Comment

How might the NHS protect the mental health of health-care workers after the COVID-19 crisis?

CrossMark

Throughout the COVID-19 crisis, many health-care workers have worked long hours in high-pressured novel circumstances characterised by trauma and moral dilemmas.¹ Health-care workers have contended with the risk of infection, and by extension infecting their families, with outcomes seemingly worse for some, including black, Asian, and minority ethnic staff. Additionally, remote working is likely to have had its own challenges. Some staff will undoubtedly thrive in such circumstances, but we should now plan how to identify and support those who do not.

Post-trauma social support and stressors experienced during recovery are the risk factors most strongly predictive of longer-term mental health status.² Such stressors might be directly attributable to the crisis (eg, a colleague's death) or secondary (such as relationship or employment difficulties).³

Much evidence shows that supportive managers foster better mental health.⁴ Furthermore, there are lessons from military practice⁵ that can be applied to the post-COVID-19 health-care landscape. There are four key elements in an evidence-based staff National Health Service recovery plan. First, giving thanks, both written and verbally, which acknowledges the challenging work undertaken, can foster individual resilience.6 This communication should include accurate up-to-date information about potential psychological difficulties and supports. Second, return-to-normal work interviews by supervisors who feel confident speaking about mental health. These interviews allow for a better understanding of a staff member's experiences, while identifying secondary stressors in order to collaboratively design individualised recovery plans. Such discussions reduce sickness absence in other trauma-exposed occupations.7 Third, active monitoring for anyone exposed to potentially traumatic events, particularly individuals considered to be at higher risk of developing mental health problems.8 Although such monitoring is another function of good management, evidence supports proactive case finding, which proved successful after the London bombings.⁹ An anonymous online self-check tool might encourage honest and meaningful responses while providing automated tailored feedback. Fourth, group discussions to help staff to

develop a meaningful narrative that reduces risks of harm. Schwartz rounds, a structured forum for clinical and nonclinical staff to discuss emotional and social aspects of work, are one such evidence-based model.

Successful recovery planning¹⁰ should minimise the onset of mental illness while maximising the opportunity for psychological growth.¹ Proactive managers should follow the evidence, which is both legally required and what staff deserve.

NG runs a psychological health consultancy that provides resilience training for a wide range of organisations, including a few UK National Health Service (NHS) teams. The work was supported by the UK National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Protection Research Unit in Emergency Preparedness and Response at King's College London (London, UK), in partnership with Public Health England and in collaboration with the University of East Anglia (Norwich, UK) and Newcastle University (Newcastle upon Tyne, UK). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, NIHR, UK Department of Health and Social Care, or Public Health England. All other authors declare no competing interests.

*Neil Greenberg, Samantha K Brooks, Simon Wessely, Derek K Tracy

neil.greenberg@kcl.ac.uk

The Health Protection Research Unit (NG, SKB, SW) and Cognition, Schizophrenia, and Imaging Laboratory, Department of Psychosis Studies (DK), Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology, and Neuroscience, King's College London, London SE5 8AF, UK; and Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK (DK)

- 1 Greenberg N, Docherty M, Gnanapragasam S, Wessely S. Managing mental health challenges faced by healthcare workers during covid-19 pandemic. *BMJ* 2020; **368:** m1211.
- 2 Ozer EJ, Best SR, Lipsey TL, Weiss DS. Predictors of posttraumatic stress disorder and symptoms in adults: a meta-analysis. *Psychol Bull* 2003; 129: 52–73.
- 3 Tempest EL, English National Study on Flooding and Health Study Group, Carter B, Beck CR, Rubin GJ. Secondary stressors after flooding: a cross-sectional analysis. Eur J Public Health 2017; 27: 1042–47.
- 4 Brooks SK, Dunn R, Amlot R, Rubin GJ, Greenberg N. A systematic, thematic review of social and occupational factors associated with psychological outcomes in healthcare employees during an infectious disease outbreak. J Occ Environ Med 2018; 60: 248–57.
- 5 Carter N. Land post-operational stress management (POSM). April, 2014. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/ uploads/attachment_data/file/428920/LFSO_3209_Redacted.pdf (accessed May 20, 2020).
- 6 McCanlies EC, Gu JK, Andrew ME, Violanti JM. The effect of social support, gratitude, resilience and satisfaction with life on depressive symptoms among police officers following Hurricane Katrina. Int J Soc Psychiatry 2018; 64: 63–72.
- 7 Milligan-Saville JS, Tan L, Gayed A, et al. Workplace mental health training for managers and its effect on sick leave in employees: a cluster randomised controlled trial. Lancet Psychiatry 2017; 4: 850–58.
- 3 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Post-traumatic stress disorder. NICE guideline [NG116]. Dec 5, 2018. https://www.nice.org.uk/ guidance/ng116 (accessed May 20, 2020).
- Brewin CR, Fuchkan N, Huntley Z, et al. Outreach and screening following the 2005 London bombings: usage and outcomes. *Psychol Med* 2010; 40: 2049–57.
- 10 Royal College of Psychiatrists. NHS staff recovery plan post COVID-19 (outbreak 1). Royal College of Psychiatrists. https://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/aboutus/responding-to-covid-19/responding-to-covid-19-guidance-for-clinicians/ wellbeing-and-support/nhs-staff-recovery-plan (accessed May 20, 2020).



Lancet Psychiatry 2020 Published Online May 28, 2020 https://doi.org/10.1016/ S2215-0366(20)30224-8