

1 International healthcare workers' experiences and 2 perceptions of the 2022 multi-country mpox outbreak

3
4 Vanessa Apea^{1,2,3¶}, Boghuma K. Titanji^{4,5¶}, Francesca H. Dakin⁶, Rosalie Hayes^{1,7}, Melanie Smuk²,
5 Habiba Kawu^{1,2}, Laura Waters⁸, Itsik Levy⁹, Daniel R. Kuritzkes¹⁰, Monica Gandhi¹¹, Jürgen Rockstroh¹²,
6 Mauro Schechter¹³, Martin Holt¹⁴, Romain Palich¹⁵, Claudia P. Cortes¹⁶, Silvia. Nozza¹⁷, Cristina
7 Mussini¹⁸, Aleaxandra. Calmy¹⁹, Brenda E. Crabtree Ramirez²⁰, José L. Blanco²¹, Sanjay Bhagani²², Claire
8 Dewsnap²³, Chloe Orkin^{1,2,3*}, for the Mpox SHARE-NET writing group

9
10 ¹SHARE Collaborative, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom

11 ²Blizard Institute, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom

12 ³Barts Health NHS Trust, Department of Infection and Immunity, London, United Kingdom

13 ⁴Emory University School of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, Atlanta, United States

14 ⁵Atlanta Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Decatur, United States

15 ⁶Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

16 ⁷Wolfson Institute of Population Health, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom

17 ⁸University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

18 ⁹Sheba Medical Center, Infectious Disease Unit, Ramat Gan, Israel

19 ¹⁰Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, United States

20 ¹¹University of California, Department of Medicine, San Francisco, United States

21 ¹²University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany

22 ¹³Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Departamento de Doenças Infecciosas e Parasitárias, Rio de
23 Janeiro, Brazil

24 ¹⁴Centre for Social Research in Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 ¹⁵Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital, Tropical Medicine and Infectious Disease Department, Paris, France,

26 ¹⁶Universidad de Chile, Faculty of Medicine, Santiago, Chile

27 ¹⁷S. Raffaele University Hospital IRCCS, Division of Infectious Diseases, Milan, Italy

28 ¹⁸University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy

29 ¹⁹Geneva University Hospitals, Division of Infectious Diseases, HIV/AIDS Unit, Geneva, Switzerland,

30 ²⁰Departamento de Infectología. Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición, Mexico City,

31 Mexico

32 ²¹University of Barcelona, Infectious Diseases Service, Hospital Clinic-IDIBAPS, Barcelona, Spain

33 ²²Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust, HIV services, Royal Free Hospital, London, United Kingdom

34 ²³Sheffield Teaching Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Sexual Health, Sheffield, United Kingdom

35

36 * Corresponding author

37 E-mail: c.m.orkin@qmul.ac.uk

38

39 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

40

41 ^ Membership of the Mpox SHARE-NET writing group is provided in the Acknowledgments.

42

43 **Abstract**

44 In May 2022, the most widespread outbreak of sustained transmission of mpox outside of countries

45 historically affected countries in Western and Central Africa occurred. We aimed to examine the

46 personal and clinical experiences of international healthcare workers (HCWs) during this public health

47 emergency. We conducted an international cross-sectional survey study between August and October

48 2022, examining the experiences and perceptions of HCWs clinically involved with the 2022 mpox

49 response. Respondents were recruited via an international network of sexual health and HIV clinicians

50 responding to mpox and promoted through clinical associations and social media. Survey domains
51 included: clinical workload; preparedness; training and support at work; psychological well-being and
52 vaccination. 725 multi-national healthcare workers across 41 countries were included in the analysis.
53 91% were physicians specialised in Sexual Health or Infectious Diseases; with 34% (n=247) of all
54 respondents involved in mpox policy. A substantial proportion of respondents (n=296, 41%) reported
55 working longer hours during the mpox outbreak, with no concomitant removal of other clinical
56 responsibilities. 30% (n=218) of respondents reported that they had never heard of mpox before the
57 outbreak and over 25% of the respondents reported that they had misdiagnosed someone initially.
58 This culminated in a high prevalence of moral distress at 30%. Less than 9% of HCWs in the region of
59 the Caribbean, Central America and South America had been offered a vaccine as compared to almost
60 1/3 in the other regions. Where offered, there were high levels of uptake across all regions. Our
61 findings highlight a critical need for addressing the profound gaps in HCW knowledge about re-
62 emerging diseases with pandemic potential. Strengthening the resilience of global health systems and
63 prioritising internationally coordinated approaches to global vaccine deployment is imperative.

64

65 **Introduction**

66 Healthcare workers (HCWs) are essential pillars of health system preparedness and resilience in public
67 health emergencies [1, 2]. The COVID-19 pandemic was a stark warning of the significant detriment
68 that pandemics can inflict on the health and wellbeing of HCWs [3-5], and the response called for rapid
69 and extensive transformation of already strained global health systems. At the population health
70 level, entrenched structural health inequalities converged with transmission dynamics of SARS CoV-2.
71 The confluence of these factors exposed system vulnerabilities and severely depleted staff capacity
72 and infrastructure [4, 6]. Frontline HCWs were challenged with providing care and comfort to very sick
73 people with a disease with a hitherto unknown clinical course and prognostic factors, alongside coping
74 with uncertainty, contagion anxiety, fear of transmission to family networks, scarcity of personal

75 protective equipment and extended working hours. This exerted a significant and pervasive toll on
76 physical and psychological well-being of HCWs [4, 7, 8].

77

78 Reports on HCW experiences describe wide-ranging experiences of adversity, moral distress (the
79 inability to provide appropriate care and act in line with personal and professional values) and
80 resilience. In a British Medical Association survey of UK doctors after the second wave of COVID-19,
81 78% of respondents stated that ‘moral distress’ resonated with their experiences at work [4].

82 International knowledge exchange and transfer were identified as key to partially combat the
83 difficulties experienced by HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic.

84

85 It was within this context, that the 2022-23 multi-country outbreak of mpox occurred. Mpox (formerly
86 known as monkeypox) is a disease caused by the zoonotic orthopoxvirus, human monkeypox virus
87 (MPXV), which is endemic in the rainforest regions of several Central and West African countries [9-
88 11]. In May 2022, simultaneous human mpox outbreaks began in Europe and extended across various
89 countries that were not typically affected; occurring in the absence of epidemiological links to
90 historically affected countries or infected animals [12]. Mpox was declared a public health emergency
91 of international concern (PHEIC) by the World Health Organisation (WHO) two months later, reflecting
92 the pace of global proliferation and the burden of disease attributable to the virus [2].

93

94 Mpox has been endemic in Central and Western Africa for over 50 years, but received scant global
95 attention prior to the 2022 outbreak. This is despite repeated calls by African physicians and scientists
96 for heightened prioritisation and investment into surveillance programmes, research and
97 development to understand the evolution and epidemic potential of mpox in Africa [9, 13]. The 2022
98 global outbreak thus took many countries, and their health systems, by surprise. Most HCWs outside
99 of historically affected countries had limited or no experience or knowledge of mpox [14]. The 2022
100 outbreak began with cases being predominantly described among sexual networks of men who have

101 sex with men through close sexual contact with lesions and body fluids [15-17]. Clinical manifestations
102 included prominent genital symptoms, including anogenital and mucosal lesions [15-17]. This differs
103 markedly from traditional descriptions of zoonotically acquired cases. Due to this specific pattern of
104 clinical symptoms, many patients were referred to Sexual Health Services where HCWs may have less
105 experience of managing tropical disease. However, this sector does have extensive experience in
106 epidemic management including the HIV epidemic.

107

108 Control measures involve isolating affected individuals, providing supportive care, and implementing
109 public health measures such as vaccination campaigns and contact tracing [18, 19]. Both therapeutics
110 for severe cases (e.g. tecovirimat) and vaccines used as mpox post-exposure prophylaxis or pre-
111 exposure prophylaxis had originally been developed to treat the closely related smallpox (variola) virus
112 [20, 21]. While these vaccinations and treatments did exist there were significant shortages even in
113 high-income countries and as with COVID-19 an unacceptable and ongoing lack of access in resource-
114 limited regions [22].

115

116 Mpox serves as a glaring reminder of the increasing risk posed by emerging pathogens and emergence
117 of known pathogens in new contexts, and further underscores the importance of robust preparedness
118 of infrastructure at global, regional and service levels. Mpox has placed a significant burden on
119 healthcare systems and on HCWs still reeling from the impact of COVID-19 and pandemic
120 fatigue. Understanding HCWs' experience and needs during outbreaks is critical to strengthening
121 health system resilience and developing effective epidemic/pandemic preparedness and response
122 strategies [1]. Yet, literature describing HCWs' experiences of the 2022 mpox outbreak is limited. The
123 experiences of HCWs are often inferred indirectly from descriptions of the challenging environments
124 in which they work. These environments are characterised by a complex mix of evolving and,
125 sometimes conflicting policies and guidelines within healthcare systems already strained by the
126 COVID-19 pandemic [23, 24].

127

128 Our study aimed to directly examine the personal and clinical experiences of international HCWs
129 during the mpox outbreak, including their clinical management of mpox and their perceived sense of
130 preparedness.

131

132 **Methods**

133 We conducted an international cross-sectional survey study between 10th August and 31st October
134 2022, examining the experiences and perceptions of HCWs clinically involved with the 2022 mpox
135 response. The survey was disseminated through clinical networks outside of previously affected
136 regions. This analysis was restricted to individuals residing in the United Kingdom (UK), the European
137 Union (EU), the Caribbean, Central America, South America, the United States (US) and Canada
138 because the purpose of the survey was to evaluate pandemic preparedness and the clinical confidence
139 of clinicians dealing with an existing pathogen emerging in a new context.

140

141 **Data collection**

142 Anonymised, self-reported data was collected via an online survey containing 87 closed and open-text
143 questions exploring: demographic characteristics; involvement in mpox clinical, research, and policy-
144 related work; self-assessment of knowledge and confidence around mpox diagnosis and management
145 and views on outbreak preparedness; educational resources; assessment of risk; workload; safety at
146 work; vaccination; and perceptions and experiences of moral distress and injury. Moral distress was
147 defined as the psychological unease generated where professionals identify an ethically correct action
148 to take but are constrained in their ability to take that action. Moral injury was defined as arising
149 where sustained moral distress leads to impaired function or longer-term psychological harm.

150

151 The survey was carried out in English, Spanish, French and Portuguese via the international
152 collaboration SHARE-Net, an informal network established and led by academic researchers within the
153 London-based SHARE Research Collaborative [26]. The survey was disseminated through newsletters
154 and social media feeds of the British Association for Sexual Health and HIV, the British HIV Association,
155 the European AIDS Clinical Society, the International AIDS Society, the Infectious Diseases Society of
156 America and the research networks of SHARE-net collaborators from 16 countries. All survey questions
157 examined in this analysis are available online at <https://osf.io/jf6kw>.

158

159 **Ethical approval and regulations**

160 The survey was administered via a survey platform compliant with general data protection regulations
161 (SMART Survey LTD, Tewkesbury, UK) and received ethical approval from the Queen Mary University
162 of London Ethics of Research Committee (QMERC22.297). The opening page contained information
163 about the aims of the study and custodianship and use of study data. The survey was piloted with ten
164 sexual health clinicians in the UK. By clicking ‘continue’ and commencing the survey, individuals were
165 considered to have given consent.

166

167 **Statistical analysis**

168 We present descriptive statistics of frequency and percentages created for relevant questions. The
169 response rate (denominator) is clearly noted. Partial responses were excluded from the analysis. Data
170 remains in the original categories. Ethnicity was defined using nine categories, including a free text
171 category. Three regional subgroups were created for our analyses; the first grouped European
172 countries (including the EU and the UK), the second grouped Caribbean, Central America and South
173 America countries and the third grouped the United States of America (USA) and Canada together.
174 We examined demographic characteristics, impact on workload, prior knowledge, confidence and
175 misdiagnosis, training and support received, vaccine uptake, moral distress and moral injury. We

176 assessed differences by geographical location, drawing comparisons across the three regions. All
177 analyses were performed using Stata Statistical Software: Release 17 (College Station, TX: StataCorp
178 LLC). Results are presented as frequency (percentage): n (%).

179

180 **Role of the funding source**

181 There was no funding source for this study.

182

183 **Results**

184 **Respondent characteristics**

185 A total of 725 respondents completed the survey across the regions of Europe (n=529), the Caribbean,
186 Central America and South America (CCS) (n=114) and the United States of America (USA) and Canada
187 (n=82). The demographic of respondents are summarised in Table 1. The analysis excluded an
188 additional 48 respondents Of these, 36 were located outside of these regions across the WHO African
189 region (n=18), South East Asian (n=2), Western Pacific (n=16) regions. 12 of those excluded did not
190 provide their location.

191

192 **Table 1 - Summary of Characteristics**

	Europe N=529	Caribbean, Central America and South America (CCS) N=114	United States of America (USA) and Canada N=82	Overall Total N=725
Age	n=529	n=114	n=82	n=725(100.00%)
18-25	4(0.76%)	0(0.00%)	1(1.22%)	5(0.69%)

26-30	42(7.94%)	15(13.16%)	1(1.22%)	58(8.00%)
31-34	56(10.59%)	12(10.53%)	9(10.98%)	77(10.62%)
35-40	84(15.88%)	17(14.91%)	6(7.32%)	107(14.76%)
41-50	168(31.76%)	29(25.44%)	20(24.39%)	217(29.93%)
51-60	119(22.50%)	13(11.40%)	18(21.95%)	150(20.69%)
60+	56(10.59%)	28(24.56%)	27(32.93%)	111(15.31%)
Gender	n=529	n=114	n=81	n=724(99.86%)
Cis-Female	302(57.09%)	52(45.51%)	42(51.85%)	396(54.70%)
Cis-Male	209(39.51%)	59(51.75%)	38(46.91%)	306(42.27%)
Non-binary/non-conforming	3(0.57%)	1(0.88%)	0(0.00%)	4(0.55%)
Prefer not to say	13(2.46%)	1(0.88%)	1(1.23%)	15(2.07%)
Transfemale	0(0.00%)	1(0.88%)	0(0.00%)	1(0.14%)
Transmale	2(0.38%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)	2(0.28%)
Ethnicity	n=514	n=114	n=82	n=710(97.93%)
White	467(90.86%)	33(28.95%)	56(68.29%)	556(78.31%)
Black/African American	8(1.56%)	2(1.75%)	6(7.32%)	16(2.25%)
Asian/Asian American	11(2.14%)	3(2.63%)	10(12.20%)	24(3.38%)
Latinx or Hispanic	6(1.17%)	75(65.79%)	5(6.10%)	86(12.11%)

American Indian or Alaska Native, Middle Eastern or North African, Native Hawaiian, Other Pacific Islander, Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Group and Other Ethnic Group.	22(4.28%)	1(0.88%)	5(6.10%)	28(3.94%)
--	-----------	----------	----------	-----------

193

194 Most were aged 41-50 years (n=217; 30%). Within the USA and Canada and Europe, 52% and 57%
 195 identified themselves as cis-female, respectively. Within the CCS region, the majority of respondents
 196 were cis male (n=59; 52%).

197

198 Those of white background formed most of the respondents in Europe (n=467; 91%) and the USA and
 199 Canada (n=56; 68%). Those of Latinx /Hispanic background formed the majority of those responding
 200 within the CCS region (n=75; 66%).

201

202 Overall the majority of respondents across all regions were physicians specialised in Sexual Health or
 203 Infectious Diseases (n=663; 91%); with 34% (n=247) of all respondents involved in mpox policy.

204

205 **Mpox related workload**

206 A substantial proportion of respondents (n=296, 41%) reported working longer hours during the mpox
 207 outbreak. Within the USA and Canada, 60% (n=49) of respondents reported longer hours, as did 43%
 208 (n=225) of those based in Europe. This proportion was comparatively lower in the CCS region, with

209 only 19% (n=22) reporting extended hours. In addition, 87% (n=627) of all respondents reported that
210 services did not remove other clinical responsibilities to allow the healthcare workers to focus on the
211 extra mpox-related work.

212

213 **Prior knowledge, confidence and misdiagnosis**

214 30% (n=218) of respondents reported that they had never heard of mpox before the outbreak; 24%
215 (n=172), 4% (n=32), and 2% (n=14) of those based in Europe, the CCS region and the USA and Canada,
216 respectively. Fewer than 1% (n=6) of respondents indicated that they had seen and treated an mpox
217 case prior to this outbreak.

218

219 Amongst respondents in Europe, 60% (n=319) described themselves as not at all or only a little bit
220 confident managing suspected or confirmed clinical cases of mpox at the beginning of the outbreak.
221 In the CCS region, 49% (n=55), and in the USA and Canada 62% (n=50), similarly described themselves
222 as not at all or only a little bit confident. In all the regions, over 25% of the respondents reported that
223 they had misdiagnosed someone with a mpox-related rash with another condition initially. The most
224 common misdiagnoses were chickenpox, syphilis and herpes.

225

226 **Training and support**

227 Overall 53% (n=384) agreed or strongly agreed that their institution provided clear, timely and
228 authoritative information about mpox. Agreement with this was lowest in the CCS region at only 31%
229 (n=35), as compared to 56% (n=297) within Europe and 63% (n=52) within the USA and Canada.

230

231 59% (n=429) reported that they had received specific education, training or instruction about mpox
232 within their facility. With regards to general outbreak management education, 41% (n=218) of

233 respondents within Europe had completed this training. However, higher proportions were reported
234 in the CCS region and the USA and Canada, 65% (n= 74) and 52% (n=43), respectively.

235

236

237

238 **Vaccines**

239 Less than 50% of respondents had been vaccinated with the smallpox vaccine before the mpox
240 outbreak. Fewer than one in three of respondents within Europe, the USA and Canada, and fewer
241 than 1 in 10 in the CCS region, had been offered the smallpox vaccine to prevent mpox (ie. as pre-
242 exposure prophylaxis). Once offered, uptake of the vaccine were high across all regions. 71% (n=121),
243 100% (n=10), and 85% (n=22) accepted and received the vaccine within Europe, the CCS region and
244 the USA and Canada; respectively.

245

246 Within Europe, 26% of respondents (n=39) did not feel they received the vaccine in a timely and
247 equitable manner compared to 30% (n=3) and 19% (n=5) in the CCS region, the USA and Canada;
248 respectively. Over 90% of respondents in each region felt vaccination should be offered for mpox to
249 people at high risk of mpox infection prior to exposure, i.e. pre-exposure prophylaxis. However, with
250 regards to vaccination being offered for mpox for all health professionals managing suspected or
251 confirmed clinical cases of mpox, proportions were lower; 61% (n=324) agreed in Europe, 89% (n=101)
252 in the CCS region and 67% (n=55) in the USA and Canada.

253

254 Just under half the respondents (n=254) in Europe indicated that vaccination was being offered to all
255 people at high risk in their countries. Comparatively fewer indicated that all people at high risk had
256 been offered vaccination in the USA and Canada (38%; n=31) and only 3% (n=3) in the CCS region. In
257 countries where vaccination was available, 47% (n=340) of HCWs thought access to vaccine for mpox

258 was not at all/slightly adequate in their country; 37% (n=268) in Europe, 3% (n=22) in the CCS
259 region and 7% (n=50) in the USA and Canada.

260

261 **Clinical guidelines and national public health agency**

262 The majority of respondents (60%; n=434) reported that their service followed local service
263 guidelines and national guidelines (72%; n=523). Within Europe, only 39% (n=207) reported that
264 their service followed international guidelines as compared to 61% (n=70) in the CCS region and
265 51.22% (n=42) in the USA and Canada.

266

267 When asked about their satisfaction with the support that their service received from their national
268 public health agency, overall 40% (n=284) were not at all or only slightly satisfied with the support.

269 The highest proportion of this dissatisfaction was noted in the CCS region (55%; n=62).

270

271 **Moral distress and moral injury**

272 Overall, more than half (55%; n=394) felt that the term 'moral distress' resonated with their
273 experiences at work managing suspected or confirmed clinical cases of mpox. Over one third (37%;
274 n=265) felt that the term 'moral injury' resonated with their experiences at work managing suspected
275 or confirmed clinical cases of mpox.

276

277

278

279

280

281

282 **Table 2 – Proportions of moral distress**

	Europe N=529	Caribbean, Central America and South America N=114	Canada and USA N=82
Does the term “moral distress” resonate with your experiences at work managing suspected or confirmed clinical cases of mpox? Definition of “moral distress” - the psychological unease generated where professionals identify an ethically correct action to take but are constrained in their ability to take that action	n=523	n=114	n=81
Does not resonate at all	252 (48.18%)	46 (40.35%)	26 (32.10%)
Somewhat resonates	80 (15.30%)	23 (20.18%)	13 (16.05%)
Slightly resonates	112 (21.41%)	22 (19.30%)	26 (32.10%)
Moderately resonates	43 (8.22%)	13 (11.40%)	9 (11.11%)
Extremely resonates	36 (6.88%)	10 (8.77%)	7 (8.64%)

283
284
285
286

Table 3 – Proportions of moral injury

Does the term “moral injury” resonate with your experiences at work managing suspected or confirmed clinical cases of mpox?	n=520	n=114	n=81
--	-------	-------	------

Definition of “moral injury” - sustained moral distress leading to impaired function or longer-term psychological harm			
Does not resonate at all	348 (66.92%)	57 (50.00%)	45 (55.56%)
Somewhat resonates	47 (9.04%)	20 (17.54%)	10 (12.35%)
Slightly resonates	90 (17.31%)	21 (18.42%)	17 (20.99%)
Moderately resonates	19 (3.65%)	9 (7.89%)	4 (4.94%)
Extremely resonates	16 (3.08%)	7 (6.14%)	5 (6.17%)

287

288 Discussion

289 Our multi-national survey study sheds light on the experiences of healthcare workers across the WHO
290 European region and the WHO region of the Americas during the mpox PHEIC of 2022-2023, which
291 unfolded less than 18 months after the second wave of COVID-19 lockdown measures.

292

293 Despite mpox being identified in animals 66 years ago and in humans 20 years later in 1970 [9, 10],
294 our study revealed significant gaps in HCW knowledge on this neglected disease. HCWs,
295 predominantly in the fields of HIV, sexual health, and infectious diseases and located outside Africa,
296 showed a concerning lack of clinical familiarity with mpox. According to the survey, 30% of HCWs had
297 never heard of mpox prior to the global outbreaks, and fewer than 1% had encountered and/or
298 treated a case. Of note, in the 2022 epidemic mpox presented in a way that was epidemiologically and
299 clinically distinct from the endemic form of mpox found on the African continent, adding a major
300 challenge to the understanding of this neglected and emerging disease.

301

302 This knowledge deficit underscores the urgent need for enhanced global pandemic preparedness
303 initiatives which prioritise HCWs most likely to be at the frontlines of any outbreak response.

304

305 A significant proportion (40%) of respondents reported an increased workload, with nearly 90%
306 indicating that their regular duties were not reduced to accommodate the additional burden brought
307 on by the mpox outbreak. This affirms the heightened vulnerability frontline HCWs face, especially
308 when mobilizing a response to a new outbreak [25]. The impact is particularly severe among HCWs
309 with expertise in infectious diseases and related fields, who bear a disproportionate burden in
310 responding to disease outbreaks. Not only did HCWs feel over-burdened in the mpox response, they
311 also felt under-prepared to respond to a new outbreak of a disease with which many of them had
312 little familiarity. This lack of support and training was strongest among respondents in the CCS region.
313 Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, many frontline workers have experienced increased physical and
314 psychological stressors and burnout, leading some to ultimately leave the workforce [3-5]. Similar
315 patterns during the mpox outbreak emphasise that, despite the well-recognised concern of the risk of
316 burnout and increased workloads during health crises, health systems still fall short in measures to
317 support HCWs. Such disconnect highlights a critical gap in our approach to healthcare preparedness
318 and HCW wellbeing as an important pillar of pandemic readiness. Particularly concerning is the mpox
319 impact on HCWs who deliver HIV, sexual health, and infectious disease services - specialties that in
320 many countries were already grappling with a crisis of attrition in the workforce due to insufficient
321 funding and low compensation in many health economies [26].

322

323 In this study, vaccine acceptance and uptake were generally high among HCWs in the sample, yet
324 significant issues of vaccine inequity and access emerged. Participants from Europe and North America
325 indicated moderate access to preventive small pox vaccines for pre-exposure vaccination (35-50%),
326 in stark contrast to those in the CCS region, where access by HCWs fell below 6%. This discrepancy
327 mirrors the ongoing neglect and lack of prioritisation faced by low-resourced countries in Africa, where
328 mpox has been endemic for over five decades [9, 10]. The effective containment of the outbreak in
329 North American and European countries was partly due to accessible vaccines for those most at risk

330 of mpox exposure. Moreover, the acquisition of mpox in healthcare settings has been recurrently
331 documented, particularly in endemic areas. HCWs face heightened infection risks while caring for
332 mpox patients, exacerbated by inadequate resources for proper infection control, such as personal
333 protective equipment and sanitary supplies, alongside overcrowding in healthcare facilities. Thus,
334 vaccinating HCWs, especially during outbreaks in regions with scarce infection prevention resources,
335 becomes crucial and should be prioritised. Our survey was designed to evaluate clinicians responses
336 to an unfamiliar pathogen and was therefore disseminated to HCWs who had not dealt with mpox
337 before within their health system. Our survey underlines the importance of conducting similar studies
338 led by African clinicians to assess the access of HCWs to essential tools like vaccines and the impact of
339 such limitations on their perceptions of support, moral distress, and moral injury as they address
340 ongoing and evolving mpox outbreaks in these settings. Building a resilient HCW workforce that is
341 equipped to effectively respond to emerging outbreaks of disease and pandemics also implies
342 prioritising the protection of the workforce with tools and resources which allow them to feel
343 confident and secure in performing their duties.

344

345 More than half of our participants reported identifying with the term "moral distress" based on their
346 experiences in managing mpox cases, and a third felt that "moral injury" described their experiences.
347 Although some level of moral distress may be inevitable for healthcare workers during times of
348 increased workload and stress, the high proportion of respondents in our study who reported these
349 feelings is concerning. A manuscript analysing open-text responses to these questions and exploring
350 responses in greater depth is forthcoming [27]. Even when HCWs find ways to be resilient, an excess
351 workload with limited support and resources is unsustainable. Systemic changes are urgently needed
352 to address understaffing, low compensation and lack of proper incentives in routine care delivery, as
353 these are even, more challenging to address in times of crisis. Additionally, efforts must also go
354 towards repairing the damage done to the morally injured HCWs by fostering community among
355 frontline workers who have shared experiences.

356

357 A number of limitations of our study should be highlighted to avoid over-interpretation of the results.

358 Firstly, this was an exploratory study that relied on a convenience sampling strategy; thus limiting its

359 generalisability. Secondly, although the demographic breakdown of respondents appears to reflect

360 the regional health care workforce, it may not be truly representative. A significant proportion of

361 respondents were from Europe and this may further limit the global applicability. Thirdly, it focussed

362 on the quantitative data from a cross-sectional survey and an inherent element of this design is recall

363 bias. Respondents were offered to share further perspectives via free text and these responses are

364 reported elsewhere. Fourthly, the sample size meant that the study was underpowered and this

365 restricted the statistical analyses that could be undertaken and the inferences that could be made.

366 This also limited any temporal changes being elicited. Finally, the mpox PHEIC occurred in varying

367 socio-political contexts which likely impacted experiences and perspectives which were not

368 specifically explored with the survey. Further qualitative exploration is needed.

369

370 **Conclusion**

371 Our survey study clearly illustrates the harsh realities faced by HCWs facing the global mpox epidemic

372 of 2022-2023 in their health system for the first time during amidst the lingering effects of the COVID-

373 19 pandemic. It highlights a critical need for addressing the profound gaps in HCW knowledge about

374 re-emerging diseases with pandemic potential like mpox, and underscores the urgency of

375 strengthening the resilience of global health systems and multidisciplinary approaches against future

376 outbreaks. The experiences of HCWs, marred by increased workloads without commensurate support,

377 inadequate access to crucial vaccines, and pervasive feelings of moral distress and injury should serve

378 as a clarion call for immediate action.

379

380 As we navigate the aftermath of the global epidemic mpox emergency and anticipate future health
381 crises, it is imperative that we prioritise the well-being and preparedness of those on the front lines.
382 This includes not only equipping HCWs with the necessary knowledge and resources to effectively
383 respond to disease outbreaks, but also ensuring their mental and psychological needs are addressed.
384 These initiatives must include a priority focus on HCWs in Africa's endemic regions, who have been
385 battling mpox outbreaks for years yet remain overlooked in global response plans. Moving forward, it
386 is crucial that the insights we have gained from the mpox outbreak and the firsthand accounts of
387 healthcare workers pave the way for a renewed approach to pandemic preparedness. This approach
388 must prioritise the health, safety, and respect of those who dedicate their lives to caring for others.

389

390 **Acknowledgements**

391 Mpox SHARE-NET writing group: Sara Paparini, Chikondi Mwendera, Anthony K J Smith, Omar Sued,
392 Jonathan M Schapiro, Ann-brit Eg Hansen, Carlos Del Rio, Dimie Ogoina, Raquel Martin Iguacel, Elena
393 Sendagorta

394

395 **References**

- 396 1. Chemali S, Mari-Sáez A, El Bcheraoui C, Weishaar H. Health care workers' experiences during the
397 COVID-19 pandemic: a scoping review. *Hum Resour Health*. 2022;20(1):27.
- 398 2. WHO. Mpox (monkeypox) outbreak 2022. World Health Organization, May 2023. Accessed 26 May
399 2023. <https://www.who.int/emergencies/situations/monkeypox-oubreak-2022>
- 400 3. Billings J, Ching BCF, Gkofa V, et al. Experiences of frontline Healthcare workers and their views
401 about support during COVID-19 and previous Pandemics: a systematic review and qualitative
402 meta-synthesis. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2021;21:923.

- 403 4. Bow SMA, Schröder-Bäck P, Norcliffe-Brown D, Wilson J, Tahzib F. Moral distress and injury in the
404 public health professional workforce during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Public Health (Oxf)*.
405 2023;45(3):697-705.
- 406 5. Preti E, Di Mattei V, Perego G, Ferrari F, Mazzetti M, Taranto P, et al. The psychological impact of
407 epidemic and pandemic outbreaks on healthcare workers: rapid review of the evidence. *Curr*
408 *Psychiatry Rep*. 2020;22(8):43. 26.
- 409 6. Lal A, Erondy NA, Heymann DL, Gitahi G, Yates R. Fragmented health systems in COVID-19:
410 rectifying the misalignment between global health security and universal health coverage. *Lancet*.
411 2021;397(10268):61-67.
- 412 7. Bryant-Genevier J, Rao CY, Lopes-Cardozo B et al. Symptoms of depression, anxiety, post-traumatic
413 stress disorder, and suicidal ideation among state, tribal, local, and territorial public healthworkers
414 during the COVID-19 pandemic—United States, March–April 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*
415 2021;70(26): 947–52eng.
- 416 8. Song YK, Mantri S, Lawson JM, Berger EJ, Koenig HG. Morally Injurious Experiences and Emotions
417 of Health Care Professionals During the COVID-19 Pandemic Before Vaccine Availability. *JAMA*
418 *Netw Open*. 2021;4(11):e2136150. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.36150
- 419 9. Beer EM, Rao VB. A systematic review of the epidemiology of human monkeypox outbreaks and
420 implications for outbreak strategy. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2019;13(10):e0007791.
- 421 10. Breman JG, Kalisa-Ruti, Steniowski MV, Zanutto E, Gromyko AI, Arita I. Human monkeypox, 1970-
422 79. *Bull World Health Organ*. 1980;58(2):165-182.
- 423 11. Gong Q, Wang C, Chuai X, Chiu S. Monkeypox virus: a re-emergent threat to humans. *Virology Sin*.
424 2022;37(4):477-482.
- 425 12. World Health Organisation. Multi-country outbreak of mpox, External situation report#15–2
426 February 2023. [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/multi-country-outbreak-of-mpox--](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/multi-country-outbreak-of-mpox--external-situation-report-15--2-february-2023)
427 [external-situation-report-15--2-february-2023](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/multi-country-outbreak-of-mpox--external-situation-report-15--2-february-2023)

- 428 13. Brown K, Leggat PA. Human Monkeypox: Current State of Knowledge and Implications for the
429 Future. *Trop Med Infect Dis*. 2016;1(1):8.
- 430 14. Jahromi AS, Jokar M, Sharifi N, Kashkooli S, Rahmanian K, Rahmanian V. Global knowledge and
431 attitudes towards mpox (monkeypox) among healthcare workers: a systematic review and meta-
432 analysis. *Int Health*. Published online October 20, 2023.
- 433 15. Thornhill JP, Barkati S, Walmsley S, et al. Monkeypox Virus Infection in Humans across 16 Countries
434 - April-June 2022. *N Engl J Med*. 2022;387(8):679-691.
- 435 16. Hraib M, Jouni S, Albitar MM, Alaidi S, Alshehabi Z. The outbreak of monkeypox 2022: An
436 overview. *Ann Med Surg (Lond)*. 2022;79:104069.
- 437 17. Simões P, Bhagani S. A viewpoint: The 2022 monkeypox outbreak. *J Virus Erad*. 2022;8(2):100078.
- 438 18. Dubey T, Chakole S, Agrawal S, et al. Enhancing Nursing Care in Monkeypox (Mpox) Patients:
439 Differential Diagnoses, Prevention Measures, and Therapeutic Interventions. *Cureus*.
440 2023;15(9):e44687.
- 441 19. Woodward A, Rivers C. Case Investigation and Contact Tracing in US State and Local Public Health
442 Agencies: Sustaining Capacities and Applying Lessons Learned From the COVID-19 Pandemic and
443 2022 Mpox Outbreak. *Health Secur*. 2023;21(S1):S8-S16.
- 444 20. DeLaurentis CE, Kiser J, Zucker J. New Perspectives on Antimicrobial Agents: Tecovirimat for
445 Treatment of Human Monkeypox Virus. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2022;66(12):e0122622.
- 446 21. Khani E, Afsharirad B, Entezari-Maleki T. Monkeypox treatment: Current evidence and future
447 perspectives. *J Med Virol*. 2023;95(1):e28229.
- 448 22. Gruber MF. Current status of monkeypox vaccines. *NPJ Vaccines*. 2022;7(1):94.
- 449 23. Sachs JD, Karim SSA, Akinin L, et al. The Lancet Commission on lessons for the future from the
450 COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet*. 2022;400(10359):1224-1280.
- 451 24. Weible CM, Nohrstedt D, Cairney P, et al. COVID-19 and the policy sciences: initial reactions and
452 perspectives. *Policy Sci*. 2020;53(2):225-241.

- 453 25. Hayes R, Dakin F, Smuk M, et al. Cross-sectional survey of sexual health professionals' experiences
454 and perceptions of the 2022 mpox outbreak in the UK. *BMJ Open*. 2024;14(1):e080250. Published
455 2024 Jan 12. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2023-080250
- 456 26. Orkin C, Paparini S, Thornhill JP The SHARE Collaborative, *et al*. SHARING to create knowledge in a
457 crisis.*BMJ Leader* 2023;7:e000810.
- 458 27. Hayes R, Smith A KJ, Sara Paparini S, Apea V, Orkin C. Outbreak distress: characterising moral
459 distress amongst international healthcare workers responding to mpox in 2022. Presented at the
460 2023 Annual conference of the British Sociological Association Medical Sociology Study Group
461 (BSA MedSoc 2023), 13-15 September 2023.
- 462
- 463