Editorial

OPEN ACCESS

The Unseen Burden of Grief: Why Bereavement Is a Social Determinant of Health

The Editorial Team, Frontiers in Preventive Medicine *

Frontiers in Preventive Medicine

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 26 February 2026
Accepted 28 February 2026

Keywords:
Bereavement;
Grief;
Health Disparities;
Social Determinants of Health

ABSTRACT

Globally, the opioid crisis, armed conflicts, climate-related disasters and the lingering aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic have given rise to a large population grappling with traumatic bereavement. As a universal human experience, bereavement exerts health impacts characterized by stark social inequities: it acts as a pivotal catalyst for population health disparities and stands as a critical issue that demands urgent attention from the global public health system.

1. THE UNIVERSAL, YET UNEQUAL, EXPERIENCE OF LOSS

Every human being will grieve. Loss is among the few experiences that cross every border of class, culture, and geography. Yet the health consequences of loss are distributed with profound inequality. Who we lose, how they die, and what structural supports surround us in the aftermath determine whether bereavement becomes a passage through sorrow or an entry point into lasting illness. This distinction is not incidental. It is a matter of public health.

The scale is already staggering. Recent estimates published in this journal suggest that 125 million adults and 1.4 million children in the United States alone have lost a family member to drug overdose. Globally, wars, climate-driven disasters, and the lingering aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic have produced a generation navigating mass, simultaneous, and often traumatic loss. Evidence consistently links bereavement exposure to elevated risks of post-traumatic stress disorder, complicated grief, depression, cardiovascular events, sleep disruption, and immune dysfunction. These are not peripheral concerns. They represent a gathering wave of downstream morbidity that public health systems are only beginning to measure.

The central argument advanced here is this: current global events are not merely increasing the rate of bereavement, they are fundamentally altering its context. And it is context — the how and why of death — that determines whether grief resolves toward resilience or hardens into a public health crisis. Until we embed this distinction into our research frameworks, clinical models, and policy responses, we will continue to underserve the populations most devastated by loss.

2. BEREAVEMENT AS BOTH CONSEQUENCE AND CAUSE

Bereavement does not arrive in a vacuum. For many populations, the death of a loved one is itself the endpoint of systemic failure — a visible marker of deeper, pre-existing inequity. This means that bereavement is not only a cause of poor health outcomes, but a consequence of them.

Consider the opioid epidemic. Families bereaved by overdose are disproportionately White, rural, and economically marginalized, yet they face a grief compounded by stigma. The concept of disenfranchised grief — loss that society implicitly refuses to legitimize — is particularly acute in overdose bereavement, where shame and blame can surround the death. In practice, this means that families are less likely to seek formal mental health support, more likely to encounter judgment within medical settings, and more exposed to the prolonged stress that elevates cortisol, disrupts sleep architecture, and increases cardiovascular risk. The systemic failure that produced the opioid crisis does not end with the death; it follows the family into their grief.

A parallel dynamic operates in contexts of war and forced displacement. Refugees and conflict-affected populations experience what scholars describe as cumulative or layered loss: not merely the death of an individual, but the simultaneous loss of home, community, ritual space, and cultural

** Corresponding author: editorial@fpmjournal.org*
ISSN: 3068-9376/ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
DOI: 10.64904/fpm2026.020

continuity. The bereaved Sudanese mother resettled in an unfamiliar city has lost not only a child but the collective support infrastructure through which that loss might otherwise be metabolized. Evidence on prolonged grief disorder among displaced populations consistently shows elevated rates, yet these populations are among the least served by existing clinical services.

Poorly supported grief does not stay contained. PTSD, cardiovascular disease, and alcohol use disorders in bereaved individuals generate substantial downstream costs for public health systems — costs that are ultimately borne by the same under-resourced communities least equipped to absorb them. Bereavement, in this sense, is not merely a response to population health failure. It is an active driver of future decline, capable of perpetuating cycles of poor health across generations.

3. THE HIDDEN VARIABLE: CONTEXT AND CULTURE

Not all bereavement carries the same health burden. The literature has long distinguished between expected loss — the death of an elderly parent after prolonged illness — and traumatic loss, including deaths by violence, suicide, overdose, or disaster. The health trajectories of survivors diverge sharply along these lines: traumatic bereavement is associated with significantly higher rates of complicated grief disorder, PTSD symptomatology, and physical health deterioration. Yet public health models, particularly in clinical triage and service allocation, routinely treat bereavement as a singular, undifferentiated condition. This is a measurement failure with real consequences.

Designing effective bereavement policy requires differentiating not just between types of loss, but between the structural conditions that surround them. A family whose loved one died in a hospital due to a preventable medical error requires support that acknowledges institutional accountability. A firefighter who has witnessed multiple traumatic deaths over a career requires occupational health frameworks that normalize cumulative exposure. A community that has experienced mass casualty events requires population-level, not merely individual, intervention. None of these are the same problem, and treating them as such produces interventions that fail across the board.

Cultural context presents an equally critical, and frequently neglected, dimension. The Western clinical model of grief, which emphasizes individual psychological processing, fixed stage-based progression, and professional therapeutic intervention, is neither universal nor culturally neutral. In many communal and ritual-based cultures, grief is a collective rather than an individual process, expressed through ceremony, storytelling, and sustained community presence over extended periods. When bereaved individuals from these cultural backgrounds encounter systems premised on brief therapy, individual disclosure, and rapid return to function, the result is not therapeutic. It is alienating. Public health systems that impose a one-size-fits-all framework on culturally diverse bereaved populations do not merely miss the mark; they can actively impede the indigenous resilience mechanisms that have historically sustained those communities.

4. REFRAMING THE PUBLIC HEALTH RESPONSE

The dominant framing of bereavement in public health discourse is individualistic: it locates resilience in the psychological attributes of the bereaved person and measures success by their return to prior function. This framing is insufficient, and in many contexts, counterproductive. What is required is a shift toward institutional resilience — structural changes that create the conditions within which individuals and communities can grieve.

Paid bereavement leave is among the most evidence-consistent policy levers available, yet it remains absent or inadequate in many national labor frameworks. In the United States, no federal mandate exists for bereavement leave, leaving millions of workers — disproportionately low-wage and less likely to have negotiated protections — to absorb the immediate aftermath of loss without financial security. The evidence that economic instability compounds grief-related health outcomes is robust. Mandated and adequately compensated bereavement leave is not a luxury; it is a public health investment.

First responders and healthcare workers represent a population whose occupational exposure to death and traumatic loss has been systematically underserved. Pandemic-era data have rendered this failure visible: rates of burnout, moral injury, complicated grief, and PTSD among healthcare workers have reached levels that constitute an occupational health emergency in their own right. Institutional responses that treat this as a personal resilience deficit rather than a structural failure of support will not reverse it.

More broadly, public health policy must adopt trauma-informed frameworks that recognize the health consequences of loss as context-dependent, structurally mediated, and often preventable. This means standardizing bereavement needs assessments within healthcare systems, expanding peer support and community-based grief programs alongside clinical services, and — critically — funding the kind of population-level bereavement surveillance that would allow us to measure what is currently invisible in the data.

5. THE PATH FORWARD

To address bereavement as a global health priority, we must stop viewing it as a singular psychological event and start viewing it as a social determinant of health. Like poverty, discrimination, and housing instability, the conditions surrounding loss shape its health consequences in ways that are patterned, predictable, and amenable to intervention.

The deaths that are driving the current surge in global bereavement — overdose, armed conflict, climate disaster, pandemic — share a common feature: they are concentrated among populations already carrying the heaviest burdens of structural disadvantage. Bereavement, in these communities, does not begin a new health trajectory. It accelerates an existing one.

The path forward requires researchers to build measurement frameworks that capture the context of loss — not just its occurrence — and that are validated across cultural settings. It requires clinicians and public health practitioners to resist the impulse to standardize grief into a uniform clinical pathway. And it requires policymakers to recognize that what happens after a death is as much a matter of public concern as what caused it.

Bereavement is universal. Its consequences do not have to be unequal. But achieving that equity demands that we attend not merely to the fact of loss, but to the conditions that surround it — and the systems that either compound or contain its harm.