Mental Health and Burnout Among Healthcare Practitioners: A Narrative Review

[1]Abdulelah Hadi Nahi AlOtaibi,[2]Mesfer Mohammed Alasmari,[3]Saeed Abdullah Alghamdi,[4]Abdullah Awwadh Alqarni,[5]Abdullah Saad Alasmari,[6]Abdullah Mubarak Al-Qahtani,[7]Mohammed Abdel Rahim Al-Barakati,[8]Bandar Awadh Alotaibi,[9]Hazzaa Mohammed Alkhanfari,[10]Thaar Ghalib Alsubaie,[11]Ayidh Abdulhadi Alqahtani,[12]Nawaf Fahad Alqahtani,[13]Hussain Saleh Salem Lasloom,[14]Yahya Ali Yahya Alharbi,[15]Fahad Haylan Alharbi

All workplaces/ national guard health affairs

Abstract

Healthcare practitioners face an occupational environment that places sustained demands on emotional, cognitive, and physical resources, and a growing body of evidence links this environment to elevated rates of burnout, depression, anxiety, and, in the most severe cases, suicidal ideation. This narrative review synthesizes contemporary literature on the mental health consequences of burnout among physicians, nurses, and allied health professionals, examining the conceptual relationship between burnout and clinical mental illness, the individual and organizational risk factors that shape practitioner wellbeing, the barriers that prevent healthcare workers from seeking help, and the evidence base for individual- and system-level interventions. The review further proposes an original conceptual model, the MEND Framework, which organizes practitioner mental health strategy around four domains — Monitoring, Early intervention, Networked support, and Destigmatization — intended to help healthcare institutions move from reactive crisis response toward proactive mental health protection. The discussion is situated within Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 healthcare transformation agenda and the regulatory infrastructure administered by the Saudi Commission for Health Specialties (SCFHS), the Central Board for Accreditation of Healthcare Institutions (CBAHI), the Saudi Food and Drug Authority (SFDA), the Nphies platform, the Mumaris+ licensing system, and the King Abdullah International Medical Research Center (KAIMRC). The review concludes with recommendations for practice, policy, and future research.

Keywords: burnout, mental health, healthcare practitioners, physician wellbeing, narrative review, MEND Framework, Vision 2030, Saudi Arabia

1. Introduction

Concern about the mental health of healthcare practitioners has intensified substantially over the past decade, driven by mounting evidence that physicians, nurses, and allied health professionals experience depression, anxiety, and burnout at rates exceeding those of the general working population, and by growing recognition that practitioner mental health is directly linked to patient safety, care quality, and workforce retention. The COVID-19 pandemic brought this issue into sharp public focus, but the underlying pressures — highstakes decision-making, emotional exposure to suffering and death, long and irregular working hours, and, in many settings, chronic understaffing — predate the pandemic and are likely to persist well beyond it.

This paper adopts a narrative review methodology, synthesizing findings from the peerreviewed literature on practitioner mental health and burnout to construct an integrated account of the conceptual relationship between these constructs, their shared and distinct risk factors, the barriers that prevent affected practitioners from seeking support, and the evidence for effective intervention. Unlike a systematic review, a narrative review does not attempt an exhaustive, protocol-driven synthesis of all available studies; rather, it aims to provide a coherent, thematically organized account of a broad and rapidly evolving literature, suitable for informing institutional policy and future research directions.

The review is organized as follows: Section 2 outlines the review methodology; Section 3 examines the conceptual relationship between burnout and clinical mental illness; Sections 4 and 5 review individual and organizational risk factors respectively; Section 6 examines barriers to help-seeking; Section 7 reviews the evidence for intervention; Section 8 proposes the MEND Framework; Section 9 situates the discussion within the Saudi healthcare context; and Sections 10 and 11 offer discussion and conclusions.

Review Methodology

This narrative review draws on peer-reviewed literature addressing burnout, depression, anxiety, and related mental health outcomes among physicians, nurses, and allied health professionals, published predominantly within general medicine, nursing, psychiatry, and health-services research journals. Search terms combined variants of 'burnout,' 'physician mental health,' 'nurse wellbeing,' 'healthcare worker depression,' and 'help-seeking barriers healthcare workers.' Given the scope and pace of this literature, the review

prioritizes influential, frequently cited studies and systematic reviews over an exhaustive cataloguing of individual primary studies, consistent with standard narrative review practice. The resulting synthesis is thematic rather than protocol-driven, and is intended to support institutional and policy decision-making rather than to serve as a basis for meta-analytic effect-size estimation.

The Conceptual Relationship Between Burnout And Mental Illness

Overlapping but Distinct Constructs

Burnout and clinical depression share overlapping symptomatology — both can present with fatigue, sleep disturbance, diminished concentration, and loss of interest or motivation — and the two constructs frequently co-occur in affected practitioners. However, the literature is consistent in treating them as conceptually distinct: burnout is defined by the World Health Organization as an occupational phenomenon arising from chronic, unmanaged workplace stress, whereas depression is a clinical mood disorder with diagnostic criteria that extend beyond the occupational domain and typically require different treatment approaches, including, in many cases, pharmacological intervention and structured psychotherapy.

Burnout as a Risk Factor for Clinical Illness

A substantial body of longitudinal research indicates that unresolved burnout functions as a risk factor for the subsequent development of clinical depression and anxiety disorders, rather than remaining a purely occupational phenomenon confined to the workplace. This progression is of particular concern in healthcare settings, where the same occupational culture that contributes to burnout — valorization of stoicism, reluctance to acknowledge vulnerability, and fear of professional consequences — often simultaneously discourages practitioners from seeking help before burnout progresses to a diagnosable mental health condition.

Suicidality Among Healthcare Practitioners

Physicians, and in particular female physicians, have been documented in multiple national studies to experience elevated suicide rates relative to the general population and to other highly educated professional groups. Nursing staff and other allied health professionals similarly show elevated risk in some studies, though the evidence base for these groups is less extensive than for physicians. The literature attributes this elevated risk to a combination of chronic occupational stress, ready clinical knowledge of lethal means, and the same helpseeking barriers that inhibit earlier intervention for burnout and depression more broadly. This evidence underscores that practitioner mental health is not merely a matter of workplace satisfaction but, in its most severe manifestations, a matter of life-and-death consequence for the workforce itself.

Individual-Level Risk Factors

Certain individual characteristics shape practitioner vulnerability to mental health difficulties, though — as with burnout more broadly — these should be understood as risk modulators operating within a demanding occupational environment rather than as explanations that locate the problem solely within the individual.

- Career stage — trainees and early-career practitioners consistently show elevated rates of depression and anxiety, associated with the combined burden of skill acquisition, evaluation pressure, and limited control over scheduling and working conditions.
- Perfectionism and self-critical cognitive style — traits that are often selected for during medical and nursing training can heighten vulnerability to depressive symptoms when practitioners perceive themselves as falling short of internalized standards.
- Prior personal or family psychiatric history — as in the general population, prior history of depression or anxiety increases vulnerability to recurrence under occupational stress.
- Social isolation — practitioners with limited social support outside of work, or whose work schedules make it difficult to maintain personal relationships, show elevated risk of both burnout and clinical mental health symptoms.

As with organizational-level burnout research, studies consistently find that individual factors account for only a modest share of the variance in mental health outcomes across healthcare settings, reinforcing the conclusion that organizational and systemic conditions carry substantial explanatory weight.

Organizational And Systemic Risk Factors

Workload, Staffing, and Time Pressure

Excessive workload and inadequate staffing are strongly associated with both burnout and clinical mental health symptoms among healthcare practitioners. Chronic time pressure limits practitioners' ability to engage in the kind of unhurried, reflective clinical practice that many find professionally meaningful, and compounds the psychological toll of managing high-acuity patients without adequate margin for rest or recovery between demanding cases.

Exposure to Death, Trauma, and Moral Distress

Practitioners in high-acuity specialties — emergency medicine, critical care, oncology, and palliative care among them — face repeated exposure to death, traumatic injury, and family grief. Where this exposure occurs without adequate debriefing, peer support, or institutional acknowledgment, it is associated with elevated rates of secondary traumatic stress and moral distress, the latter arising specifically when practitioners are constrained by systemic factors, such as resource shortages, from providing the standard of care they believe is ethically required.

Hierarchical Culture and Fear of Disclosure

Hierarchical organizational cultures, in which trainees and junior staff perceive significant power differentials relative to supervisors, are associated with reduced willingness to disclose mental health difficulties or request accommodation, out of concern for professional evaluation, licensing consequences, or reputational harm. This dynamic is particularly pronounced in specialties or institutions where seeking mental health support is perceived, rightly or wrongly, as inconsistent with the image of clinical competence and resilience.

Regulatory and Licensing Concerns

In many jurisdictions, licensing and credentialing processes historically required disclosure of any history of mental health treatment, creating a structural disincentive for practitioners to seek care even when they recognized a clear clinical need. While reform efforts in numerous health systems have sought to limit licensing inquiries to current impairment rather than treatment history, awareness of and confidence in these reforms varies, and perceived regulatory risk remains a commonly cited barrier to help-seeking in survey-based research.

The reluctance of healthcare practitioners to seek mental health support is rarely a failure of individual insight; it is, in large part, a rational response to a professional culture and regulatory environment that has historically penalized disclosure.

Barriers To Help-Seeking

Survey research across multiple health systems consistently identifies a recurring set of barriers that inhibit healthcare practitioners from seeking mental health support, even where formal services are available.

- Stigma and professional identity concerns — fear that colleagues or supervisors will perceive help-seeking as a sign of weakness or incompetence.
- Confidentiality concerns — particularly acute in smaller institutions or specialties where practitioners may be treated by colleagues they know professionally.
- Time constraints — demanding schedules leave limited time to attend appointments during standard clinic hours.
- Perceived licensing or credentialing risk — concern that disclosure of treatment could affect future licensing, credentialing, or malpractice insurance.
- Normalization of distress — a professional culture in which chronic stress and exhaustion are treated as an expected and unremarkable feature of the work, reducing practitioners' own recognition that their symptoms warrant clinical attention.

Addressing these barriers requires more than simply expanding the availability of mental health services; it requires deliberate institutional effort to normalize help-seeking, protect confidentiality, and reform licensing practices that create disincentives for disclosure.

Evidence For Intervention

Individual-Level Interventions

Mindfulness-based stress reduction, cognitive behavioral therapy, and peer-support programs have each demonstrated measurable benefit for practitioner mental health symptoms in controlled studies, and are appropriately included as components of a comprehensive institutional strategy. However, systematic reviews consistently caution that individual-level interventions alone produce modest and often short-lived effects when organizational stressors remain unaddressed.

Organizational-Level Interventions

Interventions targeting workload redistribution, protected time for rest and reflection, structured debriefing after traumatic clinical events, and improved scheduling predictability have shown larger and more durable effects on practitioner mental health outcomes than individual-level interventions alone. Programs that combine organizational change with accessible, confidential mental health services — rather than treating these as separate initiatives — show the strongest evidence of sustained benefit.

Leadership and Culture Change

Institutional leadership plays a disproportionate role in shaping whether mental health interventions succeed. Leaders who openly acknowledge the occupational mental health toll of clinical work, model help-seeking behavior, and hold managers accountable for supportive supervisory practices contribute to measurable reductions in stigma and corresponding increases in service utilization among frontline staff.

The Mend Framework: An Original Conceptual Model

Synthesizing the evidence reviewed above, this paper proposes the MEND Framework as an organizing model through which healthcare institutions can structure a proactive, rather than purely reactive, approach to practitioner mental health. The framework identifies four interacting domains, summarized in Table 1.

Domain	Focus	Illustrative Actions

Monitoring	Routine, proactive tracking of practitioner mental health indicators	Validated periodic wellbeing surveys, department-level dashboards, anonymized trend reporting
Domain	**Focus**	**Illustrative Actions**
Early intervention	Rapid, low-barrier access to support before symptoms escalate	Confidential same-week counseling access, manager training in early-warning recognition
Networked support	Peer- and team-based structures that distribute support responsibility	Structured peer-support programs, post-critical-event debriefing, mentorship pairing
Destigmatization	Cultural and regulatory change to reduce disclosure barriers	Leadership modeling of helpseeking, licensing-process reform, confidentiality safeguards

The MEND Framework is intended to be implemented as an integrated whole rather than as isolated initiatives: monitoring data should inform early-intervention thresholds, early intervention should be reinforced by networked peer support, and destigmatization efforts should create the cultural conditions under which practitioners are willing to make use of the other three domains. Institutions adopting the framework are encouraged to begin with a baseline mental health and burnout assessment, using validated instruments, before prioritizing implementation across the remaining domains.

The Saudi Regulatory Context And Vision 2030

Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 healthcare transformation program has placed workforce wellbeing and healthcare quality among its core objectives, creating an institutional environment increasingly receptive to structured practitioner mental health initiatives.

Saudi Commission for Health Specialties (SCFHS) — governs licensing and continuing professional development, and is positioned to review licensing and credentialing language to ensure it does not inadvertently discourage practitioners from seeking mental health treatment.

- Central Board for Accreditation of Healthcare Institutions (CBAHI) — sets facility-level accreditation standards; incorporating practitioner mental health monitoring and supportservice availability into accreditation criteria would embed the MEND Framework's monitoring and early-intervention domains into routine institutional practice.
- Saudi Food and Drug Authority (SFDA) — regulates pharmacological treatments relevant to mental health care pathways available to practitioners seeking clinical treatment.
- Nphies platform — could support anonymized, system-level tracking of mental-health service utilization trends among healthcare staff, informing national workforce policy.
- Mumaris+ — the national licensing and credential-verification system, through which confidentiality safeguards around treatment history could be clearly communicated to practitioners.
- King Abdullah International Medical Research Center (KAIMRC) — well positioned to support longitudinal, Saudi-specific research on practitioner mental health prevalence and intervention effectiveness.

Aligning the MEND Framework with this existing regulatory ecosystem offers a practical pathway for embedding practitioner mental health protection into routine institutional and national policy, consistent with Vision 2030's broader emphasis on healthcare workforce sustainability and quality of care.

Discussion

This narrative review indicates that the mental health consequences of burnout among healthcare practitioners are substantial, extend in severe cases to elevated suicide risk, and are shaped predominantly by organizational and systemic conditions rather than individual vulnerability alone. A recurring theme across the literature is that help-seeking barriers — stigma, confidentiality concerns, time constraints, and perceived regulatory risk — are frequently as significant a determinant of unmet mental health need as the underlying occupational stressors themselves. This suggests that institutional strategy must address both the upstream drivers of distress and the downstream barriers that prevent affected practitioners from accessing available support.

The MEND Framework proposed in this review attempts to integrate these two strands of intervention, combining proactive monitoring and early intervention with the cultural and regulatory change needed to make help-seeking a normalized, low-risk decision for practitioners. Its alignment with existing Saudi regulatory structures — particularly SCFHS licensing processes and CBAHI accreditation standards — offers a concrete mechanism through which this integration could be operationalized at national scale.

As a narrative rather than systematic review, this paper does not provide a quantitative synthesis of intervention effect sizes, and future systematic reviews and meta-analyses remain an important complement to the thematic synthesis offered here. Future primary research within the Saudi healthcare system should prioritize baseline prevalence studies of burnout and mental health symptoms across specialties, alongside evaluation of MEND-aligned interventions using validated, repeated-measures designs.

Conclusion

Mental health difficulties among healthcare practitioners, closely intertwined with occupational burnout, represent a serious and likely under-addressed dimension of healthcare workforce sustainability. Effective response requires institutions to move beyond individuallevel coping interventions toward integrated strategies that combine proactive monitoring, early and low-barrier intervention, networked peer support, and deliberate destigmatization of help-seeking, including reform of licensing practices that have historically penalized disclosure. The MEND Framework proposed in this review offers healthcare institutions an organizing model for this integrated approach, and its alignment with Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 healthcare transformation agenda provides a practical foundation for embedding practitioner mental health protection into national health policy and institutional practice.

References

1. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. World Psychiatry, 15(2), 103–111.
2. World Health Organization. (2019). Burn-out an occupational phenomenon: International classification of diseases. World Health Organization.
3. Rotenstein, L. S., Torre, M., Ramos, M. A., et al. (2018). Prevalence of burnout among physicians: A systematic review. JAMA, 320(11), 1131–1150.
4. Schernhammer, E. S., & Colditz, G. A. (2004). Suicide rates among physicians: A quantitative and gender assessment. American Journal of Psychiatry, 161(12), 2295– 2302.
5. Dyrbye, L. N., West, C. P., Satele, D., et al. (2014). Burnout among U.S. medical students, residents, and early career physicians relative to the general U.S. population. Academic Medicine, 89(3), 443–451.
6. Gold, K. J., Andrew, L. B., Goldman, E. B., & Schwenk, T. L. (2016). 'I would never want to have a mental health diagnosis on my record': A survey of female physicians on mental health diagnosis, treatment, and reporting. General Hospital Psychiatry, 43, 51–57.
7. West, C. P., Dyrbye, L. N., & Shanafelt, T. D. (2018). Physician burnout: Contributors, consequences and solutions. Journal of Internal Medicine, 283(6), 516–529.
8. Saudi Commission for Health Specialties. (2024). Continuing professional development and training standards. SCFHS.
9. Central Board for Accreditation of Healthcare Institutions. (2023). National hospital accreditation standards (6th ed.). CBAHI.
10. Saudi Ministry of Health. (2023). Vision 2030 health sector transformation strategy overview. Ministry of Health.