

1 I'm alone but not lonely. U-shaped pattern of perceived loneliness during the
2 COVID-19 pandemic in the UK and Greece

3 Alessandro Carollo¹, Andrea Bizzego¹, Giulio Gabrieli², Keri Ka-Yee Wong³, Adrian
4 Raine⁴, and Gianluca Esposito^{1,2,5}

5 ¹Department of Psychology and Cognitive Science, University of Trento, Italy

6 ²School of Social Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

7 ³Department of Psychology and Human Development, University College London,
8 London, UK

9 ⁴Departments of Criminology, Psychiatry, and Psychology, University of Pennsylvania

10 ⁵Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

11

12 I'm alone but not lonely. U-shaped pattern of perceived loneliness during the
13 COVID-19 pandemic in the UK and Greece

14 Many countries have adopted lengthy lockdown measures to mitigate the spreading of
15 the COVID-19 virus. In this study, we train a RandomForest model using 10 variables
16 quantifying individuals' living environment, physical and mental health statuses to
17 predict how long each of the UK participants (N=382) had been in lockdown.
18 Self-perceived loneliness was found to be the most important variable predicting time in
19 lockdown and, therefore, the aspect most influenced by the time the participant spent
20 in lockdown. Subsequent statistical analysis showed a significant U-shaped curve for the
21 levels of perceived loneliness ($p < 0.012$), specifically decreasing during the 4th and 5th
22 lockdown weeks. The same pattern was found on data from Greek citizens (N=129,
23 $p < 0.041$). These results suggest that lockdown measures may have affected how people
24 evaluated their social support while in lockdown, leading to a decreased sense of
25 loneliness. Implications of this study should be reflected on policies and
26 countermeasures to current and future pandemics.

27 *machine learning; COVID-19; lockdown; loneliness; global study; mental health*

28 State of relevance

29 This study aims to inform policies for the current and/or future pandemics, particularly
30 those involving lockdown restrictions. It highlights that self-perceived loneliness was the
31 trait most affected by the time spent in lockdown: data show that the very first period
32 of lockdown was characterised by a decrease in levels of perceived loneliness. The
33 machine learning approach adopted and the statistical validation on two different
34 Western European countries ensure that the uncovered pattern is substantial. This
35 result highlights the dissociation between objective social support and perceived
36 loneliness: initially, restrictions may have triggered better social behaviours among
37 communities or increased the level of gratitude for the social support people have
38 always received. The short duration of these desirable effects suggests that measures
39 and campaigns promoting better social support strategies could be potentially effective,
40 even in social isolation, to keep the levels of perceived loneliness low.

Introduction

41
42 The 2019 SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) outbreak was declared as a pandemic by the World
43 Health Organisation (WHO) on 11 March 2020. The number of positive cases
44 worldwide at the time was 179,111 and deaths, 7,426 (Organization, 2020b).

45 Globally, the months that followed saw a surge in the number of deaths and infection
46 rates, which put further strain on the sanitary and economical balance of several
47 countries. Fast forward to September 13th 2020, the total number of confirmed
48 COVID-19 cases at 28,637,952 and 917,417 deaths have since been recorded
49 (Organization, 2020a).

50 Expert concern for the mental health consequences of the current pandemic stems from
51 the evidence that was obtained during smaller epidemics, such as SARS (severe acute
52 respiratory syndrome), MERS (Middle East respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus),
53 H1N1, and Ebola. From these previous health emergencies, short- and long-term effects
54 on the healthcare workers' mental health, such as post-traumatic stress disorder
55 (PTSD) (S. M. Lee et al., 2018; Maunder et al., 2006), depression (A. M. Lee et al.,
56 2007; Liu et al., 2012), anxiety (A. M. Lee et al., 2007), stress and burnout (Maunder
57 et al., 2006) symptoms were common (Prete et al., 2020). There is evidence that
58 healthcare workers are distressed from the epidemics, during and after emergencies, and
59 that these effects also extend to the general population in the form of severe anxiety,
60 post-traumatic stress disorder, depression and increased rates of substance abuse
61 (Brooks et al., 2020; Haider et al., 2020; Lau et al., 2005; Main et al., 2011; Mak et al.,
62 2009; Zhang & Ma, 2020). Although some promising results from vaccine trials are
63 starting to emerge, the novel and highly infective virus continues to force governments
64 around the world to limit people's movements and, in some cases, re-adapt lockdown
65 restrictions once again, as in the case of the UK on September 22nd, 2020.

66 Closing schools and universities, shutting non-essential businesses, enforcing working
67 from home policies and online teaching, struggling with financial difficulties and leaving
68 the house only for necessities have fuelled genuine and perceived health threats that
69 have rapidly become ubiquitous for large populations worldwide. While restrictions

70 have helped flatten the infection curve, legitimate concerns about the physical and
71 mental health consequences have been raised. As such, this pandemic, as an extreme
72 global stressor, has provided an unprecedented opportunity for researchers to
73 investigate how several aspects of our personal life, and specifically our mental health,
74 are affected by prolonged isolation and restrictions. Social isolation is one known threat
75 to mental and physical well-being (Hall-Lande et al., 2007; Valtorta et al., 2016) and an
76 established risk factor for mortality (Alcaraz et al., 2019; Cacioppo et al., 2015;
77 Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015). Social isolation is associated with poor sleep quality
78 (Friedman, 2011) and with an increased risk of cognitive decline (Barnes et al., 2004).
79 The fact that our perception of self is ingrained in the social comparison with others
80 (Festinger, 1954) suggests that social isolation may not be an ideal situation for the
81 development of our identity either. Latest COVID-19 studies of the first weeks of
82 lockdown have already documented psychological distress, such as depression, anxiety,
83 post-traumatic stress and insomnia in Italy (Castelli et al., 2020; Gualano et al., 2020;
84 Rossi et al., 2020) and China (Ahmed et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020), the two countries
85 most severely hit by COVID-19 at the beginning of the pandemic, as well as Austria
86 (Pieh et al., 2020) and Switzerland (Elmer et al., 2020). In fact, with some preliminary
87 results on COVID-19 restrictions, this paper aims to add a piece of knowledge to the
88 existing literature to provide a scientific contribution and help governments in the
89 design of future possible lockdowns. Against this backdrop of existing psychological
90 consequences from lockdown, this study focuses on the physical and psychological
91 constructs that best predict the time spent in lockdown (TIL).

92

Methods

93 Questionnaire

94 A 20-minute online survey (available in 7 languages) was administered through the
95 website www.GlobalCOVIDStudy.com between 17 April 2020 and 10 July 2020 to
96 participants aged 18 years and above who had access to the survey link. This was
97 distributed using various social media channels (email, LinkedIn, Whatsapp, Instagram,

98 Facebook and Reddit). The survey was designed by the Global COVID Study team in
99 order to explore participants' moods and behaviours. The battery of questionnaires
100 consisted of 359 questions assessing 13 main domains: social suspicions, schizotypal
101 traits, physical health, sleep quality, aggression, empathy, anxiety, depression, worries
102 and stress, loneliness, parenting style, Special Educational Needs and demographic
103 information (see <https://osf.io/fe8q7> for more details). The study was approved by the
104 UCL Ethics Committee (REC 1331).

105 **Participants**

106 Participants for the study were recruited through convenience sampling and, eventually,
107 a total of 2,276 people (aged 18 and above) from 66 countries completed the survey
108 during lockdown. Respondents who did not give consent to treat their data ($N = 32$),
109 with incomplete ($N = 712$) or missing data ($N = 294$), or who could not complete the
110 survey within two days from their enrollment ($N = 76$) were excluded. To train the
111 Random Forest, we chose not to consider the participants who took more than one day
112 because the process required the model to find patterns of dependency between the
113 features and the amount of time spent in lockdown. Considering the fact that, in our
114 hypothesis, the time in lockdown played a role in determining the variability of the
115 selected features, by considering only the participants who completed the survey within
116 the same day, we aimed at reducing possible confounds. Furthermore, participants who
117 completed the survey from a country that was different from the one they were a
118 resident of were excluded from the study ($N = 132$). Considering the variety of
119 lockdown measures across the world, this criterion was adopted in order to reduce
120 possible confounds given by the type of restrictions adopted by individual countries.
121 Another possible confound came from the fact that not all the governments decided to
122 adopt lockdown restrictions against the pandemic and, when they did, different
123 countries entered the lockdown on different dates. For these reasons, among the
124 countries that adopted these restrictions, the new variable "Weeks in lockdown" - the
125 time of survey completion - was computed for each participant. Thus, participants were

126 grouped and compared regardless of the specific date in which their countries decided to
127 adopt restrictions, but uniquely by the amount of time spent in lockdown. Within this
128 pool of data, the UK and Greece samples were selected for the analysis conducted in
129 this study. Three main reasons drove the choice of using data from these two countries:
130 a) the sample sizes (>100 cases); b) the existence of a clear date of lockdown beginning;
131 and c) the same time span (weeks in lockdown) covered. To maintain the coverage on
132 the same time period, UK participants that completed the survey after week 9 of
133 lockdown were excluded from the study (N = 40). To summarise, the UK sample
134 consisted of 382 participants (Gender: Female = 302, Male = 71, Non-binary = 4,
135 Prefer not to say = 2, Self-identified = 3; Age: mean = 37.18; SD = 13.15), while the
136 Greek sample counted 129 participants (Gender: Female = 92, Male = 37; Age: Mean
137 = 36.08, SD = 10.79) (see Table 1).

138 **Data Analysis**

139 From the dataset, 10 variables capturing participants' living environment, mental and
140 physical health were selected (see Table 2). This procedure aimed to remove the noise
141 in the dataset by discarding the non-informative variables. All the variables for which
142 scores could not show a variation caused by the amount of time in lockdown were
143 excluded. Some examples of these variables are gender, ethnicity, dimensions of one's
144 house, and other similar variables. Moreover, considering the criteria for which data
145 from participants could potentially have at least one NA data were not considered for
146 the analysis, the next step of the selection was to optimise the number of participants
147 by not considering the variables that had a large amount of NA data.

148 In order to investigate the role of time spent in lockdown on modulating the effects of
149 lockdown restrictions (study pre-registration: <https://osf.io/8xtbq>), the study
150 consisted of two parts. In the first, we aimed at understanding which aspect was most
151 sensitive to time. In other words, which part of our physical and mental life was
152 affected the most by the time in lockdown. In the second, the interest was on how this
153 most sensitive aspect was modulated by the time.

154 **Identification of the most influential variable.** Without any available literature
155 to guide our hypothesis in identifying the variable that is most influenced by TIL, we
156 adopted a data-driven Machine Learning approach where a RandomForest (Breiman,
157 2001) regression model was trained to predict the week in which each participant
158 completed the survey, based on the total scores of the 10 selected variables. The model
159 creates an ensemble of decision trees based on the predictive information of the input
160 variables. The performance of the model was evaluated based on Mean Squared Error
161 (MSE). The data used to train the RandomForest model were those of the 382 UK
162 residents who were in the UK at the time of participation in this study. Initially, the
163 dataset was partitioned into train (75% of participants) and test (25% of participants).
164 The training process was repeated and evaluated several times on different randomized
165 folds of the train dataset to optimize the number of decision trees and rank the
166 variables based on their importance. A Borda count (Jurman et al., 2012) was then
167 computed on the rankings of variables obtained from each training iteration to identify
168 the most important variable to predict the week of survey completion. The optimal
169 number of decision trees that emerged from the training was 50. The final model, with
170 the optimal number of trees, was then trained on the whole train partition and
171 evaluated on the test partition. The adopted training scheme is standardized and was
172 derived from bioinformatics applications that are used to identify clinical biomarkers
173 from genetic data (Consortium et al., 2010).

174 **Statistical validation.** In the second part of the study, we used a Kruskal-Wallis test
175 to assess whether the most important variable (identified by the RandomForest model)
176 significantly changes during the lockdown from weeks 3 to 7. In case of significant
177 results, we adopted post-hoc Kruskal-Wallis tests to compare pairwise the 3rd week
178 with the 4th to 7th weeks. The Bonferroni method was used to correct the significance
179 level for multiple comparisons. In conducting statistical analyses, we first focused on
180 the same set of participants used to train the RandomForest model, then we validated
181 results on the dataset of participants from Greece.

Results

MSE on the training and the test partitions was 1.33 and 1.94 respectively and the feature with the highest importance was perceived loneliness (see Figure 1). Notably, scores of perceived loneliness decreased during weeks 3 to 5 after lockdown and subsequently increased in the following weeks, returning to the initial values (see Figure 2). The Kruskal-Wallis test on the data of UK participants from the 3rd to 7th week confirmed that at least one week was statistically different from the others ($H=12.86$, $p=0.012$). We then compared the 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th week with the 3rd. Significant differences were found for the 4th ($H=11.360$, $p=0.001$) and 5th ($H=7.077$, $p=0.008$) week, but not for the 6th ($H=4.011$, $p=0.045$) and the 7th ($H=0.368$, $p=0.544$) week. The same procedure was repeated on participants from Greece, focusing only on the 3rd to 6th weeks, as only one participant completed the survey during the 7th week. The results confirmed that perceived loneliness significantly changes over weeks 3 to 6 ($H=8.27$, $p=0.041$), with a significant difference between the 3rd and the 5th weeks ($H=7.6$, $p=0.006$). The difference between the 3rd and the 4th weeks ($H = 3.87$, $p=0.049$) failed to survive the Bonferroni correction. No difference was found between the 3rd and the 6th week ($H=0.68$, $p=0.408$).

Discussion

The aim of this study was to assess the impact of lockdown restrictions on people's mental and physical health. Although we adopted a rigorous methodology to train the predictive model, the achieved performances on train and test partitions are low: this outcome reflects the complexity of the psycho-social mechanisms that were at play during the lockdown period. While the questionnaires aimed at quantifying a broad range of the aspects of interest, other aspects may not have been observed. Additionally, this study investigated the temporal variations of these mechanisms, whose effects on the observed variables might be even more difficult to identify. That said, one advantage of the machine learning approach is that it permits the identification of variables that are more sensitive to the time spent in lockdown, rather

210 than a focus on predictive capability.

211 The low performance does not affect the reliability of the ranking of the variables,
212 which identified perceived loneliness as the most sensitive variable. Perceived loneliness
213 in the UK decreased during the first 4-5 weeks after the start of the lockdown, before
214 returning to initial values afterwards. The pattern was replicated in the Greek sample,
215 albeit in a smaller group of participants. This confirms that perceived loneliness does
216 capture a sensitive decrease during weeks 4-5 since the start of lockdown.

217 These results are somewhat surprising. In the emerging literature about COVID-19, the
218 number of friends and one's social support seem to play a protective role against the
219 effect of lockdown on loneliness (Bu et al., 2020a, 2020b). Counterintuitively, from our
220 study it emerged that, even though a large part of the global population was not able to
221 see their close friends, partner and family, levels of perceived loneliness interestingly
222 decreased during the initial period of lockdown. The dissociation between the objective
223 and the subjective degrees of social support has been largely discussed in the existing
224 literature (Cacioppo & Hawkley, 2009; Hawkley et al., 2008). It is believed that
225 perceived social isolation represents a quantitative or (more often) qualitative mismatch
226 between an individual's need for social support and the subjective evaluation of the
227 social support that is obtained (Hawkley & Capitanio, 2015). In other words, the
228 feeling of loneliness, resulting from the perception of social isolation, seems to depend,
229 more than on an objective condition of isolation, on a cognitive evaluation and
230 perception of the social environment. In the existing literature, the feeling of loneliness
231 emerged to be connected to the concept of Self (Goswick & Jones, 1981), the person's
232 cognitive functioning (Cacioppo & Hawkley, 2009) and, in general, the mental and
233 physical well-being of the individual (Cacioppo et al., 2015; Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015;
234 Richardson et al., 2017; Valtorta et al., 2016). For instance, lonely people are more
235 likely to suffer from depression (Jackson & Cochran, 1991; Mushtaq et al., 2014),
236 Alzheimer's disease (Holwerda et al., 2014; Mushtaq et al., 2014), alcoholism (Åkerlind
237 & Hörnquist, 1992; Hawkley & Cacioppo, 2010; Mushtaq et al., 2014), suicide (Mushtaq
238 et al., 2014; Stravynski & Boyer, 2001), personality disorders (Mushtaq et al., 2014) and

239 sleep problems (Mushtaq et al., 2014). It is not yet clear the reason behind the results
240 that emerged from this study, but some hypotheses can be advanced. For instance,
241 considering the definition of loneliness as a mismatch between desired and obtained
242 social support, the decrease of its levels in the first weeks of lockdown could signify that
243 people in that period of time were receiving the desired social support or even more of
244 it in terms of quantity, or that it is higher in quality. On the other hand, loneliness
245 could decrease as a result of a drop in the standards used for evaluating the received
246 social support. In times of danger, this could be an adaptive feature, for it could
247 facilitate behaviours of affiliation among people of the same group. As a matter of fact,
248 facing an external threat has the short-term effect of increasing cohesiveness among the
249 members of a group (Sherif et al., 1961; Staw et al., 1981). The threat of external
250 dangers (such as invaders) has often been used from past and present political leaders in
251 order to rule their countries and to increase the sense of community among the
252 population. It is possible that not only personified external threats like foreigners trying
253 to invade one's country, but also environmental dangers, such as the COVID-19
254 pandemic, can directly modulate the degree of cohesiveness among the members of a
255 group, in this case an entire population of a country. As a matter of fact, this increased
256 cohesion could have had a role in the initial decrease in levels of perceived loneliness
257 that we observed among people from the UK and Greece. Even though no certain
258 explanation can be given for understanding the observed patterns of perceived
259 loneliness, the findings of this study support the idea that social isolation (as the
260 objectively low social support) and loneliness (as the subjectively low social support)
261 are different concepts, not necessarily linked to each other, as philosophers in the past
262 centuries have largely pointed out. Having observed that lockdown restrictions have
263 short-term effects on people's feeling of loneliness and not knowing the real meaning
264 behind these observed patterns, in our opinion, the design of possible future lockdown
265 measures should be accompanied by the consideration of the role played by real and
266 perceived social support for people's physical and mental well-being.

267

Author contribution

268 Conceptualization: A.B., G.G., K.K.W., G.E.; Data curation: A.C., A.B., G.G.,
269 K.K.W.; Data analysis, Data interpretation, Writing: A.C., A.B.; Revision: A.C., A.B.,
270 G.G., K.K.W., A.R., G.E.; Supervision: G.E. All authors read and agreed to the
271 published version of the manuscript.

272

Conflicts of interest

273 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

274

Ethics

275 Ethical approval for the COVID-19 Social Study was granted by the UCL Ethics
276 Committee (REC 1331). The study is GDPR compliant.

277

Funding

278 This research is supported by Nanyang Technological University (Singapore) under the
279 NAP-SUG grant (G.E.).

References

280

- 281 Ahmed, M. Z., Ahmed, O., Aibao, Z., Hanbin, S., Siyu, L. & Ahmad, A. (2020).
282 Epidemic of covid-19 in china and associated psychological problems. *Asian*
283 *journal of psychiatry*, 102092.
- 284 Åkerlind, I. & Hörnquist, J. O. (1992). Loneliness and alcohol abuse: A review of
285 evidences of an interplay. *Social science & medicine*, 34(4), 405–414.
- 286 Åkerstedt, T. & Gillberg, M. (1990). Subjective and objective sleepiness in the active
287 individual. *International Journal of Neuroscience*, 52(1-2), 29–37.
- 288 Alcaraz, K. I., Eddens, K. S., Blase, J. L., Diver, W. R., Patel, A. V., Teras, L. R.,
289 Stevens, V. L., Jacobs, E. J. & Gapstur, S. M. (2019). Social isolation and
290 mortality in us black and white men and women. *American journal of*
291 *epidemiology*, 188(1), 102–109.
- 292 Barnes, L. L., De Leon, C. M., Wilson, R. S., Bienias, J. L. & Evans, D. A. (2004).
293 Social resources and cognitive decline in a population of older african americans
294 and whites. *Neurology*, 63(12), 2322–2326.
- 295 Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45(1), 5–32.
- 296 Brooks, S. K., Webster, R. K., Smith, L. E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N.
297 & Rubin, G. J. (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to
298 reduce it: Rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet*.
- 299 Bu, F., Steptoe, A. & Fancourt, D. (2020a). Loneliness during a strict lockdown:
300 Trajectories and predictors during the covid-19 pandemic in 38,217 united
301 kingdom adults. *Social Science & Medicine*, 113521.
- 302 Bu, F., Steptoe, A. & Fancourt, D. (2020b). Who is lonely in lockdown? cross-cohort
303 analyses of predictors of loneliness before and during the covid-19 pandemic.
304 *medRxiv*.
- 305 Buysse, D. J., Reynolds III, C. F., Monk, T. H., Berman, S. R. & Kupfer, D. J. (1989).
306 The pittsburgh sleep quality index: A new instrument for psychiatric practice
307 and research. *Psychiatry research*, 28(2), 193–213.

- 308 Cacioppo, J. T., Cacioppo, S., Capitanio, J. P. & Cole, S. W. (2015). The
309 neuroendocrinology of social isolation. *Annual review of psychology*, *66*, 733–767.
- 310 Cacioppo, J. T. & Hawkley, L. C. (2009). Perceived social isolation and cognition.
311 *Trends in cognitive sciences*, *13*(10), 447–454.
- 312 Castelli, L., Di Tella, M., Benfante, A. & Romeo, A. (2020). The spread of covid-19 in
313 the italian population: Anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress symptoms.
314 *Canadian Journal of psychiatry. Revue Canadienne de Psychiatrie*,
315 706743720938598–706743720938598.
- 316 Consortium, M. Et al. (2010). The microarray quality control (maqc)-ii study of
317 common practices for the development and validation of microarray-based
318 predictive models. *Nature biotechnology*, *28*(8), 827.
- 319 Elmer, T., Mepham, K. & Stadtfeld, C. (2020). Students under lockdown: Comparisons
320 of students' social networks and mental health before and during the covid-19
321 crisis in switzerland. *Plos one*, *15*(7), e0236337.
- 322 Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human relations*, *7*(2),
323 117–140.
- 324 Friedman, E. M. (2011). Sleep quality, social well-being, gender, and inflammation: An
325 integrative analysis in a national sample. *Annals of the New York Academy of*
326 *Sciences*, *1231*, 23.
- 327 Goswick, R. A. & Jones, W. H. (1981). Loneliness, self-concept, and adjustment. *The*
328 *Journal of Psychology*, *107*(2), 237–240.
- 329 Gualano, M. R., Lo Moro, G., Voglino, G., Bert, F. & Siliquini, R. (2020). Effects of
330 covid-19 lockdown on mental health and sleep disturbances in italy.
331 *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *17*(13), 4779.
- 332 Haider, I. I., Tiwana, F. & Tahir, S. M. (2020). Impact of the covid-19 pandemic on
333 adult mental health. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, *36*(COVID19-S4).
- 334 Hall-Lande, J. A., Eisenberg, M. E., Christenson, S. L. & Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2007).
335 Social isolation, psychological health, and protective factors in adolescence.
336 *Adolescence*, *42*(166).

- 337 Hawkey, L. C. & Cacioppo, J. T. (2010). Loneliness matters: A theoretical and
338 empirical review of consequences and mechanisms. *Annals of behavioral*
339 *medicine*, *40*(2), 218–227.
- 340 Hawkey, L. C. & Capitano, J. P. (2015). Perceived social isolation, evolutionary fitness
341 and health outcomes: A lifespan approach. *Philosophical Transactions of the*
342 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *370*(1669), 20140114.
- 343 Hawkey, L. C., Hughes, M. E., Waite, L. J., Masi, C. M., Thisted, R. A. &
344 Cacioppo, J. T. (2008). From social structural factors to perceptions of
345 relationship quality and loneliness: The Chicago health, aging, and social
346 relations study. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences*
347 *and Social Sciences*, *63*(6), S375–S384.
- 348 Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T. & Stephenson, D. (2015).
349 Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: A meta-analytic
350 review. *Perspectives on psychological science*, *10*(2), 227–237.
- 351 Holwerda, T. J., Deeg, D. J., Beekman, A. T., van Tilburg, T. G., Stek, M. L.,
352 Jonker, C. & Schoevers, R. A. (2014). Feelings of loneliness, but not social
353 isolation, predict dementia onset: Results from the Amsterdam study of the
354 elderly (Amstel). *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, *85*(2),
355 135–142.
- 356 Jackson, J. & Cochran, S. D. (1991). Loneliness and psychological distress. *The Journal*
357 *of psychology*, *125*(3), 257–262.
- 358 Johns, M. W. (1991). A new method for measuring daytime sleepiness: The Epworth
359 sleepiness scale. *sleep*, *14*(6), 540–545.
- 360 Jurman, G., Riccadonna, S., Visintainer, R. & Furlanello, C. (2012). Algebraic
361 comparison of partial lists in bioinformatics. *PloS one*, *7*(5), e36540.
- 362 Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L. & Williams, J. B. (2001). The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief
363 depression severity measure. *Journal of general internal medicine*, *16*(9),
364 606–613.

- 365 Lau, J. T., Yang, X., Pang, E., Tsui, H., Wong, E. & Wing, Y. K. (2005). Sars-related
366 perceptions in hong kong. *Emerging infectious diseases*, *11*(3), 417.
- 367 Lee, A. M., Wong, J. G., McAlonan, G. M., Cheung, V., Cheung, C., Sham, P. C.,
368 Chu, C.-M., Wong, P.-C., Tsang, K. W. & Chua, S. E. (2007). Stress and
369 psychological distress among sars survivors 1 year after the outbreak. *The*
370 *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, *52*(4), 233–240.
- 371 Lee, P. H., Macfarlane, D. J., Lam, T. H. & Stewart, S. M. (2011). Validity of the
372 international physical activity questionnaire short form (ipaq-sf): A systematic
373 review. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*,
374 *8*(1), 115.
- 375 Lee, S. M., Kang, W. S., Cho, A.-R., Kim, T. & Park, J. K. (2018). Psychological
376 impact of the 2015 mers outbreak on hospital workers and quarantined
377 hemodialysis patients. *Comprehensive psychiatry*, *87*, 123–127.
- 378 Liu, X., Kakade, M., Fuller, C. J., Fan, B., Fang, Y., Kong, J., Guan, Z. & Wu, P.
379 (2012). Depression after exposure to stressful events: Lessons learned from the
380 severe acute respiratory syndrome epidemic. *Comprehensive psychiatry*, *53*(1),
381 15–23.
- 382 Main, A., Zhou, Q., Ma, Y., Luecken, L. J. & Liu, X. (2011). Relations of sars-related
383 stressors and coping to chinese college students' psychological adjustment during
384 the 2003 beijing sars epidemic. *Journal of counseling psychology*, *58*(3), 410.
- 385 Mak, I. W. C., Chu, C. M., Pan, P. C., Yiu, M. G. C. & Chan, V. L. (2009). Long-term
386 psychiatric morbidities among sars survivors. *General hospital psychiatry*, *31*(4),
387 318–326.
- 388 Matheny Jr, A. P., Wachs, T. D., Ludwig, J. L. & Phillips, K. (1995). Bringing order
389 out of chaos: Psychometric characteristics of the confusion, hubbub, and order
390 scale. *Journal of applied developmental psychology*, *16*(3), 429–444.
- 391 Maunder, R. G., Lancee, W. J., Balderson, K. E., Bennett, J. P., Borgundvaag, B.,
392 Evans, S., Fernandes, C. M., Goldbloom, D. S., Gupta, M., Hunter, J. J. Et al.

- 393 (2006). Long-term psychological and occupational effects of providing hospital
394 healthcare during sars outbreak. *Emerging infectious diseases*, 12(12), 1924.
- 395 Mushtaq, R., Shoib, S., Shah, T. & Mushtaq, S. (2014). Relationship between loneliness,
396 psychiatric disorders and physical health? a review on the psychological aspects
397 of loneliness. *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR*, 8(9), WE01.
- 398 Organization, W. H. (2020a). Coronavirus disease (2019) - Weekly Epidemiological
399 Update.
- 400 Organization, W. H. (2020b). Coronavirus Disease 2019 - Situation Report – 51.
- 401 Pieh, C., Budimir, S. & Probst, T. (2020). The effect of age, gender, income, work, and
402 physical activity on mental health during coronavirus disease (covid-19)
403 lockdown in austria. *Journal of psychosomatic research*, 136, 110186.
- 404 Preti, E., Di Mattei, V., Perego, G., Ferrari, F., Mazzetti, M., Taranto, P.,
405 Di Pierro, R., Madeddu, F. & Calati, R. (2020). The psychological impact of
406 epidemic and pandemic outbreaks on healthcare workers: Rapid review of the
407 evidence. *Current psychiatry reports*, 22(8), 1–22.
- 408 Raine, A. & Chen, F. R. (2018). The cognitive, affective, and somatic empathy scales
409 (cases) for children. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 47(1),
410 24–37.
- 411 Richardson, T., Elliott, P. & Roberts, R. (2017). Relationship between loneliness and
412 mental health in students. *Journal of Public Mental Health*.
- 413 Rossi, R., Socci, V., Talevi, D., Mensi, S., Niolu, C., Pacitti, F., Di Marco, A.,
414 Rossi, A., Siracusano, A. & Di Lorenzo, G. (2020). Covid-19 pandemic and
415 lockdown measures impact on mental health among the general population in
416 italy. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 11.
- 417 Russell, D. W. (1996). UCLA loneliness scale (version 3): Reliability, validity, and factor
418 structure. *Journal of personality assessment*, 66(1), 20–40.
- 419 Sherif, M., Harvey, O., White, B. J., Hood, W. R. & Sherif, C. W. (1961). Intergroup
420 conflict and cooperation. *The robbers cave experiment. Oklahoma*.

- 421 Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B. & Löwe, B. (2006). A brief measure for
422 assessing generalized anxiety disorder: The gad-7. *Archives of internal medicine*,
423 *166*(10), 1092–1097.
- 424 Staw, B. M., Sandelands, L. E. & Dutton, J. E. (1981). Threat rigidity effects in
425 organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis. *Administrative science quarterly*,
426 *501*–524.
- 427 Stravynski, A. & Boyer, R. (2001). Loneliness in relation to suicide ideation and
428 parasuicide: A population-wide study. *Suicide and life-threatening behavior*,
429 *31*(1), 32–40.
- 430 Valtorta, N. K., Kanaan, M., Gilbody, S., Ronzi, S. & Hanratty, B. (2016). Loneliness
431 and social isolation as risk factors for coronary heart disease and stroke:
432 Systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal observational studies. *Heart*,
433 *102*(13), 1009–1016.
- 434 Wang, C., Pan, R., Wan, X., Tan, Y., Xu, L., McIntyre, R. S., Choo, F. N., Tran, B.,
435 Ho, R., Sharma, V. K. Et al. (2020). A longitudinal study on the mental health
436 of general population during the covid-19 epidemic in china. *Brain, behavior, and*
437 *immunity*.
- 438 Zhang, Y. & Ma, Z. F. (2020). Impact of the covid-19 pandemic on mental health and
439 quality of life among local residents in liaoning province, china: A cross-sectional
440 study. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *17*(7),
441 2381.

Sample	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Week 6	Week 7	Week 8+	TOT
UK	38	78	75	69	97	25	382
Greece	7	86	18	17	1	0	129

Table 1

Distribution of participants from the UK and Greece by week.

Score	Description	Reference
Mild activity difference	Difference between days of mild physical activity post- and pre- COVID-19 lockdown.	<i>International Physical Activity Questionnaire – Short Form</i> (IPAQ-SF, 6-items) (P. H. Lee et al., 2011)
Mild activity time difference	Difference between minutes of mild physical activity post- and pre- COVID-19 lockdown.	<i>International Physical Activity Questionnaire – Short Form</i> (IPAQ-SF, 6-items) (P. H. Lee et al., 2011)
Moderate activity difference	Difference between days of moderate physical activity post- and pre- COVID-19 lockdown.	<i>International Physical Activity Questionnaire – Short Form</i> (IPAQ-SF, 6-items) (P. H. Lee et al., 2011)
Sleep quality	Self-reported sleep quality and quantity, where higher scores reflect better sleep quality.	<i>Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index</i> (2-items) (Buysse et al., 1989), <i>Eppworth Sleepiness Scale</i> (Johns, 1991), <i>Subjective and Objective Sleepiness Scale</i> (Åkerstedt & Gillberg, 1990)
Empathy	Self-reported affective, cognitive, and somatic empathy, where higher scores reflect higher empathy.	<i>Cognitive, Affective, Somatic Empathy Scale</i> (CASES, 30-items) (Raine & Chen, 2018)
Anxiety	Higher scores reflect higher anxiety.	<i>General Anxiety Disorder-7</i> (GAD-7) (Spitzer et al., 2006)
Depression	Higher scores reflect higher depression.	<i>Patient Health Questionnaire-9</i> (PHQ-9, 9-items) (Kroenke et al., 2001)
Perceived loneliness	Higher scores reflect higher perceived loneliness.	<i>Loneliness Questionnaire</i> (LQ, 20-items) (Russell, 1996)
Living conditions/environment	Higher scores reflect more chaotic home environments.	<i>Chaos, Hubbub, and Order Scale and Health Risk Behaviors</i> (CHAOS, 6-items) (Matheny Jr et al., 1995)
Beliefs	Perceived effectiveness of govern-	Summed 9-items on COVID-19




Figure 1. Average importance of the selected variables.




Figure 2. Distribution of perceived loneliness scores for each week for participants from the UK (left) and Greece (right).

