:

- This is the first study to develop a core outcome set (COS) for the capture and measurement of doctor well-being.
- A salutogenic and consensus approach was used to achieve agreement between four stakeholder groups.
- Without an internationally agreed definition of doctor well-being, identification and classification of well-being outcomes were subjective.
- There is potential to use the COS with other groups of healthcare professionals.
- Further research is needed to identify agreed measurement tools.

Title: Which outcomes should be included in a core outcome set for capturing and measuring doctor well-being? A Delphi study

Doctors are increasingly experiencing high workloads and challenging working conditions and, consequently, are reporting high levels of stress, anxiety, depression,¹ emotional distress, burnout risk^{2,3} and suicidal feelings.^{4,5} This negatively impacts patient care quality, safety and satisfaction⁶⁻⁸ and leads to declining job satisfaction and doctors leaving the workforce.⁹ The 2022 NHS staff survey¹⁰ found that 46% of doctors felt unwell in the last 12 months because of work-related stress, and 40% often or always found their work emotionally exhausting. Emphasis is often placed on doctors to be more resilient, with stigma and a fear of potential repercussions preventing doctors from speaking up about their well-being.¹¹ However, there is an emerging consensus that some aspects of doctors' training, working conditions and organisational support negatively impact well-being.⁵ The well-being of doctors significantly impacts workforce planning, cost, healthcare quality and patient outcomes.¹² Dissatisfaction with role/place of work or NHS culture was cited as the top reason for leaving the workforce in a General Medical Council survey,¹³ with burnout/work-related stress as the third most cited reason behind retirement. Poor mental well-being of staff is estimated to cost the NHS at least £12.1 billion per year; tackling poor mental well-being and reducing the number of staff leaving the NHS could save up to £1 billion.¹⁴ The UK's health system prioritises patient care - often over staff well-being - but long-term patient care and safety depend on staff well-being.¹⁵

The need to address doctor well-being is well recognised, with government and industry reports highlighting the need for improvement (e.g.,^{2,8,11,15-18}). While recognising the urgent need to address doctors' well-being, these reports often fail to operationalise well-being or specify the outcome or measurement tools required to gauge the success of their recommendations. For example, the 'NHS Long Term Plan'¹⁹ aims to make the NHS 'the best place to work' but provides little detail on implementation or how success will be captured or measured. The NHS long term workforce plan²⁰ commits to implementing actions from the NHS People Plan²¹ to ensure that staff have access to well-being services and support; however, the British Medical Association has questioned how this ambition will be made a reality.²² Many employers and education deaneries now provide well-being programmes for doctors and implement the NHS health and well-being framework.²³ However, evidence of the success of these (and similar) programmes – often aimed at individual coping strategies, resilience and productivity – suggests limited effect.¹² The lack of consensus on what doctor well-being is and how it should be measured means that the monitoring and evaluation of these strategies are inconsistent.

The ongoing and accurate measurement of doctors' well-being is necessary to understand local and specific needs and ensure the effective delivery of staff services.¹⁷ It is, therefore, vital for both research and governance to take a consistent data-driven and evidence-based approach to doctors' well-being, taking account of the many dimensions (i.e., social, cultural, environmental, economic) and levels (i.e., individual, organisational, societal) that comprise this complex issue. However, work has not yet been undertaken to standardise the definition and measurement of doctor well-being. In addition, well-being has often been used interchangeably with, or to describe, mental health, with previous research focusing largely on 'pathologies' such as depression, anxiety and burnout rather than positive measures of well-being. Consequently, workplace well-being has become a measure of the absence of mental health disorders. A salutogenic approach^{24 25} that measures positive determinants, context, mechanisms, and individual and group well-being should be preferred when considering doctor well-being.²⁶

Our systematic review²⁷ found well-being outcomes and measurement tools used in doctor well-being research were heterogeneous, demonstrating the need for a core outcome set (COS). Core outcome sets are consensus minimum groups of outcomes with recommended reliable and valid measurement tools. Reaching agreement among stakeholders – including NHS doctors - ensures a consistent and comprehensive focus, facilitating comparison between organisations through the generation of 'big-data', and in doing so, provides decision-makers with the evidence needed to inform future workforce strategies, interventions and actions. We used a salutogenic and consensus-based approach to develop a COS to capture and report on the well-being of doctors in the NHS. To our knowledge, this study represents the first time a non-pathological concept – well-being – has been applied to the Core Outcome Set-Standards for Reporting (COS-STAD) guidance.²⁸

METHODS

Study Overview

The COS was developed in two stages: 1) the generation of a long list of outcomes, and 2) an online Delphi survey (Figure 1). The study protocol was developed following the Core Outcome Measures in Effectiveness Trials (COMET) criteria²⁹ and was prospectively registered with the COMET initiative³⁰ (Registration: 1577). The study is reported using the COS-STAD guidance.³¹

Ethical Approval

This study involved human participants and was approved by the University of Southampton Faculty of Medicine Ethics Committee (ERGO 49246). Participants gave informed consent before participating.

Phase 1: Generating a List of Outcomes

The long list of outcomes was generated from a systematic review of doctor well-being definitions and measures,²⁷ local and national doctor involvement/engagement events,²⁷ and analysis of free text response questions from a national online survey of doctor well-being.²⁷ Inductive constant comparison analysis³² allowed the participants to generate themes. As part of this ‘open coding’ technique, participants’ own words were used for code names, and the themes and meanings were constructed after the data had been collected using convergent thematic analysis.³³ Finally, any duplicates were removed, and similar concepts were merged. Outcomes that were pathologies, symptoms of pathologies, or negative in nature were removed from the long list. Uniqueness was established when the published definition of an outcome differed conceptually from those of other outcomes.³⁴ Outcomes identified as unique were compared to the outcomes and domains in health, health-related quality of life, disease, and well-being frameworks,³⁵⁻³⁸ and doctor policy documents^{21 39-43} to identify any further key concepts. Plain English descriptions – presented as ‘help text’ in the Delphi survey – were written for each outcome, guided by the published literature (See supplementary materials 1). We established relevant domains by grouping thematically similar outcomes that captured a broader concept using a well-being framework developed for this study.²⁷ ‘Think aloud’ interviews were conducted (n=3 doctors, n=2 psychologists) to review the uniqueness of the outcomes and the clarity, conciseness, and accessibility of the ‘help-text’ definitions for stakeholders.

Phase 2: Online Delphi Survey

The long list of outcomes was used to populate an online Delphi survey, delivered using the DelphiManager platform.⁴⁴ The Delphi approach is a method widely used in developing core outcome sets.^{44 45} The method aims to achieve consensus through the collection and synthesis of stakeholder opinions.




Figure 1. Flow diagram of the process for developing COS.

Stakeholder recruitment

A purposive sampling method was used to recruit participants from four stakeholder groups: i) those who could use the core outcome set in research, ii) representatives of organisations that measure doctor well-being in the NHS, iii) professionals with experience in managing doctor well-being, and iv) doctors working in the NHS (all specialities and grades). Researchers of doctor well-being were identified through academic conference programmes and abstracts, and authorship of relevant publications. Organisations measuring doctor well-being were identified through reports and publications on doctor well-being, discussions at national group meetings (i.e., Royal College of Physicians Flexibility and Wellbeing Group; BMA Wellbeing

Support Stakeholder Group), and responses from a previous survey.²⁷ (A full list of organisations can be found in Supplementary Materials 2.) Professionals with experience managing doctor well-being were identified through policy documents and attendee lists from national well-being group meetings (i.e., Practitioner Health Programme; BMA Support). Doctors who had participated in the doctor involvement/engagement events or our online survey and had given permission to be approached were invited to participate. Additionally, and with the permission of the group administrator, doctors who were members of the BMA Wellbeing Stakeholder group, and Royal College of Physicians Flexibility and Wellbeing groups were invited to participate. We further identified stakeholders for all groups through recommendations from others. All potential participants were emailed an invitation to participate in the Delphi survey with a participant information sheet, a URL link to DelphiManager, and a link to the study information video. Participants were required to consent before registering their details (name and email). All participants were assigned a Study ID at registration, meaning data were anonymous at the point of collection.

Delphi Survey and Analysis

The 43 well-being outcomes were listed with plain English descriptions by domain in a Delphi survey conducted over two rounds (Round 1 took place July 2021 and Round 2 August 2021). We asked participants to rate the importance of including each outcome in the COS using a 9-point Likert Scale. Ratings were grouped into three categories: a score of 1-3 on the Likert scale indicates the outcome is of 'limited importance to include', a score of 4-6 indicates the outcome is 'important, but not critical' for inclusion in the COS, and a score of 7-9 indicates that the outcome is critical to capture and measure in the COS. Participants had the option to declare they were unable to score an item. There was a free text comment box, and participants were encouraged to provide a rationale for their selection or additional comments. At the end of each Delphi Round, participants had the opportunity to suggest additional outcomes for possible inclusion in the COS; they were instructed that these should not be a symptom, sign or disease, nor a determinant of well-being. The criterion for considering an outcome for inclusion was that the definition of the outcome in the literature should differ conceptually from the help text offered for the existing outcomes. Where additional outcomes were suggested, the participant was emailed with the justification for inclusion or exclusion and given the opportunity to provide additional evidence/explanation.

In Round 2, the percentage of participants giving each rating for an outcome was fed back to participants. Participants were also reminded of their own ratings for each outcome from Round 1. Participants had the opportunity to re-rate each outcome based on this feedback. Participants were sent three reminder emails to complete Rounds.

The *a-priori* definition of consensus was when $\geq 75\%$ of participants rated an outcome as ‘critical for inclusion’ (Ratings 7-9). This definition aligns with those used in other core outcome set development studies (e.g.,⁴⁶⁻⁴⁹) and the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) working group.⁵⁰ The outcomes that met the threshold for inclusion in the COS were emailed to participants with an invitation to provide further comment on the core outcome set.

RESULTS

Phase 1. Generating a List of Outcomes

Our systematic review is described in detail elsewhere.²⁷ A total of 78 verbatim well-being outcomes were extracted from the systematic review. To confirm uniqueness, these outcomes were grouped using definitions created from the research and policy literature [Supplementary Materials 1]. Thirty-four outcomes were found to meet the criteria for uniqueness. Of these 34 outcomes, 25 outcomes are synthesised; that is, they are comprised of multiple verbatim outcomes with the same conceptual definition (e.g., ‘health’, ‘self-esteem’). The remaining nine could not be grouped with any other verbatim outcomes and could only be described by a single term and definition (these included ‘Satisfaction with patient care’, ‘Psychological safety’ and ‘Compassion satisfaction’). No new outcomes were extracted from the doctor engagement/involvement events, and free text responses from the national survey, as these verbatim outcomes were all found to be among those already extracted from the systematic review. Next, the 34 unique outcomes were compared with existing frameworks and policy documents, which resulted in the identification of a further 9 outcomes, giving a final long list of 43 unique well-being outcomes (Table 1). This long list was then examined to identify whether sub-groups or themes existed between the outcomes. Five domains were identified: i) Overall appraisal of wellbeing, ii) Functional components of wellbeing, iii) Activity and participation components of wellbeing, iv) work-related wellbeing, and v) Health and social care specific wellbeing.

Table 1. Outcomes and their descriptions by domain

Domain	Outcome	Description
Overall appraisal of wellbeing	General Wellbeing	A state of positive feelings/affect/happiness and meeting full potential in the world (being the best person you can be in society). It can be measured subjectively and objectively using a salutogenic (positive) approach.
	Meaning in life	Separate concept to wellbeing, subjective sense of purpose, engagement with a philosophy of life, or life-goals, and fulfilment.
	Life satisfaction	Separate concept to wellbeing, subjective appraisal of how much the person likes the life they lead; one of the indicators of quality of life.
	Wellness	Separate concept to wellbeing, subjective or objective evaluation of the active pursuit of behaviours, choices and lifestyles that lead to a state of holistic health.
Functional component of wellbeing	Vitality	Relaxed possession of energy (physical, mental, and emotional) and vigour; it is not actively strived for.
	Optimism	Hopeful transcendence beyond (rising above) immediate circumstances.
	Personality	Observable enduring characteristics/dispositions/tendencies to engage in certain patterns of behaviour.
	Health	Subjective, or objective, evaluation of state of complete physical, mental, and social wellbeing, not merely the absence of disease or infirmity (the beneficial effects of green spaces, ability to relax, for example).
	Physiological function	Objective (snapshot) of body functions i.e., Electroencephalography (EEG), Heart Rate Variability, Electro-dermal activity (temperature, sweating, cortisol levels).
	Cognitive function	Objective evaluation of domains such as, but not limited to, Attention, Memory, and Processing speed.
	Self-esteem	Self-acceptance, self-worth (pride), sense of coherence (ability to predict events, belief in ability to manage them, that it is worth the effort, ability to be their true self, confidence in other achievements in non-work-related activities).
	Sleep	Subjective, or objective, evaluation of duration, quality, and sense of feeling restored.
Activity and participation component of wellbeing	Financial security	Objective ability to pay for satisfactory accommodation, bills, care of dependents, ability to save for retirement, ability to cope with a sudden fall in income, ability to pay unexpected but necessary expenses.
	Novelty	Subjective, or objective, growth through new experiences, learning (including post traumatic growth).
	Positive relationships	Subjective, or objective, assessment of beneficial human connections (family and friends).
	Sexual wellbeing	Subjective, or objective, assessment of sense of self and body, appreciating feelings of pleasure and desire, developing, and maintaining mutually respectful gender equal relationships, safe and pleasurable sexual interactions.
	Recreational activity	Subjective, or objective, evaluation of the ability to participate and participation in non-work/leisure activities and the qualities of those chosen activities (example determinants are local investment and environment).
	Diet	Subjective, or objective, evaluation of the nutritional content, quantity, and timing.
	Physical activity	Subjective, or objective, assessment of the ability to participate in physical activity and the quality and quantity of physical exercise.

Work-related wellbeing	Engagement with preventative medicine	Subjective, or objective, assessment of participation in screening programmes they are eligible for and vaccines, accessing timely treatment.
	Financial reward satisfaction	Subjective, or objective, evaluation of ability to receive gratification from financial reward for effort (for example satisfaction with pay and pension).
	Personal safety	Subjective, or objective, ability to go about work, and get to and from work, free from threat and safe from physical or psychological harm (infection, radiation, bullying, theft, assault).
	Psychological need satisfaction	Subjective, or objective, assessment of how autonomy (being in control of your life, work) belonging and competence needs have been supported by colleagues (inclusive, positive culture), managers (adequate workforce allow development), supporting services (IT, administration, legal, occupational health).
	Psychological safety	Subjective, or objective, evaluation of the consequences of taking interpersonal risk at work (trust, information sharing).
	Job satisfaction	Subjective, or objective, evaluation of how much they like their choice of work profession, specialism, roles.
	Morale	Subjective, or objective, evaluation of feelings about the future, ability of an individual, group or organisation to have and meet shared goals/values.
	Engagement	Subjective, or objective, assessment of involvement and absorption with, commitment to, work.
	Life work balance	Subjective, or objective, quantity, quality, and equality of time away from work and at work, the salience/clarity of the roles (the ability to work flexibly).
	Workability	Timely, objective assessment of having occupational competence and virtues, the health required for competence in an appropriate work environment by appropriate occupational health professionals.
Self-care	Subjective, or objective, assessment of behaviours to look after own health and wellbeing at work (taking breaks, time off work for sickness), accessing appropriate support services, adequate resources (estates, workforce, rapid-access self-referral services) to support this.	
Professional Development	Subjective, or objective, assessment of ability to participate and engage with learning and teaching knowledge and skills, and to progress.	
Identification with work	Subjective, or objective, assessment of value and meaning assumed by the individual, or a group/team, at work (pride in work, professional identity).	
Resilience	Subjective, or objective, individual, or group level, preservation of, or return to, previous function after exposure to trauma.	
Emotional intelligence	Subjective, or objective, self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management.	
Voice and influence	Subjective, or objective, assessment of ideas, concerns and expectations expressed informing policy and practice.	
Confidence in leadership	Subjective or objective assessment of government and management competence, transparency and compassion, inclusivity, engagement and empowerment of those they are responsible and accountable for.	
Recognition satisfaction	Subjective, or objective, evaluation of appreciation by colleagues, patients, public, government (civility).	
Compassion satisfaction	Subjective evaluation of ability to receive gratification from caregiving to patients, patients' families, colleagues (satisfaction with non-financial rewards of the work).	

Health and social care specific wellbeing	Altruism	Subjective, or objective, evaluation of selfless concern for the wellbeing of others (patients and colleagues).
	Satisfaction with patient care	Subjective, or objective, assessment of quality of health and social care their patients receive from themselves and others (impacted by things such as staffing levels, competence, equipment, estates and funding available).
	Job plan/rota/rotation satisfaction	Subjective, or objective, evaluation of ability of role, responsibilities/rota/breaks to account for the quantity, types, of work (workload), the intensity, duration, of physical, mental, and emotional demands and the rest/activities/resources needed to maintain it.
	Good clinical practice	Subjective or objective assessment of ability to engage with complex or challenging patients/cases and advocate for them as indicated and in an evidence-based way.

Phase 2. Delphi Survey

Invitations to participate were sent to 72 individuals across the four stakeholder groups. Sixty participants registered for the study: giving a response rate of 83.3%. One participant withdrew, meaning 59 participated in Round 1, of which 56 participants rated every outcome. Of the 59 participants, 52 also participated in Round 2: giving a retention rate from Round 1 to Round 2 of 91.2%. In Round 2, 51 participants rated every outcome. All rated outcomes were included in the analysis. Of these participants, 35% were male and 80% were doctors, of which 54% were consultants, 32% GPs, 7% Associates Specialists and 7% Training Grade Doctors.

In Round 1, 18 suggestions were made for additional outcomes from 8 participants (Supplementary Materials 3). None of these met the criteria for inclusion into Round 2. Of the suggested outcomes, 18 were not novel and had already been captured by existing outcomes, and 4 were interventions, 1 suggestion 'Going on holiday' was classified as both an intervention and not novel, being captured under 'life work balance' and 'job plan/rota satisfaction'.

At the end of Round 2, seven well-being outcomes met the $\geq 75\%$ threshold for inclusion in the Core Outcome Set for capturing and measuring doctor well-being: General well-being, Health, Personal Safety, Job satisfaction, Morale, Life work balance and Good clinical practice (Table 2). We sent the agreed set of outcomes to the stakeholder participants for review. They approved the COS without amendment.

Table 2. The final core outcome set.

Domain	Outcome	Stakeholder rating outcomes as 'critical' %
Overall appraisal	General wellbeing	97.9
Functional component of wellbeing	Health	75.0
Work-related wellbeing	Personal safety	77.1
	Job satisfaction	85.4
	Morale	83.3
	Life work balance	93.8
Health and social care specific wellbeing	Good Clinical Practice	89.6

DISCUSSION

We have developed a core outcome set for capturing and measuring the well-being of doctors working in the NHS. By using a salutogenic and consensus approach, we have achieved agreement among four key stakeholder groups (Researchers, organisations that measure NHS doctor well-being, professionals with experience managing doctor well-being, and doctors). To our knowledge, this is the first time the COS-STAD guidance²⁸ has been applied to the non-pathological concept of well-being, demonstrating that it is feasible to

capture and measure. Our systematic review revealed heterogeneity between well-being outcomes and measurement tools.²⁷ Implementing the COS will ensure a consistent and comprehensive focus for doctor well-being data-collection and prevent duplication, facilitate the generation of big data, and enable comparison at organisational, local and national levels. We recommend that future research, organisational and governance measurements of NHS doctors' well-being use this COS. This does not preclude other outcomes from being measured as required but rather represents the minimum that should be captured and measured. Further research as to how best to operationalise and measure these well-being outcomes is now needed.

The long list of outcomes presented to stakeholders was evidence-based, drawing on doctor-specific research and the broader well-being literature.²⁷ The finding that the listed outcomes already represented the additional well-being outcomes suggested by participants in Delphi Round 1 suggests that the list was inclusive and holistic. The seven outcomes of the COS can be mapped to existing doctor surveys. For example, the outcomes 'General wellbeing' and 'Health' are captured by the Office for National Statistics⁵¹ and the NHS staff survey;⁵² 'Personal safety' has been captured by the General Medical Council's National Training Survey;⁵³ 'life work balance' has been included in the NHS staff survey since 2021,⁵⁴ mapping to the NHS People Plan promise theme of 'We work flexibly.'⁵⁵ Morale is also measured in the NHS staff survey.⁵² This suggests the COS is relevant and acceptable and that such data-capturing exercises would benefit from its implementation. It was noted that outcomes from the 'Activity and Participation' domain did not meet the threshold for inclusion. Outcomes under this domain include 'positive relationships', 'recreational activity', 'diet' and 'physical activity', also 'engaging with preventative medicine', including vaccination and medical screening. These outcomes require input and action from the individual, an understanding of the risk and severity of the threat to their well-being, and awareness of the benefits of acting.⁵⁶ Outcomes included in the COS are arguably determined by the context or system in which an individual works. However, activity and participation outcomes were commonly studied in the literature as primary and secondary interventions, for example, mindfulness training and practices (e.g.,⁵⁷⁻⁶¹) and debriefing⁶² and dialogue groups.^{63 64} Further consideration should be given to this domain in relation to doctor well-being. Good clinical practice has not been an outcome in existing surveys or data-collection exercises; this is a novel area of inquiry that requires further investigation.

There are a number of strengths to our study. To our knowledge, we developed the first COS for capturing and measuring doctor well-being and did so using the robust methodology set down in the COS-STAD guidelines.²⁸ The COS is the product of consensus opinion from four stakeholder groups, including NHS doctors, but it is the involvement of representatives from professional bodies (i.e., British Medical Association, General Medical Council, Royal college of Physicians) that is a particular strength of this study. The uptake and use of a COS

have traditionally been poor, and further research is needed to understand how uptake might be improved more broadly.⁶⁵ By including representatives from professional bodies, outcomes relevant to this group were considered in the creation of this COS. The number of participants in this study was acceptable for a Delphi study,²⁹ and the >90% retention rate means attrition bias was not present. We ensured that the domains were not predetermined but led by the list of outcomes and their descriptions. However, the lack of an agreed definition of doctor well-being is a limitation. The published literature guided each outcome's description and we found variation in how outcomes were described in the literature, with some being described by a single term and others by multiple terms. For example, the outcome 'wellbeing' had the most (n=19) non-unique terms extracted from the literature (i.e., General wellbeing, Personal wellbeing, Mental wellbeing, Physical wellbeing, Professional Wellbeing, Physician wellbeing, etc). Without an international consensus operational definition of doctor well-being, classification of outcomes and domains is subjective. To mitigate this, we published an operational definition of well-being²⁶ derived from our literature review.²⁷ Some outcomes posed a particular challenge as they did not fit the definition of well-being used for this study.²⁶ Resilience is generally considered a 'toxic term' in medical culture.^{66 67} However, it was included for completeness as it features so heavily in policy and research literature on doctor well-being.

This study aimed to create a COS for doctors working in the NHS, and accordingly, stakeholders were UK-based. While this COS might have some international relevance, it will be important to evaluate the acceptability and applicability of this COS for doctors in other countries, particularly where healthcare systems differ from the UK. The outcomes to emerge from the Delphi study, are not necessarily unique to doctors as research suggests that causes and interventions for poor mental well-being are not necessarily profession-specific.⁶⁸ The robust methodology we have applied in this study could be repeated to establish the degree to which this COS could be used to capture and measure the well-being of other healthcare professionals. Our next step is to identify and agree on measurement tools and criteria. This would further enhance the quality and consistency of data collected using this COS.

CONCLUSION

This COS is a stakeholder-derived set of outcomes that are most important to capture and measure for doctors' well-being. Its application in research and health service governance will reduce heterogeneity and allow for better synthesis of evidence underpinning future workforce well-being policies and interventions, potentially improving doctor well-being and workforce retention. Research is needed to identify and evaluate outcome measurement tools.

Twitter/ X: @C4WWellbeing

Author Contributions:

- GS designed the study and collected, analysed, and interpreted the data. Edited and approved the final article.
- NK wrote the manuscript, edited the article and approved the final article.
- DSB acquired funding, supervised the study's design, data collection, analysis and interpretation, edited and approved the article and acted as guarantor.

Funding: Health Education England (HEE) South provided financial support for this research in the form of a postgraduate fellowship awarded to GS. NK is funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration Wessex (ARC Wessex). For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC BY NC public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript arising from this submission.

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Health Education England, the National Institute for Health Research, or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Competing Interests: None declared

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank all those who participated in this Delphi study and supported the creation of this COS. Thanks to Dr Aimee O'Neill and Professor Julia Sinclair for their input into the early stages of the study and to Professor Peter Griffiths for reviewing the draft manuscript.

Data availability statement: All data relevant to the study are included in the article or uploaded as supplementary materials.

ORCID IDs:

Gemma Simons [0000-0003-2454-5948](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2454-5948)

Naomi Klepacz [0000-0001-7552-8000](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7552-8000)

David Baldwin [0000-0003-3343-0907](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3343-0907)

REFERENCES

1. Dunning A, Teoh K, Martin J, et al. Relationship between working conditions and psychological distress experienced by junior doctors in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional survey study. *BMJ Open* 2022;12(8):e061331. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2022-061331 [published Online First: 20220823]
2. British Medical Association. Caring for the mental health of the medical workforce, 2019.
3. Imo UO. Burnout and psychiatric morbidity among doctors in the UK: A systematic literature review of prevalence and associated factors. *BJPsych Bulletin* 2017;41(4):197-204. doi: 10.1192/pb.bp.116.054247 [published Online First: 2018/01/02]
4. Riley R, Buszewicz M, Kokab F, et al. Sources of work-related psychological distress experienced by UK-wide foundation and junior doctors: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open* 2021;11(6):e043521. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-043521 [published Online First: 20210623]
5. Harvey SB, Epstein RM, Glozier N, et al. Mental illness and suicide among physicians. *Lancet* 2021;398(10303):920-30. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01596-8
6. Shanafelt TD, Bradley KA, Wipf JE, et al. Burnout and self-reported patient care in an internal medicine residency program. *Ann Intern Med* 2002;136(5):358-67. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-136-5-200203050-00008
7. Hall LH, Johnson J, Watt I, et al. Healthcare Staff Wellbeing, Burnout, and Patient Safety: A Systematic Review. *PLoS One* 2016;11(7):e0159015. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0159015 [published Online First: 20160708]
8. West M, Coia D. Caring for doctors, Caring for Patients: How to transform UK healthcare environments to support doctors and medical students to care for patients: General Medical Council, 2019.
9. Hodgkinson A, Zhou A, Johnson J, et al. Associations of physician burnout with career engagement and quality of patient care: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2022;378:e070442. doi: 10.1136/bmj-2022-070442 [published Online First: 20220914]
10. NHS England. NHS Staff Survey: National Results Briefing 2023 [Available from: <https://www.nhsstaffsurveys.com/results/national-results/> accessed 3 November 2023.
11. Health Education England. NHS Staff and Learners' Mental Wellbeing Commission, 2019.
12. Carrieri D, Mattick K, Pearson M, et al. Optimising strategies to address mental ill-health in doctors and medical students: 'Care Under Pressure' realist review and implementation guidance. *BMC Medicine* 2020;18(1):76. doi: 10.1186/s12916-020-01532-x
13. General Medical Council. Completing the Picture Survey, 2021.
14. Daniels K, Connolly S, Woodard R, et al. NHS staff wellbeing: Why investing in organisational and management practices makes business sense - A rapid evidence review and economic analysis. London: EPPI Centre, UCL Social Research Institute, University College London, 2022.
15. General Medical Council. The state of medical education and practice in the UK: Workplace experiences 2023. London: General Medical Council, 2023.
16. British Medical Association. Supporting health and wellbeing at work 2018 [Available from: <https://www.bma.org.uk/media/2076/bma-supporting-health-and-wellbeing-at-work-oct-2018.pdf>.
17. British Medical Association. The mental health and wellbeing of the medical workforce - now and beyond COVID-19, 2020.
18. British Medical Association. BMA mental wellbeing charter, 2019.
19. NHS. The NHS Long Term Plan, 2019.

20. NHS England. NHS Long Term Workforce Plan, 2023.
21. NHS England. WE ARE THE NHS: People Plan for 2020/2021 - action for us all, 2020.
22. British Medical Association. The NHS Long Term Workforce Plan: what does it mean for BMA members?, 2023.
23. NHS England. NHS health and wellbeing framework: strategic overview, 2021.
24. Lindström B, Eriksson M. Salutogenesis. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 2005;59(6):440-42.
25. Espnes GA, Moksnes UK, Haugan G. The overarching concept of salutogenesis in the context of health care. *Health Promotion in Health Care—Vital Theories and Research* 2021:15-22.
26. Simons G, Baldwin DS. A critical review of the definition of 'wellbeing' for doctors and their patients in a post Covid-19 era. *Int J Soc Psychiatry* 2021;67(8):984-91. doi: 10.1177/00207640211032259 [published Online First: 20210709]
27. Simons G. How should wellbeing be measured in UK doctors? A salutogenic, consensus approach, towards a Core Outcome Set for doctor wellbeing measurement. University of Southampton, 2022.
28. Kirkham JJ, Davis K, Altman DG, et al. Core outcome Set-STAndards for development: the COS-STAD recommendations. *PLoS medicine* 2017;14(11):e1002447.
29. Williamson PR, Altman DG, Bagley H, et al. The COMET Handbook: version 1.0. *Trials* 2017;18(Suppl 3):280. doi: 10.1186/s13063-017-1978-4 [published Online First: 20170620]
30. COMET Initiative. Core Outcome Measures in Effectiveness Trials (COMET Initiative) database n.d [Available from: <https://www.comet-initiative.org/>].
31. Kirkham JJ, Gorst S, Altman DG, et al. Core Outcome Set-STAndards for Reporting: The COS-STAR Statement. *PLoS Med* 2016;13(10):e1002148. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002148 [published Online First: 20161018]
32. Corbin J, Strauss A. Basics of Qualitative Research (3rd ed.): Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory. Thousand Oaks, California, 2008.
33. Boyatzis RE. Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc 1998.
34. Young AE, Brookes ST, Avery KNL, et al. A systematic review of core outcome set development studies demonstrates difficulties in defining unique outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2019;115:14-24. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.06.016 [published Online First: 20190702]
35. Skevington SM, Gunson KS, O'Connell KA. Introducing the WHOQOL-SRPB BREF: developing a short-form instrument for assessing spiritual, religious and personal beliefs within quality of life. *Qual Life Res* 2013;22(5):1073-83. doi: 10.1007/s11136-012-0237-0 [published Online First: 20120727]
36. Huppert FA, So TT. Flourishing Across Europe: Application of a New Conceptual Framework for Defining Well-Being. *Soc Indic Res* 2013;110(3):837-61. doi: 10.1007/s11205-011-9966-7 [published Online First: 20111215]
37. Wilson IB, Cleary PD. Linking Clinical Variables With Health-Related Quality of Life: A Conceptual Model of Patient Outcomes. *JAMA* 1995;273(1):59-65. doi: 10.1001/jama.1995.03520250075037
38. Diener E, Suh EM, Lucas RE, et al. Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin* 1999;125(2):276-302. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.276
39. World Health Organization. Towards a Common Language for Functioning, Disability and Health ICF. Geneva, 2002.
40. General Medical Council. Outcomes for graduates 2018, 2018.

41. Rimmer A. Junior doctor strikes had a “significant impact” on services but did not increase deaths, study finds. *Bmj* 2018 doi: 10.1136/bmj.k782
42. Mahase E. Pensions: BMA challenges government's decision to make doctors pay for illegal reforms. *BMJ* 2021;375:n2809. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n2809 [published Online First: 20211116]
43. NHS England. Building and Strengthening Leadership: Leading with Compassion, 2014.
44. COMET Initiative. DelphiManger 2023 [Available from: <https://www.comet-initiative.org/delphimanager/>].
45. International Consortium Health Outcome Measurement. Our mission n.d. [accessed 25/09/2020.
46. Vogel C, Zwolinsky S, Griffiths C, et al. A Delphi study to build consensus on the definition and use of big data in obesity research. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2019;43(12):2573-86. doi: 10.1038/s41366-018-0313-9 [published Online First: 20190117]
47. Knaapen M, Hall NJ, van der Lee JH, et al. Establishing a core outcome set for treatment of uncomplicated appendicitis in children: study protocol for an international Delphi survey. *BMJ Open* 2019;9(5):e028861. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028861 [published Online First: 20190522]
48. Santaguida P, Dolovich L, Oliver D, et al. Protocol for a Delphi consensus exercise to identify a core set of criteria for selecting health related outcome measures (HROM) to be used in primary health care. *BMC Fam Pract* 2018;19(1):152. doi: 10.1186/s12875-018-0831-5 [published Online First: 20180904]
49. Blade J, Calleja MA, Lahuerta JJ, et al. Defining a set of standardised outcome measures for newly diagnosed patients with multiple myeloma using the Delphi consensus method: the IMPORTA project. *BMJ Open* 2018;8(2):e018850. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018850 [published Online First: 20180222]
50. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;336(7650):924-6. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD
51. Office for National Statistics. UK Measures of National Well-being Dashboard 2023 [Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/wellbeing/articles/ukmeasuresofnationalwellbeing/dashboard>].
52. NHS Staff Survey Coordination Centre. Technical guide to the 2023 staff survey data (Version 2), 2023.
53. General Medical Council. Training environments 2018: Key findings from the national training surveys, 2018.
54. NHS Staff Survey Coordination Centre. Technical Guide to the 2021 Staff Survey Data (Version 1.1), 2021.
55. NHS England. Our NHS People Promise 2021 [Available from: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/NHS-People-Promise.pdf>].
56. Rosenstock IM. The Health Belief Model and Preventive Health Behavior. *Health Education Monographs* 1974;2(4):354-86. doi: 10.1177/109019817400200405
57. Lebares CC, Guvva EV, Olaru M, et al. Efficacy of Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Training in Surgery: Additional Analysis of the Mindful Surgeon Pilot Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Network Open* 2019;2(5):e194108-e08. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.4108
58. Fendel JC, Aeschbach VM, Schmidt S, et al. The impact of a tailored mindfulness-based program for resident physicians on distress and the quality of care: A randomised controlled trial. *Journal of Internal Medicine* 2021;290(6):1233-48. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/joim.13374>

59. MOFFATT-BRUCE SD, NGUYEN MC, STEINBERG B, et al. Interventions to Reduce Burnout and Improve Resilience: Impact on a Health System's Outcomes. *Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology* 2019;62(3):432-43. doi: 10.1097/grf.0000000000000458
60. Rees C, Craigie M, Slatyer S, et al. Mindful Self-Care and Resiliency (MSCR): protocol for a pilot trial of a brief mindfulness intervention to promote occupational resilience in rural general practitioners. *BMJ open* 2018;8(e021027) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-021027
61. Goldhagen BE, Kingsolver K, Stinnett SS, et al. Stress and burnout in residents: impact of mindfulness-based resilience training. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice* 2015;6(null):525-32. doi: 10.2147/AMEP.S88580
62. Gunasingam N, Burns K, Edwards J, et al. Reducing stress and burnout in junior doctors: the impact of debriefing sessions. *Postgraduate Medical Journal* 2015;91(1074):182-87. doi: 10.1136/postgradmedj-2014-132847
63. West CP, Dyrbye LN, Rabatin JT, et al. Intervention to Promote Physician Well-being, Job Satisfaction, and Professionalism: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2014;174(4):527-33. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.14387
64. Bergman D, Arnetz B, Wahlström R, et al. Effects of dialogue groups on physicians' work environment. *Journal of Health Organization and Management* 2007;21(1):27-38. doi: 10.1108/14777260710732240
65. Williamson PR, Barrington H, Blazeby JM, et al. Review finds core outcome set uptake in new studies and systematic reviews needs improvement. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2022;150:154-64. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.06.016
66. Health and Social Care Committee. Workforce burnout and resilience in the NHS and social care. In: House of Commons, ed.: HMSO, 2021.
67. Johal HK, Prout R, Birchley G, et al. We should move away from a focus on individual resilience towards building resilient systems. *BMJ* 2021;375:n2737. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n2737
68. Maben J, Taylor C, Jagosh J, et al. Causes and solutions to workplace psychological ill-health for nurses, midwives and paramedics: the Care Under Pressure 2 realist review. Health and Social Care Delivery Research, 2023.