

1 Sustained negative mental health outcomes among healthcare workers over the 2 first year of the COVID-19 pandemic: a prospective cohort study

3
4 Roberto Mediavilla^{1,2,3,*}, Eduardo Fernández-Jiménez^{4,3}, Irene Martínez-Morata^{5,6}, Fabiola
5 Jaramillo^{7,8}, Jorge Andreo-Jover^{3,1}, Inés Morán-Sánchez^{9,6}, Franco Mascayano^{10,11}, Berta
6 Moreno-Küstner^{12,13,14}, Sergio Minué⁷, José Luis Ayuso-Mateos^{1,2,15}, Richard A. Bryant¹⁶,
7 María-Fe Bravo-Ortiz^{4,1,2,3,†}, Gonzalo Martínez-Alés^{10,3,†} and the COVID-19 HEalth caRe
8 wOrkErS – Spain (HEROES-SPA) Group[§]
9

- 10 1. Department of Psychiatry, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Madrid, Spain
- 11 2. Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red (CIBERSAM), Madrid, Spain
- 12 3. Hospital La Paz Institute for Health Research (IdiPAZ), Madrid, Spain
- 13 4. Department of Psychiatry, Clinical Psychology and Mental Health, Hospital
14 Universitario La Paz, Madrid, Spain
- 15 5. Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Columbia University Mailman School
16 of Public Health, New York, NY, United States
- 17 6. Institute for Biomedical Research of Murcia (IMIB-Arrixaca), Murcia, Spain
- 18 7. Andalusian School of Public Health, Andalusia, Spain
- 19 8. Program of Mental Health, Universidad de Chile, Santiago de Chile, Chile
- 20 9. Cartagena Mental Health Centre, Health Service of Murcia, Murcia, Spain
- 21 10. Department of Epidemiology, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health,
22 New York, NY, United States
- 23 11. New York State Psychiatric Institute, New York, NY, United States
- 24 12. Department of Personality, Assessment and Psychological Treatment, University of
25 Malaga, Malaga, Spain
- 26 13. Andalusian Group of Psychosocial Research (GAP), Andalusia, Spain
- 27 14. Biomedical Research Institute of Malaga (IBIMA), Malaga, Spain
- 28 15. Department of Psychiatry, La Princesa University Hospital, Instituto de Investigación
29 Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Madrid, Spain
- 30 16. School of Psychology, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia

31
32 † These authors share senior authorship

33
34 § The COVID-19 HEalth caRe wOrkErS – Spain (HEROES-SPA) Group includes Esther
35 Ortiz-Calvo, Elisabeth González-Gómez, Ainoa Muñoz-Sanjose, Mario Rivera-Izquierdo,
36 Cristina García Román, José Guzmán-Parra, Pablo Lorenzo Herrero, Ernesto Cañada,
37 Matilde Blanco Venzalá, Agustín Sánchez, Eulalio Valmisa, Juan José Macheño, Marta
38 Cañadilla Ferreira, Isabel López Tovar, M. Pilar Campos Navarro, Alicia Ibáñez Ros,
39 Domingo A. Sánchez Martínez, Pablo Madrigal, José A. Guardiola, Santiago Serrano, M.
40 Korina Bethencourt, Pedro A. López Romero, Eduardo Estrella, Marina Martínez Morata,
41 Marta Cañadilla Ferreira, Domingo Sánchez Martínez and Ángela Egea
42

43 * Correspondence should be address to Roberto Mediavilla (roberto.mediavilla@uam.es).
44 Department of Psychiatry, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Arzobispo Morcillo, 4,
45 28029, Madrid, Spain

46

Abstract

47

48 *Objective:* To characterize the evolution of healthcare workers' mental health status over the
49 1-year period following the initial COVID-19 pandemic outbreak and to examine baseline
50 characteristics associated with resolution or persistence of mental health problems over time.

51 *Methods:* We conducted an 8-month follow-up cohort study. Eligible participants were
52 healthcare workers working in Spain. Baseline data were collected during the initial pandemic
53 outbreak. Survey-based self-reported measures included COVID-19-related exposures,
54 sociodemographic characteristics, and three mental health outcomes (psychological distress,
55 depression symptoms, and posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms). We examined three
56 longitudinal trajectories in mental health outcomes between baseline and follow-up
57 assessments (namely *asymptomatic/stable*, *recovering*, and *persistently*
58 *symptomatic/worsening*).

59 *Results:* We recruited 1,807 participants. Between baseline and follow-up assessments, the
60 proportion of respondents screening positive for psychological distress and probable
61 depression decreased, respectively, from 74% to 56% and from 28% to 21%. Two-thirds
62 remained asymptomatic/stable in terms of depression symptoms and 56% remained
63 symptomatic or worsened over time in terms of psychological distress.

64 *Conclusions:* Poor mental health outcomes among healthcare workers persisted over time.
65 Occupational programs and mental health strategies should be put in place.

66

67 *Keywords:* healthcare workers; anxiety; depression; mental health; COVID-19; prospective
68 cohort

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

69 The COVID-19 pandemic outbreak has had substantial mental health impact on healthcare
70 workers (HCWs), largely due to increases in healthcare capacity requirements driving job
71 redeployments and extended working hours in combination with very high risk of contagion
72 and death. Estimates from cross-sectional studies conducted during the initial pandemic
73 outbreak suggest that between 25 and 50% of HCWs may have experienced clinically
74 significant symptoms of anxiety or depression (1–7) and posttraumatic stress (1,3,7).

75
76 The extent to which the deleterious mental health effects brought about by the initial pandemic
77 outbreak may have subsequently led to negative mid- and long-term mental health outcomes
78 among HCWs. However, these remain largely unexplored, despite important public health and
79 clinical implications (8). Initially, it seemed plausible that a large proportion of the burden of
80 mental health symptoms initially reported by HCWs would eventually resolve, either
81 following cessation of exposure to the acute stressor or after adequate targeted interventions
82 (e.g., self-care and low-intensity psychotherapeutic interventions). Nevertheless, because the
83 initial pandemic outbreak has been followed by a series of ongoing subsequent pandemic
84 waves that continue to strain health systems across the globe, there is a generalized concern
85 that a substantial proportion of HCWs may be experiencing persistent mental health problems.
86 According to the World Health Organization, reducing the long-term mental health impact of
87 the pandemic on HCWs is considered a major clinical and public health priority. Estimating
88 the mid- and long-term mental health impact of the COVID-19 pandemic among HCWs is
89 paramount for occupational and mental healthcare planning purposes. In addition, identifying
90 risk and protective factors for persistence of clinically significant mental health burden can
91 help improve implementation of evidence-based detection and treatment strategies.
92 Notwithstanding, evidence examining prevalence and predictors of persistence of mental
93 health symptoms among HCWs from longitudinal cohort studies is scarce (9–12).

94
95 Here we used a large sample of HCWs during the one-year period following the initial
96 pandemic outbreak in one of the largest COVID-19 hotspots globally to (1) characterize the
97 evolution of HCWs' mental health status over the year following the initial pandemic
98 outbreak, and (2) examine baseline sociodemographic and clinical characteristics associated
99 with resolution or persistence of mental health problems over time.

100

101

Methods

102

Study design, setting, and participants

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

We conducted a prospective cohort study in Spain as part of an ongoing longitudinal multi-national study (<https://mentalnet.ci/en/home/>). We collected data through an online survey at two timepoints. Baseline assessments were performed from April 24th to June 22nd, 2020 (during the initial pandemic outbreak in Spain). Follow-up assessments took place between January 26th and March 8th, 2021, which in Spain coincided with the third pandemic wave and with administration of COVID-19 vaccines for the majority of HCWs.

The study participants were HCWs aged 18 years and older, recruited from different outpatient and inpatient healthcare facilities, with clinical and non-clinical duties, and not necessarily involved in the direct care of COVID-19 patients. The sampling strategy was as follows. During both the baseline and follow-up assessments, key stakeholders (e.g., hospital managers, heads of worker unions) from healthcare facilities located in the study regions (Andalusia, Madrid, and Murcia) forwarded the survey link to all HCWs. Participants were also asked to forward the survey to peers in order to enhance response rates. In addition, during the follow-up period, we sent email or telephone survey reminders to baseline participants. Baseline assessments are described elsewhere (13). In this manuscript, we focus on participants who were assessed at follow-up only and on participants assessed at follow-up who had been assessed also during baseline procedures. We hereafter refer to these two subgroups as *partial* and *full respondents*, respectively.

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

124

125 All procedures contributing to this work comply with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as
126 revised in 2013. It received approval from the Hospital La Paz Ethics Committee (Madrid,
127 Spain) and was ratified by the local ethics committees from the participating sites.

128

129 *Variables*

130

131 Baseline assessments included the following COVID-19-related exposures: direct involvement
132 in the care of COVID-19 patients (yes, no), adequate access to personal protective equipment,
133 fear of getting infected, and fear of infecting loved ones (all rated from 0 to 3).

134

135 Both baseline and follow-up assessments included the following sociodemographic and
136 mental health outcome variables.

137

138 *Sociodemographic variables:* Age in years, gender (male, female), educational level (primary,
139 secondary, or university studies), and type of job. We collapsed job types into the following
140 categories: physicians, nurses, health technicians (e.g., nurse, X-ray, and laboratory
141 technicians), ancillary workers (e.g., security staff, drivers, administrative staff, and cleaning
142 staff), other HCWs (e.g., clinical psychologists, physiotherapists, and biologists), and
143 residential support workers (e.g., from mental health assisted living facilities, nursing homes).

144

145 *Mental health outcomes:* Psychological stress, as measured by the Spanish version of the 12-
146 item General Health Questionnaire (14); and probable depression symptoms, as measured by
147 the Spanish version of the 9-item Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) (15). We used widely
148 accepted thresholds for detecting people screening positive for psychological distress (GHQ-
149 12 higher than 2 points) (16,17) and for depression (PHQ-9 score higher than 9 points) (18). In
150 addition, follow-up assessments also included posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD)
151 symptoms, as measured by the Spanish 5-item version of the Primary Care PTSD Screen for
152 DSM-5 (PC-PTSD-5), where a total score higher than 2 points suggests probable PTSD (19).

153

154 Cronbach's alphas were 0.87 (95 percent CI: 0.86, 0.88) for the GHQ-12 total score; 0.89 (95
155 percent CI: 0.88, 0.89) for the PHQ-9 total score; and 0.70 (95 percent CI: 0.68, 0.72) for the
156 PC-PTSD-5. To control for region-level cumulative COVID-19 incidence, we calculated
157 region-specific 14-day cumulative incidence rates 2, 4, 6, and 8 weeks after the start of the
158 follow-up period and, as rates were stable over time, classified regions as "high" or "low"
159 incidence depending on whether average cumulative incidence over time points fell under or
160 over 750 cases per 100,000 based on visual examination of region-specific cumulative
161 incidence rates (**Supplementary Figures 1 and 2**).

162

163 *Statistical analyses*

164

165 First, we removed baseline respondents who provided informed consent but did not go on to
166 initiate the survey (n = 95). We reported categorical variables as frequencies and valid
167 percentages, and continuous and interval variables as either mean (standard deviation [SD]),
168 or median (interquartile range [IQR]). Descriptive statistics were calculated separately for full
169 and partial respondents.

170

171 Then, we used multivariable mixed-effects linear and binary logistic regression models to
172 explore the associations between baseline variables, including sociodemographic
173 characteristics (i.e., age, gender, and educational level) and COVID-19-related exposures (i.e.,
174 direct involvement in the care of COVID-19 patients, adequate access to personal protective
175 equipment, fear of getting infected, and fear of infecting loved ones), and follow-up mental
176 health outcomes (i.e., psychological distress, depression symptoms, and PTSD symptoms),
177 defined both as continuous questionnaire scores and dichotomous variables. We conducted
178 sensitivity analyses adjusted by baseline assessments of the follow-up outcome under

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

179 consideration. We used baseline GHQ-12 score for the model where follow-up PTSD was the
180 outcome, as we did not have estimates for the latter in the baseline assessment. The GHQ-12
181 score, an instrument that has good convergent validity with the PC-PTSD-5 and accurately
182 detects PTSD in primary care settings (20).

183

184 Next, we used baseline and follow-up mental health outcomes to categorize respondents into
185 three mental health trajectories, separately for psychological distress and for depression,
186 according to whether they screened negative at baseline and follow-up (*asymptomatic stable*),
187 positive at baseline and negative at follow-up (*recovering*), or positive or negative at baseline
188 and positive at follow-up (*persistently symptomatic/worsening*). For instance, if a respondent
189 screened negative in the GHQ-12 and positive in the PHQ-9 at baseline, and subsequently
190 screened positive in the GHQ-12 and negative in the PHQ-9 at follow-up, they would belong
191 to the *persistently symptomatic/worsening* trajectory for psychological distress and to the
192 *recovering* trajectory for depression. We selected these trajectory categories because of their
193 potential implications for clinical practice.

194

195 Finally, we explored the association between baseline exposures and longitudinal
196 psychological distress and depression trajectory membership, using multinomial regression
197 models where *asymptomatic stable* was considered the reference category. Baseline exposures
198 were age group, gender, educational level, direct involvement in the care of COVID-19
199 patients, adequate access to personal protective equipment (adequate vs. inadequate), fear of
200 getting infected (not or slightly afraid vs. considerably or extremely afraid), and fear of
201 infecting loved ones (not or slightly afraid vs. considerably or extremely afraid).

202

203 All models were adjusted by covariates to control for confounding based on prior causal
204 knowledge, using direct acyclic graphs and backdoor criteria (21). Region-level cumulative
205 incidence of COVID-19 was entered in all models as a fixed factor. We did not impute
206 missing data. All analyses were performed using packages *dplyr*, *gtsummary*, *flextable*,
207 *ggplot2*, *psych*, *multinom* of R Studio for Mac (Version 1.2.5042).

208

209 Results

210

211 Of 1,807 respondents who answered the survey at follow-up (between January 26th-March
212 25th, 2021), 1,471 (81.4%) completed the entire survey, with a median response time of 21
213 minutes. Most missing data pertained to the last section of the questionnaire, suggesting that
214 data missingness was driven by survey extension and hence largely random. Respondents who
215 did and did not complete the survey were comparable in terms of mean age (42 vs. 40 years,
216 respectively) and gender distribution (78% vs. 74% female, respectively). Response rates were
217 estimated across facilities and job types and ranged from 2.7% to 100% (see **Supplementary**
218 **Tables 1 and 2**).

219

220 There were 1,058 (59%) partial respondents (i.e., assessed only at follow-up) and 749 (41%)
221 full respondents (i.e., assessed at both baseline and follow-up). Of note, this indicates that we
222 retained 32% of the 2,370 original baseline respondents for follow-up assessments (see **Figure**
223 **1**). Sociodemographic characteristics of follow-up respondents, overall and divided into full
224 and partial respondents, are shown in **Table 1**. In short, full respondents were more frequently
225 female and more likely to have completed university studies than partial respondents. Also,
226 while most full respondents were physicians or nurses, partial respondents included a larger
227 proportion of residential support workers.

228

229 Overall, 56% of follow-up respondents screened positive for psychological distress, 21% for
230 probable depression, and 51% for PTSD. Psychological distress, probable depression, and
231 PTSD were more frequent among younger and female respondents, and respondents with
232 higher educational levels – with substantial heterogeneity across specific job types (see
233 **Supplementary Table 3**). Notably, follow-up mental health outcomes were comparable

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

234 between full and partial respondents, with similar mean (SD) GHQ-12 score (3.9 [3.5] vs. 3.8
235 [3.4], respectively), mean (SD) PHQ-9 score (6.3 [5.1] vs. 6.4 [3.4], respectively), proportion
236 of respondents screening positive for psychological distress (56% vs. 55%, respectively), and
237 proportion of respondents screening positive for probable depression (21% vs. 21%,
238 respectively).

239
240 Comparisons between baseline and follow-up mental health outcomes among full respondents
241 are shown in **Table 2**. The proportion of respondents screening positive for psychological
242 distress and probable depression decreased, respectively, from 74% to 56% and from 28% to
243 21%. **Figure 2** shows the distribution of trajectories of depression symptoms and
244 psychological distress over time, overall and across baseline covariates. Trajectories show
245 that, in terms of depression symptoms, 66% respondents remained asymptomatic/stable, 15%
246 recovered, and 19% remained symptomatic or worsened over time. In terms of psychological
247 distress, 18% respondents remained asymptomatic/stable, 26% recovered, and 56% remained
248 symptomatic or worsened over time. The distribution of trajectories was heterogeneous across
249 baseline covariates.

250
251 **Table 3** shows crude and adjusted estimates of the association between baseline exposures and
252 follow-up mental health outcome scores among full respondents. Overall, women had higher
253 scores (i.e., worse mental health) than men, and job-related factors such as direct involvement
254 in the care of COVID-19, inadequate access to protective equipment, or fear of infecting
255 oneself or loved ones were associated with higher negative mental health outcome scores -
256 especially for PTSD, and with higher odds of testing positive for psychological distress,
257 probable depression, and PTSD (see **Supplementary Table 4**). We repeated all models
258 including further adjustment by baseline mental health outcome scores: results did not change
259 substantially (see **Supplementary Tables 5 and 6**).

260
261 **Table 4** shows crude and adjusted associations between baseline exposures and trajectory
262 membership for psychological distress and probable depression. Women showed higher
263 symptom variability over time than men, as indicated by women's higher odds of belonging to
264 both the *recovering* and the *persistently symptomatic/worsening* categories for both
265 psychological distress and probable depression. In terms of psychological distress, reporting
266 inadequate access to personal protective equipment was associated with *persistently*
267 *symptomatic/worsening* category membership. In terms of probable depression, fear of
268 infecting loved ones was associated with *recovering* category membership.

269

270

Discussion

271

272 This study followed a cohort of HCWs from one of the earliest COVID-19 pandemic hotspots
273 over the one-year period after the initial pandemic outbreak. There was marked heterogeneity
274 across individuals in terms of variation in mental health outcomes over time. While we
275 detected general reductions in psychological distress (from 74 to 56%) and depression
276 symptoms (from 28 to 21%), the overall burden of poor mental health among HCWs remained
277 substantial 8 months after the pandemic onset (56% screened positive for psychological
278 distress, 21% for probable depression, and 51% for PTSD). Our analysis of mental health
279 outcome trajectories revealed that psychological distress and depression symptoms persisted
280 or worsened over time for 56% and 19% of respondents, respectively. We identified
281 prospective associations between certain baseline characteristics, such as being female,
282 reporting inadequate access to personal protective equipment, or being afraid of getting
283 infected and of infecting loved ones, and follow-up psychological distress, depression
284 symptoms, and PTSD symptoms. These results highlight the importance of adapting,
285 implementing, and scaling-up evidence-based public, occupational, and mental health
286 interventions for HCWs to prevent their mental health from further deteriorating during the
287 ongoing pandemic and its aftermath.

288

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

289 Early cross-sectional studies from high-incidence COVID-19 areas, such as the Chinese
290 region of Wuhan (22), Italy (3,5), or Spain (1), described the mental health toll taken by the
291 pandemic on HCWs' mental health, showing remarkable rates of psychological distress,
292 anxiety, depression, and PTSD symptoms. In our study sample, estimates of the point
293 prevalence of depression at baseline were similar than those found in Italy (25%) and Spain
294 (28%), probably due to similar sample characteristics and study settings. Likewise, our
295 baseline finding that three in four respondents were psychologically distressed is nearly
296 identical to that of Lai and colleagues in Wuhan at the beginning of the pandemic (late
297 January 2020). Additionally, a series of cross-sectional studies had already reported
298 associations between HCWs' characteristics, such as female gender, or inadequate access to
299 personal protective equipment and negative mental health outcomes (i.e., anxiety or
300 depression) (23–25). Our study found these associations to persist within a prospective cohort
301 design, lowering the risk of potential reverse causation bias and hence greatly enhancing
302 interpretability for decision-making.

303
304 Other prospective studies have sought to describe the evolution of HCWs' negative mental
305 health outcomes over time using a variety of outcomes and follow-up periods (9–12,25–28).
306 Somewhat in contrast to our results, López Steinmez and colleagues reported a slight increase
307 in psychological distress (from 40% to 46% point prevalence) between May and September,
308 2020, in a sample of 300 HCWs from Buenos Aires, Argentina. Differences in follow-up time
309 probably accounts for this between-study difference, as they may have captured the early
310 consequences of the initial pandemic outbreak while we conducted our assessments later,
311 when renovated reasons for optimism (e.g., vaccine development and roll-out) had already
312 started to emerge. Using a highly homogeneous sample of 200 nurses, Pinho and colleagues
313 reported stable trends in depression and decreasing trends in anxiety between April and
314 November, 2020. Differences in sample composition make their results hardly comparable to
315 our's. Other studies have either used much shorter follow-up periods (25,27,28) or reported
316 outcomes not comparable to our's, such as insomnia (26) or job stress (12). Our's is the first
317 prospective cohort analysis of risk factors for negative mental health outcomes among HCWs
318 to adjust all associations of interest for potential confounding due to area-level COVID-19
319 cumulative incidence, in addition to adjustment for individual-level confounding. Notably,
320 mounting evidence suggests higher rates of negative mental health outcomes among HCWs
321 from regions with higher incidence (29).

322
323 To our knowledge, only one study has described the trajectories of mental health problems
324 among HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic (9). Using latent class modelling based on
325 scores on three mental health outcomes (depression, anxiety, and PTSD symptoms) between
326 May and September, 2020, they found four distinct trajectories which are remarkably similar
327 to ours in terms of interpretation and prevalence within the study sample: 19% respondents
328 belonged to their 'recovered' group (for 15% in our *recovering* group), 66% to their 'resilient'
329 group (for 66% in our *asymptomatic stable* group), and 7% and 8%, respectively, to their 'sub-
330 chronic' and 'delayed' groups (for 19% in our *symptomatic/worsening* group). These same
331 trajectories have been identified in studies using latent growth mixture modelling across many
332 different populations that have experienced adversity (30). Notably, this previous study did
333 not assess psychological distress. Accordingly, our surprisingly high rates of persistence or
334 worsening of psychological distress (56% of respondents) cannot be compared to other
335 studies. While this result does not lend itself to easy interpretation until subsequent follow-up
336 studies using the GHQ-12 emerge, it seems plausible that a substantial proportion of HCWs
337 may potentially benefit from implementation of programs to lower psychological distress.

338
339 In addition to confirming associations previously reported in cross-sectional reports, our
340 findings expand existing evidence in impactful ways for public health and clinical decision-
341 making. First, by including a heterogeneous sample of HCWs with and without clinical duties,
342 our study may serve to inform strategies aimed at non-clinical workers such as administrators
343 or cleaners – largely overlooked in most studies examining mental health outcomes among

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

344 HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic. Second, our finding of scarce evidence of reliable
345 baseline predictors of mental health outcome trajectories over time suggests that all HCWs
346 should be offered easy-to-access mental health resources tailored to their needs (i.e., self-care
347 and low-intensity psychotherapeutic interventions), regardless of profile in terms of
348 sociodemographic characteristics and baseline clinical features.

349
350 Our study has limitations. First, we used a non-random sample that increases probability of
351 some degree of collider bias and hinders transportability of study results across settings. Also,
352 and in line with other multi-center studies (1,4), response rates varied significantly across sites
353 and facilities, and the possibility of self-selection bias cannot be ruled out. Nevertheless, the
354 baseline sociodemographic characteristics and mental health outcomes were however similar
355 to another Spanish study with a larger and somewhat more representative sample of HCWs (1)
356 and to other, similar European studies (2,3). Second, because of the use of observational data,
357 effect estimates are potentially subject to some degree of residual confounding. Notably,
358 substantial residual confounding is unlikely given that we included measures on all major
359 individual- and region-level confounders and that estimates from crude and adjusted
360 associations are roughly similar. Moreover, sensitivity analyses exploring differences between
361 subsamples (e.g., full vs. partial respondents) and adjusting for baseline measurements of
362 mental health outcomes obtained similar results, suggesting that our models were robust to
363 different model specifications. Third, two thirds of baseline respondents were lost to follow-
364 up. Dropout was independent from age, gender, and mental health outcomes at baseline, but
365 people lost to follow were slightly more concerned about getting the virus and infecting their
366 loved ones (data not shown). Fourth, limitations of self-reports for diagnostic screening are
367 widely known (31). In the context of HCWs' reactions to an initial pandemic outbreak,
368 available diagnostic thresholds might have misclassified early, adaptive reactions to acute
369 stressors as probable disorders (i.e., false positives). Notwithstanding, we used widely
370 accepted screening instruments with good psychometric properties validated worldwide. Last,
371 we calculated outcome trajectories based on information from two time points only. Future
372 steps will include ascertainment of mental health outcomes in subsequent follow-up
373 assessments and adoption of data-driven latent growth modelling approaches in addition to
374 previously established categories based on clinical implications.

375
376 This is the first study to describe the trajectories of change of a large sample of HCWs from an
377 early pandemic hotspot over a long follow-up period. Our results suggest preventative and
378 restorative strategies at various levels (i.e., public, occupational, and specialized mental
379 health), and outlines modifiable factors that might inform resource allocation, such as
380 provision of protective equipment or being in direct care of COVID-19 patients. Further
381 studies exploring the long-term impact of the pandemic among HCWs are warranted.

382

383

References

384

- 385 1. Alonso J, Vilagut G, Mortier P, Ferrer M, Alayo I, Aragón-Peña A, et al. Mental health
386 impact of the first wave of COVID-19 pandemic on Spanish healthcare workers: A large
387 cross-sectional survey. *Revista de Psiquiatría y Salud Mental*. 1 de abril de
388 2021;14(2):90-105.
- 389 2. Azoulay E, Cariou A, Bruneel F, Demoule A, Kouatchet A, Reuter D, et al. Symptoms
390 of Anxiety, Depression, and Peritraumatic Dissociation in Critical Care Clinicians
391 Managing Patients with COVID-19. A Cross-Sectional Study. *Am J Respir Crit Care*
392 *Med*. 15 de noviembre de 2020;202(10):1388-98.
- 393 3. Lasalvia A, Bonetto C, Porru S, Carta A, Tardivo S, Bovo C, et al. Psychological impact
394 of COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare workers in a highly burdened area of north-east
395 Italy. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences* [Internet]. ed de 2021 [citado 15 de abril
396 de 2021];30. Disponible en: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/epidemiology->

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

- 397 and-psychiatric-sciences/article/psychological-impact-of-covid19-pandemic-on
398 healthcare-workers-in-a-highly-burdened-area-of-northeast-
399 italy/E112BA22EEFDD73599534AC313CA531F
- 400 4. Morawa E, Schug C, Geiser F, Beschoner P, Jerg-Bretzke L, Albus C, et al.
401 Psychosocial burden and working conditions during the COVID-19 pandemic in
402 Germany: The VOICE survey among 3678 health care workers in hospitals. *J*
403 *Psychosom Res.* mayo de 2021;144:110415.
- 404 5. Rossi R, Soggi V, Pacitti F, Lorenzo GD, Marco AD, Siracusano A, et al. Mental Health
405 Outcomes Among Frontline and Second-Line Health Care Workers During the
406 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic in Italy. *JAMA Netw Open.* 1 de
407 mayo de 2020;3(5):e2010185-e2010185.
- 408 6. Santabárbara J, Bueno-Notivol J, Lipnicki DM, Olaya B, Pérez-Moreno M, Gracia-
409 García P, et al. Prevalence of anxiety in health care professionals during the COVID-19
410 pandemic: A rapid systematic review (on published articles in Medline) with meta-
411 analysis. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry.* 20 de abril
412 de 2021;107:110244.
- 413 7. Wanigasooriya K, Palimar P, Naumann DN, Ismail K, Fellows JL, Logan P, et al.
414 Mental health symptoms in a cohort of hospital healthcare workers following the first
415 peak of the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK. *BJPsych Open* [Internet]. enero de 2021
416 [citado 4 de mayo de 2021];7(1). Disponible en:
417 [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/bjpsych-open/article/mental-health-symptoms-](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/bjpsych-open/article/mental-health-symptoms-in-a-cohort-of-hospital-healthcare-workers-following-the-first-peak-of-the-covid19-pandemic-in-the-uk/06754995A1AF38162808CA5D08D09134)
418 [in-a-cohort-of-hospital-healthcare-workers-following-the-first-peak-of-the-covid19-](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/bjpsych-open/article/mental-health-symptoms-in-a-cohort-of-hospital-healthcare-workers-following-the-first-peak-of-the-covid19-pandemic-in-the-uk/06754995A1AF38162808CA5D08D09134)
419 [pandemic-in-the-uk/06754995A1AF38162808CA5D08D09134](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/bjpsych-open/article/mental-health-symptoms-in-a-cohort-of-hospital-healthcare-workers-following-the-first-peak-of-the-covid19-pandemic-in-the-uk/06754995A1AF38162808CA5D08D09134)
- 420 8. Ayuso-Mateos JL, Mediavilla R, Rodriguez KR, Bravo MF. Informing the response to
421 COVID-19 in Spain: priorities for mental health research. *Revista de Psiquiatría y Salud*
422 *Mental.* 1 de abril de 2021;14(2):79-82.
- 423 9. Dufour M-M, Bergeron N, Rabasa A, Guay S, Geoffrion S. Assessment of Psychological
424 Distress in Health-care Workers during and after the First Wave of COVID-19: A
425 Canadian Longitudinal Study: Évaluation de la Détresse Psychologique Chez Les
426 Travailleurs de la Santé Durant et Après la Première Vague de la COVID-19: une étude
427 longitudinale canadienne. *Can J Psychiatry.* 14 de junio de 2021;7067437211025217.
- 428 10. López Steinmetz LC, Herrera CR, Fong SB, Godoy JC. A Longitudinal Study on the
429 Changes in Mental Health of Healthcare Workers during the COVID-19 Pandemic.
430 *Psychiatry.* 30 de julio de 2021;1-16.
- 431 11. Pinho L, Correia T, Sampaio F, Sequeira C, Teixeira L, Lopes M, et al. The use of
432 mental health promotion strategies by nurses to reduce anxiety, stress, and depression
433 during the COVID-19 outbreak: A prospective cohort study. *Environ Res.* abril de
434 2021;195:110828.
- 435 12. Sasaki N, Asaoka H, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Imamura K, Kawakami N. Sustained poor
436 mental health among healthcare workers in COVID-19 pandemic: A longitudinal
437 analysis of the four-wave panel survey over 8 months in Japan. *J Occup Health.* enero de
438 2021;63(1):e12227.
- 439 13. Mediavilla R, Fernández-Jiménez E, Martínez-Alés G, Moreno-Küstner B, Martínez-
440 Morata I, Jaramillo F, et al. Role of access to personal protective equipment, treatment
441 prioritization decisions, and changes in job functions on health workers' mental health

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

- 442 outcomes during the initial outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Affective*
443 *Disorders* [Internet]. 29 de agosto de 2021 [citado 31 de agosto de 2021]; Disponible en:
444 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165032721008648>
- 445 14. Sánchez-López M del P, Dresch V. The 12-item general health questionnaire (ghq-12):
446 Reliability, external validity and factor structure in the Spanish population. *Psicothema*.
447 2008;20(4):839-43.
- 448 15. Diez-Quevedo C, Rangil T, Sanchez-Planell L, Kroenke K, Spitzer RL. Validation and
449 Utility of the Patient Health Questionnaire in Diagnosing Mental Disorders in 1003
450 General Hospital Spanish Inpatients. *Psychosomatic Medicine*. agosto de
451 2001;63(4):679-86.
- 452 16. Domínguez-Salas S, Gómez-Salgado J, Andrés-Villas M, Díaz-Milanés D, Romero-
453 Martín M, Ruiz-Frutos C. Psycho-Emotional Approach to the Psychological Distress
454 Related to the COVID-19 Pandemic in Spain: A Cross-Sectional Observational Study.
455 *Healthcare*. septiembre de 2020;8(3):190.
- 456 17. Goldberg DP, Gater R, Sartorius N, Ustun TB, Piccinelli M, Gureje O, et al. The validity
457 of two versions of the GHQ in the WHO study of mental illness in general health care.
458 *Psychol Med*. enero de 1997;27(1):191-7.
- 459 18. Manea L, Gilbody S, McMillan D. Optimal cut-off score for diagnosing depression with
460 the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9): a meta-analysis. *CMAJ*. 21 de febrero de
461 2012;184(3):E191-6.
- 462 19. Prins A, Bovin MJ, Smolenski DJ, Marx BP, Kimerling R, Jenkins-Guarnieri MA, et al.
463 The Primary Care PTSD Screen for DSM-5 (PC-PTSD-5): Development and Evaluation
464 Within a Veteran Primary Care Sample. *J Gen Intern Med*. octubre de
465 2016;31(10):1206-11.
- 466 20. Ouimette P, Wade M, Prins A, Schohn M. Identifying PTSD in primary care:
467 Comparison of the Primary Care-PTSD Screen (PC-PTSD) and the General Health
468 Questionnaire-12 (GHQ). *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*. 1 de enero de 2008;22(2):337-
469 43.
- 470 21. Pearl J. [Bayesian Analysis in Expert Systems]: Comment: Graphical Models, Causality
471 and Intervention. *Statistical Science*. 1993;8(3):266-9.
- 472 22. Lai J, Ma S, Wang Y, Cai Z, Hu J, Wei N, et al. Factors Associated With Mental Health
473 Outcomes Among Health Care Workers Exposed to Coronavirus Disease 2019. *JAMA*
474 *Netw Open*. 2 de marzo de 2020;3(3):e203976-e203976.
- 475 23. Gonzalo R-M, Ana R-G, Patricia C-A, Laura A-L, Nathalia G-T, Luis C, et al. Short-
476 term emotional impact of COVID-19 pandemic on Spaniard health workers. *Journal of*
477 *Affective Disorders*. 1 de enero de 2021;278:390-4.
- 478 24. Pappa S, Ntella V, Giannakas T, Giannakoulis VG, Papoutsis E, Katsaounou P.
479 Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during the
480 COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain, Behavior, and*
481 *Immunity*. 1 de agosto de 2020;88:901-7.
- 482 25. Sampaio F, Sequeira C, Teixeira L. Impact of COVID-19 outbreak on nurses' mental
483 health: A prospective cohort study. *Environ Res*. marzo de 2021;194:110620.

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

- 484 26. Abdalla M, Chiuzan C, Shang Y, Ko G, Diaz F, Shaw K, et al. Factors Associated with
485 Insomnia Symptoms in a Longitudinal Study among New York City Healthcare Workers
486 during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 26 de agosto de
487 2021;18(17):8970.
- 488 27. Van Steenkiste E, Schoofs J, Gilis S, Messiaen P. Mental health impact of COVID-19 in
489 frontline healthcare workers in a Belgian Tertiary care hospital: a prospective
490 longitudinal study. *Acta Clin Belg*. 28 de marzo de 2021;1-8.
- 491 28. Zhou Y, Ding H, Zhang Y, Zhang B, Guo Y, Cheung T, et al. Prevalence of poor
492 psychiatric status and sleep quality among frontline healthcare workers during and after
493 the COVID-19 outbreak: a longitudinal study. *Transl Psychiatry*. 15 de abril de
494 2021;11(1):223.
- 495 29. Romero C-S, Catalá J, Delgado C, Ferrer C, Errando C, Iftimi A, et al. COVID-19
496 Psychological Impact in 3109 Healthcare workers in Spain: The PSIMCOV Group.
497 *Psychol Med*. 14 de mayo de 2020;1-14.
- 498 30. Galatzer-Levy IR, Huang SH, Bonanno GA. Trajectories of resilience and dysfunction
499 following potential trauma: A review and statistical evaluation. *Clinical Psychology*
500 *Review*. 1 de julio de 2018;63:41-55.
- 501 31. McGrady A, Lynch DJ, Nagel RW, Tamburrino M. Coherence Between Physician
502 Diagnosis and Patient Self Reports of Anxiety and Depression in Primary Care. *The*
503 *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*. junio de 2010;198(6):420-4.
- 504

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

505

Table 1.

Characteristics of the participants who underwent baseline assessment (*full respondents*) and who did not (*partial respondents*) as measured at follow-up. [The COVID-19 HEalth caRe wOrkErS (HEROES) Study, Spain, 2021]

	Baseline assessment		
	All, N = 1,807	No (partial respondents), N = 1,058	Yes (full respondents), N = 749
Age (in years), <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	42 (11)	42 (12)	42 (11)
Missing	90	46	44
Gender, n (%)			
Male	412 (23)	273 (26)	139 (19)
Female	1,368 (77)	774 (74)	594 (81)
Missing	27	11	16
Educational level			
Primary studies	18 (1.0)	10 (1.0)	8 (1.1)
Secondary studies	397 (22)	311 (30)	86 (12)
University studies	1,355 (77)	720 (69)	635 (87)
Missing	37	17	20
Type of job			
Physicians	419 (25)	169 (17)	250 (36)
Nurses	312 (18)	107 (11)	205 (30)
Health technicians ^a	86 (5)	41 (4)	45 (6)
Other HCWs ^b	268 (16)	188 (19)	80 (12)
Ancillary workers ^c	157 (9.3)	119 (12)	38 (5)
Residential support workers	367 (22)	312 (31)	55 (8)
Other	80 (5)	59 (6)	21 (3)
Missing	118	63	55

Note

All percentages are valid percentages

HCWs = healthcare workers

^a Health technicians include nurse, X-ray, or laboratory technicians, among others

^b Other HCWs include clinical psychologists, physiotherapists, or biologists, among others

^c Ancillary workers include security staff, drivers, administrative staff, or cleaning staff, among others

506

507

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

Table 2.

Mental health outcomes among *full respondents* (N = 749) at baseline and follow-up. [The COVID-19 HEalth caRe wOrkErS (HEROES) Study, Spain, 2021]

	Baseline	Follow-up
Psychological distress (GHQ-12)		
Total score, <i>M</i> (SD) ^a	5.3 (3.5)	3.9 (3.5)
Probably distressed, n (%) ^b	504 (74)	364 (56)
Missing	72	100
Depression symptoms (PHQ-9)		
Total score, <i>M</i> (SD) ^a	7.5 (5.5)	6.4 (5.1)
Probably depressed, n (%) ^b	186 (28)	137 (21)
Missing	86	110
PTSD symptoms (PC-PTSD-5) *		
Total score, <i>M</i> (SD) ^a	-	2.54 (1.62)
Probable PTSD, n (%) ^b	-	321 (52)
Missing	-	130

Note

All percentages are valid percentages

GHQ-12 = General Health Questionnaire – 12, PHQ-9 = Patient Health Questionnaire – 9, PTSD = posttraumatic stress disorder, PC-PTSD-5 = Primary Care PTSD Screen for DSM-5

^a GHQ-12 score ranges from 0 to 12; PHQ-9 score ranges from 0 to 27; PC-PTSD-5 scores range from 0 to 5

^b Cutoff scores: PHQ-9 > 9, GHQ-12 > 2, PC-PTSD-5 > 2

* PC-PTSD-5 not included at baseline assessment

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

Table 3.

Association between participants' sociodemographic characteristics and COVID-19-related exposures, measured at baseline, and mental health outcomes' total scores (psychological distress, depressive symptoms, and posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms), measured at follow-up (8 months). [The COVID-19 HEalth caRe wOrkErS (HEROES) Study, Spain, 2021]

	Psychological distress (GHQ-12)				Depression symptoms (PHQ-9)				PTSD symptoms (PC-PTSD-5)			
	Unadjusted		Adjusted		Unadjusted		Adjusted		Unadjusted		Adjusted	
	B	95 percent CI	B	95 percent CI	B	95 percent CI	B	95 percent CI	B	95 percent CI	B	95 percent CI
Age in years ^a	0.00	(-0.03, 0.02)	0.00	(-0.02, 0.03)	-0.04	(-0.08, 0)	-0.03	(-0.07, 0.01)	-0.02	(-0.04, -0.01)	-0.02	(-0.03, -0.01)
Female gender ^b	1.05	(0.32, 1.77)	1.07	(0.33, 1.8)	2.14	(1.1, 3.18)	2.06	(1, 3.11)	0.68	(0.34, 1.02)	0.64	(0.3, 0.98)
Educational level ^c	-0.22	(-0.57, 0.12)	-0.17	(-0.52, 0.18)	-0.54	(-1.02, -0.05)	-0.51	(-1, -0.02)	-0.16	(-0.32, 0)	-0.18	(-0.34, -0.02)
Frontline position ^c	0.13	(-0.42, 0.69)	-0.04	(-0.64, 0.56)	0.08	(-0.72, 0.89)	-0.51	(-1.37, 0.35)	0.46	(0.2, 0.73)	0.42	(0.13, 0.7)
Adequate access to PPE ^c	-0.53	(-0.86, -0.2)	-0.47	(-0.81, -0.14)	-1.03	(-1.5, -0.56)	-0.86	(-1.34, -0.39)	-0.37	(-0.52, -0.21)	-0.32	(-0.48, -0.16)
Fear of getting infected ^c	0.25	(-0.13, 0.63)	0.19	(-0.19, 0.58)	0.42	(-0.12, 0.96)	0.32	(-0.24, 0.87)	0.46	(0.28, 0.64)	0.44	(0.26, 0.62)
Fear of infecting loved ones ^c	0.32	(-0.02, 0.66)	0.35	(0, 0.69)	0.66	(0.17, 1.16)	0.73	(0.24, 1.23)	0.50	(0.34, 0.65)	0.50	(0.34, 0.65)

Note

GHQ-12 = General Health Questionnaire – 12 items, PHQ-9 = Patient Health Questionnaire – 9 items, PC-PTSD-5 = Primary Care PTSD Screen for DSM-5, B = beta, CI = confidence interval, PPE = personal protective equipment

^a Adjusted for gender

^b Adjusted for age

^c Adjusted for age, gender, and region-level 14-day COVID-19 cumulative incidence (fixed factor)

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers

Table 4.

Association between participants' sociodemographic characteristics and COVID-19-related exposures, measured at baseline, and the probability of belonging to the trajectories *recovering* or *persistently symptomatic/worsening* (versus *asymptomatic stable*) at follow-up. [The COVID-19 HEalth caRe wOrkErS (HEROES) Study, Spain, 2021]

	Psychological distress (GHQ-12)								Depression symptoms (PHQ-9)							
	Recovering				Persistently symptomatic / worsening				Recovering				Persistently symptomatic / worsening			
	Unadjusted		Adjusted		Unadjusted		Adjusted		Unadjusted		Adjusted		Unadjusted		Adjusted	
	OR	95 percent CI	OR	95 percent CI	OR	95 percent CI	OR	95 percent CI	OR	95 percent CI	OR	95 percent CI	OR	95 percent CI	OR	95 percent CI
18-35 years old [ref: > 50] ^a	1.06	(0.53, 2.16)	1.00	(0.49, 2.04)	0.94	(0.5, 1.76)	0.88	(0.47, 1.66)	1.53	(0.81, 2.91)	1.46	(0.76, 2.77)	1.56	(0.88, 2.77)	1.46	(0.82, 2.62)
35-50 years old [ref: > 50] ^a	0.89	(0.46, 1.7)	0.83	(0.43, 1.61)	0.69	(0.39, 1.23)	0.64	(0.36, 1.16)	1.00	(0.54, 1.87)	0.96	(0.51, 1.81)	1.04	(0.59, 1.81)	0.99	(0.56, 1.74)
Female gender [ref: male] ^b	2.54	(1.38, 4.68)	2.54	(1.38, 4.68)	2.67	(1.58, 4.5)	2.67	(1.58, 4.5)	2.24	(1.1, 4.59)	2.45	(1.16, 5.2)	3.47	(1.66, 7.25)	3.40	(1.62, 7.12)
University studies [ref: primary/secondary] ^c	1.31	(0.57, 3.02)	1.82	(0.74, 4.44)	0.87	(0.43, 1.75)	1.09	(0.52, 2.27)	0.49	(0.25, 0.96)	0.45	(0.22, 0.91)	0.49	(0.27, 0.9)	0.48	(0.25, 0.92)
Frontline position [ref: no] ^c	1.75	(1.05, 2.91)	1.14	(0.65, 2.01)	1.28	(0.82, 2.02)	0.90	(0.54, 1.49)	1.79	(1.09, 2.95)	1.43	(0.83, 2.46)	1.01	(0.66, 1.56)	0.80	(0.49, 1.29)
Adequate access to PPE [ref: inadequate] ^c	0.69	(0.41, 1.15)	0.80	(0.47, 1.37)	0.49	(0.31, 0.78)	0.57	(0.35, 0.92)	0.63	(0.38, 1.04)	0.71	(0.43, 1.19)	0.63	(0.4, 0.98)	0.72	(0.45, 1.14)
Fear of getting infected [ref: low] ^c	2.58	(1.5, 4.45)	2.22	(1.25, 3.93)	2.34	(1.44, 3.81)	2.07	(1.24, 3.45)	1.59	(0.95, 2.65)	1.42	(0.83, 2.41)	1.31	(0.83, 2.07)	1.23	(0.76, 1.98)
Fear of infecting loved ones [ref: low] ^c	0.97	(0.52, 1.82)	1.51	(0.76, 2.98)	1.09	(0.62, 1.92)	1.57	(0.85, 2.91)	1.75	(0.87, 3.5)	2.10	(1.02, 4.32)	0.97	(0.57, 1.64)	1.09	(0.62, 1.92)

Note

GHQ-12 = General Health Questionnaire – 12 items, PHQ-9 = Patient Health Questionnaire – 9 items, OR = odds ratio, CI = confidence interval, PPE = personal protective equipment

Recovering: positive screening at baseline and negative screening at follow-up; *persistently symptomatic/worsening*: positive or negative screening at baseline and positive screening at follow-up; *asymptomatic stable*: negative screening at baseline and follow-up

^a Adjusted for gender

^b Adjusted for age

^c Adjusted for age, gender, and region-level 14-day COVID-19 cumulative incidence (fixed factor)




Figure 1. Flowchart of the participants. Follow-up respondents (N = 1,807) include participants who completed both baseline and follow-up assessments (i.e., *full respondents*) and participants who completed the follow-up assessment only (i.e., *partial respondents*). [The COVID-19 HEalth caRe wOrkErS (HEROES) Study, Spain, 2021]

COVID-19 impact on healthcare workers





Figure 2. Mental health outcome trajectories of psychological distress and depression symptoms stratified by relevant variables. Trajectories include people with positive screening at baseline and negative screening at follow-up (*recovering*), people with positive or negative screening at baseline and positive screening at follow-up (*persistently symptomatic/worsening*) and people with negative screening at baseline and follow-up (*asymptomatic stable*). [The COVID-19 HEalth caRe wOrkErS (HEROES) Study, Spain, 2021]


Baseline

Follow-up




Trajectory Asymptomatic / stable Recovering Persistently symptomatic / worsening


Overall




Age group




Gender




Educational level




Direct care of COVID-19 patients



Access to PPE



Fear of getting infected



Fear of infecting loved ones

