MEDICAL LETTER

Review Article
Volume: 3
Issue: 2

# Workplace Mental Health: From Employee Wellness to Psychologically Safe and Healthy Work

**Dr. Amit Sachdeva[1*], Mr Nasim Ahmed[2], Mrs. Tamanna Rahman[3], Dr. Anju Sachdeva[4]**

*[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Community Medicine, Indira Gandhi Medical College, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh*
*[2]Independent Researcher, Guwahati Assam, India Email: nasim@iarcon.org*
*[3] MSc in Herbal Science and Technology , Anandaram Dhekial Phookan College under Guwahati University, Assam*
*[4]Physiotherapist, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh*

**Received: March. 13, 2026; Revised: April. 11, 2026; Accepted: May. 21, 2026; Published: June. 30, 2026**

 *Doi: 10.47310/medlet.2026.v03i02.005*

**Abstract: Background:** Work can promote mental health by providing income, identity, social connection and purpose. It can also contribute to psychological distress when workers experience excessive demands, low control, insecurity, discrimination, violence, inadequate reward or poor organizational support. Workplace mental health has consequently emerged as an occupational safety, public health, human-rights and productivity priority. **Objective:** This narrative review critically examines the determinants, burden and management of mental health in the workplace, evaluates recent intervention evidence, and identifies policy and research priorities globally and in India. **Key findings:** Approximately 15% of working-age adults experience a mental disorder at any given time, while depression and anxiety are estimated to cause 12 billion lost working days annually. Evidence links adverse psychosocial working conditions—particularly job strain, effort–reward imbalance, bullying, long hours and job insecurity—with depression and other mental-health outcomes. Effective workplace policy requires a hierarchy of interventions: prevention of psychosocial hazards through organizational change; manager and worker training; confidential access to evidence-based care; reasonable accommodation; and coordinated return-to-work support. Individual-level interventions such as mindfulness or stress-management training can produce modest benefits but should not substitute for addressing excessive workloads or harmful management practices. Workplace screening alone has not improved mental-health outcomes unless linked directly to accessible treatment. India has a large and diverse workforce, including substantial informal, platform and migrant sectors, but lacks representative workplace mental-health surveillance and comprehensive enforcement of psychosocial-risk standards. **Conclusion:** Workplace mental health should be integrated into occupational safety and organizational governance. The most credible approach combines safe job design, participatory risk assessment, supportive leadership, accessible clinical care, anti-discrimination protections and outcome-based evaluation. Responsibility must be shared by governments, employers, managers, workers and health systems rather than transferred to individual employees.

**Keywords**: Workplace mental health; psychosocial risk; occupational stress; burnout; organizational intervention; India

## INTRODUCTION

Work is a major social determinant of health. Secure and meaningful employment can provide financial stability, social participation, daily structure, self-esteem and a sense of contribution. Conversely, unemployment, precarious work and harmful working conditions can contribute to psychological distress, substance use, family conflict and social exclusion.

The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that approximately 15% of working-age adults have a mental disorder at any point in time. Globally, depression and anxiety are estimated to account for around 12 billion working days lost each year, with an economic cost of approximately US$1 trillion in

lost productivity.[1] These estimates do not capture the full burden of presenteeism, impaired decision-making, workplace conflict, staff turnover and effects on families.

Workplace mental health includes more than the treatment of employees with psychiatric disorders. It encompasses promotion of positive mental well-being, prevention of work-related psychological harm, early and confidential access to care, support for people living with mental-health conditions, and safe return to work following illness or absence.

This distinction matters because many corporate programmes focus on individual resilience while leaving harmful organizational conditions unchanged. An employee may be offered meditation training while continuing to face unrealistic deadlines, chronic understaffing, unpredictable schedules or bullying. Such an approach can unintentionally imply that distress reflects personal weakness rather than exposure to preventable occupational hazards.

The WHO guidelines on mental health at work recommend a comprehensive strategy combining organizational interventions, manager and worker training, individual support, reasonable accommodation, return-to-work programmes and supported employment.[2] The central principle is that employers should first prevent or reduce psychosocial risks before asking employees to cope more effectively with them.

**Mental Health, Mental Illness and Burnout**

Mental health is not simply the absence of mental disorder. It includes the capacity to cope with ordinary stress, work productively, maintain relationships and participate in society. Workers may experience reduced well-being without meeting diagnostic criteria for depression, anxiety or another mental disorder. Conversely, people living with a mental disorder may function successfully when treatment, workplace support and reasonable accommodation are available.

Burnout is commonly invoked in workplace discussions but is frequently used imprecisely. In the International Classification of Diseases, 11th Revision, burnout is classified as an occupational phenomenon rather than a medical disorder. It is characterized by exhaustion, increased mental distance or cynicism towards work, and reduced professional efficacy resulting from chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed.

Burnout overlaps with depression but is not synonymous with it. Depression affects multiple areas of life and may include persistent low mood, loss of interest, guilt, sleep or appetite changes and suicidal thoughts. Burnout is explicitly linked to the occupational context. A worker described as “burned out” may have depression, anxiety, sleep disturbance or no diagnosable disorder; careful assessment is required.

Overmedicalizing understandable reactions to harmful working conditions can shift attention away from prevention. At the same time, dismissing clinically significant depression as ordinary job stress can delay treatment. Workplace policies should permit both occupational risk assessment and access to clinical evaluation.

**Psychosocial Hazards at Work**

Psychosocial hazards are aspects of work design, organization, management or social context that can cause psychological or physical harm. They should be assessed with the same seriousness as chemical, ergonomic or physical hazards.

**High demands and low control**

Job strain occurs when psychological demands are high but workers have limited control over how or when work is performed. Examples include unrealistic deadlines, excessive caseloads, constant monitoring, inadequate staffing and inability to take rest breaks. Lack of autonomy is especially harmful when workers are held accountable for outcomes but lack the authority or resources necessary to achieve them.

Workload is not measured solely by hours. Cognitive complexity, emotional demands, interruptions, staffing ratios and responsibility for safety may create severe strain within nominally standard shifts. Health-care workers, teachers, emergency personnel and customer-facing staff frequently encounter emotional labour in addition to task demands.

**Effort–reward imbalance and organizational injustice**

Distress may arise when high effort is not matched by salary, security, recognition, career opportunity or respect. Perceived unfairness in promotion, evaluation, workload allocation or disciplinary action can undermine trust and psychological safety.

Organizational justice has procedural, distributive and interpersonal dimensions. Workers may tolerate difficult decisions more readily when processes are transparent, participation is meaningful and communication is respectful.

**Job insecurity and precarious employment**

Temporary contracts, informal employment, unpredictable scheduling, platform work and fear of redundancy create chronic uncertainty. Workers who lack paid leave or social protection may continue working when unwell, increasing presenteeism and delaying care.

Technological change and artificial intelligence create opportunities for safer and more productive work but may also intensify surveillance, deskill jobs or generate fears of displacement. The mental-health effect depends less on technology itself than on how change is implemented, communicated and governed.

**Long and irregular working hours**

Prolonged hours reduce opportunities for sleep, recovery, exercise, family life and social participation. Night shifts and rotating schedules disrupt circadian rhythms and may aggravate mood and sleep disorders. A culture that rewards constant availability can extend work into evenings and weekends even when formal hours appear reasonable.

Remote work may reduce commuting and improve autonomy, but it can also blur boundaries, increase isolation and create expectations of continuous digital responsiveness. Flexible work is beneficial when employees have meaningful choice; imposed flexibility that transfers operational uncertainty to workers may be harmful.

**Bullying, harassment and violence**

Bullying involves repeated unreasonable behaviour that creates a risk to health. Sexual harassment, discrimination, humiliation, threats and workplace violence can lead to anxiety, depression, post-traumatic symptoms, absence and job departure.

Certain workers face heightened vulnerability, including women, migrant workers, sexual and gender minorities, persons with disabilities, trainees, domestic workers and those in hierarchical professions. Complaint systems are ineffective when complainants fear retaliation or when investigations lack independence.

**Evidence Linking Work and Mental Health**

A 2023 Lancet review concluded that epidemiological evidence supports causal relationships between several adverse working conditions and depressive disorders.[3] Strong or moderately persuasive evidence exists for job strain, effort–reward imbalance, organizational injustice, bullying, job insecurity and long working hours, although the strength varies by exposure and outcome.

Causal inference remains difficult because workers are not randomly assigned to jobs. Personality, socioeconomic position, previous mental illness and physical health can influence both employment conditions and mental-health outcomes. Self-reported exposure and symptoms may also create common-method bias.

Nevertheless, prospective cohort studies showing that exposure precedes illness, dose–response patterns and improvements after organizational change strengthen causal interpretation. The correct conclusion is not that every episode of depression is caused by work, but that workplace conditions can materially contribute to the population burden and are legitimate targets for prevention.

Work-related mental illness also has physical-health implications. Chronic stress may influence sleep, cardiovascular risk, immune function and health behaviours. Depression and anxiety can impair concentration, communication and safety-sensitive performance. These links should not be used to stigmatize affected workers; rather, they justify timely treatment and safe work design.

## A Hierarchy of Workplace Interventions

**Organizational interventions**

Organizational interventions change work rather than focusing exclusively on the worker. Examples include staffing improvements, workload redistribution, participatory scheduling, increased job control, clearer roles, predictable hours, anti-bullying procedures and improved supervisor practices.

These interventions are conceptually strongest because they address hazards at source. Evidence, however, is heterogeneous. Organizational change is difficult to standardize, implementation varies, and studies may be disrupted by restructuring or leadership turnover. A systematic review of organizational interventions in health-care workers found that implemented workplace changes and participatory approaches could reduce burnout or stress, but effects were inconsistent and dependent on implementation quality.[4]

Participation is essential. Managers may underestimate workload or misunderstand operational constraints, while employees possess detailed knowledge of how work is actually performed. Consultation must lead to genuine decision-making influence rather than symbolic surveys.

**Manager training**

Managers influence workload, role clarity, recognition, conflict resolution and access to support. Training can improve mental-health literacy, confidence in approaching distressed workers and knowledge of referral pathways. It should also teach managers to examine job design rather than merely identify vulnerable individuals.

Managers are not therapists. They should listen, respond respectfully, protect confidentiality, discuss work adjustments and facilitate professional care. Attempting to diagnose employees or demanding disclosure can cause harm.

A well-trained manager cannot compensate for impossible staffing or punitive organizational policies. Training is effective only when supported by authority, resources and senior leadership.

**Worker education and individual interventions**

Mental-health literacy programmes may improve knowledge and reduce stigmatizing attitudes. Stress-management, cognitive behavioural, mindfulness, physical-activity and digital interventions can produce small to moderate improvements in symptoms or well-being in some groups.

These interventions are valuable when voluntary, confidential and evidence based. They become problematic when used to suggest that employees should adapt to unsafe conditions. Participation should not affect appraisal, promotion or insurance.

Generic wellness programmes often attract already-engaged employees and may have low participation among those with severe distress, shift work, disability or caregiving responsibilities. Access during paid working hours and culturally appropriate delivery can improve equity.

**Clinical care and employee-assistance programmes**

Employees with clinically significant symptoms require timely access to qualified mental-health professionals. Employee-assistance programmes may provide short-term counselling, crisis support and referral. Their effectiveness depends on quality, confidentiality, provider competence and continuity beyond a limited number of sessions.

Workers may distrust employer-funded services if they believe information will reach managers. Contracts should specify that individual clinical information will not be disclosed without consent except where legally required for immediate safety.

Treatment should not be restricted to counselling. Depending on need, workers may require psychiatric assessment, medication, psychological therapy, substance-use treatment, emergency intervention or specialist services.

**Return to work and reasonable accommodation**

Returning to work after mental illness can support recovery, income and social connection, but poorly planned return can trigger relapse. Effective programmes involve communication among the worker, clinician, occupational-health professional and workplace, with the worker's consent.

Adjustments may include a graded return, temporary workload reduction, flexible scheduling, quieter workspaces, protected treatment appointments or modified responsibilities. Accommodation should respond to functional needs rather than diagnostic labels.

The aim is not permanent removal of all challenge. It is to create a sustainable fit between the worker's capacity, recovery stage and essential job demands.

**Screening: Useful Tool or False Reassurance?**

Many organizations administer questionnaires for depression, anxiety, stress or burnout. Screening may identify unmet need, but it is not an intervention by itself.

**Table 1. Workplace Mental-Health Risks, Interventions and Audit Indicators**

| Domain | Common hazards or gaps | Priority interventions | Suggested indicators | Important cautions |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Workload and staffing | Excessive demands, understaffing, missed breaks and unrealistic deadlines | Workload assessment, staffing review, task prioritization and protected recovery time | Overtime, missed breaks, workload–capacity ratio and stress-related absence | Resilience training cannot substitute for adequate staffing |
| Job control | Limited autonomy, constant surveillance and inability to influence schedules | Participatory job redesign, predictable scheduling and decision latitude | Employee-reported control, schedule predictability and participation rates | Consultation must produce genuine influence |
| Leadership | Unsupportive supervision, inconsistent decisions and poor communication | Manager training, leadership accountability and supportive supervision | Manager competencies, complaints, team climate and follow-up actions | Managers should not diagnose employees |
| Bullying and harassment | Humiliation, discrimination, sexual harassment and retaliation | Independent complaints, anti-retaliation protection and timely investigation | Complaint resolution time, recurrence and worker confidence | Low complaint numbers may reflect fear rather than safety |
| Working hours | Long shifts, night work, digital availability and insufficient rest | Safe rostering, limits on excessive hours and boundary-setting policies | Weekly hours, consecutive shifts, rest intervals and out-of-hours communication | Flexibility should not transfer all risk to workers |
| Mental-health literacy | Stigma, poor recognition and uncertainty about available help | Worker and manager education with clear referral pathways | Knowledge, attitudes, help-seeking and service awareness | Awareness without available treatment has limited value |
| Screening | Unstructured surveys, unclear purpose and insecure data | Use only when linked to confidential assessment and accessible treatment | Uptake, referral completion, treatment access and adverse effects | Screening alone has not improved mental-health outcomes |
| Clinical support | Long waits, limited sessions and concerns about confidentiality | Evidence-based counselling, psychiatry, crisis pathways and external referral | Waiting time, treatment completion and patient-reported outcome | Employers should receive only aggregated data |
| Reasonable accommodation | Disclosure-related stigma and inflexible job requirements | Individualized adjustment and occupational-health coordination | Requests, implementation time, retention and recurrence of absence | Diagnosis should not automatically imply incapacity |
| Return to work | Abrupt full-duty return and poor follow-up | Graded return, workload modification and relapse-prevention plan | Time to sustainable return and repeated absence | Earlier return is not always better if unsafe |
| Remote and platform work | Isolation, algorithmic control and blurred boundaries | Transparent algorithms, human review, peer connection and disconnect periods | Availability demands, rating disputes and worker control | Digital monitoring may itself create psychosocial harm |
| Governance | One-off wellness events and no accountability | Psychosocial-risk policy, worker participation and board-level oversight | Risk assessments, action completion and annual reporting | Avoid greenwashing-equivalent "well-being washing" |

A 2023 systematic review found that screening followed only by feedback or advice did not improve employee mental-health symptoms. Screening linked directly to facilitated access to treatment produced a small benefit, but the certainty of evidence was low.[5]

Screening can also create harm through false positives, labelling, anxiety and confidentiality breaches. Employees may underreport symptoms if they fear consequences for promotion, security clearance or job retention. Participation should therefore be voluntary, purpose-limited and separated from performance management.

Organizations seeking population-level information may use anonymous, aggregated psychosocial-risk surveys rather than identifiable clinical screening. Individual screening should occur only when referral pathways, emergency procedures and data protection are already in place.

**Stigma, Disclosure and Psychological Safety**

Workers often conceal mental illness because they fear being viewed as unreliable, weak or unsuitable for advancement. Stigma can delay care and increase presenteeism.

Psychological safety means that employees can raise concerns, acknowledge mistakes and request help without humiliation or retaliation. It does not mean absence of accountability. High-performing organizations can maintain demanding standards while permitting respectful challenge and honest communication.

Disclosure should remain the worker's choice except in narrowly defined safety circumstances. Employers generally require information about functional limitations and accommodations rather than detailed diagnosis or treatment records.

Anti-stigma campaigns can improve attitudes, particularly when they include credible contact with people who have lived experience. Evidence regarding long-term behavioural effects remains limited, and campaigns are unlikely to succeed where discriminatory employment practices persist.[6]

**Public Health Significance**

Workplaces reach a large proportion of the adult population and can influence mental health daily over decades. They provide an opportunity for prevention, early support and social inclusion. They can also reproduce inequalities through insecure work, wage disparities, discrimination and unequal bargaining power.

Mental-health-related absence is visible, but presenteeism may create a larger hidden burden. Employees may remain at work while experiencing severe distress, reduced concentration or impaired decision-making because they cannot afford leave or fear negative consequences.

Small and medium enterprises, informal workplaces and self-employed workers are often excluded from corporate wellness initiatives. Public policy must therefore extend beyond large companies and include occupational-health services, primary care, social insurance and community support.

Protecting mental health is also a safety issue. Fatigue, distress and impaired concentration can contribute to errors in health care, transport, construction, manufacturing and other safety-sensitive sectors. Responses must avoid blaming individual workers for systemic failures.

## Recent Advances and Emerging Issues

**Hybrid work and the right to disconnect**

The p ost-pandemic expansion of hybrid work has increased attention to autonomy, loneliness, digital overload and boundary control. Evidence does not support a universal conclusion that remote work is beneficial or harmful. Outcomes depend on voluntariness, home conditions, management, workload and frequency of in-person contact.

Policies limiting unnecessary out-of-hours communication can support recovery. Exceptions may be necessary for emergencies and specific services, but constant availability should not become an implicit job requirement.

**Algorithmic management and artificial intelligence**

Digital platforms increasingly allocate work, monitor productivity, rank workers and trigger disciplinary decisions. Algorithmic systems may improve efficiency but can reduce autonomy and create opaque or unstable performance expectations.

Workers should be informed when automated systems influence employment decisions and should have access to meaningful human review. Mental-health surveillance using emails, keystrokes, facial expressions or wearable data raises serious ethical concerns. Apparent early detection does not justify intrusive monitoring without validity, consent and safeguards.

**Trauma-informed workplaces**

Health-care workers, emergency personnel, journalists, humanitarian workers and content moderators may encounter traumatic material or events. Trauma-informed practice includes preparation, rotation away from repeated high-intensity exposure, peer support, confidential care and non-punitive responses after critical incidents.

Mandatory single-session psychological debriefing should not be assumed to prevent post-traumatic stress and may be unhelpful for some workers. Support should be flexible and evidence based.

**Climate change and worker mental health**

Extreme heat, disasters, livelihood insecurity and displacement increasingly affect workers' psychological well-being. Outdoor workers, farmers, emergency responders and health-care staff face combined physical and psychological risks. Climate-resilient occupational-health planning should include mental-health support but prioritize prevention of dangerous exposure and income loss.

**Indian Perspective**

India's workplace mental-health agenda must account for extraordinary diversity. The workforce includes formal corporate employees, industrial workers, agricultural labourers, domestic workers, migrants, health-care personnel, gig workers and a very large informal sector. Risks and access to support differ sharply between these groups.

The National Mental Health Survey 2015–2016 estimated that approximately 10.6% of Indian adults had a current mental disorder, excluding tobacco-use disorders.[7] The survey was not designed to estimate workplace-attributable illness, and India still lacks representative national data on psychosocial working conditions, burnout, workplace bullying and mental-health-related absence. A second national mental-health survey was initiated in 2025, but workplace-specific findings were not yet available at the time of this review.

The Mental Healthcare Act 2017 establishes rights to mental-health care, equality, non-discrimination and confidentiality.[8] The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016 includes mental illness within its disability framework and provides protections relating to non-discrimination and reasonable accommodation for eligible persons.[9] These laws support workplace inclusion, although awareness and implementation remain variable.

India brought its four consolidated labour codes into effect on November 21, 2025, including the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code.[10] The reformed framework strengthens the wider occupational-safety architecture, but explicit standards and enforcement mechanisms for psychosocial hazards, mental-health risk assessment, excessive digital availability and white-collar overwork remain less developed than those for physical safety.

Large companies increasingly provide employee-assistance programmes, counselling platforms and wellness initiatives. These developments may improve access, but utilization is limited when workers doubt confidentiality or believe that organizational causes of distress will remain unchanged.

Public-sector and health-care workplaces deserve particular attention. Staff shortages, violence, hierarchical cultures, long shifts and moral distress can harm worker well-being and patient safety. Institutional responses should focus on staffing, scheduling, respectful supervision and violence prevention alongside counselling.

Informal and gig workers may have little job security, no paid mental-health leave and limited access to occupational services. Platform-based systems should not classify workers as independent while exercising extensive algorithmic control without responsibility for psychosocial safety.

**Challenges and Limitations**

Workplace mental-health evidence is heterogeneous. Interventions differ in intensity, setting and outcome measurement. Many studies rely on self-report, short follow-up and voluntary participation, producing selection bias.

The distinction between work-related and non-work-related illness is rarely absolute. Family stress, financial hardship, physical disease and workplace conditions interact. Employers should not deny support simply because work is not the sole cause.]A further limitation is "well-being washing": organizations publicize mental-health days or apps while maintaining excessive demands, insecurity or discriminatory management. Evaluation must examine working conditions and outcomes rather than the number of activities offered.

Economic claims also require caution. Some programmes may yield productivity gains, but return-on-investment estimates vary and can omit implementation costs. Mental-health protection should not depend entirely on proving short-term financial benefit; it is also an occupational right.

Finally, approaches developed in high-income, formal-sector workplaces may not transfer directly to small enterprises, farms or informal employment. Context-specific implementation research is essential.

**Future Directions**

Governments should recognize psychosocial hazards explicitly within occupational-safety regulation and provide practical standards for workload, hours, bullying, violence and organizational change.

Workplaces should conduct regular participatory psychosocial-risk assessments and publicly report aggregated action plans. Indicators should include working hours, staffing, control, discrimination, violence, sickness absence, turnover and access to care.

Research should prioritize organizational and multilevel interventions, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, small enterprises, informal work and platform labour. Studies should measure sustainable work participation, clinical outcomes, equity and unintended effects.

India requires a national workplace mental-health surveillance module linked to labour-force, occupational-health and mental-health surveys. Data should be disaggregated by sex, age, occupation, employment type, migration status and disability.

Confidential occupational mental-health services should be expanded through collaboration between employers, primary care, the District Mental Health Programme and tele-mental-health services. Support should remain accessible after short-term employee-assistance benefits end.

Workers and trade unions should participate in policy design. Mental health cannot be improved sustainably through programmes imposed without trust or influence over working conditions.

## CONCLUSION

Work can protect mental health, but poorly designed work can also contribute to psychological illness and exclusion. Workplace mental health is therefore not solely a matter of personal resilience or access to counselling; it is an occupational and organizational responsibility.

The strongest framework begins with prevention of psychosocial hazards. Reasonable workloads, job control, fair reward, safe hours, respectful leadership and protection from bullying are foundational. Manager training, worker education and clinical services are necessary but complementary.

Screening without confidential access to effective treatment offers little benefit and may cause harm. Similarly, mindfulness and wellness activities cannot compensate for chronic understaffing or unsafe management.

India has important legal and health-system foundations but needs explicit psychosocial-risk standards, representative surveillance and stronger implementation across formal, informal and platform work.

A mentally healthy workplace is not one in which distress is hidden or every worker remains constantly productive. It is one in which preventable harm is controlled, concerns can be raised safely, illness does not result in discrimination, and people can participate in decent work with dignity.

## REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization, International Labour Organization. *Mental health at work: policy brief* [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2022 [cited 2026 Aug 10]. Available from: WHO publication page.
2. World Health Organization. *WHO guidelines on mental health at work* [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2022 [cited 2026 Aug 10]. Available from: WHO publication page.
3. Rugulies R, Aust B, Greiner BA, Arensman E, Kawakami N, LaMontagne AD, et al. Work-related causes of mental health conditions and interventions for their improvement in workplaces. Lancet. 2023;402(10410):1368-1381. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(23)00869-3.
4. Aust B, Leduc C, Cresswell-Smith J, O'Brien C, Rugulies R, Leduc M, et al. The effects of different types of organisational workplace mental health interventions on mental health and wellbeing in healthcare workers: a systematic review. Int Arch Occup Environ Health. 2024;97(5):485-522. doi:10.1007/s00420-024-02065-z.
5. Strudwick J, Gayed A, Deady M, Haffar S, Mobbs S, Malik A, et al. Workplace mental health screening: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Occup Environ Med. 2023;80(8):469-484. doi:10.1136/oemed-2022-108608.
6. Tóth MD, Ihionvien S, Leduc C, Aust B, Amann BL, Cresswell-Smith J, et al. Evidence for the effectiveness of interventions to reduce mental health related stigma in the workplace: a systematic review. BMJ Open. 2023;13(2):e067126. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-067126.
7. Gururaj G, Varghese M, Benegal V, Rao GN, Pathak K, Singh LK, et al. *National Mental Health Survey of India, 2015-16: prevalence, patterns and outcomes* [Internet]. Bengaluru: National Institute of Mental Health and Neuro Sciences; 2016 [cited 2026 Aug 10]. NIMHANS Publication No. 129. Available from: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare report PDF.
8. Government of India. *The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017* [Internet]. Act No. 10 of 2017. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India; 2017 [cited 2026 Aug 10]. Available from: India Code—Mental Healthcare Act, 2017.
9. Government of India. *The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016* [Internet]. Act No. 49 of 2016. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India; 2016 [cited 2026 Aug 10]. Available from: India Code—Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.
10. Government of India. *The Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020* [Internet]. Act No. 37 of 2020. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India; 2020 [cited 2026 Aug 10]. Available from: India Code—Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020.