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BACKGROUND

• Health and social care key workers are at high risk for acute and long-lasting mental health issues due to adversities faced during the pandemic

• The NHS Clinical Leaders Network (2020) issued an urgent call for action to ensure that the NHS prioritised initiatives to enhance mental health resilience and support provision for key workers

• Research priorities:
  o Monitoring of mental health
  o Determining the best ways of signposting and delivering mental health services for key workers
  o Identify and provide interventions to promote wellbeing and prevent mental health difficulties
  o Delivered now and at scale


BACKGROUND

- The Resilience Hubs mixed-methods study is evaluating an NHS outreach, screening and support service, to address the mental health needs of key workers during the COVID-19 pandemic.

- The research was conducted over 20 months to evaluate the Hub model in four UK sites:
  - Quantitative analyses of routine mental health screening data collected
  - Health economic analyses conducted using Hub clients’ service use and health status data;
  - In-depth interviews with Hub providers (recovery workers; therapists; service managers; commissioners), and key workers who did and did not register with the Hubs
  - Triangulate findings from the above, by producing mixed methods case studies for each Hub
AIM

- To summarise the health status of key workers accessing Hub support.
- To compare them to a pre-pandemic sample of key workers using 2018 data from Health Survey for England (HSE).
METHODS

Service use questionnaire sent (email invitation, alternative versions offered) to key workers screened by a Hub (Hub clients) approximately 6-month after screening.

299 Hub clients recruited from 4 Resilience Hubs
- Mainly NHS staff
- Many had several mental health difficulties, including anxiety, depression, and PTSD

The EQ-5D measure of health status
- Includes 5 domains (mobility, self-care, usual activity, pain/discomfort, anxiety/depression) with 5 levels
- Converted to utility values using published crosswalk algorithm
- 270 complete cases summarised using simple descriptive statistics
METHODS

To assess how the Resilience Hub clients health status compared to other groups, we identified relevant groups for comparison:

- General population norms
- Mental health conditions
- Key worker groups (majority health and social care professionals)
  - No identified published studies in this groups
  - 2018 HSE data reported the EQ-5D and also occupation groups that allowed us to restrict to health and social care professionals to represent a sample of key workers pre-COVID-19 pandemic (n=348)
RESULTS

General population
- Age group 35-44 mean EQ-5D norm is 0.893 and age group 45-54 norm is 0.855

Mental health conditions
- Resilience Hub clients health status was typically higher when compared with publications (UK trials of mental health interventions)

Key worker groups (health and social care professionals)
- When compared with the HSE sample, Resilience Hub clients health status is lower than would be expected

Hub client sample mean EQ-5D 0.755 (95% CI 0.731, 0.779)
- Mean age 44
- 84% female
## RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Hub clients</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSE sample</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-care</td>
<td>Hub clients</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSE sample</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usual activities</td>
<td>Hub clients</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSE sample</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain/discomfort</td>
<td>Hub clients</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSE sample</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety/depression</td>
<td>Hub clients</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSE sample</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

Anxiety/depression domain

Proportion reporting

EQ-5D level
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## RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Resilience clients&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>0.494, 0.964</td>
<td>0.732, 0.842</td>
<td>0.729, 0.812</td>
<td>0.673, 0.77</td>
<td>0.707, 0.822</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.731, 0.779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>HSE health professional crosswalk</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>0.827, 0.942</td>
<td>0.914, 0.959</td>
<td>0.859, 0.944</td>
<td>0.829, 0.907</td>
<td>0.835, 0.908</td>
<td>0.759, 0.866</td>
<td>0.853, 0.888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** <sup>a</sup> Includes participants with missing gender or who identified in another way
DISCUSSION

- First known EQ-5D data related to a sample of keyworkers

- The Hub client sample EQ-5D scores were lower than would be expected from the population norms and the sample of keyworkers from HSE data, which aligns with wider evidence on health of keyworkers during the pandemic\(^1\)
  - Proportion undergoing treatment/on waiting lists
  - Impact of COVID-19\(^2\)
  - Evidence of delayed dysfunction following disasters\(^3\)

- Challenges making these comparisons (e.g. sample differences)

Further research needed
- Exploratory analysis
- More data needed to assess changes in health status resulting from Hub support
- Changes in health status of keyworkers pre and post pandemic (future HSE data?)

---

\(^1\) Health-related quality of life and mental well-being of healthy and diseased persons in 8 countries: Does stringency of government response against early COVID-19 matter?