

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Title: Burnout and Stress Among Residents in 4 Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) Countries Using the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) and Stress Overload Scale-Short Form (SOS-S)

Authors: Feras Abuzeyad, Luma Bashmi, Leena Alqasem, Fawas Al-Refae, Asma Al Balushi, Basim Al Saywid, Rawan Al-Hashem, Abdullah Ali, Abdulla Almusalam, Priya Das, Stephanie Hsu

Submitted Date: 29-05-2022

Accepted Date: 30-08-2022

Please cite this article as: Abuzeyad F, Bashmi L, Alqasem L, Al-Refae F, Al Balushi A, Al Saywid B, Al-Hashem R, Ali A, Almusalam A, Das P, Hsu S. Burnout and Stress Among Residents in 4 Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) Countries Using the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) and Stress Overload Scale-Short Form (SOS-S). Education in Medicine Journal. 2023 (early view).

This is a provisional PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article.

ARTICLE INFO

Submitted: 29-05-2022
Accepted: 30-08-2022

Burnout and Stress Among Residents in 4 Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) Countries Using the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) and Stress Overload Scale-Short Form (SOS-S)

Feras Abuzeayad¹, Luma Bashmi², Leena Alqasem³, Fawas Al-Refae⁴, Asma Al Balushi⁵, Basim Al Saywid⁶, Rawan Al-Hashem⁴, Abdullah Ali⁴, Abdulla Almusalam², Priya Das⁷, Stephanie Hsu⁷

1 Department of Emergency Medicine, King Hamad University Hospital, Muharraq, Bahrain

2 Department of Scientific Research & Development, King Hamad University Hospital, Muharraq, Bahrain

3 National Health Regulatory Authority, Sanabis, Bahrain

4 Kuwait Institute for Medical Specializations (KIMS), Kuwait

5 Oman Medical Specialty Board (OMSB) - Trainees Affairs Department, Oman

6 Saudi Commission for Health Specialties (SCFHS), Saudi Arabia

7 King Hamad University Hospital, Muharraq, Bahrain

To cite this article: Abuzeayad F, Bashmi L, Alqasem L, Al-Refae F, Al Balushi A, Al Saywid B, Al-Hashem R, Ali A, Almusalam A, Das P, Hsu S. Burnout and Stress Among Residents in 4 Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) Countries Using the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) and Stress Overload Scale-Short Form (SOS-S). *Education in Medicine Journal*. 2023 (early view)

ABSTRACT

Physician burnout and stress can have consequential effects on healthcare services and are a leading cause for medical errors and lower quality of care. This is the first study to assess the prevalence rates and associated variables for burnout and stress levels of medical residents in four Gulf Cooperation Council countries by combining the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory and Stress Overload Scale – Short Form as assessment tools.

A cross-sectional, quantitative research method design using an online survey. This online survey was distributed to second year and above medical residents training in tertiary healthcare centers in four Gulf Cooperation Council countries (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, and Oman). Eligible residents (n= 16,686) were recruited via convenience sampling. Out of 2886 respondents, 996 responses were excluded due to incomplete information. The data was collected from 13th September 2020 to 15th November 2020.

Of 1,890 included medical residents, 961 (50.8%) were females, and the mean (SD) age was 29.5 (3.2) years. Personal burnout prevalence rates were highest, followed by work-related and patient-related burnout (98.4%, 97.8%, and 79.3%, respectively). Arab and Kuwait Board residents had the highest rates of burnout across all domains. Stress overload scores were high with 51.6% of residents at high risk for illness, with Saudi Board residents most likely to be at high risk and Oman Medical Specialty Board residents at low risk. Burnout predictors included: no access to a wellness program ($p= 0.000$), longer shifts ($p= 0.000$), high personal vulnerability ($p= 0.000$), and intention to leave ($p= 0.05$).

Our findings show that burnout and stress rates are high for Gulf Cooperation Council residents, suggesting a significant problem for residents to provide the highest quality of healthcare possible. Further research is needed to evaluate the efficacy of residency wellness interventions to address this issue.

Keywords: *Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI), Stress Overload Scale-Short Form (SOS-S), GCC residents*

CORRESPONDING

Feras Abuzeayad, Department of Emergency Medicine, King Hamad University Hospital, Muharraq, Bahrain

Email: research3@khuh.org.bh

INTRODUCTION

Physicians in residency programs are unique and are an essential part of the healthcare system, in which they are both learning and providing services at the same time. For many residents, burnout is a consequence of the stress factors which become accumulative and persistent during their residency training period (1,2,3). The World Health Organization (WHO) recognized burnout as a syndrome resulting from enduring workplace stress, listing it as an occupational phenomenon in the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11) (4). Burnout in the physician workforce is substantial as established in literature being one of the leading causes for medical errors, lower quality of care, higher costs, and overall worse outcomes (5). As such, it is crucial to identify the stress factors and burnout levels among residents during training that can be targeted within interventions to deal with this global issue. Multiple studies have shown that resident physicians are prone to high rates of burnout (6-10), ranging between 27-75% in different specialties (11). To our knowledge, no previous multi-center study examining burnout and stress among residents in various residency training programs in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries has been published. This multi-center cross-sectional study measured the prevalence rates for burnout in residency programs in four GCC countries including Kingdom of Bahrain, Sultanate of Oman, State of Kuwait, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The participating programs were: Arab Board (AB), Saudi Board (SB), Oman Medical Specialty Board (OMSB), and the Kuwait Board Medical Training Program (KBMTTP). The study's secondary objectives were to identify modifiable factors related to burnout and stress that could be

targeted within resident wellness programs, and compare stress, burnout, and related factors across the residency programs. Acknowledgement and awareness of burnout and stress levels among residents will help guide the residency training programs in GCC countries in implementing strategies to tackle this vital issue, reducing its negative impact on healthcare services.

Methods

This study was conducted by distributing an electronic self-administered survey to residents who met the inclusion criteria. Data collection was conducted between 13 September and 15 November 2020. Each training program distributed the survey to all residents in their second year of residency and above (total n=16,686): AB (n=226), KBMTP (n=829), OMSB (n=431), and SB (n=15,200). Samples required to compute statistically significant results at 95% CI and 5% margin of error for each board was: AB (n= 143), KBMTP (n= 263), OMSB (n=204), and SB (n=376). Responses received from AB was 145, KBMTP was 326, OMSB was 225 and SB was 2190, hence the sample size requirement was met for each board. The total response rate was 17.3% (n=2886; (n=2886; AB: 64.1%, KBMTP: 39.3%, OMSB 52.2%, SB: 14.4%).

Newly joined first year residents were excluded from the study as data was collected at the start of the academic year and these residents did not have sufficient exposure to the program to reflect burnout and stress levels directly related to the program. In addition, responses with incomplete information (e.g., completed only one of the two scales) were excluded from statistical analysis.

Overall, the survey was composed of 44 questions divided into four sections following a brief explanation of the study and the informed consent form. Residents were notified by their respective Program Director to participate and email reminders were sent to increase response rates on a weekly basis over eight weeks. Socio-demographic data collected included age, gender, nationality, current hospital, marital status, number of kids, living environment, residency program name, specialty, year, whether a wellness program exists, history of probation, remediation, interruption, transfer, or withdrawal during training, number of hours worked per week, number of sick and missed days (not related to sickness), and intention to leave training. The sequence of the two scales (Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) and Stress Overload Scale – Short Form (SOS-S)) were set to appear in random sequence to enhance response rate and eliminate order bias.

Research Instruments

The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI)

The 19-item CBI was used to evaluate burnout over three domains: personal (6-item), work-related (7-item), and patient-related (6-item). Personal burnout items relate to somatic and emotional exhaustion that a resident can experience. Work-related burnout assesses somatic and emotional exhaustion that a resident can experience due to their working environment. Patient-related burnout assesses somatic and emotional exhaustion due to resident interaction with patients. All items have five response categories in a Likert scale, ranging either from “to a very low degree” to “to a very high degree” or from “never” to “always.” Each scale ranges from 0 to 100 points, with high scores indicating higher levels of burnout. Total score on the scale is the average of the scores on the items. If less than 3 questions were answered in any of the domains (less than 4 items in the work-related burnout), the respondent was classified as a non-responder. The CBI has been validated and translated into 8 languages; it is suitable for healthcare professionals because it focuses on the source of burnout rather than its symptoms. Although the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) has been more commonly used worldwide, cross-cultural studies and a recent systematic review found that CBI was superior to MBI when measuring the psychometric properties of burnout across various settings and countries (12-19). An Arabic version of the CBI was used to assess the burnout among community pharmacists (CPs) in Lebanon (20). Their results provided evidence for the validity and reliability of the Arabic CBI as a valid tool to measure burnout among CPs. English-version of the CBI scale has been earlier validated in GCC populations (21,22).

The Stress Overload Scale-short form (SOS-S)

The Stress Overload Scale (SOS) has demonstrated effectiveness in predicting pathology in various populations, including English, Arabic, Spanish, and Korean populations exposed to a laboratory and real-world stressors (23, 24, 25). A short version (SOS-S; 10 items) has been validated among English and Arabic populations and shown to be as effective in predicting illness as the full version and included a representative sample from the GCC (25).

The SOS-S is a 10-item stress measurement tool. Responses are on a five-point Likert scale that ranged from not at all (1) to a lot (5). Odd-numbered items measured personal vulnerability (PV), whereas even numbered items measured event load (EL). Mean scores for the entire scale were computed to measure stress overload levels, whereas the mean of the odd-numbered items was computed to measure PV levels and the mean of even-numbered items were computed to measure EL.

levels. Higher scores reflect higher levels of stress overload, PV, and EL. While there are no cutoff scores for the SOS-S, categorical scores can be determined by splitting each SOS-S subscale at its mean and crossing the scales to form a 2 x 2 matrix. This matrix provides four subgroups categorized according to participants' risk of illness: High Risk (High PV, High EL), Fragile (High PV, Low EL), Challenged (Low PV, High EL), and Low Risk (Low PV, Low EL) (26,27).

Data Analysis

Data was transferred into SPSS software version 25.0 to determine quantitative and descriptive statistics. Binary logistic regression was used for multivariate analysis to predict significant demographic and residency variables for PV and EL. The coded variables which were significant on a bivariate analysis was used for regression analysis to define significant predictors of personal, work-related and patient-related burnout. A p-value of < .05 was considered statistically significant and p < .01 was highly significant.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from the responsible entity in each participating country [Arab Board (Kingdom of Bahrain): IRB# 20- 337; Saudi Board (Kingdom of Saudi Arabia): IRB#5/20.September.2020, Protocol No. SRP-000037; Oman Medical Specialty Board (Sultanate of Oman): REC/05/2020; Kuwait Board Medical Training Program (State of Kuwait): #1463. In addition, participants were informed of the choice to withdraw from the study at any point without any risks, no personal identifiers would be collected, responses would remain anonymous and kept with the investigators for research purposes only.

RESULTS

In total, 1890 responses were valid and considered for statistical analysis.

The gender distribution was relatively equal with a mean age of 29.51 ± 3.22 years old. Around 50% of residents were married and 42.5% were single, where 36.5% had children. Most residents were from the SB (69.1%), followed by the KBMTP (14.5%), OMSB (9.5%), and AB (6.8%). The top three residency specialties were Medical (25.9%), Surgical (18.8%), and Family Medicine (18.0%). Residents were almost equally distributed across the second (29.4%), third (20.7%), and fourth year (21.2%). Almost a quarter of residents (24.8%) had access to a wellness program, but only 6.2% participated in it. Intention to leave represented 19% of residents. Within the sick and missed days' breakdown, seven respondents reported taking sick leave due to quarantining during the COVID-19

pandemic and as such, were removed from analysis for that factor. As for missed days, 11 respondents were excluded as six of them missed days due to maternity/postpartum and five respondents had 3-7 missed days due to an emergency (death in family) or study reasons (see Table 1).

Table 1: Socio-demographic and work-related characteristics of GCC Residents

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage	Total (n)
Age			
24-28	669	35.4%	1890
29-33	712	37.7%	
≥34	143	7.6%	
No response	366	19.4%	
Gender			
Male	927	49.0 %	1890
Female	961	50.8 %	
No response	2	0.1 %	
Marital status			
Single	804	42.5 %	1890
Engaged	83	4.4 %	
Married	962	50.9 %	
Divorced	36	1.9 %	
Widowed	2	0.1 %	
No response	3	0.2 %	
Have children			
No	1193	63.1 %	1890
Yes	690	36.5 %	
No response	7	0.4 %	
Living environment			
Alone	214	11.3 %	1890
Alone with relatives nearby	111	5.9 %	
With partner	392	20.7 %	
With family	1173	62.1 %	
Residency Program			
Arab Board	129	6.8 %	1890
Saudi Board	1306	69.1 %	
Omani Board	179	9.5 %	
Kuwaiti Board	274	14.5 %	
No response	2	0.1 %	
Residency Program Specialty			
Anesthesia	74	3.9 %	1890
Emergency Medicine	72	3.8 %	

Family Medicine	340	18.0 %	
Medical (includes Internal Medicine)	490	25.9 %	
OBGYN	164	8.7 %	
Pathology/Laboratory	41	2.2 %	
Pediatrics	238	12.6 %	
Radiology	101	5.3 %	
Surgical	355	18.8 %	
No response	15	0.8%	
Residency year			
First year	300	15.9 %	1890
Second year	555	29.4 %	
Third year	391	20.7 %	
Fourth year	400	21.2 %	
Fifth year	183	9.7 %	
No response	61	3.2 %	
Do you have a wellness program?			
Yes	468	24.8 %	1890
No	1419	75.1 %	
No response	3	0.2 %	
Participated in a wellness program			
Yes	117	6.2 %	1890
No	1220	64.6 %	
No response	553	29.3 %	
Have you been placed on probation, remediation status, been interrupted from training, transferred between different specialties, or temporarily withdrew from training during your residency program?			
Yes	335	17.7 %	1890
No	1531	81.0 %	
No response	24	1.3 %	
Shift/work schedules per week			
<40 hours a week	304	16.1 %	1890
41-60 hours a week	729	38.6 %	
51-70 hours a week	418	22.1 %	
>71 hours a week	430	21.8 %	
No response	9	0.5 %	
Sick days per year			
0-1	680	36.0 %	1890
2-7	740	39.2 %	
>7	265	14.0 %	
No response	205	10.8 %	
Missed days per year (not related to sickness)			
0-1	1132	59.9 %	1890

2-7	349	18.5 %	
>7	112	5.9 %	
No response	297	15.7 %	
Do you have an intention to leave your training in the next year?			
Yes	364	19.3 %	1890
No	1525	80.7 %	
No response	1	0.1 %	

Prevalence of burnout and stress overload among GCC residents

Personal burnout prevalence rates were highest, followed by work-related and patient-related burnout (98.4%, 97.8%, and 79.3%, respectively; see Table 2). Stress overload mean scores were high, followed by EL and PV (31.87 ± 11.04 , 17.08 ± 5.63 , 14.78 ± 5.81 , respectively). There were 51.6% residents who were at high risk for illness, 30.3% who were low risk, 17.2% fragile (i.e., showing higher levels of PV than average), and only 0.7% were challenged (i.e., having higher EL levels, but low PV levels).

Table 2: Mean Scores and Prevalence of Burnout and Stress

	Mean Score (SD)	Prevalence (%), Confidence Interval
CBI		
Personal Burnout	66.75 (22.52)	1860 (98.4%, CI: 97.9 % - 99.0%)
Work-related Burnout	60.47 (20.12)	1849 (97.8%, CI: 97.1 % - 98.4%)
Patient-related Burnout	38.50 (25.89)	1498 (79.3%, CI: 77.4 %- 81.0%)
SOS-S	31.87 (11.04)	High Risk (High PV and EL): 975 (51.6%)
Personal Vulnerability (PV)	14.78 (5.81)	Challenged (Low PV, High EL): 13 (0.7%)
Event Load (EL)	17.08 (5.63)	Fragile (High PV, Low EL): 326 (17.2%)
		Low Risk (Low PV, Low EL): 576 (30.5%)

CBI: Copenhagen Burnout Inventory; SOS-S: Stress Overload Scale (short version); SD: Standard deviation

The relationship between burnout, stress, and their subscales demonstrated low to medium correlations, ranging from 0.364 to 0.743 (significant at the 0.01 level, 2-tailed). Personal burnout and stress overload had the strongest correlation (see Table 3).

Table 3: Pearson Correlations between the CBI dimensions and the SOS-S total scores and its subscales*

	Personal Burnout	Work-related Burnout	Patient-related Burnout	Personal Vulnerability (r)	Event Load (r)	SOS-S Total (r)
Personal Burnout	-	0.790	0.435	0.696	0.737	0.743
Work-related Burnout	0.790	-	0.507	0.646	0.668	0.681
Patient-related Burnout	0.435	0.507	-	0.317	0.384	0.364
Personal Vulnerability	0.696	0.646	0.317	-	0.862	0.964
Event Load	0.737	0.668	0.384	0.862	-	0.966
SOS-S Total	0.743	0.681	0.364	0.964	0.966	-

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
SOS-S: Stress Overload Scale (short version)

Burnout and stress overload across Gender, Marital Status, and Boards

A chi-square test showed gender differences were statistically significant for personal burnout and SOS-S, where more female residents reported personal burnout ($p = 0.01$). Female residents were also at higher risk for illness due to stress overload ($p=0.003$) (see Table 4).

Table 4: Chi-square test for CBI and SOS-S domains based on demographic and other variables

	CBI Domains			SOS-S Categories (Risk for Illness)				SOS Categorical Scores (p-value)
	Personal Burnout (score \geq 50) N (%), p-value	Work-related burnout (score \geq 50) N (%), p-value	Patient-related burnout (score \geq 50) N (%), p-value	Low Risk N (%)	Fragile N (%)	Challenged N (%)	High Risk N (%)	
Total	1860(98.4 %)	1849 (97.8 %)	1498 (79.3 %)	975 (51.6%)	326 (17.2%)	13 (0.7%)	576 (30.5%)	
Age								
24-28	662 (99.0%)	661 (98.8 %)	526 (78.6%)	189 (28.3%)	120 (17.9%)	4 (0.6%)	356 (53.2%)	p= 0.57
29-33	698 (98.2%)	692 (97.2 %)	562 (78.9%)	224 (31.5%)	123 (17.3%)	5 (0.7%)	360 (50.6%)	
\geq 34	139 (97.2%)	137 (95.8 %)	110 (76.9%)	53 (37.1%)	25 (17.5%)	0 (0.0%)	65 (45.5%)	
Gender								
Male	906 (97.7%)	905 (97.6%)	744 (80.3%)	317 (34.2%)	158 (17.0%)	8 (0.9%)	444 (47.9%)	p= 0.003
Female			752 (78.3%)			5 (0.5%)		

	952 (99.2%) p= 0.01	942 (98.0%) p= 0.63	p= 0.30	259 (27.0%)	168 (17.5%)		529 (55.0%)	
Marital status								
								p= 0.001
Single	792 (98.5%)	788 (98.0%)	635 (79.0%) 68 (81.9%)	221 (27.5%)	135 (16.8%)	12 (1.5%) 0 (0.0%)	436 (54.2%)	
Engaged	83 (100.0%)	83 (100.0%)	765 (79.5%) 28 (73.7%)	19 (22.9%)	16 (19.3%)	0 (0.0%) 1 (2.6%)	48 (57.8%) 470(48.9%)	
Married	945 (98.3%)	939 (97.6%)	p= 0.76	324 (33.7%)	168 (17.5%)		19 (50.0%)	
Divorced/widowed	37 (97.4%) p= 0.070	36 (94.7%) p= 0.27		12 (31.6%)	6 (15.8%)			
Have children								
								p= 0.004
No	1178 (98.7%)	1172 (98.2%)	957 (80.2%) 535 (77.5%)	341 (28.6%)	202 (16.9%)	13 (1.1%) 0 (0.0%)	637 (53.4%)	
Yes	675 (98.0%) p= 0.24	670 (97.1%) p= 0.13	p= 0.17	232 (33.6%)	124 (5.2%)		334 (48.4%)	
Living environment								
								p= 0.17
Alone	210 (98.1%)	166 (76.5%)	86 (39.3%) 41 (36.0%)	58 (27.1%)	35 (16.4%)	3 (1.4%) 2 (1.8%)	118 (55.1%)	
Alone with relatives nearby	111 (100.0%)	76 (66.7%) 302	150 (38.1%) 453 (36.8%)	38 (34.2%)	12 (10.8%)	0 (0.0%) 8 (0.7%)	59 (53.2%) 207	
With partner	387 (99.0%)	(76.8%) 893	p= 0.874	112 (28.6%)	73 (18.6%)		(52.8%) 591	
With family	1152 (98.2%) p= 0.38	(72.7%) p= 0.092		368 (31.4%)	206 (17.6%)		(50.4%)	
Residency Program								
								p= 0.000
Arab Board	128 (99.2%)	129 (100.0%)	104 (80.6%) 1054 (80.7%)	32 (24.8%)	32 (24.8%)	1 (0.8%) 11 (0.8%)	64 (49.6%) 741	
Saudi Board	1290 (98.8%)	1285 (98.4%)	113 (63.1%)	340 (26.0%)	214 (16.4%)	1 (0.6%) 0 (0.0%)	(56.7%) 41 (22.9%)	
Omani Board	168 (93.9%)	165 (92.2%)	225 (82.1%) p= 0.000	112 (62.6%)	25 (14.0%)		128 (46.7%)	
Kuwaiti Board	272 (99.6%) p= 0.000	268 (97.8%) p= 0.000		91 (33.2%)	55 (20.1%)			
Residency Year								
								p= 0.32
First year	298 (99.3%)	293(97.7%) 541 (97.55)	236 (78.7%) 436 (78.7%)	84 (28.0%)	59 (19.7%)	2 (0.7%) 3 (0.5%)	155 (51.7%)	
Second year	545(98.2%) 388 (99.22)	385 (98.5%)	313 (80.1%) 328 (82.0%)	175 (31.5%)	97 (17.5%)	5 (1.3%) 3 (0.8%)	280 (50.5%)	
Third year	388 (97.2%)	391 (97.8%)	142 (77.6%) p= 0.65	119 (30.4%)	49 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	218 (55.8%)	
Fourth year	182 (99.5%) p= 0.06	179 (97.8%) p= 0.89		125 (31.3%)	72 (18.0%)		200 (50.0%)	
Fifth year				54 (29.5%)	38 (20.8%)		91 (49.7%)	
Residency Specialty								
								p= 0.016
Anesthesia	74 (100.0%) 69 (95.8%) 70 (97.2%) 331 (97.6%)	73 (98.6%) 69 (95.8%) 331 (97.4%) 473 (98.5%)	57 (77.0%) 56 (77.8%) 281 (82.6%) 392 (80.0%) 134 (81.7%)	21 (28.4%) 32 (44.4%) 132 (38.8%)	14 (18.9%) 7 (9.7%) 57 (16.8%)	0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%) 2 (0.6%) 5 (1.0%) 1 (0.6%)	39 (52.7%) 33 (45.8%) 149 (43.8%) 262 (53.5%)	
Emergency Medicine	483 (98.6%)	162 (98.8%)	28 (68.3%) 189 (79.4%)	141 (28.8%)	24 (14.6%)	0 (0.0%) 3 (1.3%)	99 (60.4%) 13 (31.7%)	
Medical	164 (100.0%)	40 (97.6%)	267 (75.2%) p= 0.39	40 (24.4%)	11 (14.6%)	0 (0.0%) 2 (0.6%)	123 (51.7%)	
OBGYN	39 (95.1%) 234 (98.3%)	238 (100.0%) 100 (99.0%)		17 (41.5%)	50 (21.0%)		55 (54.5%) 196 (55.2%)	
Laboratory	100 (99.0%)	349 (98.3%)		62 (26.1%)	16 (15.8%)			
Pediatrics	351 (98.9%)	p=0.05		30 (29.7%)	64			

	p= 0.06			93 (26.2%)	(18.0%)			
Do you have a wellness program?								
Yes	456 (97.4%)	447 (95.5%)	364 (77.7%) 1131 (79.7%)	187 (40.0%)	84 (17.9%)	4 (0.9%) 9 (0.6%)	193 (41.2%)	p= 0.000
No	1401 (98.8%) p= 0.04	1399 (98.6%) p= 0.000	p= 0.39	389 (27.4%)	242 (17.1%)		779 (54.9%)	
Have you participated in a wellness program?								
Yes	113 (96.6%)	113 (96.6%)	95 (81.2%) 1198 (78.4%)	38 (32.5%)	18 (15.4%)	1 (0.9%) 8 (0.7%)	60 (51.3%) 633 (51.9%)	p= 0.97
No	1503 (98.2%) p= 0.13	1194 (97.9%) p= 0.32	p= 0.55	379 (31.1%)	200 (16.4%)			
Have you been placed on probation, remediation status, been interrupted from training, transferred between different specialties, or temporarily withdrew from training during your residency program?								
Yes	333 (99.7%)	332 (99.1%)	282 (84.2%) 1198 (78.2%)	80 (23.9%)	52 (15.5%)	3 (0.9%) 10 (0.7%)	200 (59.7%)	p= 0.007
No	1200 (98.4%) p= 0.04	1493 (97.5%) p= 0.09	p= 0.017	490 (32.0%)	270 (17.6%)		761 (49.7%)	
Sick Days								
0-1	663 (97.5%)	666 (97.9%)	529 (77.8%) 592 (80.0%)	22 (32.6%)	128 (18.8%)	1 (0.1%) 6 (0.8%)	329 (48.4%)	p= 0.000
2-7	732 (99.1%)	727 (98.2%)	214 (80.8%)	215 (29.1%)	143 (19.3%)	2 (0.8%)	376 (50.8%)	
>7	262 (98.9%) p= 0.08	257 (97.0%) p= 0.55	p= 0.68	65 (24.5%)	36 (13.6%)		162 (61.1%)	
Missed Days								
0-1	1108 (97.9%)	1107 (97.8%)	883 (78.0%) 288 (82.5%)	352 (31.1%)	223 (19.7%)	4 (0.4%) 4 (1.1%)	553 (48.9%)	p= 0.003
2-7	347 (99.7%)	342 (98.0%)	88 (78.6%)	97 (27.8%)	54 (15.5%)	1 (0.9%)	194 (55.6%)	
>7	111 (99.1%) p= 0.07	110 (98.2%) p= 0.98	p= 0.30	28 (25.0%)	19 (17.0%)		64 (57.1%)	
Shift/work schedules per week								
<40 hours a week	291 (95.7%)	282(92.8%) 717 (98.4%)	221 (72.7%) 584 (80.1%)	152 (50.05)	34 (11.2%)	0 (0.0%) 5 (0.7%)	118 (38.8%)	p= 0.000
41-60 hours a week	715 (98.2%)	414 (99.0%)	331 (79.2%)	251 (34.4%)	149 (20.4%)	6 (1.4%) 2 (0.5%)	324 (44.4%)	
51-70 hours a week	417 (99.8%)	427 (99.3%)	356 (82.8%)	97 (23.2%)	74 (17.7%)		241 (57.7%)	
>71 hours a week	428 (99.5%) p= 0.000	p= 0.000	p= 0.009	74 (17.2%)	68 (15.8%)		286 (66.5%)	
Do you have an intention to leave your training in the next year?								
Yes	361 (99.4%)	362(99.5%) 1486 (97.4%)	318(87.4%) 1179 (77.3%)	40 (11.0%)	36 (17.3%)	3 (0.8%) 10 (0.7%)	285 (78.3%)	p= 0.000
No	1498 (98.2%) p= 0.09	p= 0.015	p= 0.000	536 (35.1%)	290 (19.0%)		689 (45.2%)	

CBI: Copenhagen Burnout Inventory; SOS-S: Stress Overload Scale (short version)

There were significant differences between boards in burnout prevalence rates. AB and KBMTP residents had the highest rates of burnout across all domains (p= 0.000) (Figure 1). SB residents were most likely to be at high risk for illness, whereas OMSB residents were most likely to be low risk (p= 0.000) (Figure 2). Significant differences in work-related burnout rates (p= 0.05) and risk for illness were found between residency specialties, with Pediatric residents suffering from the highest burnout

rates and OBGYN, Surgical and Radiology residents being at higher risk for illness (60.4%, 55.2%, and 54.5%, respectively; $p= 0.016$).




Figure 1. Bar graph illustrating the prevalence of personal burnout, work-related burnout, patient-related burnout among GCC residents.




Figure 2. Bar graph illustrating the prevalence of personal vulnerability (PV), event load (EL), and total stress overload (SOS-S) among GCC residents.

Burnout and stress' relationship with wellness programs and other work-related factors

Rates of personal and work-related burnout were lower among residents who had a wellness program ($p= 0.04$ and $p= 0.000$). Also, residents with no wellness program were more likely to be at high risk for illness ($p= 0.000$).

Personal and patient related burnout were higher among residents who were on probation, remediation status, were interrupted from training, transferred between different specialties, or temporarily withdrew from training during their residency program ($p= 0.04$ and $p= 0.017$). Residents in these categories were also more likely to be at high risk for illness ($p = 0.007$). Residents who took more sick leave or missed days were also more likely to be at high risk for illness ($p = 0.000$).

Prevalence of personal, work-related, and patient-related burnout was highest among residents working >71 hours per week ($p = 0.000$ to 0.009 , respectively). Prevalence of work and patient related burnout was higher among residents who had an intention to leave training in the next year ($p= 0.015$ and $p = 0.000$). Residents with longer work shifts and an intention to leave were also more significantly at high risk for illness ($p = 0.000$).

Predictive factors for burnout and stress overload

Predictive factors of personal and work-related burnout included work hours per week ($p = 0.01 - 0.03$, $p = 0.000-0.021$, respectively) and PV ($p = 0.03$, $p = 0.000$, respectively). Predictive factors of patient-related burnout included Residency board ($p = 0.002$ to $p = 0.045$), PV ($p = 0.000$), and EL ($p = 0.007$).

Predictive factors for PV included gender ($p < 0.001$), access to a wellness program ($p = 0.01$), work hours per week ($p = 0.01$ to 0.03), and intention to leave ($p < 0.001$). Predictive factors for EL were gender ($p < 0.001$), Residency program ($p < 0.001$ to 0.001), access to a wellness program ($p = 0.003$), sick days > 7 ($p = 0.006$), and intention to leave ($p < 0.001$).

Table 5. Regression Analysis Model Considering Significant Predictors of A) Burnout B) Stress

A) Significant Predictors of Burnout

PERSONAL BURNOUT (Model with R² =0.385)			
Factor	Adjusted		
	OR	95% CI	P value
Shift/work schedules per week			
<40 hours a week	Ref		
41-60 hours a week	2.68	1.1- 6.6	0.03
51-70 hours a week	13.71	1.6- 112.4	0.01
>71 hours a week	9.89	1.2- 82.9	0.03
PV	9.09	1.18- 69.6	0.03
WORK RELATED BURNOUT (Model with R² =0.277)			
Shift/work schedules per week			
<40 hours a week	Ref		
41-60 hours a week	4.10	1.9- 8.7	0.000
51-70 hours a week	5.13	1.6- 15.6	0.004
>71 hours a week	4.44	1.2- 15.6	0.021
PV	12.96	4.4- 37.4	0.000
PATIENT RELATED BURNOUT (Model with R² =0.086)			
Residency Program			
Arab Board	1.76	1.0- 3.07	0.045
Saudi Board	1.67	1.18 -2.3	0.004
Omani Board	Ref		
Kuwaiti Board	2.02	1.29- 3.16	0.002
PV	2.06	1.5- 2.8	0.000
EL	1.55	1.1- 2.1	0.007

B) Significant Predictors of Stress

PV (Model with R² =0.142)			
Factor	Adjusted		
	OR	95% CI	P value
Gender			
Male	Ref		
Female	1.79	1.41-2.28	<0.001
Do you have a wellness program?			
Yes	1.40	1.80-1.83	0.01
No			

Shift/work schedules per week <40 hours a week 41-60 hours a week 51-70 hours a week >71 hours a week	Ref 2.68 13.71 9.89	1.2- 6.6 1.6- 112.4 1.2- 82.9	0.03 0.01 0.03
Do you have an intention to leave your training in the next year? Yes No	3.32 Ref	2.28- 4.81	<0.001
EL (Model with R² =0.151)			
Gender Male Female	Ref 1.62	1.30-2.02	<0.001
Residency Program Arab Board Saudi Board Omani Board Kuwaiti Board	2.55 4.04 Ref 2.81	1.44- 4.51 2.61- 6.24 1.72- 4.59	0.001 <0.001 <0.001
Do you have a wellness program? Yes No	Ref 1.477	1.14-1.90	0.003
Sick Days 0-1 2-7 >7	Ref 1.57	1.13-2.18	0.006
Do you have an intention to leave your training in the next year? Yes No	3.54 Ref	2.62- 4.78	<0.001

PV: Personal Vulnerability; EL: Event Load; R²: the coefficient of determination

DISCUSSION

This is the first study to assess burnout and stress levels of residents in the GCC by combining the CBI and SOS-S as assessment tools. Our findings illustrate that burnout prevalence rates are very high in all three CBI burnout dimensions across all residents of participating countries. Prevalence rates for personal burnout ranged from 93.9% to 99.6%, 92.2% to 100% for work-related burnout, and 63.1% to 82.1% for patient-related burnout. The KBMTP scored the highest in both personal (99.6%) and patient-related burnout (82.1%), whereas the AB scored highest in work-related burnout (100%). Compared to other countries, resident burnout rates have been reported as 27.9% in Brazil (28), 21% in The Netherlands (29), 27% in Lebanon (30) 14.4% in Greece (31), and 65% (male residents) and 73% (female residents) in a United States General Surgery program (32). In another study in the US,

76% of residents met the criteria for burnout (33). Our results showed that residents were also highly susceptible to illness, with the SB having the highest percentage of residents at high risk for illness (56.7%), followed by the AB (49.6%), while the OMSB had the lowest (22.9%).

There were statistically significant gender differences for personal burnout only (higher among females), residency program (KBMTP residents reported the highest burnout across all domains), wellness program (availability of wellness programs showed lower personal and work-related burnout), probation/remediation status (higher personal and patient related burnout for this status), shift length (longer shifts reflected higher burnout across all domains), and intention to leave (those with intention to leave had higher personal and patient related burnout) (p-values = 0.000 to 0.05). Predictors of personal and work-related burnout included shift length per week and PV (p-values = 0.000 to 0.021). Patient-related burnout predictors included residency program, shift length, PV, and EL (p-values = 0.000 to 0.045).

Stress overload amongst GCC residents showed statistically significant differences across gender, marital status, having children, residency program, specialty, wellness program availability, probation/remediation status, number of sick or missed days, shift length, and intention to leave (p-values ranged from 0.000 to 0.016). PV Predictors included gender, wellness program availability, shift length, and intention to leave (p-values <0.001 to 0.03). EL predictors included gender, residency program, wellness program availability, sick days, and intention to leave (p-values <0.001 to 0.003).

Our results are in line with the existing literature globally. Several studies have shown that higher levels of burnout are associated with longer working hours, more working days, and shift work (36, 37). Extended and irregular work shifts have also been found to contribute to burnout and depression in medical residents in the UAE (34), Saudi Arabia (38) and India (39). There is conflicting data about the relationship between marriage and burnout among residents. Burnout was reported higher in married residents in one study (38). Another study reported that married or engaged residents showed higher emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (40), whereas other studies reported no relation between marital status and burnout (10,35). Female residents with children reported the highest levels of emotional exhaustion. Male residents with children reported lower levels of emotional exhaustion compared to male residents without children (41). The lower levels of burnout among married residents and those with children in our study may be attributed to the social support received by partners and family members as several studies have shown its importance (42, 43).

Additionally, the predictors we listed for burnout and stress overload illustrate the significance of wellness programs and shift length as factors to consider when aiming to reduce burnout and stress overload in residency programs. For example, as the OMSB residents reported the lowest burnout and

stress rates, one can attribute this to the early development and implementation of the wellness program by the board in 2012 (44). It must be noted that although SB launched a wellness program called “Daem” in early 2019 (45), no assessment has been made of its effectiveness. Wellness as a concept is “a dynamic process involving self-awareness that results in healthy choices” (46). The importance of wellness programs and their effect on reducing burnout in residents is well-established (47-50). Two studies that assessed the same program found that 64% of participants had improved health and mental wellbeing (50) and 91% reported improved team building and friendship (50).

Our study reported much higher prevalence rates of burnout and stress among residents than other studies. A possible explanation for the discrepancy may be the measures used to assess burnout. Another explanation is that rates were inflated as data was collected during a peak period of the COVID-19 pandemic in the region. A study conducted in Saudi Arabia suggested that training residents are especially susceptible to COVID-19 infections, with an elevated proportion of them experiencing moderate to severe depression and anxiety. The study also listed possible dissatisfaction with residents’ respective training programs and delays in the delivery of the curriculum material due to the COVID-19 pandemic as another reason for these high rates (51).

Strengths & Limitations:

Our results are in accordance with studies published regionally and globally. However, direct comparison with other studies may be limited due to differences in settings of residency training programs and participation rates. For example, SB residents represented a large percentage of our participants; residency programs from Qatar and UAE did not participate (both countries are GCC members), which may bias our results. However, we had a sufficient representative sample from each board. Our response rates were low, but still in line with the burnout literature (8, 51-54). Several strengths were identified: 1- Our study can be considered the largest multinational multi-center study in the GCC focusing on stress and burnout in residents; 2- the application of the CBI and SOS-S on a large scale for the first time in the GCC. These tools are becoming more commonly used globally and have shown improved reliability and validity compared to their counterparts (52, 55,59).

CONCLUSION

Burnout and stress are highly prevalent among physician residents in the four GCC countries included in the study, especially in Bahraini, Kuwaiti, and Saudi Arabian residents. Findings highlight the importance of measuring burnout and stress overload using standardized and validated assessment methods to better understand their effects on medical residents. Our findings also provide useful information to guide and support medical education endeavors to target factors associated with

burnout and stress overload. Intervention programs to help combat burnout and stress overload should be implemented by the various medical institutions in the GCC dedicated to the advancement of medical education. Further research is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of residency wellness programs.

List of abbreviations:

AB: Arab Board
CBI: Copenhagen Burnout Inventory
COVID: Coronavirus Disease
EL: Event Load
GCC: Gulf Cooperation Council
ICD: International Classification of Diseases
KBMTP: Kuwait Board Medical Training Program
OMSB: Oman Medical Specialty Board
PV: Personal Vulnerability
SB: Saudi Board
SOS-S: Stress Overload Scale – Short Form
UAE: United Arab Emirates
WHO: World Health Organization

Declaration

We confirm that all methods were performed in accordance with the relevant guidelines and regulations. Informed consent was obtained from all subjects prior to their participation in the survey.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

An ethical approval was acquired by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at King Hamad University Hospital (KHUH), Arab Board (AB), Saudi Board (SB), Oman Medical Specialty Board (OMSB), and the Kuwait Board Medical Training Program (KBMTP) prior to conducting this multi-center cross-sectional study from the concerned bodies.

Availability of data and materials:

The datasets used and analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. The data generated and analyzed during this study are included in this published article.

REFERENCES

1. Rotbart HA. The Developmental Process of Residency Education. *Am J Dis Child* [Internet]. 1985 Aug 1;139(8):762. Available from: <http://archpedi.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/archpedi.1985.02140100024018>
2. Aach RD, Cooney TG, Girard DE, Grob D, McCue JD, Page MI, et al. Stress and Impairment during Residency Training: Strategies for Reduction, Identification, and Management. *Ann Intern Med* [Internet]. 1988 Jul 15;109(2):154. Available from: <http://annals.org/article.aspx?doi=10.7326/0003-4819-109-2-154>
3. Basu S, Qayyum H, Mason S. Occupational stress in the ED: a systematic literature review. *Emerg Med J* [Internet]. 2017 Jul;34(7):441–7. Available from: <https://emj.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/emj-2016-205827>
4. WHO, Burn-out an "occupational phenomenon": International Classification of Diseases. Available at: <https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases>. Accessed November 10, 2021.
5. Yates SW. Physician Stress and Burnout. *Am J Med* [Internet]. 2020 Feb;133(2):160–4. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0002934319307570>
6. Verougstraete D, Hachimi Idrissi S. The impact of burn-out on emergency physicians and emergency medicine residents: a systematic review. *Acta Clin Belg* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 2;75(1):57–79. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17843286.2019.1699690>
7. Holmes EG, Connolly A, Putnam KT, Penaskovic KM, Denniston CR, Clark LH, et al. Taking Care of Our Own: A Multispecialty Study of Resident and Program Director Perspectives on Contributors to Burnout and Potential Interventions. *Acad Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2017 Apr 19;41(2):159–66. Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s40596-016-0590-3>
8. Dyrbye LN, West CP, Satele D, Boone S, Tan L, Sloan J, et al. Burnout Among U.S. Medical Students, Residents, and Early Career Physicians Relative to the General U.S. Population. *Acad Med* [Internet]. 2014 Mar;89(3):443–51. Available from: <http://journals.lww.com/00001888-201403000-00025>

9. IsHak WW, Lederer S, Mandili C, Nikravesh R, Seligman L, Vasa M, et al. Burnout During Residency Training: A Literature Review. *J Grad Med Educ* [Internet]. 2009 Dec 1;1(2):236–42. Available from: <https://meridian.allenpress.com/jgme/article/1/2/236/33694/Burnout-During-Residency-Training-A-Literature>
10. Martini S. Burnout Comparison Among Residents in Different Medical Specialties. *Acad Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2004 Sep 1;28(3):240–2. Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1176/appi.ap.28.3.240>
11. Taher A, Crawford S, Koczerginski J, Argintaru N, Beaumont-Boileau R, Hart A, et al. Position Statement on Resident Wellness. *CJEM* [Internet]. 2018 Sep 1;20(5):671–84. Available from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S1481803518000088/type/journal_article
12. Kristensen TS, Borritz M, Villadsen E, Christensen KB. The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work Stress* [Internet]. 2005 Jul;19(3):192–207. Available from: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02678370500297720>
13. Chambers CNL, Frampton CMA, Barclay M, McKee M. Burnout prevalence in New Zealand’s public hospital senior medical workforce: a cross-sectional mixed methods study. *BMJ Open* [Internet]. 2016 Nov 23;6(11):e013947. Available from: <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-013947>
14. Creedy DK, Sidebotham M, Gamble J, Pallant J, Fenwick J. Prevalence of burnout, depression, anxiety and stress in Australian midwives: a cross-sectional survey. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* [Internet]. 2017 Dec 9;17(1):13. Available from: <http://bmcpregnancychildbirth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12884-016-1212-5>
15. Molinero Ruiz E, Basart Gómez-Quintero H, Moncada Lluís S. Fiabilidad y validez del Copenhagen Burnout Inventory para su uso en España. *Rev Esp Salud Pública* [Internet]. 2013 Apr;87(2):165–79. Available from: http://scielo.isciii.es/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1135-57272013000200006&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=en

16. Thrush CR, Gathright MM, Atkinson T, Messias EL, Guise JB. Psychometric Properties of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory in an Academic Healthcare Institution Sample in the U.S. *Eval Health Prof* [Internet]. 2021 Dec 15;44(4):400–5. Available from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0163278720934165>
17. Moreno-Jiménez B, Barbaranelli C, Herrer MG, Hernández EG. The physician burnout questionnaire: A new definition and measure. *TPM - Testing, Psychom Methodol Appl Psychol*. 2012; doi:10.4473/TPM19.4.6.
18. Schaufeli WB, Taris TW. The conceptualization and measurement of burnout: Common ground and worlds apart The views expressed in *Work & Stress Commentaries* are those of the author(s), and do not necessarily represent those of any other person or organization, or of the journal. *Work Stress* [Internet]. 2005 Jul;19(3):256–62. Available from: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02678370500385913>
19. Shoman Y, Marca SC, Bianchi R, Godderis L, van der Molen HF, Guseva Canu I. Psychometric properties of burnout measures: a systematic review. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 13;30:e8. Available from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S2045796020001134/type/journal_article
20. Youssef, D., Abou-Abbas, L. & Youssef, J. Feeling the burn in the era of COVID-19: cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the Arabic version of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory among community pharmacists. *J of Pharm Policy and Pract* 15, 21 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40545-022-00419-x>
21. Aljuhayman AM, Alkhamees MA, Alkanhal HF, Al-Zahrani MA, Almutair SA, Alkhamees AA. Assessment of burnout among urology residents in KSA: a cross-sectional study. *Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences*. 2021 Feb 1;16(1):29-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtumed.2020.10.014>
22. Aljuffali LA, Alshabanah MO, Almalag HM. Cross-sectional study to evaluate burnout among pharmacy staff in Saudi Arabia during COVID-19 pandemic. *Saudi Pharmaceutical Journal*. 2022 Apr 1;30(4):440-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsps.2022.01.017>
23. Amirkhan, J. H. (2012). Stress overload: A new approach to the assessment of stress. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 49(1-2), 55–71. doi:10.1007/s10464-011-9438-x
24. Amirkhan, J. H., Urizar, G. G., & Clark, S. (2015). Criterion validation of a stress measure: The Stress Overload Scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 27(3), 985–996. doi:10.1037/pas0000081

25. Bashmi, L. & Amirkhan, J. H. (2018). Constructing an Arabic language version of the Stress Overload Scale (SOS). *Arab Journal of Psychology*, 5:167-206.
26. Amirkhan JH. A Brief Stress Diagnostic Tool: The Short Stress Overload Scale. *Assessment* [Internet]. 2018 Dec 6;25(8):1001–13. Available from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1073191116673173>
27. Bashmi, L. & Amirkhan, J. H. (2018). Constructing an Arabic language version of the Stress Overload Scale (SOS). *Arab Journal of Psychology*, 5:167-206.
28. Gouveia PA da C, Ribeiro Neta MHC, Aschoff CA de M, Gomes DP, Silva NAF da, Cavalcanti HAF. Factors associated with burnout syndrome in medical residents of a university hospital. *Rev Assoc Med Bras* [Internet]. 2017 Jun;63(6):504–11. Available from: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0104-42302017000600504&lng=en&tlng=en
29. Prins JT, Hoekstra-Weebers JEHM, Gazendam-Donofrio SM, Dillingh GS, Bakker AB, Huisman M, et al. Burnout and engagement among resident doctors in the Netherlands: a national study. *Med Educ* [Internet]. 2010 Mar;44(3):236–47. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03590.x>
30. Talih F, Warakian R, Ajaltouni J, Shehab AAS, Tamim H. Correlates of Depression and Burnout Among Residents in a Lebanese Academic Medical Center: a Cross-Sectional Study. *Acad Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2016 Feb 6;40(1):38–45. Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s40596-015-0400-3>
31. Zis P, Anagnostopoulos F, Sykioti P. Burnout in Medical Residents: A Study Based on the Job Demands-Resources Model. *Sci World J* [Internet]. 2014;2014:1–10. Available from: <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/tswj/2014/673279/>
32. Elmore LC, Jeffe DB, Jin L, Awad MM, Turnbull IR. National Survey of Burnout among US General Surgery Residents. *J Am Coll Surg* [Internet]. 2016 Sep;223(3):440–51. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1072751516301855>

33. Shanafelt TD, Bradley KA, Wipf JE, Back AL. Burnout and Self-Reported Patient Care in an Internal Medicine Residency Program. *Ann Intern Med* [Internet]. 2002 Mar 5;136(5):358. Available from: <http://annals.org/article.aspx?doi=10.7326/0003-4819-136-5-200203050-00008>
34. Abdulrahman M, Farooq M, Al Kharmiri A, Al Marzooqi F, Carrick F. Burnout and depression among medical residents in the United Arab Emirates: A Multicenter study. *J Fam Med Prim Care* [Internet]. 2018;7(2):435. Available from: https://journals.lww.com/10.4103/jfmpe.jfmpe_199_17
35. Al Subhi A, Al Lawati H, Shafiq M, Al Kindi S, Al Subhi M, Al Jahwari A. Prevalence of burnout of residents in oman medical specialty board: A cross-sectional study in Oman. *J Musculoskelet Surg Res* [Internet]. 2020;4(3):136. Available from: <https://journalmsr.com/prevalence-of-burnout-of-residents-in-oman-medical-specialty-board-a-cross-sectional-study-in-oman/>
36. Alotaibi AK, Alsalim A, Alruwaili F, Almubarak A, Alhamzah A, Albahlal A, et al. Burnout during ophthalmology residency training: A national survey in Saudi Arabia. *Saudi J Ophthalmol* [Internet]. 2019 Apr;33(2):130–4. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1319453418303734>
37. Aldubai SR, Aljohani A, Alghamdi A, Alghamdi K, Ganasegeran K, Yenbaawi A. Prevalence and associated factors of burnout among family medicine residents in Al Madina, Saudi Arabia. *J Fam Med Prim Care* [Internet]. 2019;8(2):657. Available from: https://journals.lww.com/10.4103/jfmpe.jfmpe_268_18
38. Hameed TK, Masuadi E, Al Asmary NA, Al-Anzi FG, Al Dubayee MS. A study of resident duty hours and burnout in a sample of Saudi residents. *BMC Med Educ* [Internet]. 2018 Dec 2;18(1):180. Available from: <https://bmcmededuc.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12909-018-1300-5>
39. Dhusia A, Dhaimade P, Jain A, Shemna S, Dubey P. Prevalence of occupational burnout among resident doctors working in public sector hospitals in Mumbai. *Indian J Community Med* [Internet]. 2019;44(4):352. Available from: <http://www.ijcm.org.in/text.asp?2019/44/4/352/270818>

40. Jamjoom RS, Park YS. Assessment of pediatric residents burnout in a tertiary academic centre. *Saudi Med J* [Internet]. 2018 Mar;39(3):296–300. Available from: <https://smj.org.sa/lookup/doi/10.15537/smj.2018.3.22328>
41. Afana A, Ghannam J, Ho E, Al-Khal A, Al-Arab B, Bylund C. Burnout and sources of stress among medical residents at Hamad Medical Corporation, Qatar. *East Mediterr Heal J* [Internet]. 2017 Jan 1;23(1):40–6. Available from: http://applications.emro.who.int/emhj/v23/01/EMHJ_2017_23_01_40_45.pdf?ua=1&ua=1
42. Cohen S, Wills TA. Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychol Bull* [Internet]. 1985 Sep;98(2):310–57. Available from: <http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310>
43. Prins JT, Hoekstra-Weebers JEHM, Gazendam-Donofrio SM, Van De Wiel HBM, Sprangers F, Jaspers FCA, et al. The role of social support in burnout among Dutch medical residents. *Psychol Health Med* [Internet]. 2007 Jan;12(1):1–6. Available from: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13548500600782214>
44. Oman Medical Specialty Board. Resident manual. Available at: http://omsb.org/File_Publications/files_20160814092650801_491c9cb8-60ce-404f-97bc-bf1312b458be.pdf. Accessed November 10, 2021.
45. The Saudi Commission for Health Specialties. E-Services Gate. Trainees Services. Daem Service. Available at: <https://www.scfhs.org.sa/en/eservices/trainees/Pages/TrainingGuidanceServiceDesc.aspx>. Accessed November 10, 2021
46. Vasquez TS, Close J, Bylund CL. Skills-Based Programs Used to Reduce Physician Burnout in Graduate Medical Education: A Systematic Review. *J Grad Med Educ* [Internet]. 2021 Aug 1;13(4):471–89. Available from: <https://meridian.allenpress.com/jgme/article/13/4/471/469335/Skills-Based-Programs-Used-to-Reduce-Physician>

47. Spiotta AM, Fargen KM, Denham SL, Fulton ME, Kellogg R, Young E, et al. Incorporation of a Physical Education and Nutrition Program Into Neurosurgery. *Neurosurgery* [Internet]. 2016 Oct;79(4):613–9. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/neurosurgery/article-lookup/doi/10.1227/NEU.0000000000001358>
48. Eckleberry-Hunt J, Lick D, Boura J, Hunt R, Balasubramaniam M, Mulhem E, et al. An Exploratory Study of Resident Burnout and Wellness. *Acad Med* [Internet]. 2009 Feb;84(2):269–77. Available from: <http://journals.lww.com/00001888-200902000-00040>
49. Spiotta AM, Fargen KM, Patel S, Larrew T, Turner RD. Impact of a Residency-Integrated Wellness Program on Resident Mental Health, Sleepiness, and Quality of Life. *Neurosurgery* [Internet]. 2019 Feb;84(2):341–6. Available from: <https://journals.lww.com/00006123-201902000-00006>
50. Buchholz AL, Henderson F, Lowe S, Alshareef M, Wolgamott L, Patel S, et al. Perspectives from a Residency Training Program Following the Implementation of a Wellness Initiative. *World Neurosurg* [Internet]. 2018 Nov;119:e947–55. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S187887501831790X>
51. Alsaywid B, Housawi A, Lytras M, Halabi H, Abuzenada M, Alhaidar SA, et al. Residents' Training in COVID-19 Pandemic Times: An Integrated Survey of Educational Process, Institutional Support, Anxiety and Depression by the Saudi Commission for Health Specialties (SCFHS). *Sustainability* [Internet]. 2020 Dec 16;12(24):10530. Available from: <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/24/10530>
52. Crowe RP, Bower JK, Cash RE, Panchal AR, Rodriguez SA, Olivo-Marston SE. Association of Burnout with Workforce-Reducing Factors among EMS Professionals. *Prehospital Emerg Care* [Internet]. 2018 Mar 4;22(2):229–36. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10903127.2017.1356411>
53. Shanafelt TD, West CP, Sinsky C, Trockel M, Tutty M, Satele D V., et al. Changes in Burnout and Satisfaction With Work-Life Integration in Physicians and the General US Working Population Between 2011 and 2017. *Mayo Clin Proc* [Internet]. 2019 Sep;94(9):1681–94. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0025619618309388>

54. Allegra CJ, Hall R, Yothers G. Prevalence of burnout in the US oncology community: results of a 2003 survey. *Journal of Oncology Practice*. 2005 Nov;1(4):140-7. DOI: 10.1200/jop.2005.1.4.140
55. Leake R, Rienks S, Obermann A. A Deeper Look at Burnout in the Child Welfare Workforce. *Hum Serv Organ Manag Leadersh Gov* [Internet]. 2017 Jun 21;1–11. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23303131.2017.1340385>
56. Walters JE, Brown AR, Jones AE. Use of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory with Social Workers: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis. *Hum Serv Organ Manag Leadersh Gov* [Internet]. 2018 Oct 20;42(5):437–56. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23303131.2018.1532371>
57. Mari S, Meyen R, Kim B. Resident-led organizational initiatives to reduce burnout and improve wellness. *BMC Med Educ* [Internet]. 2019 Dec 27;19(1):437. Available from: <https://bmcmmededuc.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12909-019-1756-y>
58. Thrush CR, Gathright MM, Atkinson T, Messias EL, Guise JB. Psychometric Properties of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory in an Academic Healthcare Institution Sample in the U.S. *Eval Health Prof* [Internet]. 2021 Dec 15;44(4):400–5. Available from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0163278720934165>
- Wood BA, Guimaraes AB, Holm CE, Hayes SW, Brooks KR. Academic Librarian Burnout: A Survey Using the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI). *J Libr Adm* [Internet]. 2020 Jul 3;60(5):512–31. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0193082>