



## Review Articles

# Bereavement as a Catalyst of Inequity: How the Context of Loss Shapes Population Health

Jordan Thompson\*, Nicholas Buchman

Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, United States

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 17 March 2026

Accepted 15 April 2026

## Keywords:

Bereavement

Population health

## ABSTRACT

Bereavement is increasingly recognized as a global public health priority, yet existing research and policy frameworks often treat it as a psychologically uniform experience. This paper argues that the health consequences of bereavement are not uniformly distributed but are profoundly shaped by the context in which loss occurs — specifically, the circumstances of death, the structural conditions surrounding the bereaved, and the cultural frameworks available for processing grief. Drawing on evidence from the opioid epidemic, armed conflict, climate-related disasters, and occupational health literature, we demonstrate that bereavement functions both as a consequence of systemic public health failures and as an independent cause of downstream morbidity, including post-traumatic stress disorder, complicated grief disorder, cardiovascular events, and immune dysfunction. We examine how the conflation of traumatic and expected bereavement in current epidemiological models constitutes a measurement failure with direct policy implications, and how the imposition of Western clinical grief frameworks on culturally diverse populations compounds existing disparities in bereavement support. Finally, we advance a structural reframing of the public health response: moving away from individual resilience models toward institutional resilience, including mandated bereavement leave, trauma-informed occupational health policy, and culturally adapted community-based support. We argue that bereavement must be reconceptualized as a social determinant of health — one whose inequitable distribution reflects, and reproduces, broader patterns of structural disadvantage. Policy and research recommendations are offered accordingly.

© Journal of Public Health and Preventive Medicine. Published by Public Health Young Scholars Alliance. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Every human being will grieve. Loss is among the few experiences that cross every boundary of class, culture, and geography, and in that sense bereavement is universal. Yet the health consequences of loss are distributed with profound inequality. The circumstances surrounding a death, whether it was expected or sudden, stigmatized or socially legitimized, embedded within a community of support or occurring in conditions of isolation and displacement, shape the trajectory of grief in ways that are patterned, predictable, and amenable to intervention. To treat bereavement as a singular psychological event is to obscure the structural forces that determine whether grief becomes a passage through sorrow or an entry point into lasting illness.

The public health scale of bereavement is difficult to overstate. Recent publications estimate that 125 million adults and 1.4 million children in the United States have lost a family member to drug overdose, a figure that

reflects only one dimension of a broader epidemic of loss [1]. Globally, armed conflicts, climate-driven disasters, pandemic mortality, and escalating rates of suicide and overdose have produced conditions of mass, simultaneous, and often traumatic bereavement at a scale with few historical precedents. Evidence consistently links bereavement exposure to elevated risks of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), complicated grief disorder (CGD), major depressive disorder, cardiovascular events, sleep disruption, and immune dysfunction [2][3][4]. These are not peripheral concerns, they represent a growing wave of downstream morbidity whose costs are unevenly concentrated in populations already carrying the heaviest burdens of structural disadvantage.

This paper advances three interconnected arguments. First, that the context of death — how and why a person dies — is the most consequential and least studied determinant of bereavement-related health outcomes. Second, that existing public health frameworks, by conflating qualitatively distinct types of loss and defaulting to Western clinical models of grief, systematically underserve the populations most affected. Third, that an effective public health response to bereavement requires a structural

\* Corresponding author: Jordan Thompson.

ISSN: 3071-4265/ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

DOI: 10.64904/20260573



reframing: reconceptualizing grief not as an individual psychological process requiring clinical management but as a social determinant of health requiring institutional intervention [5]. The paper proceeds by reviewing evidence on the health consequences of bereavement across population subgroups, examining the role of context and culture, critiquing existing policy frameworks, and proposing a research and policy agenda oriented toward equity.

## 2. Bereavement as a Consequence and Cause of Population Health Failure

### 2.1. Bereavement as a Downstream Marker of Systemic Failure

For many populations, a death and its attendant grief do not arrive unexpectedly. They are the visible endpoints of extended processes of systemic neglect, structural disadvantage, and inadequate care, making bereavement not only a health outcome in its own right but a marker of earlier failures in the public health system. This has particular salience in the context of the opioid epidemic. Families bereaved by overdose are disproportionately concentrated in White, rural, and economically marginalized communities, and they face what Doka [4] termed disenfranchised grief: loss that social norms implicitly refuse to legitimize. Stigma surrounding addiction and overdose death means that bereaved families are less likely to seek formal mental health support, more likely to encounter judgment within medical settings, and more frequently left to process loss without community acknowledgment [7]. The systemic failure that produced the opioid crisis does not end with the death; it follows the family into their grief, amplifying the biological and psychological stress responses that elevate long-term health risk.

A structurally analogous dynamic operates in contexts of armed conflict and forced displacement. Refugees and conflict-affected populations experience what the literature describes as cumulative or layered loss: not merely the death of an individual but the simultaneous loss of home, community infrastructure, ritual space, and cultural continuity [8]. The mechanisms through which bereavement is ordinarily processed — communal mourning rituals, extended family support networks, religious practice embedded in place — are often precisely the resources that conflict and displacement have destroyed. Evidence consistently documents elevated rates of prolonged grief disorder and PTSD among conflict-affected bereaved populations, yet these groups remain among the least served by existing mental health and bereavement support services [9].

The case of climate-related disaster bereavement is more recent in the literature but no less significant. Studies following major floods, wildfires, and hurricanes have documented elevated rates of complicated grief, depression, and suicidality in bereaved survivors, with outcomes worsened by the compounding effects of property loss, community dispersal, and the recurring nature of climate-driven disasters [10]. In communities where the same hazards return cyclically, the accumulation of unresolved grief becomes a population-level burden whose health costs are largely invisible in conventional surveillance systems.

### 2.2. Bereavement as an Independent Driver of Future Morbidity

The health consequences of poorly supported grief are well documented and extend well beyond the period of acute loss. A substantial body of evidence has established that bereavement is an independent risk factor for mortality, particularly in older adults and in the months immediately following loss, a phenomenon known as the widowhood effect, whereby

the death of a spouse approximately doubles the mortality risk of the surviving partner in the short term [11]. The mechanisms involved are multiple and partially overlapping: hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis dysregulation, elevated inflammatory markers, disrupted sleep architecture, and behavioral changes including reduced physical activity, increased substance use, and deteriorating medication adherence [12].

Complicated grief disorder — characterized by persistent, intense yearning, difficulty accepting the loss, and impaired daily functioning lasting beyond six months — affects an estimated 10 to 20 percent of bereaved individuals, with substantially higher rates following traumatic or stigmatized deaths [3]. Clinically significant PTSD symptoms are documented in 20 to 40 percent of individuals bereaved by violent or sudden loss [13]. The downstream healthcare utilization associated with these conditions — emergency department visits, psychiatric hospitalizations, primary care consultations, and long-term pharmacotherapy — represents substantial economic costs that are borne disproportionately by the communities least equipped to absorb them.

Poorly supported grief, in short, does not stay contained. It generates persistent demand on public health systems and contributes to the intergenerational transmission of health disadvantage, particularly in children bereaved by parental loss during developmental years [14]. Bereavement is not merely a response to population health failure; it is an active driver of future decline, capable of reproducing cycles of poor health across generations unless actively interrupted.

## 3. The Hidden Variable: Context, Type, and Culture

### 3.1. The Health Consequences of Bereavement Type

Public health models and clinical triage protocols routinely treat bereavement as an undifferentiated condition, allocating equivalent (and often minimal) support resources regardless of the circumstances of death. This conflation is a measurement failure with direct consequences for service efficacy. The epidemiological literature has long recognized that the health trajectories of the bereaved diverge substantially along the axis of expected versus traumatic loss.

Expected bereavement — typically following the death of an elderly family member after prolonged illness — occurs within a predictive framework that permits preparatory grief, facilitates advance care conversations, and generally takes place in a context of institutional support (palliative care, hospice services). While such losses are not without health consequences, they are associated with lower rates of complicated grief and more rapid functional recovery than traumatic loss [2]. Traumatic bereavement — defined by suddenness, violence, preventability, or stigma — bypasses these preparatory processes entirely. Deaths by suicide, homicide, overdose, and disaster all fall within this category, and the literature consistently demonstrates that survivors of traumatic loss face significantly elevated risks of PTSD, complicated grief disorder, and prolonged psychological disability [15][16].

A particularly underexamined category is institutional bereavement: the experience of families who lose a patient to a preventable medical error or in contested circumstances within a healthcare system. These families must simultaneously manage grief and navigate complex institutional accountability processes, often in the absence of transparent information and with the additional burden of perceived abandonment by the very system that caused the death. Their support needs differ fundamentally from those of families bereaved through chronic illness, yet no standardized

bereavement needs assessment protocol currently differentiates between them in most healthcare systems.

### 3.2. Occupational Exposure to Bereavement

Healthcare workers, first responders, and military personnel represent populations for whom exposure to death is not incidental but occupational — yet whose bereavement experiences remain poorly integrated into occupational health frameworks. The concept of cumulative grief, developed within nursing and emergency medicine literature, describes the accretion of loss experienced by professionals who witness death repeatedly over the course of a career [17]. Unlike the bereavement of a family member, cumulative occupational grief rarely receives formal acknowledgment, rarely qualifies for structured time away, and is frequently managed through suppression and avoidance — coping strategies associated with poorer long-term psychological outcomes. Pandemic-era data have rendered the scale of this problem visible. Surveys conducted among healthcare workers during and after the COVID-19 pandemic documented rates of burnout, moral injury, complicated grief, and PTSD that substantially exceeded pre-pandemic baseline estimates across multiple national healthcare systems [18][19]. These outcomes are not adequately explained by reference to individual psychological resilience deficits. They reflect, in large part, the structural failure of healthcare institutions to provide proportionate bereavement support, peer supervision, and meaningful workload adjustment during periods of mass death — failures that predated the pandemic and that pandemic conditions exposed with particular clarity.

### 3.3. Cultural Context and the Limits of Western Clinical Models

The dominant clinical model of grief, which emphasizes individual psychological processing, sequential stage-based progression through well-defined emotional phases, and resolution through professional therapeutic intervention, reflects a historically and culturally specific set of assumptions. Its conceptual foundations, traceable to Freudian theories of mourning and later to stage-based models associated with Kubler-Ross [20], have been critiqued extensively for their limited cross-cultural applicability, their pathologizing of divergent grief expressions, and their implicit prioritization of individual over collective modes of healing [21][22].

In many non-Western and Indigenous cultural traditions, grief is a collective rather than individual process, embedded in extended community ritual, ancestral relationship, and sustained communal presence over periods that may extend for years. When bereaved individuals from these traditions encounter mental health systems premised on brief individual therapy, professional disclosure, and rapid return to productive function, the encounter is not merely unhelpful — it can be experienced as a second act of dispossession, invalidating the cultural tools through which loss would otherwise be metabolized [23][24]. Public health systems that impose standardized clinical grief frameworks 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 through collective loss.

This has direct implications for measurement. The instruments most commonly used to assess complicated grief and PTSD symptomatology in bereaved populations were largely developed and validated in Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic (WEIRD) samples [25]. Their cross-cultural validity in assessing bereavement-related distress in refugee populations, Indigenous communities, and conflict-affected

societies remains inadequately established. The result is a systematic undercount of bereavement-related morbidity in precisely the populations most affected by traumatic loss, and a corresponding misallocation of research investment and service resources.

## 4. Toward Institutional Resilience: A Structural Reframing

### 4.1. From Individual Resilience to Structural Support

The prevailing public health discourse on bereavement is organized around the concept of individual resilience: the capacity of bereaved individuals to adapt to loss without persistent functional impairment. While individual resilience is a legitimate object of clinical and research interest, its dominance as a policy frame carries significant risks. It locates the locus of response within the bereaved person, implicitly framing inadequate recovery as a personal deficit rather than a structural failing. It directs intervention resources toward individual psychological treatment while leaving the conditions that produced the loss, and the institutional voids that surround it, unaddressed. And it is particularly ill-suited to the contexts of mass, traumatic, or disenfranchised grief in which individual coping resources are most overwhelmed.

The alternative we propose is institutional resilience: a commitment to building the structural conditions within which bereaved individuals and communities can grieve effectively, regardless of their individual psychological resources. This reframing has several practical implications. It shifts the primary locus of intervention from the clinic to the policy environment. It directs attention toward the social, economic, and institutional factors that mediate bereavement outcomes. And it provides a framework for evaluating the adequacy of societal responses to loss that does not reduce to measuring individual symptom trajectories.

### 4.2. Policy Priorities and Existing Gaps

Mandated and adequately compensated bereavement leave represents one of the most evidence-consistent policy levers available for reducing the downstream health consequences of loss, yet it remains absent or inadequate in many national labor frameworks. In the United States, no federal statute mandates bereavement leave, leaving coverage entirely to employer discretion. Workers in low-wage, part-time, and gig economy positions — who are disproportionately women, people of color, and those with lower educational attainment — are least likely to have negotiated bereavement leave protections, and most likely to face immediate financial pressure in the aftermath of a family death [26]. The evidence that financial instability compounds grief-related health outcomes is robust [27]: the interaction between economic insecurity and bereavement stress is not additive but synergistic, each condition amplifying the pathophysiological impact of the other.

Within healthcare systems, the provision of bereavement support following the death of a patient remains inconsistent, underfunded, and poorly standardized. Family members who lose a patient to chronic disease may receive brief follow-up contact from palliative care services; those who lose a patient to a sudden or traumatic death in an emergency department typically receive no structured bereavement follow-up at all [28]. This discrepancy does not reflect evidence about differential need — it reflects institutional inertia and resource allocation decisions that have never been subjected to systematic equity analysis. A family bereaved by medical error requires not only grief support but navigation of accountability processes;

a family bereaved by suicide requires specialized postvention support to reduce their own elevated suicide risk; neither is served by generic grief literature distributed at discharge.

Mental health support for first responders and healthcare workers requires reclassification as a core occupational health obligation rather than a discretionary wellness offering. Peer support programs, mandatory psychological debriefing following mass casualty events, protected time for grief processing, and workload adjustments during periods of heightened exposure have all demonstrated evidence of benefit in reducing rates of PTSD and complicated grief among high-exposure occupational groups [29]. Their inconsistent provision across healthcare and emergency services systems represents a policy gap that pandemic-era outcomes have made increasingly difficult to justify.

#### 4.3. Measurement Reform and Research Priorities

Progress in the public health response to bereavement is constrained by significant measurement limitations. National health surveillance systems do not systematically capture bereavement exposure or its contexts; cause-of-death data are collected without linkage to family bereavement outcomes; and the instruments available for assessing complicated grief and bereavement-related PTSD have been validated predominantly in Western clinical samples. These gaps mean that the full burden of bereavement-related morbidity in diverse populations is not visible in the data that inform policy decisions.

Research priorities for the next decade should include: the development and cross-cultural validation of bereavement assessment instruments for use in non-Western and conflict-affected settings; the integration of bereavement exposure and type as standard covariates in population health surveys and longitudinal cohort studies; the expansion of viromics and naturalistic longitudinal designs to capture the temporal trajectory of immune and cardiovascular dysregulation following different types of loss; and the evaluation of structural interventions — including bereavement leave policy changes, community-based peer support programs, and culturally adapted grief services — using rigorous quasi-experimental designs that can support causal inference.

## 5. Discussion

The argument advanced in this paper is not that bereavement is more common or more painful than previously recognized. It is that the health consequences of bereavement are more structurally mediated, more culturally contingent, and more amenable to policy intervention than prevailing frameworks have acknowledged. The evidence reviewed here supports a reconceptualization of bereavement as a social determinant of health — a domain in which the distribution of outcomes is systematically patterned by social position, structural conditions, and institutional responses, in the same way that the health consequences of poverty, discrimination, or housing instability are patterned.

This reconceptualization has several implications for how the field ought to proceed. It suggests that the primary questions driving bereavement research should not be confined to the psychology of the bereaved individual but should extend to the structural conditions that determine whether grief is socially legitimate, institutionally supported, economically survivable, and culturally resonant. It suggests that the most important outcomes to measure are not only symptom trajectories in clinical samples but population-level patterns of bereavement-related morbidity across demographic and structural subgroups. And it suggests that the most

impactful interventions will not be found primarily in the clinic but in the policy environment: in labor law, healthcare system design, occupational health regulation, and the governance of humanitarian response.

Several limitations of the present analysis warrant acknowledgment. The evidence base on bereavement and population health, while substantial, remains unevenly distributed across population groups and geographic settings, with significant overrepresentation of Western, high-income, and clinical samples. The causal identification of bereavement-specific health effects — as distinct from the pre-existing conditions and structural disadvantages that co-occur with high-risk bereavement contexts — remains methodologically challenging in observational data. And the interventions for which the strongest evidence exists (individual-level psychological therapy for complicated grief disorder; social support provision) are not necessarily those with the greatest potential for population-level impact. These gaps underscore the urgency of the measurement and research investments called for above.

## 6. Conclusion

Bereavement is universal. Its consequences do not have to be unequal. But achieving equity in the health consequences of loss requires a fundamental reorientation of how the field understands the problem. As long as bereavement is framed primarily as a psychological event requiring clinical response, the structural forces that determine who grieves well and who grieves with lasting harm will remain outside the scope of effective intervention.

The deaths that are driving the current global surge in bereavement — overdose, armed conflict, climate disaster, suicide, pandemic — share a common feature: they are concentrated among populations already navigating the heaviest burdens of structural disadvantage. Bereavement in these communities does not begin a new health trajectory. It accelerates an existing one, converting prior vulnerability into lasting morbidity, and transmitting the health consequences of structural failure across generations. The path forward requires researchers to build measurement frameworks that capture the context of loss — not merely its occurrence — and that are validated across cultural settings. It requires clinicians and public health practitioners to resist the standardization of grief into a uniform clinical pathway. It requires healthcare systems to differentiate their responses according to the circumstances of death rather than defaulting to generic bereavement follow-up that serves no specific bereaved population well. And it requires policymakers to recognize that what happens after a death is as much a matter of public concern as what caused it — and to invest accordingly in the structural conditions that allow loss to be survived with dignity and health intact.

To address bereavement as a global health priority, we must stop viewing it as a singular psychological event and start treating it as what it is: a social determinant of health, shaped by the same forces of inequality that pattern every other dimension of population health, and equally deserving of the structural, institutional, and political responses that those forces demand.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bharel, M., Brinkley-Rubinstein, L., & Wakeman, S. (2022). Addressing the opioid epidemic's bereavement burden: A public health imperative. *American Journal of Public Health*, 112(4), 558–560. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2021.306682>

- [2] Stroebe, M. S., Hansson, R. O., Schut, H., & Stroebe, W. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of bereavement research and practice: 21st century perspectives*. American Psychological Association.
- [3] Shear, M. K. (2015). Complicated grief. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 372(2), 153-160. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMcp1315618>
- [4] Buckley, T., Sunari, D., Marshall, A., Bartrop, R., McKinley, S., & Tofler, G. (2012). Physiological correlates of bereavement and the impact of bereavement interventions. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, 14(2), 129-139. <https://doi.org/10.31887/DCNS.2012.14.2/tbuckley>
- [5] Feigelman, W., Gorman, B. S., & Jordan, J. R. (2009). Stigmatization and suicide bereavement. *Death Studies*, 33(7), 591-608. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481180902979973>
- [6] Doka, K. J. (2002). *Disenfranchised grief: New directions, challenges, and strategies for practice*. Research Press.
- [7] Feigelman, W., Jordan, J. R., & Gorman, B. S. (2011). Parental grief after a child's drug death compared to other death causes: Investigating a greatly neglected bereavement population. *OMEGA — Journal of Death and Dying*, 63(4), 291-316. <https://doi.org/10.2190/OM.63.4.a>
- [8] Miller, K. E., & Rasmussen, A. (2010). War exposure, daily stressors, and mental health in conflict and post-conflict settings: Bridging the divide between trauma-focused and psychosocial frameworks. *Social Science and Medicine*, 70(1), 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.09.029>
- [9] Silove, D., Ventevogel, P., & Rees, S. (2017). The contemporary stress-adaptation-distress framework for understanding common mental disorders. *World Psychiatry*, 16(1), 13-20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20381>
- [10] Raker, E. J., Lowe, S. R., Arcaya, M. C., Johnson, S. T., Rhodes, J., & Waters, M. C. (2019). Twelve years later: The long-term mental health consequences of Hurricane Katrina. *Social Science and Medicine*, 242, Article 112610. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112610>
- [11] Moon, J. R., Kondo, N., Glymour, M. M., & Subramanian, S. V. (2011). Widowhood and mortality: A meta-analysis. *PLOS ONE*, 6(8), e23465. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0023465>
- [12] O'Connor, M.-F., Wellisch, D. K., Stanton, A. L., Eisenberger, N. I., Irwin, M. R., & Lieberman, M. D. (2008). Craving love? Enduring grief activates brain's reward center. *NeuroImage*, 42(2), 969-972. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.04.256>
- [13] Prigerson, H. G., Horowitz, M. J., Jacobs, S. C., Parkes, C. M., Aslan, M., Goodkin, K., Raphael, B., Marwit, S. J., Wortman, C., Neimeyer, R. A., Bonanno, G. A., Block, S. D., Kissane, D., Boelen, P., Maercker, A., Litz, B. T., Johnson, J. G., First, M. B., & Maciejewski, P. K. (2009). Prolonged grief disorder: Psychometric validation of criteria proposed for DSM-V and ICD-11. *PLOS Medicine*, 6(8), e1000121. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000121>
- [14] Saldinger, A., Porterfield, K., & Cain, A. C. (2004). Meeting the needs of parentally bereaved children: A framework for child-centered parenting. *Psychiatry: Interpersonal and Biological Processes*, 67(4), 331-352. <https://doi.org/10.1521/psyc.67.4.331.56570>
- [15] Currier, J. M., Holland, J. M., & Neimeyer, R. A. (2006). Sense-making, grief, and the experience of violent loss: Toward a mediational model. *Death Studies*, 30(5), 403-428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481180600614351>
- [16] Kristensen, P., Weisaeth, L., & Heir, T. (2012). Bereavement and mental health after sudden and violent losses: A review. *Psychiatry*, 75(1), 76-97. <https://doi.org/10.1521/psyc.2012.75.1.76>
- [17] Papadatou, D. (2009). *In the face of death: Professionals who care for the dying and bereaved*. Springer.
- [18] Restauri, N., & Sheridan, A. D. (2020). Burnout and posttraumatic stress disorder in the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic: Intersection, impact, and interventions. *Journal of the American College of Radiology*, 17(7), 921-926. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacr.2020.05.021>
- [19] Greenberg, N., Docherty, M., Gnanapragasam, S., & Wessely, S. (2020). Managing mental health challenges faced by healthcare workers during COVID-19 pandemic. *BMJ*, 368, m1211. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1211>
- [20] Kubler-Ross, E. (1969). *On death and dying*. Macmillan.
- [21] Walter, T. (1999). *On bereavement: The culture of grief*. Open University Press.
- [22] Rosenblatt, P. C. (2008). Grief across cultures: A review and research agenda. In M. S. Stroebe, R. O. Hansson, H. Schut, & W. Stroebe (Eds.), *Handbook of bereavement research and practice: Advances in theory and intervention* (pp. 207-222). American Psychological Association.
- [23] Gone, J. P. (2009). A community-based treatment for Native American historical trauma: Prospects for evidence-based practice. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 77(4), 751-762. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015390>
- [24] Kirmayer, L. J., Narasiah, L., Munoz, M., Rashid, M., Ryder, A. G., Guzder, J., Hassan, G., Rousseau, C., & Pottie, K. (2011). Common mental health problems in immigrants and refugees: General approach in primary care. *CMAJ*, 183(12), E959-E967. <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.090292>
- [25] Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2-3), 61-83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- [26] Congressional Research Service. (2023). *Bereavement leave: Legal requirements and employer practices* (Report No. R47621). U.S. Congress.
- [27] Li, J., & Prigerson, H. G. (2020). Assessment and associated features of prolonged grief disorder among Chinese bereaved individuals. *BMC Psychiatry*, 20, Article 180. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-020-02594-4>
- [28] Lobb, E. A., Kristjanson, L. J., Aoun, S. M., Monterosso, L., Halkett, G. K. B., & Davies, A. (2010). Predictors of complicated grief: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Death Studies*, 34(8), 673-698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481187.2010.496686>
- [29] Halpern, J., & Maunder, R. G. (2011). Acute and chronic workplace stress in emergency medical technicians and paramedics. In J. Langan-Fox & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Handbook of stress in the occupations* (pp. 121-134). Edward Elgar Publishing.