



# The Psychological Health Status of Healthcare Workers During the COVID-19 Outbreak: A Cross-Sectional Survey Study in Guangdong, China

#### **OPEN ACCESS**

#### Edited by:

Stefanie Schreiter, Charité—Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany

#### Reviewed by:

Yutong Jiang, Third Affiliated Hospital of Sun Yat-sen University, China Panagiota Anyfanti, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

> \*Correspondence: Feng Liu pfys1103@126.com

<sup>†</sup>These authors have contributed equally to this work

#### Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Public Mental Health, a section of the journal Frontiers in Public Health

Received: 18 May 2020 Accepted: 26 August 2020 Published: 18 September 2020

#### Citation:

Li Q, Chen J, Xu G, Zhao J, Yu X, Wang S, Liu L and Liu F (2020) The Psychological Health Status of Healthcare Workers During the COVID-19 Outbreak: A Cross-Sectional Survey Study in Guangdong, China. Front. Public Health 8:562885. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2020.562885 Qing Li<sup>†</sup>, Jinglong Chen<sup>†</sup>, Gang Xu<sup>†</sup>, Jun Zhao, Xiaoqi Yu, Shuangyan Wang, Lei Liu and Feng Liu<sup>\*</sup>

Department of Geriatric Medicine, Guangzhou First People's Hospital, School of Medicine, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou, China

**Background:** The sudden outbreak of COVID-19 has caused mental stress on healthcare workers (HCW). This study aimed to assess their psychological health status at the peak of COVID-19 and to identify some coping strategies.

**Methods:** A cross-sectional survey study was conducted during the outbreak of COVID-19. The survey was completed by 908/924 HCW (response rate 98.27%) in government-designated hospitals in Guangdong, China. A quality of life (QoL) scale, the Zung Self-Rating Anxiety Scale (SAS), and the Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale (SDS) were used to evaluate their psychological status. Logistic regression models were used to identify the occupational factors related to anxiety or depression.

**Results:** A total of 221 (24.34%) respondents had varying levels of anxiety, and 299 (32.93%) of them had depression. The mean SAS (42.9) and SDS (47.8) scores of HCW indicated that they were in the normal range for both anxiety and depression. Contact with COVID-19 cases or suspected cases, worry about suffering from COVID-19, worry about their family, and dismission during the COVID-19 period were significant work-related contributing factors to the psychological health problems of HCW (all p < 0.01).

**Conclusions:** The overall psychological health status of HCW in Guangdong, China, during the outbreak of COVID-19 was not overly poor. Updating and strengthening training in disease information, the provision of adequate medical supplies, and care about the life and health of medical staff and their family members may reduce their mental stress.

Keywords: COVID-19, healthcare workers, anxiety, depression, psychological health

# INTRODUCTION

In December 2019, the outbreak of pneumonia caused by the 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in Wuhan, Hubei Province, China (1, 2), was quickly spread by the largest human migration in the world, the Spring Festival travel rush. By the time of this submission, it had become a serious infectious disease that has spread throughout the world. The World Health Organization (WHO) named the infection COVID-19 in February 2020. In China, provinces successfully began the first-level response to Major Public Health Emergencies on January 23, 2020. Guangdong, where the author is located, is one of the most populous provinces in China due to its hyper active economy and booming industry that attracts migrant workers. It is also the province with the largest number of cases after Hubei reported during our study period, and huge migration may bring serious outbreaks.

Previous studies have shown that doctors, nurses, and other staff in hospitals suffer from psychological problems during an epidemic of an infectious disease. During the outbreaks of the 2003 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) and 2015 Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS), psychological problems, including anxiety, depression, and sleep disorders, were very common in medical workers in Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore, Korea, and Canada (3-13). Similar to SARS and MERS, front-line healthcare workers (HCW) may be in direct contact with and have to care for patients and suspected cases of COVID-19; they are therefore at a particularly high risk of infection. In the battle against COVID-19, more than 3,000 doctors and nurses have been infected, and a dozen have died. HCW also face pressure from overwork, lack of supplies, negative emotions of patients, and concerns about their families. These factors may cause many psychological stress (14, 15). To date, there have been few known systematic studies targeting this topic. The aim of our study was to assess the psychological status of HCW in Guangdong Province, China, and to identify coping strategies during the outbreak of COVID-19.

# **METHODS**

This study was a cross-sectional survey study. It was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Guangzhou First People's Hospital (K-2020-055-01). Considering the high infectivity of COVID-19, the popularity of WeChat in China, and the feasibility of electronic questionnaires, a professional online questionnaire platform powered by www.wjx.cn was used in answering the paperless survey. We started the survey on February 3 for the medical institutions that resumed their work after the Spring Festival. At that time, 10 days had passed since the Chinese government officially declared a state of emergency on January 23. The research objects of this study were doctors, nurses, and other staff in the government-designated hospitals in Guangdong including Guangzhou First People's Hospital, Guangzhou Eighth People's Hospital (Infectious disease hospital), and 10 other hospitals. Non-medical staff were defined as a control group. Persons with previous mental illness were excluded. February 24 was used as the cut-off point because the Major Public Health Emergency was adjusted to the second level on that day. The study was conducted at the peak of the COVID-19 outbreak. All respondents completed the survey anonymously. They were required to complete questionnaires on quality of life (QoL) and psychological comorbidities. Each item had to be answered before it could be submitted. A mobile Internet Protocol Address was limited to only one response to avoid duplication. A professional psychologist participated in the whole process of this research and assisted in evaluating the psychological state of the respondents. The results were used for analysis.

# QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire consisted of three sections and started with informed consent. All participants provided informed consent before proceeding with the subsequent investigations. The first section recorded the participants' sociodemographic variables and personal information, including age, gender, marital status, education, occupation, working hours, financial status, income satisfaction, and essential sleep conditions. We defined the front-line doctors and nurses in the fever clinic, emergency department, and intensive care unit as high-risk medical staff, while others were low risk. The second section collected information about COVID-19. Because COVID-19 is a new disease, we could not find a validated instrument for it. We referred to studies on SARS and MERS and then designed several items, such as exposure to COVID-19, training for the disease, and stigma. Two established methods were used in the third section. Anxiety and depression were the most prevalent mental illnesses. Symptoms of anxiety and depression in the past week were assessed by the Zung Self-Rating Anxiety Scale (SAS) (16) and the Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale (SDS) (17), which have been well-validated (18). Both SAS and SDS use 20-items Likert scales with four potential answers ranging from one (little of the time) to four (most of the time). The raw scores are transformed into index scores (range 25-100) (SAS index score: < 50 = normal, 50-59 = mild anxiety, 60-69 = moderate anxiety, >70 = severe anxiety; SDS index score: < 53 = normal, 53-62 = mild depression, 63-72 = moderate depression,  $\geq 73 =$ severe depression).

### STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistics were performed on demographic factors, health factors, economic factors, work factors, and SAS and SDS scores. Differences in SAS and SDS scores for occupation were accessed with analysis of variance (ANOVA). Then we compared the morbidities of anxiety and depression between two different occupational groups using the Chi-squared test.

Multivariate logistic regression models (unadjusted and adjusted) were used to examine the relationships between COVID-19 work-related factors and anxiety and depression. We defined cases with anxiety when the SAS score was over 50 and defined cases with depression when the SDS score was over 53. In all models, we separately included the following factors: occupation, working years, contact with COVID-19 cases, worry about suffering from COVID-19, worry about their family suffering from COVID-19, worry about stigma due to COVID-19-related jobs, and dismission intention during the COVID-19 period. For each model, we adjusted for age, gender, education, marital status, monthly income, and history of basic illness. We defined statistical significance as P < 0.05 for a two-tailed test, and all statistical analyses were conducted using R v3.42 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

### RESULTS

A total of 924 surveys of HCW were collected, 908 (response rate 98.27%) of which were completed correctly. Sixteen respondents (1.73%) were excluded due to significant data errors in the age, height, and weight items. And 369 questionnaires of the controls were completed at the same time. The sociodemographic characteristics and other information for COVID-19 of healthcare workers and controls are given in Table 1. The results showed that there was no significant difference between HCW and the controls in terms of age, gender, marital status, and history of basic illness. In total, 67.7% of the HCW respondents had direct contact with COVID-19 patients or suspected cases at work. A total of 25.88 and 41.08% of the HCW respondents worried about themselves or their family members being infected by COVID-19, respectively. Only 6 (0.66%) HCW respondents had feelings of social discrimination. A total of 16.19% of the HCW respondents showed the intention to take leave or resign from their job.

Compared with the controls, HCW has a significantly higher morbidity of both anxiety and depression. Among them, 221 (24.34%) HCW participants had varying levels of anxiety with a mean SAS score of 42.9, and 299 (32.93%) of them had depression. The mean SDS score was 47.8. SAS and SDS scores in different occupational groups and morbidity of anxiety and depression are shown in **Table 2**. The Chi-squared test showed that the morbidity of anxiety was increased significantly in clinicians at high risk than at low risk ( $\chi^2 = 8.895$ , df = 1, P = 0.003). There was an increase in morbidity of both anxiety and depression in nurses at high risk compared with nurses at low risk (anxiety:  $\chi^2 = 8.895$ , df = 1, P = 0.003, depression:  $\chi^2 = 4.398$ , df = 1, P = 0.036).

The determining factors of anxiety and depression are shown in **Tables 3**, **4**. In **Table 3**, contact with COVID-19 patients or suspected cases (AOR = 0.42, 95%CI:0.31-0.58), worry about suffering from COVID-19 (AOR = 1.58, 95%CI:1.12-2.22), worry about their families (AOR = 2.34, 95%CI:1.71-3.21), and dismission during the COVID-19 period (AOR = 1.88, 95%CI:1.17-2.99) were associated with anxiety with a statistical difference as evaluated by SAS.

**Table 4** shows that based on the SDS, exposure to COVID-19 (AOR = 0.49, 95%CI:0.36-0.66) and worry about themselves (AOR = 1.71, 95%CI:1.25-2.34) and their family (AOR = 0.52, 95%CI:0.06-4.52) exerted significant effects on depression.

### DISCUSSION

Previous studies have shown that 23.9–68.8% of HCW suffered from mental health problems in China due to the high workload, promotion pressure, deteriorating doctor-patient relationships, medical disputes, and even violence (19–22). On this basis, the outbreak of COVID-19 undoubtedly increased the psychological pressure of HCW, who were the soldiers in this battle. Our study found that the anxiety and depression rates of HCW during the peak of the COVID-19 epidemic were 24.34 and 32.93%, respectively. Staff in low risk positions had a lower rate of psychological problems than doctors and nurses who worked in positions with a high risk of COVID-19 exposure, such as fever clinics, emergency departments, and intensive care units, especially nurses. Compared with doctors, nurses had more opportunities to have contact with cases, which increased the risk of infection.

However, surprisingly, the mean scores of the SAS (42.9) and SDS (47.8) of HCW indicated that they were in the normal range for both anxiety and depression, which seemed to differ from the results of previous studies on SARS and MERS (3–13). We performed stratification analysis by occupational exposure risk or patient contact history but obtained similar results.

Reviewing the past few months in China during COVID-19, whether it was Wuhan in the peak of the epidemic, or in Harbin, Heilongjiang Province, where the hospital infection outbreak happened recently, COVID-19 mainly attacked theoretically low risk HCW (medical staff in departments for ophthalmology, surgery, neurology, and caregivers) (23). Critical illness medical staff were also in this category. In Harbin, epidemiological studies further confirmed that the lack of sufficient vigilance and personal protection in HCW was the main reason for the hospital infection. This could suggest that there is no real low risk area during COVID-19. Our study was conducted after the notification of high infection in low risk departments in Wuhan. Guangdong was the most seriously affected area except Hubei at that time. But the anxiety and depression of HCW in low risk departments were still significantly lower than those in high risk departments. This situation was most likely due to insufficient vigilance. Anxiety helps us anticipate and assess potential danger in ambiguous situations (24, 25). Combined with the results of our study, it is possible that our awareness of disease prevention and self-protection can be strengthened by some psychological pressure during COVID-19. On the contrary, it may increase the chance of infection due to lack of tension or negligence of the disease. This is the population that should be concerned and their knowledge of disease and personal protection should be enhanced.

Our aim was to identify the determinative factors of the impact of COVID-19 on HCW's psychological status. A review of previous literature suggests that many factors can also affect the mental health of HCW in non-epidemic situations (19–22). Further adjusted logistic regression showed that there was no significant correlation between the exposure risk and occupation, working years, and stigma and the psychological status of HCW during the outbreak of COVID-19. However, concerns about self-infection and family health were statistical factors that were all

#### TABLE 1 | Sociodemographic characteristics and information for COVID-19 of healthcare workers (N = 908) in Guangdong, China.

Frequency     Percent (%)     Frequency     Percent (%)       Age (Nem ± SD)     33.8 ± 6.33     *     36.3 ± 7.73     *     0.105       Gande (Male Winde)     22/086     *     109/281     *     0.003       Education       101/283     *     0.003       Education       111     1.21     14     3.79     *     0.003       Education       1.51     1.62     0.02     *     *     0.003       Senderal model     1.51     1.6.97     2.68     0.0.2     *		HCW (/	HCW ( <i>n</i> = 908)		Controls ( $n = 369$ )		
Angle (Mean + S(I))     S3.8.3 + 6.9.3     *-     S1.8.3 + 7.7.8     *-     0.105       Gandar (Musii-Fanda)     222/266     *-     102/261     *-     0.075       Education     222/266     *-     102/261     *-     0.075       Education     207/701     *     101/268     *-     0.083       Education     0631     75     2268     08.022     *-       Bachdor     0531     75     2268     08.022     *-       Occupation     0108     11.67     *-     *-     *-       Onication at flyin risk     105     16.67     *-     *-     *-       Name at flow risk     225     24.78     *-     *-     *-       Name at flow risk     20     2.2     *-     *-     *-       Machine flow risk     20     2.2     *-     *-     *-       Name at flow risk     20     2.2     *-     *-     *-       Machine flow risk     200     2.3     201     2.7		Frequency	Percent (%)	Frequency	Percent (%)		
Quence (Market)Q20920*109201*0.073Market satus (Singler Market)Q07701*101286*0.075Market satus (Singler Market)Q07701*143.73*Less ten high saturcal111.74143.73**High saturcal1611.7522880.62**Bachelor6617.522880.62***Bachelor16115.63-****Occupation15416.66-*****Occupation16115.61** <t< td=""><td>Age (Mean <math>\pm</math> <i>SD</i>)</td><td><math>33.8 \pm 6.93</math></td><td>"_</td><td><math>35.3 \pm 7.78</math></td><td>"_</td><td>0.105</td></t<>	Age (Mean $\pm$ <i>SD</i> )	$33.8 \pm 6.93$	"_	$35.3 \pm 7.78$	"_	0.105	
Number spectra spectra2007701*101/268*0.083Education11.211.43.70*High schold/College7.17.224.111.10*Becholor1611.572.6868.92*Parlyackala161.91.6968.93***Occupation11.111.69.976.801.61.8**Occupation12.122.681.61.8***Oriclain al high risk16416.96*****Ninse at high risk1691.61**	Gender (Male/Female)	222/686	"_	108/261	"_	0.075	
Education     11     1.21     1.4     3.7.9     1.4       Lams thru right nethool (Ologoe)     71     7.8.2     1.4     1.1.1     1.1.1     1.1.2     1.4.1     1.1.1 <td>Marital status (Single/ Married)</td> <td>207/701</td> <td>"_</td> <td>101/268</td> <td>"_</td> <td>0.083</td>	Marital status (Single/ Married)	207/701	"_	101/268	"_	0.083	
Lass than high school111.211.413.79High school/College717.824.111.11Bocholer6817.66.856.92Polignatulue1.601.675.856.91Concupation21523.68Chriden at high risk1.961.61Nirse at high risk1.961.61Nirse at high risk1.901.62Nirse at high risk1.901.61Nirse at high risk1.901.61Nirse at high risk1.901.62<	Education						
High school/College?1?.424.11.1.11.4.Bacheor6.817525.860.92?.Decugation </td <td>Less than high school</td> <td>11</td> <td>1.21</td> <td>14</td> <td>3.79</td> <td>"_</td>	Less than high school	11	1.21	14	3.79	"_	
Bachelor6817528969.929.93Postgraduato1451685613.185Occupation116.085.65.185Childan at Ngin rink15416.085.75.05.0Narse at Ingin rink16918.615.05.05.0Narse at Ingin rink1692.085.05.05.0Compolers10012.116.317.075.0Medica lechnician192.022.05.05.0Medita lechnician192.025.05.05.0Stotdome (MB)2.016.3117.075.05.00Stotdome (MG)10012.116.3117.075.0Stotdome (MG)10012.116.3117.075.0Stotdome (MG)10012.116.3137.677.0Stotdome (MG)10012.116.3137.673.0Stotdome (MG)1007.672.006.235.00Stotdome (MG)1007.07.05.05.00Stotdome (MG)10010.110.110.010.1Stotdome (MG)10010.110.010.110.0Stotdome (MG)10010.110.010.110.0Stotdome (MG)10010.110.010.110.010.1Stotdome (MG)10010.110.010.110.010.1Stotdome (MG)<	High school/College	71	7.82	41	11.11	"_	
Postgraduale14515.075615.181°.ConcursClinician at hjör risk15416.961°°°.Clinician at hjör risk21523.68-°°°.Narsa at high risk25524.78-°°°.Caregivers10611.67-°°°.Administrative staft202.2-°°°.Administrative staft202.2-°°°.S0.0048052.8621157.18-°S0.0048052.8621157.18-°S0.0048052.8621157.18-°S0.0048052.862137.07S0.0028028.31397.07S0.0029329.31397.67S0.0129828.2219151.76S0.0229.828.2219151.76S0.0329.828.2219151.76S0.0429.828.2219151.76S0.0529.828.2219151.76S0.0529.929.828.219151.76S0.0529.929.828.219151.76S0.0529.929.828.619.8 <td>Bachelor</td> <td>681</td> <td>75</td> <td>258</td> <td>69.92</td> <td>"_</td>	Bachelor	681	75	258	69.92	"_	
OregationClinician at byor hisk15416.6Clinician at byor hisk16.018.61Nurse at hyor hisk16.018.61Caesplayers10.611.67Medical lecthinician192.09Medical lecthinician192.09Medical lecthinician192.09Medical lecthinician192.09Mothy income (MBJ)0.00048.02.822.1167.80.00048.03.022.637.670.00048.03.025.3317.070.00048.03.025.337.972.160.00049.02.637.672.306.230.00019.02.637.672.306.230.0002.637.672.307.670.00019.02.637.672.307.6710.0002.6419.02.637.672.141.76<	Postgraduate	145	15.97	56	15.18	"_	
Clinician at buy risk16416.861°.1°.1°.Clinician at buy risk21523.68-°°°.Nurse at hujy risk22524.78-°°°.Caregivers10611.67-°°°.Caregivers10611.67-°°°.Administrable staff2.092.09-°°°.Administrable staff2.002.00-°°°.Store (MB)Store (NDC)10.012.1163.117.07-Store (NDC)10.026.8021.9157.18-Store (NDC)10.026.8021.9157.18-Store (NDC)20.027.3719.9037.67-Staffaction with income27.0027.8319.9037.67-Norse (Ser)27.1027.6727.67Staffaction with income28.0029.8079.921.41-Staffaction with income28.0029.8219.1057.60-Staffaction with income28.0029.8219.1057.60-Staffaction with income28.0029.8219.1057.60-Staffaction with income28.0029.8219.1057.60-Staffaction with income28.0029.8219.1057.60-Staffaction with income29.0029.82	Occupation						
Clinician at low risk21623.68*-*-*-Nurse at low risk16918.61*-*-*-Caregovers10611.67*-*-*-Caregovers10811.67*-*-*-Administrative staft2092.2*-*-*-Administrative staft2002.2*-*-*-StoOO10.00040.052.8021157.07*-*-StoOo10.00031835.029525.76*-*-Staffaction with income31835.029525.76*-*-No23.074.6723.0062.33<-	Clinician at high risk	154	16.96	"_	"_	"_	
Nurse at high risk     169     16.01     1     1       Nurse at how risk     225     24.78     1     1       Caregivers     106     11.87     1     1       Madical technician     19     2.09     1     1       Administrative staff     19     2.09     1     1       Mothy income (RMB)     110     12.11     6.33     17.07     1       5.000-10,000     480     62.86     211     57.87     1       5.000-10,000     480     62.02     25.78     2     7       5.000-10,000     20.0     25.03     12.0     70     7       5.000-10,000     480     57.02     70     70     70       5.000-10,000     20.01     7.01     7.0     70     70       5.000-10,000     20.01     7.01     7.0     70     70       5.000-10,000     20.01     7.0     70     70     70       5.100-10,000     20.03	Clinician at low risk	215	23.68	"_	"_	"_	
Nurse at low risk     225     24.78     1     1     1       Caregivers     106     11.67         Medical technican     20     2.2         Administrative staff     20     2.2         Monthy income (MMB)           5000-10.000     480     52.86     211     57.18        5000-10.000     480     52.86     211     57.18        5000-10.000     480     52.86     211     57.18        5000-10.000     480     52.86     211     57.18        Statisfaction with income     230     25.33     139     37.67        Statisfaction with income     230     25.33     52     14.09        Statisfaction with income     230     25.33     52     14.09        Statisfaction with income     230     25.23     14.09         Statisfaction with income </td <td>Nurse at high risk</td> <td>169</td> <td>18.61</td> <td>"_</td> <td>"_</td> <td>"_</td>	Nurse at high risk	169	18.61	"_	"_	"_	
Caregivers1061.671.1.1.Medical technician192.01.01.0Administrative staff2.02.21.01.0Administrative staff2.01.02.16.01.05.000-10.00040052.6021.157.161.05.000-10.00031835.029525.761.0Solocation with income31835.029525.761.0Subscription25.331.397.071.01.0Visition staff2.62.5.31.390.6.371.0Solocation with income2.52.5.31.390.6.371.0Visition staff2.62.9.37.92.1.411.0Solocation with income2.02.0.37.92.1.411.0Visition staff2.62.9.37.92.1.411.0Solocation with income2.02.0.37.92.1.411.0Solocation with income2.02.0.37.92.1.411.0Solocation with income2.0.32.0.11.01.01.0Solocation with income2.0.12.0.11.01.01.0Solocation with income2.0.12.0.11.01.01.0Solocation with income2.0.12.0.11.01.01.01.0Solocation with income2.0.12.0.11.01.01.01.01.01.0Solocation	Nurse at low risk	225	24.78	"_	"_	"_	
Medical techniciani     19     2.09     1-     1-     1-       Administrative staff     20     2.2     2.3     2.5     3.5       Methylincome (RMB)     5.000     10.0     12.11     6.3     17.07     7.5       5.0001.0000     480     52.66     2.11     57.18     7.5       5.0001.0000     480     52.66     2.11     57.18     7.5       Statisfaction with income     2.30     2.5.33     13.9     37.67     7.5       Statisfaction with income     2.30     2.5.33     13.9     37.67     7.5       Vorking years (year)     2.30     2.9.3     52     14.09     7.5       5-10     19.00     2.9.3     7.9     21.41     7.5       5-10     19.00     2.9.3     7.9     21.41     7.5       5-10     19.00     19.68     47     12.31     6.5       5-10     19.69     19.69     10.61     13.69     7.5       5-12     45     4.96     42	Caregivers	106	11.67	"_	"_	"_	
Administrative staff     20     2.2     *.     *.     *.       Monthly income (RMB)     . </td <td>Medical technician</td> <td>19</td> <td>2.09</td> <td>"_</td> <td>"_</td> <td>"_</td>	Medical technician	19	2.09	"_	"_	"_	
<table-container>Admithigeneric (MBB)&lt;\$.000</table-container>	Administrative staff	20	2.2	"_	"_	"_	
<.000     110     12.11     63     17.07     *       5.000-10.000     480     52.86     211     57.18     *       >10.000     318     35.02     95     25.76     *       >10.000     230     25.33     139     37.67     *       No     230     25.33     139     37.67     *       Yes     67.8     74.67     230     62.33     <0010	Monthly income (RMB)						
5,000-10,00048052.8621157.18*.>10.0031835.029525.76*.Satistaction with income23.025.3313.937.67*.Yes67.874.6723.062.33<.0.001	<5,000	110	12.11	63	17.07	"_	
> 1,00031835.029595.07"-Satisation with income23.0325.3313.937.67"-No26.3025.3313.902.33<0.001	5,000-10,000	480	52.86	211	57.18	"_	
Satisfaction with income     No     230     25.33     139     37.67     ~-       Yes     678     74.67     20.00     62.03     62.00       Working years (year)     200     62.03	>10,000	318	35.02	95	25.76	"_	
No     230     25.33     139     97.67     "       Yes     678     74.67     230     62.33     <0.001	Satisfaction with income						
Yes67874.6728062.03<<Working years (year)229.35.214.09%.35-101902.037.921.41%.35-101902.037.921.41%.311-202.982.821915.16%.3>2015418.964712.73%.3Working time (hour/day)3.164.964.20%.38-1249053.964.26%.3>12454.964.211.63%.4Hstory of basic illness1191.116016.260.141Heart disease161.761.443.79%.4Diabetes90.99192.71%.4Diabets90.99184.88%.4Others7.88.591.84.88%.4Others7.88.591.84.88%.4Others19721.76617.88%.44-619721.76617.88%.45-81000%%.4%.45-8101.747.832.516.80%.45-810001.8%.4%.45-810001.8%.4%.45-810001.8%.4%.45-810001.21.4%.4 <td>No</td> <td>230</td> <td>25.33</td> <td>139</td> <td>37.67</td> <td>"_</td>	No	230	25.33	139	37.67	"_	
Working years (year)     Second Seco	Yes	678	74.67	230	62.33	< 0.001	
$< 5$ $266$ $29.3$ $52$ $14.09$ "- $5-10$ $190$ $20.93$ $79$ $21.41$ "- $11-20$ $298$ $32.82$ $191$ $51.76$ "- $>20$ $15$ $208$ $32.82$ $191$ $51.76$ "- $>20$ $15$ $166$ $47$ $12.3$ "- $>20$ $150$ $373$ $40.08$ $229$ $62.06$ "- $8$ $373$ $40.08$ $229$ $62.06$ "- $8-12$ $490$ $53.96$ $98$ $26.56$ "- $>12$ $45$ $4.96$ $422$ $11.38$ "-History of basic illness $119$ $13.11$ $60$ $16.26$ $0.141$ Heart disease $16$ $1.76$ $14$ $3.79$ "-Diabetes $9$ $0.99$ $19$ $2.71$ "-Unmor $8$ $0.88$ $5$ $1.36$ "-Unmor $8$ $0.88$ $5$ $1.36$ "-Del (s/m2) (Mean $\pm SD)$ $22.06 \pm 3.19$ "- $23.79 \pm 6.91$ "-Steping time (hour/day) $21.06 \pm 3.19$ $71.7$ $66$ $17.88$ "- $<4$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $  <4$ $0$ $0$ $62$ $14.09$ "- $<4$ $696$ $76.87$ $324$ $87.8$ "- $<50$ $698$ $76.87$ $324$ $87.8$ "- $<50$ $698$ $76.87$ $324$ $87.8$ "- <tr< td=""><td>Working years (year)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr<>	Working years (year)						
5-10     190     20.93     79     21.41     "-       11-20     298     32.82     191     51.76     "-       >20     154     16.96     47     12.73     "-       Working time (hour/day)      373     40.8     229     62.06     "-       8     373     40.8     229     62.06     "-       8-12     490     53.06     98     26.56     "-       >12     45     4.96     42     11.38     "-       History of basic illness     119     13.11     60     16.26     0.141       Heard disease     16     1.76     14     3.79     "-       Diabetes     9     0.92     2.12     5.69     "-       Tumor     28     0.88     5     1.36     "-       Steign time (hour/day)     22.06 ± 3.19     "-     23.79 ± 6.91     *-     <0.00	<5	266	29.3	52	14.09	"_	
11-2029832.8219151.76"->2015416.964712.73"-Working time (hour/day)37340.9822.962.06"-8-1249053.969826.56"->12454.964211.38"-Histor of basic lilness11913.116016.260.141Heart disease161.76143.79"-Diabetes90.99192.71"-Hypertension323.52215.69"-Tumor80.8851.36"-Others788.9184.88"-Steping time (hour/day)2.04 ± 3.19"-2.0521.36"-4-619721.776617.88"5-80000"4-619721.776617.88"-6-871.178.325.168.02"-> 80.8976.8732.487.8"-Sometims16418.06349.21"-Alary16.418.6732.487.8"-56.8576.8732.487.8"-56.8576.8732.487.8"-65.06112.98"-1.84516.418.0534.49.21"-6	5–10	190	20.93	79	21.41	"_	
>2015416.964712.73"-Working time (hour/day)<8	11–20	298	32.82	191	51.76	"_	
Working time (hour/day)     Single	>20	154	16.96	47	12.73	"_	
373     40.08     229     62.06     "-       8-12     490     53.96     98     26.56     "-       >12     45     4.96     42     11.38     "-       History of basic illness     119     13.11     60     16.26     0.141       Heart disease     16     1.76     14     3.79     "-       Diabetes     9     0.99     19     2.71     "-       Hypertension     32     3.52     21     5.69     "-       Tumor     8     0.88     5     1.36     "-       Others     78     8.59     18     4.88     "-       Steping time (hour/day)     22.06 ± 3.19     "-     23.79 ± 6.91     "-     <0.001	Working time (hour/day)						
8-12     490     53,96     98     26,56     "-       >12     45     4,96     42     11,38     "-       History of basic illness     119     13,11     60     16,26     0.141       Heart disease     16     1.76     14     3.79     "-       Diabetes     9     0.99     19     2.71     "-       Hypertension     32     3.52     21     5.69     "-       Tumor     8     0.88     5     1.36     "-       Others     78     8.59     18     4.88     "-       Seling time (hour/day)     22.06 ± 3.19     "-     23.79 ± 6.91     "-     <-0001	<8	373	40.08	229	62.06	"_	
>12   45   4.96   42   11.38   "-     History of basic illness   119   13.11   60   16.26   0.141     Heart disease   16   1.76   14   3.79   "-     Diabetes   9   0.99   19   2.71   "-     Hypertension   32   3.52   21   5.69   "-     Tumor   8   0.88   5   1.36   "-     Others   78   8.59   18   4.88   "-     BMI (kg/m2) (Mean ± SD)   22.06 ± 3.19   "-   23.79 ± 6.91   "-   <-0.001     Steeping time (hour/day)   22.06 ± 3.19   "-   23.79 ± 6.91   "-   <-0.001     4-6   0   0   0   0   0   "-   <-0.001     4-6   197   21.7   66   17.88   "-     5-8   0   0   0   0   "-     5-8   0   0   0   52   14.09   "-     Steeping aids   76.87   324   87.8   "-	8–12	490	53.96	98	26.56	"_	
History of basic illness11913.116016.260.141Heart disease161.76143.79"-Diabetes90.99192.71"-Hypertension323.52215.69"-Tumor80.8851.36"-Others788.59184.88"-BMI (kg/m2) (Mean $\pm$ SD)22.06 $\pm$ 3.19"-23.79 $\pm$ 6.91"-<0.001	>12	45	4.96	42	11.38	"_	
Hard disease161.76143.79"-Diabetes90.99192.71"-Hypertension323.52215.69"-Tumor80.8851.36"-Others788.59184.88"-BMI (kg/m2) (Mean $\pm$ SD)22.06 $\pm$ 3.19"- $23.79 \pm$ 6.91"- $<0.001$ Steeping time (hour/day)<4	History of basic illness	119	13.11	60	16.26	0.141	
Diabetes90.99192.71"-Hypertension323.52215.69"-Tumor80.8851.36"-Others788.59184.88"-BM (kg/m2) (Mean $\pm$ SD)22.06 $\pm$ 3.19"-23.79 $\pm$ 6.91"-<00	Heart disease	16	1.76	14	3.79	"_	
Hypertension $32$ $3.52$ $21$ $5.69$ "-Tumor $8$ $0.88$ $5$ $1.36$ "-Others $78$ $8.59$ $18$ $4.88$ "-BM (kg/m2) (Mean $\pm SD$ ) $22.06 \pm 3.19$ "- $23.79 \pm 6.91$ "- $<0.001$ Steeping time (hour/day)<4	Diabetes	9	0.99	19	2.71	"_	
Tumor80.8851.36"-Others788.59184.88"-BM (kg/m2) (Mean $\pm$ SD)22.06 $\pm$ 3.19"-23.79 $\pm$ 6.91"-<00	Hypertension	32	3.52	21	5.69	"_	
Others788.59184.88"-BMI (kg/m2) (Mean $\pm$ SD) $22.06 \pm 3.19$ "- $23.79 \pm 6.91$ "- $<0.001$ Sleeping time (hour/day)<4	Tumor	8	0.88	5	1.36	"_	
BMI (kg/m2) (Mean $\pm$ SD)22.06 $\pm$ 3.19"- $23.79 \pm 6.91$ "-<0.001Sleeping time (hour/day)<4	Others	78	8.59	18	4.88	"_	
Sleeping time (hour/day)   0   0   0   0   "-     <4	BMI (kg/m2) (Mean $\pm$ SD)	$22.06 \pm 3.19$	"_	$23.79 \pm 6.91$	"_	< 0.001	
<4000"-4-619721.76617.88"-6-871178.325168.02"->8005214.09"-Sleeping aids*-Never69876.8732487.8"-Sometime16418.06349.21"-Always465.06112.98"-	Sleeping time (hour/day)						
4-619721.76617.88"-6-871178.325168.02"->8005214.09"-Seeping aidsNever69876.8732487.8"-Sometime16418.06349.21"-Always465.06112.98"-	<4	0	0	0	0	"_	
6-8 711 78.3 251 68.02 "-   >8 0 0 52 14.09 "-   Sleeping aids    *-   Never 698 76.87 324 87.8 "-   Sometime 164 18.06 34 9.21 "-   Always 46 5.06 11 2.98 "-	4–6	197	21.7	66	17.88	"_	
>8     0     0     52     14.09     "-       Sleeping aids <t< td=""><td>6–8</td><td>711</td><td>78.3</td><td>251</td><td>68.02</td><td>"_</td></t<>	6–8	711	78.3	251	68.02	"_	
Sleeping aids     Sleeping aids     State     State <thstate< th="">     State     State<!--</td--><td>&gt;8</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>52</td><td>14.09</td><td>"_</td></thstate<>	>8	0	0	52	14.09	"_	
Never     698     76.87     324     87.8     "-       Sometime     164     18.06     34     9.21     "-       Always     46     5.06     11     2.98     "-	Sleeping aids						
Sometime     164     18.06     34     9.21     "-       Always     46     5.06     11     2.98     "-	Never	698	76.87	324	87.8	"_	
Always 46 5.06 11 2.98 "-	Sometime	164	18.06	34	9.21	"_	
	Always	46	5.06	11	2.98	"_	

(Continued)

#### TABLE 1 | Continued

	HCW ( <i>n</i> = 908)		Controls	P-value	
	Frequency	Percent (%)	Frequency	Percent (%)	
COVID-19 knowledge and protection training					
No	0	0	"_	"_	"_
Yes	908	100	"_	"-	"_
Satisfaction with protective measure					
No	9	0.99	"_	"_	"_
Yes	899	99.01	"_	"_	"_
Contact with COVID-19 patients or suspected cases					
No	299	32.93	"_	"_	"_
Yes	609	67.07	"_	"_	"_
Worry about stigma due to COVID-19 related job					
No	902	99.34	"_	"_	"_
Yes	6	0.66	"_	"_	"_
Worry about suffering from COVID-19					
No	673	74.12	111	30.38	"_
Yes	235	25.88	258	69.92	< 0.001
Worry about families suffering from COVID-19					
No	535	58.92	89	24.12	"_
Yes	373	41.08	280	75.88	< 0.001
Have a dismission intention during the COVID-19 period					
No	761	83.81	169	18.70	"_
Yes	147	16.19	200	54.20	< 0.001
Anxiety	221	24.34	33	8.94	< 0.001
Mild	157	17.29	23	6.23	<0.001*
Moderate	57	6.28	5	1.36	"_
Severe	7	0.77	5	1.36	"_
Depression	299	32.92	63	17.07	< 0.001
Mild	206	22.69	49	13.28	<0.001*
Moderate	82	9.03	12	3.25	"_
Severe	11	1.21	1	0.27	"_

\*The p-value of the Chi-square Test between the three groups.

positively related to both anxiety and depression according to the SAS and SDS scores. We will attempt to determine reasons for this result.

Similar to SARS and MERS, COVID-19 can be spread by respiratory droplets and direct contact, with urine, stool, and saliva being potential routes (26–29). Although an early study evaluated its R0 = 2.2 (1), other studies found the average R0 to be 3.28, even reaching 6.47 (26–29). Compared with SARS (R0 = 3.6), the contagious power of COVID-19 is much higher (27). HCW who face such a highly contagious disease with an incubation period, especially nurses at high risk (40.83%, 69/169), show serious concern about their possibility of infection. A total of 41.12% of the respondents worried about their families due to both the lack of care and the high risk of infection caused by the HCW themselves.

However, the statistical results showed that the experience of contact with patients or suspected cases was a positive factor for both anxiety and depression. Our investigation showed that all the respondents, even administrative staff, received different levels of medical knowledge and protection training about this infectious disease. Apart from the brief panic at the beginning, 99.01% of them believed that the available protective measures were adequate at this moment. This may be due to the improvement of China's disease control system and the development of awareness of infectious disease prevention and control after the experience of SARS (30). The more people are prepared for COVID-19, the more confident they can be.

During SARS and MERS, 20–49% of HCW experienced social stigmatization because of their jobs (3, 5, 7, 10, 12). However, in our study, it seemed that HCW did not worry about stigma (99.34%). This may be related to the development of social media, information disclosure, and the government's positive publicity. Accurate and timely COVID-19 information was provided to the public to reduce uncertainty and minimize stigmatization of HCW. This suggestion was mentioned in Ya Mei Bai's article and now seems to be effective (3), and HCW are hailed as heroes in harm's way (31). The public has shown more respect for medical staff, which may reduce the stress of HCW.

#### TABLE 2 | SAS and SDS scores in different occupational groups and morbidity of anxiety and depression.

Occupation	N	S	SAS	SDS		
		Mean (SD)	Anxiety: N (%)	Mean (SD)	Depression: N (%)	
Clinician at high risk	154	42.13 (11.78)	52 (33.77)	46.42 (13.49)	63 (40.9)	
Clinician at low risk	215	41.51 (9.961)	43 (20.0)	46.08 (13.49)	73 (33.95)	
Nurse at high risk	169	45.11 (11.43)	60 (35.5)	50.11 (12.78)	65 (38.46)	
Nurse at low risk	225	43.89 (8.477)	39 (17.33)	49.39 (9.241)	64 (28.44)	
Caregivers	106	42.49 (7.987)	19 (17.92)	47.79 (9.341)	23 (21.69)	
Medical technician	19	39.74 (10.51)	4 (21.05)	43.95 (12.19)	6 (31.58)	
Administrative staff	20	39.56 (11.06)	4 (20.0)	43.44 (12.71)	5 (25.0)	
Total	908	42.9 (10.15)	221 (24.34)	47.8 (11.51)	299 (32.93)	

TABLE 3 | Factors associated with anxiety during the COVID-19 period for healthcare workers (N = 908) in Guangdong, China.

	Uni-variable analysis			Adjusted OR <sup>*</sup>	95%CI	P-value
	Crude OR	95%CI	P-value			
Occupation						
Clinician at high risk	2.04	(0.65, 6.37)	0.23	1.66	(0.5, 5.52)	0.41
Clinician at low risk	1	(0.32, 3.13)	>0.99	0.85	(0.26, 2.82)	0.79
Nurse at high risk	2.2	(0.71, 6.85)	0.17	3.11	(0.94, 10.26)	0.06
Nurse at low risk	0.84	(0.27, 2.63)	0.76	1.32	(0.39, 4.45)	0.65
Caregivers	0.87	(0.26, 2.89)	0.83	1.48	(0.42, 5.23)	0.54
Medical technician	1.67	(0.23, 5.01)	0.94	1.13	(0.23, 5.69)	0.88
Administrative staff	Ref.	۰_ -	<u>ن</u> _	Ref.	·	·_
Working years						
<5	Ref.	<u>'</u> _	<u>ن</u> _	Ref.	۰_	<b>'</b> _
5–10	0.79	(0.52, 1.21)	0.28	0.75	(0.44, 1.27)	0.28
11–20	0.74	(0.51, 1.08)	0.12	0.65	(0.34, 1.24)	0.19
>20	0.73	(0.45, 1.15)	0.17	0.99	(0.37, 2.62)	0.98
Contact with COVID-19 patients or suspected cases						
No	Ref.	۰_ -	<u>ن</u> _	Ref.	·	·_
Yes	0.39	(0.29, 0.54)	< 0.001	0.42	(0.31, 0.58)	< 0.001
Worry about suffering from COVID-19						
No	Ref.	۰_ -	<u>ن</u> _	Ref.	·	·_
Yes	1.55	(1.12, 2.16)	0.009	1.58	(1.12, 2.22)	0.008
Worry about families suffering from COVID-19						
No	Ref.			Ref.		
Yes	2.36	(1.74, 3.21)	< 0.001	2.34	(1.71, 3.21)	< 0.001
Worry about stigma due to COVID-19 related job						
No	Ref.	۰_ -	<u>ن</u> _	Ref.	·	·_
Yes	0.62	(0.07, 5.28)	0.663	0.81	(0.09, 6.98)	0.84
Have a dismission intention during the COVID-19 period						
No	Ref.	۰_	·_	Ref.	۰_	<b>'</b> _
Yes	1.6	(1.02, 2.52)	0.04	1.88	(1.17, 2.99)	0.009

\*Adjusted for age, gender, education, marital status, monthly income, history basic illness.

We found that 16.19% of the respondents, mainly caregivers (66.03%, 70/106), had the intention to resign or take leave, while only a few doctors and nurses had this intention. This was a statistically significant factor associated with anxiety among HCW. Among the caregivers, 91.51% were married females. This has been seen as an escape in some

studies (3, 5, 11). This may be due to a lower education level (77.35% did not receive a college education) and family identity as a mother, which has caused a shortage of caregivers in many hospitals. A similar conclusion was mentioned by Chenyu Zhou in her research on Chinese medical staff (20).

		Uni-variable analysis		Adjusted OR <sup>*</sup>	95%CI	P-value
	Crude OR	95%CI	P-value			
Occupation						
Clinician at high risk	2.08	(0.72, 5.97)	0.18	2.2	(0.73,6.61)	0.16
Clinician at low risk	1.54	(0.54, 4.39)	0.42	1.75	(0.59,5.20)	0.313
Nurse at high risk	1.87	(0.65, 5.38)	0.24	2.4	(0.80,7.16)	0.12
Nurse at low risk	1.19	(0.42, 3.40)	0.74	1.6	(0.54, 4.80)	0.40
Caregivers	0.83	(0.27, 2.51)	0.74	1.19	(0.38, 3.75)	0.76
Medical technician	1.38	(0.34, 5.57)	0.65	1.7	(0.40, 7.20)	4.48
Administrative staff	Ref.	·_	·_	Ref.	·_	<b>'</b> _
Working years						
<5	Ref.	·_	·_	Ref.	·_	<u>،</u>
5–10	0.81	(0.55, 1.20)	0.30	0.69	(0.42,1.13)	0.14
11–20	0.83	(0.59,1.17)	0.29	0.62	(0.35,1.14)	0.13
>20	0.66	(0.43,1.02)	0.06	0.62	(0.25,1.52)	0.30
Contact with COVID-19	patients or suspected	cases				
No	Ref.	۰_	"_	Ref.	۰_	·_
Yes	0.47	(0.35, 0.62)	<0.001	0.49	(0.36, 0.66)	< 0.001
Worry about suffering fr	rom COVID-19					
No	Ref.	۰_	"_	Ref.	۰_	·_
Yes	1.72	(1.27, 2.34)	< 0.001	1.71	(1.25, 2.34)	<0.001
Worry about families su	ffering from COVID-19					
No	Ref.	۰_	۰_	Ref.	·	<u>ن</u> _
Yes	2.81	(2.11, 3.73)	< 0.001	2.82	(2.10, 3.78)	<0.001
Worry about stigma due	e to COVID-19 related jo	ob				
No	Ref.	۰_	"_	Ref.	۰_	·_
Yes	0.41	(0.05, 3.45)	0.41	0.52	(0.06, 4.52)	0.56
Have a dismission inten	tion during the COVID-	19 period				
No	Ref.	4	<u>،</u>	Ref.	۰_	·_
Yes	0.94	(0.65,1.37)	0.76	1.07	(0.73,1.58)	0.072

TABLE 4 | Factors associated with depression during the COVID-19 period for healthcare workers (N = 908) in Guangdong, China.

\*Adjusted for age, gender, education, marital status, monthly income, history basic illness.

In addition, our investigation showed that 58.92% of HCW worked more than 8 h a day, 25.33% of them were dissatisfied with their current income, and 23.12% of them had sleeping problems and needed hypnotics. Previous studies have shown that these factors were related to the mental health of medical staff in usual jobs. This may be a long-term problem rather than a current one that is specific to the COVID-19 epidemic. After the Guideline of Psychological Crisis Intervention for 2019-nCoV pneumonia was released by the National Health Commission of China on January 27, it seemed that some measures had been taken (32, 33). Our study finds that there was some effect. The psychological health of HCW was better than expected.

The limitations of our study are as follows. Firstly, the study was completed on mobile devices, and the sampling was voluntary. Therefore, the possibility of selection bias should be considered. Secondly, we could not cover all potential risk factors in this investigation. Thirdly, the objects of this study were HCW in Guangdong Province, and this sample cannot represent the mental status of HCW in Hubei, the center of the epidemic, who might suffer from more serious psychological problems.

### CONCLUSIONS

Although some HCW in Guangdong, China, had psychological problems during the outbreak of COVID-19 especially the firstline doctors and nurses, the findings of the present study indicated that their overall psychological health status was not too poor. It is possible that our awareness of disease prevention and self-protection can be strengthened by psychological pressure. Updating and strengthening training in disease information, providing adequate medical supplies, and caring about the life and health of medical staff and their family members may reduce their mental stress, ensure their working ability, and reduce the risk of treatment for patients. Currently, COVID-19 has become a global pandemic. Perhaps the Chinese experience may provide lessons for others.

# DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

#### **ETHICS STATEMENT**

The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of the Guangzhou First People's Hospital (K-2020-055-01). Written informed consent for participation was not required for this study in accordance with the national legislation and the institutional requirements.

### REFERENCES

- Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus-infected pneumonia. N Engl J Med. (2020) 382:1199–207. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa20 01316
- Wang C, Horby PW, Hayden FG, Gao GF. A novel coronavirus outbreak of global health concern. *Lancet.* (2020) 395:470– 3. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30185-9
- Bai Y, Lin C-C, Lin C-Y, Chen JY, Chue CM, Chou P. Survey of stress Reactions among health care workers involved with the SARS outbreak. *Psychiatric Services*. (2004) 55:1055–7. doi: 10.1176/appi.ps.55.9.1055
- Chan AO, Huak CY. Psychological impact of the 2003 severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak on health care workers in a medium size regional general hospital in Singapore. *Occup Med.* (2004) 54:190– 6. doi: 10.1093/occmed/kqh027
- Chong MY, Wang WC, WC Hxieh, Chen CL. Psychological impact of severe acute respiratory syndrome on health workers in a tertiary hospital. Br J Psychiatry. (2004) 185:127–33. doi: 10.1192/bjp.185.2.127
- Tam CW, Pang EP, Lam LC, Chiu HF. Severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in Hong Kong in 2003: stress and psychological impact among frontline healthcare workers. *Psychol Med.* (2004) 34:1197–204. doi: 10.1017/S00332917040 02247
- Styra R, Hawryluckb L, Robinsonc S, Gold WL. Impact on health care workers employed in high-risk areas during the Toronto SARS outbreak. J Psychosom Res. (2008) 64:177–83. doi: 10.1016/j.jpsychores.2007. 07.015
- Maunder RG, Lancee WJ, Rourke S, Fones CS. Factors associated with the psychological impact of severe acute respiratory syndrome on nurses and other hospital workers in Toronto. *Psychosom Med.* (2004) 66:938– 42. doi: 10.1097/01.psy.0000145673.84698.18
- Wu P, Fang Y, Guan Z, Hoven CW. The psychological impact of the SARS epidemic on hospital employees in China: exposure, risk perception, and altruistic acceptance of risk. *Can J Psychiatry*. (2009) 54:302– 11. doi: 10.1177/070674370905400504
- Chua SE, Cheung V, Cheung C, Tsang KW. Psychological effects of the SARS outbreak in Hong Kong on high-risk health care workers. *Can J Psychiatry*. (2004) 49:391–3. doi: 10.1177/0706743704049 00609
- Wong TW, Yau JK, Chan CL, Lit CH. The psychological impact of severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak on healthcare workers in emergency departments and how they cope. *Eur J Emerg Med.* (2005) 12:13– 8. doi: 10.1097/00063110-200502000-00005
- Park JS, Lee EH, Park NR, Choi YH. Mental health of nurses working at a government-designated hospital during a MERS-CoV outbreak: a cross-sectional study. Arch Psychiatr Nurs. (2018) 32:2–6. doi: 10.1016/j.apnu.2017.09.006
- Lee SM, Kang WS, Cho AR, Park JK. Psychological impact of the 2015 MERS outbreak on hospital workers and quarantined hemodialysis patients. *Compr Psychiatry*. (2018) 87:123–7. doi: 10.1016/j.comppsych.2018. 10.003
- Kang L, Li Y, Hu S, Liu Z. The mental health of medical workers in Wuhan, China dealing with the 2019 novel coronavirus. *Lancet Psychiatry*. (2020) 7:e14. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30047-X

### **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

All authors have read through the manuscript and approve for submission. As the corresponding author, I have had full access to all aspects of the research and writing process, and I assume final responsibility for the contents of the paper.

- Xiang YT, Yang Y, Li W, Ng CH. Timely mental health care for the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak is urgently needed. *Lancet Psychiatry.* (2020) 7:228–9. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(20)3 0046-8
- Zung WWK. A rating instrument for anxiety disorders. *Psychosomatics*. (1971) 12:371–9. doi: 10.1016/S0033-3182(71)71479-0
- Zung WWK. A self-rating depression scale. Arch Gen Psychiatry. (1965) 12:63–70. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.1965.01720310065008
- Dunstan DA, Scott N, Todd AK. Screening for anxiety and depression: reassessing the utility of the Zung scales. *BMC Psychiatry*. (2017) 17:329. doi: 10.1186/s12888-017-1489-6
- Wang JN, Sun W, Chi TS, Wang L. Prevalence and associated factors of depressive symptoms among Chinese doctors: a cross-sectional survey. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health.* (2010) 83:905–11. doi: 10.1007/s00420-010-0508-4
- Zhou C, Shi L, Gao L, Fan L. Determinate factors of mental health status in Chinese medical staff. *Medicine*. (2018) 97:e0113. doi: 10.1097/MD.000000000010113
- Xi X, Lu Q, Wo T, Ung COL. Doctor's presenteeism and its relationship with anxiety and depression: a cross-sectional survey study in China. *BMJ Open.* (2019) 9:e028844. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028844
- Mata DA, Ramos MA, Bansal N, Sen S. Prevalence of depression and depressive symptoms among resident physicians: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA*. (2015) 314:2373–83. doi: 10.1001/jama.2015. 15845
- Wang D, Hu B, Zhu F, Peng Z, Zhu F, Liu X, et al. Clinical characteristics of 138 hospitalized patients with 2019 novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*. (2020) 323:1061–9. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020. 1585
- Mohammad F, Aryal S, Ho J, Stewart JC, Norman NA, Tan TL, et al. Ancient anxiety pathways influence drosophila defense behaviors. *Curr Biol.* (2016) 26:981–6. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2016.02.031
- Blanchard DC, Griebel G, Blanchard RJ. Mouse defensive behaviors: pharmacological and behavioral assays for anxiety and panic. *Eur J Pharmacol.* (2003) 463:97–116. doi: 10.1016/S0014-2999(03) 01276-7
- Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, et al. Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 in China. N Engl J Med. (2020) 382:1708– 20. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2002032
- Liu Y, Gayle AA, Wilder-Smith A. The reproductive number of COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. J Travel Med. (2020) 27:taaa021. doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa021
- Tang SY, Xiao YN, Peng ZH, Chen HB. Predicition modeling with data fusion and prevention strategy analysis for the CPVID-19 outbreak (Chinese). *Chin J Epidemiol.* (2020) 41:480–4. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.cn112338-20200216-00107
- Zhang YP. The epidemiological characteristics of an outbreak of 2019 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in China (Chinese). *Chin J Epidemiol.* (2020) 41:145–51. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0254-6450.2020. 02.003
- Maunder RG, Leszcz M, Savage D, Schulman B. Applying the lessons of SARS to pandemic influenza: an evidence-based approach to mitigating the stress experienced by healthcare workers. *Can J Public Health*. (2008) 99:486– 8. doi: 10.1007/BF03403782

- fmprc.gov.cn. Wang Yi Delivers a Speech at the 56th Munich Security Conference. Available online at:http://www.china.org.cn/chinese/2020-05/13/ content\_76039155.htm
- National Health Commission of China. The Guideline of Psychological Crisis Intervention for 2019-nCoV pneumonia. National Health Commission of China (Chinese). Available online at: http://www.nhc.gov.cn/jkj/s3577/ 202001/6adc08b966594253b2b791be5c3b9467.shtml
- 33. Li W, Yang Y, Liu ZH, Xiang YT. Progression of Mental Health Services during the COVID-19 Outbreak in China. J Biol Sci. (2020) 16:1732–8. doi: 10.7150/ijbs. 45120

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2020 Li, Chen, Xu, Zhao, Yu, Wang, Liu and Liu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.