

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

COVID-19 associated anxiety enhances tinnitus

Short title: COVID-19-related anxiety and tinnitus

Li Xia^a, Gang He^a, Yong Feng^a, Xiaoxu Yu^a, Xiaolong Zhao^a, Zhengnong Chen^b, Shankai Yin^b,
Jian Wang^{c*}, Jiangang Fan^{a*}, Chuan Dong^{a*}

a Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Sichuan Provincial
People's Hospital and Sichuan Academy of Medical Sciences, Chengdu, Sichuan, 610072,
China.

b Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Shanghai Jiao Tong
University Affiliated Sixth People's Hospital, 200233, Shanghai.

c School of Communication Science and Disorders, Dalhousie University, Halifax,
Nova Scotia B3H 4R2, Canada.

15 **Abstract**

16 **Objectives**

17 To investigate if the anxiety associated with COVID-19 is a promoting factor to tinnitus.

18 **Methods**

19 A retrospective research design was used to compare the clinical characteristics of
20 tinnitus between the patients in 2020 under pandemic pressure and those from the
21 matching period in 2019. While anxiety was quantified using the Zung's Self-rating
22 Anxiety Scale (SAS), tinnitus severity was evaluated using the Tinnitus Handicap
23 Inventory (THI) questionnaire and the test of minimum masking level (MML). The
24 assessments were repeated after the sound therapy plus educational counselling (STEC)
25 and compared with EC alone therapy.

26 **Results**

27 A large increase in anxiety was evident in 2020 in both case rate and SAS. The treatment
28 of both methods was less effective in 2020. SAS, THI and MML were all deteriorated
29 after the EC alone treatment in 2020, while an improvement was seen in 2019. This
30 suggests that EC alone could not counteract the stress by COVID-19 at all, and the stress,
31 if not managed well, can significantly increase the severity of tinnitus and associated
32 anxiety.

33 **Conclusions**

34 By using the EC subgroup in virtual control, we conclude that anxiety can serve as a
35 promoting factor to tinnitus. We believe that this is the first study report that confirm the
36 causative/promotive role of anxiety on tinnitus.

37 **Keywords**

38 Anxiety, tinnitus, educational counseling, sound therapy, COVID-19

39 **Introduction**

40 The spread of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has already reached pandemic
41 proportions, affecting the majority of countries, areas, and territories across the world
42 (Remuzzi et al., 2020) . By the end of June 2020, over nine million people had tested
43 positive for COVID-19 with the death toll increasing to more than 484,000 globally
44 (World Health Organization, 2020) . Decisive containment measures in China have
45 reduced new cases and the spread of infection (Liu et al., 2020). However, worries about
46 the spread of the disease, living difficulties, and financial burden related to the pandemic
47 are likely to have had negative psychosocial impacts on residents, as reported by many
48 recent studies (Brooks et al., 2020; Lu et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020b). It would be
49 reasonable, therefore, to expect an increase in the incidence of disorders that are
50 associated with psychological issues.

51 Tinnitus is typically referred to as the perception of sound in the absence of an
52 acoustic stimulus or that is only generated by structures in the ear, commonly described
53 as ringing in one or both ears (Bauer, 2018). While the exact mechanisms of tinnitus
54 remain unclear, many risk or promoting factors have been identified, including
55 sensorineural hearing loss, vestibular schwannoma, ototoxic medications, and emotional
56 stress (Baguley et al., 2013). Tinnitus has been linked to stress and related disorders in
57 many previous studies. This link has been thoroughly reviewed, repeatedly, by different
58 authors (e.g., (Durai et al., 2016; Malouff et al., 2011; Mazurek et al., 2019; Pattyn et al.,
59 2016; Wallhausser-Franke et al., 2012; Ziai et al., 2017; Zirke et al., 2013)). The direction
60 and causality of this link remain unclear, as pointed out in many previous studies,
61 although individuals' emotional states appear to be an important factor mediating the

62 effects of tinnitus loudness on tinnitus-related distress (Probst et al., 2016a; Probst et al.,
63 2016b; Schlee et al., 2016); anxiety, somatization, and in particular depression have also
64 been identified as possible mediators of tinnitus-related distress (Bartels et al., 2010a;
65 Bartels et al., 2010b; Trevis et al., 2016a; Trevis et al., 2016b).


66 The clinicians in our department noticed that the tinnitus patients seen since the
67 hospital was reopened after COVID-19 had more emotional complaints than before. We
68 thought that this might be related to the various pressures experienced by the patients
69 during the pandemic event and the lockdown. Therefore, the COVID-19 pandemic and
70 lockdown might provide a good opportunity to investigate whether anxiety impacts
71 tinnitus as a promoting or enhancing factor. The present study explored whether anxiety
72 was increased by the COVID-19 pandemic in subjects with tinnitus, and if so whether the
73 increased anxiety affected the severity of tinnitus and the outcomes of tinnitus treatments.

74 **Methods**

75 **Study Design**

76 In this retrospective study, clinical data from outpatients visiting our department (the
77 Hearing Center of Otolaryngology Department of the Sichuan Provincial People's
78 Hospital and Sichuan Academy of Medical Sciences, Chengdu, Sichuan, People's
79 Republic of China) were collected over the same periods, from March 1 to April 14, in
80 both 2020 and 2019. This period in 2020 was the first 6 weeks of the reopening of our
81 department to non-emergency visits after the nationwide lockdown for COVID-19 in
82 China (from January 23 to February 29, 2020) that coincided with the deceleration phase
83 of the pandemic and the resumption of economic activities. In this period, there were
84 concerns about a resurgence of COVID-19 (Bedford et al., 2020).

85 The same protocol was followed for the treatment of patients during both years. On
86 the initial visit, after collecting their history, every patient received a comprehensive
87 audiological and psychological assessment. After the assessment, they were treated with
88 one of three methods based on reported efficacy, financial cost, and the patient's
89 preference: sound therapy (ST) with educational counseling (EC) or relaxation
90 therapy, sound amplification with EC and relaxation therapy, or EC and relaxation
91 therapy without further treatment. Two months after the initial appointment, every
92 participant was examined in a second assessment. Figure 1 shows a flowchart of the
93 major procedures of this study. Although no procedure was experimental, we sought and
94 received approval for the study from the Ethics Review Board of the Sichuan Provincial
95 People's Hospital and Sichuan Academy of Medical Sciences (permit number: 2020–355).
96 This study was conducted according to the principles expressed in the Declaration of
97 Helsinki (World Medical Association, 2018).



98

99 **Figure 1. Flowchart of the major procedures in this study.** *numbers in parentheses are those of cases

100 that were lost to the study. THI: tinnitus handicap inventory, SAS: Zung's Self-Rating Anxiety Sale,

101 ST: sound therapy, HA: hearing aid, EC: educational counseling.

102 **Audiological Tests and Tinnitus Evaluation**

103 The procedures for all tests were explained to the patients before they were

104 conducted. All patients were examined using monocular otoscopy to identify any sign of

105 blockage or inflammation in ear canals or perforation in the tympanic membrane.

106 Tympanometry was tested at the most common 226 Hz probe tone, using an AT235

107 impedance meter (Interacoustics, Assens, Denmark); the type of tympanogram was
108 determined for each ear (with type A as normal). Those who were abnormal in those tests
109 were not included in this study.

110 The hearing status was tested with pure-tone audiometry (AC40, Interacoustics) in a
111 soundproofed room. The air conduction threshold was examined for frequencies ranging
112 from 250 Hz to 8 kHz using TDH 39 headphones (Telephonics, NY, USA) and bone
113 conduction hearing was examined from 500 Hz to 4 kHz using a B-72 bone-conduction
114 vibrator (Radioear, PA, USA), each in octave steps. The hearing thresholds were
115 determined at each frequency using the standard Hughson–Westlake up–down procedure.
116 Thresholds of 20 dB HL or lower were considered normal. The minimum masking level
117 (MML) was tested in each ear with tinnitus, this test evaluates the maskability of tinnitus
118 by external sounds. Broadband noise with a flat power spectrum was used for this
119 evaluation, which was generated by a table-top sound generator (BTD01, BetterLife
120 Medical Technology Co., Ltd., Jiangsu, China). To measure the MML, the level of the
121 noise was gradually increased by the tester in 1 dB steps until the patient stated that the
122 tinnitus had become nearly inaudible, then this level was recorded as the MML.

123 **Educational Counseling and Relaxation Therapy**

124 The counseling was performed by the audiologists for each patient with tinnitus to
125 acknowledge the patient’s suffering, and to help the patient understand tinnitus,
126 demystify the condition, and correct any false preconceptions (duration 1 h) (Langguth,
127 2015). Relaxation therapy consisted of home-based exercises, such as listening to music,
128 avoiding unnecessary tension, and tai chi (Arif et al., 2017; Tyler, 2014). Patients were
129 advised to execute this for two sessions of 30 min per day over a period of 8 weeks.

130 **Sound Therapy**

131 The first step of the ST was to identify the nature of the tinnitus in pitch and loudness.
132 Pitch matching was conducted using the same sound generator (BTD01) as in the MML
133 test to produce pure tones for tonal tinnitus or narrow-band noise for non-tonal tinnitus.
134 The match was established by adjusting the central frequency and bandwidth, which
135 could be changed from 100 Hz to 1 kHz, around the center frequency. In loudness
136 matching, the matched tone or noise was presented continuously, and the level of the
137 matching signal was adjusted from low to high until the tinnitus could hardly be heard. In
138 this report, loudness matching results are presented in dB SL. Using the pitch and
139 loudness matching data, a sound file was generated for each individual to produce a
140 sound matching their tinnitus in frequency and level. This sound file was the uploaded to
141 an ear level sound generator (BTM-N6, BetterLife Medical Technology Co., Ltd.) that
142 was dispensed to the patient. The patients were instructed to listen to the sound file for
143 30 min each time, and to gradually increase from once to 3–6 times per day, every day,
144 during the whole course of home-based therapy, which lasted for 2 months.

145 **Questionnaires**

146 The tinnitus patients recruited in this study all completed two questionnaires at the
147 initial visit and again during the follow-up, two months later. The Chinese version of the
148 Tinnitus Handicap Inventory (THI) questionnaire was used in this study (Kam et al.,
149 2009), consisting of 25 questions to assess the difficulty caused by tinnitus with respect
150 to its functional, emotional, and catastrophic aspects (Meng et al., 2012; Newman et al.,
151 1996).

152 A Chinese version of Zung's Self-rating Anxiety Scale (SAS) questionnaire was used,

153 which was adapted from a previous report (Gao et al., 2011; Zung, 1965). The raw scores
154 were multiplied by 1.25 to generate the index scores (Zung, 1965). We used a value of 45
155 as the cut-off for anxiety, instead of 50, as reported in the most recent publication
156 (Dunstan et al., 2020).

157 **Statistical Analyses**

158 All parametric data are presented as mean \pm standard deviation unless otherwise
159 specified. When the parameters of participants were compared between two groups, the t-
160 test was used or, if among multiple groups, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for
161 continuous variables and the chi-square test for categorical variables, including sex, age,
162 and site of tinnitus, and for risk factors among groups. Treatment outcomes were
163 evaluated by comparing the scores of THI and SAS before and after the treatments, using
164 a paired t-test or ANOVA. All analyses were performed using the SPSS 19.0.0 software at
165 a significance level of 0.05. In figures, the significant level was indicated by the number
166 of symbols (e.g., *), with 1, 2 or 3 representing $p < 0.05$, 0.01, and 0.001 respectively.

167

168 **Results**

169 A total of 99 cases were collected between March 1 and April 14, 2020, and 89 in the
170 same period in 2019 (Figure 1). Table 1 compares the demographics and tinnitus
171 characteristics between the subjects in the different years. The case load for tinnitus
172 appeared to be higher in 2020 than in the same period in 2019 (99 vs. 89, or an increase
173 of 11.2%). Such an increase could be largely attributed to the accumulation of cases when
174 all the non-emergency visits were suspended during the lockdown between January and
175 February 2020. The two groups of different years were matched by all clinical

176 characteristics except the incidence of anxiety.

177 Table 1. Comparison of initial clinical characteristics of patients between 2020 and 2019


	March-April 2020	March-April 2019	<i>p</i> value
Sex (M:F)	43:56	43:46	.502
Age (year old, M ± SD)	50.8 ± 15.1	52.6 ± 14.7	.487
Educational background			.812
Bachelor and superior	54	47	
Inferior to bachelor	45	42	
Duration (month)	25 ± 53.6	31.3 ± 50.4	.108
Site			.177
Bilateral	36	41	
Unilateral	63	48	
Anxiety involved/total#	74/99 (74%)	53/89 (59%)	.026
Risk factors			
Sensorineural hearing loss	69	65	.614
Noise exposure	1	0	1
Hypertension	3	6	.179
Hyperthyroidism	1	0	1
Head/neck trauma	1	0	1

178 Chi-square test was used for the between-group comparison, sex, educational
 179 background, site, anxiety and the risk factor of sensorineural hearing loss using, t-test on
 180 age, Mann-Whitney Rank Sum Test on Duration, Fisher's exact test on the risk factors of
 181 noise exposure, hypertension, hyperthyroidism and head/neck trauma.
 182

183 **The increase in Anxiety in 2020 and its impact on THI and MML**

184 In the 2020 group, 74 out of 99 (or 74.7%) subjects had an SAS higher than 45 (the
 185 criterion for anxiety), which was significantly higher than that in the 2019 group (53/89,
 186 or 59%, $\chi^2 = 4.938$, $p = 0.026$). Overall, the SAS score in 2020 group was significantly
 187 higher than that of 2019 group (61.9 ± 11.9 in 2020 versus 49.1 ± 8.6 in 2019; $U = 6867$
 188 via Mann-Whitney Rank Sum Test, $p < 0.001$, Figure 2A), which was fully due to the
 189 difference in the anxiety subgroups (68.0 ± 6.4 in 2020 vs. 54 ± 8 in 2019; $U = 3550$ via
 190 Mann-Whitney Rank Sum Test, $p < 0.001$, Figure 2A). Therefore, the higher SAS in 2020

191 was not simply due to the higher incidence of subjects with anxiety, but also the higher
192 level of anxiety in the involved subjects.



194 **Figure 2. Comparisons of initial SAS, THI scores and MML between years and subjects with and**
195 **without anxiety.** A: SAS showing a significant difference between years and between the subgroups within
196 the two years. B and D: The differences in THI and MML as the result of the two main factors—year and
197 anxiety. C and E: *Post-hoc* comparison on THI and MML showing the difference within the factors of year
198 and anxiety respectively. Within 2020, subjects with anxiety appeared to have a significantly higher THI
199 and MML; no difference was seen in THI between anxiety and non-anxiety subgroups within 2019, while a
200 higher MML was seen in non-anxiety subgroup within 2019. THI: tinnitus handicap inventory, SAS:
201 Zung’s Self-Rating Anxiety Sale, MML: minimum masking levels.

202 The THI score in the 2020 group was 40.1 ± 6.9 , which was significantly higher than
203 that in the 2019 group (34 ± 8.3) as shown by the group effect in a two-way ANOVA
204 against year group and anxiety ($F_{1,184} = 16.278$, $p < 0.001$). The ANOVA also
205 demonstrated a significant effect of anxiety: 38.8 ± 8.6 for subjects with anxiety and
206 33.8 ± 7.5 for those without ($F_{1,184} = 11.628$, $p < 0.001$, Figure 2B). However, there was
207 not a significant interaction between two factors ($F_{1,184} = 2.3$, $p = 0.131$). *Post-hoc*
208 pairwise comparisons showed that the THI score of anxiety subgroup in 2020 was
209 41.7 ± 7.7 , which was significantly higher than the corresponding subgroup in 2019
210 (34.8 ± 8.1 ; $q = 6.904$, $p < 0.001$), and that of non-anxiety subgroup in 2020 (35.6 ± 5 ;
211 $q = 4.766$, $p < 0.001$, Figure 2C). Interestingly, the THI of non-anxiety subgroup in 2020
212 was (almost) same as that of the anxiety subgroup in 2019. However, there was no
213 significant difference in THI score across the non-anxiety subgroups between years
214 (Figure 2C).

215 The between-year difference in THI was further analyzed using a breakdown of the
216 scores in the emotional, functional, and catastrophic questionnaire sections. A significant
217 between-year difference was demonstrated in the emotional score (14.636 ± 3.7 in 2020

218 and 12.3 ± 3.3 in 2019; the Mann–Whitney rank-sum test, $U = 5942.5$, $p < 0.001$), in the
219 functional score (18.515 ± 3.6 in 2020 and 15.5 ± 4.2 in 2019, $U = 5211.5$, $p < 0.001$) and
220 in the catastrophic scores (7.0 ± 2.5 vs. 6.1 ± 2.6 , $U = 5173$, $p = 0.035$). This result
221 suggests that the higher THI in 2020 could be partially related to the increase in anxiety.

222 A two-way ANOVA similar to that for THI showed a significant year effect with
223 subjects in 2020 had significantly lower MMLs (8.3 ± 3.5 dB SL) as compared to those in
224 the 2019 group (10.4 ± 4.3 dB SL; $F_{1,184} = 21.745$, $p < 0.001$). However, the effect of
225 anxiety was not significant ($F_{1,184} = 0$, $p = 0.977$; Figure 2D). The higher MML in 2019
226 could be largely attributed to the high MML in the non-anxiety subgroup this year as
227 demonstrated by the *Post-hoc* pairwise test, which showed that the non-anxiety
228 subgroups had a higher MML (11.7 ± 4.1 dB SL) in 2019 than the patients with anxiety in
229 2019 (9.5 ± 4.3 dB SL, $q = 3.627$, $p < 0.001$, Figure 2E). Within 2020, however, the
230 anxiety subgroup had an MML of 8.9 ± 3.7 dB SL, which was slightly but significantly
231 higher than the non- anxiety subgroup this year (6.7 ± 2.0 dB SL, $q = 3.441$, $p = 0.015$;
232 Figure 2E). The result suggests that there is no clear indication whether anxiety played a
233 role in the loudness of tinnitus.

234 Pearson correlation was conducted between SAS and THI and MML respectively in
235 each year. In 2020, a weak positive correlation was seen between SAS and catastrophic
236 THI ($r = 0.319$, $p = 0.001$), but not to another two subscales of THI. In this year there is
237 also a moderate correlation between SAS and MML ($r = 0.337$, $p < 0.001$). In 2019,
238 however, the significant correlation was seen in any pair of measurement ($p > 0.05$).

239 **Anxiety and Treatment Outcomes**

240 The 94 patients in the 2020 group completed their face-to-face follow-up 2 months

241 after the first assessment, while this number was 85 in the 2019 group (Figure 1). The
 242 numbers of patients who received ST with EC (STEC), hearing aids with EC (HAEC), or
 243 EC alone were 38, 14, and 42, respectively in the 2020 group, while the respective
 244 numbers were 58, 10, and 17 in the 2019 group. Due to the small sample sizes in patients
 245 receiving hearing aids in 2020, we only analyzed the treatment outcomes of STEC and
 246 EC alone. No between-year differences were seen in basic demographic features, risk
 247 factors and duration of tinnitus between the years in subjects treated with STEC (Table 2)
 248 and EC alone (Table 3). The incidence of anxiety in the patients receiving STEC was
 249 higher in the 2020 group (Table 2), but not such year difference was seen in patients
 250 received EC alone (Table 3).

251 Table 2. Between-year match in the demographic and selected clinic features in tinnitus
 252 patients treated with STEC

	May-June 2020	May-June 2019	p-value
Sex (M:F)	16:22	30:28	.356
Age (year old, mean \pm standard deviation)	48.2 \pm 15.7	50.2 \pm 14.1	.629
Educational background			.507
Bachelor and superior	21	36	
Inferior to bachelor	17	22	
Duration of tinnitus (month)	25.5 \pm 43.7	31.8 \pm 54.3	.428
Site			.454
Bilateral	18	32	
Unilateral	20	26	
Anxiety involved/total #	29/38 (76%)	32/58 (55%)	.035
Risk factors			
Sensorineural hearing loss	24	40	.555
Noise exposure	0	0	\
Hypertension	1	6	.396
Hyperthyroidism	0	0	\
Head/neck trauma	0	0	\

253 Chi-square test was used for the between-group comparisons on sex, educational
 254 background, site, anxiety and the risk factor of sensorineural hearing loss using, t-test on
 255 age and duration, Fisher's exact test on the risk factors hypertension.

256
 257 Table 3. Between-year match in the demographic and selected clinic features in tinnitus
 258 patients treated with EC alone

	May-June 2020	May-June 2019	p-value
Sex (M:F)	19:23	5:12	.262
Age (year old, mean \pm standard deviation)	49.3 \pm 15.3	56.4 \pm 12.9	.097
Educational background			.149
Bachelor and superior	21	5	
Inferior to bachelor	21	12	
Duration of tinnitus (month)	20.6 \pm 33.4	27.5 \pm 45.7	.66
Site			.222
Bilateral	15	9	
Unilateral	27	8	
Anxiety involved/total #	29/42 (69%)	13/17 (76%)	.753
Risk factors			
Sensorineural hearing loss	27	11	.976
Noise exposure	0	0	\
Hypertension	1	0	1
Hyperthyroidism	0	0	\
Head/neck trauma	0	0	\

259 Chi-square test was used for the between-group comparisons on sex, educational
 260 background, site and the risk factor of sensorineural hearing loss, t-test on age and
 261 tinnitus duration, Fisher's exact test on anxiety and the risk factors of hypertension.
 262

263 ***The effect of treatment on SAS***

264 Figure 3 summarized the effect of the two treatments on SAS. In consistency with
 265 the data of whole sample (Figure 2A), the pre-treatment SAS was much higher in 2020
 266 than in 2019 for the subjects treated with both STEC (Mann-Whitney Rank Sum Test, U
 267 = 411, $p < 0.001$, Figure 3A) and EC alone ($U = 460.5$, $p = 0.031$, Figure 3C). However,
 268 the effect of EC alone on SAS appeared to be qualitatively different from that of STEC in
 269 that the SAS was not decreased (improved) but increased in 2020 group after the
 270 treatment (Figure 3C), so that the post-treatment SAS in the 2020 group (63 ± 11) was
 271 even significantly higher than the before-treatment SAS in the 2019 group (52.9 ± 10 ,
 272 Mann-Whitney rank-sum test, $U = 527$, $p < 0.004$). This raised the question whether and
 273 how the number of subjects qualified as having anxiety changed after each treatment.
 274 Such changes were summarized in Table 4. In 2019, a large portion of subjects who had
 275 anxiety changed to non-anxiety status after either of the two treatments. In 2020, however,


276 the number of cases with anxiety was increased, slightly after STEC, but largely after EC
 277 alone. In each method, there was a significant difference between years in the % change
 278 of cases with anxiety.

279 Table 4. Changes of cases with anxiety after the treatments of STEC and EC alone.

		total cases	initial anxiety	# to non- anxiety	# to anxiety	final anxiety	Change %	<i>p</i> pre- post treatment	<i>p</i> between year within method	<i>p</i> between method within year
STEC	2020	38	29	1	3	31	6.89% #	.574	.001	.488*
	2019	58	32	17	0	15	-53.10%	.001		.638
EC alone	2020	42	29	0	7	36	24.1% #	.068	< .001 *	\
	2019	17	13	6	0	7	-46.2%	.037		\

280 #: a positive change means an increase in cases with anxiety, *: the *p* values were the
 281 results of Fisher's Exact Test, other cells using Chi-square tests.

282 The SAS was significantly reduced in both years after the STEC treatment (Mann-
 283 Whitney Rank Sum Test, $p < 0.001$). However, due to the large initial difference, the
 284 post-treatment SAS score in the 2020 group (58.0 ± 10.6) was still significantly higher
 285 than the pre-treatment SAS in the 2019 group (48.3 ± 8.5 , Mann-Whitney rank-sum test,
 286 $U = 534$, $p < 0.001$). These results suggest that the anxiety associated with COVID-19
 287 was not been fully counteracted by the treatment.



288

289 **Figure 3. The SAS difference before and after the treatment of STEC (upper panels) and EC alone**
 290 **(the lower panels).** A and C: The pre- and post-SAS. B and D: the pre-post difference of SAS score. STEC
 291 treatment reduced SAS in both years (A). However, EC alone did not improve SAS in 2020, instead the
 292 SAS was increased significantly in the 2nd assessment (C). Correspondingly, STEC produced a slightly
 293 better improvement in SAS in 2019 than in 2020, but improvement by EC alone was much better in 2019
 294 than in 2020, in which SAS was deteriorated. The number of symbols (*, \$ or #) represents the level of
 295 significance, with 1, 2 or 3 symbols for $p < 0.05$, 0.01, or 0.001 respectively. STEC: sound therapy +
 296 educational counseling, EC: educational counseling.


297 To further evaluate the effect of STEC on anxiety, a two-way ANOVA was

298 performed on the pre-post SAS difference against the factor of year group and anxiety
299 (Figure 3B). A significant year difference was seen since the SAS improvement appeared
300 to be slightly but significantly smaller in 2020 (5.0 ± 8.6) than in 2019 (6.1 ± 3.8 ,
301 $F_{1, 92} = 6.046$, $p = 0.016$). Combined with the higher initial SAS in 2020, this implies that
302 the higher initial anxiety in 2020 may have made the treatment less effective in reducing
303 anxiety. However, this assumption is conflicted with the fact that the subjects with
304 anxiety gained more reduction in SAS after STEC (6.6 ± 6.2 in the subjects with anxiety
305 vs. 4.0 ± 5.9 in the non-anxiety subjects; effect of anxiety: $F_{1, 92} = 10.447$, $p = 0.002$).
306 Furthermore, the *post-hoc* test within 2020 revealed a larger SAS reduction (7.0 ± 8.0) in
307 the anxiety subgroup this year than the non-anxiety subgroup in which the SAS was
308 increased (negative improvement: -1.5 ± 7.2 , *post-hoc* test within 2020, Tukey method; q
309 = 5.364, $p < 0.001$). This result was in sharp contrast with the null difference in the SAS
310 improvement between the anxiety subgroup (6.6 ± 6.2) and the non-anxiety subgroup
311 (6.0 ± 3.5) in 2019 (Figure 3B).

312 A two-way ANOVA similar to the STEC was done for EC alone and showed a
313 significant effect of year group: the pre-post difference in SAS in 2020 was negative (-3.4
314 ± 4.6 , for an worse SAS) as compared with the large improvement in 2019 (7.1 ± 7.5 ; $F_{1, 55} = 26.022$, $p < 0.001$). Since the initial SAS in the subgroup in 2020 receiving STEC
315 was not significantly different from that in the subgroup receiving EC alone this year (63
316 ± 12 versus 59.5 ± 12.1 ; Mann–Whitney rank-sum test, $U = 640.5$, $p = 0.129$), the
317 deteriorated SAS after EC alone suggests that the subjects in the EC subgroup in 2020
318 had experienced an increased stress after the first assessment, and the stress largely
319 increased anxiety, which was not counteracted by the EC alone treatment. A significant
320

321 effect of anxiety was also seen in subjects treated with EC alone: the SAS change after
322 EC was 1 ± 7.4 in patients with anxiety before EC and -4 ± 6 in those without ($F_{1,55} =$
323 11.038 , $p = 0.002$). There was no significant interaction between the two factors ($F_{1,55} =$
324 2.773 , $p = 0.102$). The large deterioration in SAS in the non-anxiety subjects received EC
325 is obviously due to such change in 2020 in which the SAS changes in the non-anxiety
326 subjects was -5.4 ± 5.7 , although this value was not significantly different from the
327 change in non-anxiety subgroup in 2019 (0.5 ± 4.9 ; *post-hoc* test, $q = 2.813$, $p = 0.052$;
328 Figure 3D). In both years, SAS improvement was smaller in the non-anxiety subgroups,
329 and in 2020, SAS was deteriorated, instead of improved, in both anxiety and non-anxiety
330 subgroups. In 2019, the SAS improvement in the anxiety subgroup 9.1 ± 7.1 , which was
331 significantly higher than the non-anxiety subgroup (0.5 ± 4.9) (*post hoc* test, via Tukey
332 Method, $q = 4.084$, $p = 0.006$). In 2020, the SAS change in the anxiety subgroup was -
333 2.5 ± 3.8 , and that in the non-anxiety subgroup was -5.4 ± 5.7 . However, the difference
334 was not significant (post hoc test, Tukey method, $q = 2.324$, $p = 0.106$). To further
335 evaluate the impact of anxiety on clinic features of tinnitus, Pearson product moment
336 correlation was calculated between the initial SAS score and the changes after the
337 treatment. There was a moderate, positive, linear relationship between the initial SAS
338 score and the change in patients receiving STEC in 2020 ($r = 0.511$, $p = 0.001$), but no
339 significant correlation was found in 2019 (Figure 4A). In addition, a moderate and
340 positive linear relationship was also seen between the initial SAS score and the change in
341 patients receiving EC alone in 2020 ($r = 0.413$, $p = 0.006$; Figure 4B) but not in 2019 ($r =$
342 0.488 , $p = 0.071$). These results suggest that the treatment was more effective for
343 mitigating anxiety in subjects with higher SAS scores in 2020, which was associated with

344 the COVID-19 pandemic.



345

346 **Figure 4. Correlations between the initial SAS score and the improvement in SAS score.** A: The
 347 correlation of STEC by year. B: The correlation of EC alone by year. Significant, moderate correlations
 348 were seen in STEC group and EC alone groups in 2020 in which the average initial SAS scores were much
 349 higher. SAS: Zung’s Self-rating Anxiety Scale, ST: sound therapy, EC: educational counseling


350 ***The effect of treatments on THI and MML***

351 The effect of the treatments was first examined by self-reported improvement
 352 (reduction) of tinnitus loudness. As expected, the case number and rate reporting an
 353 improvement were higher in subjects treated with STEC than in those with EC alone in
 354 both years. More importantly, the case number with improvement was significantly lower
 355 in 2020 group than in 2019 in subjects treated with both methods (Table 5). However,
 356 there were no significant differences in the case rate reporting an improvement between
 357 subjects with and without anxiety (data not shown).

358 Table 5. Self-reported improvement of tinnitus loudness in the Follow-ups of treatment
 359 groups between years

	STEC group	EC alone group	p between methods
2020	27/38 (71%)	8/42 (19%)	< 0.001*
2019	51/58 (88%)	9/17 (53%)	0.004**
p between year	.038*	.024**	

360 *: chi-square test, **: Fisher’s Exact Test



361


362 **Figure 5. The difference in THI before and after the treatment of STEC (upper panels) and EC alone**
 363 **(the lower panels).** A and C: The pre- and post-THI scores. B and D: the pre-post difference of THI score.
 364 STEC resulted in a significant THI reduction in both years (A), but there was no significant difference in
 365 the amount of reduction between years and between subjects with and without anxiety (B). EC alone
 366 reduced THI in 2019, but opposite in 2020 (C and D). The THI got deteriorated in 2020 and worse than
 367 2019 in both subgroups with and without anxiety (D). Therefore, within subjects with or without anxiety,
 368 the treatment resulted in a better THI in year 2019. STEC: sound therapy + educational counseling, EC:
 369 educational counseling.

370 STEC significantly reduced the THI scores in both 2020 group from 40.7 ± 6.7 to
 371 37.7 ± 8.0 (via paired t-tests, $t_{0.05/37} = 3.253$, $p = 0.002$) and 2019 group from 32.7 ± 8.3

372 to 28.7 ± 7.6 (via Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, $W = -1590$, $p < 0.001$) as shown in Figure
373 5A. Figure 5B summarized the result of a two-way ANOVA on the improvement of THI
374 (the pre-THI minus post-THI) by STEC against the factor of year group and anxiety.
375 There was no significant effect for both factors (year effect: $F_{1, 92} = 2.104$, $p = 0.15$;
376 anxiety effect: $F_{1, 92} = 0.09$, $p = 0.759$).


377 Surprisingly, the THI scores in 2020 rose from 39.8 ± 8.9 to 42.1 ± 9.1 after EC
378 alone treatment (Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, $W = 426$, $p < 0.001$), while an
379 improvement was seen in 2019 from 35.7 ± 5.2 to 30.2 ± 6.3 (Wilcoxon Signed Rank
380 Test, $W = -153$, $p < 0.001$, Figure 5C). Therefore, the change in THI by EC alone was -
381 2.2 ± 2.9 in 2020, but 5.4 ± 6.9 in 2019, as shown by the significant year effect in the
382 two-way ANOVA ($F_{1, 55} = 25.73$, $p < 0.001$). In this ANOVA, the effect of anxiety was
383 not significant (Figure 5D). Correspondingly, the between-year difference in THI
384 improvement was larger in anxiety subjects than non-anxiety ones (*post hoc* tests, $q =$
385 7.323 , $p < 0.001$ in anxiety between year and $q = 4.031$ $p = 0.006$ in non-anxiety between
386 year).

387 Correlation analysis showed a moderate and positive linear relationship between the
388 improvements of THI in the emotional subscale and the SAS improvement in the subjects
389 treated with STEC in both 2020 ($r = 0.506$, $p = 0.001$) and 2019 ($r = 0.623$, $p < 0.001$;
390 Figure 6A). In subjects treated with EC alone, significant correlation was seen only in
391 2019 group ($r = 0.536$, $p < 0.026$) but not in 2020 group (Figure 6B).



392

393 **Figure 6. Correlations between the improvements of emotional section in THI and SAS in 2020 and**
394 **2019.** A: The correlation in ST-EC group. B: The correlation in EC alone group. Significant, moderate
395 correlations were seen in ST with EC group in both years and EC alone groups in 2019. SAS: Zung's Self-
396 rating Anxiety Scale, ST: sound therapy, EC: educational counseling.



397

398 **Figure 7. The changes in MML between the two assessments before and after the treatment of STEC**
 399 **(upper panels) and EC alone (the lower panels).** A and C: The pre- and post-MML. B and D: the pre-post
 400 difference of MML. The MML got deteriorated in 2020 and worse than 2019 in the subgroup with anxiety
 401 (D). Significance: ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$ in ANOVA. STEC: sound therapy + educational counseling,
 402 EC: educational counseling.

403 MML was reduced by STEC in 2020 group (from 9 ± 4.4 dB SL to 7.3 ± 4.2 dB SL;
 404 Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, $W = -391$, $p = 0.003$) and 2019 group (from
 405 10.0 ± 3.8 dB SL to 7.9 ± 3.8 dB SL; $W = -1525$, $p < 0.001$; Figure 7A). The
 406 improvement (2.1 ± 1.7 dB) was slightly higher in 2019 than in 2020 (1.6 ± 2.7 dB), but

407 the difference was not statistically significant as shown by the main effect of year in a
 408 two-way ANOVA ($F_{1, 92} = 1.513$, $p = 0.222$, Figure 7B). Neither a significant effect of
 409 anxiety was seen in this ANOVA ($F_{1, 92} = 0.006$, $p = 0.935$).

410 Like THI, EC alone treatment in 2020 did not reduced MML, but increased it from
 411 10.9 ± 4.9 dB SL to 12.4 ± 5.8 dB SL (Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, $W = 172$, $p = 0.003$),
 412 yielding an increase of 1.5 ± 3.1 (Figure 7D). This was opposite to the decrease in MML
 413 from 12.4 ± 4.9 dB SL to 10.3 ± 4.7 in 2019 (Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, $W = -91$, $p <$
 414 0.001 ; Figure 7C). Correspondingly, a significant year effect was seen in a two-way
 415 ANOVA ($F_{1, 55} = 10.036$, $p = 0.003$), which did not show a significant effect of anxiety
 416 ($F_{1, 55} = 1.944$, $p = 0.169$). However, the year difference was mainly due to the between-
 417 year difference in the anxiety subjects in the *post-hoc* test (Tukey method, $q = 5.24$, $p <$
 418 0.001), since no significant difference was seen in non-anxiety subjects between years (q
 419 $= 2.129$, $p > 0.05$, Figure 7D). Moreover, correlation analyses did not show any
 420 significant correlation between initial SAS and the change of MML after both treatment
 421 in each of the two years. Those results suggest that high anxiety in 2020 made EC alone
 422 treatment ineffective in mitigating loudness of tinnitus. The overall correlations between
 423 SAS improvements and THI (with subscale THI), MML improvements by two treatment
 424 methods in two years were seen in Table 6.

425 Table 6. Correlation between SAS improvements and those in THI and MML

Target	r	p-value	r	p-value
	(A) STEC in 2020		(B) STEC in 2019	
THI Total	0.459	0.003	0.193	0.146
THI Functional	0.17	0.307	-0.379	0.003
THI Emotional	0.506	0.001	0.623	< 0.001
THI Catastrophic	0.313	0.055	0.149	0.265
MML	0.134	0.424	0.143	0.286
	(C) EC in 2020		(D) EC in 2019	
THI Total	0.3	0.053	-0.008	0.975
THI Functional	0.313	0.04	-0.347	0.172

THI Emotional	0.07	0.629	0.536	0.026
THI Catastrophic	0.112	0.481	-0.04	0.856
MML	0.117	0.461	0.222	0.392

426 **r: Person correlation coefficient**

427

428 **Discussion**

429 Several interesting findings were seen in this retrospective study. (1) We
430 demonstrated a significantly increased anxiety in the tinnitus subjects seen in 2020 in
431 terms of the incidence of subjects with anxiety (Table 1) and the averaged SAS (Figure
432 2A). Based upon the significant between-year difference, this increase in anxiety is
433 clearly associated with COVID-19 pandemic. (2) The high SAS was associated with a
434 high THI score, especially in the emotional subscale in 2020 as compared with the values
435 of 2019 (Figure 2B and 2C), suggesting that the increased psychological stress in 2020
436 does enhance tinnitus. (3) However, the increased anxiety was not clearly linked to
437 measure of tinnitus loudness by MML (Figure 2D and 2E). (4) Overall, the treatments of
438 both STEC and EC alone were less effective in 2020 in anxiety reduction (Table 4 and
439 Figure 3B and 3D) and in the self-reported mitigation of tinnitus (Table 5). In fact, the
440 anxiety was even worse after the treatment in 2020, especially in those who received EC
441 alone. This suggested that an increased stress was experienced by the subjects in 2020
442 group after the first assessment, which could not be counteracted by the therapy. (5)
443 There was no significant difference between years for the reduction of tinnitus severity as
444 measured by THI and MML by STEC (Figure 4B and 5B). (6) However, the treatment of
445 EC alone was much less effective in reducing THI and MML, and in 2020 it resulted in a
446 deterioration increase in anxiety (Table 4, Figures 3D, 4D), THI (Figure 5D) and in MML
447 (Figure 7D). Since EC alone did show benefit in 2019, the deterioration in 2020 suggests
448 that the anxiety in 2020 largely enhanced tinnitus, and made it difficult to be managed.

449 There is no doubt that a significant psychological stress was developed because of
450 the COVID-19 pandemic. Many recently published articles have revealed the high

451 prevalence of anxiety across China during the COVID-19 pandemic, from 28.8% to 35.1%
452 (Huang et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020a), as compared to the previously reported
453 prevalence of 5.6% and 7.6% for the years of 2009 and 2019, respectively (Huang et al.,
454 2019; Phillips et al., 2009). A cross-sectional survey, using the same anxiety
455 questionnaire as adapted in the present study, reported an average SAS score of
456 45.89 ± 1.1 among front-line clinical staff during the pandemic (Wu et al., 2020). This
457 value was located between the scores for our subjects with and without anxiety
458 (68.0 ± 6.0 vs. 43.9 ± 1.5), and lower than the average for all subjects in the 2020 group
459 (61.9 ± 11.9). This implies that our tinnitus patients seen in 2020 have experienced
460 extremely high psychological pressure, even higher than those medical doctors who were
461 in the most challenging job during the pandemic. The number of tinnitus subjects seen in
462 the 6-week period in 2020 was higher than that last year. However, this increase may be
463 largely attributable to the accumulation of patients during the hospital closure in the
464 national lockdown.

465 The association between tinnitus and anxiety has been investigated in many previous
466 studies and has been well reviewed (Durai et al., 2016; Malouff et al., 2011; Mazurek et
467 al., 2019; Pattyn et al., 2016; Wallhausser-Franke et al., 2012; Ziai et al., 2017; Zirke et
468 al., 2013). However, no information is available on the direction and causality between
469 the two ends of the link (Danioth et al., 2020; Lugo et al., 2020; Mazurek et al., 2019;
470 Park et al., 2019b; Wallhausser-Franke et al., 2012), although many studies have implied
471 that psychological states, such as those related to common stressors, influence perception
472 of, or coping with tinnitus (Lazarus, 1993; Lazarus, 2000). In this regard, two related
473 systems are involved in tinnitus: (1) the brain regions along the hypothalamic–pituitary–

474 adrenal axis (see reviews (Mazurek et al., 2019; Ziai et al., 2017)), which is the main
475 neuroendocrine system involved in stress response, and (2) the limbic system including
476 the hippocampus and amygdala, which regulates the perception of tinnitus and the
477 adaptation (thereby, the ability to cope with stress) (Chen et al., 2017; Kapolowicz et al.,
478 2019; Leaver et al., 2016; Lockwood et al., 1998; Raghavan et al., 2016; Zhang et al.,
479 2015). While the data from the previous studies have indicated the possible role of
480 emotional factors in tinnitus via those systems, the relationship was mostly investigated
481 in animal models, or in cross-sectional comparisons across subjects with different levels
482 of tinnitus and those without, with focus on establishing the connection, rather than on
483 the directional nature of the link.

484 The COVID-19 pandemic provides a good opportunity to investigate whether stress
485 or anxiety could enhance tinnitus as a causative or promotive factor, by clearing some
486 clouds. For example, in many of the previous studies, the effect of anxiety on tinnitus
487 were evaluated in a special population, such as those in veterans (Hu et al., 2015), in
488 elderly (Danioth et al., 2020), in those with headache (Lugo et al., 2020), and those with
489 sleeping disorders (Xu et al., 2016a). In other extreme, the link was investigated in cross-
490 sectional studies in which the anxiety cases of different causes was included (Park et al.,
491 2019a). Moreover, the anxiety has been evaluated with many different methods, including
492 Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (McKenna et al., 2017), Beck Anxiety Index
493 (Mahboubi et al., 2017), as well as SAS (Xu et al., 2016b). All those variations make it
494 difficult to generalize a finding, if reported, for the directional nature of the link between
495 anxiety and tinnitus. Although large variation existed across different individuals in
496 relationship to their jobs and financial situations, as well as their closeness to COVID-19

497 patients, the stress factor associated with this study was much more homogeneous than
498 those that had been examined in previous studies. Moreover, it has been shared by
499 general population rather than impacting on small groups. In addition, the same
500 methodologies were used over the two years, which ensured a valid comparison for
501 verifying the impact of anxiety associated with COVID-10. We therefore think that the
502 between-year differences in the tinnitus clinic afforded a good chance to verify whether
503 anxiety plays a causative or promotive role for tinnitus.

504 In the present study, at least three lines of evidence pinpointed the
505 causative/promotive role of anxiety on tinnitus. Firstly, the high anxiety (in both the case%
506 and SAS) was associated with the higher THI in all three subscales in 2020. Secondly, the
507 high anxiety reduced the effectiveness of the tinnitus treatment in 2020 as compared with
508 2019 result, in the change of SAS (Figure 3B and 3D), the case% of subjects with anxiety
509 (Table 4), self-reported improvement in tinnitus loudness (Table 5) and THI (Figure 4D).
510 The results in Table 4 indicate a sharp contrast in the changes of cases with anxiety after
511 the treatments between years: an increase of 6.89% by STEC in 2020 versus a decrease of
512 53.1% in 2019, an increase of 24.1% by EC alone in 2020 versus a decline of 46.2% in
513 2019. The between-year differences indicates that the higher-level stress in 2020 affected
514 the efficacy of the two treatments in mitigating anxiety. Furthermore, the self-reported
515 improvement in tinnitus loudness (Table 5) was also significantly less in 2020 in both
516 treatments. Thirdly, the promoting/enhancing effect of anxiety on tinnitus was indicated
517 by the significant difference in the treatment effectiveness between STEC and EC alone.
518 To evaluate the full impact of the stress on tinnitus, an untreated control group would be
519 ideally used. Unfortunately, we do not have such control. However, the EC alone

520 treatment was given for only one time of 30-60 minutes session over the whole 2 months.
521 This was not a comprehensive therapy by any means. Therefore, the EC subgroup could
522 be used as a virtually no-treatment control, although this method exerted a “better than
523 nothing” effect in 2019. We found a significant increase in SAS in the subjects treated
524 with EC alone in 2020, while a reduction in SAS in the STEC subgroup. Since the initial
525 SAS was not different between the subjects treated with the different methods, this
526 difference suggests that there was an increased or accumulated anxiety during the two
527 months after the first assessment in 2020, which could not be counteracted by EC alone
528 treatment. There were no significant between-year differences in the change of THI and
529 MML by STEC. However, the THI and MML got worse in 2020 EC alone subgroup in
530 association with a large increase in SAS, while the same treatment somehow improved
531 both THI and MML in 2019. These results suggest that the increased stress, if not treated
532 effectively, have significantly enhanced the tinnitus in 2020.

533 EC is a psychological treatment that was often recommended in combination with
534 other treatments, like sound therapy or hearing aid fitting (Brennan-Jones et al., 2020;
535 Jastreboff et al., 2000). However, different effectiveness of EC alone was also reported in
536 some studies. For instance, an early study reported a successful ratio of 18% in tinnitus
537 release (Jastreboff et al., 1996); while another study reported a significant THI reduction
538 from 46.11 ± 22.74 to 31.94 ± 20.41 (Liu et al., 2018). In the present study, the THI was
539 reduced by 5.4 ± 6.9 after EC alone treatment in 2019. This result demonstrates the
540 effectiveness of our EC treatment, while the quantitative difference between our data and
541 others may reflect the detail difference in EC procedures and other factors such as subject
542 variables. Anyway, the EC alone treatment reduced SAS (Figure 3D), THI (Figure 5D)

543 and MML (Figure 7D) in 2019. However, the change of SAS, THI and MML occurred in
544 the opposite direction after the EC in 2020. The between-year difference validates the use
545 of EC alone as a virtual control because it is obvious that this treatment was not sufficient
546 to counteract the effect of anxiety.

547 **Limitations**

548 There were several limitations to our study. Firstly, this was a retrospective study in
549 which only the SAS was used to evaluate anxiety. This makes it difficult to compare our
550 study with previous ones. Secondly, STEC was compared with EC alone without the use
551 of wait-list control, making it difficult to fully evaluate the impact of anxiety on tinnitus.
552 Thirdly, more patients in 2020 selected EC alone treatment probably due to the financial
553 constraints, which may have produced some bias in comparison with 2019 subgroup. Last
554 but not least, the overall sample size in the present study was small as the data were
555 collected only from one hospital within a limited period. Although the data and
556 conclusion are solid in the present study, further investigation would be helpful to verify
557 the conclusion with a larger sample.

558 Currently, the link between anxiety and tinnitus was more evaluated in the direction
559 of how tinnitus, as a stressor, can interact with (pre-existing) psychological disorders and
560 change the subjects responses to them (Kroner-Herwig et al., 2006), but was not
561 emphasized on the direction whether other stressors would enhance tinnitus. This has
562 been reflected in evaluation tools. For example, the THI questions for the emotional
563 subscale (e.g., Question 22: Does your tinnitus make you feel anxious) obviously ask the
564 impact of tinnitus on emotion, but there is no question asking whether a stressor changes
565 the severity of tinnitus (Newman et al., 2008). This bias appears to be a limitation for

566 investigating the causative role of anxiety or stressor on tinnitus, and is likely one of the
567 reasons why there was only a weak correlation between the large increase in SAS in 2020
568 and the THI in the initial assessment. In future investigation, THI questionnaire should be
569 revised accordingly.

570 **Conclusion**

571 A substantial increase in anxiety was seen in tinnitus subjects in 2020 in association
572 with COVID-19 pandemic and was evident as a promoting factor to tinnitus. The increase
573 in SAS was associated with a smaller increase of THI in 2020, but not by the difference
574 in MML. However, the difference in treatment effect between STEC and EC alone
575 suggested that, the tinnitus severity was increased (in both THI and MML) when it was
576 not comprehensively treated (such as by EC alone). Therefore, the present study provided
577 clear evidence for the promoting effect of anxiety on tinnitus.

578

579 **Acknowledgement**

580 The authors acknowledge the colleagues for participating in this study. We are deeply
581 indebted to the families who participated in the study.

582 **Disclosure Statement**

583 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interests.

584

585 **References**

- 586 Arif, M., Sadlier, M., Rajenderkumar, D., James, J., Tahir, T. 2017. A randomised controlled study of
587 mindfulness meditation versus relaxation therapy in the management of tinnitus. *J Laryngol Otol*
588 131, 501-507.
- 589 Baguley, D., McFerran, D., Hall, D. 2013. Tinnitus. *Lancet* 382, 1600-7.
- 590 Bartels, H., Middel, B., Pedersen, S.S., Staal, M.J., Albers, F.W. 2010a. The distressed (Type D) personality is
591 independently associated with tinnitus: a case-control study. *Psychosomatics* 51, 29-38.
- 592 Bartels, H., Pedersen, S.S., van der Laan, B.F., Staal, M.J., Albers, F.W., Middel, B. 2010b. The impact of Type
593 D personality on health-related quality of life in tinnitus patients is mainly mediated by anxiety
594 and depression. *Otol Neurotol* 31, 11-8.
- 595 Bauer, C.A. 2018. Tinnitus. *N Engl J Med* 378, 1224-1231.
- 596 Bedford, J., Enria, D., Giesecke, J., Heymann, D.L., Ihekweazu, C., Kobinger, G., Lane, H.C., Memish, Z., Oh,
597 M.D., Sall, A.A., Schuchat, A., Ungchusak, K., Wieler, L.H. 2020. COVID-19: towards controlling of a
598 pandemic. *Lancet* 395, 1015-1018.
- 599 Brennan-Jones, C.G., Thomas, A., Hoare, D.J., Sereda, M. 2020. Cochrane corner: Sound therapy (using
600 amplification devices and/or sound generators) for tinnitus. *Int J Audiol* 59, 161-165.
- 601 Brooks, S.K., Webster, R.K., Smith, L.E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., Rubin, G.J. 2020. The
602 psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *Lancet*
603 395, 912-920.
- 604 Chen, Y.C., Xia, W., Chen, H., Feng, Y., Xu, J.J., Gu, J.P., Salvi, R., Yin, X. 2017. Tinnitus distress is linked to
605 enhanced resting-state functional connectivity from the limbic system to the auditory cortex.
606 *Hum Brain Mapp* 38, 2384-2397.
- 607 Danioth, L., Brotschi, G., Croy, I., Friedrich, H., Caversaccio, M.D., Negoias, S. 2020. Multisensory
608 environmental sensitivity in patients with chronic tinnitus. *J Psychosom Res* 135, 110155.
- 609 Dunstan, D.A., Scott, N. 2020. Norms for Zung's Self-rating Anxiety Scale. *BMC Psychiatry* 20, 90.
- 610 Durai, M., Searchfield, G. 2016. Anxiety and depression, personality traits relevant to tinnitus: A scoping
611 review. *Int J Audiol* 55, 605-15.
- 612 Gao, L.L., Ip, W.Y., Sun, K. 2011. Validation of the short form of the Chinese Childbirth Self-Efficacy
613 Inventory in Mainland China. *Res Nurs Health* 34, 49-59.
- 614 Hu, J., Xu, J., Streelman, M., Xu, H., Guthrie, O. 2015. The Correlation of the Tinnitus Handicap Inventory
615 with Depression and Anxiety in Veterans with Tinnitus. *Int J Otolaryngol* 2015, 689375.
- 616 Huang, Y., Zhao, N. 2020. Generalized anxiety disorder, depressive symptoms and sleep quality during
617 COVID-19 outbreak in China: a web-based cross-sectional survey. *Psychiatry Res* 288, 112954.
- 618 Huang, Y., Wang, Y., Wang, H., Liu, Z., Yu, X., Yan, J., Yu, Y., Kou, C., Xu, X., Lu, J., Wang, Z., He, S., Xu, Y., He,
619 Y., Li, T., Guo, W., Tian, H., Xu, G., Xu, X., Ma, Y., Wang, L., Wang, L., Yan, Y., Wang, B., Xiao, S.,
620 Zhou, L., Li, L., Tan, L., Zhang, T., Ma, C., Li, Q., Ding, H., Geng, H., Jia, F., Shi, J., Wang, S., Zhang,
621 N., Du, X., Du, X., Wu, Y. 2019. Prevalence of mental disorders in China: a cross-sectional
622 epidemiological study. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 6, 211-224.
- 623 Jastreboff, P.J., Jastreboff, M.M. 2000. Tinnitus Retraining Therapy (TRT) as a method for treatment of
624 tinnitus and hyperacusis patients. *J Am Acad Audiol* 11, 162-77.
- 625 Jastreboff, P.J., Gray, W.C., Gold, S.L. 1996. Neurophysiological approach to tinnitus patients. *Am J Otol* 17,
626 236-40.
- 627 Kam, A.C., Cheung, A.P., Chan, P.Y., Leung, E.K., Wong, T.K., van Hasselt, C.A., Tong, M.C. 2009.
628 Psychometric properties of the Chinese (Cantonese) Tinnitus Handicap Inventory. *Clin Otolaryngol*
629 34, 309-15.
- 630 Kopolowicz, M.R., Thompson, L.T. 2019. Plasticity in Limbic Regions at Early Time Points in Experimental
631 Models of Tinnitus. *Front Syst Neurosci* 13, 88.
- 632 Kroner-Herwig, B., Zachriat, C., Weigand, D. 2006. Do patient characteristics predict outcome in the
633 outpatient treatment of chronic tinnitus? *Psychosoc Med* 3, Doc07.
- 634 Langguth, B. 2015. Treatment of tinnitus. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 23, 361-8.
- 635 Lazarus, R.S. 1993. Coping theory and research: past, present, and future. *Psychosom Med* 55, 234-47.
- 636 Lazarus, R.S. 2000. Toward better research on stress and coping. *Am Psychol* 55, 665-73.

- 637 Leaver, A.M., Seydell-Greenwald, A., Rauschecker, J.P. 2016. Auditory-limbic interactions in chronic
638 tinnitus: Challenges for neuroimaging research. *Hear Res* 334, 49-57.
- 639 Liu, N.N., Tan, J.C., Li, J., Li, S., Cai, Y., Wang, H. 2020. COVID-19 Pandemic: Experiences in China and
640 implications for its prevention and treatment worldwide, *Current cancer drug targets*,
641 2020/04/15 ed.
- 642 Liu, Y.Q., Chen, Z.J., Li, G., Lai, D., Liu, P., Zheng, Y. 2018. Effects of Educational Counseling as Solitary
643 Therapy for Chronic Primary Tinnitus and Related Problems. *Biomed Res Int* 2018, 6032525.
- 644 Lockwood, A.H., Salvi, R.J., Coad, M.L., Towsley, M.L., Wack, D.S., Murphy, B.W. 1998. The functional
645 neuroanatomy of tinnitus: evidence for limbic system links and neural plasticity. *Neurology* 50,
646 114-20.
- 647 Lu, W., Wang, H., Lin, Y., Li, L. 2020. Psychological status of medical workforce during the COVID-19
648 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. *Psychiatry Res* 288, 112936.
- 649 Lugo, A., Edvall, N.K., Lazar, A., Mehraei, G., Lopez-Escamez, J.A., Bulla, J., Uhlen, I., Canlon, B., Gallus, S.,
650 Cederroth, C.R. 2020. Relationship between headaches and tinnitus in a Swedish study. *Sci Rep*
651 10, 8494.
- 652 Mahboubi, H., Haidar, Y.M., Kiumehr, S., Ziai, K., Djalilian, H.R. 2017. Customized Versus Noncustomized
653 Sound Therapy for Treatment of Tinnitus: A Randomized Crossover Clinical Trial. *Ann Otol Rhinol*
654 *Laryngol* 126, 681-687.
- 655 Malouff, J.M., Schutte, N.S., Zucker, L.A. 2011. Tinnitus-related distress: A review of recent findings. *Curr*
656 *Psychiatry Rep* 13, 31-6.
- 657 Mazurek, B., Boecking, B., Brueggemann, P. 2019. Association Between Stress and Tinnitus-New Aspects.
658 *Otol Neurotol* 40, e467-e473.
- 659 McKenna, L., Marks, E.M., Hallsworth, C.A., Schaette, R. 2017. Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy as a
660 Treatment for Chronic Tinnitus: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Psychother Psychosom* 86, 351-
661 361.
- 662 Meng, Z., Zheng, Y., Liu, S., Wang, K., Kong, X., Tao, Y., Xu, K., Liu, G. 2012. Reliability and validity of the
663 chinese (mandarin) tinnitus handicap inventory. *Clin Exp Otorhinolaryngol* 5, 10-6.
- 664 Newman, C.W., Jacobson, G.P., Spitzer, J.B. 1996. Development of the Tinnitus Handicap Inventory. *Arch*
665 *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 122, 143-8.
- 666 Newman, C.W., Sandridge, S.A., Bolek, L. 2008. Development and psychometric adequacy of the screening
667 version of the tinnitus handicap inventory. *Otol Neurotol* 29, 276-81.
- 668 Park, E., Kim, H., Choi, I.H., Han, H.M., Han, K., Jung, H.H., Im, G.J. 2019a. Psychiatric Distress as a Common
669 Risk Factor for Tinnitus and Joint Pain: A National Population-Based Survey. *Clin Exp*
670 *Otorhinolaryngol*.
- 671 Park, E., Kim, H., Choi, I.H., Han, H.M., Han, K., Jung, H.H., Im, G.J. 2019b. Psychiatric Distress as a Common
672 Risk Factor for Tinnitus and Joint Pain: A National Population-Based Survey, *Clin Exp*
673 *Otorhinolaryngol*.
- 674 Pattyn, T., Van Den Eede, F., Vanneste, S., Cassiers, L., Veltman, D.J., Van De Heyning, P., Sabbe, B.C.G.
675 2016. Tinnitus and anxiety disorders: A review. *Hear Res* 333, 255-265.
- 676 Phillips, M.R., Zhang, J., Shi, Q., Song, Z., Ding, Z., Pang, S., Li, X., Zhang, Y., Wang, Z. 2009. Prevalence,
677 treatment, and associated disability of mental disorders in four provinces in China during 2001-
678 05: an epidemiological survey. *Lancet* 373, 2041-53.
- 679 Probst, T., Pryss, R., Langguth, B., Schlee, W. 2016a. Emotional states as mediators between tinnitus
680 loudness and tinnitus distress in daily life: Results from the "TrackYourTinnitus" application. *Sci*
681 *Rep* 6, 20382.
- 682 Probst, T., Pryss, R., Langguth, B., Schlee, W. 2016b. Emotion dynamics and tinnitus: Daily life data from
683 the "TrackYourTinnitus" application. *Sci Rep* 6, 31166.
- 684 Raghavan, P., Steven, A., Rath, T., Gandhi, D. 2016. Advanced Neuroimaging of Tinnitus. *Neuroimaging Clin*
685 *N Am* 26, 301-12.
- 686 Remuzzi, A., Remuzzi, G. 2020. COVID-19 and Italy: what next? *Lancet* 395, 1225-1228.
- 687 Schlee, W., Pryss, R.C., Probst, T., Schobel, J., Bachmeier, A., Reichert, M., Langguth, B. 2016. Measuring
688 the Moment-to-Moment Variability of Tinnitus: The TrackYourTinnitus Smart Phone App. *Front*
689 *Aging Neurosci* 8, 294.

- 690 Trevis, K.J., McLachlan, N.M., Wilson, S.J. 2016a. Psychological mediators of chronic tinnitus: The critical
691 role of depression. *J Affect Disord* 204, 234-40.
- 692 Trevis, K.J., McLachlan, N.M., Wilson, S.J. 2016b. Cognitive Mechanisms in Chronic Tinnitus: Psychological
693 Markers of a Failure to Switch Attention. *Front Psychol* 7, 1262.
- 694 Tyler, R.S. 2014. Mindfulness-Based Therapy: New Study Underscores Tinnitus Treatment Options. *The*
695 *Hearing Journal* 67.
- 696 Wallhausser-Franke, E., Brade, J., Balkenhol, T., D'Amelio, R., Seegmuller, A., Delb, W. 2012. Tinnitus:
697 distinguishing between subjectively perceived loudness and tinnitus-related distress. *PLoS One* 7,
698 e34583.
- 699 Wang, C., Pan, R., Wan, X., Tan, Y., Xu, L., Ho, C.S., Ho, R.C. 2020a. Immediate Psychological Responses and
700 Associated Factors during the Initial Stage of the 2019 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Epidemic
701 among the General Population in China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 17, 1729.
- 702 Wang, G., Zhang, Y., Zhao, J., Zhang, J., Jiang, F. 2020b. Mitigate the effects of home confinement on
703 children during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Lancet* 395, 945-947.
- 704 World Health Organization. 2020. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report – 158 [Online]
705 [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200626-covid-19-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200626-covid-19-sitrep-158.pdf?sfvrsn=1d1aae8a_2)
706 [sitrep-158.pdf?sfvrsn=1d1aae8a_2](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200626-covid-19-sitrep-158.pdf?sfvrsn=1d1aae8a_2).
- 707 World Medical Association. 2018. WMA declaration of Helsinki: Ethical principles for medical research
708 involving human subjects [Online] [https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-](https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/)
709 [helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/](https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/).
- 710 Wu, K., Wei, X. 2020. Analysis of Psychological and Sleep Status and Exercise Rehabilitation of Front-Line
711 Clinical Staff in the Fight Against COVID-19 in China. *Med Sci Monit Basic Res* 26, e924085-
712 e924085.
- 713 Xu, Y., Yao, J., Zhang, Z., Wang, W. 2016a. Association between sleep quality and psychiatric disorders in
714 patients with subjective tinnitus in China. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol* 273, 3063-72.
- 715 Xu, Y., Yao, J., Zhang, Z., Wang, W. 2016b. Association between sleep quality and psychiatric disorders in
716 patients with subjective tinnitus in China. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology* 273,
717 3063-3072.
- 718 Zhang, J., Chen, Y.C., Feng, X., Yang, M., Liu, B., Qian, C., Wang, J., Salvi, R., Teng, G.J. 2015. Impairments of
719 thalamic resting-state functional connectivity in patients with chronic tinnitus. *European journal*
720 *of radiology* 84, 1277-1284.
- 721 Ziai, K., Moshtaghi, O., Mahboubi, H., Djalilian, H.R. 2017. Tinnitus Patients Suffering from Anxiety and
722 Depression: A Review. *Int Tinnitus J* 21, 68-73.
- 723 Zirke, N., Seydel, C., Szczepek, A.J., Olze, H., Haupt, H., Mazurek, B. 2013. Psychological comorbidity in
724 patients with chronic tinnitus: analysis and comparison with chronic pain, asthma or atopic
725 dermatitis patients. *Qual Life Res* 22, 263-72.
- 726 Zung, W.W. 1965. A Self-Rating Depression Scale. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 12, 63-70.
- 727