

Did institutional racism contribute to adverse COVID-19 clinical outcomes in ethnic minority healthcare staff? Systematic review

Authors: Oluwatomisin Adewole¹, Kismet Lalli¹, Holly Peters², Chris Price³, Blanche Lumb⁴, Micaela Gal⁵, Alison Cooper⁵

Author Affiliations:

1. Cardiff University School of Medicine, Cardiff University, Wales
2. Centre for Medical Education, Cardiff University, Wales
3. Health Education and Improvement Wales, UK
4. Cardiff and Vale University Health Board, Wales
5. Wales COVID-19 Evidence Centre, Wales

Abstract

Introduction: Of the United Kingdom National Health Service (NHS) healthcare workers who died during the first wave of the pandemic, 63% belonged to an ethnic minority background, despite making up 21% of the NHS workforce. Previous research has considered biological and social causes such as obesity or overcrowded housing. This review aims to explore whether elements of institutional racism contributed to ethnic disparities in adverse COVID-19 clinical outcomes among healthcare staff.

Method: Eleven databases were searched including MEDLINE and the Cochrane Library. Eight healthcare organisations within the grey literature were also searched. A narrative synthesis was conducted.

Results: 20 studies were included for review. There were ethnic disparities in the rate of COVID-19 infection, mortality and wellbeing. Three elements of institutional racism were identified associated with these adverse outcomes, namely, overrepresentation of ethnic minority staff in frontline roles, discriminatory redeployment and harassment and bullying.

Conclusion: The pandemic exacerbated pre-existing racial inequalities within the UK healthcare workforce. Further research is required to clarify the definition of institutional racism and increase understanding of how this manifests in a healthcare setting and can be mitigated.

Funding statement: The Wales COVID-19 Evidence Centre was funded for this work by Health and Care Research Wales on behalf of Welsh Government.

Did institutional racism contribute to adverse COVID-19 clinical outcomes in ethnic minority healthcare staff? Systematic review

Authors: Oluwatomisin Adewole, Kismet Lalli, Holly Peters, Chris Price, Blanche Lumb, Micaela Gal, Alison Cooper

Author Affiliations:

Cardiff University School of Medicine
Wales COVID-19 Evidence Centre (WCEC)
General Medical Council (GMC)
Health Education and Improvement Wales (HEIW)

Abstract

Introduction: Of the United Kingdom National Health Service (NHS) healthcare workers who died during the first wave of the pandemic, 63% belonged to an ethnic minority background, despite making up 21% of the NHS workforce. Previous research has considered biological and social causes such as obesity or overcrowded housing. This review aims to explore whether elements of institutional racism contributed to ethnic disparities in adverse COVID-19 clinical outcomes among healthcare staff.

Method: Eleven databases were searched including MEDLINE and the Cochrane Library. Eight healthcare organisations within the grey literature were also searched. A narrative synthesis was conducted.

Results: 20 studies were included for review. There were ethnic disparities in the rate of COVID-19 infection, mortality and wellbeing. Three elements of institutional racism were identified associated with these adverse outcomes, namely, overrepresentation of ethnic minority staff in frontline roles, discriminatory redeployment and harassment and bullying.

Conclusion: The pandemic exacerbated pre-existing racial inequalities within the UK healthcare workforce. Further research is required to clarify the definition of institutional racism and increase understanding of how this manifests in a healthcare setting and can be mitigated.

Introduction

Healthcare workers in the UK were seven times more likely to be exposed to the Sars-Cov-2 virus and develop COVID-19 compared with the general population during the COVID-19 pandemic (1). However, staff who identify as ethnic minority faced even greater adverse clinical outcomes due to events occurring in the first-wave of the pandemic (2). The first 11 National Health Service (NHS) doctors to die due to contracting the virus were of an ethnic minority background (3). By April 2020, 95% of all NHS doctors who died were minority ethnic (3). Furthermore, 63% of all NHS healthcare workers who died were Black, Asian or minority ethnic despite making up just 21% of the NHS workforce (3). Ethnic minority individuals were also more likely to be admitted into Intensive Care Units (ICU) and require invasive ventilation compared to their white counterparts (4).

Proposed biological causes of these disparities include higher genetic susceptibility to the coronavirus and the presence of pre-existing conditions (5). Other research places greater focus on socio-economic factors such as low-income employment, residing in over-crowded areas where the virus is more prevalent and transmissible, as well as culturally-influenced health-seeking behaviours (6). When

these social and biological factors are accounted for in research, a disparity in outcomes still remains between ethnic groups, suggesting that there is another cause that is not being addressed (7).

One cause to consider is that of institutional racism. The British Medical Journal (BMJ) defines institutional racism as ‘the processes of racism that are embedded in laws (local, state, and federal), policies, and practices of society and its institutions that provide advantages to ethnic groups deemed as superior, while differentially oppressing, disadvantaging, or otherwise neglecting ethnic groups viewed as inferior’(2). Elements that comprise this term are outlined in Figure 1. This term is not clearly defined in research and other used definitions such as Macpherson’s(8), are less applicable to a healthcare context .

The aim was to explore whether racism persisting at an institutional level within the UK healthcare system contributed to the racial disparities in COVID-19 adverse clinical outcomes among NHS healthcare staff.

Our objectives included:

- Identifying and describing the adverse clinical outcomes experienced by ethnic minority healthcare staff compared with white healthcare staff during the COVID-19 pandemic;
- Identifying factors that contributed to the differences in adverse clinical outcomes;
- Exploring how elements of institutional racism might contribute to these differences

Method

We conducted this review in September 2021 accordance with the Cochrane Handbook of Reviews and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (9). We registered the protocol with International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO)(10). We were supported by representatives from Health Education Improvement Wales (HEIW) and the General Medical Council (GMC) as stakeholders who had an interest in this area. They supported the review throughout: clarifying terminology, protocol planning, review progress meetings and dissemination of findings.

Search strategy

We developed a search strategy, developed by stakeholders (CP, BL, KL, RJ) and two information scientists (EG, DM). Key search terms were divided into five concepts based on the research question: “COVID clinical outcomes”, “ethnic minority”, “healthcare staff/employees” and “institutional racism”.

Sources of data

We searched eleven databases: MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library, Web of Science, PsychINFO, SCOPUS and Joanna Briggs Institute Evidence-Based Practice database (JBI EBP), L*OVECovid, VA-ESP*, Cochrane COVID review bank and Collabovid. The searches occurred between 11th – 30th January 2022.

We also searched the grey literature between 30th January – 5th February 2022. Eight healthcare organisations were searched for grey literature material (Figure 2).

The eligibility criteria are outlined in Table 1. Clinical outcomes outlined in Table 1 were derived from current research in the general population and are not specific to healthcare staff and employees. Therefore, studies that assessed other adverse outcomes, for example wellbeing, were included.

Study Selection

The studies identified, were independently screened by a single reviewer (OA) against the eligibility criteria. Studies were screened by title and abstract, followed by full text screening. 20% of the studies were double coded by a second reviewer (KL) to check the consistency in interpretation of the eligibility criteria. Any uncertainty was discussed among the research team.

Data Extraction

Data were extracted from each eligible study by an independent reviewer (OA) using a data extraction form and presented in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The data extraction table of all eligible studies is provided in the supplementary material. Data were extracted based on their sample characteristics, study design and the outcome measured (11).

Critical Appraisal

We critically appraised each study according to their design (12). Four studies were appraised using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) opinion and commentary checklists (13). Four studies used the JBI prevalence checklists (14). One study was appraised using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) qualitative checklist(15). Six studies were appraised using the Specialist Unit for Review Evidence (SURE) cross-sectional checklist and five were appraised using the SURE cohort study checklist(16, 17).

Results

A total of 1520 studies was identified from electronic databases, and 1446 studies were screened by title and abstract following deduplication (Figure 2). 1386 studies were excluded by the reviewer (OA) as they were non-UK based, irrelevant to the PECO and beyond the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

3225 items were identified from grey literature, press articles and blogs were excluded, 16 reports were assessed against the eligibility criteria and two reports were included. 20 studies remained for analysis, 18 sourced from electronic databases and two from the grey literature.

Most of the studies were observational in design ($n = 11$). This included six cross-sectional and five cohort studies. Four of the included papers were opinion pieces, whilst four others were surveys. One study was qualitative. Eighteen studies measured a COVID-19 clinical outcome among healthcare staff. Six of these also assessed for an element of institutional racism. Two opinion pieces discussed elements of institutional racism but no clinical outcome.

The included studies were mapped according to adverse COVID-19 clinical outcomes and the elements of institutional racism (Figure 3). This map, which is initialled according to study design, highlights many evidence gaps. Several studies assessed for more than one element of institutional racism or clinical outcome.

Strength of Evidence:

Most studies were of moderate-to-low quality due to poor justification of their methods and discussion of results. Many of the studies did not adjust for confounders when calculating the risk of COVID-19 infection, nor did they address the likelihood of information bias among participants.

There was a consistent lack of explanation regarding sample size or recruitment methods in the observational studies.

Four studies were of high quality; two cross-sectional, one cohort and one qualitative study (18-21). These studies obtained large datasets, provided thorough explanations of methodology and acknowledged sources of bias. The qualitative study provided a variety of rich, in-depth experiences of ethnic minority staff during the pandemic and a thorough thematic analysis. Critical appraisal of each study is provided in the supplementary material.

Ethnic disparities in adverse COVID-19 clinical outcomes

When socio-economic and demographic factors were adjusted for, an ethnic disparity among staff still remained (20, 23, 25). Other factors that may have contributed to ethnic disparities included genetic predisposition and inhabiting socially deprived regions (20, 24, 25).

SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 infection

Of 10 studies that measured the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among ethnically diverse healthcare staff, nine found disparities in the prevalence, rate and risk between ethnic groups (18, 20-28). Eight studies, which measured the SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence (detection of the SARS-CoV-2 antibody which indicates a positive infection) within the healthcare population, found that this was greater among ethnic minority than white healthcare workers (18, 20-24, 26, 27). One paper, which measured the seropositivity (presence of a positive SARS-CoV-2 antibody test) among healthcare staff, found no difference between ethnicities (28).

Hospitalisation and ICU admission

This outcome was measured in one paper, which found no difference in hospitalisation and Intensive Care Unit (ICU) admission rates between ethnic groups of healthcare workers (22).

Mortality

One cohort study examined the risk of COVID-related death among an ethnically diverse cohort of consultants, which found that the risk of death was greater among ethnic minority groups (29). When comparing white physicians with Asian, Black and Mixed physicians, the risk of mortality for ethnic minority women over 60 and men over 50, was two-fold. This level of risk increased five-fold in ethnic minority men over 60 (Hazard Ratio: 5.46, 5.50, 5.65 vs HR: 3.82) (29).

Mental and physical wellbeing

Six articles identified ethnic disparities in wellbeing, including clinical safety during the pandemic (19, 30-34). Ethnic minority staff were more likely to receive inadequate PPE-training whilst working on COVID wards and have reduced access to PPE equipment (30, 31). Ethnic minority nurses had concerns

about inadequately designed masks, which they felt did not consider cultural or physiological differences between ethnic groups (33).

Potential elements of institutional racism:

None of the studies used the term 'institutional racism'. Discrimination and racism were alluded to by authors but un-defined (25, 27, 28). The elements of institutional racism identified in this review were derived from the BMJ definition(2).

Overrepresentation in frontline roles and lack of job security

'Minority ethnic groups are systemically over-represented at lower level of NHS grade hierarchy, working in the shadow of snowy white peaks'(35)

There is evidence of ethnic disparities in healthcare professions across six papers. Ethnic minority staff are more likely to work in junior roles, occupy lower pay bands and are underrepresented in senior, managerial clinical and non-clinical positions (20, 31-33, 35, 36). Two papers suggested that the pandemic exacerbated concerns over career progression among ethnic minority healthcare staff and increased the lack in promotion opportunities (19, 32). In a survey, members of staff reported feeling as though they were excluded from senior-level discussions concerning their safety whilst working during the pandemic and that they were appointed 'riskier responsibilities' in comparison with their white colleagues such as having to see patients without PPE (31).

Ethnic minority healthcare staff are more likely to undergo frequent employment changes due to overrepresentation in temporary roles (31, 35, 36). Ethnic minority staff were less likely to receive in-person training than their white colleagues whilst working in COVID wards (31).

Ethnic minority staff, particularly within the nursing profession, expressed feeling a lack of job security (19, 31, 33). An article reported that ethnic minority nurses felt as though they had a lack of agency or power when speaking to their line managers and senior staff (33).

Discriminatory redeployment and higher risk of exposure

'I was told to see a COVID patient without extra PPE...when I expressed my concerns, I was dismissed and told I had no right to refuse to see any patient...I felt so undervalued and worthless'(37)

Redeployment is the process of reassigning staff and employees to a new role or work location to meet new demands (38). Five studies found that ethnic minority healthcare workers were more likely to be redeployed to COVID wards than their white colleagues and were at greater risk of exposure to the virus (30, 31, 33-35). Both ethnic minority senior and junior healthcare workers were four times more likely to be redeployed to patient facing roles than their white colleagues (31). Ethnic minority staff believed themselves to be at greater risk of mortality because of 'racially motivated' redeployment methods (30, 33).

Harassment and bullying

‘There were...people who...chose to not follow guidance and they wanted to see patients face to face...because they were worried about their position in the team and about bullying’(19)

A finding across five studies was an inability for ethnic minority staff to raise concerns regarding their clinical safety due to fear of how it may impact their job (19, 30, 31, 33, 34). Some felt that there was a ‘culture of appeasement’ that was prohibiting raising concerns of welfare (31). Staff described a ‘disregard’ and lack of understanding regarding the experiences of ethnic minority employees in the workplace, causing a barrier in conversation with their white managers (19). In a survey around wellbeing of healthcare staff during the pandemic, 32% of ethnic minority healthcare workers felt overlooked and were treated without dignity or respect. 39% of respondents felt unsupported by their white seniors (34). They spoke of the ‘pressure’ applied to those working from home “because [they] were not trusted to be doing what [they] should be doing” by white managers (19). Ethnic minority staff were reluctant to work from home due to fear of perceived special treatment and how this might impact interprofessional relationships at work (19).

Discussion

Main findings:

Among 20 UK-based studies, ethnic disparities were found in the acquisition of COVID-19 infection, clinical wellbeing and mortality rates. Potential evidence of institutional racism included: overrepresentation of ethnic minority staff in frontline roles, discriminatory redeployment, and harassment and bullying, which may have contributed to these ethnic disparities in outcomes.

Strengths and Limitations:

This is the first systematic review to assess the impact of institutional racism impacting UK ethnic minority healthcare staff during the pandemic. We searched 11 databases and extensively in the grey literature. Selecting exclusively UK-based studies increases the transferability of the findings to the NHS. Stakeholder involvement helped to focus the review and interpret findings.

Most evidence was of moderate-to-low quality. The data extraction and critical appraisal processes were not checked by a second reviewer due to time constraints, this could have introduced information bias. Additionally, interpretations of elements of institutional racism may have been subjective. However, this was mitigated through discussion of uncertainties within the research team and stakeholders. Another limitation was a lack of consistency regarding ethnic categories, where attention to specific sub-groups varied between studies.

Comparison with literature:

Before the pandemic, ethnic minorities were disproportionately represented in high-risk, low-paying jobs within the NHS (39-41). This was exacerbated during the pandemic, which saw an uptake of at-risk healthcare roles by predominantly ethnic minority staff (42). These roles are less-valued within the healthcare system and have been associated with job insecurity, poorer health and a greater risk of exposure (42, 43).

Wider evidence suggests that this overrepresentation may be due to underemployment of ethnic minority staff in senior positions (44). White staff are more likely to be appointed into senior roles from shortlisting compared with ethnic minority staff (45). Additionally, ethnic minority staff

constitute 10% of NHS trust boards despite making up over 19.7% of the workforce (45, 46). This excludes them from employment decisions, hinders career progression and provides unequal opportunities to staff.

A consistent finding identified within this review was a lack of agency and job insecurity felt among NHS staff. Literature attributes this to multiple factors, including the feeling of inferiority to white colleagues, which is perpetuated by the presence of pay-gaps and ongoing workplace racism. As a result, staff members have reported feeling unable to raise concerns with their seniors regarding their wellbeing, for fear of how this will impact their job. Ethnic minority staff are 1.5 times more likely than their white colleagues to enter the formal disciplinary process due to referral by a senior member of staff (47, 48). This creates a workplace culture of fear and appeasement, in which staff feel compelled to dismiss safety concerns to avoid being perceived as a 'troublemaker' (49). Pope et al. referred to this culture as a form of 'organizational silence' designed to prohibit ethnic minority staff from voicing out (49).

This review highlighted the exacerbation of harassment and bullying towards ethnic minority healthcare staff during the pandemic. The results align with a pre-pandemic picture of harassment and bullying in the NHS. Staff from ethnic minority groups have consistently been subjected to higher levels of bullying, harassment and abuse from their colleagues, compared with white staff(45). Despite the actions of organisations such as the Workforce Race Equality Standard (WRES), harassment and bullying towards ethnic minority staff is still increasing. In 2021, the NHS staff survey revealed that the rate of bullying and harassment of ethnic minority staff had increased from 14.5% in 2019 to 17% (50). However, as the NHS is an employer organisation, their surveys may be subject to reporting bias, as ethnic minority staff may feel uncomfortable disclosing their personal experiences (51). Furthermore, bullying and harassment appears to be most prevalent in nursing, where 1 in 5 nurses are of an ethnic minority background (52). This may be due to a greater exposure to vertical harassment and bullying, from staff in senior positions, as well as horizontal harassment and bullying, from staff within the same level (53). The consequences of harassment and bullying include a deterioration in mental wellbeing and poorer health outcomes as a result of chronic stress (51, 54, 55). It is apparent that the fear of being stereotyped or disrespected by their colleagues deprives ethnic minority staff of an environment where they feel able to voice concerns about their safety.

Prejudice was not explicitly stated in any of the studies, nor has it been sufficiently defined in wider literature. However, we identified an association between discrimination and the review findings. Several of the studies allude to the redeployment process as a form of discrimination against ethnic minority healthcare staff (31, 33, 35, 37). The BMJ states that discrimination results in 'inequitable access to opportunities and resources'(2), this review identified two studies in which there was a clear disparity in PPE and training opportunities between white and ethnic minority healthcare staff (31, 37). Similarly, the lack of ethnic minority representation in senior NHS positions presents as 'disadvantaging or otherwise neglecting' (2) these groups as they are excluded from decisions involving their employment and safety (19, 31, 32).

Conclusion

The pandemic highlighted pre-existing racial inequalities present within the UK healthcare workforce. These inequalities need to be addressed by governing bodies and healthcare organisations, with interventions robustly evaluated. Further research is required to clarify the definition of Institutional racism and increase understanding about how this manifests in a healthcare setting and can be mitigated.

Acknowledgements:

The authors of this review would like to thank Professor Adrian Edwards, Rhian Jones and Katie Laugharne for their support and feedback.

Competing Interests:

There are no competing interests among the authors and contributors of this review.

Ethical Approval:

None Required

References:

1. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, Joshi AD, Guo C-G, Ma W, et al. Risk of COVID-19 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2020;5(9):e475-e83. doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30164-X
2. Razai MS, Kankam HKN, Majeed A, Esmail A, Williams DR. Mitigating ethnic disparities in covid-19 and beyond. *BMJ*. 2021;372:m4921. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m4921
3. Cook T, Kursumovic E, Lennane S. Exclusive: Deaths of NHS staff from covid-19 analysed. In: HSJ, editor.; 2020.
4. Apea VJ, Wan YI, Dhairyawan R, Puthuchery ZA, Pearse RM, Orkin CM, et al. Ethnicity and outcomes in patients hospitalised with COVID-19 infection in East London: an observational cohort study. *BMJ open*. 2021;11(1):e042140-e. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042140
5. Barsoum Z. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic and Health Workers of an Ethnic Group-A Slant on a Shocking Report. *SN comprehensive clinical medicine*. 2020:1-2. doi: 10.1007/s42399-020-00422-w
6. Phiri P, Delanerolle G, Al-Sudani A, Rathod S. COVID -19 and Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic Communities: A Complex Relationship Without Just Cause. *JMIR public health and surveillance*. 2021;7(2):e22581-e. doi: 10.2196/22581
7. Raisi-Estabragh Z, McCracken C, Bethell MS, Cooper J, Cooper C, Caulfield MJ, et al. Greater risk of severe COVID-19 in Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic populations is not explained by cardiometabolic, socioeconomic or behavioural factors, or by 25(OH)-vitamin D status: study of 1326 cases from the UK Biobank. (1741-3850 (Electronic))
8. Macpherson W. The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry: Report of an Inquiry by Sir William Macpherson of Cluny. London 1999. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/277111/4262.pdf
9. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71
10. Adewole O, Cooper A, Gal M, Peters H, Edwards A, Lalli K. Does institutional racism contribute to adverse clinical outcomes among ethnic minority healthcare staff and employees during the COVID-19 pandemic? A systematic review. 2022.
11. Lefebvre C, Glanville J, Briscoe S, Littlewood A, al e. Chapter 4: Searching for and selecting studies
Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Intervention 6.2 ed; 2021.
12. Page MJ, Higgins JP, Sterne JA.
13. McArthur A, Klugárová J, Yan H, Florescu S. Innovations in the systematic review of text and opinion. *JBI Evidence Implementation*. 2015;13(3):188-95.

14. Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D, Tufanaru C. Methodological guidance for systematic reviews of observational epidemiological studies reporting prevalence and cumulative incidence data. *International journal of evidence-based healthcare*. 2015;13(3):147-53.
15. Casp C. CASP qualitative checklist. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. 2018
16. Specialist Unit for Review E. Questions to assist with the critical appraisal of cross-sectional studies. 2018
17. Specialist Unit for Review E. Questions to assist with the critical appraisal of cohort studies. 2018
18. Hanrath AT, Schim van der Loeff I, Lendrem DW, Baker KF, Price DA, McDowall P, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Testing of 11,884 Healthcare Workers at an Acute NHS Hospital Trust in England: A Retrospective Analysis. *Frontiers in Medicine*. 2021;8
19. Jesuthasan J, Powell RA, Burmester V, Nicholls D. 'We weren't checked in on, nobody spoke to us': an exploratory qualitative analysis of two focus groups on the concerns of ethnic minority NHS staff during COVID-19. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(12):e053396. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-053396
20. Jones Cr HFWTAMTTME. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG in healthcare workers and other staff at North Bristol NHS Trust: a sociodemographic analysis (preprint). *Medrxiv*. 2020:2020.11.12.20230458. doi: 10.1101/2020.11.12.20230458
21. Martin CA, Pan D, Melbourne C, Teece L, Aujayeb A, Baggaley RF, et al. Predictors of SARS-CoV-2 infection in a multi-ethnic cohort of United Kingdom healthcare workers: a prospective nationwide cohort study (UK-REACH). *medRxiv*. 2021:2021.12.16.21267934. doi: 10.1101/2021.12.16.21267934
22. Choudhry N, Drysdale K, Usai C, Leighton D, Sonagara V, Buchanan R, et al. Disparities of SARS-CoV-2 Nucleoprotein-Specific IgG in Healthcare Workers in East London, UK. *FRONTIERS IN MEDICINE*. 2021;8 doi: 10.3389/fmed.2021.642723
23. Ken-Dror G, Wade C, Sharma SS, Irvin-Sellers M, Robin J, Fluck D, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody seroprevalence in NHS healthcare workers in a large double-sited UK hospital. *CLINICAL MEDICINE*. 2021;21(3):E290-E4. doi: 10.7861/clinmed.2020-1096
24. Martyn EM, Whitaker H, Gil E, Ighomereho P, Lambe G, Conley R, et al. Disproportionate impact of SARS-CoV-2 on ethnic minority and frontline healthcare workers: A cross-sectional seroprevalence survey at a North London hospital. *The Journal of infection*. 2021;82(6):276-316. doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2021.02.027
25. Maxime I, Ros K, Priya L, David N, Zahid A, Tracy M, et al. *Research Square*. 2022 doi: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-1008151/v1
26. Shields A, Faustini SE, Perez-Toledo M, Jossi S, Aldera E, Allen JD, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and asymptomatic viral carriage in healthcare workers: a cross-sectional study. *Thorax*. 2020;75(12):1089. doi: 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-215414
27. Valdes AM, Moon JC, Vijay A, Chaturvedi N, Norrish A, Ikram A, et al. Longitudinal assessment of symptoms and risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in healthcare workers across 5 hospitals to understand ethnic differences in infection risk. *eClinicalMedicine*. 2021;34 doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.100835
28. Zheng C, Hafezi-Bakhtiari N, Cooper V, Davidson H, Habibi M, Riley P, et al. Characteristics and transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in healthcare workers at a London teaching hospital. *JOURNAL OF HOSPITAL INFECTION*. 2020;106(2):325-9. doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2020.07.025
29. Verma AM, Goddard AF, O'Donoghue D, Newbery N, Phillips C, Trudgill N. The UK physician workforce: one-third at increased risk of death from COVID-19. *Clinical Medicine*. 2021;21(2):e161. doi: 10.7861/clinmed.2020-0756
30. Ali P, Adam Z, West J, Pareek M, Raza M, Iqbal J. Perceptions of COVID-19-related risk and mortality among ethnically diverse healthcare professionals in the UK. *Ethnicity & Health*. 2021;26(1):1-10. doi: 10.1080/13557858.2020.1849568

31. Kapilashrami A, Otis M, Omodara D, Nandi A, Vats A, Adeniyi O, et al. Ethnic disparities in health & social care workers' exposure, protection, and clinical management of the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK. *Critical Public Health*. 2021;1-14. doi: 10.1080/09581596.2021.1959020
32. Otu A, Ahinkorah BO, Ameyaw EK, Seidu A-A, Yaya S. One country, two crises: what Covid-19 reveals about health inequalities among BAME communities in the United Kingdom and the sustainability of its health system? *International Journal for Equity in Health*. 2020;19(1):189. doi: 10.1186/s12939-020-01307-z
33. Qureshi I, Garcia R, Ali N, Randhawa G. Understanding the disproportionate effects of COVID-19 on nurses from ethnic minority backgrounds. *Nursing standard*. 2021;36(9):29-34. doi: 10.7748/ns.2021.e11645
34. King O, McGill C. South East Survey on BAME staff, the COVID-19 pandemic and wellbeing. NHS England; 2020.
35. Chaudhry FB, Raza S, Raja KZ, Ahmad U. COVID 19 and BAME health care staff: Wrong place at the wrong time. *Journal of global health*. 2020;10(2):020358-. doi: 10.7189/jogh.10.020358
36. Dey T, Sinha A. Ethnicity and COVID-19 - A commentary on "World Health Organization declares global emergency: A review of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19)" (*Int J Surg* 2020;76:71-6). *International Journal of Surgery*. 2020;83:75-6. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijssu.2020.08.046>
37. Ali P AZWJPMRMJIJ. Perceptions of COVID-19-related risk and mortality among ethnically diverse healthcare professionals in the UK. *Ethnicity & health*. 2021;26(1):1-10. doi: 10.1080/13557858.2020.1849568
38. Panda N, Sinyard RD, Henrich N, Cauley CE, Hannenberg AA, Sonnay Y, et al. Redeployment of Health Care Workers in the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Qualitative Study of Health System Leaders' Strategies. *Journal of Patient Safety*. 2021;17(4)
39. Esmail A, Kalra V, Abel P. A critical review of leadership interventions aimed at people from black and minority ethnic groups: Health Foundation; 2005.
40. Crisp N. 24 hours to save the NHS: The Chief Executive's account of reform 2000 to 2006: OUP Oxford; 2011.
41. England NHS. A fair experience for all: Closing the ethnicity gap in rates of disciplinary action across the NHS workforce. 2019
42. Organisation for Economic C-o, Development. The unequal impact of COVID-19: a spotlight on frontline workers, migrants and racial/ethnic minorities. 2022
43. Moorthy A, Sankar TK. Emerging public health challenge in UK: perception and belief on increased COVID19 death among BAME healthcare workers. *Journal of Public Health*. 2020;42(3):486-92. doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdaa096
44. Workforce Race Equality Standard (WRES). 2019 Data Analysis Report for NHS Trusts and Clinical Commissioning Groups. 2020
45. Workforce Race Equality Standard (WRES). 2020 Data Analysis Report for NHS Trusts and Clinical Commissioning Groups. 2021.
46. Rimmer A. Ethnic minority staff: trust boards still do not reflect NHS workforce. *BMJ: British Medical Journal (Online)*. 2020;368
47. Atewologun D, Kline R, Ochieng M. Fair to Refer. Reducing disproportionality in fitness to practise concerns reported to the GMC. 2019.
48. West E, Nayar S, Taskila T, Al-Haboubi M. The progress and outcomes of black and minority ethnic (BME) nurses through the Nursing and Midwifery Council's "Fitness to Practise" process. 2017
49. Pope R. Organizational Silence in the NHS: 'Hear no, See no, Speak no'. *Journal of Change Management*. 2019;19(1):45-66. doi: 10.1080/14697017.2018.1513055
50. National Health Service (NHS). NHS Staff Survey 2021 National Results Briefing. 2021.
51. Rhead RD, Chui Z, Bakolis I, Gazard B, Harwood H, MacCrimmon S, et al. Impact of workplace discrimination and harassment among National Health Service staff working in London trusts: results from the TIDES study. *BJPsych Open*. 2021;7(1):e10. doi: 10.1192/bjo.2020.137

52. National Health Service (NHS). An overview of workforce data for nurses, midwives and health visitors in the NHS. 2021.
53. Wright W, Khatri N. Bullying among nursing staff. Health care management review. 2015;40(2):139-47.
54. Okechukwu CA, Souza K, Davis KD, de Castro AB. Discrimination, harassment, abuse, and bullying in the workplace: Contribution of workplace injustice to occupational health disparities. American Journal of Industrial Medicine. 2014;57(5):573-86. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.22221>
55. Carter M, Thompson N, Crampton P, Morrow G, Burford B, Gray C, et al. Workplace bullying in the UK NHS: a questionnaire and interview study on prevalence, impact and barriers to reporting. BMJ Open. 2013;3(6):e002628. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-002628

Word count (excluding abstract, references, tables, figures): 3008 words




Figure 1 - Elements of institutional racism (adapted by author)

159x68mm (150 x 150 DPI)

	Inclusion	Exclusion
Population	Healthcare staff/employees in the UK	Studies that do not include staff or only focus on patients and the general population Non-UK based
Exposure	Primary: Institutional racism Secondary: Socioeconomic background, pre-existing conditions, age etc.	Studies that do not report ethnicity
Comparison	Comparison of COVID-related adverse clinical outcomes between ethnic minority and white healthcare staff	No comparison enabled (based on ethnicity)
Outcome(s)	Rate/Incidence/Prevalence of Sars-Cov-2 or Covid-19 infection Mortality ICU admission Hospitalisation	Studies that do not assess for these outcomes in ethnic minority staff

Table 1 - Eligibility Criteria for inclusion and exclusion of studies

159x81mm (220 x 220 DPI)




Figure 2 - PRISMA Flowchart

259x149mm (220 x 220 DPI)

Element of institutional racism described by BMJ definition (2)	COVID-19 Clinical Outcome														
	Sars-Cov-2/Covid-19 infection			Mortality			ICU admission			Hospitalisation			Other (wellbeing, clinical safety)		
Seniority, role and job security	O												F	S	C
													C	S	
Redeployment and Exposure	Q	O	O	S	C	C							F	S	C
	O												S		
Harassment and Bullying													F	S	C
													C	S	
Racial discrimination				C									S	C	
Prejudice															
Implicit bias															
Unconscious bias															
Socio-economic factors and co-morbidities															
Socio-economic factors	O														
Other															
Studies that were not listed under an element of institutional racism or a socio-economic factor	O	S	O												
	O	O	O												
	O														
Quantitative								Qualitative							
Survey				Quantitative other				Observational				Focus		Commentary	

Figure 3 - Evidence map of the included studies, mapped according to study design
398x378mm (87 x 87 DPI)



Search plan strategy

Research project title: Did institutional racism contribute to adverse COVID-19 clinical outcomes in ethnic minority healthcare staff and employees? A Systematic Review

Databases searched: MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library, Web of Science, PsychINFO, SCOPUS, JBI EBP, L*OVECovid, VA-ESP*, Cochrane COVID review bank and Collabovid

Key concepts and search terms:

COVID-19	Clinical outcomes	Ethnic minority	Healthcare staff/employees	Elements of institutional racism
<p>The following filter was devised by Elizabeth Gillen and Mala Mann of the Wales Covid-19 Evidence Centre: exp Coronavirus/ COVID-19/ ((corona* or corono*) adj1 (virus* or viral* or virinae*)).ti,ab,kw (coronavirus* or coronavirus* or coronaviri* or 2019-nCoV or 2019nCoV or nCoV2019 or nCoV-2019 or covid-19* or covid19* or ncov* or n-cov* or HCoV* or SARS-CoV-2 or SARSCoV-2 or SARSCov2 or SARS-CoV2 or severe acute respiratory syndrome).ti,ab,kw ((outbreak* or pandemic* or epidemic*) adj10 (wuhan or hubei or china or Chinese or Huanan)).ti,ab,kw</p>	<p>Death* Mortality Hospitalisation*/Hospitalization* Sars-CoV-2 infection* ICU admission* Risk*adj2 admission* Diagnostic rate*</p>	<p>Ethnic minorit* Ethnicity Ethnic* Ethnic group* Minority ethnic group* Minority ethnic* BAME* Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic* Minority group*</p>	<p>Healthcare workforce NHS adj1 (employee or staff or workforce or worker or professional) Healthcare adj1 (employee or staff or workforce or worker or professional) Hospital staff Health personnel Physician*/Doctor* Healthcare professional* Nurse* Cleaner* Porter* Hospital worker*</p>	<p>(race or racial or racism) adj3 (discriminat* or prejudice or harass* or microaggression*) Structural racism Cultural incompetenc* White privilege* Systemic racism Implicit bias* Unconscious bias*</p>

Supplementary material: Data Extraction tables (1-3)

Author (1st)	Publication Year	Country	Sample Characteristics					Methodology	Covid clinical outcome(s)	Results	Institutional racism	Free text	
			No. of participants	Ethnicity	Occupation	Age	Gender						
Parveen AI	2021	UK		BAME (71%) Non-BAME (29%)	Healthcare Practitioners (Doctors (7.2%), nurses (15%), other HCPs (13%))	45 +/- 9.5 years	Female (44%) Male (56%)	Cross-sectional prospective survey	HCPs' perception of mortality in HCPs and BAME HCPs HCPs' concern and worries about COVID, PPE and the government's response to the statistics	Ethnic minority HCP were more likely to have concerns about inadequate PPE, mortality Ethnic minority HCPs were more likely to agree that Ethnic minority HCPs should be removed from direct clinical care Ethnic minority HCPs are more at risk of mortality because of professional factors (PPE, high-risk jobs, inability to raise concerns) and social/biological factors (co-morbidities, genetics)	N/A	N/A	
Chaudry, Faisal	2020	UK	N/A	N/A	Healthcare workers	N/A	N/A	Authors views' and opinion piece	(Discussed) Mortality among ethnic minority HCWs	Evidence of discriminatory deployment of ethnic minority HCPs into high-risk areas Ethnic minority HCPs less likely to be appointed into non-medical senior managerial roles Overrepresentation of ethnic minority HCPs at the lower-grade of the NHS hierarchy	N/A	N/A	
Choudry, Naheed	2021	UK	228	White (54.5%) Asian (34.2%) Black (7.5%) Mixed (0.4%) Other (3.5%)	Healthcare workers	20 - 69 years	Male (45.2%) Female (54.8%)	Matrix Equivalence Study	The measure the presence of Sars-CoV-2 antibody to indicate diagnosis of Sars-CoV-2 infection To identify disparities in Sars-CoV-2 antibody positivity among HCWs	Sars-CoV-2 antibody more prevalent among Frontline HCWs More prevalent among ethnic minority HCWs	N/A	N/A	
Dey, Thonmoy	2020	UK	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Commentary piece	Mortality among HCWs	Ethnic minority HCWs make up a large proportion of frontline workers Disparity could be due to high prevalence of co-morbidities among ethnic minority healthcare staff and deprivation/employment in low-income NHS jobs			
Martin, A. Christopher	2021	UK	10, 772	White (70%) Asian (19.1%) Black (4.3%) Mixed (4.1%) Other (2.1%)	Healthcare workers (including ancillary workers)	43.5-46	Male (24.9%) Female (75.1%)	Prospective cohort study	Primary outcome was Sars-CoV-2 infection (positive PCR, suspected to have COVID by HCP)	Infection was more prevalent among black HCWs than white HCWs Religiosity was higher among black HCWs than white HCWs			
Hanrath, Aidan T.	2021	UK	N = 3338 (PCR testing) N = 11, 103 (Serological testing) N = 17, 126 (Total number of HCWs in trust)	White (N = 9500, 96%) BAME (N = 834, 7.5%)	Healthcare workers (including caterers, domestic services staff)	43	Male (18.3%) Female (76.9%)	Retrospective Analysis	Covid clinical outcomes: Positive PCR test (prevalence of infection) Seropositivity	Seropositivity rate was higher in ethnic minority HCWs than in White HCWs			
Jesuthasan, Jehanita	2021	UK	13	Eastern European (n = 1) Indian (n = 2) Mixed white and black Caribbean (n = 1) Caribbean (n = 1) Mixed White and Asian (n=1), African (n=2), Arab (n=1), Bangladeshi (n=1), Asian Other (n=2) and Other (n = 1)	Healthcare workers (clinical staff in primary and secondary care settings, n = 11) (administrative roles, n = 2)	42.7	Male (n = 2) Female (n = 11)	Qualitative cross-sectional online focus groups	Wellbeing of ethnic minority healthcare staff	Five domain themes: 1. Viral vulnerability 2. Risk assessment 3. Interpersonal relationships in the workplace 4. Lived experience of racial inequality 5. Community attitudes	Several themes of institutional racism explored in this study Views included insufficient acknowledgement of the ethnic disparities in COVID outcomes because the affected population is not majority white Vulnerability misperceptions: Viral vulnerability is attributed to co-morbidities such as obesity but structural determinants, such as exposure differentials and unconscious racism were overlooked Ethnic minority staff are excluded from conversations concerning them Lack of support from non-ethnic minority seniors and management Cultural insensitivity relating to racial discrimination both within the workplace and		
Jones, Cr	2020	UK	12, 254 (N = 6858 in final analysis)	White British (58%), Black, Asian and Ethnic Minority (52%)	Healthcare workers	51-70	Female (58%), Males (49%)	Cross-sectional study	Seroprevalence of Sars-Cov-2	Seroprevalence of Sars-Cov-2 was higher among ethnic minority HCWs than white HCWs (14.6% vs 8.2%) - this was across all staff groups except for the Medical/Dental	Employment: Ethnic minority HCWs in other staff jobs are more likely to be in junior roles and so have greater exposure to the virus	Exposures: Occupation role, environment, socio-economic and demographic factors. Ethnic minority HCWs tend to live in	

Kapilashrami, A	2021	UK	456	White (70.2%), Asian and Arab (15.4%), Black (14.5%)	Healthcare workers, social workers (73% secondary care, 13.3% social care, 14% primary care)		Female (75%), Male (24%), Trans or non-binary (1%)	Online cross-sectional survey	N/A	Ethnic minority HCWs are more likely to work in COVID areas than white HCWs. Ethnic minority HCWs are more likely to receive inadequate PPE and be involved in discussions around PPE. Ethnic minority nurses were more likely to be deployed than white nurses	There is overrepresentation of ethnic minority HCWs in less valued but people-facing roles. There is evidence of ongoing racial discrimination that prevents ethnic minority HCWs from negotiating risky responsibilities and discussing career progression. Historical racism may prevent ethnic minority HCWs from speaking up about safety concerns such as lack of PPE. Senior ethnic minority HCWs and ethnic minority junior HCWs were 3-4 times more likely to be in patient-facing roles than white senior and junior HCWs,	Current research does not address whether ethnic disparities in COVID may be due to profession or job seniority. Ethnic minority HCWs working in high-risk areas did not feel supported, felt that there was a culture of 'appeasement' and so did not feel able to speak up about safety concerns or PPE inadequacy. There was
Ken-drer, G	2020	UK	3119 (tested for positive antibody)	White (61.1%), Non-white (38.9%)	Healthcare workers	43 +/- 13	Male (24.8%), Female (75.2%)	Cross-sectional study	Seroprevalence of Sars-Cov-2 (positive antibody test)	613/3119 = positive antibody test. 30% of non-white healthcare staff (n = 350) were positive versus 12.5% of white staff		
Martyn, E. M	2021	UK	3285	White British/Irish (23%), Black African (24%), Indian Subcontinent (15%),	Healthcare workers	41	Male (28%), Female (72%)	Cross-sectional survey	Seroprevalence of Sars-Cov-2	All non-white ethnic groups had increased odds of seropositivity when compared with white British/Irish		
Inghels, M	2021	UK	13, 880	White (87.9%), South Asian (5.3%), Black (1.9%)	Healthcare professionals (Nurses and midwives (27.8%), clinical services (21.9%), administrative and clerical (21.9%))	41-60	Male (23.1%), Female (76.9%)	Cohort study	Rate of Sars-Cov-2 infection (incidence of infection)	Incidence was higher among black and South Asian employees (18.6%, 14.7%). Significant differences in risk of infection even after adjusted for confounders (age, sex, NHS pay grade, staff group, contract type), Black and South Asian employees had a higher probability to test positive (20.5% and 15.8% vs 10.5%)	Ethnic disparities in the incidence of infection still remains after adjusting for several confounders, which supports that structural and institutional barriers have a contribution	This study does not report the percentage of each ethnicity in each staff profession or grade (to identify if there overrepresentation in the low NHS pay grades and occupations with more patient exposure). Despite Black employees making up only 1.9% (the smallest minority) of the study cohort, they have the greatest risk of infection among all ethnic groups.
Otu, A Otu, A	2020	UK	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Commentary	N/A	N/A	Overrepresented at lower NHS pay bands and underrepresented at higher NHS pay bands (Black NHS doctors earn £10000 and nurses earn £2700 less than their white counterparts). There is evidence of pay gaps across medical professionals, lower positions held by ethnic minority staff, lack of promotion coupled with bullying and harassment.	This study expresses that these factors may contribute to overall poorer performance among ethnic minority healthcare staff compared with their white counterparts.
Qureshi, I	2021	UK	N/A	N/A	Nurses	N/A	N/A	Article	N/A	N/A	26% of ethnic minority nurses are working in band 5 (lowest band in nursing qualification) and 2% are present within the highest nursing bands. This results in a diminishment of power and agency among ethnic minority nurses and creates a feeling of inferiority to their white colleagues. Nurses from ethnic minority backgrounds have been historically underrepresented in senior and managerial roles. The overrepresentation of ethnic minority nurses in these roles results in a lack of autonomy which may increase their likelihood of redeployment to high-risk COVID areas. Discrimination manifests as unfair redeployment and respondents in research feel that this has contributed to the disproportionate number of deaths among ethnic minority NHS staff	Using evidence proposes several factors that contribute to the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 clinical outcomes on nurses: Lower pay scale banding/lack of specialist status/positions in managerial jobs, bullying and prejudicial redeployment. Evidence of poorly-designed masks that do not meet cultural needs or consider physiological differences in ethnic groups.
Shields, A	2020	UK	545	Asian British Bangladeshi (0.4%) Asian British Indian (4.8%) Asian British other/not stated (3.5%) Asian British Pakistani (2.1%) Black African (1.9%) Black British (3.3%) Filipino (4.1%) Mixed heritage (1.9%) Not disclosed (14.3%) Other (2.5%) White Irish (1%) White other (4.8%) White British (55.2%)	Healthcare workers	42	Male (24.8%), Female (75.2%)	Cross-sectional study	Seroprevalence of Sars-Cov-2	Ethnic minority healthcare staff carry a greater risk of seropositivity than their white counterparts		There are more ethnic minority healthcare staff living in deprived areas than white healthcare staff according to the IMD.

Valdes, A.M	2021	UK	1364	73.5% of White, 4.3% Black ethnicity, 9.4% South Asian, 5.7% East Asian, 6.2% other or mixed	Healthcare workers	40.7	Male (28.1%), Female (71.6%)	Longitudinal study	Seroprevalence of Sars-Cov-2 and rate of infection	Rate of infection was higher in Black HCWs than in white HCWs (42% vs 19%). This difference remained after adjusting for confounders (age, sex, BMI, IMD, level of exposure at work). There was no ethnic differences in seropositivity between white HCWs and other non-black ethnic groups.		Suggestions for the difference in seropositivity between black and white HCWs rests on biological differences. There is evidence of genetic variations in adaptive and innate immunity between individuals of European and African descent. Causes of severe disease and mortality among South Asian HCWs may be due to co-morbidities and socio-economic factors as this study suggests that a greater likelihood of infection cannot account for these outcomes.
Verma, A.M	2021	UK	13, 502	White (65%), Mixed (1.8%), Black (2.3%), Asian (27.7%), Other (3.2%)	Consultant Physicians	40-50 (Female), 50-60 (Male)	Male (62.3%), Female (37.8%)	Cohort study	Risk of mortality (COVID-19 related death)	There is a doubled increased risk of COVID-related death in ethnic minority female staff over the age of 60 and over the age of 50 in men. The risk increases by 5-6 fold in ethnic minority men over the age of 60.		The study does show that ethnic minority consultant physicians are at increased risk of infection. Ethnic minority consultants physicians are prevalent in specialties; stroke medicine, endocrine/diabetes and acute medicine.
Zheng, C	2020	UK	1045	White/White British (51%) Asian/Asian British (20%) Black/Black British (17%) Chinese/Other (5%) Mixed race (4%) Not stated (3%)	clinical (nurses, doctors, allied health professionals, healthcare assistants) or non-clinical (administrative, non-patient facing specialties, e.g. laboratory scientists, housekeeping, estates and facilities etc.)			Cross-sectional study	Seroprevalence of Sars-Cov-2 (positive COVID-19 test)	There was no statistical difference in rates of seropositivity between White healthcare staff and ethnic healthcare staff		Black healthcare staff made up 2% of the medical/dental profession, however they made up 9% and 16% of the nursing and healthcare assistant roles respectively
King, O	2021	UK	413	Asian (34%), Black (33%), Mixed (9%), White (9%), Other (15%)	Clinical staff, NHS workers	N/A	N/A	Survey	Wellbeing and safety	32% of ethnic minority healthcare staff did not feel that they were treated with dignity and respect, some felt patronized, overlooked and stereotyped by colleagues. 57% of respondents felt that there was no opportunity to advance in their career. Over 39% of respondents did not access support from their line managers about worries or concerns.	Ethnic minority healthcare staff felt as though they could not raise concerns regarding safety, harassment or bullying for fear of how it would impact their career progression. There is a lack of support, guidance and education for ethnic minority HCWs. There was concern that visible and audible (difference in accent) will impact their career progression. There is lack of motivation among senior decision-makers to increase ethnic minority representation in senior positions.	
BMA	2020	UK	7776	White (73%), non-White/Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups (27%)	Doctors, Medical students	N/A	N/A	Survey	Wellbeing and safety during the COVID-19 pandemic	72% of ethnic minority healthcare staff said they only felt partly or not protected at all, compared with 60%. 16% of ethnic minority staff compared with 10% of white staff felt they were not confident in having		

Supplementary Material: Critical Appraisal Tables (1-12)

Specialist Unit for Review Evidence (SURE) cohort checklist					
<u>Author, Year, Country of Publication</u>	Martin, A. Christopher et al. 2020, United Kingdom	Inghels, M et al. 2021, United Kingdom	Verma, A.M et al. 2021, United Kingdom	Valdes, A.M et al. 2021, United Kingdom	Choudhry, N et al. 2021, United Kingdom
Is the study design clearly stated?	Yes – The authors state in the introduction and method section that this is a prospective nationwide cohort study	Yes – It is stated both in the title and the methodology that this study is a occupational cohort study	No – The study design is not clearly stated in either the introduction or methods section however this was deciphered from other details of the methodology	Yes – It is stated to be a longitudinal study	Can't tell – The description given in the study design is one of a cohort study, however it is not clearly stated by authors what exactly the study design is. There are two study's occurring however it is does not meet the criteria of a mixed-methods approach.
Does the study address a clearly focused question?	Yes – The study aimed to address how demographic and occupational factors influence infection risk in healthcare staff	Yes – The aim of this study was to quantify the prevalence of infection among ethnic minority healthcare staff and to decipher a causal pathway by considering other factors	Yes – The authors aim to determine those at increased risk of dying for COVID among a cohort of consultant physicians	Yes – Aims to address ethnic differences in risk of Sars-Cov-2 infection among healthcare workers	Yes – Aims to address disparities in Sars-Cov-2 infection in healthcare workers

<p>Are the setting, locations and relevant dates provided?</p>	<p>Yes - The study is set in the UK context and is nationwide, so there is no specific location, however the authors explain this. Recruitment was via a questionnaire that was administered between December 2020 and March 2021</p>	<p>Yes – The study is set at three hospital trusts within Lincolnshire. Participants were followed retrospectively between 1st January 2020 – 10th February 2020</p>	<p>Yes – The study is set nationwide and is looking at data collected from consultants in the England, Scotland and Wales through Royal College of Physicians (RCP). The data being analysed was collected from a questionnaire distributed on the 30 September 2018 (the last available census).</p>	<p>Yes – The study is set across 5 hospitals in the UK (Nottingham and London); Nottingham City Hospital and Queen’s Medical Centre - both Nottingham University Hospital NHS trust; COVID-sortium, London: St Bartholomew’s, Nightingale and Royal Free Hospitals The study took place between the 23rd March – 10th July 2020</p>	<p>Yes – The study is set in Barts Health trust in East London. The recruitment took place between June – August 2020</p>
<p>Were participants fairly selected?</p>	<p>Yes – The authors list the eligibility criteria in the Methods section. Participants over the age of 16, employed by any one of the UK Regulatory bodies (i.e. General Medical Council) and working as a healthcare worker (HCW) or ancillary worker (cleaner, porter etc.) were eligible to participate in this study</p>	<p>Yes – The authors clearly outlined the eligibility criteria in the methods section of this study. All employees of the three trusts were selected to follow (excluding students as they do not have a staff assignment group). Employees working in multiple facilities were also excluded.</p>	<p>Can’t tell</p>	<p>Partial Yes – Healthcare workers including nurses, doctors, allied professionals and frontline workers were recruited from both Nottingham and London. However, other workers such as ancillary and admin staff were only recruited from London</p>	<p>Yes – Eligibility criteria is provided by the authors in supplementary material.</p>
<p>Are participant characteristics provided?</p>	<p>Yes – A summary table of the characteristics of each cohort (total cohort and analysed cohort) are provided which list demographic,</p>	<p>Yes – A summary table is provided listing demographic and occupational characteristics</p>	<p>Yes – A summary table is provided listing the age, sex and ethnicity of the cohort</p>	<p>Yes – Provided in a table alongside their serology status</p>	<p>Yes – A summary table is provided including demographic details and work status</p>

	household and occupational factors				
Are the measures of exposures & outcomes appropriate?	Yes Outcome: Sars-Cov-2 serology which was assessed by either self-reported positive PCR or PCR testing performed by the research team Exposure: Ethnicity which was self-reported by participants which was categorised into five broader groups	Yes Outcome: Positive PCR test result (collected from human resources data within each trust)	Can't tell	Yes Outcome (seropositivity): PCR and antibody testing Exposures (demographic and occupational factors): Data collection from the respective trusts/hospitals and self-reported by participants	Yes Outcome (Sars-Cov-2 antibody): Matrix Equivalence study (a quantitative measure of calculating seropositivity), antibody testing
Was bias considered? e.g. recall or selection bias	Yes – Authors state that there is a potential for selection bias given the amount of information that is self-reported, i.e. the self-reported PCR test result, demographic and occupational information. They state that self-reporting of outcomes has the potential to cause recall bias, however they do not expect this to have	Can't tell – The authors state that the quality of data collection was overseen by senior healthcare staff at every stage of the study, however there is no clear statement that considers any form of bias	No	Yes – There were no differences between the timing of infection among seropositive (infected) HCW, which the authors state may be due to recall bias. They also consider a risk of symptom recall bias among HCWs. They were able to adjust for confounders which may have reduced bias.	No – Authors did not clearly outline whether they had considered bias

	a substantial effect on their outcome measure				
Is there a description of how the study size was arrived at?	No	No – Although it is implied that this size is based off of the number of employees within each of the trusts	No	No – Though it is implied that the size is based off of the number of employees who had been infected with the virus / had symptoms	Yes – A sample size and power calculation was included
Are the statistical methods well described?	Yes – These methods are well described and clear.	Yes – They clearly state the regression analysis that they used in adjusting for confounders and other variables	Yes	Yes	Yes
Is information provided on participant flow?	Yes – Figure 1 outlines the formation of the analysed cohort included at which point and the number participants were excluded (including reasons for exclusion)	No	No	No	Yes – outlines each stage of the study, recruitment and number lost to follow-up (including the reasons)
Are the results well described?	Yes – Findings are presented using confidence intervals and p-values. Categorical variables are summarised as percentage and frequency. Comparison between ethnic group of demographic and	Yes – Confidence intervals used to present data but not consistently	No – Results presented using only hazard ratios and percentages. No presentation with confidence intervals.	Yes – Results presented using 95% Confidence intervals and p-values, as well as odd ratios.	Yes – Data presented with confidence intervals, odds ratios and percentages

	occupational factors was done using chi-square tests and Kruskal-Wallis tests.				
Is any sponsorship/conflict of interest reported?	Yes – Some of the authors have substantial roles in organisations that may have vested interest in the subject matter of this study. One of the authors is a director of the University of Leicester Centre for Black Minority Ethnic Health and another is the medical director for the GMC	No	No	Two of the authors declared their involvement with external organisations such as Medical Research Council, COVID- 19 Rapid Response Rolling Call but other authors had nothing to declare	The study received funding from Abbott Rapid Diagnostics
Did the authors identify any limitations and, if so, are they captured above?	Yes – Limitations were mainly recorded around selection and recall bias due to self-selection and reporting by participants. They are captured above.	Yes – Authors identify variables and confounders that they were not able to adjust for in their analysis and also discuss the low generalisability of the study	Yes – Underestimation of risk due to not accounting for confounders such as co-morbidities	Yes – Clearly stated limitations due to recall bias, sensitivity/specificity of testing and difficulties in adjusting for confounders	Yes – Did not adjust for certain confounders (socio-economic inequalities) which may have linked ethnicity with sars-Cov-2 serology status
Overall quality grade	High	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate

Specialist Unit for Review Evidence (SURE) cross-sectional checklist						
Author, Date and Country of Publication	Parveen AI, et al, 2021, United Kingdom	Hanrath, Aidan T, et al, 2021, United Kingdom	Jones, Cr, et al, 2020, United Kingdom	Ken-Dror, Gie et al., 2020, United Kingdom	Shields, Adrian et al., 2020, United Kingdom	Zheng, C et al, 2020, United Kingdom
Is the study design clearly stated?	Yes – The study design is a cross-sectional prospective study that has collected data through an online questionnaire	No – The authors have cited the study design to be a ‘Retrospective Analysis’ however there are no details provided of what this entails. From the introduction the reviewer can decipher that this a retrospective cross-sectional study design	Yes – This is clearly stated in the methodology	Yes – It is stated in the abstract and methods section that it is a cross-sectional study	Yes – Authors state that this is a cross-sectional study in the ‘Design’ section	No – The design of this study is not explicitly stated anywhere in the text
Does the study address a clearly focused question?	Yes – This study aims to describe the perceptions of risk and mortality associated with COVID-19 among ethnically diverse healthcare staff	Yes – The study explores the prevalence of PCR positivity among healthcare staff and the potential association between seropositivity and demographic/occupational factors	Yes – To explore the relationship between socio-demographic factors (i.e. ethnicity) and differences in seroprevalence among healthcare staff	Yes – This study sought to quantify the prevalence of Sars-Cov-2 in healthcare workers	Yes – This study aims to measure how many participants are infected with Sars-Cov-2 or have positive Sars-Cov-2 serology	Yes – The reviewer is able to decipher the PECO from the introduction, however it is not clearly outlined
Are the setting, locations and relevant dates provided?	Yes – Information relevant to the study was provided. The questionnaire was conducted online via Google Forms between 28 th April – 4 th May 2020	Yes – The study was set in Newcastle-Upon-Tyne (NUTH) hospitals trust. The dataset analysed was from between 10 th March – 6 th July 2020	Yes – The study’s setting is North Bristol NHS trust. Data was collected from participants between January – June 2020 and antibody testing took place in May 2020	Yes – This study is set in Surrey in two separate hospitals (Ashford and St Peters)	Yes – This study was set in Birmingham at the UHBFT (University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation trust) and recruitment took place over a period of 24 hours	No – The testing period is vaguely outlined with no specific dates mentioned. Authors state vaguely that the study is set in a teaching hospital in London (a huge city, in which there are

					between 24 th – 25 th April 2020	multiple teaching hospitals) with no information regarding the demographics or population it serves etc. (if there is a reason for this omission of detail, it is not given)
Were participants fairly selected?	Can't tell – Participants had to be a healthcare professional working in the UK. Participants were contacted through various social media sites and healthcare professional networking sites (i.e. Doctors. Net, National Primary Care) which may have excluded those who do not use social media. 71% of the sample are described as 'BAME', which may indicate selection bias.	Yes – All National Health Service (NHS) employees in the NUTH trust were selected as participants, which may minimise selection bias. The eligibility criteria is not stated clearly in this study, however this may be due to the fact that the only essential criteria is to be an active employee of this particular NHS trust.	Yes – All employees of the NHS trust were invited to participate in the study. Though eligibility criteria is not clearly outlined and the participation in antibody testing was voluntary.	All adults employed by the trust were invited for antibody testing, there is no clearly outlined eligibility criteria except for participants needing to be >18y/o.	Can't tell – Participants were individually selected, they were invited on the basis that they were employed by the trust. Participants were excluded if they showed COVID symptoms on the day or if they had been self-isolating for 2 weeks prior	Can't tell – No information given on how participants were enrolled (was it self-reported, where they invited etc.) No eligibility criteria clearly outlined Staff who were symptomatic were referred by their line managers to drive-through testing pods which could introduce bias
Are participant characteristics provided?	Yes – A table is provided that details the ages, genders and professional groups of the sample. Ethnicity is	Yes – Two tables summarising occupational and demographic characteristics are provided in supplementary material	Details regarding the characteristics of the participants are provided in results (to explain findings),	Yes – A summary table of key sample characteristics is provided	Yes – A summary table of sample characteristics is provided (Age, Sex and Ethnicity)	No – There is a table provided that details the ethnicity of the participants but no other demographic

	recorded as either 'BAME' or 'non-BAME'		however there is no summary table provided that clearly outlines the characteristics of the sample cohort			characteristics which is not sufficient
Are the measures of exposures & outcomes appropriate?	Can't tell – Questionnaire is used to collect data on perceptions around COVID-19 related risk and mortality. The survey included a combination of Likert scales (1 – 10) and multiple choice questions	Yes – Outcomes: Seropositivity – PCR/antibody testing, data Hospitalisation/ICU admission/ventilation – Dataset Exposures (occupational factors, i.e. role and demographic factors, i.e. deprivation) are measured using data from ESR (Electronic staff record) and postcodes	Yes – Outcomes: Antibody testing and employee medical records Exposures (characteristics): Age, sex, employee status - Employee medical records Deprivation - IMD	Yes Outcomes: Sars-Cov-2 prevalence – Antibody testing results Exposures (Characteristics): - Self-reported medical records	Yes Outcomes: Sars-Cov-2 serology – antibody testing and nasal swab Exposures: Self-reported data and records from NHS England	Yes Outcomes: Sars-Cov-2 serology – PCR testing and occupational health data/staff records Details on measures of exposure are not clear
Is there a description of how the study size was arrived at?	No	Yes – The study size was decided based on the number of staff employed by the NHS trust at the time of analysis which was 17, 126	Yes – The size was based on the number of staff employed by the North Bristol NHS trust	No – However it is implied that the study size is the number of individuals who responded to the invite for testing (4000 were invited for antibody testing, 3119 responded)	No – Authors stated that there was no predefined sample size as participants self-reported for enrolment	No
Are the statistical methods well described?	No –The use of SPSS was described and comparison performed using t-test. Data presented as 95% CI and	Yes	Yes Data was presented using descriptive analysis with n (%) or median (IQR)	Yes – They are described in depth including how they will be summarised and presented (i.e.	Yes	No – Statistical methods are not described

	ORs, but no justification is given			descriptive analyses of data is summarised with standard deviation or median (IQR))		
Is information provided on participant eligibility?	Yes – Any individual who works as a healthcare professional in the UK is eligible	Yes – There was no exclusion criteria, the main inclusion criteria was that the participant was employed by the NUTH NHS trust. HCWs not directly employed by the trust and whose information was not available in ESR were excluded.	No – There was no outlined or specific eligibility criteria provided for the reviewer’s discretion, however the authors do state that every employee of the trust is eligible including temporary and bank staff	Can’t tell – Eligibility criteria is not specific or clearly outlined for the reviewer, however in the text the authors do state that all staff over the age of 18 were invited for testing	Yes – The authors briefly state criteria for exclusion from the study (mentioned previously)	No
Are the results well described?	Yes – The confidence intervals and standard deviation are provided, along with percentages and summarised tables of figures	Yes – The authors describe the results of each outcome assessed and the association (if any) between the outcome and the demographic/occupational factors 95% Confidence intervals and odds ratios are provided to present the data	Yes – Any differences in seroprevalence between staff groups based on key characteristics (ethnicity, deprivation score) are outlined	Yes	Yes – They are described in detail using statistical analyses (95% Confidence intervals and adjusted Odds ratios), however it could be more clearly or logically laid out	No - There is vague evidence of thorough statistical analyses and no use of confidence intervals or p-values to summarise data
Is any sponsorship/conflict of interest reported?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Did the authors identify any limitations and, if so, are they captured above?	No – They briefly mention that there is selection bias but not in sufficient detail. They vaguely mention that they have similar limitations to other rapid online surveys but do not go on to list these, which underlines the transparency of the results	Yes – The authors did identify limitations within their methodology and study design as well as how they presented their results	Yes – The authors identify that voluntary participation in antibody testing may have introduced selection bias into their study.	Yes – Confounders such as underlying health conditions, BMI or deprivation indices were not adjusted for This study only used antibody testing to measure seroprevalence which is not as thorough without PCR testing alongside to determine seropositivity of Sars-CoV-2	Yes – Introduction of selection bias due to self-enrolment of participants.	Yes – Lack of available data and vague eligibility criteria regarding COVID symptoms etc.
Overall quality grade	Moderate	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low

Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) qualitative checklist	
Author, Year, Country of Publication	Jesuthasan, Jehanita et al., 2021, United Kingdom
Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?	Yes – To gain insight into the impact of COVID-19 on the mental wellbeing of ethnic minority healthcare staff the
Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?	Yes – It is conducive to exploring in-depth the thoughts, experiences and opinions of the participants in a way that quantitative methodology could not achieve

Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	Can't tell – This study utilised semi-structured focus groups however the justification for this design is not explicitly stated. The authors do mention that focus groups will enable participants to respond to each other's opinions and comments which might be helpful in exploration of their overall experiences. It was a cross-sectional design which is appropriate given the context of the study, it enables the researchers to get a snapshot sample of the experiences of ethnic minority healthcare and social workers during the pandemic
Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?	Yes – The authors state that they use purposeful sampling to recruit participants and this was done to select participants who were likely to meet the objectives of the study (i.e. from an ethnic minority background individuals, working in a healthcare/social setting). This recruitment was done through public and patient involvement networks as well as through advertisement in NHS trusts.
Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?	Yes – Data collection was via focus groups. The authors did not clearly state why this method was chosen, however they did provide details regarding the form of data
Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?	Yes – The facilitator of the both focus group sessions was non-ethnic minority, which they argued may have led to some bias/inhibited conversation, however they countered this by explaining that the facilitator had substantial experience in diverse fields and low-middle income countries. Additionally, another author, who is an ethnic minority, was present in both sessions
Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	Yes – Details regarding the purpose and method of the focus group were reiterated to the participants. They were assured that they were welcome to withdraw from the focus group at any time and were encouraged to ask questions at any stage.
Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Yes – Thematic analysis was used as analysis. The themes identified are outlined clearly in a diagram. Each theme is explored and explained in considerable depth and detail for the reviewer.
Is there a clear statement of findings?	Yes – There are several statements included in the discussion that clearly summarise the evidence found
How valuable is the research?	The authors state that these findings are supported by other literature and studies into the mental wellbeing of ethnic minority healthcare staff. They highlight gaps in consideration of ethnic disparities in COVID outcomes, i.e. structural barriers, unconscious bias and express the need for more supportive management
Overall quality grade	High

Joanne Briggs Institute (JBI) prevalence studies checklist				
<u>Author, Year, Country of Publication</u>	Kapilashrami, A et al, 2021, United Kingdom	Martyn, E.M et al., 2021, United Kingdom	King, Olivia et al. (NHS England) 2020, United Kingdom	British Medical Association, 2020, United Kingdom
Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	Yes – All health and social care workers across the UK were invited to participate	Yes – All workers employed by the NMUH trust were invited to participate	Yes – Particular focus on ethnic minority staff working in clinical areas (i.e. not ancillary workers)	Partial Yes – The survey includes responses from doctors, however also includes medical students and excludes other healthcare professions
Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	Yes – The authors justified their use of snowball sampling, stating that it allowed for the frequent workplace changes of the first peak of the COVID-19 pandemic	Unclear – Details on the type of sampling used are not explicitly stated by the authors. It simply says that a questionnaire was administered online to staff in the NMUH workforce.	Unclear – Details on type of sampling are not provided by author.	Can't tell – Details on type of sampling or recruitment methods are not provided by the organisation
Was the sample size adequate?	Yes – No sample size calculation was made because this study administered a nationwide survey. The proportions of individuals (i.e. ethnic minorities, female population) within the cohort were largely representative of the national demographics. However, one may argue that given the large population of health and social workers in the UK, that the sample size is not as large as it could be	Yes – A very large sample size was used	Yes – A large enough sample size is used, however there was no sample size calculation performed or included	Yes – A large sample size was used, but no justification or sample size calculation is included

Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	Yes – Details of the study subjects are provided both in the results section and in the form a summary table which is provided in the supplementary material. This includes details regarding demographics and occupation.	Yes – A forest plot detailing the demographic and occupational characteristics of the participant is provided. These details are also provided in the results section. The survey was distributed to healthcare workers in the North Middlesex University Hospital (NNUH)	Yes – The details of the respondents are provided in the text and in the form of summary tables. The survey is set in the South East England, though this described vaguely and does not mention specific locations (i.e. specific trusts, hospitals etc.)	No – The sample characteristics are not described for the participants. It is a nationwide survey, participants are from England, Wales and Northern Ireland
Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	Unclear – Authors do not explicitly state the response time of the cohort or each subgroup so the reviewer is not able to decipher this information	Unclear – Authors do not clearly state when data analysis commenced in relation to when each participant/subgroup had responded	Unclear	Unclear
Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	Unclear – The majority of the outcome measures are observer reported or self-reported by participants, which may decrease objectivity and increase the risk of over-reporting.	Yes – Seropositivity was measured via antibody testing (conducted 4 th June – 3 rd July 2020) and these results were linked to the responses from the questionnaires by occupational health numbers	Yes – There is great potential for under/over-reporting of outcomes because they are observer reported and self-reported by participants	Yes – Though the outcomes are observer reported/self-reported so there is a risk of under/over-reporting
Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	Yes – All authors and those involved in the design and distribution of the survey have considerable research experience and expertise in this field. The outcomes were measured the same way for all participants.	Unclear – Not much detail given regarding authors research field or relevant expertise. It is implied that the outcome was measured the same way for all participants.	Unclear	Unclear – This information is not made available by the organisation
Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	Yes – Results and presented with percentages alongside confidence intervals, as well as odd ratios.	Yes – Results are presented with confidence intervals, percentages and odds ratios	No – The responses are qualitative in nature and only percentages or bar graphs are provided to present the data	No - Only percentages were used to present data

Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) opinion and commentary checklists				
Author, Date, Country of Publication	Chaudry, Faisal et al. 2021, United Kingdom	Dey, Thonmoy et al 2020, United Kingdom	Otu, Akaninyene 2020, United Kingdom	Qureshi, Irtiza 2021, United Kingdom
Is the source of the opinion clearly identified?	Yes – The author is named and credited	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the source of opinion have standing in the field of expertise?	Yes – The publications and credits of the author are stated within the text and there is evidence of expertise in global health	No – No publications or credits are cited for any of the authors of this commentary which undermines the validity and expertise of the source	Yes – The publications of each of the authors are accessible and there is evidence of expertise in infectious diseases	Yes – Publications and credentials are accessible for the reviewer
Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	Yes – Response rate was good and the majority of people who received the survey responded.	Unclear - The authors do not comment on the response rate, but the majority of staff invited to complete the survey, did respond which implies an adequate response rate	Unclear – The authors only state the number of respondents but do not state the number of participants that were invited to complete the survey	Unclear – No information regarding the total number of participants invited to complete the survey
Overall quality grade	Moderate – High	Moderate – Low	Low	Low

Are the interests of the relevant population the central focus of the opinion?	Yes - The subject of this text is 'COVID-19 and BAME healthcare staff' and the content revolve around the disproportionate impact of COVID health outcomes on 'BAME' healthcare staff and discusses the potential causes (overrepresentation of ethnic minority HCWs in front line roles)	Unclear – The title of this commentary implies that the focus is on the relationship between ethnicity and COVID-19 with no specificity to healthcare workers. However, much of the content of the text focuses on the factors underlying high mortality and cases among ethnic minority healthcare workers rather the general population. A clearer statement would be appropriate.	No – Ethnic minority HCWS are not the central focus (the general ethnic minority population is discussed in this commentary), however they are discussed in depth in part of the text	Yes – This commentary focuses specifically on ethnic minority nurses and the disproportionate effect of COVID clinical outcomes on this population
Is the stated position the result of an analytical process, and is there logic in the opinion expressed	Yes – The authors studied data relating to the COVID-19 mortality among healthcare workers and analysed this against population demographics	No – No analytical process has been described or can be implied from the text however, the arguments expressed are logical and presented in a critical way	No - However there is logic in the expressed opinion	Yes – The argument presented is very logical and based on wider literature
Is there reference to the extant literature?	Yes – However the inclusion of external literature is non-critical and exists only to support the argument being made. It is not non-biased nor critically appraised. Having said this they do discuss residing in urban areas as a confounding factor.	Yes – External literature is referenced in a descriptive way, however it is non-critical and does not strengthen the argument being made.	Yes - External literature is referenced to support the presence of systemic discrimination that silences ethnic minority HCWs	Yes – The majority of this opinion piece is supported by wider literature which
Is any incongruence with the literature/sources logically defended?	No – The authors draw on external literature to show that there is wider support for their main line of argument but no inconsistencies are identified	No	No	No
Quality grade	Moderate – High	Low – Moderate	Moderate	Moderate – High