1



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Trends of Prevalence Estimates and Risk Factors of Depressive Symptoms among Healthcare Workers Over one Year of the COVID-19 Pandemic

Ahmed Yassin^{1,*}, Abdel-Hameed Al-Mistarehi², Ola Soudah³, Reema Karasneh³, Sayer Al-Azzam⁴, Aref A. Qarqash⁵, Aws G. Khasawneh⁶, Kefah A. Alhayk¹, Majdi Al Qawasmeh¹, Raid M. Kofahi¹, Salma Y. Bashayreh¹ and Khalid El-Salem¹

¹Department of Neurology, Faculty of Medicine, Jordan University of Science and Technology, Irbid, Jordan ²Department of Public Health and Family Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Jordan University of Science and Technology, Irbid, Jordan ³Department of Basic Medical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan ⁴Department of Clinical Pharmacy, Jordan University of Science and Technology, Irbid, Jordan ⁵Faculty of Medicine, Jordan University of Science and Technology, Irbid, Jordan

⁶Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, Jordan University of Science and Technology, Irbid, Jordan

Abstract:

Background:

COVID-19 pandemic has an overwhelming psychologic burden on healthcare workers (HCWs). This study aims to investigate the changes in the prevalence, estimates, severity, and risk factors of depressive symptoms among HCWs within the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Methods:

An observational e-survey collected data on HCWs' socio-demographic characteristics, occupational situation, and depressive symptoms as measured by Patient Health Questionnaire–9 (PHQ-9). The e-survey was distributed one month after the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic (onset group) and again after one year (one-year group).

Results:

A total of 422 HCWs were included (Mean (SD) age, 35.3 (9.9) years; 71.3% males), with 211 (50%) participants in each group. In the total cohort, the mean PHQ-9 score was 8.5, and 36.7% reported clinically significant levels of depressive symptoms with a PHQ-9 score of \geq 10. Compared to the onset group, the one-year group reported a higher risk of major depressive disorder (41.7% vs. 31.8%; OR 1.538; 95%CI 1.032–2.291; p=0.034), a higher mean PHQ-9 score (9.5 (6.8) vs. 7.4 (5.3), p<0.001), and more severe depressive symptoms (p<0.005). Participants who were younger, unmarried, underwent testing for COVID-19, reported lower monthly income, did not receive special COVID-19 education, or had lower satisfaction with institutional preparedness had significantly higher depression scores and symptoms in both onset and one-year group. Occupation as a physician, history of COVID-19 testing or infection, and perception of significant changes in work schedule or intensity were significantly associated with higher depression scores and symptoms among the one-year group.

Conclusion:

This study sheds light on an unspoken but significant rise in prevalence estimates and severity of depressive symptoms among HCWs over a year of the COVID-19 pandemic and shows the vulnerable subgroups for whom a psychological intervention might be warranted.

Keywords: COVID-19, Depression, Healthcare workers, Health providers, Physicians, One-year.

Article History Received: March 3, 2022 Revised: April 21, 2022 Accepted: April 27, 2022
--

1. INTRODUCTION

Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic and its associated precautionary measures have affected life aspects across the globe in all possible ways [1 - 10]. According to the

Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center, by the end of January 2022, more than 200 nations have been affected by the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the cause of COVID-19, with more than 370 million confirmed cases and over 5.6 million deaths globally [11]. Although COVID-19 presents mainly with respiratory manifestations, its complications are vast and could include

^{*} Address correspondence to this author at the Department of Neurology, School of Medicine, Jordan University of Science and Technology, P.O.Box: (630001) Irbid (22110) Jordan; E-mail: amyassin@just.edu.jo

cardiovascular, thromboembolic, and neurological ones [12 - 16]. Besides, COVID-19 harms the psychosocial well-being of patients and the general public as a whole [17 - 19]. A Swedish cross-sectional study conducted early in the Pandemic from March 26 to April 5, 2020, found that 22.2% of the general population reported clinically significant levels of depressive symptoms (PHQ-9 \ge 10) [18].

Healthcare workers (HCWs), who are on the frontline, have also been significantly affected. A study with a total of 1978 participants in the general population across the United States of America (USA) found that employment as an HCW was a significant risk factor for depression [20]. The negative effect of the pandemic on HCWs likely results from their perceived risk of acquiring the infection upon direct contact with suspected or confirmed cases [21]. Other contributing factors include the increase in the HCWs' workload, their worries about transmitting the infection to other patients, loved ones, colleagues, and family members, their negative feelings that progressively build up as they see the patients' suffering and anxiety about their families, the periods of lockdown and movement restriction, and the adverse effects of the pandemic on their social support system [21 - 24]. Thus, HCWs are vulnerable to emotional distress and psychological challenges, resulting in stress, depression, and anxiety symptoms [25 - 31].

On March 2, 2020, the first COVID-19 case was confirmed in Jordan, with no new reported cases of COVID-19 until March 15, when 11 new cases had been tested positive for COVID-19, followed by a rise in cases in the following days and weeks [13, 32]. Accordingly, on March 17, the government enforced different levels of lockdown for three months. Thus, the number of cases was relatively low throughout this period. A few months after the lockdown's end, around October-November 2020, the number of cases started to rise significantly until we reached the first peak. Consequently, partial restrictions on people's movement were imposed, including a curfew after 9 pm on weekdays and a complete lockdown on weekends. Numbers got relatively under control towards the end of 2020. However, later in February and March 2021, cases started to rise again significantly (second peak), resulting in more tightening of the restrictions [11, 33, 34] (Fig. 1). This COVID-19 should be a reminder to be prepared for the potential public health and psychiatric challenges of emerging pandemics in the future [35].

To our knowledge, this study is one of the first to assess the trend in prevalence rates, severity degree, and risk factors for symptoms of depression among HCWs over the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic. The study achieves this goal by investigating depressive symptoms among HCWs approximately one month after the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic (onset group) and again after one year during the second peak (one-year group). The ultimate goal is to recommend interventions to alleviate depressive symptoms, particularly for vulnerable subgroups, and potentially prevent these symptoms from occurring if similar health crises occur in the future. Such recommendations would be directed to health care providers' and administrators' attention at institutional, national, and even international levels.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Study Design, Population, and Ethical Approval

This study is an exploratory observational survey conducted online using the Google Form tool. To achieve the study objectives, the e-survey was conducted *via* two-stage sampling. The e-survey was firstly distributed after about one month of COVID-19 pandemic onset in Jordan, between the 15th and 30th of April 2020. Then, the same questionnaire was distributed again after one year of COVID-19 pandemic onset between the 15th and 30th of March 2021. Thus, the total cohort consisted of two subgroups: onset and one-year groups. Participants were eligible if they were HCWs, 18 years of age or older, living in Jordan, and had internet access *via* smart-



Fig. (1). Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) daily and weekly average new cases in Jordan over 2020-2021. The first case was confirmed on March 02, 2020; the first peak was around November 2020, and the second one was around April 2020. The figure was reprinted and adapted with permission from COVID-19 Dashboard by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University (JHU) [11, 34].

phone or computer. The study investigators shared the e-survey link *via* social media platforms, mainly WhatsApp, and asked the participants to further disseminate the e-survey to their peers. On receiving and clicking the link, participants would be auto-directed to the informed consent page, and a short message describing the objectives and design of the study followed by a consent question would appear. If they agree to participate, they would be further directed to the survey questions; unless the form will terminate. Participants could terminate the survey at any time desired. The survey was anonymous, and information confidentiality was assured. Participants did not receive any compensation or rewards for their participation in the study.

The study protocol was revised and ethically approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the research and ethics committee at Jordan University of Science and Technology, Irbid, Jordan (IRB number 106/132/2020). This study was conducted following the 1975 Helsinki Declaration, revised in 2008, and later amendments or comparable ethical standards. This work has been reported based on the STROBE statement guidelines for reporting observational studies [36].

2.2. Survey Instruments

The participants self-reported the data, and the questionnaire was designed based on the literature [18, 20, 37 - 42]. The questionnaire validity was checked by a pilot study that included 20 random HCWs who assessed the questionnaire's clarity, and no significant modifications were required. The questionnaire consisted of 3 sections, including socio-demographic characteristics, occupational situation, and depressive symptoms.

Participants first completed socio-demographic characteristics, including age, gender, area of living, marital status, and whether they were living with an elderly of 65 years or older (yes/no). Then, they were asked about their personal history of COVID-19 testing, infection, and the need for hospital admission if they got infected. The history of getting the anti-COVID-19 vaccine was investigated within the one-year sample, as the vaccine was unavailable at the onset of the pandemic [43].

The occupational situation was assessed using questions asked about the participant's working position, monthly income in Jordanian Dinar (JD), whether they were in direct contact with confirmed or suspected COVID-19 individuals or samples during the work (yes/no), the estimated number of confirmed or suspected COVID-19 individuals or samples that participants dealt with, and whether they received an exceptional education to deal with COVID-19 patients (yes/no). Participants' perception of contact with COVID-19 patients was also assessed using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from "1=low level of contact" to "5=high level of contact". Furthermore, participants' evaluation of their institution's preparedness to deal with COVID-19 patients was studied using a 6-point Likert scale ranging from "Very bad" to "Excellent". In addition, the perceived level of change in work schedule and intensity due to the COVID-19 pandemic was assessed with response options of no perceived changes / A little / some / much / very much.

The third part of the questionnaire assessed depression symptoms experienced by the participants using the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9), a validated and reliable clinical and research tool for major depressive disorder (MDD) screening and depression severity grading [44 - 46]. PHQ-9 consists of nine items asking about nine symptoms based on the diagnostic criteria for MDD in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV). The frequency of each symptom was assessed using a 4point Likert scale (0 = not at all, 1 = several days, 2 = morethan half of the days, 3 = nearly every day), then a total score ranging from 0 to 27 was obtained by summing the items scores. Depressive symptoms were described in three formats; PHQ-9 scores, severity categories of depression, and binary categorization into high risk and low risk for MDD determined by a total score cutoff of 10, which was found to have a sensitivity of 88% and a specificity of 85-88% for predicting MDD [44 - 46]. Severity categories were defined as normal (score 0-4), mild (score 5-9), moderate (score 10-14), moderately severe (score 15-19), and severe (score, 20-27) [44]. Among our participants, the Cronbach's alfa (α) for the items on the PHQ-9 depression scale was 0.903.

2.3. Statistical Analysis

All data analyses were performed using the IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software for Windows, version 25.0. Continuous variables, including age, perceived level of contact with COVID-19 patients, and PHQ-9 scale total scores, were presented as mean \pm standard deviation (m±SD) after verifying the normality of the dataset. The age variable was further presented as a categorical variable with four groups, based on the interquartile range, as 23-27, 28-31, 32-39, and \geq 40 years. Descriptive statistics were conducted to calculate the frequencies and percentages for the categorical variables. Internal consistency reliability was measured using Cronbach's α for the PHQ-9 scale.

The differences between onset and one-year samples were analyzed using a chi-square test for categorical variables, including socio-demographics, occupational characteristics, and severity categories of depression. In contrast, Student's ttest or one-way ANOVA was used for continuous variables, including PHQ-9 total scores and perceived level of contact with COVID-19 patients. Moreover, we investigated the differences in the PHQ-9 scale total scores among each sample using Student's t-test or one-way ANOVA. The differences in the severity categories of depression among each sample were assessed using the chi-square test.

Binary logistic regression analyses were used to estimate the Odds Ratio (OR) and 95% Confidence Interval (95% CI) for MDD risk factors among each sample of HCWs. Model selection using the stepwise backward approach with a cutoff *p-value of 0.2* was used to select the final, most parsimonious model where age, gender, marriage status, living with the elderly, occupation, monthly income, COVID-19 vaccination, previous testing, previous infection, direct contact with COVID-19 patients or samples during the work, getting an exceptional education to deal with COVID-19 patients, participant's evaluation of institutional preparedness, and perceived changes in work schedule due to COVID-19 pandemic were included as independent explanatory variables. The variables in the last model were checked for multicollinearity using the variance inflation factor (VIF). Statistical significance was considered at a *p*-value of ≤ 0.05 .

3. RESULTS

3.1. Participants' Characteristics

In this study, from 494 HCWs invited to participate (239 onset and 253 one-year groups), 427 respondents initiated the survey with a participation rate of 86.4%. Of the respondents, 422 (98.8%) completed the survey items and were included in the final sample (Figs. **2A** and **2B**).

3.2. Total Cohort Characteristics

The participants' age ranged from 23 to 73 years with a mean (SD) of 35.3 (9.9) years, and 71.3% were males. Of the total cohort, 254 (60.2%) were married, and 168 (39.8%) were single, widowed, or divorced. Most participants (n=344, 81.5%) were physicians, while 78 (18.5%) were nurses,

pharmacists, or technicians. More than half of the participants (58.1%) reported a low monthly income (less than one thousand Jordanian Dinar-JD).

3.3. The Onset and One-year Sample Characteristics

Each group of the two samples included 211 participants, representing 50% of the total cohort. A similar age mean (SD) were observed in the two samples (24-70 years, 34.7 (9.3) in the onset sample, and 23-73 years, 35.8 (10.5) in the one-year sample). Among the onset group, 73.0% were males, 62.6% were married, 77.7% were physicians, and 62.5% reported a low monthly income. Among the one-year sample, 69.7% were males, 57.8% were married, 85.3% were physicians, and 53.6% informed a low monthly income. The two groups matched age, gender, marital status, occupation, and monthly income (p > 0.05). Table **1** shows the participants' characteristics in the total cohort and the onset and one-year groups.

In the one-year group, the proportions of HCWs who got tested for (87.2%) or infected with (46.0%) COVID-19 were significantly higher than that of the onset group (23.2%, 0.5%, respectively) (p<0.001 for each).



Fig. (2A). Study participants' flow chart one month after COVID-19 pandemic onset.



Fig. (2B). Study participants' flow chart one year after COVID-19 pandemic onset.

Table 1. Socio-demographic and occupational characteristics of the survey participants in total cohort and subgroups.

Characteristic	Total Cohort, n=422 n (%)	Onset Group, n=211 n (%)	One-year Group, n=211 n (%)	p-value	
	Age, y ®	n (70)	n (70)		
23-27	90 (21.3)	47 (22.3)	43 (20.4)		
28-31	107 (25.4)	56 (26.5)	51 (24.2)	1	
32-39	118 (28.0)	59 (28.0)	59 (28.0)	0.761	
≥40	107 (25.4)	49 (23.2)	58 (27.5)	1	
	Gender				
Male	301 (71.3)	154 (73.0)	147 (69.7)	0.451	
Female	121 (28.7)	57 (27.0)	64 (30.3)	0.451	
l	Marital status		•		
Unmarried*	168 (39.8)	79 (37.4)	89 (42.2)	0.220	
Married	254 (60.2)	132 (62.6)	122 (57.8)	0.320	
Living with eld	erly of 65 years old or	older	•		
No	217 (51.4)	125 (59.2)	92 (43.6)	0.001	
Yes	205 (48.6)	86 (40.8)	119 (56.4)	0.001	
	Occupation				
Physician	344 (81.5)	164 (77.7)	180 (85.3)	0.060	
Others†	78 (18.5)	47 (22.3)	31 (14.7)	0.000	
Monthly inco	ome, Jordanian Dinar ((JD)			
<500	56 (13.3)	25 (11.8)	31 (14.7)		
500-1000	189 (44.8)	107 (50.7)	82 (38.9)	0.066	
1000-2000	66 (15.6)	33 (15.6)	33 (15.6)	0.000	
>2000	111 (26.3)	46 (21.8)	65 (30.8)		
COVI	D-19 characteristics		_		
Vaccinated against COVID-19*	-	-	151 (71.6)	-	
Tested for COVID-19	233 (55.2)	49 (23.2)	184 (87.2)	< 0.001	
Hx of COVID-19 infection	98 (23.2)	1 (0.5)	97 (46.0)	< 0.001	
Hx of hospital admission due to COVID-19 infection (% out of infected persons)	5 (5.1)	0 (0.0)	5 (5.2)	-	

(Table 1) contd....

Direct contact with confirmed or suspected COVID-19 individuals or samples	197 (46.7)	52 (24.6)	145 (68.7)	< 0.001
Perceived level of contact with COVID-19 patients, Mean (SD) (score range; 1-5)	3.09 (1.30)	2.59 (1.19)	3.59 (1.20)	< 0.001
Estimated number of confirmed or suspe	cted COVID-19 cas	es that participants de	alt with	
Zero	227 (53.8)	160 (75.8)	67 (31.8)	
1-49	91 (21.6)	31 (14.7)	60 (28.4)	<0.001
50-100	40 (9.5)	9 (4.3)	31 (14.7)	< 0.001
>100	64 (15.2)	11 (5.2)	53 (25.1)	
Receiving an exceptional edu	cation to deal with C	COVID-19 patients		-
No	293 (69.4)	152 (72.0)	141 (66.8)	0.245
Yes	129 (30.6)	59 (28.0)	70 (33.2)	0.245
Participants' evaluations of their institut	ion preparedness to	deal with COVID-19	patients	
Very bad	26 (6.2)	9 (4.3)	17 (8.1)	
Bad	63 (14.9)	25 (11.8)	38 (18.0)	
Fair	98 (23.2)	38 (18.0)	60 (28.4)	0.002
Good	116 (27.5)	65 (30.8)	51 (24.2)	0.002
Very good	92 (21.8)	57 (27.0)	35 (16.6)	
Excellent	27 (6.4)	17 (8.1)	10 (4.7)	
Perceived changes in work schedul	e and intensity due	to COVID-19 pandemi	ic	
No perceived changes	27 (6.4)	10 (4.7)	17 (8.1)	
A little	31 (7.3)	19 (9.0)	12 (5.7)	
Some	78 (18.5)	39 (18.5)	39 (18.5)	0.474
Much	165 (39.1)	81 (38.4)	84 (39.8)	
Very much	121 (28.7)	62 (29.4)	59 (28.0)	

The Chi-square test assessed the differences between onset and one-year samples for socio-demographic and occupational characteristics. The student's t-test was used to estimate the difference in means of perceived level of contact with COVID-19 patients between the two groups.

R Age was defined as a categorical variable with four groups, divided approximately at the interquartile ranges.

*Unmarried category included single (never married), widowed, and divorced participants.

† Others included nurses, pharmacists, and technicians.

¥ COVID-19 vaccine was not available at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.

3.4. Occupational Situation

HCWs' contact with COVID-19 patients and samples in the one-year group was significantly higher than the rate in the onset group (p < 0.001). There were no significant differences between the two groups in the percentage of HCWs who received special education to deal with COVID-19 patients. Compared to the onset sample, more participants in the oneyear sample reported poor evaluation of institutional preparedness to deal with COVID-19 patients. There were no significant differences in the perception of changes in work schedule and intensity between the two groups (p=0.474).

3.4.1. Trends of Depressive Symptoms among HCWs over a year of the COVID-19 Pandemic

In the total cohort, 155 HCWs (36.7%) reported clinically significant levels of depressive symptoms, indicating a high risk for MDD. Their mean (SD) PHQ-9 score was 8.5 (6.2), and the severity of depression symptoms was mild in 33.4%, moderate in 20.4%, moderately severe in 9.5%, and severe in 6.9%.

For the one-year group, 88 participants (41.7%) had a high risk for MDD compared to 67 participants (31.8%) in the onset group (Fig. **3**). This difference was statistically significant with an unadjusted OR of 1.538; 95% CI, 1.032–2.291; p=0.034. Moreover, the mean (SD) score of the PHQ-9 scale for

depression was significantly higher in the one-year sample compared with the onset sample (9.5 (6.8) vs. 7.4 (5.3), p < 0.001). Moreover, the one-year group reported more severe depression symptoms than the onset group (p=0.005). Table **2** shows the scores and severity of depression symptoms among HCWs in the total cohort and onset and one-year groups.

3.4.2. Factors Associated with Depressive Symptoms in the Onset Group

In the onset sample, younger participants, women, and unmarried participants had significantly higher depression scores than their counterparts Table 3. Data from this sample showed a trend of significantly decreasing depression scores with increasing monthly income. Moreover, HCWs who had undergone testing for COVID-19 reported higher mean scores on PHQ-9 than those who had not (10.35 (6.34) vs. 6.54 (4.63), p < 0.001). Similarly, higher depression mean scores were observed among HCWs with direct contact with COVID-19 patients and samples than those who did not report such contact (10.42 (6.29) vs. 6.45 (4.56), p<0.001). HCWs who did not receive a special COVID-19 education had significantly higher scores on the PHQ-9 scale than those who did (8.05 (5.69) vs. 5.83 (3.73), p=0.006). Lastly, poor evaluation of institutional COVID-19 preparedness was significantly associated with higher depression scores Table 3.



Fig. (3). Trends of prevalence estimates of major depressive disorder (MDD) among health care workers within a year of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Total Cohort, n=422	Onset Group, n=211	One-year Group, n=211	p-value
РНQ-9,	depression symptoms		-
8.48 (6.16)	7.43 (5.31)	9.53 (6.75)	< 0.001
Depression S	Severity Categories, n (%)		-
126 (29.9)	69 (32.7)	57 (27.0)	
141 (33.4)	75 (35.5)	66 (31.3)	
86 (20.4)	47 (22.3)	39 (18.5)	0.005
40 (9.5)	12 (5.7)	28 (13.3)	
29 (6.9)	8 (3.8)	21 (10.0)	
	PHQ-9, 8.48 (6.16) Depression S 126 (29.9) 141 (33.4) 86 (20.4) 40 (9.5)	PHQ-9, depression symptoms 8.48 (6.16) 7.43 (5.31) Depression Severity Categories, n (%) 126 (29.9) 69 (32.7) 141 (33.4) 75 (35.5) 86 (20.4) 47 (22.3) 40 (9.5) 12 (5.7)	PHQ-9, depression symptoms 8.48 (6.16) 7.43 (5.31) 9.53 (6.75) Depression Severity Categories, n (%) 126 (29.9) 69 (32.7) 57 (27.0) 141 (33.4) 75 (35.5) 66 (31.3) 86 (20.4) 47 (22.3) 39 (18.5) 40 (9.5) 12 (5.7) 28 (13.3)

Table 2. Scores and severity categories of depression in total cohort and subgroups.

One-way ANOVA was used to estimate the difference in means of PHQ-9 scores, while the chi-square test was conducted to assess the differences in depression severity categories.

Abbreviations: PHQ-9, 9-item Patient Health Questionnaire

Table 3. Differences in the scores and severity categories of depression among the onset group (n=211).

Characteristic	PHQ-9, Depression Symptoms							
	Total Score, Mean (SD)	p-value		Depr	ession Severi	ty Categories, n (%)		
			Normal	Mild	Moderate	Moderately Severe & Severe	p-value	
		A	ge, y					
23-27	9.53 (5.70)		10 (21.3)	12 (25.5)	18 (38.3)	7 (14.9)		
28-31	7.61 (5.41)	<0.001	18 (32.1)	20 (35.7)	12 (21.4)	6 (10.7)	0.002	
32-39	7.81 (4.99)	< 0.001	15 (25.4)	26 (44.1)	11 (18.6)	7 (11.9)	0.002	
≥40	4.73 (4.08)	1	26 (53.1)	17 (34.7)	6 (12.2)	0 (0.0)		
	i	Ge	nder					
Male	6.55 (5.18)	<0.001	63 (40.9)	53 (34.4)	25 (16.2)	13 (8.4)	<0.001	
Female	9.79 (4.95)	< 0.001	6 (10.5)	22 (38.6)	22 (38.6)	7 (12.3)	< 0.001	
	·	Marria	ige status					
Unmarried*	9.46 (5.95)	<0.001	17 (21.5)	24 (30.4)	24 (30.4)	14 (17.7)	<0.001	
Married	6.21 (4.49)	< 0.001	52 (39.4)	51 (38.6)	23 (17.4)	6 (4.5)	< 0.001	
	Living with	h elderly o	of 65 years	old or older				

8 Clinical Practice & Epidemiology in Mental Health, 2022, Volume 18

uble 3) contd		_	_	-			
No	7.25 (5.67)	0.557	46 (36.8)	41 (32.8)	24 (19.2)	14 (11.2)	0.214
Yes	7.69 (4.76)	0.337	23 (26.7)	34 (39.5)	23 (26.7)	6 (7.0)	0.214
		Occi	ipation				
Physician	7.65 (5.56)	0.249	54 (32.9)	54 (32.9)	39 (23.8)	17 (10.4)	0.425
Others [†]	6.64 (4.29)	0.249	15 (31.9)	21 (44.7)	8 (17.0)	3 (6.4)	0.423
	Monthly	income, J	ordanian D) Dinar (JD)			
<500	9.76 (6.09)		4 (16.0)	12 (48.0)	4 (16.0)	5 (20.0)	
500-1000	8.97 (4.96)	< 0.001	19 (17.8)	41 (38.3)	33 (30.8)	14 (13.1)	< 0.001
1000-2000	4.33 (3.96)	<0.001	20 (60.6)	9 (27.3)	4 (12.1)	0 (0.0)	<0.001
>2000	4.78 (4.45)	1	26 (56.5)	13 (28.3)	6 (13.0)	1 (2.2)	
	C	OVID-19	characteris	tics			
COVID-19 tested	10.35 (6.34)	< 0.001	11 (22.4)	13 (26.5)	14 (28.6)	11 (22.4)	0.001
Direct contact with COVID-19 pts. or samples	10.42 (6.29)	< 0.001	11 (21.2)	13 (25.0)	15 (28.8)	13 (25.0)	< 0.001
Perceived contact with COVID-19 pts, Mean (SD)	-	-	2.23 (1.19)	2.65 (1.11)	2.70 (1.18)	3.30 (1.17)	0.002
Estim	ated number of confirmed	l or suspe	cted COVI	D-19 that p	articipants	dealt with	
Zero	6.33 (4.26)		56 (35.0)	67 (41.9)	33 (20.6)	4 (2.5)	<0.001
1-49	8.19 (5.95)		13 (41.9)	6 (19.4)	6 (19.4)	6 (19.4)	
50-100	13.56 (5.59)	< 0.001	0 (0.0)	2 (22.2)	4 (44.4)	3 (33.3)	
>100	16.27 (5.57)	1	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (36.4)	7 (63.6)	
	Receiving an exception	al educati	on to deal v	with COVII)-19 patient	S	
No	8.05 (5.69)	0.006	46 (30.3)	49 (32.2)	39 (25.7)	18 (11.8)	0.024
Yes	5.83 (3.73)	0.006	23 (39.0)	26 (44.1)	8 (13.6)	2 (3.4)	0.034
Participa	ants' evaluations of their i	nstitution	preparedn	ess to deal v	vith COVII	0-19 patients	
Very bad	11.11 (5.51)		0 (0.0)	3 (33.3)	5 (55.6)	1 (11.1)	
Bad	10.80 (5.79)	1	4 (16.0)	6 (24.0)	9 (36.0)	6 (24.0)	
Fair	8.87 (5.63)	<0.001	8 (21.1)	13 (34.2)	12 (31.6)	5 (13.2)	<0.001
Good	7.20 (4.76)	< 0.001	18 (27.7)	28 (43.1)	14 (21.5)	5 (7.7)	< 0.001
Very good	5.46 (4.44)	1	28 (49.1)	21 (36.8)	6 (10.5)	2 (3.5)	
Excellent	4.76 (4.45)	1	11 (64.7)	4 (23.5)	1 (5.9)	1 (5.9)	
Pe	rceived changes in work s	chedule a	nd intensity	due to CO	VID-19 pan	demic	
No changes	6.40 (3.81)		4 (40.0)	4 (40.0)	2 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	
A little	5.74 (5.11)	1	7 (36.8)	10 (52.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (10.5)	
Some	6.77 (5.94)	0.247	16 (41.0)	13 (33.3)	6 (15,4)	4 (10.3)	0.305
Much	7.44 (4.99)]	26 (32.1)	29 (35.8)	18 (22.2)	8 (9.9)	
Very much	8.50 (5.48)	7	16 (25.8)	19 (30.6)	21 (33.9)	6 (9.7)	_

Student's t-test or one-way ANOVA was conducted to investigate the differences in the PHQ-9 scale scores with socio-demographic and occupational characteristics. In contrast, the differences in the severity categories of depression were assessed using a chi-square test. *Unmarried category included single, widowed, and divorced participants.

† Others included nurses, pharmacists, and technicians.

Regarding the severity categories of depression, similar to the previous findings based on PHQ-9 scores, HCWs who were younger, women, unmarried, or had a lower monthly income experienced significantly more severe symptoms of depression than their counterparts. Moreover, HCWs who underwent testing for SARS-CoV-2 infection, had direct contact with COVID-19 patients or samples, did not receive special COVID-19 education, and were unsatisfied with the institution's preparedness had more severe depressive symptoms than their counterparts Table **3**.

Living with the elderly, occupation, and perceived changes in work schedule or intensity were not associated with depression (score or severity categories) in the onset group (p>0.05).

3.4.3. Factors Associated with Depressive Symptoms in the One-year Group

One-year participants had higher scores and severity levels of depression symptoms than the onset group. However, the factors associated with significantly higher depression scores and more severe symptoms were to a large degree similar to those observed in the onset group. One-year participants who were younger, women, unmarried, had lower monthly income, had direct contact with COVID-19 patients or samples, did not receive special COVID-19 education, or were unsatisfied with institutional preparedness had higher depression scores and severity compared to their counterparts, Table **4**.

However, a few risk factors were different between the onset and the one-year groups. Physicians in the one-year group had higher mean scores of depression (9.53 (6.75)) than

in the onset group (7.43 (5.31)) with a mean difference of 2.10 (t(420) = 3.56, p < 0.001) for PHQ-9 depression score. Moreover, unlike the onset group, physicians in the one-year group experienced significantly more severe depressive symptoms than other HCWs (p=0.009). Unlike the onset group participants, data from the one-year sample indicated that perceived more work schedule and intensity changes were associated with more depression symptoms (p < 0.001). Among the one-year group, approximately half of the participants (46.0%) reported a history of COVID-19 infection, and they had significantly higher PHQ-9 scores and depression severity levels than those who did not get infected (p < 0.05).

Among the one-year group, about two-thirds (71.6%) of HCWs became vaccinated against COVID-19 one year after the pandemic onset, and the depression mean (SD) score was lower among vaccinated participants (8.90 (6.13)) than those who did not get the vaccine (9.78 (6.99)). However, this difference was not statistically significant, with a *p*-value of 0.394. Living with the elderly was insignificant for depression scores and severity among the onset and one-year samples (p>0.05).

3.4.4. Risk Factors of Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) among HCWs

Binary logistic regression analyses showed that, after controlling for confounders, low monthly income, lack of special education to deal with COVID-19 patients, and poor evaluation of institutional preparedness were independent risk factors for developing MDD among both onset and one-year samples (Table 5). Female gender (OR, 2.31; 95% C.I. 1.13–4.74; p=0.022) and having direct contact with COVID-19 patients or samples (OR, 2.27; 95% C.I. 1.01–5.09; p=0.046) were significant risk factors for developing clinically depressive symptoms among the onset sample only. In contrast,

undergoing a test for COVID-19 was an independent risk factor for developing MDD symptoms in the one-year sample only (OR, 4.48; 95% C.I. 1.07–18.81; p=0.041).

4. DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this study is one of the first to investigate the change in prevalence rates and risk factors of depressive symptoms among HCWs over a year during the COVID-19 pandemic. Our study showed a high proportion of HCWs manifesting depressive symptoms with a significant increase in the prevalence rate and severity of symptoms over the first year of the pandemic in Jordan (32% at onset vs. 42% after one year). This study necessitates the importance of applying mental health support interventions for HCWs during pandemics, including but not limited to communication support, appropriate work shifts, and good communication between the team leader and staff [47]. The change in factors associated with depressive symptoms was not impressive. HCWs who were younger, unmarried, did not receive special COVID-19 education, had lower satisfaction with institutional preparedness, and had lower monthly income were at higher risk for depression and had more severe symptoms in both onset and one-year groups. However, unlike the one-year group, female gender and direct contact with COVID-19 patients or samples were significant risk factors within the onset group. On the other hand, occupation (physician), perceived changes in work schedule or intensity, and being tested for COVID-19 were significantly associated with depressive symptoms within the one-year group. As expected, the one-year group had way higher rates of COVID-19 infection with significantly higher depression scores and severity. The anti-COVID19 vaccine was received by twothirds of the one-year group and was considered a relative, but insignificant, protective action.

Table 4. Differences in the scores and severity categories of depression among the one-year group (n=211).

Characteristic			PHQ-9,	Depression	Symptoms		
	Total Score, Mean (SD)	p-value		Depr	ession Seve	rity Categories, n (%)	
			Normal	Mild	Moderate	Moderately Severe & Severe	p-value
		Α	ge, y				
23-27	11.79 (6.71)		6 (14.0)	13 (30.2)	7 (16.3)	17 (39.5)	
28-31	11.71 (6.83)	< 0.001	6 (11.8)	19 (37.3)	11 (21.6)	15 (29.4)	0.001
32-39	9.02 (6.18)	<0.001	19 (32.2)	16 (27.1)	15 (25.4)	9 (15.3)	0.001
≥ 40	6.47 (6.09)	1	26 (44.8)	18 (31.0)	6 (10.3)	8 (13.8)	
		Ge	ender				
Male	8.48 (6.68)	0.001	50 (34.0)	45 (30.6)	24 (16.3)	28 (19.0)	0.002
Female	11.94 (6.35)	0.001	7 (10.9)	21 (32.8)	15 (23.4)	21 (32.8)	0.003
		Marria	age status		•		
Unmarried [*]	11.69 (6.41)	< 0.001	13 (14.6)	29 (32.6)	15 (16.9)	32 (36.0)	< 0.001
Married	7.96 (6.59)	<0.001	44 (36.1)	37 (30.3)	24 (19.7)	17 (13.9)	<0.001
	Living wit	h elderly (of 65 years	old or olde	r		
No	9.24 (6.87)	0.592	27 (29.3)	29 (31.5)	17 (18.5)	19 (20.7)	0.950
Yes	9.76 (6.68)	0.582	30 (25.2)	37 (31.1)	22 (18.5)	30 (25.2)	0.850
		Occi	upation				
Physician	10.06 (6.95)	0.000	45 (25.0)	55 (30.6)	31 (17.2)	49 (27.2)	0.000
Others [†]	6.48 (4.49)	0.006	13 (41.9)	13 (41.9)	4 (12.9)	1 (3.2)	0.009
	Monthly	income, J	lordanian I	Dinar (JD)		•	

10 Clinical Practice & Epidemiology in Mental Health, 2022, Volume 18

able 4) contd							
<500	16.87 (4.71)		1 (3.2)	1 (3.2)	6 (19.4)	23 (74.2)	
500-1000	10.28 (6.21)	< 0.001	13 (15.9)	31 (37.8)	23 (28.0)	15 (18.3)	< 0.00
1000-2000	7.33 (6.22)	<0.001	14 (42.4)	12 (36.4)	2 (6.1)	5 (15.2)	<0.00
>2000	6.20 (5.53)		29 (44.6)	22 (33.8)	8 (12.3)	6 (9.2)	
		COVID-19	characteris	tics			-
Vaccinated	8.90 (6.13)	0.394	37 (24.5)	53 (35.1)	21 (13.9)	40 (26.5)	0.007
COVID-19 tested	10.10 (6.73)	0.001	43 (23.4)	56 (30.4)	39 (21.2)	46 (25.0)	0.002
COVID-19 infected	10.71 (6.64)	0.019	20 (20.6)	27 (27.8)	22 (22.7)	28 (28.9)	0.046
Direct contact with COVID-19 pts. or samples	10.85 (6.85)	< 0.001	29 (20.0)	45 (31.0)	28 (19.3)	43 (29.7)	0.00
Perceived contact with COVID-19 pts, Mean (SD)	-	-	3.02 (1.33)	3.48 (1.04)	3.72 (1.21)	4.29 (0.87)	<0.00
Estimate	d number of confirmed	or suspecte	ed COVID-	19 that par	ticipants we	re dealt with	•
Zero	6.66 (5.54)		28 (41.8)	19 (28.4)	15 (22.4)	5 (7.5)	<0.001
1-49	8.68 (5.74)	-0.001	15 (25.0)	27 (45.0)	9 (15.0)	9 (15.0)	
50-100	11.19 (7.17)	< 0.001	9 (29.0)	3 (9.7)	6 (19.4)	13 (41.9)	
>100	13.15 (7.19)		5 (9.4)	17 (32.1)	9 (17.0)	22 (41.5)	
·	Receiving an exception	onal educat	ion to deal	with COVI	D-19 patient	s	
No	10.80 (7.05)	-0.001	28 (19.9)	44 (31.2)	25 (17.7)	44 (31.2)	< 0.001
Yes	6.97 (5.29)	< 0.001	29 (41.4)	22 (31.4)	14 (20.0)	5 (7.1)	
Participa	nts' evaluations of their	r institution	preparedn	ess to deal	with COVII	D-19 patients	
Very bad	17.88 (5.10)		0 (0.0)	1 (5.9)	4 (23.5)	12 (70.6)	
Bad	10.92 (6.99)		9 (23.7)	9 (23.7)	7 (18.4)	13 (34.2)	
Fair	9.55 (5.25)	-0.001	11 (18.3)	22 (36.7)	16 (26.7)	11 (18.3)	.0.00
Good	7.71 (6.66)	< 0.001	18 (35.3)	19 (37.3)	6 (11.8)	8 (15.7)	< 0.00
Very good	7.09 (6.37)		14 (40.0)	12 (34.3)	5 (14.3)	4 (11.4)	
Excellent	7.80 (7.21)		5 (50.0)	3 (30.0)	1 (10.0)	1 (10.0)	
Per	ceived changes in work	schedule a	nd intensity	y due to CC	VID-19 par	demic	
No changes	8.82 (6.25)		8 (47.1)	1 (5.9)	5 (29.4)	3 (17.6)	
A little	7.92 (6.78)		3 (25.0)	6 (50.0)	2 (16.7)	1 (8.3)	
Some	7.03 (4.99)	< 0.001	15 (38.5)	15 (38.5)	5 (12.8)	4 (10.3)	< 0.00
Much	8.81 (6.66)		25 (29.8)	30 (35.7)	9 (10.7)	20 (23.8)	
Very much	12.75 (7.06)		6 (10.2)	14 (23.7)	18 (30.5)	21 (35.6)	

Student's t-test or one-way ANOVA was conducted to investigate the differences in the PHQ-9 scale scores with socio-demographic and occupational characteristics. In contrast, the differences in the severity categories of depression were assessed using a chi-square test. *Unmarried category included single, widowed, and divorced participants.

† Others included nurses, pharmacists, and technicians.

Table 5. Risk factors for Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) among healthcare workers identified by bina	ry logistic
regression analyses*.	

Variable	No. of Disease Cases/ No. of Total Cases (%)	Adjusted OR	95% CI	p-value
	O	nset sample (n=211)		
		Gender		
Male	38/154 (24.7)	REF	REF	REF
Female	29/57 (50.9)	2.312	1.127 - 4.744	0.022
-	Monthly in	come, Jordanian Dinar (JD)		-
<500	9/25 (36.0)	1.077	0.281 - 4.126	0.914
500-1000	47/107 (43.9)	2.883	1.122 - 7.403	0.028
1000-2000	4/33 (12.1)	0.964	0.245 - 3.791	0.958
>2000	7/46 (15.2)	REF	REF	REF
		COVID-19 tested		
Yes	25/49 (51.0)	2.258	0.951 - 5.358	0.065
No	42/162 (25.9)	REF	REF	REF
	Direct contact	with COVID-19 pts. or sam	oles	•

Trends of Prevalence Estimates and Risk Factors

(Table 5) contd.....

) contd				-
Yes	28/52 (53.8)	2.271	1.013 - 5.092	0.046
No	39/159 (24.5)	REF	REF	REF
	Receiving an exceptional e	education to deal with CO	VID-19 patients	
Yes	10/59 (16.9)	REF	REF	REF
No	57/152 (37.5)	4.081	1.714 - 9.720	0.001
	Participants' evaluations of institu	tion preparedness to deal	with COVID-19 patients	
Very bad	6/9 (66.7)	6.155	1.119 - 19.089	0.034
Bad	15/25 (60.0)	6.603	1.173 - 37.160	0.032
Fair	17/38 (44.7)	3.987	0.768 - 20.687	0.100
Good	19/65 (29.2)	2.064	0.414 - 10.276	0.376
Very good	8/57 (14.0)	1.088	0.205 - 5.768	0.921
Excellent	2/17 (31.8)	REF	REF	REF
	One-	year sample (n=211)		
	Monthly inc	ome, Jordanian Dinar (Jl	D)	
<500	29/31 (93.5)	32.549	6.602 - 160.470	<0.001
500-1000	38/82 (46.3)	2.296	1.043 - 5.058	0.039
1000-2000	7/33 (21.2)	0.687	0.234 - 2.018	0.495
>2000	14/65 (21.5)	REF	REF	REF
	(COVID-19 tested		
Yes	85/184 (46.2)	4.475	1.065 - 18.813	0.041
No	3/27 (11.1)	REF	REF	REF
	Direct contact v	with COVID-19 pts. or sa	mples	
Yes	71/145 (49.0)	1.932	0.882 - 4.232	0.099
	Bold indicates statisti	cal significance with a p-v	alue <0.05.	
No	17/66 (25.8)	REF	REF	REF
	Receiving an exceptional e	education to deal with CO	VID-19 patients	
Yes	19/70 (27.1)	REF	REF	REF
No	69/141 (48.9)	2.762	1.345 - 5.672	0.006
	Participants' evaluations of institu	tion preparedness to deal	with COVID-19 patients	
Very bad	16/17 (94.1)	21.338	1.423 - 320.057	0.027
Bad	20/38 (52.6)	2.096	0.343 - 12.817	0.423
Fair	27/60 (45.0)	1.645	0.282 - 9.591	0.580
Good	14/51 (27.5)	0.891	0.148 - 5.351	0.900
Very good	9/35 (25.7)	1.369	0.216 - 8.701	0.739
Excellent	2/10 (20.0)	REF	REF	REF

* Socio-demographic characteristics (including age, gender, marriage status, living with elderly, occupation, and monthly income), COVID-19 characteristics (including vaccination status, previous testing, previous infection, and direct contact with COVID-19 patients or samples), getting an exceptional education to deal with COVID-19 patients, participants' evaluations of institution preparedness, and perceived changes in work schedule and intensity due to COVID-19 pandemic were included as independent explanatory variables in the backward stepwise binary logistic regression model.

4.1. Depression among HCWs

Previous studies showed a significant but unspoken high depression risk among HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic, similar to our study [37, 40, 48, 49]. A multicentric surveybased study in China using the HPQ-9 questionnaire with 1257 HCWs found that 50% manifested symptoms of depression [37]. A study in northeast Italy found that 26.6% of HCWs had at least moderate depression [40]. Another study in southeast Ireland reported positive depression scores among 42.6% of HCWs working in acute hospital settings [48]. A multicenter, cross-sectional study on HCWs in Ghana conducted from July 11 to August 12, 2020, found that 21.1% of participants had depression [49]. However, none of these studies trended depression scores and severity among HCWs over a longer duration as our study investigated.

Other studies on the general public compared depression scores before and during the pandemic [39, 50]. A study that looked at the change in the prevalence estimates of depressive symptoms among US adults before and during COVID-19 showed a 3-fold increase in depression prevalence estimates during the pandemic [39]. A Chinese study found higher depression scores among people in 2020, particularly those living in more heavily impacted provinces than among the 2016 sample [50]. Another Chinese study based on the Chinese undergraduate cohort showed that new Chinese undergraduate students had no worsening of depressive symptoms after three months of mass quarantine for COVID-19 [51]. However, all these studies trended depressive symptoms in the general population rather than HCWs as we did in our study.

4.1.1. Factors Associated with Depressive Symptoms

4.1.1.1. Shared Depression-associated Factors between Onset and One-year Groups

Our study showed that younger age and unmarried status were persistent risk factors for depression, regardless of time.

Similar to our findings, previous studies have shown that younger adults had more depressed moods during the COVID-19 pandemic [18, 50, 52]. The movement restrictions and social isolation associated with the pandemic could have resulted in more depressive symptoms [53, 54]. Such social isolation could negatively impact younger unmarried HCWs as they are usually more socially active than older married HCWs. Besides, the literature reported that marriage and the presence of supportive social systems as protective factors against depression during the COVID-19 pandemic [18, 39]. French and Spanish studies showed that feelings of loneliness increased the risk of depression during COVID-19 lockdown [3, 52]. A recent study from Denmark compared the risk of stress, depression, and functional impairment before lockdown, before March 11, 2020, with that risk during the lockdown and among re-interviewees in July 2021 [55]. The authors found fewer depressive symptoms among adults with children living at home.

There was no significant difference in the percentages of HCWs who received special education to deal with COVID-19 between the onset and one-year groups. Lack of such education was a risk factor for depression, using binary logistic regression, in both groups of similar significance. This finding indicates that lacking knowledge about a new health crisis has a persistent similar negative impact on the psychology of HCWs over time.

Even though one-year participants were less satisfied with the institutional preparedness to deal with COVID-19 patients than the onset group, which is likely an expected result of the increased burden of the pandemic over time, low satisfaction was a significant risk factor for depression, using binary logistic regression, in both groups.

Our study found that lower monthly income is a significant risk factor for depression, using binary logistic regression, in both onset and one-year groups. This observation indicates that limited income is a constant risk factor for depression regardless of the timing of a health crisis. Many studies showed a similar negative impact of low economic status, financial problems, and losing a job on the psychological immunity of adults to stressful times during COVID-19 [3, 18, 39, 47, 50, 56]. Financial support, on the other hand, such as the government's tax-free salary relief, was shown to counteract these adverse psychological effects [49].

4.1.1.2. Depression-associated Factors at the Onset of the Pandemic

Unlike the one-year group, the female gender was a significant risk factor for MDD, using binary logistic regression in the onset group. This finding is concordant with previous studies' results which indicated that females in general and female HCWs had a higher risk and more severe degree of depression than males [3, 17, 30, 37, 40 - 42, 48, 50, 57]. This could be attributed to the fact that women usually tend to be more worried and careful and display higher levels of fear of COVID-19 about themselves and their families at the beginning of the non-previously experienced and unpredicted stressful event [56]. Moreover, some mood changes and depressed feelings could be attributed to hormonal changes in

women [58, 59].

Our findings showed that direct contact with COVID-19 patients or samples was a risk factor for depression, using binary logistic regression, in the onset group only. Previous studies showed that HCWs directly engaged with COVID-19 patients had a higher risk and more severe degrees of depression [3, 37, 40, 41, 50, 57]. However, direct contact with COVID19 patients was significantly lower in the onset group than in the one-year group. This might reflect the amplified perception of risk for acquiring and transmitting infection on contact with COVID-19 patients and samples at the beginning of the pandemic, which eased up over time and with growing experience in dealing with such patients/samples. W. Lu *et al.* (2020) reported that frontline medical workers with close contact with infected COVID-19 patients have higher fear, anxiety, and depression scores than administrative staff [25].

<u>4.1.1.3. Depression-associated Factors after One Year of the</u> <u>Pandemic</u>

Our study showed that among HCWs, physicians had significantly more depressive symptoms within the one-year group. This finding indicated that physicians likely had the highest cumulative psychological burden over a year of work among HCWs, given their direct responsibility for managing patients with COVID-19 and dealing with their morbidity and mortality with the increased number of cases [60 - 62]. Thus, the increasing trend of depression symptoms among our cohort after one year of the pandemic onset could also be attributed to the higher practical burden, increased responsibilities of providing families with regular updates, and HCWs may feel more socially isolated, more concerned for their health, and helpless for not having helped or supported the patient enough with high COVID-19 rates in light of reported lack sufficient knowledge about data sharing and patient confidentiality [62, 63]. A cross-sectional, web-based study investigating the mental health outcomes among HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic in Italy found that general practitioners were more likely to endorse posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) than other HCWs [64]. Moreover, a recent systematic review reported higher prevalence rates of depression among physicians (40.4%) than nurses (28%) [61].

There were no significant differences in the perception of changes in work schedule and intensity between the two groups. However, the change in work schedule and intensity resulted in higher depressive symptoms over time. This finding emphasizes the importance of stress chronicity as a risk factor for developing depressive symptoms. A study from the USA on the general population found that the prevalence of depression during the pandemic was statistically significantly higher among those who worked full time compared with part-timers and unemployed people [20].

The testing for COVID-19 was a risk factor, using binary logistic regression, for developing depressive symptoms in the one-year sample. More frequent testing for COVID-19 could result in frequent and more prolonged contact with patients with confirmed or suspected infection, which per se increases stress over time and results in depressive symptoms. Vaccination became routine across HCWs after one year of the pandemic, and although not statistically significant, COVID-19 vaccination was associated with lower depression mean (SD) scores among vaccinated participants than unvaccinated ones. This finding is concordant with a previous study that reported an association between getting the first dose of the anti-COVID-19 vaccine and significant improvement in mental health [65].

4.2. Study Limitations

This study has a few limitations. It is a single-center study, the sample size of participants was relatively small, and the achieved representativeness was low; thus, limiting our findings to other populations. Thus, the results are unlikely to be generalizable beyond the people who responded. However, the novelty of this study is in its timeliness as it investigates the changes in depressive symptoms over a year of the COVID-19 pandemic. The study method of using an observational internet-based survey with its inherent limitations, such as recall bias and the lack of available data on non-respondents, are other limitations that could affect the results' interpretation. A selection bias cannot be ruled out as the participants needed access to a smartphone/computer to participate, limiting our sample's generalizability. However, the internet-based survey is a cost-effective approach for data collection that provides a safe and private environment for the participants to give accurate and honest information. The study did not survey the same HCWs to see the actual trend in their depression scores, severity, and risk factors. However, this limitation was compensated for by the fact that the onset and one-year groups matched in age, gender, marital status, occupation, and monthly income. Most respondents were physicians and males, which, although relatively similar in both onset and one-year surveys, makes the generalizability of this study results to all HCWs and particularly female HCWs less accurate. However, this can partly be explained by the fact that most of the HCWs in Jordan (70%) are males [66]. Also, this study did not investigate the coping mechanisms for depression among HCWs and the possible psychiatric and cognitive effects of physical activity, diet, sleep habits, smoking status, nicotine dependence, comorbidities, disabilities, and laboratory investigations [17, 38, 67 - 74]. Thus, future studies with a larger cohort of HCWs examined a wide range of potential factors for depression and investigated possible coping skills and interventions are suggested.

CONCLUSION

Health care providers have a high prevalence estimate of depressive symptoms, which has increased, along with depression severity, over the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic. Factors associated with depression have not changed significantly over time. Persistently vulnerable HCWs included those who were young, unmarried, did not receive special COVID-19 education, had lower satisfaction with institutional preparedness, or had lower monthly income. Female gender and direct contact with COVID-19 patients or samples were significant risk factors for pandemic onset. While physicians, HCWs with intense work schedules, those who underwent a test for COVID-19, and those who got infected with COVID-19 had higher rates and more severe depressive symptoms one year after the pandemic onset. We emphasize

the urgent need for health care officials to implement exceptional interventions, strategies, and policies to promote mental health wellness among HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic.

ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

All procedures performed in this study involving human participants were reviewed and ethically approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the research and ethics committee at Jordan University of Science and Technology (JUST), Irbid, Jordan (IRB number: 106/132/2020).

HUMAN AND ANIMAL RIGHTS

No animals were used in this research. All human research procedures followed in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2013.

CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

Electronic informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

STANDARDS OF REPORTING

This work has been reported based on the STROBE statement guidelines for reporting observational studies.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIALS

The datasets generated and analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author [A.Y].

FUNDING

This research did not receive any grants from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest, financial or otherwise.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Deanship of Research at Jordan University of Science and Technology (JUST), Irbid, Jordan, and all health care workers who participated in this survey.

REFERENCES

- Chriscaden K. Impact of COVID-19 on people's livelihoods, their health and our food systems World Heal Organ 2020.https://www.who.int/news/item/13-10-2020-impact-of-COVID-1 9-on-people's-livelihoods-their-health-and-our-food-systems
- [2] Allain-Dupré D, Chatry I, Kornprobst A. The territorial impact of COVID-19: Managing the crisis across levels of government Available from: https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/the-territorial-imp act-of-COVID-19-managing-the-crisis-across-levels-of-governmentd3e314e1/
- [3] Andersen AJ, Mary-Krause M, Bustamante JJH, Héron M, El Aarbaoui T, Melchior M. Symptoms of anxiety/depression during the COVID-19 pandemic and associated lockdown in the community: longitudinal data from the TEMPO cohort in France. BMC Psychiatry 2021; 21(1): 381.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12888-021-03383-z] [PMID: 34320943]

- [4] Cohut M. Global impact of the COVID-19 pandemic: 1 year on. Med News Today 2021. Available from: https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/global-impact-of-the-CO VID-19-pandemic-1-year-on
- [5] Yassin A, AlOmari M, Al-Azzam S, Karasneh R, Abu-Ismail L, Soudah O. Impact of social media on public fear, adoption of precautionary behaviors, and compliance with health regulations during COVID-19 pandemic. Int J Environ Health Res 2021. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09603123.2021.1935778]
- [6] Petretto DR, Carta SM, Cataudella S, et al. The use of distance learning and e-learning in students with learning disabilities: A review on the effects and some hint of analysis on the use during COVID-19 outbreak. Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health 2021. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/1745017902117010092]
- [7] Melca IA, Nardi AE, Gonçalves LL, Ferreira RM, de Padua MSKL, King ALS. Sex, digital devices, social media, and social isolation: A study on sexual behavioral during COVID -19 pandemic. Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health 2021; 17(1): 235-41.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/1745017902117010235] [PMID: 35173793]
 [8] Mijwil M, Al-Mistarehi A-H, Mutar DS. The practices of artificial intelligence techniques and their worth in the confrontation of COVID-19 pandemic: A literature review. Mob Forensics 2022; 4(1) Available from: http://journal2.uad.ac.id/index.php/mf/article/view/5691
- [9] Aggarwal K, Mijwil MM. Has the future started? The current growth of artificial intelligence, machine learning, and deep learning. Iraqi J Comput Sci Math 2022; 3(1): 115-23.https://journal.esj.edu.iq/index.php/IJCM/article/view/100
- [10] Mijwil MM, Al-Mistarehi A-H, Aggarwal K. The effectiveness of utilising modern artificial intelligence techniques and initiatives to combat COVID-19 in South Korea: A narrative review. Asian J Appl Sci 2021; 9(5): 2321-0893.https://ajouronline.com/index.php/AJAS/article/view/6753
- [11] JHU. COVID-19 dashboard by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University (JHU) Johns Hopkins Univ 2021. Available from: https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/COVID-19
- [12] Yassin A, Nawaiseh M, Shaban A, et al. Neurological manifestations and complications of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): A systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Neurol 2021; 21(1): 138. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12883-021-02161-4] [PMID: 33784985]
- [13] Samrah SM, Al-Mistarehi AW, Ibnian AM, et al. COVID-19 outbreak in Jordan: Epidemiological features, clinical characteristics, and laboratory findings. Ann Med Surg (Lond) 2020; 57: 103-8. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2020.07.020] [PMID: 32742648]
- [14] Samrah SM, Al-Mistarehi AH, Kewan T, et al. Viral clearance course of COVID-19 Outbreaks. J Multidiscip Healthc 2021; 14: 555-65. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S302891] [PMID: 33707949]
- [15] Yassin A, Ghzawi A, Al-Mistarehi A-H, et al. Mortality rate and biomarker expression within COVID-19 patients who develop acute ischemic stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Futur Sci OA 2021; 7(7): FSO713. [PMID: 34254031]
- [16] Hasabo EA, Ayyad FA, Alam Eldeen SAM, et al. Clinical manifestations, complications, and outcomes of patients with COVID-19 in Sudan: a multicenter observational study. Trop Med Heal 2021; 49(1): 1-13. Available from: https://tropmedhealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s41182-021 -00382-4
- [17] Samrah SM, Al-Mistarehi AH, Aleshawi AJ, et al. Depression and Coping Among COVID-19-Infected Individuals After 10 Days of Mandatory in-Hospital Quarantine, Irbid, Jordan. Psychol Res Behav Manag 2020; 13: 823-30.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S267459] [PMID: 33116970]
 [18] Rondung E, Leiler A, Meurling J, Bjärtå A. Symptoms of depression and anxiety during the early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic in Sweden. Front Public Heal 2021; 9
- [19] Al-Shatanawi TN, Sakka SA, Kheirallah KA, et al. Self-Reported Obsession Toward COVID-19 Preventive Measures Among Undergraduate Medical Students During the Early Phase of Pandemic in Jordan. Front public Heal 2021; 9: 562437. [PMID: 34820347]
- [20] Khubchandani J, Sharma S, Webb FJ, Wiblishauser MJ, Bowman SL. Post-lockdown depression and anxiety in the USA during the COVID-19 pandemic. J Public Health (Oxf) 2021; 43(2): 246-53. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdaa250] [PMID: 33426559]
- [21] Jin YH, Huang Q, Wang YY, et al. Perceived infection transmission

routes, infection control practices, psychosocial changes, and management of COVID-19 infected healthcare workers in a tertiary acute care hospital in Wuhan: a cross-sectional survey. Mil Med Res 2020; 7(1): 24.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s40779-020-00254-8] [PMID: 32393381]

- [22] Ramadan M, Hasan Z, Saleh T, *et al.* Beyond knowledge: Evaluating the practices and precautionary measures towards COVID-19 amongst medical doctors in Jordan. Int J Clin Pract 2021; 75(6): e14122. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ijcp.14122] [PMID: 33650228]
- [23] Terry DL, Hui P, Buntoro S. The Initial Positive and Negative Impacts of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Rural Healthcare Providers: Associations With Team Culture and Leadership. J Healthc Manag 2021; 66(5): 396-406.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/JHM-D-20-00258] [PMID: 34495004]

[24] De Kock JH, Latham HA, Leslie SJ, et al. A rapid review of the impact of COVID-19 on the mental health of healthcare workers: implications for supporting psychological well-being. BMC Public Health 2021; 21(1): 104.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-10070-3] [PMID: 33422039]

- [25] Lu W, Wang H, Lin Y, Li L. Psychological status of medical workforce during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. Psychiatry Res 2020; 288: 112936. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112936] [PMID: 32276196]
- [26] Liu CY, Yang YZ, Zhang XM, et al. The prevalence and influencing factors in anxiety in medical workers fighting COVID-19 in China: A cross-sectional survey. Epidemiol Infect 2020; 148: e98. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0950268820001107] [PMID: 32430088]
- [27] Liang Y, Wu K, Zhou Y, Huang X, Zhou Y, Liu Z. Mental health in frontline medical workers during the 2019 novel coronavirus disease epidemic in China: A comparison with the general population. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2020; 17(18): 1-12.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17186550] [PMID: 32916836]
 [28] Shreffler J, Petrey J, Huecker M. The impact of COVID-19 on healthcare worker wellness: A scoping review. West J Emerg Med 2020: 21(5): 1059.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.5811/westjem.2020.7.48684]

- [29] Kheirallah K, Bloukh S, Khasawneh W, et al. Medical students' relative immunity, or lack thereof, against COVID-19 emotional distress and psychological challenges; A descriptive study from Jordan. F1000 Res 2021; 10: 297. [http://dx.doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.52051.2] [PMID: 34026047]
- [30] Carmassi C, Pedrinelli V, Dell'Oste V, et al. PTSD and depression in healthcare workers in the italian epicenter of the COVID-19 outbreak. Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health 2021; 17(1): 242-52. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/1745017902117010242] [PMID: 35173794]
- [31] Yassin A, Al-Mistarehi A-H, El-Salem K, *et al.* Prevalence estimates and risk factors of anxiety among healthcare workers in Jordan over one year of the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2022; 19(5): 2615. [http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19052615] [PMID: 35270333]
- [32] Khassawneh AH, Alrabadi N, Al-Mistarehi AH, Obeidat N, Kheirallah KA. The role of non-state actors in combating COVID-19 spread in Northern Jordan. Ann Med Surg (Lond) 2020; 60: 484-6. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2020.11.005] [PMID: 33194175]
- [33] WHO. World Health Organization (WHO). Overview of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) by date. Jordan. World Heal Organ 2021. Available from: https://www.who.int/countries/jor/
- [34] Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. Lancet Infect Dis 2020; 20(5): 533-4.http://www.thelancet.com/article/S1473309920301201/fulltext [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30120-1] [PMID: 32087114]
- [35] Kheirallah KA, Al-Mistarehi AH, Alsawalha L, et al. Prioritizing zoonotic diseases utilizing the One Health approach: Jordan's experience. One Health 2021; 13: 100262. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2021.100262] [PMID: 34027008]
- [36] von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: Guidelines for reporting observational studies. Ann Intern Med 2007; 147(8): 573-7. [http://dx.doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-147-8-200710160-00010] [PMID: 17938396]
- [37] Lai J, Ma S, Wang Y, et al. Factors associated with mental health outcomes among health care workers exposed to coronavirus disease 2019. JAMA Netw Open 2020; 3(3): e203976. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.3976] [PMID:

32202646]

- [38] Khassawneh AH, Alzoubi A, Khasawneh AG, et al. The relationship between depression and metabolic control parameters in type 2 diabetic patients: A cross-sectional and feasibility interventional study. Int J Clin Pract 2020; 75(4): e13777-. [PMID: 33098211]
- [39] Ettman CK, Abdalla SM, Cohen GH, Sampson L, Vivier PM, Galea S. Prevalence of depression symptoms in US adults before and during the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Netw Open 2020; 3(9): e2019686. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.19686] [PMID: 32876685]
- [40] Lasalvia A, Bonetto C, Porru S, et al. Psychological impact of COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare workers in a highly burdened area of north-east Italy. Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci 2020; 30: e1. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S2045796020001158] [PMID: 33331255]
- [41] Fari G, de Sire A, Giorgio V, *et al.* Impact of COVID-19 on the mental health in a cohort of Italian rehabilitation healthcare workers. J Med Virol 2022; 94(1): 110-8.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jmv.27272] [PMID: 34387886]
- [42] Rawashdeh SI, Ibdah R, Kheirallah KA, et al. Prevalence estimates, severity, and risk factors of depressive symptoms among coronary artery disease patients after ten days of percutaneous coronary intervention. Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health 2021; 17(1): 103-13. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/17450179021170101031 [PMID: 34733349]
- [43] Al-Mistarehi AH, Kheirallah KA, Yassin A, et al. Determinants of the willingness of the general population to get vaccinated against COVID-19 in a developing country. Clin Exp Vaccine Res 2021; 10(2): 171-82.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.7774/cevr.2021.10.2.171] [PMID: 34222130]
 [44] Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure. J Gen Intern Med 2001; 16(9): 606-13.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x] [PMID: 11556941]

- [45] Levis B, Benedetti A, Thombs BD. Accuracy of Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) for screening to detect major depression: individual participant data meta-analysis. BMJ 2019; 365: 11476. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.11476] [PMID: 30967483]
- [46] He C, Levis B, Riehm KE, et al. The Accuracy of the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 Algorithm for Screening to Detect Major Depression: An Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis. Psychother Psychosom 2020; 89(1): 25-37.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000502294] [PMID: 31593971]

- [47] Puangsri P, Jinanarong V, Wattanapisit A. Impacts on and care of psychiatric patients during the outbreak of COVID-19. Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health 2021; 17(1): 52. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/1745017902117010052]
- [48] Ali S, Maguire S, Marks E, Doyle M, Sheehy C. Psychological impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare workers at acute hospital settings in the South-East of Ireland: An observational cohort multicentre study. BMJ Open 2020; 10(12): e042930. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042930] [PMID: 33371046]
- [49] Ofori AA, Osarfo J, Agbeno EK, Manu DO, Amoah E. Psychological impact of COVID-19 on health workers in Ghana: A multicentre, cross-sectional study. SAGE Open Med 2021; 9: 20503121211000919.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/20503121211000919] [PMID: 33786183]

- [50] Han X, Chen S, Bi K, Yang Z, Sun P. Depression following COVID-19 lockdown in severely, moderately, and mildly impacted areas in China. Front Psychiatry 2021; 12: 596872. [http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.596872] [PMID: 33679471]
- [51] Lu P, Yang L, Wang C, et al. Mental health of new undergraduate students before and after COVID-19 in China. Sci Rep 2021; 11(1): 18783.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-98140-3] [PMID: 34552105]
 [52] Ayuso-Mateos JL, Morillo D, Haro JM, Olaya B, Lara E, Miret M. Changes in depression and suicidal ideation under severe lockdown restrictions during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in Spain: A longitudinal study in the general population. Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci 2021; 30: e49.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S2045796021000408] [PMID: 34074355]

- [53] Liu CH, Zhang E, Wong GTF, Hyun S, Hahm H. "Chris." Factors associated with depression, anxiety, and PTSD symptomatology during the COVID-19 pandemic: Clinical implications for U.S. young adult mental health. Psychiatry Res 2020; 290.
- [54] Benke C, Autenrieth LK, Asselmann E, Pané-Farré CA. Lockdown, quarantine measures, and social distancing: Associations with

depression, anxiety and distress at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic among adults from Germany. Psychiatry Res 2020; 293: 113462.

- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113462] [PMID: 32987222]
 [55] Andersen LH, Fallesen P, Bruckner TA. Risk of stress/depression and functional impairment in Denmark immediately following a COVID-19 shutdown. BMC Public Health 2021; 21(1): 984.
- [56] Sotomayor-Beltran C, Matta-Solis H, Perez-Siguas R, Matta-Solis E, Matta-Zamudio L. Fear of COVID-19 among peruvian people living in disadvantaged communities: A cross-sectional study. Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health 2021; 17(1): 19-25.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/1745017902117010019] [PMID: 34040650]
 [57] Asnakew S, Amha H, Kassew T. Mental health adverse effects of COVID-19 pandemic on health care workers in north west Ethiopia: A multicenter cross-sectional study. Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat 2021; 17: 1375-84.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/NDT.S306300] [PMID: 33994787]

- [58] MayoClinic. Depression in women: Understanding the gender gap -Mayo Clinic 2019. Available from: https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/depression/in-depth/d epression/art-20047725
- [59] Lewis G, Ioannidis K, van Harmelen AL, et al. The association between pubertal status and depressive symptoms and diagnoses in adolescent females: A population-based cohort study. PLoS One 2018; 13(6): e0198804.https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/depression/

in-depth/depression/art-20047725 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0198804] [PMID: 29912985]

- [60] ALGhasab NS, ALJadani AH, ALMesned SS, Hersi AS. Depression among physicians and other medical employees involved in the COVID-19 outbreak: A cross-sectional study. Medicine (Baltimore) 2021; 100(5): e25290 . Available from: https://journals.lww.com/md-journal/Fulltext/2021/04160/Depression_ among_physicians_and_other_medical.23.aspx
- [61] Fernandez R, Sikhosana N, Green H, et al. Anxiety and depression among healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic umbrella review of the global evidence. BMJ Open 2021; 11(9): e054528.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-054528] [PMID: 34548373]

- [62] Picardi A, Miniotti M, Leombruni P, Gigantesco A. A qualitative study regarding COVID-19 inpatient family caregivers' need for supportive care. Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health 2021; 17(1): 161.
- [63] Karasneh R, Al-Mistarehi AH, Al-Azzam S, et al. Physicians' knowledge, perceptions, and attitudes related to patient confidentiality and data sharing. Int J Gen Med 2021; 14: 721-31. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/IJGM.S301800] [PMID: 33688243]
- [64] Rossi R, Socci V, Pacitti F, et al. Mental health outcomes among frontline and second-line health care workers during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic in Italy. JAMA Netw Open 2020; 3(5): e2010185. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.10185] [PMID:

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.10185] [PMID: 32463467]

- [65] Perez-Arce F, Angrisani M, Bennett D, Darling J, Kapteyn A, Thomas K. COVID-19 vaccines and mental distress. PLoS One 2021; 16(9): e0256406.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0256406] [PMID: 34496006]
 DoS. Jordan In Figure 2018. Department of statistics. Dep Stat Jordan 2018. Available from:
- http://dosweb.dos.gov.jo/products/jordan-in-figure2018/
 [67] Carta MG, Aviles Gonzalez CI, Minerba L, et al. Exercise in older adults to prevent depressive symptoms at the time of COVID-19: Results of a randomized controlled trial with follow-up. Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health 2022; 18(1): e174501792112231.
 [http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/17450179-v18-e2112231]
- [68] El-Salem K, Khalil H, Al-Sharman A, et al. Serum vitamin d inversely correlates with depression scores in people with multiple sclerosis. Mult Scler Relat Disord 2021; 48: 102732.http://www.msard-journal.com/article/S2211034820308063/fu lltext

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.msard.2020.102732] [PMID: 33422916]

[69] El-Salem K, Al-Mistarehi AH, Hanan Khalil. Serum tumor necrosis factor-alpha levels correlate with cognitive function scales scores in multiple sclerosis patients. Mult Scler Relat Disord 2021; 47: 102621.http://www.msard-journal.com/article/S2211034820306957/fu lltext

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.msard.2020.102621]

[70] Abbadi A, Alnahar J, Zoghoul S, et al. Waterpipe nicotine dependence

and depressive symptoms among adolescent waterpipe and dual users. J Environ Public Health 2020; 2020: 2364571. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2020/2364571] [PMID: 33204280]

- [71] Al Quran T, Bataineh Z, Al-Mistarehi A-H, et al. Quality of life among patients on levothyroxine: A cross-sectional study. Ann Med Surg (Lond) 2020; 60: 182-7.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2020.10.030] [PMID: 33163174]
 Yassin A, Al-Mistarehi A-H, Beni Yonis O, Aleshawi AJ, Momany SM, Khassawneh BY. Prevalence of sleep disorders among medical students and their association with poor academic performance: A cross-sectional study. Ann Med Surg (Lond) 2020; 58: 124-9.

© 2022 Al Yassin et al.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Public License (CC-BY 4.0), a copy of which is available at: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Yassin et al.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2020.08.046] [PMID: 32983431]

- [73] Al-Mistarehi A-H, Yassin A, Dulaimy Ö, *et al.* Water-pipe usage among Jordanian high school students: Prevalence and basic features. Eur Respir J 2019; 54(Suppl. 63): PA4466.https://erj.ersjournals.com/content/54/suppl_63/PA4466
- [74] Al-Mistarehi A-HW, Ibnian AM, Shaqadan S, Khassawneh BY. The impact of sleep disorders on academic performance among medical students. Am Thorac Soc Int Conf Meet Abstr Am Thorac Soc Int Conf Meet Abstr 2019; 199: A4296-6. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1164/ajrccm-conference.2019.199.1_MeetingAbs tracts.A4296]