

Measurement of doctor wellbeing prior to the Covid pandemic: a methodological systematic review

Simons G^{1,2,3}, Opalinski D⁴, Jenkins J⁵, Boxley E², Baldwin DS^{2,6}

1. Centre for Workforce Wellbeing, University of Southampton, University Department of Psychiatry, College Keep, 4-12 Terminus Terrace, Southampton, SO14 3DT, United Kingdom. Telephone: +44 (0)2382 310764, g.simons@soton.ac.uk (Corresponding author).

2. Clinical and Experimental Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Hampshire, United Kingdom.

3. Solent NHS Trust

4. St Mary's Hospital, Imperial College Healthcare, NHS Trust

5. St Georges University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

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

Word Count 4000 words, **Number of Tables and figures:** 5

Ethics approval

The University of Southampton Ethics Committee approved this review as part of a Core Outcome Set development study ERGO55747.

Trial Registry: Prospero ID: CRD42020141866

Abstract (300 words)

Objectives

Attention has been focused on health professional during and after the Covid-19 pandemic, but relatively little is known about wellbeing before the pandemic struck. We therefore wished to describe which wellbeing outcomes had been measured in doctors and which wellbeing outcome measurement instruments had been used with doctors, prior to 2020.

Design

A methodological review of existing literature.

Setting

MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), PsycINFO, and the International Bibliography of Social Science were searched for all study types, in all languages.

Outcome measures

Wellbeing outcomes were categorised as being defined/operationalised in the aims, the methods or the results, **Error! Reference source not found.** and by whether the outcome used to represent wellbeing included the word wellbeing, another positive concept, a pathological symptom, a pathology, and were work-specific or doctor-specific. The outcome measurement instruments used were then categorised as published or unpublished and the frequency of use was collected.

Results

A total of 218 studies were included in this review. The majority of studies were not interventional (83.9%). The total number of unique outcomes used to capture wellbeing in the eligible studies was 57, with 369 non-unique outcomes. The percentage of outcomes used that contained the word wellbeing, its components and other positive concepts, was 69.9% (258/369). The percentage of negative concept use such as negative work context outcomes, symptoms of pathologies, or pathologies, was 30.1% (111/369). For the outcome “general wellbeing” alone, 92 different measurement tools were used. The Maslach Burnout Inventory was the most frequently used measurement tool for all outcomes, used in 16.3% of studies.

Conclusions

Wellbeing has been measured heterogeneously in doctors in terms of the outcomes and the outcome measurement instruments used. In approximately one-third of the times it was measured, the best that could be achieved was an absence of pathological symptoms, as a negative concept was used to operationalise it.

Strengths and limitations of this study

Strengths

- This methodological review includes 218 studies on doctor wellbeing
- This study utilised a novel methodology for determining eligibility and identifying outcomes for poorly defined concepts, such as wellbeing that reduces reviewer bias

Limitations

- This study relates only to the methods used in studies of doctor wellbeing
- The findings are based on studies published prior to the Covid-19 pandemic
- It was not possible to double extract all data

Background

‘Wellbeing’ has no international consensus definition¹ and inconsistent approaches to defining wellbeing in the literature have led to use of a diverse range of outcomes^{2,3}. A systematic review of wellbeing measurement scales identified 60 different subjective wellbeing measurement tools⁴ and a more recent systematic review identified 99 measures⁵. In the UK, policy documents on doctor wellbeing, from the British Medical Association (BMA)⁶⁻⁸, Society of Occupational Medicine⁹, General Medical Council (GMC)¹⁰ and Health Education England¹¹ that describe and make recommendations on doctors’ wellbeing, share the same lack of operationalisation of wellbeing. In a systematic review, only 11 of the 78 included papers contained an explicit definition of doctor ‘wellness’¹².

There are multiple factors to consider in the measurement of wellbeing. These include why it is being measured: as examples, for screening of pathology; describing epidemiology; or assessing the efficacy of an intervention. Who measures also matters - an independent, impartial, third-party doing the measuring could be verified and is ‘objective’. However, subjective measurement is used most often for wellbeing, where answers can be ranked by the individual with numbers to make ordinal data. The locale of the measurement of wellbeing is relevant; it could be measured nationally (as examples, the NHS Staff Survey, BMA surveys), regionally or locally (for example, NHS Trusts). The context of measurement can be at work only, or life in general. It can be measured quantitatively or qualitatively depending on the context. It could be measured in terms of individual wellbeing currently or over a set or undefined time period, and in terms of concepts or determinants.

Pathologies are often used to describe wellbeing; in the systematic review of doctor wellness ‘burnout’ was the most common outcome measured¹³. This is understandable given the lack of a consensus definition and the tradition for pathology to be studied and described in medicine, but hinders progress on what wellbeing is, how it should be measured, and supported.

These factors emphasise the need for a careful analysis and synthesis of findings into a comprehensive summary of how wellbeing measurement in doctors has been undertaken. To provide a knowledge base on which a Delphi consensus can be built to address these issues, a systematic review is normally undertaken to identify possible outcomes and outcome measurement instruments⁵ and that approach is undertaken here.

Research questions

1. Which wellbeing outcomes have been measured in doctors?
2. Which wellbeing outcome measurement instruments have been used with doctors?

Methodology

No existing systematic review answered the research questions, so a protocol to answer them was developed and registered with Prospero ([Prospero ID: CRD42020141866](#)). This Systematic Review followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) Checklist¹⁴.

Eligibility criteria

The PICO (Participant, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome) method of identifying key concepts was utilised and adapted to the research questions.

PICO Concepts used in the Systematic Review

Participants: All grades and specialities of doctor

Intervention: For the research questions posed in this review no intervention needed to be captured, but the measurement of wellbeing was the process that needed to be captured

Comparison: No control or comparative measure was required

Outcome: Wellbeing was the outcome of interest

The definition of wellbeing utilised was *'Wellbeing is a state of positive feelings and meeting full potential in the world. It can be measured subjectively and objectively, using a salutogenic approach'*¹⁵. This definition was used as it was important that this review should capture objective as well as subjective, hedonist and eudemonic outcomes. It was also important for the synthesis and discussion of the results that measures could be grouped; into those that measure wellbeing, those that measure pathologies and negative outcomes, and those measuring positive concepts other than wellbeing. No language restrictions were placed. All types of study were included if they measured,

or discussed measurement of, doctors' wellbeing, for any purpose, including reviews and opinion pieces: including qualitative and quantitative measures, and measures which have been recommended but not yet utilised.

Information sources

The following databases were searched with no restrictions.

Bibliographic databases:

1. MEDLINE,
2. EMBASE,
3. Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL)

Subject-specific databases:

4. PsycINFO,
5. International Bibliography of Social Science

Search strategy

The search strategy (online supplemental file 1) was applied with no defined time period or language on 25/11/2019 (the first reported cluster of probable Covid-19 was reported in December 2019).

Selection process

Titles and abstracts were assessed to allow irrelevant reports to be excluded by two researchers independently. When there was a disagreement about eligibility this was arbitrated by a third reviewer. Full-text versions of the potentially relevant reports were sought to assess their eligibility further. Papers that met the criteria had data extracted using a standardised form that allowed the planned outcomes to be captured.

Data collection process

Data was extracted, collated, and assessed in Microsoft Excel¹⁶ using a data extraction form designed prior to extraction. If needed, authors were contacted for any missing data.

Data items

The context of the studies:

- study type
- year of publication
- country conducted in

The sample studied:

- average age
- gender proportions
- specialities studied
- grades studied

Study bias:

- number approached
- number responded
- number at follow up

The mechanism of measurement of wellbeing:

- wellbeing in the title
- operationalisation of wellbeing, how it was described as an outcome (as an aim, in the methods or in the results **Error! Reference source not found.**)
- delivery method for surveys
- outcomes used to capture wellbeing
- measurement instruments used to capture outcomes

Risk of bias assessment

To reduce study risk of bias, results from running the search strategies in the bibliographic databases were exported and merged in Endnote¹⁷. Duplicate records of the same report were identified using the Endnote 'Find duplicates' function (year, title, volume, issue, pages) and by manual searching and removed. Multiple reports of the same study were linked. Two reviewers screened the studies and used the search function in Endnote Click¹⁷ to identify where wellbeing was operationalised.

Synthesis of results

Due to the varied methodology, interventions and outcome measures used, a narrative synthesis was conducted. The operationalisation of wellbeing was conceptualised in three categories:

- 1) Studies that listed wellbeing as an explicit outcome in the results section,
- 2) Studies that listed wellbeing as an explicit outcome in the methods section (but did not use the word wellbeing in the results),

- 3) Studies that listed wellbeing as a measurement aim in the introduction or background (with no explicit mention of wellbeing in the methods or results).

Outcomes and outcome measurement instruments were identified using the criteria shown:

- Outcomes and measurement instruments that captured wellbeing, as defined by this study
- Outcomes and measurement tools that did not do so

There were many outcomes and measurement instruments that did not measure wellbeing but other positive concepts. They were either general or specific to the context of being at work, or being a doctor, and therefore the conceptual model of context was used:

- General positive concepts
- Work-specific concepts
- Doctor-specific concepts

The outcomes and measurement instruments that were not constructed to capture positive concepts were further categorised into:

- Pathologies
- Symptoms of pathologies

Outcome measurement instruments were categorised as above and as:

- Published
- Unpublished
- Quantitative
- Qualitative

Reporting bias assessment

An update search at the end of the review process was not undertaken as this was a snapshot methodological review to capture measurement before the introduction of wellbeing roles within NHS Trusts as recommended by the NHS Staff and Learners' Mental wellbeing commission and before Covid¹⁸.

Certainty assessment

The use of this method of categorising the operationalisation of a poorly defined concept allowed the reviewers to capture all the ways wellbeing had been measured. This methodology removed the

bias of pre-defining what outcomes and/or measurement tools would be included when it was the methodology that was being studied.

To estimate the sensitivity of the search strategy: the percentage of relevant reports found out of the total in existence, the total number of relevant reports identified through database searches was divided by the total number of relevant reports identified through database searches and relevant systematic review backward citation searches. A total of 199 of the 235 relevant studies (84.7%) were identified by the search strategy.

The precision of the search strategy: the percentage of results found that were relevant out of all the results found was calculated by dividing the total number of relevant reports identified through database searches by the total number of irrelevant reports found through both systematic and backward citation searches. It was calculated that 4% of search results were relevant.

Results

A total of 218 studies were included in this review. The studies that were eligible were heterogeneous in the contexts in which they studied doctors, the outcomes and outcome measurement instruments used.

Study selection

PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases, registers and other sources




Figure 1. PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for this systematic review¹⁹ (CC BY 4.0)

Study characteristics and contexts

The 218 studies identified were heterogeneous, and the growth of publications on doctor wellbeing since 1985 was exponential. Studies that measured wellbeing to demonstrate the efficacy of an intervention (See Table 1) comprised 16.1% (n=35) of the studies, with 72% (n=157) capturing the epidemiology of wellbeing in doctors. Of these, 28.7% (n=45) did so at more than one time-point, and 71.3% (n=112) at only one time-point. The USA was the origin of the most studies (38.9%), and 99% of studies were conducted in Western cultures. In all the studies, 48.9% were undertaken in mixed speciality doctor populations and 61.5% in mixed grades of doctor. Those studies that captured the age of participants had a pooled median age of 38.9 years. The median percentage of male doctors in study populations was 53.5%.

Total number of studies n=218 (%)	Wellbeing operationalised in results total n=142	Wellbeing operationalised in methods total n=49	Wellbeing operationalised in methods total n=27
Interventional studies 35 (16.1% of all studies)	Wellbeing operationalised in results n=16 interventional	Wellbeing operationalised in methods n=16 interventional	Wellbeing operationalised in aims n=3 interventional
Primary interventions (22.9% of interventional studies)	Duty hour policy ²⁰	Duty hours ^{21,22}	
	Rest breaks ²³	Rota design ²⁴	
	Treadmill desks ²⁵		
	Site improvement plan implementation ²⁶	Operating Theatre noise ²⁷	
Secondary interventions (77.1% of interventional studies)	Mindfulness ²⁸⁻³²	Mindfulness training ³³⁻³⁶	Mindfulness ^{37,38}
	Solution focused seminars ³⁹	Cognitive Behavioural Therapy ^{40,41}	Cognitive behavioural therapy ⁴²
	Dialogue groups ^{43,44}	Debriefing sessions ⁴⁵	
	Peer Mentoring ⁴⁶	Health and wellbeing workshops ⁴⁷	
	Reflection Rounds ⁴⁸	Meditation Training ^{49,50}	
	Management training ⁵¹	Stress management training ⁵²	
	Resident Assessment Facilitation Team meetings ⁵³	Relaxation CDs ⁵⁴	

Table 1. Summary of interventional study findings

The interventions that were examined by studies were mainly secondary interventions (77.1%), i.e., group interventions that aim to strengthen the individual, rather than primary interventions that aim

to strengthen the wider system. Mindfulness was the most studied secondary intervention^{7,55-64}, studied in 31.4% of interventional studies.

Risk of bias in studies

Selection bias

The majority (51.4%) of eligible studies were cross-sectional surveys capturing epidemiological data at a single time-point (71.3%), making the majority of studies unsuitable to investigate causality, and being at risk of sampling bias and conformity bias. This would have been mitigated by 72.7% of studies being conducted in multiple centres; however, most multi-centre studies were undertaken in hospitals in the USA, through the same healthcare provider group. Response rates for the cross-sectional surveys could be established in 41 of 112 studies (36.7%); the median response rate across studies was 62.7% (range 1.1-99%). Of the 16% of studies that were interventional 62.9% used a control and 42.9% used randomisation.

Performance bias

All the interventional studies were unable to 'blind' participants, as doctors would be aware of what all the interventions comprised.

Detection bias

Given the knowledge of doctors and their professional status there is potential for them to answer self-report outcomes more 'correctly' than the general population, to conform with social desirability. This would have been more problematic in the non-anonymous outcome collection methods.

Attrition bias

For the prospective observational studies, cohort studies, randomised controlled trials, non-randomised controlled studies, and interventional studies with no control, the percentage of participants lost to follow up could be calculated in 31 of 80 studies (38.8%); the median attrition rate was 27.1% (range 0-55.1%).

Reporting biases

Where results were missing, the authors were not contacted as this methodological review aimed to describe what was published about study design. Some interpretation was required to identify which measurement tool was chosen to capture the outcome wellbeing, usually involving a process

of elimination as other outcome concepts were better defined and their measurement instruments could be paired with them more easily.

Results of synthesis

Research Question 1 – Outcomes measured in doctors

The total number of unique outcomes used to capture wellbeing in all the eligible studies was 57. Unique outcomes were those that represented a novel concept. Non-unique outcomes were those that described the same concept, using different wording. The total count of non-unique wellbeing outcomes used in the 218 studies was 369. The number and percentage of times an outcome was used that contained the word ‘wellbeing’ was 42.3% (156/369). The percentage of outcomes used that contained the word wellbeing, its components and other positive concepts, was 52.6% (194/369). If the positive work-context outcomes were also counted the positive outcome use percentage was 69.9% (258/369). The percentage of negative concept use such as negative work context outcomes, symptoms of pathologies, or pathologies, was 30.1% (111/369).

Number of:	Operationalisation of wellbeing			Totals
	In the Aims	In the Methods	In the Results	
	27	49	142	218
Studies with wellbeing in the title	9	17	67	93
General Wellbeing outcomes	10	30	116	156
Positive concept outcomes	12	9	17	38
Work specific outcomes	28	13	40	81
Symptom of pathology outcomes	10	16	20	46
Pathology outcomes	13	12	23	48

Table 2 Summary of findings table, the way in which wellbeing was operationalised and measured. Studies could capture more than one outcome

Research question 2 - Wellbeing outcome measurement instruments used in doctors

For the outcome “general wellbeing” 92 different measurement tools were used, the most commonly employed being shown in Table 3. The measurement tools used could be classed as published wellbeing measurement tools (n=9), published measurement tools for positive concepts other than wellbeing (n=13), doctor-specific wellbeing measurement tools (n=10), work-specific

measurement tools (n=9), measurement tools for symptoms of pathologies (n=6), pathology screening tools (n=13), unpublished study-specific measurement tools (n=20) and qualitative tools (n=12).

The Maslach Burnout Inventory⁶⁵ was the most frequently used measurement tool for all outcomes, used in 16.3% of studies; 22 studies that operationalised wellbeing as an explicit outcome in the results section, nine studies that operationalised wellbeing as an explicit outcome in the methods and three studies that stated wellbeing measurement was an explicit aim.

Measurement Tool	Description of tool	Number of times used	References
Maslach Burnout Inventory	Published pathology screening tool	8	66,67 63,64,68,69 69
WHO wellbeing index (5 item 5-point)	Published wellbeing measurement tool	5	70-74
1 item VAS (100mm)	Published wellbeing measurement tool	5	70,75-77
LASA QOL	Published positive concept measurement tools	4	78-81 82
GHQ12	Published pathology screening tools	4	10 83-85
Dupuy Psychological General Wellbeing scale	Published wellbeing measurement tool	3	86-89
Physician wellbeing index	Published Doctor-specific measurement tools	3	9 90,91
Stanford professional fulfilment (PFI)	Published Doctor-specific measurement tools	3	92 93,94

Table 3. The most commonly used published outcome measurement instruments to capture the outcome general wellbeing

Discussion

Principal findings

The word ‘wellbeing’ was used in the title of 42.7% of studies, more so in studies that operationalised wellbeing in the results (72.1%). Importantly, each of the different ways of operationalising wellbeing included in this review (as an aim, or as an outcome in the methods, or in the results) was justified as each approach identified 10.5 - 21.1% of the unique outcomes. In a systematic review of physician wellness⁹⁵ 24 pre-defined ‘dimensions’ of wellness were used to

categorise 75 non-unique outcomes in 43 studies published between 2010 and 2015. In comparison this review identified 57 unique wellbeing outcomes and 369 non-unique outcomes. Including studies that operationalised wellbeing as a measurement aim, or as an outcome in the methods, as well as in the results, allowed identification of all the ways that wellbeing in doctors has been measured. The heterogeneity of how doctor wellbeing was operationalised highlights both its multi-faceted nature and the need for a consensus approach to wellbeing research in doctors. A lack of operational definitions is not a problem unique to reviews of wellbeing research. A systematic review of core outcome set development studies found that no study defined how outcomes were differentiated and how final numbers of unique outcomes were determined ⁹⁶.

The 92 measurement tools used to capture the outcome 'General wellbeing' alone again reflects the lack of a consensus operational definition for wellbeing, as does the finding that 21.7% of the measurement tools used were self-created. The finding that the Maslach Burnout Inventory, despite its associated cost, was the most commonly used tool (16.3% of all studies) shows a desire for a well operationalised concept and psychometrically tested tool. The use of a pathological outcome measurement instrument is worrying, as it limits the best a doctor can achieve to a lack of mental ill health. The finding that 30.1% of outcomes used to capture wellbeing were pathological or negative concepts reflects the 'medicalisation' of the concept of wellbeing, which is inherently positive and holistic.

Strengths and weaknesses of the study

This systematic review included a large number of studies (n=218) compared to the previous systematic reviews identified through database searches ^{9,97-104} which identified a median of 28.5 eligible studies (range 3-81). The inclusion of all study types and languages, as well as searching diverse databases should have reduced selection bias in this systematic review. Reporting bias will be present, as published work is accessed more easily and it was not practically possible to search 'grey literature', given the 7878 studies retrieved in the existing database searches.

This systematic review utilised a novel way of categorising how a poorly defined concept – 'wellbeing' – is conceptualised in publications. It achieved this by coding whether the concept featured in the aims, method or results. This strategy enabled Adobe Acrobat Pro DC ⁵ and Endnote click ¹⁰⁵ to be used to identify where the concept was mentioned, which reduced reviewer error and subjective bias as reviewers are only required to identify if the word is being used as an outcome.

The inductive collection of outcomes without a pre-conceived framework used in this systematic review has been used in other systematic review of wellbeing measurement^{12,13,106,107} and provides a more complete picture of the doctor wellbeing landscape by allowing for a comprehensive synthesis of all methods for measuring doctor wellbeing.

To mitigate selection bias, double screening was used with 10% of full-text articles being double-screened at the 'Title and Abstract' stage. Reviewers were not blind to authors and institutions, but these data did not need to be read to assess for eligibility; selection bias risk was therefore low. Ideally, all studies would have had data extracted by two independent researchers, but this was only possible for 36.5% of the reports. An audit was performed of 10% of the extracted outcome data for each of the 3 ways wellbeing could be operationalised: as an aim, in the methods or in the results, with no disagreements. It was not possible to comment on the sensitivity of this review compared to others, as the only other methodological systematic review in this area did not report the necessary data⁸¹

Meaning of the study and Implications for clinicians, policymakers and future research

The heterogeneity of outcomes used to measure doctor wellbeing hinders comparisons between studies looking at epidemiology or the efficacy of interventions. There is no consensus about which measurement tools are appropriate for the measurement of doctor wellbeing, leading to many different and often self-created tools being utilised. Meta analysis will not be possible until the same outcome measurement instruments start to be used.

Conclusion

Wellbeing has been measured heterogeneously in doctors in terms of the outcomes and the outcome measurement instruments used. Just under a third of the times it was measured, the best that could be achieved was an absence of pathological symptoms, as a negative concept was used to operationalise it.

The results of this systematic review highlight the importance of Core Outcome Sets, in which a minimum agreed set of outcomes and recommended measurement tools to capture them allow comparisons across studies. The use of a Core Outcome Set, including recommended outcome measurement instruments would provide the optimal environment for synthesis and meta-analysis to occur in the field of doctor wellbeing.

Author contribution

Simons G: Designed the study, collected, analysed and interpreted the data and wrote the manuscript.

Opalinski D: Collected, analysed and interpreted data and contributed to the manuscript.

Jenkins J: Collected, analysed and interpreted data.

Boxley B: Collected, analysed and interpreted data.

Baldwin DS: Funding acquisition, overseeing design of the study, data collection and analysis. Edited and approved the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr Aimee O'Neill and Professor Julia Sinclair for their contributions to discussions of notions of wellbeing and their connotations.

Keywords (3-10)

Wellbeing

Measurement

Doctors

Funding statement

Health Education England (HEE) South has provided financial support for a postgraduate student fellowship for 3 years. No grant number.

Competing interests statement

None declared

Data sharing statement

All data supporting this study are openly available from the University of Southampton repository at <https://doi.org/10.5258/SOTON/D1933>

1. House of Commons Health and Social Care Committee. *Workforce burnout and resilience in the NHS and social care*. <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm5802/cmselect/cmhealth/22/2202.htm> (accessed 15/01/2022).
2. House of Commons Public Accounts Committee. *Covid-19: Government procurement and supply of Personal Protective Equipment*. <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4607/documents/46709/default/> (accessed 03/10/2021).
3. British Medical Association. *Remembering the UK doctors who have died of covid-19*. <https://www.bmj.com/covid-memorial> (accessed 03/10/2021).
4. British Medical Association. *Doctors with long covid*. <https://www.bma.org.uk/news-and-opinion/doctors-with-long-covid> (accessed 03/10/2021).

5. British Medical Association. *Caring for the mental health of the medical workforce*. <https://www.bma.org.uk/advice-and-support/nhs-delivery-and-workforce/workforce/mental-health-workforce-report> (accessed 30/05/19).
6. Matthew-King A. *Revealed: the rising tide of GP burnout as NHS cuts support*. . <https://www.pulsetoday.co.uk/news/politics/revealed-the-rising-tide-of-gp-burnout-as-nhs-cuts-support/> (accessed 03/10/2021).
7. World Health Organisation. *International Classification of Diseases 11th Revision*. <https://icd.who.int/en/> (accessed 26/11/2020).
8. NHS Improvement. *Performance of the NHS provider sector for the quarter ended 30 June 2018*. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/financial-accounting-and-reporting/quarterly-performance-of-the-nhs-provider-sector-quarter-4-2018-19/> (accessed 30/05/19).
9. General Medical Council. *Completing the picture report*. <https://www.gmc-uk.org/about/what-we-do-and-why/data-and-research/research-and-insight-archive/completing-the-picture-report> (accessed 07/10/2021).
10. Health Education England. *NHS staff and learners mental wellbeing commission*. <https://www.hee.nhs.uk/sites/default/files/documents/NHS%20%28HEE%29%20%20Mental%20Wellbeing%20Commission%20Report.pdf> (accessed 30/05/19).
11. British Medical Association. *Supporting health and wellbeing at work*. <https://www.bma.org.uk/media/2076/bma-supporting-health-and-wellbeing-at-work-oct-2018.pdf> (accessed 31/08/21).
12. British Medical Association. *BMA mental wellbeing charter*. <https://www.bma.org.uk/media/4363/bma-mental-wellbeing-charter-oct-2019.pdf> (accessed 22/01/2022).
13. General Medical Council. *Caring for doctors, caring for patients. How to transform UK healthcare environments to support doctors and medical students to care for patients*. https://www.gmc-uk.org/-/media/documents/caring-for-doctors-caring-for-patients_pdf-80706341.pdf (accessed 04/08/2020).
14. General Medical Council. *National Training Survey Results*. <https://www.gmc-uk.org/about/what-we-do-and-why/data-and-research/national-training-surveys-reports> (accessed 21/09/21).
15. Nuffield Trust. *The NHS workforce in numbers*. <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/resource/the-nhs-workforce-in-numbers> (accessed 03/10/2021).
16. Microsoft Excel, Version 2102. [program]. US: Microsoft Corporation, 2021.
17. Quinn MA, Bazari H, Ripp J, et al. A Roadmap for Research on Resident Well-Being. *Am J Med* 2018;131(3):323-28. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2017.12.001>.
18. Health Education England. *NHS staff and learners mental wellbeing commission*. 2019. <https://www.hee.nhs.uk/sites/default/files/documents/NHS%20%28HEE%29%20%20Mental%20Wellbeing%20Commission%20Report.pdf>.
19. Gable SL, Haidt J. What (and Why) is Positive Psychology? *Review of General Psychology* 2005;9(2):103-10. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.103>.
20. Desai SV, Asch DA, Bellini LM, et al. Education Outcomes in a Duty-Hour Flexibility Trial in Internal Medicine. *New England journal of medicine* 2018;378(16):1494-508. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa1800965>.
21. Bilimoria KY, Chung JW, Hedges LV, et al. Development of the Flexibility in Duty Hour Requirements for Surgical Trainees (FIRST) Trial Protocol: A National Cluster-Randomized Trial of Resident Duty Hour Policies. *JAMA surgery* 2016;151(3):273-81. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamasurg.2015.4990>.
22. Parthasarathy S, Hettiger K, Budhiraja R, et al. Sleep and well-being of ICU housestaff. *Chest* 2007;131(6):1685-93. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1378/chest.06-1398>.
23. Frey R, Decker K, Reinfried L, et al. Effect of rest on physicians' performance in an emergency department, objectified by electroencephalographic analyses and psychometric tests.

- Critical care medicine* 2002(10):2322-29. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1097/00003246-200210000-00022>.
24. Parshuram CS, Amaral ACKB, Ferguson ND, et al. Patient safety, resident well-being and continuity of care with different resident duty schedules in the intensive care unit: A randomized trial. *CMAJ* 2015;187(5):321-29. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.140752>.
 25. Thompson WG, Koepp GA, Levine JA. Increasing physician activity with treadmill desks. *Work: Journal of Prevention, Assessment & Rehabilitation* 2014;48(1):47-51. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3233/wor-131708>.
 26. Dunn PM, Arnetz BB, Christensen JF, et al. Meeting the imperative to improve physician well-being: assessment of an innovative program. *Journal of general internal medicine* 2007;22(11):1544-52. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-007-0363-5>.
 27. Rogers CM, Palmerton H, Saway B, et al. Effect of Various OR Noise on Fine Motor Skills, Cognition, and Mood. *Surgery Research and Practice* 2019;2019:5372174. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2019/5372174>.
 28. Lebares CC, Guvva EV, Olaru M, et al. Efficacy of Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Training in Surgery: additional Analysis of the Mindful Surgeon Pilot Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA network open* 2019;2(5):e194108-. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.4108>.
 29. Lui WS. A randomized controlled trial study to alleviate healthcare workers' burnout and perceived stress by mindful practice program. 2019. Available from: <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2183358447?parentSessionId=xEK%2FOTCAKzggvqQoLzTCXLoSJS10k%2B6ifr0XoUoL4%3D&accountid=13963>. (accessed 17/01/2022).
 30. Moffatt-Bruce SD, Nguyen MC, Steinberg B, et al. Interventions to reduce burnout and improve resilience: Impact on a health system's outcomes. *Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology* 2019;62(3):432-43. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/GRF.0000000000000458>.
 31. Rees C, Craigie M, Slatyer S, et al. Mindful Self-Care and Resiliency (MSCR): Protocol for a pilot trial of a brief mindfulness intervention to promote occupational resilience in rural general practitioners. *BMJ Open* 2018;8(6):e021027. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-021027>.
 32. Goldhagen BE, Kingsolver K, Stinnett SS, et al. Stress and burnout in residents: impact of mindfulness-based resilience training. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice* 2015;6:525-32. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2147/amep.s88580>.
 33. Asuero AM, Queraltó JM, Pujol-Ribera E, et al. Effectiveness of a mindfulness education program in primary health care professionals: a pragmatic controlled trial. *Journal of continuing education in the health professions* 2014;34(1):4-12. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/chp.21211>.
 34. Schmidt S, Goritz A. *Otium in the hospital? A mindfulness-based intervention for resident physicians*. https://www.drks.de/drks_web/navigate.do?navigationId=trial.HTML&TRIAL_ID=DRKS00014015 (accessed 17/01/2022).
 35. Moody K, Kramer D, Santizo RO, et al. Helping the helpers: mindfulness training for burnout in pediatric oncology--a pilot program. *J Pediatr Oncol Nurs* 2013;30(5):275-84. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1043454213504497>.
 36. Montero-Marin J, Gaete J, Araya R, et al. 'Impact of a blended web-based mindfulness programme for general practitioners: A pilot study': Erratum. *Mindfulness* 2018;9(1):359-59. doi: <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s12671-017-0782-2>.
 37. Krasner MS, Epstein RM, Beckman H, et al. Association of an educational program in mindful communication with burnout, empathy, and attitudes among primary care physicians. *JAMA: Journal of the American Medical Association* 2009;302(12):1284-93. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2009.1384>.
 38. Szuster RR, Onoye JM, Eckert MD, et al. Presence, resilience, and compassion training in clinical education (PRACTICE): Evaluation of a mindfulness-based intervention for residents.

- International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine* 2019. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0091217419887639>.
39. Winefield H, Farmer E, Denson L. Work stress management for women general practitioners: An evaluation. *Psychology, Health & Medicine* 1998;3(2):163-70. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548509808402232>.
 40. Gardiner M, Lovell G, Williamson P. Physician you can heal yourself! Cognitive behavioural training reduces stress in GPs. *Fam Pract* 2004;21(5):545-51. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmh511>.
 41. Gardiner M, Kearns H, Tiggemann M. Effectiveness of cognitive behavioural coaching in improving the well-being and retention of rural general practitioners. *The Australian Journal of Rural Health* 2013;21(3):183-89. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajr.12033>.
 42. Mache S, Bernburg M, Baresi L, et al. Evaluation of self-care skills training and solution-focused counselling for health professionals in psychiatric medicine: a pilot study. *International journal of psychiatry in clinical practice* 2016;20(4):239-44. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13651501.2016.1207085>.
 43. Bergman D, Arnetz B, Wahlstrom R, et al. Effects of dialogue groups on physicians' work environment. *Journal of health organization and management* 2007;21(1):27-38. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/14777260710732240>.
 44. West CP, Dyrbye LN, Rabatin JT, et al. Intervention to promote physician well-being, job satisfaction, and professionalism a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2014;174(4):527-33. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.14387>.
 45. Gunasingam N, Burns K, Edwards J, et al. Reducing stress and burnout in junior doctors: the impact of debriefing sessions. *Postgrad Med J* 2015;91(1074):182-7. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/postgradmedj-2014-132847>.
 46. Chanchlani S, Chang D, Ong JS, et al. The value of peer mentoring for the psychosocial wellbeing of junior doctors: a randomised controlled study. *The Medical journal of Australia* 2018;209(9):401-05. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5694/mja17.01106>.
 47. Axisa C, Nash L, Kelly P, et al. Burnout and distress in Australian physician trainees: Evaluation of a wellbeing workshop. *Australasian Psychiatry* 2019;27(3):255-61. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1039856219833793>.
 48. Wen L, Sweeney TE, Welton L, et al. Encouraging mindfulness in medical house staff via smartphone app: A pilot study. *Academic Psychiatry* 2017;41(5):646-50. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-017-0768-3>.
 49. Oman D, Hedberg J, Thoresen CE. Passage meditation reduces perceived stress in health professionals: a randomized, controlled trial. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology* 2006;74(4):714-9. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.74.4.714>.
 50. Manoch R, Gordon A, Black D, et al. Using meditation for less stress and better wellbeing - A seminar for GPs. *Australian family physician* 2009;38(6):454-8. Available from: <https://www.racgp.org.au/afp/2009/june/using-meditation>. (accessed 17/01/2022).
 51. von Vultée PJ, Axelsson R, Arnetz B. Individual and organizational well-being of female physicians--an assessment of three different management programs. *MedGenMed* 2004;6(1):4. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc1140715/>. (accessed 17/01/2022).
 52. Rowe MM. Four-year longitudinal study of behavioral changes in coping with stress. *Am J Health Behav* 2006;30(6):602-12. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5993/AJHB.30.6.7>.
 53. Foster E, Biery N, Dostal J, et al. *RAFT (Resident Assessment Facilitation Team): supporting resident well-being through an integrated advising and assessment process*. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233405348_RAFT_Resident_Assessment_Facilitation_Team_Supporting_Resident_Well-Being_Through_an_Integrated_Advising_and_Assessment_Process (accessed 17/01/2022).

54. Christakis I, Pagkratis MT, Varvogli L, et al. Measuring the stress of the surgeons in training and use of a novel interventional program to combat it. *Journal of the Korean Surgical Society* 2012;82(5):312-16. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4174/jkss.2012.82.5.312>.
55. Huang ECH. Resident burnout in Taiwan Hospitals-and its relation to physician felt trust from patients. *Journal of the Formosan Medical Association* 2019;118(10):1438-49. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jfma.2018.12.015>.
56. Margiotta F. Prevalence and co-variables of burnout in consultant hospital doctors: burnout in consultants in Ireland Study (BICDIS). *Irish Journal of Medical Science* 2019;188(2):355-64. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11845-018-1886-y>.
57. Robinson DBT, James OP, Hopkins L, et al. Stress and Burnout in Training; Requiem for the Surgical Dream. *Journal of Surgical Education* 2019;77(1):e1-e8. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsurg.2019.07.002>.
58. Sun H, Warner DO, Macario A, et al. Repeated Cross-sectional Surveys of Burnout, Distress, and Depression among Anesthesiology Residents and First-year Graduates. *Anesthesiology* 2019;131(3):668-77. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0000000000002777>.
59. Asuero AM, Queralto JM, Pujol-Ribera E, et al. Effectiveness of a mindfulness education program in primary health care professionals: a pragmatic controlled trial. *Journal of continuing education in the health professions* 2014;34(1):4-12.
60. Yates M, Samuel V. Burnout in oncologists and associated factors: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *European Journal of Cancer Care* 2019;28(3):1-19. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ecc.13094>.
61. Dolan P, Kudrna L, Stone A. The Measure Matters: An Investigation of Evaluative and Experience-Based Measures of Wellbeing in Time Use Data. *Social Indicators Research* 2017;134(1):57-73. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-016-1429-8>.
62. Office for National Statistics. *What Matters to you? Measuring what matters. National statisticians' reflections on the national debate on measuring national well-being.* <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-wellbeing> (accessed 22/08/19).
63. Core Outcome Measurement in Efficacy Trials Initiative. *About COMET.* <http://www.comet-initiative.org/About> (accessed 25/09/2020).
64. International Consortium Health Outcome Measurement. *ICHOM, Our mission.* <https://www.ichom.org/mission/> (accessed 25/09/2020).
65. Maslach C, Jackson SE. The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of organizational behavior* 1981;2(2):99-113.
66. Medical Research Council and National Institute for Health Research. *Developing and evaluating complex interventions.* <https://mrc.ukri.org/documents/pdf/complex-interventions-guidance/> (accessed 24/09/2020).
67. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, et al. A new framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions: update of Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ* 2021;374:n2061. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n2061>.
68. Kirkham JJ, Davis K, Altman DG, et al. Core Outcome Set-STAndards for Development: The COS-STAD recommendations. *PLoS Med* 2017;14(11):e1002447. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002447>.
69. Stiglitz J SA, Fitoussi J P. Report by the commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress. 2009. <http://files.harmonywithnatureun.org/uploads/upload112.pdf>. (accessed 29/09/2020).
70. Stevenson D; Farmer P. *Thriving at work. The Independent Review of mental health and employers.* <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/thriving-at-work-a-review-of-mental-health-and-employers> (accessed 22/08/19).
71. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Physical activity in the workplace.* <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ph13> (accessed 22/08/19).

72. Department for Work and Pensions. *Working for a healthier tomorrow*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/working-for-a-healthier-tomorrow-work-and-health-in-britain> (accessed 22/08/19).
73. National Institute of Health and Care Excellence. *Mental wellbeing at work*. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ph22> (accessed 22/08/19).
74. Department for Business Innovation and Skills. *Does worker wellbeing affect workplace performance?* <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/worker-wellbeing-and-workplace-performance> (accessed 22/08/19).
75. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Workplace health: management practices*. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng13> (accessed 22/08/19).
76. Department of Health and Social Care. *Preventing suicide in England: a cross-government outcomes strategy to save lives*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/suicide-prevention-strategy-for-england> (accessed 22/08/19).
77. Endsley MR. Towards a New Paradigm for Automation: Designing for Situation Awareness. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes* 1995;28(15):365-70. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-6670\(17\)45259-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-6670(17)45259-1).
78. Hamdan M, Abu Hamra A. Workplace violence towards workers in the emergency departments of Palestinian hospitals: a cross-sectional study. *Human resources for health* 2015;13:28. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12960-015-0018-2>.
79. Health Education England. *Quality Framework*. https://www.rcpe.ac.uk/sites/default/files/files/hee_quality-framework.pdf (accessed 26/08/19).
80. Health Education England. *Facing the facts, shaping the future – a draft health and care workforce strategy for England to 2027*. <https://www.hee.nhs.uk/our-work/workforce-strategy> (accessed 22/08/19).
81. NHS England. *National NHS Staff Survey 2018 in England*. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/2019/02/26/2018-national-nhs-staff-survey-in-england/> (accessed 27/09/2020).
82. NHS Providers. *NHS Staff Survey 2019, National results briefing*. <https://nhsproviders.org/resource-library/briefings/on-the-day-briefing-nhs-staff-survey-results-2019> (accessed 21/01/2022).
83. NHS Employers. *Workforce health and wellbeing framework*. https://www.nhsemployers.org/-/media/Employers/Publications/Health-and-wellbeing/NHS-Workforce-HWB-Framework_updated-July-18.pdf (accessed 26/08/19).
84. NHS England; NHS Improvement; Health Education England. *We are the NHS: People Plan 2020/21 -action for us all*. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/We-Are-The-NHS-Action-For-All-Of-Us-FINAL-March-21.pdf> (accessed 21/01/2022).
85. Helou MA, DiazGranados D, Ryan MS, et al. Uncertainty in Decision Making in Medicine: A Scoping Review and Thematic Analysis of Conceptual Models. *Academic Medicine* 2020;95(1):157-65. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1097/acm.0000000000002902>.
86. Panari C, Caricati L, Pelosi A, et al. Emotional exhaustion among healthcare professionals: the effects of role ambiguity, work engagement and professional commitment. *Acta bio-medica : Atenei Parmensis* 2019;90(6-S):60-67. doi: <https://doi.org/10.23750/abm.v90i6-S.8481>.
87. Duarte D, El-Hagrassy MM, Couto TCE, et al. Male and Female Physician Suicidality: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2020;77(6):1-11. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1001%2Fjamapsychiatry.2020.0011>.
88. Clough BA, March S, Leane S, et al. What prevents doctors from seeking help for stress and burnout? A mixed-methods investigation among metropolitan and regional-based Australian doctors. *J Clin Psychol* 2019;75(3):418-32. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22707>.

89. Maeckelbergh ELM. Doctors and medical students as non-smoking role models? Using the right arguments. *European Journal of Public Health* 2013;23(2):190-92. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckt003>.
90. Tzortziou Brown V, McCartney M, Heneghan C. Appraisal and revalidation for UK doctors—time to assess the evidence. *BMJ* 2020;370:m3415. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m3415>.
91. Frischer M. Trends in morbidity and general practitioners' workload for middle-aged and elderly people from 1956 to 1982. *Journal of Public Health* 1991;13(3):198-203. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.pubmed.a042618>.
92. Papanicolas I, Mossialos E, Gundersen A, et al. Performance of UK National Health Service compared with other high income countries: observational study. *BMJ* 2019;367:l6326. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l6326>.
93. NHS Digital. *NHS Hospital and Community Health Services (HCHS): HCHS doctors by gender, in NHS Trusts and CCGs in England, as at 30 September each year, 2009 to 2018, headcount*. <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/nhs-workforce-statistics/september-2018> (accessed 27/09/2020).
94. Burnett SJ, Deelchand V, Franklin BD, et al. Missing Clinical Information in NHS hospital outpatient clinics: prevalence, causes and effects on patient care. *BMC Health Services Research* 2011;11(1):114. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-11-114>.
95. Brady KJS, Trockel MT, Khan CT, et al. What Do We Mean by Physician Wellness? A Systematic Review of Its Definition and Measurement. *Acad Psychiatry* 2018;42(1):94-108. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-017-0781-6>.
96. Scheepers RA, Boerebach BC, Arah OA, et al. A Systematic Review of the Impact of Physicians' Occupational Well-Being on the Quality of Patient Care. *Int J Behav Med* 2015;22(6):683-98. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007%2Fs12529-015-9473-3>.
97. Weber EJ, Mason S, Freeman JV, et al. Implications of England's Four-Hour Target for Quality of Care and Resource Use in the Emergency Department. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 2012;60(6):699-706. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annemergmed.2012.08.009>.
98. Wise J. Survey of UK doctors highlights blame culture within the NHS. *BMJ* 2018;362:k4001. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.k4001>.
99. Mahase E. GPs are being blamed for government failures in primary care, say doctors. *BMJ* 2021;374:n2234. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n2234>.
100. General Medical Council. *Factsheet: Dr Bawa-Garba's case*. https://www.gmc-uk.org/-/media/documents/20180419-factsheet---dr-bawa-garba-case-final_pdf-74385491.pdf (accessed 07/10/2021).
101. Iacobucci G. Man charged after assaulting staff at GP surgery. *BMJ* 2021;374:n2316. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n2316>.
102. O'Dowd A. Funding boost aims to expand England's medical school places. *BMJ* 2021;374:n1998. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n1998>.
103. Rimmer A. Junior doctor strikes had a "significant impact" on services but did not increase deaths, study finds. *BMJ* 2018;360:k782. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.k782>.
104. House of Commons Library. *Pension tax rules - impact on NHS consultants and GPs*. <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-8626/CBP-8626.pdf> (accessed 07/10/2021).
105. Health Education England. *Enhancing Junior Doctors' working lives: A progress report*. https://www.hee.nhs.uk/sites/default/files/documents/EJDWL_Report_June%2020%20FINA_L.pdf (accessed 26/08/19).
106. Kinman G; Teoh K. *What could make a difference to the mental health of UK doctors? A review of the research evidence*. https://www.som.org.uk/sites/som.org.uk/files/What_could_make_a_difference_to_the_mental_health_of_UK_doctors_LTF_SOM.pdf (accessed 26/08/19).

107. General Medical Council. *Training environments 2018: Key findings from the National Training Surveys*. https://www.gmc-uk.org/media/documents/training-environments-2018_pdf-76667101.pdf (accessed 26/08/19).