Psychological Stress and Gender Differences during COVID-19 Pandemic in Chinese Population

Song Kangxing[1] Li Tao[2] Luo Dan[3] Hou Fengsu[4] Bi Fengying[3] Terry D. Stratton[5]

Voyko Kavcic[6] Jiao Rong[7] Xu Rui[8*] Yan Shiyan[8*], Jiang Yang[5]

1 Department of Cardiology, the First Medical Center, Chinese PLA General Hospital, Beijing 100853, China

2 Research Project and Achievement Management Office, Joint Service Support Force of the Chinese PLA, Wuhan 430019, China

3 School of Public Health, Central South University, Hunan 410078,China

4 Shenzhen Kangning Hospital, Guangzhou 518020, China

5 Department of Behavioral Science, College of Medicine, University of Kentucky, KY 40536-0086,USA

6 Institute of Gerontology, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, 48202, USA

7 The First Clinical College, Hainan Meidical University, Haikou 570100, China

8 Institute of Clinical Basic Medicine, China Academy of Chinese Medical Sciences,

Beijing 100700, China

* Corresponding author: Xu Rui, anxietypsy@163.com, 15300275523

Yan Shiyan, yanshiyan0927@sina.com ,13521436209

Abstract

Background The COVID-19 disease has been spreading for more than four months in China and been pronounced as a pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO). As an urgent public health crisis, it has severe physical and psychological impacts on human. The related experience and mental health on individuals and society during the pandemic can be devastating and has lasting impact.

Objective To investigate the psychological stress and gender difference responding to the threat of COVID-19 and relevant factors.

Methods A cross-sectional population-based study using online questionnaires via a social media software, WeChat, from 20th to 27th Feb, 2020. Psychological stress was measured by visual analogue scale (VAS). The relevant factors included demographics, the epidemic and living status characteristics related to COVID-19, psychological status, the needs of psychological support services, and psychological resilience. Psychological responses to depression, anxiety were also measured.

Results Total 3088 questionnaires from 32 provinces in China were collected online. The average score of psychological stress was 3.4. The risk factors related to psychological stress included: female, ≤45 years old, higher education, farmer/worker/clerical and business/service, unemployed, more diseases, uncertainty local epidemic status, close contact or completed a medical observation, higher desire for knowledge about the COVID-19, the diseases, psychological, economic difficulties during the epidemic. The protect factors included: frequently contacting with colleagues, calm mood, and high psychological resilience. There were gender differences on stress, the adaption to current living/working status, the coping strategy for heating, and the psychological support service needs.

Conclusion The stress, anxiety and depression were mainly related to gender, age, education, and occupation during the epidemic of COVID-19. It suggested that we should make appropriate control measures and provide different psychological supports according to different population characteristics.

Keywords: COVID-19; Psychological stress; Depression; Anxiety; Psychological resilience

Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) as an unknown infectious disease with a cluster of acute respiratory symptoms was initially detected in Wuhan, China, in December 2019[1], and cases dramatically increasing by the end of January. No specific effective therapy, overlong incubation, asymptomatic infection, and re-positive cases after recovered made the situation uncertainty and might aggravate the public's worries and fragile mind [2-4]. Meanwhile, a series of changes of life, such as lockdown of city, level-1 public health emergency response and home quarantine for the individuals due to COVID-19 epidemic severely affected on the aspects of public's health, socialization, economic and way of life [5].

COVID-19 has been an pandemic period in China, which as a psychological stressors might lead to a obvious psychological impact on the Chinese. A survey conducted during the early phase of epidemic in Hong Kong, indicated 97% of respondents were worried about COVID-19, and 99.5% of them were alert to the disease progression; borderline abnormal of anxiety level, high perceived susceptibility and high perceived severity were reported[6]. Medical workers reported stress, anxiety and depression symptoms [7,8]. According to previous studies, stress induced vulnerability to anxiety, depression and other neuropsychiatric disorders [9,10]. Stress-related and adjustment disorders, such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, and substance use disorders, etc., were also frequently reported post-disaster studies [11]. Social situations involving social conflict, isolation, devaluation, rejection, and exclusion historically increased risk for physical injury and infection, anticipatory neural-immune reactivity to social threat was likely highly conserved[12]. Therefore, COVID-19 the psychological stress caused by sense of insecurity should be concerned.

Gender difference should be given a particular concern for studying psychological stress. A clear gender differences has established in exposure to potentially traumatic events and in subsequent PTSD[13]. Many studies showed females were showed vulnerable to mental or physical problems in exposure to life stress or potentially traumatic events [14-16]. Up to now, the gender differences of psychological stress affected by COVID-19 were still not fully investigated, although female medical workers was noticed had more negative influences by epidemic[8] . Our study aimed to

investigate the psychology health of the general population and its influence factors, especially gender differences.

Methods

We conducted a cross-sectional population-based study using an online questionnaire via a social networking software, Wechat, from 20th to 27th Feb, 2020. The questionnaire was designed by professional psychiatrists and clinical epidemiologists. The study has been proved by the institution review board of School of Public Health, Central South University(XYGW-2020-04).

Respondents were asked about their demographics (including sex, age, marital status, province, education, occupation, diseases). We also investigated the epidemic and living status characteristics related to COVID-19, including assessment of local epidemic status, current status (confirmed patients, suspected infection, anyone in close contact, person who has completed a medical observation, general people), the number of people living together during the outbreak, who contacted more than 3 times a week, a desire to acquire knowledge of COVID-19, time spent on the information about outbreak in a day, mood changes and the biggest difficulties during the epidemic. Measurements of mental health and psychological related factors were investigated including psychological stress, depression, anxiety, resilience, and the needs of psychological support services. psychological stress was measured by a 10 cm visual analogue scale (VAS) from 0 (‘not stressful’) and 10 (‘extremely stressful’)[17]. We used the first two items of patient health questionnaire (PHQ-2 scale) to measure depression, which had good psychometric properties for screening and diagnosing depression [18,19]. A cutoff of 3 or greater has been found to have the greatest sensitivity and specificity for screening of depression [20]. The first two items of generalized anxious disorder scale (GAD-2) was adopted to measured anxiety. It has excellent overall accuracy for identifying clinically significant anxiety symptoms at a cutoff of 3 [21]. PHQ-2 and GAD-2 items are rated on a 4-point scale, ranging from 0 (not at all) to 3 (nearly every day), for a total score ranging from zero to six. The Chinese version of Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) was used to assess the psychological resilience with a total of 100 scores, which rate items on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 4 (extremely true) . A higher score indicates a higher level of resilience [22].

Statistics analysis

All the statistical analysis were based on 3088 participants. Frequency and proportions of respondents were calculated. A regression models used to analyze the influence factors related to psychological stress, which psychological stress set as independent variable; gender, age(≤ 45,>45years), education, occupation, epidemic intensity of the living region (according to the cumulative number of cases at 1st March of respondents' province) , the number of diseases reported by respondents (0, 1-2, >2), local epidemic status, respondent's status(confirmed, suspected infection, close contact, completed a medical observation, general people), the number of persons living together during the outbreak, persons contacted more than 3 times a week, desire to acquire knowledge of COVID-19, time spending on the outbreak in a day, current mood, the greatest difficulty encountered during the epidemic, and CD-RISC as dependent variables. Martial status was not including in the model, because there were co-linear with the number of people living together during the outbreak. In order to explore the differences in different subgroups, a regression model were further conducted in gender and respondent' status (close contact or completed a medical observation persons v.s. general people) , respectively. Psychological stress and CD-RISC scores were compared between male and female, general people and respondents who was close contact or completed a medical observation with t-tests. The adaption to current living/working status, PHQ-2, GAD-2, the coping strategy for heating, and the psychological support service needs between male and female, general people and respondents who was close contact or completed a medical observation were analyzed with Chi-square tests.

The significant level was 0.05. All the analysis were done with Statistical analysis software (SAS, SAS institute Inc, Cary, NC).

Results

3088 questionnaires were collected covered 32 provinces in China (Appendix Figure 1). There were 1749 female (56.6%) and the average age was 37.5(Standard Deviation (SD)=13.5). Seven percent and 11.5% of respondents were front-line medical personnel and non-front-line medical personnel, respectively. The details of participants were showed in Table 1. The descriptions of

each item in the questionnaire were showed in Table 1 of Appendix.

The results showed the average score of psychological stress was 3.4(SD=2.4). 14.1% of the respondents were depressed, 13.2% were anxious, and 7.8% had both anxiety and depression. The average score of psychological resilience was 28.6(SD=8.1) (Table 4).

The regression analysis results of stress showed that the risk factors included female, ≤45 years old, higher education, farmer/worker/clerical and business/service, unemployed, more diseases, uncertainty local epidemic status, close contact or completed a medical observation, higher desire for knowledge about the COVID-19, the greatest difficulties during the epidemic (diseases problems, psychological problems, economic problems, can not go to work/study, social limitations as references) . The protect factors of stress included frequently contacting with colleagues, calm mood, and high psychological resilience. Except for age, high education, and resilience, for male, more time spending on the outbreak and unable to work/study during the epidemic aggravated psychological stress. Compared with male, in female, however, there were more risk factors were associated with stress(Table 2). Time spending on the outbreak and unable to work/study during the epidemic were no longer the risk factors, higher desire for knowledge about the COVID-19 was instead. And frequently contacting with colleagues was the protect factor of stress in female. In population who was close contact or completed a medical observation, living alone and low psychological resilience were the risk factors of stress(Table 3).

The stratified analysis showed that there were no significant gender differences on PHQ-2 and GAD-2. Stress and GAD-2 of persons who were close contact or completed a medical observation was larger than that of general people(P=0.0102) , but PHQ-2 and resilience were no difference between general people and person who was close contact or completed a medical observation(Table 4).

There were gender differences on the adaption to current living and working status, the coping strategy for heating, and the psychological support service needs. The proportion of unadaption in male was higher than that of female(P=0.0029). More male chose to fever clinic immediately when he was heating, but more female chose to observe at home(P<0.0001). Compared with male, more female chose self-psychological adjustment guidance and mental health assessment

(P=0.048)(Table 4).

Discussion

Psychological research showed that major life events lead to psychological stress, especially the major negative events (such as a significant life change or death of family members) closely related to diseases [17]. COVID-19 has been a pandemic disease and now more than 2.1 millions confirmed patients were involved and has 146,088 death all the world [23]. Many countries adopt strict control measurements, industries and schools were closed down and people was recommended staying at home. These series of measurements changed people's life and have negative impacts on their mental health. Our study involved all provinces in China, except Taiwan, and was conducted during the epidemic period of COVID-19. The results suggested that female, ≤45 years old, higher education, farmer/worker/clerical and business/service, unemployed, more diseases, uncertainty local epidemic status, close contact or completed a medical observation, higher desire for knowledge about the COVID-19, diseases/psychological/economic problems and can not go to work/study difficulties during the epidemic were the risk factors of stress. The protective factors included frequently contacting with colleagues, calm mood, and high psychological resilience. Many previous studies have indicated that psychological stress was related with higher education. Diseases, local epidemic status, psychological or economic problems, or unable to study/work can be induce to the external factors of psychological stress. Uncertainty brought by this unknown disease and strict measurements, such as lockdown of city, level-1 public health emergency response and home quarantine changed every Chinese life and deeply affected on their health, socialization, and economic condition [2,3]. It may be contributed to the long term strict control measures, which severely affected the economy and daily life, further resulted in worse economic situation. In addition, these control measures aggravated the stress of unemployed and farmer/worker/clerical and business/service respondents and results in anxiety. For these respondents without sustain income, the affects of control measures were heavier than other population. It should be considered when we made COVID-19 control and protecting measures. The desire to acquire knowledge of COVID-19, more time spent on the epidemic, and frequently contacting with colleagues can be seen as the behaviors to seek for social supports against psychological stress. Conforming to the common perceptions, people instinctively alerted

to risks and threats and tended to seek for outside help. A study conducted in China preprinted on 19th Feb, 2020 also demonstrated that time spend on the COVID-19 (≥3 hours per day) was associated with mental health [24]. Social support could buffer the stressful cognition, so high usually are associated with lower depression, anxiety and emotional stress [25]. Therefore, our study suggested that we should provide appropriate social supports to relieve the stress during the epidemic, such as providing more professional knowledge of COVID-19, the protective measures, the real time epidemic report, urgent medical service, basic living security measures, alternative communication means such as online meeting software, and so on.

Age was another factor related to the psychological stress. Our study suggested that younger respondents were, larger stress was. This results were consistent with the similar study about COVID-19 conducted in China and the previous studies about psychological impacts after disaster [24,26]. Compare with younger, elder maybe pay more attention on positive emotion simulation and neglect negative simulation, which called 'positive effects' [27]. Younger might face more life stress and social responsibility, and worry about their own and families' infection with the virus, lacking living materials, and financial resources caused by the breakout.

Psychological resilience was highlighted as a protective factor to overcome pressure in our study. Higher psychological resilience was associated with stronger ability of adaptability and controls of the external environment. Many studies found that psychological resilience protected individuals against stress-related mental problems, such as PTSD, anxiety and depression [28]. A investigate of Jiuzhaigou earthquake showed resilience and social support had direct and indirect effects on PTSD through anxiety and depression [29]. The resilience of male was higher than that of female in our study. It can partly explain why the male's stress was lower than female.

Our study suggested that female's stress was greater than that of male in an emergency, which were consistent with the existed evidences [14,16]. Gender differences of stress were estimated by affecting social environmental, psychodynamic, and cognitive processes [30,31]. Female tends to overestimate the pain of highly negative stimulate from a self-perspective than from an other-perspective [32]. Characteristics and behaviors including behavioral responses to distress, cognitive factors, and the experience and expression of emotion were influenced by assigned gender

[13]. Recently, a perspective believed that gender differences in susceptibility to stress could be explained by physiological factors [33,34]. It was found ovarian hormone fluctuations modulate female's susceptibility to stress [30,35]. Endogenous estradiol changes across the menstrual cycle alter mood and neural responses to psychosocial stress[36]. A fMRI-stress task also dedicated during stress, male recruit regions associated with emotion and stress regulation, self-referential processing and cognitive control more strongly than female [37]. The relationship between education and psychological stress was different in gender in our study. For male, psychological stress was increasing with education and the time spent on the outbreak. It might be explained by the more information received in higher education male than others, and further induced massive negative influence. The gender differences further induce the difference about the psychological support service needs. Our results showed that the needs for psychological supports were larger in female than in male. It may be caused that male are more likely to self-manage to coping with stress, while female are more likely to get professional help.

For the population who was close contact or completed a medical observation, the stress of the respondents who were living alone were larger than others. There were no gender difference on depression and anxious. And the depression status were no significant different between the population who was close contact or completed a medical observation and general population. However, the proportion of anxious status was more than that of general population. Those results suggested we should pay more attention to the mental health of the population who was close contact or completed a medical observation and give them appropriated psychological supports to relieve their anxious emotion. For general population, we should provide different psychological supports according to different gender and population.

Our study had several limitations. Firstly, although a national sample was obtained, our sample were mainly outside the heaviest epidemic area, Wuhan. It might be different with the condition of Wuhan. Secondly, considering the condition of COVID-19 epidemic in China at that time, we have to adopt the online survey with Wechat. Therefore, the population maybe have slight limitation. But Wechat can expand the scope of investigation, our survey almost covered all the provinces of China. Finally, confirmed and suspected infection patients were not included, and the proportion of close contact and have completed medical observation persons were few. Therefore,

It should be caution to extrapolate the results.

Conclusion

The stress were mainly related to gender, age, education, and occupation during the epidemic of COVID-19. It suggested that we should make appropriate control measures and provide different psychological supports according to different population characteristics.

References

1. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet.* Feb 15 2020;395(10223):497-506.

2. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *The New England journal of medicine.* Feb 28 2020.

3. Bai Y, Yao L, Wei T, et al. Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19. *Jama.* Feb 21 2020.

4. Peleg O, Mass-Friedman M. Worry about terror among young adults living in ongoing security uncertainty. *International journal of psychology : Journal international de psychologie.* 2013;48(3):407-421.

5. Taghrir MH, Akbarialiabad H, Ahmadi Marzaleh M. Efficacy of Mass Quarantine as Leverage of Health System Governance During COVID-19 Outbreak: A Mini Policy Review. *Archives of Iranian medicine.* Apr 1 2020;23(4):265-267.

6. Kwok KO, Li KK, Chan HH, et al. Community responses during the early phase of the COVID-19

epidemic in Hong Kong: risk perception, information exposure and preventive measures. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.2002.2026.20028217.

7. Siyu C, Xia M, Wen W, et al. Mental health status and coping strategy of medical workers in China during The COVID-19 outbreak. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.2002.2023.20026872.

8. Zhu Z, Xu S, Wang H, et al. COVID-19 in Wuhan: Immediate Psychological Impact on 5062 Health Workers. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.2002.2020.20025338.

9. McCloskey RJ, Pei F. The role of parenting stress in mediating the relationship between neighborhood social cohesion and depression and anxiety among mothers of young children in fragile families. *Journal of community psychology.* May 2019;47(4):869-881.

10. Banjongrewadee M, Wongpakaran N, Wongpakaran T, Pipanmekaporn T, Punjasawadwong Y, Mueankwan S. The role of perceived stress and cognitive function on the relationship between neuroticism and depression among the elderly: a structural equation model approach. *BMC psychiatry.* Jan 20 2020;20(1):25.

11. North CS, Pfefferbaum B. Mental health response to community disasters: a systematic review. *Jama.* Aug 7 2013;310(5):507-518.

12. Slavich GM. Social Safety Theory: A Biologically Based Evolutionary Perspective on Life Stress, Health, and Behavior. *Annual review of clinical psychology.* Mar 6 2020.

13. Street AE, Dardis CM. Using a social construction of gender lens to understand gender differences in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Clinical psychology review.* Dec 2018;66:97-105.

14. Vigna L, Brunani A, Brugnera A, et al. Determinants of metabolic syndrome in obese workers: gender differences in perceived job-related stress and in psychological characteristics identified using artificial neural networks. *Eat Weight Disord.* Feb 2019;24(1):73-81.

15. Yamada M, Sekine M, Tatsuse T. Psychological Stress, Family Environment, and Constipation in Japanese Children: The Toyama Birth Cohort Study. *J Epidemiol.* Jun 5 2019;29(6):220-226.

16. Ishiguro A, Inoue M, Fisher J, Inoue M, Matsumoto S, Yamaoka K. Gender-Based Risk and Protective Factors for Psychological Distress in the Midterm Recovery Period Following the Great East Japan Earthquake. *Disaster medicine and public health preparedness.* Jun 2019;13(3):487-496.

17. Martinez de Tejada B, Jastrow N, Poncet A, Le Scouezec I, Irion O, Kayser B. Perceived and measured physical activity and mental stress levels in obstetricians. *European journal of obstetrics, gynecology, and reproductive biology.* Nov 2013;171(1):44-48.

18. Inagaki M, Ohtsuki T, Yonemoto N, et al. Validity of the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ)-9

and PHQ-2 in general internal medicine primary care at a Japanese rural hospital: a cross-sectional study. *General hospital psychiatry.* Nov-Dec 2013;35(6):592-597.

19. Arrieta J, Aguerrebere M, Raviola G, et al. Validity and Utility of the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ)-2 and PHQ-9 for Screening and Diagnosis of Depression in Rural Chiapas, Mexico: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Journal of clinical psychology.* Sep 2017;73(9):1076-1090.

20. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The Patient Health Questionnaire-2: validity of a two-item depression screener. *Medical care.* Nov 2003;41(11):1284-1292.

21. Plummer F, Manea L, Trepel D, McMillan D. Screening for anxiety disorders with the GAD-7 and GAD-2: a systematic review and diagnostic metaanalysis. *General hospital psychiatry.* Mar-Apr 2016;39:24-31.

22. Connor KM, Davidson JR. Development of a new resilience scale: the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and anxiety.* 2003;18(2):76-82.

23. WHO. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report – 89. *https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200418-sitrep-89-covid-19.pdf.* 2020; Accessed 18 April 2020.

24. Huang Y, Zhao N. Generalized anxiety disorder, depressive symptoms and sleep quality during COVID-19 outbreak in China: a web-based cross-sectional survey. *Psychiatry research.* Apr 12 2020;288:112954.

25. Shi J, Huang A, Jia Y, Yang X. Perceived stress and social support influence anxiety symptoms of Chinese family caregivers of community-dwelling older adults: a cross-sectional study. *Psychogeriatrics : the official journal of the Japanese Psychogeriatric Society.* Jan 23 2020.

26. Leung K, Wu JT, Liu D, Leung GM. First-wave COVID-19 transmissibility and severity in China outside Hubei after control measures, and second-wave scenario planning: a modelling impact assessment. *Lancet.* Apr 25 2020;395(10233):1382-1393.

27. Jeronimus BF, Snippe E, Emerencia AC, de Jonge P, Bos EH. Acute stress responses after indirect exposure to the MH17 airplane crash. *British journal of psychology.* Nov 2019;110(4):790-813.

28. Lee EE, Martin AS, Tu X, Palmer BW, Jeste DV. Childhood Adversity and Schizophrenia: The Protective Role of Resilience in Mental and Physical Health and Metabolic Markers. *The Journal of clinical psychiatry.* May/Jun 2018;79(3).

29. Xi Y, Yu H, Yao Y, Peng K, Wang Y, Chen R. Post-traumatic stress disorder and the role of resilience, social support, anxiety and depression after the Jiuzhaigou earthquake: A

structural equation model. *Asian journal of psychiatry.* Mar 2020;49:101958.

30. Slavich GM, Sacher J. Stress, sex hormones, inflammation, and major depressive disorder: Extending Social Signal Transduction Theory of Depression to account for sex differences in mood disorders. *Psychopharmacology.* Oct 2019;236(10):3063-3079.

31. Stevens JS, van Rooij SJH, Jovanovic T. Developmental Contributors to Trauma Response: The Importance of Sensitive Periods, Early Environment, and Sex Differences. *Current topics in behavioral neurosciences.* 2018;38:1-22.

32. Luo P, Xu D, Huang F, Wei F. Emotion intensity modulates perspective taking in men and women: an event-related potential study. *Neuroreport.* Jun 13 2018;29(9):773-778.

33. Goldstein JM, Lancaster K, Longenecker JM, et al. Sex differences, hormones, and fMRI stress response circuitry deficits in psychoses. *Psychiatry research.* Jun 30 2015;232(3):226-236.

34. King SB, Toufexis DJ, Hammack SE. Pituitary adenylate cyclase activating polypeptide (PACAP), stress, and sex hormones. *Stress.* Sep 2017;20(5):465-475.

35. Goldstein JM, Jerram M, Abbs B, Whitfield-Gabrieli S, Makris N. Sex differences in stress response circuitry activation dependent on female hormonal cycle. *The Journal of neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience.* Jan 13 2010;30(2):431-438.

36. Albert K, Pruessner J, Newhouse P. Estradiol levels modulate brain activity and negative responses to psychosocial stress across the menstrual cycle. *Psychoneuroendocrinology.* Sep 2015;59:14-24.

37. Kogler L, Seidel EM, Metzler H, et al. Impact of self-esteem and sex on stress reactions. *Scientific reports.* Dec 8 2017;7(1):17210.

Table 1 The demographic information of respondents

Variables	Frequency（n）	Proportions（%）
Gender		
Male	1339	43.4
Female	1749	56.6
Age(years) Mean, SD	37.5(13.5)	
≤14	17	0.6
15-24	614	19.9
25-34	784	25.4
35-44	676	21.9
45-59	796	25.8
60-69	171	5.5
≥70	30	1.0
Marital status		
Single	978	31.7
Married	2014	65.2
Divorced	70	2.3
Widowed	26	0.8
Education		
Senior high school/technical secondary school and below	635	20.6
Associate degree in college	551	17.8
Bachelor's degree	1448	46.9

Master's degree and upper	454	14.7
Occupation		
Front-line medical personnel	216	7.0
Non-front-line medical personnel	354	11.5
Military	107	3.5
Farmer	97	3.1
Worker	199	6.4
Government and management	373	12.1
Scientist	96	3.1
Teacher	299	9.7
Clerical and business	92	3.0
Service	320	10.4
Student	582	18.9
Unemployed	98	3.2
Others	423	13.7
Disease reported by subjects		
Without disease	2440	79.0
Respiratory disease	72	2.3
Infectious disease	17	0.6
Cardia-cerebrovascular disease	199	6.4
Disease of digestive tract	181	5.9
Endocrine disease	93	3.0
Urinary system diseases	51	1.7
Malignancy, anemia and other blood diseases	29	0.9

Surgical illness	71	2.3
Mental disorder	10	0.3
Others	140	4.5
Number of disease reported by respondents		
0	2374	76.9
1-2	694	22.5
≥3	19	0.6

Table 2 The factors related to the stress in all respondents and different gender respondents

Variables	All respondents		Male		Female	
	Estimates	P values	Estimates	P values	Estimates	P values
Intercept	12.45	<.0001	7.46	<.0001	9.62	<.0001
Gender	3.03	0.0024				
Age	-4.30	<.0001	-2.96	0.0031	-3.04	0.0024
Education	4.00	<.0001	3.47	0.0005	2.14	0.0326
Occupation						
Military(as reference)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Medical personnel	0.78	0.4355	-0.40	0.6876	1.76	0.0780
Farmer/Worker/Clerical and business/service	2.42	0.0156	1.77	0.0766	2.29	0.0219
Government and management	1.29	0.1979	0.65	0.5149	1.74	0.0818
Scientist	1.11	0.2653	0.38	0.7060	1.68	0.0926
Teacher	0.51	0.6132	-0.12	0.9012	1.46	0.1450
Student	0.37	0.7141	0.00	0.9900	1.33	0.1830
Unemployed	0.24	0.0254	1.36	0.1731	2.27	0.0236
Others	1.28	0.2002	1.17	0.2429	1.54	0.1237
Provinces	0.47	0.6357	0.69	0.4930	0.07	0.9441

Number of diseases reported by respondents	2.77	0.0057	1.12	0.2636	2.78	0.0055
Local epidemic status	-2.04	0.0416	-0.29	0.7746	-2.55	0.0108
Close contact or completed a medical observation v.s. general people	2.84	0.0046	2.52	0.0120	1.06	0.2882
The number of people living together during the outbreak	0.47	0.6390	-0.41	0.6845	1.12	0.2637
Single v.s. ≥2 persons						
People contacted more than 3 times a week						
Family members	0.98	0.3257	0.29	0.7691	1.20	0.2308
Friends	-0.78	0.4354	-0.41	0.6815	-0.46	0.6468
Colleagues	2.76	0.0057	1.53	0.1259	2.42	0.0155
Classmates	-0.40	0.6864	-0.33	0.7424	-0.19	0.8516
Wardmates	1.57	0.1170	1.09	0.2742	1.44	0.1511
Medical staff	0.75	0.4505	0.21	0.8320	1.01	0.3125
Net friends	1.61	0.1073	1.94	0.0525	0.58	0.5610
Desire to acquire knowledge of COVID-19	-3.29	0.0010	-1.35	0.1778	-3.35	0.0008
Time spending on the outbreak in one day	1.81	0.0698	2.03	0.0424	0.76	0.4470
calm mood comparing with the	-9.17	<.0001	-6.10	<.0001	-6.52	<.0001

early epidemic phase						
The greatest difficulty encountered during the epidemic						
Problem of diseases	2.40	0.0164	0.75	0.4559	2.27	0.0235
Psychological problems	6.39	<.0001	4.13	<.0001	4.52	<.0001
Economic problems	4.83	<.0001	3.81	0.0001	3.06	0.0022
Inconvenience in daily life	0.92	0.3580	1.31	0.1890	-0.10	0.9218
Unable to work/study	2.72	0.0065	2.04	0.0419	1.63	0.1033
Social limitations(reference)	-	-	-	-	-	-
RISC	-17.35	<.0001	-9.17	<.0001	-15.36	<.0001

Table3 The factors related to the stress value in Close contact or completed a medical observation persons and general people

Variables	Close contact or completed a medical observation persons		General people	
	Estimates	P	Estimates	P
Intercept	2.27	0.0306	12.04	<.0001
Gender	-0.72	0.4742	3.21	0.0013
Age	1.35	0.1872	-4.30	<.0001
Education	1.16	0.2569	3.79	0.0002
Occupation				
Military(as reference)	-	-	-	-
Medical personnel	-0.00	0.9962	0.67	0.5034
Farmer/Worker/Clerical and business/service	1.12	0.2696	2.12	0.0343
Government and management	-1.18	0.2455	1.14	0.2544
Scientist	0.98	0.3333	0.96	0.3367
Teacher	-0.04	0.9690	0.29	0.7747
Student	1.25	0.2227	0.20	0.8395
Unemployed	-	-	2.06	0.0397
Others	1.82	0.0782	1.01	0.3123

Provinces	-1.87	0.0713	0.77	0.4432
Number of diseases reported by subjects	0.22	0.8240	2.68	0.0073
Local epidemic status	-0.36	0.7197	-2.03	0.0428
The number of people living together during the outbreak	-2.79	0.0090	0.96	0.3353
Single v.s. ≥2 persons				
People contacted more than 3 times a week				
Family members	0.15	0.8840	1.30	0.1951
Friends	0.0073	0.4276	-0.74	0.4565
Colleagues	0.64	0.5298	3.09	0.0020
Classmates	0.78	0.4420	-0.48	0.6318
Wardmates	-1.91	0.0652	2.46	0.0141
Medical staff	0.71	0.4853	0.66	0.5084
Net friends	0.08	0.9360	1.47	0.1414
Desire to acquire knowledge of COVID-19	0.51	0.6154	-3.26	0.0011
Time spending on the outbreak in one day	-0.97	0.3392	1.86	0.0634
current mood comparing with the early epidemic phase	-0.19	0.8485	-9.23	<.0001
The greatest difficulty encountered during the epidemic				
Problem of diseases	0.68	0.4990	2.38	0.0172

Psychological problems	1.24	0.2250	6.52	<.0001
Economic problems	1.44	0.1608	4.89	<.0001
Inconvenience in daily life	1.26	0.2182	0.84	0.3990
Unable to work/study	1.71	0.0979	2.76	0.0058
Social limitations(reference)	-	-	-	-
RISC	-3.27	0.0027	-16.90	<.0001

Table 4 The psychological measurements of different populations

		Gender			Respondents' status		
	All respondents	Male	Female	P	General people	Close contact or completed a medical observation	P
Stress $\bar{x}(s)$	3.4(2.4)	3.63(2.56)	3.99(2.61)	0.0001	3.81(2.58)	5.00(2.70)	0.0003
PHQ-2 n(%)							
<3	2653(85.9%)	1140(85.14%)	1513(86.51%)	0.2787	2601(85.96%)	52(83.87%)	0.6405
≥3	435(14.1%)	199(14.86%)	236(13.49%)		425(14.04%)	10(16.13%)	
GAD-2 n(%)							
<3	2679(86.8%)	1175(87.75%)	1504(85.99%)	0.1527	2632(86.98%)	47(75.81%)	0.0102
≥3	409(13.2%)	164(12.25%)	245(14.01%)		394(13.02%)	15(24.19%)	
CD-RISC $\bar{x}(s)$	28.6(8.1)	29.60(8.52)	27.76(7.67)	<0.0001	28.57(8.10)	27.77(8.14)	0.4429
Do you adapt to current living and working status n(%)				0.0029			0.2568
Very adaptable	260(8.4%)	106(7.92%)	154(8.81%)		256(8.46%)	4(6.45%)	
Adaptable	1503(48.7%)	627(46.83%)	876(50.09%)		1465(48.41%)	38(61.29%)	
Tolerated inadaptable	746(24.2%)	315(23.53%)	431(24.64%)		735(24.29%)	11(17.74%)	
Inadaptable at most time	579(18.8%)	291(21.73%)	288(16.47%)		570(18.84%)	9(14.52%)	
The coping strategy for heating n(%)				<0.0001			0.7339
Indecision	66(2.1%)	37(2.76%)	30(1.72%)		65(2.15%)	2(3.23%)	
To fever clinic immediately	1698(55.0%)	783(58.48%)	915(52.32%)		1666(55.06%)	32(51.61%)	
Observe at home	1205(39.0%)	460(34.35%)	745(42.6%)		1179(38.96%)	26(41.94%)	

Recover by yourself	52(1.7%)	32(2.39%)	20(1.14%)		52(1.72%)	0(0%)	
Others	67(2.2%)	27(2.02%)	39(2.23%)		64(2.12%)	2(3.23%)	
The psychological support service needs							
Not need	503(16.3%)	240(17.92%)	263(15.05%)	0.0487	52(1.72 %)	1(1.61 %)	0.9480
Hot-line	53(1.7%)	27(2.02%)	26(1.49%)		171(5.65 %)	4(6.45 %)	
Internet counseling	175(5.7%)	84(6.27%)	91(5.21%)		1237(40.88 %)	28(45.16 %)	
Self - psychological adjustment guidance	1265(41.0%)	528(39.43%)	737(42.16%)		661(21.84 %)	13(20.97 %)	
Personal protection and psychological counseling	673(21.8%)	287(21.43%)	387(22.13%)		344(11.37 %)	7(11.29 %)	
Mental state assessment	351(11.4%)	138(10.31%)	213(12.19%)		496(16.39 %)	7(11.29%)	
Others	67(2.2%)	35(2.61%)	32(1.83%)		65(2.15 %)	2 (3.23 %)	
Total	3088	1339	1749		3026	62	